



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—Tuesday, June 9, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by the guest chaplain, Rabbi Harold Kravitz from Minnetonka, MN.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Our God of all that is good, it is a privilege to be inside this Capitol Building, richly designed to inspire those who govern to achieve the loftiest goals possible for this Nation.

Guide the Senators who sit in this Chamber to do what the Book of Deuteronomy describes: "that which is right and good in the sight of the Eternal One."

We pray for all Americans, especially those who lack sufficient food to feed themselves and their families. This body has the power to change this reality, to do that which is right and good.

May the One who Provides Sustenance for All—Hazan et Hakol—bless this United States Senate with the wisdom and compassion to act on its responsibilities for those who are vulnerable and in need.

May all God's people in this land be able to live with dignity and share in the plenty with which this Nation is blessed.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the majority leader and I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Thank you, Leader REID.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to thank Rabbi Harold Kravitz for offering the opening prayer today in the Senate and to praise him for all of his excellent work.

Rabbi Kravitz is rabbi at Adath Jeshurun in my State of Minnesota and is an important leader in our State. In addition to serving his congregation, Rabbi Kravitz is also a leader in the fight against hunger. He is outgoing chair of the board of Mazon: A Jewish Response to Hunger, where he has been working to end hunger for all people regardless of their faith background.

One of the things most notable about Rabbi Kravitz is his commitment to bringing together people of all faiths to end hunger. I especially want to recognize Rabbi Kravitz's work in Minnesota to make school lunches free and available for all children.

No child should ever go hungry. We know kids won't do as well in school when they are hungry. It is also just wrong. That is why I have taken up the issue at the Federal level as well, to try to make this commonsense policy that Rabbi Kravitz has championed in Mazon as widespread as possible.

Rabbi Kravitz has done excellent work in Minnesota and as a national leader in the fight against hunger. Thank you for that, Rabbi, and thank you again for offering the opening prayer this morning.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, sometimes the divide between the White House and reality can be stark. That was evident yesterday when President Obama told us that Obamacare was "working" and that essentially "none" of the warnings of the law's failures and broken promises had come to pass. I imagine the families

threatened with double-digit premium increases would beg to differ, as would the millions of families who received cancellation notices for the plans they had and wanted to keep. That is especially true considering something else the President said—that Obamacare "hasn't had an adverse effect on people who already had health insurance." That is what the President said, that Obamacare hasn't had an adverse effect on people who already had health insurance. President Obama actually said that. It may border on the absurd, but he did say it.

Perhaps the President will make even more bizarre claims today as he tries to bolster the image of a law that only 11 percent of Americans say is a success—only 11 percent of Americans say Obamacare is a success—or perhaps he will keep realities facing the middle class in mind. Instead of jousting with reality again, perhaps he will consider the concerns of constituents who write in literally every day to tell us how this law is hurting them. Maybe he will remember the Kentuckian who wrote to tell me this: "I cried myself to sleep."

"I cried myself to sleep," said this Kentuckian who wrote to me about this law. That is how she felt after losing health coverage with her employer and then being forced—forced—into an exchange plan she called "subpar" with a nearly \$5,000 deductible. How helpful to most middle-class people is a health insurance policy with a \$5,000 deductible? She said, "I work hard for every penny I earn, and this is completely unacceptable." It is also another example of a law that has failed, and the sooner President Obama can come to grips with that reality, the sooner we can work together to replace the fear and anguish of Obamacare with the hope and promise of true health care reform.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, the Defense authorization legislation before

the Senate would authorize the programs and funding that provide the kind of training and equipment our military needs in the face of aggressive threats such as ISIL. It would provide a well-deserved pay raise to the brave men and women who give us everything to keep us safe. It contains exactly the same level of funding—exactly the same level of funding—President Obama requested in his own budget: \$612 billion.

It is just the kind of legislation you would expect to receive strong bipartisan support. Up until now, it has. The NDAA is a bill we typically consider every year, and it is one that typically passes with bipartisan support. This year's House bill passed with votes from both parties, while the Senate version of the bill passed the Armed Services Committee by a huge bipartisan margin of 22 to 4. That was in the Senate Armed Services Committee, the vote on the bill we have before us. It should be sailing through the Senate for passage by a similar margin this week, but some in the Democratic leadership are now trying to hold it hostage for partisan reasons.

We live in an age when, as Henry Kissinger recently put it, "the United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War." Yet some Democratic leaders seem to think this is the moment to hold our national security hostage to the partisan demands for more spending on Washington bureaucracies, such as the IRS. They seem to think it is OK to hold our troops and their families to ransom if they can't plus-up unrelated bills, such as the one that funds their own congressional offices.

The Armed Services Committee chairman just penned an op-ed on the issue that I would ask my colleagues to read. It made many important points, including this one: There is bipartisan consensus that we cannot continue to hold defense funding at BCA levels after years of dangerous cuts. Military officials have told us that to do so could put American lives at risk, which means it is a scenario we should be working to avoid at all costs. But some Democratic leaders seem to view such a worrying scenario as little more than leverage to extract more spending for unrelated bureaucracies.

"It is the first duty of the federal government to protect the nation," Senator McCain wrote in his piece. "With global threats rising, it simply makes no sense to oppose a defense policy bill full of vital authorities that our troops need for a reason that has nothing to do with national defense spending." He is right.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator McCain's op-ed be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Here is what I am asking today. I am asking every sensible Democratic col-

league to keep onside with the American people and pull these party leaders back from the edge. I am asking my friends across the aisle to join with us to support wounded warriors instead of more partisan brinksmanship, to give our troops a raise instead of giving gridlock a boost. And I am asking them to work with us to defeat the contingency funding amendment offered by the senior Senator from Rhode Island so that we can keep this bill intact and consistent with the budget resolution.

The new Congress has been on a roll in recent months, getting things done for the American people in a spirit of greater openness and cooperation. Let's keep the momentum going. Let's keep that spirit alive. If Senators have amendments, I would encourage them to work with Senator McCain to get them processed. But above all, let's ignore the partisan voices of the past and work together for more shared achievements instead. I think our troops and their families deserve no less.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Politico, June 9, 2015]

OBAMA IS WRONG TO HOLD DEFENSE FUNDING HOSTAGE

(By Sen. John McCain)

Congress has passed a National Defense Authorization Act, vital legislation providing the necessary funding and authorities for our military and the men and women who volunteer to defend the nation, for 53 consecutive years. This year's NDAA should be no different.

The NDAA delivers sweeping defense reforms that will enable our military to rise to the challenges of a more dangerous world. The legislation contains the most significant reforms in a generation to a broken acquisition system that takes too long and costs too much. It modernizes and improves our 70-year-old military retirement system, expanding benefits to the vast majority of service members excluded from the current system. The NDAA reforms Pentagon management to ensure precious defense dollars are focused on our war fighters, not on expanding bloated staffs, which have grown exponentially in recent years.

With \$10 billion in wasteful and excessive spending identified in the Pentagon's budget, the legislation invests in crucial military capabilities for our war fighters. The bill accelerates Navy shipbuilding and adds fighter aircraft to address shortfalls across the services. As adversaries threaten our military technological advantage, the bill looks to the future and invests in new breakthrough technologies, including directed energy and unmanned combat aircraft.

Despite these critical reforms, President Barack Obama is threatening to veto the NDAA and future defense spending bills for reasons totally unrelated to national security.

The Budget Control Act, which set in motion dangerous defense cuts, establishes caps on defense and nondefense discretionary spending. There is bipartisan consensus on the dangerous impact these spending caps would have on defense. All of the military service chiefs testified this year that funding defense at the level of the BCA caps would put American lives at risk.

Rather than seeking to avoid this scenario at all costs, the president is using it as leverage to extract increases in nondefense spending. As his veto threat made clear, the president "will not fix defense without fixing non-defense spending."

Such intransigence shows a disturbing misalignment of White House priorities. It is the first duty of the federal government to protect the nation. With global threats rising, it simply makes no sense to oppose a defense policy bill full of vital authorities that our troops need for a reason that has nothing to do with national defense spending.

The NDAA fully supports Obama's budget request of \$612 billion for national defense, which is \$38 billion above the spending caps established by the Budget Control Act. In other words, this legislation gives the president every dollar of budget authority he requested. The difference is that NDAA follows the Senate Budget Resolution and funds that \$38 billion increase through Overseas Contingency Operations funds.

Parroting White House rhetoric, some Senate Democrats have been spreading misinformation about OCO funding, saying this funding is inappropriate or somehow limited in its ability to support our military. This is nonsense. The NDAA purposefully placed the additional \$38 billion of OCO funding in the same accounts and activities for which the president himself requested OCO money.

To be clear, using OCO to pay for our national defense is not my preference. But given the choice between OCO money and no money, I choose OCO, and multiple senior military leaders testified before the Armed Services Committee this year that they would make the same choice for one simple reason. This is \$38 billion of real money that our military desperately needs, and without which our top military leaders have said they cannot succeed.

It remains my highest priority as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee to achieve a long-term, bipartisan solution that lifts the BCA caps once and for all. Obama says this is his goal as well. But the NDAA is a policy bill—not a spending bill—and cannot accomplish that goal. In the absence of such an agreement, I refuse to ask the brave young Americans in our military to defend this nation with insufficient resources that would place their lives in unnecessary danger. Holding the NDAA hostage to force that solution would be a deliberate and cynical failure to meet our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense.

It is simply incomprehensible that as America confronts the most diverse and complex array of crises around the world since the end of World War II, that a president would veto funding for our military to prove a political point. The NDAA before the Senate authorizes \$612 billion for national defense. This is the amount requested by the president and justified by his own national security strategy. For the sake of the men and women of our military and our national security, it's time the president learned how to say yes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the majority leader can't seem to let the facts as

they exist get in the way of his ideology. The facts are that the Affordable Care Act is working, and 16.5 million people are proof of that because they have access to health care, most of whom did not have it before.

In the light of day, it has been shown that private insurance companies were taking advantage of the American people. They cannot do that now under the Affordable Care Act. Companies that are proposing these huge rate increases simply won't get them. Understand that 80 percent of every dollar that is charged by an insurance company in premiums—80 percent of it—has to go toward caring for people. If it doesn't, there are rebates, and hundreds of thousands of Americans during the last few years have gotten rebates as a result of insurance companies not spending 80 percent of the money they are getting in premiums for health care.

The sad commentary is that insurance companies took advantage—took advantage by not insuring people who had preexisting disabilities. One “disability” that insurance companies said was preexisting was the fact that you are a woman. Some insurance companies charged more for the same care if you are a woman and not a man. We have wide-ranging evidence that was in existence before and I guess my Republican colleagues want back again where insurance companies determine how much—they could arbitrarily cut off insurance to someone. They had these arbitrary limits. They can't do that anymore. Senior citizens have received millions of benefits from the Affordable Care Act. They get a wellness check every year for no cost at all. They no longer have to worry about the hole in the doughnut, so to speak, as we call it, on coverage for their prescriptions.

There are many things we can talk about. The fact is that the Affordable Care Act is working, and we are going to continue to defend it as the American people want us to do.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate will vote on an important amendment offered by a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, the Senator from Rhode Island, JACK REED, who is also the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

I commend Senator REED for the stellar job he has done in being a manager of this bill. He is one of the most thoughtful and responsible Members of the Senate and always has been. He has great legislative experience, having served in the House before he came here.

Senator REED's amendment addresses a major threat to our national security and the middle class—sequestration. Sequestration refers to deep, mindless,

automatic cuts throughout the government. These cuts were authorized 4 years ago to force Congress to reduce the deficit in a balanced way.

Unfortunately, they did not work. Republicans are unwilling to close even a single tax loophole—not a single tax loophole to reduce the deficit. Now we face the prospect of arbitrary and unreasonable cuts that were once assumed to be so stupid that Congress would not allow them to happen. But something that everyone thought was stupid is now official Republican policy. Unless we can reach a bipartisan agreement to fix sequestration, these cuts will occur, not smoothly but as if done by a meat cleaver.

That threatens not only our military security but also the economic security of America's middle class, which really is our national security. The bill aims to avoid sequestration for the Defense Department with a widely ridiculed budget loophole, which would put actual defense spending on the Nation's credit card, increasing our deficit and our debt.

I am stunned by my friend, the senior Senator from Arizona. When I was an appropriator, I was on this Senate floor and I watched him, with his staff in the back of the room every time we did an appropriations bill. He pored through line by line with his staff of every appropriations bill. If there was something he thought was askew he would object to it. We got used to that because, frankly, it saved money over time.

He referred to all the pork that was in these bills, and he and I disagreed on what was determined to be pork, but I understood where he was coming from. I am just flabbergasted now that the senior Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is agreeing to a one-time gimmick. All the experts have said these gimmicks don't work—especially this one. Now, the committee, led by my friend the senior Senator from Arizona, is agreeing to this gimmick. Think of that. The Republicans, led by the senior Senator from Arizona, are advocating deficit spending big time—not a little bit, big time—tens of billions of dollars.

Our troops deserve better than this. Meanwhile, unless we deal with the impact of sequestration more broadly, middle-class America will suffer drastic cuts in things that matter to them the most—cuts in priorities such as education, job creation, and lifesaving research. Sequestration of nondefense programs is also an attack on our military families. For example, sequestration threatens to cut VA spending, health care spending for the military, job training for returning veterans, schools that teach children of military families, and heating assistance for veterans who are struggling.

If we are going to be fair to military families, just as to millions of other

working Americans, we need to fix sequestration for more than just the Pentagon. We need to fix it for defense and nondefense programs jointly. Defense and nondefense are inextricable. They are certainly things we cannot separate.

That is what the Reed amendment is designed to change through bipartisan negotiations. There is no reason to wait to negotiate a bipartisan budget. It makes no sense to start spending extra money on defense or anything else until we agree on an overall plan. Put simply, we ought to budget first and spend later. That is the only responsible way for a family or our Nation to conduct its business.

That is why the Reed amendment makes so much sense. I urge my colleagues to support the Reed amendment. A plan that avoids unnecessary cuts to priorities such as education, job creation, and research is what the Reed amendment is all about. It is a plan that funds all agencies that protect our security, including the FBI, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Drug Enforcement Administration—all of these vital programs. It is a plan that funds our troops, protects military families, and makes the long-term investment needed to ensure a secure, prosperous future for all Americans.

Less than 2 years ago, Democrat PATTY MURRAY and Republican PAUL RYAN proved it could be done. Let's put an end to the games and gimmicks and start putting together a responsible budget.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

The Senator from South Dakota.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last fall, Republicans promised that if we were elected to the majority in the Senate, we would get the Senate working again. A big part of that is getting the appropriations process working again. When the Senate is functioning properly, 12 separate appropriations bills are considered individually in the Appropriations Committee and then brought to the Senate floor for debate and amendment.

This process is designed to allow Senators to carefully examine programs and consider the best and most responsible way to distribute funding. But the appropriations process has not worked that way for a while. Too often, over the past few years, the majority of the year's appropriations bills have been thrown together in one catchall funding bill, greatly reducing Senators' ability to take a hard look at spending and to ensure that funds are being allocated responsibly.

Republicans are determined to change that. We started the appropriations process by passing a balanced budget resolution for the first time in over 10 years. This week, we continue the process with the National Defense Authorization Act, which authorizes funding for our Nation's defense and our men and women in uniform. This authorization bill is the first step in the appropriations process for defense funding under what we call regular order.

This legislation accomplishes a number of important things. It authorizes funding for our military at the President's requested level of \$612 billion. It also eliminates waste and inefficiencies. Specifically, the bill targets \$10 billion in wasteful and unnecessary spending and redirects those funds to military priorities such as funding for aircraft and weapons systems and modernization of Navy vessels.

The bill also focuses heavily on reform. The military's current process for acquiring new equipment and technologies is inefficient and bureaucratic. It wastes our Nation's resources and, even more importantly, it reduces our military readiness by delaying the acquisition of essential weapons, equipment, and technology. The National Defense Authorization Act introduces broad reforms to modernize and streamline the acquisitions process, which will significantly improve the military's ability to access technology and equipment when it needs it.

The act also implements a number of reforms to the Pentagon's administrative functions. Over the past few years, Army Headquarters staff has increased while combat personnel have been cut. Army Headquarters staff increased 60 percent over the past decade, yet the Army is currently cutting brigade combat teams.

From 2001 to 2012, the Department of Defense's civilian workforce grew at five times the rate of Active-Duty military. Prioritizing bureaucracy at the expense of our preparedness and our Active-Duty military is not an acceptable use of resources.

The Defense authorization bill that we are considering changes the emphasis at the Department of Defense from administration to operations, which will help ensure that our military personnel receive the training they need and that our military is ready to meet

any threats that arise. Finally, this bill overhauls our military retirement system. The current military retirement system limits retirement benefits to soldiers who served for 20 years or more, which eliminates 83 percent of those who have served, including many veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The National Defense Authorization Act replaces this system with a modern retirement system that would extend retirement benefits to 75 percent of our servicemembers. The bill before us today is a strong bill. It is the product of bipartisan efforts. It authorizes funding for our troops at the level requested by the President and provides key reforms that will strengthen our Nation's defense and improve training benefits and quality of life for our servicemembers.

Supporting this legislation should be a no-brainer. Incredibly, however, the President has threatened to veto this important legislation. His reason is that the President does not want our military to receive the increased levels of funding proscribed in this bill unless the President's nondefense funding priorities receive an increased level of funding.

That is right. Apparently, President Obama is willing to hold up funding for our Nation's military until Congress provides more funding for agencies such as the IRS and the EPA. Well, the President can certainly make his case to Congress when it comes to funding government agencies. Holding troop funding hostage for political purposes is reckless and irresponsible. If that were not enough, the White House is busy lobbying Senate Democrats to abandon bipartisan efforts that went into this bill and back up a Presidential veto.

The National Defense Authorization Act plays a key role in keeping our Nation safe. The President's attempt to hijack this bill for his political purposes is wrong. I very much hope that he will consider the implications of what he is doing and rethink that threat.

OBAMACARE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, before I close, I want to take just a few minutes and discuss the President's health care law. The President made some comments yesterday on the upcoming Supreme Court ObamaCare decision. Referring to his health care law, the President said:

What's more, the thing's working. Part of what's bizarre about this whole thing is we haven't had a lot of conversations about the horrors of ObamaCare because it hasn't come to pass.

That was from the President yesterday. Let me just repeat and put that into context. The President of the United States thinks that ObamaCare

is working and that negative predictions about the law have not come to pass. Well, to respond to that, let me just read a few headlines from the past couple of weeks. This from CNN: "Obamacare sticker shock: Big rate hikes proposed for 2016." From the Associated Press: "Many health insurers go big with initial 2016 rate requests." From The Hill: "Overhead costs exploding under ObamaCare, study finds." From the Associated Press again: "8 Minnesota health plans propose big premium hikes for 2016." From the Lexington Herald-Leader: "Most health insurance rates expected to rise next year in Kentucky."

I could go on. The truth is that not only is ObamaCare not working, but it is rapidly unraveling. A May 1 headline from the Washington Post reported: "Almost half of Obamacare exchanges face financial struggles in the future."

Hawaii's exchange has already failed. California's exchange is struggling to sign up consumers. One-third of the consumers who purchased insurance on the California exchange in 2014 declined to reenroll in 2015. The Massachusetts exchange is being investigated by the Federal Government.

Colorado's exchange is struggling financially and has raised fees for consumer insurance plans. Rhode Island's Governor is pushing for new fees on insurance plans to help fund the \$30.9 million operating cost of the Rhode Island exchange. Now, incidentally, that is \$30.9 million to run an exchange that serves just 30,000 people.

The Minnesota exchange was supposed to cover more than 150,000 individuals in its small business marketplace by 2016. So far, it is covering 1,405 individuals, or approximately 1 percent of the number it is intended to cover. The Minnesota exchange has cost Federal taxpayers \$189 million so far—\$189 million for an exchange that provides coverage for just 61,000 people.

A recent Forbes article notes that Vermont's exchange "will need \$51 million a year to provide insurance to fewer than 32,000 enrollees—or \$1,613 per enrollee in overhead. Before ObamaCare, \$1,600 would have been enough to pay for the entire annual premium for some individual insurance plans."

While the ObamaCare exchanges unravel, health insurance costs on the exchanges are soaring. Insurers have requested double-digit premium increases on 676 individual and small group plans for 2016. More than 6 million people are enrolled in plans facing average rate increases of 10 percent or more. Around the country, rate increases of 20, 30, 40, and even 50 percent are common.

One health care plan in Arizona is seeking a rate increase of 78.9 percent—so much for the President's promise that his health care plan would "bring

down the cost of health care for millions". In my home State of South Dakota, proposed rate increases range up to 44.4 percent. That is not something South Dakota families can afford.

The discussion about ObamaCare's success or failure is no longer theoretical. The evidence is in, and it shows the President's health care law is broken. It is time to repeal ObamaCare and to replace it with real health care reforms that will actually drive down costs. Five years under ObamaCare is long enough for American families.

EPA RULE AND BIG STONE PLANT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the President's misguided plan to reduce carbon emissions from existing powerplants, specifically the impact it is going to have on my home State, South Dakota.

Over the last year, EPA has claimed its rule will grant States flexibility to meet burdensome emission reduction targets. However, there is really only one way for South Dakota to meet its staggering target of a 35-percent reduction; that is, by effectively shutting down Big Stone Plant, our only base-load coal-fired plant, which will soon be among the cleanest in the country.

The plant, which provides affordable power to thousands in South Dakota and neighboring States, is nearing completion of a \$384 million environmental upgrade project to meet the EPA's regional haze and Utility MACT regulations. So as you can see, the clean powerplant would threaten this significant investment.

The EPA has required this nearly \$400 million upgrade—which is more than the original cost, the entire original cost of the plant itself—and is now turning around and saying: That is not enough. We want it shut down.

Let me repeat that. The EPA has required a \$384 million environmental upgrade to make the plant among the cleanest in the country and now wants to put all that to waste. This isn't right, and this will stick South Dakotans with holding the bill.

When the Obama EPA pushes new regulations to attack affordable and reliable coal generation, it is low-income families who take the biggest hit. South Dakotans have already seen their electricity rates increased to pay for that \$384 million add-on, but the Clean Power Plan will limit the ability for this investment to be recouped, and now they will be charged even more.

This is because the Clean Power Plan would require Big Stone Plant to run less, even on a limited or seasonal basis, not at the high capacity for which it was designed and is most efficient. At the same time, the Clean Power Plan would require the plan to run more efficiently to meet strict emission requirements. So, again, we have had this nearly \$400 million in-

vestment to make the plant cleaner and more efficient in order to satisfy the EPA, and now the Obama EPA wants to shut it down.

The Obama EPA should not push regulations that result in higher utility costs for consumers, less grid reliability, and fewer jobs. Affordable and reliable energy helps grow the economy and helps low- and middle-income families make ends meet.

Unfortunately, the EPA's rule will only increase electrical rates and hurt those who can afford it the least by forcing our most affordable energy sources offline.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this burdensome rule and to prevent the serious economic burden it will impose on middle-income families in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this morning President Obama will be speaking at a meeting of the Catholic Health Association of the United States.

Now, the White House says the President will talk about his health care law. The President has already been spending a lot of time talking about the law. At the G7 summit in Germany this past weekend, the President was asked about the law and what he said is: "The thing is working."

He said: "We haven't had a conversation about the horrors of ObamaCare because none of them have come to pass."

The President must be kidding himself.

This morning, when he talks to this Catholic health care group, President Obama should stop his denial and he should confess the truth. If he gives another rosy speech about the impact of this terrible law, he will be, once again, intentionally and deliberately misleading the people in his audience.

The President should not stand on the stage today and pretend his law is helping more people than it hurts. He should not stand on that stage today and pretend he hasn't heard that his law is causing premiums to skyrocket. He should not stand on that stage today and pretend he has kept his promises about this law. He should not stand on that stage today without admitting his law has cut into the take-home pay of millions of hard-working Americans.

What the President should do is talk about how his health care law has hurt nonprofit hospitals like the Catholic hospitals across the country. That was the subject of a Wall Street Journal article just last Wednesday with the headline: "Hospitals Expected More of a Boost From Health Law."

Now, remember, President Obama said his health care law was going to help hospitals. He said it would help hospitals because uninsured people wouldn't be coming into the emergency room needing free care anymore.

Well, that hasn't happened. Even more people are going to the emergency room today. According to the Wall Street Journal, nonprofit hospitals have seen a huge increase in Medicaid patients—and Medicaid pays only about half of the cost of caring for patients.

The article gives an example of a group of nonprofit hospitals near St. Louis. It has lost about \$5 million as a result of President Obama's Medicaid expansion. That is a big hit for a nonprofit hospital to take. It directly affects hospitals' ability to continue providing high-quality care.

If President Obama is honest today, I would say he needs to explain to this Catholic health care group why his health care law has not lived up to expectations. Is he going to explain why his law is hurting their ability to provide care? It is not only hospitals that are being hurt by ObamaCare, millions of people across the country are seeing the news that their insurance premiums might soar by 20 percent, 30 percent or even more next year.

In North Carolina, Blue Cross Blue Shield says it needs to raise premiums by 26 percent. In Minnesota, Blue Cross wants to raise rates by 54 percent. President Obama spent part of his childhood in Hawaii. One insurance company there is planning to raise premiums by 49 percent.

Will the President explain to this group today why premiums are skyrocketing?

I will tell you why they are skyrocketing. It is because of the cost of all the Washington-mandated services that came from ObamaCare. Another reason costs are going up is all the bureaucracy that came with the health care law.

There was an article in The Hill newspaper May 27 with the headline: "Overhead costs exploding under ObamaCare, study finds."

The article says:

Five years after the passage of ObamaCare, there is one expense that's still causing sticker shock across the health care industry: overhead costs.

It continues:

The administrative costs for healthcare plans are expected to explode by more than a quarter trillion dollars over the next decade, according to a new study.

This is \$270 billion "over and above what would have been expected had the health care law not been enacted."

That is what this study found.

Under the health care law, Washington has been spending billions of taxpayer dollars on health care: \$1 out of every \$4 is going to overhead—not to treat sick or injured people, not to help

or prevent disease, no, to overhead. It is the President's law. It is incredible. This money isn't being used to help one sick child, to provide medicine for a single individual, it is overhead.

As one of the study's authors put it, the money "is just going to bureaucracy." According to this study, this works out to \$1,375 per newly insured person per year under Obama's health care law. Now, of course, people's premiums are going through the roof. The health care law created or raised 20 different taxes.

Maybe President Obama today should explain why \$1 out of every \$4 that Washington spends on health care should go to bureaucracy instead of caring for patients. The President's health care law is hurting hard-working American families who are going to have to pay premiums of 40 to 50 percent more next year. It is hurting the hospitals that are supposed to provide the actual health care to those patients. It is wasting hundreds of billions of dollars on overhead and bureaucracy instead of caring for sick people.

ObamaCare is an expensive disaster. Now, that is not just my opinion. A new poll came out the other day from CNN. It found only 11 percent, only one in nine Americans say the law is a success. President Obama says the law is working. Well, only one in nine agree with him. In another poll, just 39 percent of people support the law. That is down 10 percentage points in 1 year.

You ask: Why is it?

Well, because people look at it and say it is a bad deal for them personally.

The President made promises, and he has broken them. He said: If you like your coverage, you can keep your coverage.

Millions lost their coverage. He said the cost of insurance premiums would drop by \$2,500 per year.

Costs have exploded, the cost of the premiums, the cost of the copays, the cost of the deductibles, and many people who have this expensive new insurance cannot get care. Coverage does not equal care. That is why this health care law is more unpopular now than ever before.

Sometime this month the Supreme Court could make an important decision about the health care law. The Court is set to rule on whether some of the billions of taxpayer dollars that President Obama has been spending were even supposed to be spent under the law. This decision could affect more than 6 million Americans. So you would assume the White House is prepared for the decision. You would assume the White House would have a plan.

Well, does the White House have a plan for these 6 million Americans who are worried about how they will pay for their expensive, new ObamaCare plans with all of its mandates? Not according to the President.

In Germany yesterday, the President refused repeatedly—refused—to talk about a plan B. The closest he came was to say, "Congress could fix this whole thing with a one-sentence provision." That is not a real solution. People see their premiums going up, and they are very concerned.

President Obama owes America a serious answer. Republicans aren't interested in a one-sentence fix unless that sentence is: ObamaCare is repealed.

We want to protect the American people from this complicated, confusing, and costly health care law.

If the Court rules against the President, then Republicans will be ready to sit down with Democrats to get some things right. That means stopping ObamaCare's broken promises and its harmful mandates.

Republicans will offer a plan, and we will work with the President to give people back the freedom, the freedom to make health care choices that work for them and for their families. It will be up to the President and Democrats in Congress whether they want to join us or if they want to continue with their partisan fight and their delusions that this law is popular and working. I hope they will work with us on the reforms the American people need, want, and deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

ARENA ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise to speak about our Nation's energy economy.

"Alpha Natural to Lay Off 439 at West Virginia Coal Mine"; "Murray Energy expects more than 1,800 coal mine layoffs"; "Job Cuts Are Devastating Blow for Ohio Valley Coal Miners"; "Coal analyst says industry facing toughest time"; "Power Bills To Get Higher"—these are just some of the headlines that have been in the recent news in my area. These headlines are a stark reminder of the impact misguided Federal policies will have on the lives of real people.

West Virginia and other energy-producing States have suffered devastating blows. Hard-working Americans are losing their jobs as their energy bills keep climbing. I come to the floor to encourage my colleagues to stand up for our Nation's energy future.

Last month, I introduced the Affordable Reliable Energy Now Act—the ARENA Act—with Leader McConnell, Chairman INHOFE, my fellow West Virginian JOE MANCHIN, and nearly 30 of my colleagues. This bipartisan legislation would empower States to protect families and businesses from electricity rate increases, reduced electrical reliability, and other harmful effects of the Clean Power Plan.

The ARENA Act would require that any greenhouse gas standards set by the EPA for new coal-fired powerplants are achievable by commercial powerplants, including highly efficient plants that utilize the most modern, state-of-the-art emissions control technologies.

Back in February, I asked EPA Acting Assistant Administrator Janet McCabe to explain why, despite multiple invitations from Federal and State legislators, the EPA did not hold a public hearing on its proposed Clean Power Plan in West Virginia, given the large role coal plays in our economy and our electricity generation. And do you know what she said? She told me public hearings were held in places where people were "comfortable." Well, that response is unacceptable to me and to the people of my State. That response, which represents EPA's disregard for the real-world impacts of its policies, helped shaped this legislation.

The EPA's proposed greenhouse gas regulations will negatively impact both energy affordability and energy reliability. Coal provided 96 percent of West Virginia's electricity last year and West Virginia was among the lowest electricity prices in the Nation. Last year, the average price was 27 percent below the national average, but these low prices are not likely to survive this administration's policies.

Studies have projected that the Clean Power Plan will raise electricity prices in West Virginia between 12 and 16 percent. Just last month, 450,000 West Virginia families learned of a 16-percent increase in the cost of electricity. While there were multiple factors that contributed to this rate increase, compliance with previous EPA regulations played a significant role. If we allow EPA's plan to move forward, last week's rate increase will only be the tip of the iceberg.

Affordable energy matters. Mr. President, 430,000 low- and middle-income families in West Virginia, which is nearly 60 percent of our State's households, take home an average of less than \$1,900 a month and spend 17 percent of their aftertax income on energy. These families are especially vulnerable to the price increases that will result from the Clean Power Plan.

Other West Virginia families will bear the brunt of the EPA's policy more directly. In the past few weeks, 1,800 West Virginia coal miners received layoff notices. The notices came at Alpha Natural Resources and Murray Energy—the two largest coal companies in our State. Patriot Coal also filed for bankruptcy for a second time. Three coal-fired powerplants closed, also costing more jobs in the State of West Virginia.

When mines and coal-fired powerplants close, the ripple effect is felt throughout our entire economy. The Wheeling Intelligencer reported that

the Murray Energy layoffs alone would mean almost \$62 million in annual lost wages for Ohio Valley residents.

Other parts of our State have been hit just as hard. In Nicholas County, the local government was forced to lay off employees, including a number of sheriff's deputies, because of a drop in the coal severance tax.

Last month, the Energy Information Agency released its analysis of the proposed rule. The administration's own energy statistician found that the Clean Power Plan would shut down more than double the coal-fired power-plant capacity we have by the end of this decade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. CAPITO. I thank the Chair. I urge support for the ARENA Act, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, what is our parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. NELSON. May I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to give my overall support for the content of the Defense authorization bill, but my considerable concern and, therefore, my "no" vote on final passage in the Committee on Armed Services was because the bill, as crafted by the majority in the committee, is a travesty, using an artificial budget to authorize the necessary operations and troop readiness of our military establishment.

Now, that is what the bill does. It is an artificial budget. That may not sound particularly offensive, particularly when as a policy bill there are many good things in this Defense bill; things such as providing for the increase of our military services; things such as certain weapons systems that are authorized.

Historically, this bill has been recognized as being bipartisan, and it addresses the problems posed by an increasingly dangerous world. The Defense authorization bill has historically provided the military with the resources our Nation needs. But the ranking Democrat, the Senator from Rhode Island, and I are compelled to oppose this bill because it addresses these problems with an artificial budget that treats an essential part of our military, which is preparedness—the necessary operations training and maintenance, preparedness of our military—in an unplanned way. They are treating it as an expense by sending it

over to an account that is not even on the budget—an account called overseas contingency operations or the funds for what used to be the Iraq war and is now the winding down of the Afghanistan war. This is an unbudgeted item—operations readiness, training—necessary for our military to be ready, and they are taking it out of the Defense Department budget and sticking it over here. Now, that doesn't make sense.

Some might say: Well, why in the world would they do that? Because folks around here are concerned about something called the sequester, which is supposedly an artificial limit on keeping expenditures of the Federal Government below a certain level. That may sound like a good thing, if it is done with legitimate numbers, but when in fact you are creating that artificial limit pressing down on Federal spending, but you take a major part of that Federal spending out and put it over here in an unaccounted-for account that doesn't reach those budgetary caps, that is nothing more than—I will put it politely—budgetary sleight of hand. I will put it more directly: That is budgetary fakery. Therefore, this Senator is going to oppose the bill.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services has received testimony from military leader after military leader—chief master sergeants, generals, admirals—who have said the policy of this arbitrary budget cap called sequestration is harming our national security and is putting our military strategy at risk.

Our strategy is not just dependent on defense spending, but it is very dependent upon nondefense spending, which in this bill is not even being addressed because that artificial ceiling—the sequestration—is like a meat ax right across the Federal budget. That is affecting—and every one of those military leaders will tell you—that is affecting our military preparedness.

These arbitrary budget caps impact this nondefense spending. It keeps us from providing funds for other agencies that are so essential to the national security. The Coast Guard, they are out there in the war zone. They are in another war zone down in the Caribbean as they are interdicting all kinds of drug smugglers. What about the FBI, the CIA, the DEA, Customs, Border Patrol, Air Traffic Control, TSA? All of those are affected and affect national security.

So if we are going to continue to budget like this, the result is going to be more budget uncertainty for our military, and it is going to end up bleeding funds away from our military readiness.

What we are doing is we are avoiding the obvious. The obvious is working around to bring those numbers down under those artificial budget caps. So it is time for us to get rid of the sequester. We did it before, 2 years ago,

with a bipartisan budget—the one known as Murray-Ryan. We need to do it again. Otherwise, right now, we are wasting our time working on bills that have no chance of becoming law. We need to fix the budget caps for defense and nondefense spending. You do not use a bandaid when you have an artery that is gushing blood.

Now, it is not just this. There are other examples. Take, for example, a program that I have some familiarity with—our Nation's space program. We have been trying since 2010, since Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, a Republican from Texas, and I passed a NASA authorization bill that put us on the course that will ultimately, as the President has now announced, take us to Mars. But we can't get the policy updated because we can't pass another NASA authorization bill. So what happens? It goes to the Committee on Appropriations. Thank goodness we have folks such as Senator SHELBY and Senator MIKULSKI who direct that.

But now what is happening to appropriations bills? They are being put under this sequester, and, because of that, it is going to be hard in this Chamber to get 60 votes to pass appropriations bills. As a result, we are going to be in near cardiac arrest right at the end of the time, during a continuing resolution, which is no way to run a railroad when you appropriate money. We have to come to the altar and realize what we are facing, and that is this artificial budgetary cap.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following speakers in morning business be limited to speak for up to 5 minutes each: Myself, Senators GILLIBRAND, MANCHIN, and MARKEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to support amendment No. 1521, which would limit the use of overseas contingency operations, or OCO, funds. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this amendment, which was filed by the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator JACK REED.

I wish to start by thanking Senator MCCAIN and Senator REED for their leadership in producing the underlining bill. Drafting the National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA, is no small task, and I support many important provisions included in the bill. As Ranking Member of the Seapower Subcommittee, I worked with Chairman WICKER to include provisions that will

strengthen and support our Navy and Marine Corps.

Every Defense bill presents challenges and tradeoffs. There are competing priorities and compromises. For 52 consecutive years, both Chambers have debated the details and come up with a product that supports and enhances our national security. However, this year's bill presents more than just a difference over details. The overall framework of this bill is a problem. Before us is a bill that presents a serious question about our national values—a question that the Reed amendment would help to answer.

Earlier this year, the Republicans pushed through a budget resolution. That resolution clearly set forth the framework that Chairman MCCAIN had to work within. That framework basically said: We are not going to address sequestration in a meaningful way. Instead, we are only going to provide sequester relief for the defense budget. I note that this budget resolution passed the Senate without a single Democratic vote. I ask my colleagues to join me in objecting to an approach that bifurcates sequester relief as though our country's national security lies only with the Department of Defense, because that is what this NDAA bill does. How? The bill before us takes \$38 billion out of the base budget at the Department of Defense and moves it into the OCO budget. The OCO budget is not subject to Budget Control Act caps. The reason for this is that OCO funds are intended to support the unknown unknowns that arise during our security operations abroad. Using the OCO account to fund noncontingency items is irresponsible. It is a 1-year fix, and it adds to our budget deficit. It is not fair to our commanders on the ground, who have told us that we need to fix sequester permanently so they can prepare for the long term. Using the OCO account to shield the DOD from sequester has been called a gimmick by many.

I am for a strong national defense. However, the foundation of our military strength is the strength of our economy. It is the strength of our communities. It is the strength of our future. Failing to fix sequestration for both defense and nondefense will undermine the strength of our national defense. Again, our national security is not just tied to our military strength. There are other national security initiatives that are not funded by the Department of Defense. For example, we have the State Department, the FBI, Homeland Security, the Coast Guard, and other law enforcement agencies and programs that are all important components of our national security. None of these programs is funded by the Department of Defense.

In addition, the Department of Defense has said that fewer than one in four Americans in the eligible age range are qualified to enlist in the

Armed Services. This is due to a variety of reasons, including health, obesity, fitness, mental aptitude, et cetera. Cutting funding to nutrition programs, education initiatives, preventative health measures, and fitness programs will result in even fewer individuals qualifying for our Armed Services. By not fixing both the military and domestic sides of the budget, we are undermining the foundation of our security and our future.

America is one country, and the decisions we make in Congress should reflect that reality. We need to eliminate the sequester because these across-the-board cuts hurt our middle-class families, our small businesses, our military, and our national security. We need to eliminate the sequester—period. To continue to be bound by mindless, across-the-board cuts to both our defense and domestic budgets—cuts that were never supposed to become reality—is pure folly. Congress should come together in a spirit of bipartisan cooperation to fix sequester.

This proposal by Senator REED just fences the \$38 billion in OCO funds until Congress comes together to do just that. It doesn't take the funding out of the budget. But it does prevent spending it before relief from Budget Control Act cuts are achieved on both the defense and domestic sides.

I urge my colleagues to support the Reed amendment to provide for a responsible defense budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I have always said that being a superpower means more than super military might. It means super diplomacy. It would contain restraint and super fiscal responsibility. All of these are part of being a superpower.

Admiral Mullen, the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, once said that the greatest threat to our national security is our debt—not another nation, not another army, not the fear of terrorism, but basically our debt.

The United States has and will continue to have the greatest military in the world. But in order to remain the most powerful, we have to get our financial house in order. I think we all agree to that, but we don't seem to be practicing it very much.

I fully support Senator REED's amendment to basically fence the OCO funding.

If we look to see how we have gotten ourselves into the situation we have now, it is not Democrat or Republican. It is our fault, and it is our responsibility to fix it. Basically, we have had two wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that

we didn't fund. We did it through accounting procedures, emergency procedures, and contingency funds. Now we continue to expand upon that, if we go down this route without fixing it with Senator REED's amendment.

Ensuring the safety of the American people does not mean increasing defense spending to fund never-ending wars in the Middle East while ignoring nondefense programs that are also crucial to our national security. I have said this over and over. If we thought money and military might could fix that part of the world, the United States of America would have done it by now.

For years, critical nondefense programs, such as the Department of Homeland Security and the State Department, have been forced to absorb damaging across-the-board cuts. They are also extremely important in safeguarding the homeland.

While we continue to keep in place the budget cuts for these agencies, we have underhandedly gone around spending limits and improperly increased war funding. The most recent gimmick we are talking about, which has been explained, is an attempt to transfer roughly \$39 billion from the base budget to the OCO budget to increase funding for overseas conflict. I have said time and again that after a decade of war in the Middle East, costing more than \$1.6 trillion, does anyone believe we haven't done our part and tried? If money and might could have changed it, we would have done it by now.

What is more important is that we are denying the funding from other important programs that desperately need these funds to keep our country stable, safe, and secure. In order to be truly secure, we need our non-Department of Defense departments and agencies to be able to function at full capacity also. The Pentagon simply cannot meet the complex set of national security challenges without the help of other government departments and agencies. We are all in this together. We are all responsible to protect this country. But we are all responsible to make sure that we can properly ensure that people have the opportunity to take care of themselves also.

Retired Marine Corps General Mattis said: "If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition." He might have said that in jest, but I think underlying it he really meant it. And last week showed how vulnerable our networks are to cyber attacks from foreign nations and those who wish us harm.

We have had a cyber bill before us for many years now. We have been told on an almost weekly or monthly basis of the threat we face from all different countries trying to hack in to do us harm. Yet we haven't been able to

move because of the toxic political atmosphere we have here.

Our national security is also inherently tied to our economic security. Failures to invest in programs such as STEM education and infrastructure projects are short sighted. Failing to provide BCA cap relief to non-DOD departments and agencies would also shortchange our veterans who receive employment services, transition assistance, and housing/homeless support through other agencies such as the Department of Labor. The bottom line is that we need to get our long-term budget that reduces the deficit in line. Increasing the OCO money, as the bill does right now, only hurts that goal and makes it much more difficult and elusive.

Defense budgeting needs to be based on our long-term military strategy, which requires the Department of Defense to focus at least 5 years into the future. This is only a 1-year plan. Do we think it is not going to be extended and extended and extended? Do we think we are going to start it and stop it in 1 year? I don't think so.

The fiscally responsible approach we need to take is to fix the BCA caps. We are hearing about the whole issue of sequestration and how horrible it is. Well, let me tell you how you can fix it: Sit down and put together a budget that is realistic and makes our long-term financial plans solid. That is all it takes. Yet we are unwilling to do it. We are just condemning it. We are condemning it because it constrains how we want to do business, which means not being held accountable or responsible. That is all.

Every meeting I go to, whether it is nondiscretion or military spending—we all need more to expand programs. Yet we never take the GAO's report. The General Accountability Office says we could save \$300 billion to \$400 billion a year if we could just get rid of the waste and the redundancies that go on, and we are not doing anything about that.

I say again that our national debt is not a Democratic problem or a Republican problem. It is our problem. We all own this one.

In 2008, our country faced one of the worst financial crises in our Nation's history. We added \$1 trillion to our debt—on top of the trillions of dollars already spent on two costly wars and the Bush tax cuts, which President Obama basically extended twice.

Between the wars, the tax cuts, the recession, and our out-of-control spending, our Nation's debt has exploded from \$5 trillion to \$18 trillion. Currently, our deficits are decreasing, from \$1.4 trillion in 2009 down to a little under one-half billion dollars, according to the CBO, and it is expected to remain stable for the next couple of years.

The bad news is that after 2017, if we don't change our ways, the deficits are

projected to increase over \$1 trillion a year through 2025. Unless Congress can put aside partisan politics and put the country on a fiscally sustainable path, we will add over \$7.5 trillion to our debt in the next 10 years. That is adding \$7.5 trillion to \$18 trillion of debt we have right now. There is no way the next generation and the generation after will ever be able to dig out of this hole if we don't fix it now. But we have to be smart about how we reduce spending.

As we saw in the 2013 sequestration, indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts harmed bad and good programs alike, did nothing to reduce waste and abuse, and caused individuals to be furloughed and lose their jobs.

I have always said this: When you start cutting, you don't cut, basically, the items that continue to make progress for you. When the IRS doesn't do its job and it is incapable of doing it—the revenues owed to this country and the taxes that people should be paying—we can't cut back on that and expect it to be solid.

I have pushed hard for a bipartisan compromise that would reduce spending, fix our broken tax system, and reform entitlement programs in order to reduce our debt and provide the economy with certainty and stability.

For instance, we could enact \$2.5 trillion in deficit reduction over the next 10 years if we just follow the Simpson-Bowles recommendations. It is an all-encompassing approach that raises revenue and promotes growth through comprehensive tax reform that brings our Tax Code into the modern age—increasing efficiency and simplifying the process for both individuals and businesses.

Additionally, the plan enacts serious entitlement reform and makes additional targeted spending cuts aimed at long-term deficit reduction so that we can encourage economic growth. It is crucial that we make the necessary reforms that will make this Nation a better place for future generations.

With that being said, I again express my support for Senator REED's amendment to the defense budget that would block any additional unnecessary, unaudited spending for a continual war effort where we have no oversight. We were elected to basically look at the process we have.

I ask unanimous consent for an extra 2 minutes, if I could, to finish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANCHIN. With that being said, Mr. President, all I am saying is that we should be smart and learn from our past and the experiences we have had. It has not worked well for us right now, and we can change it. We are the only ones who can change it.

This country has a strong economy. It could be even stronger if we work to-

gether. The bottom line is we want to be smart. We want to be smart about where we invest our money and where we send our troops and put Americans in harm's way. We want to be smart in the domestic investments we make here in this country. We want to make sure they are working. If they are not working, then, you know what, do not be afraid to say: I tried and it did not work. I am going to try something different.

Basically, if you have two programs doing the same thing, consolidate. Let's start looking for ways that we can run this country the way each American is expected to run their life. Every small business or large business is expected to make prudent investments and work efficiently. That is all we have asked for. This type of spending, basically unaccountable, will lead us down the path to increase the debt and does not make us any more secure and gets us involved in places where we do not have any oversight or any input.

I do not—I do not—as a U.S. Senator wish to walk away from my responsibilities to make recommendations for what I think would be best for not only the West Virginia people, whom I represent, but for this entire country, which I love.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I voted against the Budget Control Act as a Member of the House of Representatives because I did not think it was a responsible course for our country. To me, "sequestration" is just a fancy term for mindless budget cuts. Unfortunately, sequestration became law and the mandated across-the-board spending cuts went into effect in March of 2013.

I have been fighting to completely eliminate sequestration through a balanced approach to Federal spending and changes to our Tax Code to reduce our budget deficit. That is why I am very disappointed that the Defense authorization bill we are considering today uses a budget gimmick to end sequestration cuts for defense spending but continues to impose mandatory cuts for critical domestic priorities, such as education, health care, and medical research.

This legislation transfers nearly \$40 billion in defense spending to a glorified slush fund called the overseas contingency operations account, OCO account, as a way to avoid triggering sequestration cuts. Let's be clear. OCO really stands for "open checkbook operation" for our budget, and it stands for "outrageous copout" by the GOP.

Instead of cutting funding for defense, Republicans choose instead to cut programs for the defenseless. This is not responsible budgeting; it is a cynical game. The majority is attempting to avoid its responsibilities under

sequestration that they themselves demanded be enacted into law just a few years ago. Instead, we get \$40 billion in additional spending for the Pentagon and \$36 billion in cuts to food stamps, Head Start, preventive health care, and critical social programs.

This is what the game is all about. Sequestration is now being dishonored. They believe they have found an exit ramp for the Defense Department for the cuts that they had accepted as a party—the Republicans—would be imposed if the Democrats would accept in equal measure cuts in social programs. That is the deal, a sword of Damocles hanging over both programs, defense and nondefense—that is civilian and domestic programs—to force us as an institution to work together in a responsible fashion. That was the deal with sequestration. That was the point of it. It was to force us to work together. Instead, the Republicans want an exit ramp for the Defense Department out of the sequestration program while allowing the social programs for the poor, for the sick, and for the elderly to stay inside of these cuts that occur under a sword of Damocles on an automatic basis.

We are endangering our ability to teach our kids the skills they will need for the jobs of the future. We are making it harder for poor families in Massachusetts and across the country to put food on the table. We are jeopardizing the health of grandma and grandpa.

And what are we really protecting when we mandate these cuts for critical social programs but not for our defense spending? We are protecting America's nuclear arsenal budget of \$50 billion a year that is filled with waste and can be cut significantly without harming our national security. We spend more money on nuclear weapons than all other countries combined. This is the epitome of overkill. Can we find anything in the nuclear weapons budget that could be cut? Absolutely not, say the Republicans. We have to increase that budget. How are we going to pay for it? We are going to pay for it from poor children, from the elderly in our country.

We spend more money on nuclear weapons just because the Defense Department and the military contractors want them. That is why I have introduced legislation with JEFF MERKLEY, BERNIE SANDERS, and AL FRANKEN called the SANE Act, the Smarter Approach to Nuclear Expenditures Act. It would cut \$100 billion over the next 10 years from our bloated nuclear weapons budget.

It is time to stop funding a nuclear weapons budget that threatens to undermine our long-term economic security. We should be funding education, not annihilation. We should be helping people find jobs, not helping to build new nuclear weapons. We should be

curing diseases, not creating new instruments of death.

Even within our own budget, the Department of Defense should be prioritizing higher pay for marines, not more Minutemen missiles. Somewhere, Dr. Strangelove is smiling from the grave while millions of American families struggle to meet the daily budget they have to balance.

I am a cosponsor of the Reed amendment to stop any increase in this so-called OCO account until the Budget Control Act caps for both defense and nondefense spending are lifted equally.

For those who say the cuts to defense spending endanger our security, I say we face a very real type of economic security threat here at home. Millions of seniors worry about an end to Medicare and Medicaid. Millions of students need help to pay for college. Millions of American workers cannot make ends meet on the minimum wage.

I support the Reed amendment. That will keep America truly safe, healthy, and secure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute.

McCain amendment No. 1456 (to amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.

Reed amendment No. 1521 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the availability of amounts authorized to be appropriated for overseas contingency operations pending relief from the spending limits under the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Cornyn amendment No. 1486 (to amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Vitter amendment No. 1473 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units.

Markey amendment No. 1645 (to amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Con-

gress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Reed (for Blumenthal) amendment No. 1564 (to amendment No. 1463), to increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

McCain (for Paul) Modified amendment No. 1543 (to amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

Reed (for Durbin) modified amendment No. 1559 (to amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.

McCain (for Burr) amendment No. 1569 (to amendment No. 1463), to ensure criminal background checks of employees of the military child care system and providers of child care services and youth program services for military dependents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3 p.m. will be equally divided between the managers and their designees.

The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, as we consider the amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island, I would like to again remind my colleagues that the world is in turmoil. The world has never seen greater crises since the end of World War II, according to people as well respected as Dr. Kissinger.

I repeat my assertion that OCO was not the right or best way to do business. The worst way to do business is to have an authorization that will eliminate our ability to defend this Nation and the men and women who serve it.

I urge my colleagues to read in this weekend's New York Times "The Global Struggle to Respond to the Worst Refugee Crisis in Generations."

Eleven million people were uprooted by violence last year, most propelled by conflict in Syria, Iraq, Ukraine and Afghanistan. Conflict and extreme poverty have also pushed tens of thousands out of parts of sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia. . . . the worst migration crisis since World War II, according to the United Nations.

That is what is going on in the world, and we are worried about how we are going to defend the Nation with priorities that are dramatically strewn and unfair.

"Islamic State attacks government office on western fringe of Baghdad." That was yesterday.

Three militants disguised in military uniform killed at least eight people in a local government office in Amiriyat al-Falluja in western Iraq on Tuesday, in an attack claimed by Islamic State.

"The U.S. Army's main Web site is down—and the Syrian Electronic Army is claiming credit."

The Syrian Electronic Army hacked the official Web site for the U.S. Army, a Twitter account apparently associated with the hacktivist group claimed Monday. The site

was down in the afternoon, while screenshots posted on the social network by the group purported to show messages of support for beleaguered Syrian President Bashar al-Assad on the site earlier in the day.

That was from the Washington Post, June 8 at 4:53 p.m.

The World: "Islamic State seizes power plant near Libyan city of Sirte."

Islamic State militants have seized a power plant west of the Libyan city of Sirte which supplies central and western parts of the country with electricity, the group and a military source said on Tuesday.

"The plant . . . was taken," Islamic State said in a message on social media, adding that the capture of the plant meant that the militants had driven their enemies out of the entire city.

Libya descending into chaos and ISIS extending its influence.

The Washington Post, June 6: "Libyan gains may offer ISIS a base for new attacks."

Misurata, Libya—As the Islamic State scores new victories in Syria and Iraq, its affiliate in Libya is also on the offensive, consolidating control of Moammar Gaddafi's former home town and staging a bomb attack on a major city, Misurata.

The Islamic State's growth could further destabilize a country already suffering from a devastating civil war. And Libya could offer the extremists a new base from which to launch attacks elsewhere in North America.

That was from the Washington Post.

FOX News, June 9: "ISIS captures 88 Eritrean Christians in Libya, US official confirms."

The ISIS terror group kidnapped 88 Eritrean Christians from a people-smugglers' caravan in Libya last week, a U.S. defense official confirmed Monday.

The Washington Post: "What is at stake in Ukraine if Russia continues its onslaught."

Ukraine is fighting a war on two fronts. The one you see on television is taking place in the east of our country, where thousands of Russian troops are engaged in an armed aggression against Ukraine's territorial integrity, including the illegal annexation of Crimea.

This is a piece that is important, by the Prime Minister of Ukraine, Arseniy Yatsenyuk.

The Wall Street Journal: "President Obama admits his anti-ISIS strategy isn't 'complete.'"

President Obama doesn't give many press conferences at home, so sometimes his most revealing media moments come when he's button-holed abroad. Witness his answer Monday in Austria to a question about Iraq.

Mr. Obama offered a startling explanation for why the war against Islamic State isn't going so well: His strategy still isn't up and running.

"We don't yet have a complete strategy because it requires commitments on the part of the Iraqis, as well, about how recruitment takes place, how that training takes place. And so the details of that are not yet worked out," Mr. Obama said.

We still do not have a strategy to try to counter the Islamic State or ISIS.

The quote continues:

Wow. Islamic State, or ISIS, took control of Mosul a year ago, and it beheaded two Americans for all the world to see last summer. Mr. Obama announced his anti-ISIS strategy in a September speech, promising to "degrade" and "destroy" the self-styled caliphate.

Nine months later here we are: ISIS has overrun Ramadi, a gateway to Baghdad, the grand alliance that Mr. Obama promised barely exists, the Kurds in the north are fretting publicly about the lack of weapons to forestall a major ISIS assault, the U.S. bombing campaign is hesitant, and now Mr. Obama tells us the training of Iraqis is barely under way.

I will skip through some of these because I know my colleagues are waiting to speak.

The Associated Press: "Activists: Syrian air raids kill 49 in northwestern village."

Government airstrikes on a northwestern Syrian village Monday killed at least 49 people and left survivors screaming in anguish as they pulled bodies from the rubble, according to activists and videos of the chaotic aftermath.

The Local Coordination Committees said two air raids on the village of Janoudiyeh in Idlib province killed 60 people and wounded others. The Britain-based Syrian Observatory for Human Rights said the air raid killed 49 people, including six children. It said the death toll could rise as some people are still missing.

The Associated Press June 6 headline: "Houthi rebels fire Scud missile from Yemen into Saudi Arabia."

BloombergView, by Eli Lake: "Iran Spends Billions to Prop Up Assad."

Iran is spending billions of dollars a year to prop up the Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad, according to the U.N.'s envoy to Syria and other outside experts. These estimates are far higher than what the Barack Obama administration, busy negotiating a nuclear deal with the Tehran government, has implied Iran spends on its policy to destabilize the Middle East.

By the way, I will add to that, Iranians are basically even taking over Cabinet positions in the Bashar al-Assad government.

This is a report dated June 5: "Report: China Dispatching Surveillance Vessels Off Hawaii."

China has begun dispatching surveillance vessels off the coast of Hawaii in response to the Navy's monitoring activities of disputed islands in the South China Sea. . . . The purported surveillance comes on the heels of raised tensions between China and the United States late last month. . . .

This from the June 7 edition of the Financial Times: "US struggles for strategy to contain China's island-building."

China's efforts to dredge new land on remote coral atolls in the South China Sea have left the US struggling to come up with a response.

For Washington, Chinese land-creation has helped make allies of former adversaries now fearful of military domination by an assertive China. The latest example was the trip to Vietnam last week by Ashton Carter, US defence secretary, who pledged US patrol craft to the Vietnamese navy.

But there is a limit to how far countries in the region are willing to present a united front to China, which has reclaimed 2,000 acres of land in the past 18 months, far outstripping all other claimants combined, according to Mr. Carter. The Obama administration is also unsure about how strongly it should push back against what US officials see as a long-term Chinese plan to control the region's waters.

Finally, this is an article that is in Politico today:

Actually, the United States does have a strategy to fight the Islamic State, a State Department spokesman says.

"The president was referring yesterday to a specific plan to improve the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces, and the Pentagon is working on that plan right now. But absolutely, we have a strategy," Kirby said Tuesday on MSNBC's "Morning Joe."

I would be overjoyed to have a complete strategy and that plan presented to Congress and the American people. It would be a wonderful event. The fact is they have no strategy or policy and the world is on fire, and here we are trying to pass an amendment which would deprive the men and women who are serving the means and wherewithal to defend this Nation.

I hope my colleagues will strongly reject the amendment that will be pending before this body.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator MIKULSKI, Senator MERKLEY, Senator UBALL, Senator LEAHY, Senator DONNELLY, Senator BOXER, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator BOOKER, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator CARDIN, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and Senator PETERS as cosponsors of the Reed amendment No. 1521 to H.R. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss my amendment No. 1521 to fence all funding above \$50.9 billion in the account for overseas contingency operations until budget caps on both defense and nondefense have been raised. My amendment specifically recognizes the need for these resources, but it objects to the way this OCO fund is being used as a way to circumvent the Budget Control Act. It does so, I think, on a very sound ground that over the long run will be beneficial to the Department of Defense and to everyone who is engaged in the defense of the United States.

We debate and vote on many issues in the Senate. While all of the issues are important, occasionally we must face an issue that could truly change the course of our Nation because the consequences of our actions are often not known for years. The votes may be very difficult when they are taken, but they are very important.

One example of such an issue is Iraq. Thirteen years ago, the majority of the body—79 Senators from both parties—

voted to go to war in Iraq. I did not vote in favor of the war. In fact, I spoke against it. I think the outcome could have been very different back then if we had more of a debate about the true costs and the long-term costs, the thousands of lives lost, and the countless wounded—some with invisible scars—if we had thought the United States would be on a war footing for over a decade and American taxpayers would be on the hook for trillions of dollars and that we would perhaps even contribute by our actions to new threats we are facing today.

Back then it was implied and sometimes stated that opposing the Iraq war meant you didn't support the troops or were weak on national security. I think the intervening years have shown that to be inaccurate.

We are hearing echoes of that rhetoric again: If you don't support this version of the NDAA, then you don't support the troops or terms like "taking this bill hostage." That is just not the case.

Since 2005, Senate Republicans voted against cloture on the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act, 10 times, and over that same period, they cast votes against final passage of the NDAA on the Senate floor 8 times. Sometimes it was because of policy differences, such as ending "don't ask, don't tell." Other times it was over something like gas prices at the pump or other issues. But I don't think anyone has ever done it to be unpatriotic.

We can't change history, but we can certainly learn from it. We can't see into the future, but we know we must plan for it, and we must pay for it by making strategic investments today. This debate really boils down to this: What is the most effective way to provide for our national defense? I don't think inflating the overseas contingency operations, OCO, is the way to go because it complicates rather than helps the Pentagon's budgetary problems. It doesn't allow the military to effectively plan for the future.

We need to replace the senseless sequester with a balanced approach that keeps America safe and strong at home and abroad. When it comes to the defense budget, Congress should adhere to the same standards of honesty, transparency, and discipline that we demand for our troops. But right now there is a serious disconnect in the OCO mechanism of this bill, and Congress needs to step up and fix it.

The President's fiscal year 2016 budget request for defense was \$38 billion above the 2011 Budget Control Act, the BCA—their spending caps. The President requested this \$38 billion be authorized and appropriated as part of the annual base budget so they could be part of the Defense Department's funding, not just for 1 year, as OCO is, but in the budget for an indefinite period of time.

The request also contained \$50.9 billion for the OCO account, meaning funding for truly war-related expenses and not enduring base budget requirements. However, this bill, following the lead of the majority's budget resolution, does not address the BCA's damaging impacts on defense and non-defense. Instead, it turns to a gimmick.

This bill initially transferred \$39 billion from the base budget request by the President to the OCO budget, leaving a base budget conveniently below the BCA levels in order to avoid triggering automatic reductions for sequestration. The funding shifted to OCO is for enduring requirements of military services, not direct war-related costs and not those costs generated in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. It includes flying hours for aircraft, steaming days for ships and submarines, and all training that supports the "National Military Strategy." These are not appropriate OCO expenses. These are the expenses of the Department of Defense facing the long-term challenges and maintaining the long-term capabilities of the U.S. defense forces.

Some have said we should avoid subjecting defense spending to the budget control caps through this OCO approach for a year while a deal to revise or eliminate the BCA caps is negotiated. I couldn't disagree more, because if we used this approach—this gimmick—for 1 year, it would be easier to do it next year and the year after and the year after that, ensuring an enduring imbalance between security and domestic spending. Using OCO in this way is completely counter to the intent of the BCA, the Budget Control Act.

The BCA imposed steep cuts to defense and nondefense spending to force a bipartisan compromise. This approach unilaterally reneges on that bipartisan approach. Rather than generating momentum for a permanent solution to sequestration, this approach essentially exempts defense spending from the BCA caps and releases all pressure to find a solution that provides similarly for domestic spending priorities.

The President's defense budget request placed the needed funding in the base where it should be and provided for the OCO funds for contingencies overseas that exist today. The budget resolution and the bill before us met the President's request for overall funding. This is not a question of whether the President asked for a certain amount of money and my Republican colleagues are asking for more. What they did is essentially say: We are not going to technically—and I emphasize "technically"—violate the BCA account. We are just going to move more money into OCO. So we can stand up with a straight face and say: Well, BCA applies across the whole board.

Every government agency is subject to the same tight limits that the Budget Control Act imposes. But, of course, the truth is that through the use of OCO those limits don't apply to the Department of Defense.

It is particularly startling when you look at the President's request for domestic agencies. He asks for \$37 billion for all of the other domestic agencies above the BCA cap. Without that money they are going to have a very difficult—indeed, perhaps impossible—challenge of meeting the basic needs of the American public—needs that every colleague in this Chamber recognizes. Some might disagree with them, but they recognize that we need to support education, as we have done for decades through the Title I Program. We need to support people—our seniors, particularly—through senior housing programs. In every State, in every community, that has to be done. But if we follow this path, it will be harder and harder for nondefense agencies to do this.

What we have created is a huge loop-hole through the BCA for defense. Again, let me remind you, the President and my colleagues on the other side are not arguing about the resources necessary for defense. They have picked the same number. But what they have done on the other side is funded that—not straightforwardly, not recognizing that we have to deal with this—instead by using this gimmick.

If it remains in the bill, I believe this approach will be a magnet for non-defense spending in future years. Not only will we become addicted to OCO spending, many interesting things will find their way into the OCO account.

For example, in fiscal year 1992 Congress added funds to the Defense bill for breast cancer research. At the time, spending was subject to statutory caps under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. This is the follow-on to the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings act of 1985. What we had done was to establish caps on discretionary domestic spending, but there were no similar caps on the other side. That is precisely what the effect of this proposal is today.

The initial funding led to the establishment of the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs or CDMRP. Every Senator is familiar with this important program. I would suspect every Senator has stood and said: Yes, that research on breast cancer is so important; that research on other diseases is so critical and so important. It has strong bipartisan support.

Each fiscal year Congress authorizes and appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars to the CDMRP for cutting-edge and critically essential medical research areas. In fact, since 1992, CDMRP funding has received over \$13 billion. While this program is funded

through the Defense bill, and the program is managed by the Army, the Department of Defense does not execute any of the money itself. It is a competitive grant process, and proposals are subjected to stringent peer and programmatic review criteria. DOD acts as a passthrough because, back then, the only way you could get this done was because there were no caps effectively on defense spending. I would suggest that is going to repeat itself over and over if we start on this path.

That is why we can look today and say we have these pressing crises all across the globe, and it is true. But if we go down this path, we will see these types of developments. Again, I am a strong supporter of medical research. These programs have saved countless lives. I will support the funding in this bill. I think it is a way that we have established to deal with these programs. But we should recognize that it came about not because it was the most logical place to put medical research funding, but it was a budgetary precedent, just like this approach today, and it will be replicated.

Looking forward 10 years, I would suggest that you will see lots of meritorious programs that bear less and less connectivity to our overseas operations included in OCO, if that is the way we choose to get around the BCA. And that is what this bill is doing.

There is another point I would like to add. Moving this funding from the base budget to OCO has no impact on reducing the deficit. OCO and emergency funding are outside budget caps for a reason. They are for the costs of ongoing military operations or responding to other unforeseen events such as natural disasters. To suddenly ignore the true purpose of OCO and to treat it as a budgetary gimmick or slush fund to skirt the BCA is an unacceptable use for this important tool for our warfighters.

Just to highlight how this OCO approach skews defense spending, consider the amount of OCO in relation to the number of deployed troops. You can ask someone on the street: Are these overseas funds used to support our forces overseas? There has to be some relationship between the number of our forces overseas and our OCO spending. Well, let's see. In 2008, at the height of our Nation's troop commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan, there were 187,000 troops deployed. We spent approximately \$1 million in OCO funding for every servicemember deployed to those countries. Under this bill, we would expend approximately \$9 million in OCO for every servicemember who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, roughly 9,930 military personnel. We are doing a lot more than spending for OCO in this bill—deliberately a lot more. We are doing what we used to do and what we should do in the base budget of the Department of Defense.

It circumvents the law, the BCA. It is not fiscally responsible, and it is not an honest accounting to the American public. If years ago, with 187,000 troops, our OCO costs were about \$1 million per troop and now we are at \$9 million, something is askew.

Adding the funds to OCO does not solve—and in some cases complicates—the DOD's budgetary problems.

As Army Chief of Staff General Odierno said:

OCO has limits and it has restrictions and it has very strict rules that have to be followed. And so if we're inhibited by that, it might not help us. What might happen at the end of the year, we have a bunch of money we hand back because we are not able to spend it.

The defense budget needs to be based on a long-term military strategy, which requires the DOD to focus on at least 5 years in the future. A 1-year plus-up to OCO does not provide DOD with the certainty and stability it needs when building a 5-year budget. As General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified, "we need to fix the base budget . . . we won't have the certainty we need," if there is a year-by-year OCO fix. Defense Secretary Carter added that raising OCO does not allow the Department of Defense to plan "efficiently or strategically."

Adding funds to OCO is a managerially unsound approach to what should be a multiyear budget process. As the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army General Allyn said:

The current restrictions on the employment of OCO will not allow it to be a gap-filler that is currently being proffered to offset the reduction in our base budget that is driven by the current proposals that are before Congress. In order to meet the needs of our Army, it must have greater flexibility . . . it must be less restrictive and must enable us to sustain and modernize as we go forward.

This instability undermines the morale of our troops and their families, who want to know their futures are planned for more than 1 year at a time, and the confidence of the defense industry partners that we want to rely on to provide the best technologies available to our troops.

Abuse of OCO in this massive way risks undermining support for a critical mechanism used to fund the incremental increased costs of overseas conflicts. We have to have a disciplined system for estimating the cost and funding the employment of a trained and ready force.

The administration has indicated that legislation implementing the majority's budget framework will be subject to veto. As Secretary Carter has said, this approach is "clearly a road to nowhere. I say this because President Obama has already made clear that he won't accept a budget that locks in sequestration going forward, as this approach does, and he won't accept a

budget that severs the vital link between our national security and our economic security."

When we talk about national security, true national security requires that non-DOD departments and agencies also receive relief from BCA caps. The Pentagon simply cannot meet the complex set of national security challenges without the help of other government departments and agencies, including State, Justice and Homeland Security. In the Armed Services Committee, we have heard testimony on the essential role of other government agencies in ensuring that our national defense remains strong. The Defense Department's share of the burden would surely grow if these agencies are not adequately funded as well.

There is a symbiotic relationship between the Department of Defense and other civilian departments and agencies that contribute to our national security. It has to be recognized that a truly whole-of-government approach requires more than just a strong DOD.

The BCA caps are based on a misnomer—that discretionary spending is divided into security and nonsecurity spending. But Members need to be clear: Essential national security functions are performed by government agencies and departments other than the Defense Department.

According to the Commander of the U.S. Southern Command, General Kelly:

We do not and cannot do this mission alone. Our strong partnerships with the U.S. interagency—especially with the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Departments of Treasury and State—are integral to our efforts to ensure the forward defense of the U.S. homeland.

Retired Marine Corps General Mattis said: "If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition." General Mattis' point is perhaps best illustrated in the administration's nine lines of effort to counter the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, or ISIL, which 83 percent of Americans think is the No. 1 threat to the United States. Of the administration's nine lines of effort, only two—which are security and intelligence—fall squarely within the responsibilities of the Department of Defense and intelligence community. The remaining seven elements of our counter-ISIL strategy rely heavily on civilian departments and agencies.

For example, No. 1 is supporting effective governance in Iraq. No amount of military assistance to the Government of Iraq will be effective in countering the ISIL threat in Iraq if the Abadi government does not govern in a more transparent and inclusive manner that gives Sunnis hope that they will participate politically in Iraq's future. We need our diplomatic and political

experts in the State Department to engage with Shia, Sunni, Kurd, and minority communities in Iraq to promote and build reconciliation in Iraq and build the political unity among the Iraqi people needed to defeat ISIL. That is not strictly a Defense Department issue.

No. 2, we have to build partner capacity. The coalition is building the capabilities and capacity of our foreign partners in the region to wage a long-term campaign against ISIL. While the efforts to build the capacity of the Iraqi security forces and some other foreign partners are funded by the Defense Department, the State Department and USAID are also responsible for billions of dollars in similar activities and across a broader spectrum of activities. Under the Republican plan, none of the State and USAID programs will be plussed-up. Their unwillingness to address this gap is a threat to our Nation's efforts to combat ISIL.

No. 3, we have to disrupt ISIL's finances. ISIL's expansion has given it access to significant and diverse sources of funding. Countering ISIL's financing will require the State Department and the Treasury Department to work with their foreign partners and the banking sector to ensure that our counter-ISIL sanctions regime is implemented and enforced. These State Department and Treasury Department efforts are deemed to be non-security activities under the BCA caps and, under the Republican approach, our efforts to disrupt the finances of ISIL may be hampered. It is also notable that the Office of Foreign Assets Control and the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence in the Treasury Department are also characterized as non-security activities under the BCA caps.

The Republican funding strategy not only means that our counter-ISIL efforts will be hampered, so too will our efforts to impose effective sanctions against Iran, Sudan, and individuals who support their illicit activities also be affected.

We have to continually expose the true and brutal nature of ISIL. Our strategic communication plan against ISIL requires a truly whole government effort, including the State Department, Voice of America, and USAID. The Republican approach to funding our strategic communication strategy is a part-of-government plan, not a whole-of-government plan.

We have to disrupt the flow of foreign fighters. They are the lifeblood of ISIL. Yet key components of the Department of Homeland Security would be facing cuts under the Republican budget proposal, undermining efforts to disrupt the flow of foreign fighters to Syria and Iraq. Without the efforts of our diplomats prodding our foreign partners to pass laws or more effectively enforce the laws on their books, the ef-

forts of the coalition to stem the flow of foreign fighters will never be successful.

My colleague Senator MCCAIN pointed out the huge refugee crisis. Again, our first agency typically to respond to refugees is USAID—the United States Agency for International Development—and other State Department agencies. We will not be able to effectively deal with that issue if those budget caps are imposed on USAID and other agencies. Those refugee camps are one of the breeding grounds for the foreign fighters who flow back into the conflict zone.

Unless we adopt a much broader approach, unless we do something other than simply plus-up defense, we will not achieve true national security. Of course we have to protect the homeland. While a small portion of the Department of Homeland Security is considered security related, under the BCA, the vast majority of the Department falls under the nonsecurity BCA cap. This further demonstrates that the Republican plan is a misnomer. It is an effort to play a game of smoke and mirrors with the American public. The agents at the Department of Homeland Security who are on guard, the DEA agents who pick up intelligence about threats to the Nation—all of them vitally contribute to our national security, but they will be treated distinctly different than our military if we adopt the approach that is included in this Defense authorization bill.

I talked about the refugee crisis. Virtually none of the activities that support our humanitarian efforts in the region are considered security activities. Military commanders routinely tell us that the efforts of State, USAID, the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance are critical to our broader security efforts. This is particularly true from a counter-ISIL campaign.

Again, those refugees who are flooding into the countries adjacent to Syria and to Iraq have to be dealt with not only on humanitarian grounds but also as potential sources of foreign fighters. That is going to require a whole-of-government approach, not simply using OCO to beef up our defense spending. Taken together, the Republican plan could compromise our broader campaign against ISIL and deprive significant elements of our government of the resources needed to do the job to protect the American people.

The men and women of our military volunteer to protect this Nation and are overseas fighting for our ideals, including good education, economic opportunity, and safe communities. Efforts to support all of those goals will be hampered unless civilian departments and agencies also receive relief from the BCA caps.

I had the privilege of commanding a paratrooper company at Fort Bragg,

NC. We fought for many reasons, including to give people a chance in this country—not just to protect them from a foreign threat but to give them real opportunities here.

By the way, our servicemembers and their families rely on many of the services provided by non-DOD departments and agencies. For example, the Department of Education administers Impact Aid to local school districts, where children of servicemembers go to learn. The Department of Agriculture supports the School Lunch Program, from which troops and their children and their families benefit. The National Institutes of Health supports lifesaving medical research, including by contributing to advanced efforts on traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress, and suicide prevention. The Department of Health and Human Services runs Medicare, which provides health care for retirees and disabled individuals, and Medicaid, which provides services to parents, including military parents with children with special needs.

Failing to provide BCA cap relief to non-DOD departments and agencies would also shortchange veterans who receive employment services, transition assistance, and housing and homelessness support.

Not only does this approach fail to support, potentially, our servicemen through schooling and through other aspects, our national security is also inherently tied to our economic security. Secretary Carter made this very clear. He said the approach that is being proposed disregards “the enduring, long-term connection between our nation's security and many other factors. Factors like scientific R&D to keep our technological edge, education of a future all-volunteer military force, and the general economic strength of our country.”

Where will we get the soldiers of the future who have the skills and the training and the expertise if we are underinvesting in the basic education for all of our citizens?

My amendment would keep the pressure on for a permanent solution to the BCA caps and sequestration by requiring that the BCA caps be eliminated or increased in proportionally equal amounts for both security and non-security spending before the additional OCO funds are available for obligation or expenditure.

Let me again emphasize that we are not taking away these funds. We simply say what I think makes a great deal of sense: Until we develop an approach to BCA that allows us to provide for a comprehensive defense of the Nation and to invest in the economic health of the Nation, then these funds will be reserved. Once we do that, then automatically all of the funding that is included in this bill will become available to the Department of Defense.

We have heard colleagues on both sides of the aisle talk for years now about the need to resolve the BCA, to end sequestration. Every uniformed servicemember who came forward, every chief of service said their No. 1 priority was to end sequestration, end the BCA. This bill does not do it; it sidesteps the issue. We can no longer sidestep the issue. We have to engage on this issue. I think we have to move promptly and thoroughly and thoughtfully forward to resolve the BCA.

The legislation I have proposed recognizes the need for these resources but also recognizes the overarching issue: Unless we are able to effectively modify or eliminate the BCA, our comprehensive national security will be threatened, our economic progress will be threatened, and our aspirations for the country could be thwarted.

My amendment seeks to implement, by the way, a sense-of-the-Senate that is already in the bill, and it clearly states that sequestration relief should include equal defense and nondefense relief. We have made—and I commend the chairman for this—a statement—without an effective means of implementation. It is a statement, an aspirational goal, that we should fix BCA and relieve defense and nondefense spending. I think that is an important statement, but my amendment makes sure we go further and provide an action to do this.

I believe very strongly in this amendment. I believe it is relevant to the consideration of this bill. I believe it goes to the heart of the most important questions we face in the country today: How do we provide for the comprehensive defense of the Nation? How do we invest in our people so that we will continue to be strong? I think if we do not provide this type of mechanism to start this discussion on the BCA and hopefully promptly complete it, then we will be missing not only a historic opportunity, we will be locking ourselves into a road that will leave us less secure in the future, less productive, and less strong as a nation.

Let me remind people that the stated purpose of the bill is “to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense.” We have to begin this appropriations process by recognizing that the BCA will not help us going forward, and we must move to modify or repeal it.

With that, I will close simply by saying again that if we continue these caps going forward, it will harm our military readiness. Our national defense should be based upon long-term needs. They should be reflected in a transparent, forthright budget that puts the money in the base, provides contingency funds for true contingencies overseas but does not turn things upside down and make our contingency funding really the heart of the bill in so many respects.

We have to work together. We have to make sure every Federal agency can benefit because every Federal agency contributes to the country. So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, to begin this dialogue, and to move forward, the sooner the better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, how does the budget fund defense? That is what we are talking about. The balanced budget resolution recently approved by Congress recognizes the responsibility that the Federal Government has to defend the Nation while recognizing the threats our overspending and growing debt pose to our national security. That is why the balanced budget approved by Congress last month makes national defense a priority and provides for the maximum allowable defense funding under current law.

Let me say that again. The budget provides for the maximum allowable defense funding under current law. That current law is a law which was signed by this President and provides vital support for our military personnel and their families, the readiness of our Armed Forces, and the modernization of critical platforms.

Does anybody deny that this is a critical time? With the increasing number of threats around the world, our total defense spending level should reflect our commitment to keeping America safe and ensuring that our military personnel are prepared to tackle all challenges. While we have troops in harm's way, we need to do all we can to protect them. Given the global threat environment, the funding approach taken by the Senator from Arizona and the Armed Services Committee, which was bipartisan, ensures that the men and women of our Armed Forces have the resources they need to confront an increasingly complex and dangerous security environment.

Is sequestration a threat to our military? If appropriated at the levels provided by the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act, the defense budget would not face indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts known as sequestration, while it provides for the needs we are reviewing right now. People have a chance to amend the needs right now. If they think there is something in there that is not needed, they can amend it—they can try to amend it. There should be justification for what they want.

This bill puts us on a path to spend \$612 billion on defense this year. This is the same overall amount that was requested by the President earlier this year. Numerous officials at the Pentagon have made it clear that they see this funding level as the bare minimum budget needed to execute our defense strategy. So why are some Senators

concerned about the level of budgetary resources this bill provides to the Department of Defense? They simply do not like the use of the overseas contingency operations funding, the OCO.

It is important to note that those not familiar with the Budget Control Act—that is not the budget; that is the Budget Control Act. It was passed with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Obama back in August of 2011. It established a discretionary spending cap, but it also allowed for certain cap adjustments. The BCA caps can be adjusted for emergencies, disasters, program integrity initiatives, and OCO.

Yes. That is in the Budget Control Act, the Budget Control Act passed August 2011 and signed by President Obama. Those are the four ways you can adjust the budget caps without forcing sequestration. Now, in the case of OCO—overseas contingency operations—funding, both Congress and the President have to agree that the funding should be designated in that manner. Therefore, the OCO funding in this bill will only occur if Congress appropriates it and the President agrees to it in the future. I would hope that when the President and his advisers said this is the overall level of funding they needed for defense, they meant it. But only time and the appropriations process will tell.

Did the budget account for OCO spending? While there is no requirement to offset OCO spending, when we addressed the issue in our budget resolution, we accounted for every single dollar of OCO we assumed would be spent. Even with these OCO levels, the budget resolution still met its overall goal of balancing within 10 years. Let me repeat that. We accounted for every single dollar of OCO that we assumed would be spent. Even with these OCO levels, the budget resolution still met its overall goal of balancing within 10 years.

It is good to see my colleague so concerned about the deficit, and I look forward to working with him to fully implement our balanced budget. This will ensure that we can get our Nation's fiscal house in order while providing resources needed for our national defense.

Unfortunately, the concern expressed over providing OCO funding doesn't seem to be centered on the fiscal concerns because even most critics support the need for more defense money. No, their concerns are based on the demand to increase nondefense discretionary spending on a dollar-for-dollar basis with defense spending. But the only way to do this in the short term is by raising taxes on hard-working American families. Defense is making its case and has made its case. Nondefense has not.

Do we really need to increase the caps? If we want to increase nondefense

spending, Congress should take a closer look at what we are actually funding. Last year, we provided nearly \$293.5 billion for more than 260 authorizations that have expired. Yes, we have 260 authorizations. That is where Congress says this is what we ought to be spending our money on.

They expired, and we are still spending money on them—\$293.5 billion a year. Usually, we talk about over 10 years here. That would practically balance the budget by itself over a 10-year period. Those are programs we need to take a look at. Those are programs that have expired. Some of those programs expired as long ago as 1983, but we are still spending money on them every year. That means we have been paying for some of these expired programs for more than 30 years, and it is not just the length of time these programs have overstayed their welcome, the funds we allocated to them every year are more than what the law called for in those authorizations when passed. In some cases, that means we are spending as much as four times what the bill allowed.

Savings usually are found in the spending details, but Congress hasn't examined the details in some time, except on defense. We do the Defense authorization every year. These others, well, I mentioned one of them expired in 1983, some in 1987. I mentioned it is 260 authorizations. It affects 1,200 programs. Do you think in 1,200 programs for \$293 billion a year we couldn't find \$38 billion to match what we are doing in defense? We ought to be ashamed if we can't.

It is time for Congress to take a look at these programs and decide if they are even worth funding anymore. After all, a project not worth doing well should not be worth doing at that time all. But how would committees know if they haven't looked at these programs in years? How would they know if they don't have a way to measure how well the programs are working?

Were defense and nondefense spending treated equally under the BCA under the budget caps? The insistence that any change to the discretionary changes be based on dollar limits for both categories of spending fails to take into account the different treatment each took under the budget caps, the BCA.

Defense spending, which makes up less than one-fifth of all government spending, received less than half of the reductions in the BCA. Defense spending also faced more budgetary pressure than nondefense spending because it is largely discretionary. Nondefense spending was able to distribute its BCA reductions over a larger amount of accounts and over a larger portion of mandatory programs. That provides a fudge factor.

The continued insistence on tying both defense and nondefense spending

together has left only the approach taken by this bill to fund the defense at the President's level.

We know from the administration that the President's advisers are recommending he veto this bill. We also know some of my colleagues are considering blocking appropriations bills this year to force a government shut-down.

Every bill should stand on its own for justification. No one is arguing the need for national defense. What they are actually arguing is the need for the nondefense increases. This is an attempt to leverage defense programming to get nondefense, which I mentioned the 260 programs, \$293.5 billion a year that has expired—so they want this OCO to be replaced with a deal.

What we are supposed to do in Congress is legislate, not deal make. But that is what is being proposed. Let's make a deal. Now, if they step back and look at the facts laid out today, hopefully, they can move away from this brinkmanship and realize the path they are on only leads to more uncertainty for the men and women in our Armed Forces. Strengthening our national defense and providing for the brave men and women of our military should be something both sides agree on.

So what is the future of the BCA caps? It is time both parties get serious about addressing our Nation's chronic overspending. We know some on both sides want the caps from the Budget Control Act changed—but at what price for our Nation and the hard-working taxpayers? Without any changes to the BCA structure, just raising these budget caps without increasing the debt in the short-term would require increasing taxes. That is why we asked for the extra year to be able to work on this whole thing.

If Congress is serious about addressing the challenges of the Budget Control Act, it has to first start by tackling its addiction to overspending and once again become good fiscal stewards of the taxes paid by each and every hard-working American.

Of course, if the administration would stop overregulating, the economy would grow, and in a short time we would have more revenue without raising taxes. Yes, that is what both the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget—one works for Congress and one works for the President—said; that if we could just raise the economy by 1 percent a year, CBO says that would provide \$300 billion. The President's office says that would provide \$400 billion in taxes.

We are receiving more tax revenue right now than we have in the history of the United States, but we spend more than that. Of the amounts that we get to make a decision on, we are spending almost 50 percent more than

what we take in. We can't continue to do that. We can't continue to afford the interest on the debt if we keep doing that.

Americans are working harder than everyone to make ends meet. Shouldn't their elected officials be doing the same thing? By tackling these issues honestly and directly, we can help ensure that our Nation is safe and secure by investing in America's Armed Forces while also maintaining fiscal discipline.

On a related note, the Senate Budget Committee has produced an indepth analysis of defense spending and the OCO funding provision as part of our June budget bulletin, which was published today. People interested in learning more can do so by going to our Web site: budget.senate.gov or contact on [twitter@budgetbulletin](https://twitter.com/budgetbulletin).

I close with some words from today's paper from the Casper Star-Tribune editorial:

Many of the servicemen and servicewomen returning from faraway battlefields—Vietnam or any other place of conflict—have seen horrible, unspeakable things. They've been courageous in the face of death and destruction. Some gave up a relatively easy, safe life to travel far from home and fight for what we as a nation believe the world should be, or could be, someday. That kind of commitment doesn't come without pain or sacrifice—immense pain and sacrifice, in some cases.

None of that has anything to do with politics. Politics is the arena of our elected leaders, not our troops, and it's both necessary and patriotic for us as voters to evaluate those leaders' decisions and actions and speak out against the ones we disagree with. That's democracy and dissent.

But our troops are our representatives on the ground. We must not use our vaunted system of democracy as a tool to inflict pain on this brave group of people. They're not obligated to support our leaders' political ideologies any more than the rest of us, but uniquely, they have made it their responsibility to represent our treasured way of life at home and abroad in pursuit of a better, more peaceful world. And after they do that, they deserve the thanks of a grateful nation.

That's how it should have been in the 1970s. That's how it is now. We must make it our responsibility to ensure that this is how it will always be.

We have a crucial decision to make on funding our national defense. I don't think it should be held hostage to other budget concerns. Each of those should stand on their own. Each of those should review all of the things under their jurisdiction. I ask for you to defeat the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I thank my friend from Wyoming for his remarks. I don't always agree with him, but he is sincere, thoughtful, and puts every effort into coming up with a decision he believes is right, so we appreciate that very much.

I also thank my colleague from Rhode Island, our ranking member on

Armed Services, who has laid out in very careful terms why the amendment, the Reed amendment, is so important. I thank him. He has also, like my friend from Wyoming, been assiduous, diligent, and careful in his work on the Armed Services Committee, and I thank him for offering this amendment.

We have come to the floor with a very simple message for our Republican colleagues, and it is articulated in this amendment. If you want to make America strong by replacing the harsh and arbitrary automatic cuts in this budget as we do, then you have to do it in a way that makes sure we will have a strong military abroad and the things we need to be strong and secure at home as well.

That means equally replacing cuts to both defense and domestic budgets—\$1 for defense, \$1 for the middle class—in the hopes that they can raise their income levels, and it can be easier for others who are not yet in the middle class to reach. That is what the amendment would require.

The truth is, the way the Republicans have put this bill together signals a poor approach to both major areas of our budget. It locks in the sequester cuts for our men and women in uniform, instead using the OCO, essentially a wartime account, as a one-time gimmick to make up for shortfalls. That is a bad idea.

Using the OCO account to pay for our troops, maintain and operate our military or purchase weapons that will keep us safe is a terrible mistake. Why is that? It is 1-year funding. You have to do a plan for 3 years. You have to build a submarine that takes 4 or 5 years.

I talk to defense contractors. I talk to military leaders. They can't do it 1 year at a time. It doesn't make sense. Our military families need stability and support. They need to know that programs that benefit them—suicide prevention, sexual assault—will be fully funded when other defense priorities come back into the base budget for future years. Under OCO, these things could get squeezed out. Our military brass needs to know that the weapons systems they are relying on 4 years from now—but being paid out of OCO this year—can be funded and finished. So our military doesn't deserve budget gimmicks, they deserve real support.

What my friends on the other side of the aisle have done with this OCO increase is a budgetary sleight of hand—a half-hearted attempt to fund the Defense Department while leaving key, middle-class programs behind. Our Defense Department gets budget workarounds and exceptions, while hard-working families must continue to feel the harsh cuts imposed by sequestration. That is a double standard because we need both for a strong America. We

need a strong military, and we need a strong middle class. To choose one over the other—and do it by budgetary sleight of hand—is nothing anyone can be proud of, in my opinion.

So regardless of what happens with NDAA this month, one thing should be absolutely clear to my Republican friends—and I see our ranking member of Appropriations who has led this fight on the floor. Democrats will not vote to put a defense appropriations bill on the floor that uses accounting trickery or budgetary gimmicks to fund our troops. We will not vote to proceed to the Defense appropriations bill or any appropriations bill until our colleagues from the other side of the aisle have sat down at the table and figured out with us how we are going to properly fund the Defense Department and the key priorities that help families, fuel economic growth—in short, keeping us safe and strong both at home and abroad.

We simply cannot and will not move forward with one acceptable bill at a time on the appropriations side until we are able to sit down and reach an agreement that replaces cuts equally for our military and our domestic needs.

This amendment requires that balance. That is why I salute the Senator from Rhode Island, my dear friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services for putting it together. It says that the extra money in OCO cannot be used unless we give equal or greater relief to domestic programs that help the middle class.

If my friends on the other side of the aisle are serious about escaping the senseless, obtuse budget cuts imposed by the sequester and their use of OCO, admittedly a gimmick—they are admitting that is the case, that we have to do more and go above sequestration for military and average families—they will wholeheartedly support the Jack Reed amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED. Characteristic of him, it is a thoughtful solution to a very serious problem related to the funding of our national security needs.

I would like to support and salute Senator REED for his outstanding job. Many don't realize that Senator JACK REED is a graduate of West Point. He served in the U.S. military, bringing that breadth of his considerable background to additional public service, both in the House and now in the Senate. He is the ranking member on the defense authorization committee and also serves in great capacity on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Now, let us talk about the Reed amendment and the funding for the De-

partment of Defense. I want to be very clear. I do want to support funding for the national security of the United States of America. We take an oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies foreign and domestic, and we must uphold that oath not only with lip service but with real money in the real Federal checkbook. We need to do it in a way that doesn't use gimmicks or smoke and mirrors to end sequester or to finesse or do a shell deal behind the budget caps.

Remember, we passed a bill that does have significant budget caps. But the way to deal with that problem is not to cap the Department of Defense but to be honest about what it takes to fund national security. The Reed amendment does that. It makes clear that the Department of Defense should receive \$38 billion, but in its base budget to take care of the troops, to protect the troops while they protect us, to make sure they have the right gear, the right equipment, the right technology, and also the right intelligence to be able to do their job. The Reed amendment also looks out for military families. It does what we need to do.

Only when there is a new budget agreement that increases the defense budget as well as the budget for domestic programs will we be able to solve the problem that is facing us.

Now, what our generals have told us is we cannot meet our defense needs with the current budget caps. They also say: Senator—this is General Dempsey, and this is General Odierno, who spoke so well at the funeral of the Vice President's son on Saturday; these men have devoted their lives to the defense of our country and to have the best military in the world—don't give us sequester. Instead of figuring out how to fight terrorism, we have to figure out how to fight the stupidity of Congress.

Now, they do not use those words; I am using those words. When we instituted sequester, it was a technique to force us to make the tough decisions. We keep hiding behind the technique. We need to change that. The bill we have now raises funding for something called the overseas contingency fund by \$38 billion, but it uses it to fund activities that should be in the base bill rather than the war cost it was intended for. Essentially, it is a budget gimmick.

What is the overseas contingency fund? It was meant to be a line item where we could actually see what war costs us. In Afghanistan and Iraq it was kind of commingled through a lot of the other items related to defense, but we didn't know the actual cost of the war. OCO is meant for war. It is not meant to be a way to avoid the budget caps. Instead of just raising the caps and funding DOD at the needed level, this bill uses this gimmick, so nothing about it is really in the national interest.

Our military leaders tell us: No. 1, get rid of sequester. No. 2, you must increase the base bill.

Defense budgeting cannot be done on a year-to-year basis. It must be multiyear because it is for the planning of procurement for them to have the best weapons systems. It is recruitment and training and sustaining of the military and their personnel needs.

Defense Secretary Ash Carter said: "Our defense industry partners, too, need stability and longer-term plans, not end-of-year crises." GEN Dan Allyn, Army Vice Chief of Staff, said: "OCO does not give you the predictable funding to be able to plan the force we are going to need."

I want to make another point. The defense of the United States doesn't lie only with DOD. That is our warfighting machine. But we have other programs that are related to national security that come out of domestic discretionary spending that are shortchanged and are shrinking and, quite frankly, I am concerned about it.

What am I talking about? In order to have national security, you need to have a State Department. You need to have a State Department to do the kind of work that involves diplomacy. That involves working with nations around the world and the needs of these nations and also to engage in important negotiations such as we have now ongoing on the Iran nuclear. That is not done by generals. That is done by diplomats. You need to have a Department of State. Look at what happened in Benghazi, where there is so much focus on this. While they are focusing—and we should focus—on Benghazi, we appropriators are focusing on embassy security. Embassy security is funded through the Department of State and funded by discretionary spending. If you want to protect Americans overseas, you have to have embassy security. You have to have a Department of State.

Then we have the Department of Homeland Security. Look at all the cyber attacks on us right at this minute. We need to have a cyber component to defense, but we need to have the cyber defense strategy at the Department of Homeland Security. Even our military is being hacked. Insurance programs are being hacked. People in the United States are having important information about their health records, their Social Security numbers, and so on being stolen. We need to have a robust Department of Homeland Security. They have a program called Einstein that is supposed to do it, but we don't have to be Einsteins to know that in order to protect America we also have to protect the Department of Homeland Security.

Then of course there are the promises made and promises kept. There is the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related

Agencies. We must fund our promises made to our veterans. That is out of discretionary spending. That is not out of defense. But the infrastructure for our military, our military bases here in our own country, come out of military construction.

I don't want to sound as if I am defending government programs. That is not what I am here to do. I am here to defend the Nation and defend it the right way. We need to be able to put money in the Federal checkbook that funds our Department of Defense without gimmicks, without sleight of hand, without finessing or playing dodge ball. We have to play hard ball with the terrorists and others who have predatory intent against the United States.

We have to be Team U.S.A. not only on the sports field but on this playing field right here on the floor of Congress. Let us work together. Let us get a new budget agreement. Let us solve the problems. Let us end sequester. Let us work together to be able to do it. I believe a big step forward would be supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED. I ask, in the interest of national security, that we vote for the Reed amendment and that we go to the budget. Let's go to the negotiating table and come up with a real framework to fund the compelling needs of our Nation, and let's do it, Team U.S.A.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:41 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

AMENDMENT NO. 1486

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this Chamber is currently having a very important debate about our national security priorities, including the authorized funding levels for our Nation's Armed Forces. But I would like to speak just briefly about an element of our national security that is often overlooked, and that has to do with the interconnection between our energy resources here in America and global security.

I will start by quoting the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, GEN Martin Dempsey, who said: "I think we've got to pay more and particular attention to energy as an instrument of national power."

Well, I could not agree, in this instance, with General Dempsey more.

So I want to again address a way in which I believe the United States can utilize our vast domestic energy resources to not only enhance our economy but also help enhance our national security and help us meet our strategic objectives around the world and specifically by helping many of our NATO allies in Europe in this process.

As I mentioned on the floor last week, many of these countries rely heavily on energy resources from Russia, creating strategic vulnerability for them as well as for the United States, their treaty ally. This is not a hypothetical matter because we know Vladimir Putin has literally turned the spigot off to countries like Ukraine and threatens to do so to Europe if they happen to disagree with Russian policy, particularly with regard to its expropriation of Crimea and Ukraine.

But the United States can use its energy resources to reassure our allies and partners and to lessen, reduce, at the same time, their dependence on bad actors like Russia and Iran. So it is as simple as helping our friends and checking the abuse of power by our adversaries.

Now, while allowing energy exports to some of our allies when their security is threatened probably sounds like a commonsense notion to a lot of people, there are some skeptics. One of our colleagues, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, has suggested that approving crude oil exports to anybody—including on a limited basis to our allies who are being coerced and under duress from Vladimir Putin—that somehow that would result in a tax on consumers at the pump. In other words, he is arguing that exporting our natural resources around the world would actually cause gasoline prices to go up.

Well, I am here to say that is a faulty assumption and it is simply not grounded in fact. It is at odds with the research and leading opinions of multiple experts, think tank organizations, and officials. And you know what. It is even at odds with the Obama administration's leading expert in this field. Here is what Secretary Moniz said on February 12, 2015, about the effect of crude oil exports on U.S. gas prices. He said there would be no effect on gas prices. He said: "And their [EIA's] conclusion was, probably none to possibly minor decreases in domestic prices."

So if you think about it, actually more American supply increases the world's supply of oil. Indeed, gasoline is already sold around the world at a global price. So more supply of oil, which is the chief component of gasoline, would actually increase the supply. Even according to a recovering lawyer who is not an economist, on a supply-and-demand basis, with static demand increasing, the supply is actually going to bring down the price.

The Energy Secretary is not the only one who believes there will either be no

change or actually a downward price to consumers on gasoline.

After reviewing several studies on this issue, the Government Accountability Office noted that “consumer fuel prices, such as gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel, could decrease as a result of removing crude oil export restrictions.” So this is the Government Accountability Office that said that, actually confirming, essentially, what Secretary Moniz said; that we would actually see gasoline prices go down at the pump were we to lift this domestic sanction we have imposed upon ourselves when it comes to exporting crude.

Another think tank, the Aspen Institute, said it would have “significant positive and durable effects on [our gross domestic product], aggregate employment and income.”

The Aspen Institute, just as another example, thinks it would be good for income, it would be good for jobs, it would be good for our economy.

So it seems the only people who do not think lifting the ban would be good are limited to the Halls of Congress or perhaps some of the lobbyists who raise money scaring people when it comes to the use of our fossil fuels, particularly oil and gas.

While I think it is important to come and rebut this faulty argument, the amendment that is pending to the underlying bill is actually much more narrowly targeted. It simply ensures that we will have a reliable sense of the energy vulnerabilities of our European partners. In fact, we are a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and under article 5, were they to be attacked, all members of the treaty would be required to come to their assistance. So why in the world would we not want to reduce their vulnerability to economic hostage-taking?

We also want to get a better understanding of Russia's ability to use this dependency against our allies in NATO and Europe in general. So my amendment would allow us to see the big picture when it comes to just how dependent our allies in the region are on nations that wield their energy supply as a weapon.

Now, I just want to make clear my amendment would actually not change any of the current law. It would not change any of the current law. It simply restates the current authority that the President has in his discretion to allow crude oil and natural gas exports, if determined to be consistent with the national interest.

I would say, even though Russia and Europe and NATO are the primary focus, this is not just limited to NATO. It could include important allies of ours in the Middle East, like Israel, as well. My amendment reiterates this existing authority, and it encourages the President to use it to help reduce the vulnerabilities of our allies in Europe

and around the world when it is determined to be in our national interest. It does not add to that authority, and it does not constrain it either.

Well, the President just returned from the so-called G7 summit—representing the leading seven economies of the free world—and here is what the G7 said about this topic. The G7 leaders said that “we reaffirm our support for Ukraine and other vulnerable countries . . . and reiterate that energy should not be used as a means of political coercion or as a threat to security.”

So if that is the position of the G7, if the Obama administration takes the position that lifting the ban on exports of oil will not do anything to raise the price of gasoline at the pump and could well reduce it, then I think the Senate would be well advised to support the amendment I have offered which, again, just restates the current authority, does not expand it, and then asks the Defense Department and the intelligence community to do an assessment of how we can better understand the role our energy assets play as an element of our soft power and national security.

Our allies are pretty clear-eyed about all this. They recognize that shrinking their dependence will not be complete or easy. But one goal this amendment seeks to recognize is that we have allies that are asking for help that will put them on a path toward less reliance and will put Russia on notice that they will not be able to hold these countries hostage to energy.

This is about options, alternatives, and a stable supply on the world market that are all helped by increased U.S. production and this renaissance in natural gas and oil that has been brought about thanks to the great innovation and technology improvements in the private sector, created here in the United States but benefiting the entire world.

The G7 leaders noted that the diversification of the world's energy supply is “a core element of energy security,” including a diversity of “energy mix[es], energy fuels, sources, and routes.”

So my amendment is based on the idea that we may supplement the global market, and that ultimately brings about increased diversity in fuel supply, which benefits everyone.

My amendment is not about limiting the President's authority under current law. I did not intend to do that. This amendment does not do it. It is about taking a modest first step toward addressing the requests, the pleas, in some cases, of our allies and our partners in an increasingly unpredictable world.

So I would encourage our colleagues to support this amendment and, in doing so, take the long-term view of our national security interests as well as the peace and stability of our most trusted allies and partners.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, if I may withhold that request.

I ask unanimous consent that the time in the quorum call be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Will the Senator repeat his request?

Mr. CORNYN. I will be glad to restate it. I am asking unanimous consent that the time in the quorum call be equally divided between the sides.

Mr. REED. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is currently considering H.R. 1735.

Approximately 22 minutes remain on the majority side.

Mr. MCCAIN. Twenty-two minutes on the majority side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, and 11 minutes on the minority side.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that such time as the Senator from Rhode Island may need to conclude the debate be in order and I have 10 minutes in order before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we have Senator STABENOW and Senator DURBIN coming, and I believe we have heard that Senator GRASSLEY is also coming, and with the Senator's 10 minutes, I think that will fill up the time until the vote at 3 o'clock.

Mr. MCCAIN. We have Senator SESSIONS as well.

Well, let me suggest the absence of a quorum first, and then we will work it out.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I am here on the floor to speak to the amendment we will be voting on as it relates to Senator REED's amendment.

I first thank both of the leaders of this committee for important work that is being done. But the amendment

in front of us is absolutely critical for the safety and security of the American people and certainly for our troops. We all agree—we need to agree—that our troops deserve more than budget gimmicks. What we have in here are too many budget gimmicks that do not reflect the commitment we need to have to our troops and their families.

Further, it does not allow us to fully fund the security needs of the country. We are going to be having a very important debate after this legislation on what to do around appropriations, and it is critical that Senator REED's amendment be passed so we have the opportunity to fully fund the full range of security needs of our country—not only in the Department of Defense, which we all know is very important, but our border security, cyber security, counterterrorism, police and firefighter efforts—those on the frontlines. Whom do we think is called when we dial 9-1-1, when there is an emergency of any kind. It is police officers and firefighters that, unfortunately, without the Reed amendment, will not receive the kind of support and funding needed to keep our communities safe.

We need to stop weapons of mass destruction, focus on airport security. We are on and off airplanes every single week, as are millions of Americans. We know how critical it is that we be funding our airport security. We know there are outbreaks, like Ebola and other infectious diseases and attacks that may come from that, that are not in the bill in front of us but are critical to the funding of the national security interests of our families, our communities, and our country.

Senator REED has put forward an amendment that would guarantee we would not only think of security in the context of the Department of Defense but that we would understand it is throughout the Federal Government—all of the various services and folks coming together from border security, cyber security, counterterrorism, local police and firefighters on the frontline, the ability to stop weapons of mass destruction, airport security, Ebola protection with the Centers for Disease Control and Protection, and so much more. The people of the country understand it is not just about the Department of Defense.

Certainly, we need to make sure that even within the Department of Defense budget, we are doing more than budget gimmicks. Certainly, our troops deserve that. But without the amendment that Senator REED has so thoughtfully put forward and designed, we will be undercutting critical parts of national security for our people.

So I strongly urge that we come together on a bipartisan basis. We talk a lot about border security. We hear a lot about that here. We certainly understand what is happening in cyber secu-

rity and the needs of our country. We could go through all of the other parts of the Federal budget that impact security and realize that if we aren't willing to look at security for our families and communities and our country as a whole, as Senator REED does, we will be undercutting the safety and security we all want for our families and communities.

So I strongly support and urge colleagues to come together and vote for the Reed amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak before the vote: Senator DURBIN for 8 minutes, Senator SESSIONS for 8 minutes, Senator MCCAIN for 7 minutes, and Senator REED for 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we have an industry in America called for-profit colleges and universities. It is a unique part of America's private sector—and I use the phrase “private sector” with some caution. These are profitable entities which portray themselves as colleges and universities. We know their names: the University of Phoenix, DeVry University, Kaplan University, and—until very recently—Corinthian, one of the largest for-profit schools. What do they do? They entice young people to sign up at their for-profit colleges and universities and promise them they are going to give them training or education to find a job.

Now, it turns out that as alluring as that is, it doesn't tell the whole story. The real story about the for-profit college industry can be told with three numbers:

Ten. Ten percent of all high school graduates go to these for-profit colleges and universities.

Twenty. Twenty percent of all the Federal aid to education goes to these for-profit colleges and universities. About \$35 billion a year flows into these schools. If it were a separate Federal agency, it would be the ninth largest Federal agency in Washington, DC—\$35 billion.

But the key number we should remember is 44. Forty-four percent of all the student loan defaults in America are students at for-profit colleges and universities.

How can that be—10 percent of the students and 44 percent of the loan defaults.

First, they overcharge their students; secondly, when the students get deeply in debt, many of them drop out; and, third, those who end up graduating find out many times the diploma is worthless. That is what has happened.

Back in December of 2013, I wrote to the Department of Education asking them to investigate Corinthian Colleges. There was an article in the Huffington Post that drew my attention to it, as well as the actions by the California attorney general, Kamala Harris. It turned out that Corinthian was lying. It was lying to the students about whether they would ever end up getting a job, and it was lying to the Federal Government about their performance and how well they were doing. They were caught in their lie. As a consequence, the Department of Education started threatening Corinthian Colleges for defrauding taxpayers and the government in their official reports. Things went from bad to worse. Corinthian Colleges declared bankruptcy.

What happens when one of these for-profit colleges and universities declares bankruptcy? Well, the students many times are left high and dry. They have nothing, no school to go to. Oh, wait a minute. They don't have “nothing.” They have something. They have debt—a debt that they carry away from these failed schools.

Well, we have a provision in the law which says if your school goes bankrupt, you might be able to walk away from your student debt.

The Department of Education made an announcement yesterday, which I support, that says that they are going to work with these students who have been defrauded by Corinthian Colleges and misled into believing this college was worth their time and money. Some of these students will get a chance to be relieved from their college debt.

It is a good thing because student loan debt is not like a lot of other debts. It is not like the money you borrowed for a car. It is not like the money you borrowed for a home. Student loan debts are not discharged in bankruptcy. You have them for a lifetime. If you make a bad decision when you are 19 years old and sign up for \$18,000 a year at Corinthian Colleges or at ITT Tech, you have it until you pay it off. We find that many of these schools garnish Social Security checks. They will stay with you for a lifetime. So now the Department of Education is working on this, trying to do the right thing by these Corinthian students.

I have been in touch with Arne Duncan, Secretary of Education, whom I respect. I told him this is, unfortunately, an early indication of an industry that is on hard times. The stock

prices of these for-profit schools are in deep trouble across the board. People are finally realizing there is too much fraudulent activity going on at these institutions.

Who are the losers? It is not just the students with debts from these worthless schools but taxpayers. We are the ones who send these billions of dollars to these so-called private companies that have their CEOs take home millions of dollars while the kids are getting little or no education. They are the losers.

What should we do about it? I think we ought to be a lot tougher when it comes to the for-profit colleges and universities—holding them accountable for what they are doing to these young people and their families, holding them accountable for what they have done to taxpayers.

Do you know how much money we sent to Corinthian after it became clear they were lying to us? It was \$1 billion dollars—\$1 billion dollars, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer. There are schools like that, unfortunately, across this country.

The last point I will make on this is that, speaking to the Secretary of Education and others, the real losers many times are also veterans—veterans. The GI bill was offered to veterans after they served our country for a chance to get an education, training, and to make a life. They used it, sadly, at worthless for-profit colleges and universities, and they have used up a once-in-a-lifetime chance to build a future. They are left high and dry, not with a student-loan debt but with an empty promise that this education is going to lead to something.

I am going to continue to work with my colleagues, including Senator BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut, to change that and to protect our veterans. But I am also going to continue to work on these for-profit colleges and universities. America can do better. These schools with 10 percent of the students, 20 percent of the Federal aid to education, and 44 percent of the student loan defaults have to be held accountable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask that I be notified after 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I start by saying Commander Pilcher is a fabulous naval officer. He is doing great work in our office as we deal with the defense issues in this country, and he has been of real assistance to us. I have to say that I am proud of him. He reflects well on the Navy and the people who defend this country every day.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521

Mr. President, what is happening now is unfortunate. On the Defense bill that

came out of the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, that ranking member Senator REED and Senator MCCAIN worked on, we have had virtually no significant disagreements except this one. What our Democratic colleagues are insisting upon, driven by the President and political interests, is that defense gets no increase in funding unless nondefense gets an increase in funding over the budget cap established by the Budget Control Act.

In 2011, we passed the Budget Control Act. A part of that was the sequester, and it was not something that was never intended to occur, as some of my colleagues have claimed. It was in the law. They always say: Well, we never intended this to occur. Not so—we passed it into law. It said there would be a commission and the commission could look at entitlements and other things with the hope that we would come up with some way to save more money and put us on a sound financial path.

They said if they did not come up with that agreement, then what we put in the law would take effect as limits on defense and nondefense discretionary spending.

Under the Budget Control Act, next year will be the last year it holds those limits. It will be basically flat spending again this year, but it will increase thereafter at 2.5 percent a year. We are not destroying nondefense discretionary spending.

Remember, this legislation was passed in 2011. That is the year President Obama said: Iraq is settled; we are going to pull all the troops out. Senator MCCAIN pleaded with him not to do that. He said we could have danger in the future. He warned that if we did that, chaos could occur. But no, the President, to comply with his campaign promise, said we were pulling them all out.

Unfortunately, Senator MCCAIN was correct. We have ISIS. Iraq is in turmoil. The Syrian turmoil has gotten worse. Since 2011, Russia invaded Crimea. Yemen is in trouble. Iran is hardening its position with regard to nuclear weapons. Libya is experiencing serious problems.

All of this, I suggest, was the result of an unwise, unclear, and weak foreign policy. Every one of those situations could be better today had we had clearer leadership and people that listened to someone such as Chairman MCCAIN, who knew what he was talking about. But that is all water over the dam at this point.

What do we do now? We have to have more money for defense. I am a budget hawk. I was ranking member on the budget when we did the 2011 cap and limit on spending. I defended it consistently. But I have to tell you, colleagues, both the President, our Democratic Members, and Republican Mem-

bers believe we are going to have to increase our defense budget.

What is the problem? The problem is our colleagues are saying: Well, you cannot increase defense unless you increase nondefense by the same amount. How silly is that? Imagine, you have a tight budget at home, and a tree falls on your house. Emergency—you have to go out and find money, borrow money to fix the roof. Does that mean now that you are going to spend twice as much on your vacation? Are you going to go out and buy a new car that you did not plan to buy because you had to spend more money to fix the house?

How irresponsible is that? It is unbelievable to me. This is exactly what has occurred. They are demanding that we will not get a defense budget until we give more money for the nondefense account and spend above what we agreed to spend in the Budget Control Act. Remember, it will soon begin to grow at 2.5 percent a year. We have saved money through the Budget Control Act. It was a successful thing. We do not need to destroy it and give it up.

I want to say that I wish we had not had these dangerous conditions erupt throughout much of the world. I wish it had not happened. Senator MCCAIN warned that the foreign policy we were executing was going to result in just this kind of problem. But it has resulted, and we are going to have to defend our country. These are overseas contingency operations that we will be funding. If we do this, it does not mean we have to increase equally nondefense spending.

Let me just repeat the bad news I think most of us know. Every penny increased on the defense budget is borrowed money. If we increase nondefense spending, that is going to be borrowed, too. We do not need to borrow more money than necessary. Just because we have to spend more on defense does not mean we have to spend more on nondefense.

That is all I am saying. I think it is a mistake for our colleagues on the Democratic side to try to use the security of America as a leverage to demand more nondefense spending.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Alabama for his very important remarks.

I rise to oppose this amendment. I do so with the great respect that I have for my friend and colleague, the ranking member. The Senator from Rhode Island and I have worked together very closely on every aspect of this legislation. We agree on the overwhelming majority of its provisions. As I have said before, this legislation is better because of the good work and cooperation that I have enjoyed with my friend

from Rhode Island. I respect his knowledge of and experience on national defense issues, and I agree that we must fix sequestration. I also agree with him that our national security does not depend solely on the Department of Defense. But unfortunately, I disagree with my friend on the amendment before us.

Since the Budget Control Act became law, threats to this country have only increased and increased dramatically. Today, the United States faces the most diverse and complex array of crises around the world since the end of World War II. In the face of these global challenges, this amendment would prevent the Department from using \$38 billion of vital budget authority through overseas contingency operations, known as OCO.

Despite the claims that OCO is a slush fund, the entirety of the OCO budget goes towards real defense requirements. With this budget authority, we are supporting our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq, operations against ISIL, and broader counterterrorism efforts. The Armed Services Committee has also funded a portion of operation and maintenance activities in OCO. These activities are directly tied to supporting our operating forces. They pay for training, transportation, fuel, and maintenance of our combat equipment. These budgetary lines pay for the readiness of our Active Forces and directly support our ongoing military operations.

It would be a disaster if this \$38 billion is removed from what we are trying to achieve in this legislation. That is why it is not surprising the President himself has requested OCO funding for the exact same activities. The NDAA funded \$38 billion of operation and maintenance with OCO money because the President had requested OCO funding for these activities already. They were the most closely linked to the government's growing number of overseas contingencies in which we are engaged.

To reiterate, I agree with Senator REED that we must absolutely fix the Budget Control Act. Finding a bipartisan solution to do so remains my top priority. But in absence of such an agreement, I refuse to hold funding for the military hostage, leaving defense at sequestration levels of spending that every single military service chief has testified would put more American lives at risk of those serving in the Armed Forces of the United States. We cannot do that. We cannot add greater danger to the lives of the men and women who are serving in the military. This amendment would do that.

The NDAA is a policy bill. It cannot solve the Budget Control Act. It deals only with defense issues. It does not spend a dollar. It provides the Department of Defense and our men and women in uniform with the authorities

and support they need to defend the Nation.

The NDAA is a reform bill—a reform bill, my friends—that will enable our military to rise to the challenge of a more dangerous world. It tackles acquisition reform, military retirement reform, personnel reform, even commissary reform, and headquarters and management reform. The list goes on and on. The Armed Services Committee identified \$10 billion of excess and unnecessary spending from the President's defense budget request, and we are reinvesting it in military capabilities for our warfighters and reforms that can yield long-term savings for the Department of Defense. We did all of this while upholding our commitments to our servicemembers, retirees, and their families.

Members of the Armed Services Committee understand the need to fix the Budget Control Act. That is why we included a provision in the bill that would authorize the transfer of the additional \$38 billion from OCO to the base budget in the event that legislation is enacted that increases the budget caps on discretionary defense and nondefense spending in proportionately equal amounts. This was the product of a bipartisan compromise, and it was the most we could responsibly do in the committee to recognize the need for a broader fiscal agreement without denying funding for our military.

Every one of us has a constitutional duty to provide for the common defense, and as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that is my highest responsibility. Funding our national defense with OCO is not ideal, but it is far better than the alternative, which is to deny the men and women in uniform the \$38 billion they desperately need now. The President requested \$38 billion, and our military leaders have said they cannot succeed without that \$38 billion.

Regrettably, that is what this amendment would do, and I oppose it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first, let me say with great respect how I appreciate the collaboration and cooperation of the chairman on so much of the bill where we worked together, but this is an issue that I feel very strongly about.

Let me be very clear about what this amendment does. First, it recognizes the need—as the President did in his budget submission—for adequate resources for our Department of Defense. But what it does is it says that the additional money above the President's request for OCO—the \$38 billion which was taken from the base and put into this overseas account—would be essentially fenced or set aside until we resolve the Budget Control Act, and I think we have to begin that process immediately.

Senator MCCAIN has said quite sincerely and quite persistently that we have to fix sequestration. Every uniformed service chief who came before our committee said we have to fix sequestration and the budget control caps. The reality is that this legislation does not do that. Indeed, my amendment does not do it, but it points us in that direction and gives us a strong incentive to fix the BCA and to do what all of our defense leaders have asked us to do for the welfare and safekeeping of our troops and forces in the field.

The President recognizes this need. His budget is virtually identical to the top-line number we are talking about today. But what he also recognized is that we had to put this money into the base budget of the Department of Defense, not into the OCO account.

OCO was created because of our contingency operations overseas in Afghanistan and Iraq. It was created to fund those unpredictable year-by-year needs that arise when you have forces in conflict and in combat. It was not designed to be a fund that would take care of long-term, routine demands of the Department of Defense.

Interestingly enough, in 2008 we had 187,000 troops deployed in Afghanistan and Iraq. If we look at the OCO number for that year, we were spending approximately \$1 million per troop—all the costs, such as the fuel, the ammunition, and their own safekeeping. Today, we have 9,930 troops deployed in these combat zones. Yet, if we look at the same ratio we are asking for in this bill, it is about \$9 million per individual soldier, sailor, marine, and airman. That shows us that this fund has gone way beyond its intent. It has become an escape valve from the Budget Control Act just for the Department of Defense.

It is important to emphasize that our defense is not just the Department of Defense. Our national security rests on a strong Homeland Security Department that protects our borders. It rests on our Border Patrol, which is part of Homeland Security. It rests on the Coast Guard, which patrols our waters, the Justice Department, and the FBI.

We had an incident just a few days ago in Massachusetts where an FBI agent and a Massachusetts police officer confronted an alleged terrorist. It wasn't military forces, it was the local police force and FBI agents who were protecting our neighborhoods and communities. Those functions will not be adequately funded if we get on this path for OCO. In fact, that is my greatest concern. If this were a 1-year, temporary fix, we might be able to justify it, but what we are seeing is a pathway that will have us taking more from OCO every year, and there will be more interesting and more remote uses of OCO funds. Unfortunately, that is the way it tends to be around here. You go

where the money is, and right now the money is in OCO.

I think we should step back and do what the chairman said. We have to fix it. And he is committed to fixing it, but we have to begin now. We have to make the case now. We can't simply sit back and say we will take it up later. And that is at the heart of this.

The other issue here is very clear: OCO is not a perfect fix for the Department of Defense. As the Chief of Staff of the Army said, it has limits, it has restrictions, and it is funded for 1 year, but it is there, and they will take the money. We know that. But it is our duty and responsibility to have a more thoughtful, long-term approach, and in doing so, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It does not take away the resources. It simply says that these resources will be there once we fix the Budget Control Act, and that is what I hear everyone in this Chamber—practically everyone—saying every day: We will fix it. We will fix it. When we do, this money will already be authorized.

I am convinced that unless we stand up right now and say—hopefully with one voice—in a formal way that we have to get on the task of fixing the Budget Control Act, days will pass, weeks will pass, and months will pass to the detriment of our country, to the detriment of our military forces, and ultimately we will find ourselves, both in terms of national security and a whole range of programs, in a very bad position.

I ask that all of my colleagues consider this amendment and give it support.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I believe the vote on my amendment is in order at this time, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 1521, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 205 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Baldwin	Brown	Coons
Bennet	Cantwell	Donnelly
Blumenthal	Cardin	Durbin
Booker	Carper	Feinstein
Boxer	Casey	Franken

Gillibrand
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Hirono
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
McCaskill

Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Peters
Reed
Reid
Sanders
Schatz

Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—51

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Daines
Enzi

Ernst
Fischer
Flake
Gardner
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kirk
Lankford
Lee
McCain
McConnell

Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Perdue
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Sasse
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz

Rubio

Vitter

The amendment (No. 1521) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily set aside so that Senator FEINSTEIN may offer amendment No. 1889 and that amendment No. 1889 be set aside so that Senator FISCHER may offer amendment No. 1825.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 1889 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I call up the McCain-Feinstein-Reed-Colins amendment No. 1889.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], for Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1889 to amendment No. 1463.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reaffirm the prohibition on torture)

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1040. REAFFIRMATION OF THE PROHIBITION ON TORTURE.

(a) LIMITATION ON INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES TO THOSE IN THE ARMY FIELD MANUAL.—

(1) ARMY FIELD MANUAL 2-22.3 DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “Army Field Manual 2-22.3” means the Army Field Manual 2-22.3 entitled “Human Intelligence Collector Operations” in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act or any similar successor Army Field Manual.

(2) RESTRICTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual described in subparagraph (B) shall not be subjected to any interrogation technique or approach, or any treatment related to interrogation, that is not authorized by and listed in the Army Field Manual 2-22.3.

(B) INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this subparagraph is an individual who is—

(i) in the custody or under the effective control of an officer, employee, or other agent of the United States Government; or

(ii) detained within a facility owned, operated, or controlled by a department or agency of the United States, in any armed conflict.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—Interrogation techniques, approaches, and treatments described in Army Field Manual 2-22.3 shall be implemented strictly in accord with the principles, processes, conditions, and limitations prescribed by Army Field Manual 2-22.3.

(4) AGENCIES OTHER THAN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—If a process required by Army Field Manual 2-22.3, such as a requirement of approval by a specified Department of Defense official, is inapposite to a department or an agency other than the Department of Defense, the head of such department or agency shall ensure that a process that is substantially equivalent to the process prescribed by Army Field Manual 2-22.3 for the Department of Defense is utilized by all officers, employees, or other agents of such department or agency.

(5) INTERROGATION BY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this subsection shall preclude an officer, employee, or other agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other Federal law enforcement agency from continuing to use authorized, non-coercive techniques of interrogation that are designed to elicit voluntary statements and do not involve the use of force, threats, or promises.

(6) UPDATE OF THE ARMY FIELD MANUAL.—

(A) REQUIREMENT TO UPDATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and once every three years thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall complete a thorough review of Army Field Manual 2-22.3, and revise Army Field Manual 2-22.3, as necessary to ensure that Army Field Manual 2-22.3 complies with the legal obligations of the United States and reflects current, evidence-based, best practices for interrogation that are designed to elicit reliable and voluntary statements and do not involve the use or threat of force.

(ii) AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.—Army Field Manual 2-22.3 shall remain available to the public and any revisions to the Army Field Manual 2-22.3 adopted by the Secretary of Defense shall be made available to the public 30 days prior to the date the revisions take effect.

(B) REPORT ON BEST PRACTICES OF INTERROGATIONS.—

(i) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the interagency body established pursuant to Executive Order 13491 (commonly known as the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group) shall submit to the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, the Attorney General, and other appropriate officials a report on current, evidence-based, best practices for interrogation that are designed to elicit reliable and voluntary statements and do not involve the use of force.

(ii) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The report required by clause (i) may include recommendations for revisions to Army Field Manual 2-22.3 based on the body of research commissioned by the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group.

(iii) **AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.**—Not later than 30 days after the report required by clause (i) is submitted such report shall be made available to the public.

(b) **INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS ACCESS TO DETAINEES.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—The head of any department or agency of the United States Government shall provide the International Committee of the Red Cross with notification of, and prompt access to, any individual detained in any armed conflict in the custody or under the effective control of an officer, employee, contractor, subcontractor, or other agent of the United States Government or detained within a facility owned, operated, or effectively controlled by a department, agency, contractor, or subcontractor of the United States Government, consistent with Department of Defense regulations and policies.

(2) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to create or otherwise imply the authority to detain; or

(B) to limit or otherwise affect any other individual rights or state obligations which may arise under United States law or international agreements to which the United States is a party, including the Geneva Conventions, or to state all of the situations under which notification to and access for the International Committee of the Red Cross is required or allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

AMENDMENT NO. 1825 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

(Purpose: To authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes)

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1825.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mrs. FISCHER] proposes an amendment numbered 1825 to amendment No. 1463.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of June 8, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about Senate amendment No. 1825, the Maritime Administration Enhancement Act, which would reauthorize the Maritime Administration, or MARAD, for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. MARAD will be and traditionally has been added to the National Defense Authorization Act on the Senate floor.

MARAD strengthens our national security through its numerous programs to maintain a U.S. Merchant Marine fleet. Under the bipartisan amendment, MARAD will be authorized at \$380 million, which is similar to the levels authorized in the House NDAA. This bi-

partisan agreement will authorize MARAD spending above current authorized levels, as requested by the White House, while providing support to MARAD's economic and national defense programs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I want to speak on my amendment but not call it up at this moment. It is amendment No. 1578. The purpose of the amendment is to create an unbiased military justice system. I believe the Senate needs to vote on this amendment.

Over the last few years, Congress has forced the military to make incremental changes to address the crisis of sexual assault. After two decades of complete failure and lip service to zero tolerance, the military now says, essentially: Trust us. We have got it this time.

They spin the data, hoping nobody will dig below the surface of their top lines, because when you do, you will find the assault rate is exactly where it was in 2010.

We see an average of 52 new cases every day. Three out of four service-members who are survivors still don't think it is worth the risk of coming forward to report these crimes committed against them. One in seven victims was actually assaulted by someone in their chain of command. In 60 percent of cases, the survivor says a unit leader or supervisor is responsible for sexual harassment or gender discrimination. So it is no surprise that one in three survivors believes reporting would hurt their career.

For those who do report, they are more likely than not to experience retaliation. Despite the much touted reform that made retaliation a crime, the DOD has made zero progress on improving the 62-percent retaliation rate we had in 2012. So in 2012, 62 percent of those who reported a crime against them were retaliated against for doing so. In 2014, again, 62 percent were retaliated against.

Human Rights Watch looked into these figures and into the stories, and they found the DOD could not provide a single example from the last year where disciplinary action was actually taken against someone for retaliation. A sexual assault survivor is 12 times more likely to suffer retaliation than see their offender get convicted of sexual assault.

In my close review of 107 cases from 2013 from our four largest military

bases—one for each service—I found that nearly half of those who did move forward to report in an unrestricted report, half of them withdrew from their case during the first year.

So we can talk all we want about reporting, reporting, but if half of those who report withdraw during the year of their prosecution, it shows there is no faith in the system. Survivors do not have faith in the current system. Under any metric, the system remains plagued with distrust and does not provide fair and just process that survivors deserve.

Simply put, the military has not held up to the standard posed by General Dempsey 1 year ago when he said the Pentagon was on the clock.

I urge my colleagues to hold the military to this higher standard. Let us put these decisions into the hands of trained military prosecutors. Enough is enough with the spin, with the excuses, and with false promises. We have to do the right thing and we have to act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about an amendment—amendment No. 1628—to the Defense Authorization Act. This is an amendment I have submitted with Senator PETERS, and it has strong bipartisan support.

This is about the threat of tunnels—tunnels used by terrorists. We saw those tunnels being used in the 2014 conflict that Israel had with Hamas. Israel found more than 30 terror tunnels that had been dug by terrorists to infiltrate and attack Israel.

The Israeli military said these tunnels were intended to carry out attacks, such as abductions of Israeli citizens and soldiers, infiltrations into Israeli communities, mass murders and hostage-taking scenarios.

In one disturbing attack in July of 2014, Hamas terrorists used one of these terror tunnels to sneak into Israel and then attack and kill five Israeli soldiers.

This is a picture of one of these terror tunnels. You can imagine, if terrorists can use a tunnel to come into your country, the feeling of fear that can create in the civilian population.

Unfortunately, terror tunnels are not a new problem. In 2006, terrorists used tunnels to capture Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit. They used tunnels to take Gilad back to Gaza and held him captive for 5 years. Two other soldiers were killed in this same attack where these terror tunnels were used.

Again, this issue of terror tunnels is not unique to the conflict the Israeli people have been subjected to. In fact, one of Israel's primary objectives in Operation Protective Edge last year was to destroy these terror tunnels that posed unacceptable risk to the Israelis and to their national security.

That is why Israel has devoted so much attention to this problem and how to destroy these terror tunnels.

But not only are terror tunnels a leading security concern for the Government of Israel, tunnels are being used by terrorists in Syria and in Iraq. According to a public report yesterday, ISIS used several dozen tunnel bombs in Syria and used tunnels to help take the Iraqi city of Ramadi. On March 11, ISIS reportedly detonated a tunnel bomb under an Iraqi Army headquarters, killing an estimated 22 people. On March 15, a second tunnel bomb was reportedly used to attack Iraqi security forces.

Terror tunnels can also be used to threaten U.S. Embassies and forward-deployed U.S. military personnel. In addition, drug trafficking organizations and international criminal organizations continue to construct tunnels on our southern border in order to illegally move people, drugs, and anything else they think will advantage them into the United States. Drug cartels are exploiting vulnerabilities on our border. While this undoubtedly affects border communities and border States, it has consequences far beyond the border States.

In my home State of New Hampshire, heroin is killing people. It is a public health epidemic. I have spoken to law enforcement, first responders, firefighters, and public safety officials, and we have seen a dramatic increase in the number of people dying in my State. According to a recent DEA report and drug control experts, heroin is most commonly being brought into the United States via the southwest border.

In many places on our border with Mexico, we have fences. Unfortunately, these criminals and their syndicates—by the way, we have heard from the commander of Southern Command, and he believes these networks could be used by terrorists if they wanted to infiltrate our country. Unfortunately, they are being dug on our southern border.

This is a picture of a tunnel built on our southern border that is used to smuggle drugs, smuggle people—smuggle anything criminals and other bad people want to move into our country.

In a 2-day period alone in April, two tunnels were discovered beneath the California-Mexico border. Again, these tunnels are often used to smuggle almost anything you can think of into this country, drugs being the most prominent thing smuggled in. According to public reports, dozens of smuggling tunnels have been discovered on our southern borders since 2006.

The amendment I have submitted to the Defense authorization, along with my colleague, Senator PETERS from Michigan, is an amendment that builds on a provision already in the Defense authorization that I had included in

section 1272. Our amendment promotes and authorizes greater cooperation between Israel and the United States to counter terror tunnels in Israel.

If we work with close allies such as Israel to develop better capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize tunnels, not only can we help defend Israel and Israel defend itself against terrorist groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah, but we can also use the capabilities we develop together to better protect our own border, our own U.S. Embassies, and our forward-deployed U.S. troops.

My amendment specifically highlights the tunnel threat on our southern border. It calls on the administration to use the anti-tunneling capabilities developed to help Israel to better protect the United States, our people, our interests, and our border. In short, this amendment will help Israel, our closest and most reliable ally in the Middle East. It will help us defeat the use of terror tunnels. It will better equip officials on our southern border to find and shut down tunnels that are being used to smuggle drugs and that can be used to smuggle other dangerous items into the United States of America by these criminal syndicates.

Again, the commander of our Southern Command said he believes this network can also be used by terrorists.

Not surprisingly, this effort and this amendment have received strong bipartisan support. I thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have sponsored this amendment. This is a commonsense amendment, and I hope my colleagues, when it is offered for a vote on the Senate floor, will support this amendment so that we can work with the Israeli Government, that we can share our understanding of how to stop these terror tunnels and we can deploy that same technology on our southern borders to keep our country safe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1485, 1510, 1520, 1538, 1579, 1622, 1791, 1677, 1701, 1733, 1739, 1744, 1781, AND 1796 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the ranking member and I have a small package of amendments that have been cleared by both sides.

I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up and agreed to en bloc: No. 1485, Hoeven; No. 1510, Heller; No. 1520, Rounds; No. 1538, Wicker; No. 1579, Ernst; No. 1622, Moran; No. 1791, Rubio; No. 1677, Udall; No. 1701, Wyden; No. 1733, Stabenow; No. 1739, McCaskill; No. 1744, Feinstein;

No. 1781, Heitkamp; and No. 1796, Cardin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up and agreed to en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1485, 1510, 1520, 1538, 1579, 1622, 1791, 1677, 1701, 1733, 1739, 1744, 1781, and 1796) agreed to en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1485

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on the nuclear force improvement program of the Air Force)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1637. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE NUCLEAR FORCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM OF THE AIR FORCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senates makes the following findings:

(1) On February 6, 2014, Air Force Global Strike Command (AFGSC) initiated a force improvement program for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) force designed to improve mission effectiveness, strengthen culture and morale, and identify areas in need of investment by soliciting input from airmen performing ICBM operations.

(2) The ICBM force improvement program generated more than 300 recommendations to strengthen ICBM operations and served as a model for subsequent force improvement programs in other mission areas, such as bomber operations and sustainment.

(3) On May 28, 2014, as part of the nuclear force improvement program, the Air Force announced it would make immediate improvements in the nuclear mission of the Air Force, including enhancing career opportunities for airmen in the nuclear career field, ensuring training activities focused on performing the mission in the field, reforming the personnel reliability program, establishing special pay rates for positions in the nuclear career field, and creating a new service medal for nuclear deterrence operations.

(4) Chief of Staff of the Air Force Mark Welsh has said that, as part of the nuclear force improvement program, the Air Force will increase nuclear-manning levels and strengthen professional development for the members of the Air Force supporting the nuclear mission of the Air Force in order “to address shortfalls and offer our airmen more stable work schedule and better quality of life”.

(5) Secretary of the Air Force Deborah Lee James, in recognition of the importance of the nuclear mission of the Air Force, proposed elevating the grade of the commander of the Air Force Global Strike Command from lieutenant general to general, and on March 30, 2015, the Senate confirmed a general as commander of that command.

(6) The Air Force redirected more than \$160,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 to alleviate urgent, near-term shortfalls within the nuclear mission of the Air Force as part of the nuclear force improvement program.

(7) The Air Force plans to spend more than \$200,000,000 on the nuclear force improvement program in fiscal year 2015, and requested more than \$130,000,000 for the program for fiscal year 2016.

(8) Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel said on November 14, 2014, that “[t]he nuclear mission plays a critical role in ensuring the Nation’s safety. No other enterprise we have is more important”.

(9) Secretary Hagel also said that the budget for the nuclear mission of the Air Force should increase by 10 percent over a five-year period.

(10) Section 1652 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-201; 128 Stat. 3654; 10 U.S.C. 491 note) declares it the policy of the United States “to ensure that the members of the Armed Forces who operate the nuclear deterrent of the United States have the training, resources, and national support required to execute the critical national security mission of the members”.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the nuclear mission of the Air Force should be a top priority for the Department of the Air Force and for Congress;

(2) the members of the Air Force who operate and maintain the Nation’s nuclear deterrent perform work that is vital to the security of the United States;

(3) the nuclear force improvement program of the Air Force has made significant near-term improvements for the members of the Air Force in the nuclear career field of the Air Force;

(4) Congress should support long-term investments in the Air Force nuclear enterprise that sustain the progress made under the nuclear force improvement program;

(5) the Air Force should—

(A) regularly inform Congress on the progress being made under the nuclear force improvement program and its efforts to strengthen the nuclear enterprise; and

(B) make Congress aware of any additional actions that should be taken to optimize performance of the nuclear mission of the Air Force and maximize the strength of the United States strategic deterrent; and

(6) future budgets for the Air Force should reflect the importance of the nuclear mission of the Air Force and the need to provide members of the Air Force assigned to the nuclear mission the best possible support and quality of life.

AMENDMENT NO. 1510

(Purpose: To require a report on the interoperability between electronic health records systems of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs)

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON INTEROPERABILITY BETWEEN ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS SYSTEMS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report that sets forth a timeline with milestones for achieving interoperability between the electronic health records systems of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

AMENDMENT NO. 1520

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive plan to support civil authorities in response to cyber attacks by foreign powers)

At the appropriate place in subtitle B of title XVI, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO SUPPORT CIVIL AUTHORITIES IN RESPONSE TO CYBER ATTACKS BY FOREIGN POWERS.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a comprehensive plan for the United States Cyber Command to support civil authorities in responding to cyber attacks by foreign powers (as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801)) against the United States or a United States person.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A plan for internal Department of Defense collective training activities that are integrated with exercises conducted with other agencies and State and local governments.

(B) Plans for coordination with the heads of other Federal agencies and State and local governments pursuant to the exercises required under subparagraph (A).

(C) Note of any historical frameworks that are used, if any, in the formulation of the plan required by paragraph (1), such as Operation Noble Eagle.

(D) Descriptions of the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of Federal, State, and local authorities as the Secretary understands them.

(E) Descriptions of the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of the active components and reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(F) A description of such legislative and administrative action as may be necessary to carry out the plan required by paragraph (1).

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REVIEW OF PLAN.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan developed under subsection (a)(1).

AMENDMENT NO. 1538

(Purpose: To allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. MELVILLE HALL OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.

(a) GIFT TO THE MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.—The Maritime Administrator may accept a gift of money from the Foundation under section 51315 of title 46, United States Code, for the purpose of renovating Melville Hall on the campus of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

(b) COVERED GIFTS.—A gift described in this subsection is a gift under subsection (a) that the Maritime Administrator determines exceeds the sum of—

(1) the minimum amount that is sufficient to ensure the renovation of Melville Hall in accordance with the capital improvement plan of the United States Merchant Marine Academy that was in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) 25 percent of the amount described in paragraph (1).

(c) OPERATION CONTRACTS.—Subject to subsection (d), in the case that the Maritime Administrator accepts a gift of money described in subsection (b), the Maritime Administrator may enter into a contract with the Foundation for the operation of Melville Hall to make available facilities for, among other possible uses, official academy functions, third-party catering functions, and industry events and conferences.

(d) CONTRACT TERMS.—The contract described in subsection (c) shall be for such period and on such terms as the Maritime Administrator considers appropriate, including a provision, mutually agreeable to the Maritime Administrator and the Foundation, that—

(1) requires the Foundation—

(A) at the expense solely of the Foundation through the term of the contract to maintain Melville Hall in a condition that is as good as or better than the condition Melville Hall was in on the later of—

(i) the date that the renovation of Melville Hall was completed; or

(ii) the date that the Foundation accepted Melville Hall after it was tendered to the Foundation by the Maritime Administrator; and

(B) to deposit all proceeds from the operation of Melville Hall, after expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of Melville Hall, into the account of the Regimental Affairs Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentality or successor entity, to be used solely for the morale and welfare of the cadets of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

(2) prohibits the use of Melville Hall as lodging or an office by any person for more than 4 days in any calendar year other than—

(A) by the United States; or

(B) for the administration and operation of Melville Hall.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term “contract” includes any modification, extension, or renewal of the contract.

(2) FOUNDATION.—In this section, the term “Foundation” means the United States Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association and Foundation, Inc.

(f) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed under section 3105 of title 41, United States Code, as requiring the Maritime Administrator to award a contract for the operation of Melville Hall to the Foundation.

AMENDMENT NO. 1579

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should maintain and enhance robust military intelligence support to force protection for installations, facilities, and personnel of the Department of Defense and the family members of such personnel)

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1664. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING MILITARY INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO FORCE PROTECTION FOR INSTALLATIONS, FACILITIES, AND PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Maintaining appropriate force protection for deployed personnel of the Department of Defense and their families is a priority for Congress.

(2) Installations, facilities, and personnel of the Department in Europe face a rising threat from international terrorist groups operating in Europe, from individuals inspired by such groups, and from those traversing through Europe to join or return from fighting the terrorist organization known as the “Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant” (ISIL) in Iraq and Syria.

(3) Robust military intelligence support to force protection is necessary to detect and thwart potential terrorist plots that, if successful, would have strategic consequences for the United States and the allies of the United States in Europe.

(4) Military intelligence support is also important for detecting and addressing early indicators and warnings of aggression and assertive military action by Russia, particularly action by Russia to destabilize Europe with hybrid or asymmetric warfare.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should maintain and enhance robust military intelligence support to force protection for installations, facilities, and personnel of the Department of Defense and the family members of such personnel, in Europe and worldwide.

AMENDMENT NO. 1622

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on reviewing and considering findings and recommendations of the Council of Governors regarding cyber capabilities of the Armed Forces)

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1628. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REVIEWING AND CONSIDERING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCIL OF GOVERNORS ON CYBER CAPABILITIES OF THE ARMED FORCES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should review and consider any findings and recommendations of the Council of Governors pertaining to cyber mission force requirements and any proposed reductions in and synchronization of the cyber capabilities of active or reserve components of the Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT NO. 1791

(Purpose: To authorize a land exchange at Navy Outlying Field, Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida)

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2822. LAND EXCHANGE, NAVY OUTLYING LANDING FIELD, NAVAL AIR STATION, WHITING FIELD, FLORIDA.

(a) LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy may convey to Escambia County, Florida (in this section referred to as the “County”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, containing Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 in Escambia County associated with Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Milton, Florida.

(b) LAND TO BE ACQUIRED.—In exchange for the property described in subsection (a), the County shall convey to the Secretary of the Navy land and improvements thereon in Santa Rosa County, Florida, that is acceptable to the Secretary and suitable for use as a Navy outlying landing field to replace Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8.

(c) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Navy shall require the County to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the land exchange under this section, including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, other administrative costs related to the land exchange, and all costs associated with relocation of activities and facilities from Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 to the replacement location. If amounts are collected from the County in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the land exchange, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the County.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the land exchange. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or ac-

count, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy.

(e) CONVEYANCE AGREEMENT.—The exchange of real property under this section shall be accomplished using a quit claim deed or other legal instrument and upon terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy and the County, including such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 1677

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense to submit information to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to the exposure of members of the Armed Forces to airborne hazards and open burn pits)

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. SUBMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS RELATING TO EXPOSURE TO AIRBORNE HAZARDS AND OPEN BURN PITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs such information in the possession of the Secretary of Defense as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs considers necessary to supplement and support—

(1) the development of information to be included in the Airborne Hazards and Open Burn Pit Registry established by the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 201 of the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–260; 38 U.S.C. 527 note); and

(2) research and development activities conducted by the Department of Veterans Affairs to explore the potential health risks of exposure by members of the Armed Forces to environmental factors in Iraq and Afghanistan, in particular the connection of such exposure to respiratory illnesses such as chronic cough, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, constrictive bronchiolitis, and pulmonary fibrosis.

(b) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall include in the information submitted to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under subsection (a) information on any research and surveillance efforts conducted by the Department of Defense to evaluate the incidence and prevalence of respiratory illnesses among members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to open burn pits while deployed overseas.

AMENDMENT NO. 1701

(Purpose: To improve the provisions relating to adoption of retired military working dogs)

On page 117, insert between lines 12 and 13, the following:

(b) LOCATION OF RETIREMENT.—Subsection (f) of such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(2) by inserting “(1)” before “If the Secretary”;

(3) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

(A) by striking “, and no suitable adoption is available at the military facility where the dog is location,”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting

“within the United States” after “to another location”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply if a United States citizen living abroad adopts the dog at the time of retirement.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1733

(Purpose: To require a report on plans for the use and availability of airfields in the United States for homeland defense missions)

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON PLANS FOR THE USE OF DOMESTIC AIRFIELDS FOR HOMELAND DEFENSE AND DISASTER RESPONSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Transportation, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the plans for airfields in the United States that are required to support homeland defense and local disaster response missions.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The report shall include the following items:

(1) The criteria used to determine the capabilities and locations of airfields in the United States needed to support safe operations of military aircraft in the execution of homeland defense and local disaster response missions.

(2) A description of the processes and procedures in place to ensure that contingency plans for the use of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations are coordinated among the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies with jurisdiction over those airfields.

(3) An assessment of the impact, if any, to logistics and resource planning as a result of the reduction of certain capabilities of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations.

(4) A review of the existing agreements and authorities between the Commander of the United States Northern Command and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration that allow for consultation on decisions that impact the capabilities of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations.

(c) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(2) CAPABILITIES OF AIRFIELDS.—The term “capabilities of airfields” means the length and width of runways, taxiways, and aprons, the operation of navigation aids and lighting, the operation of fuel storage, distribution, and refueling systems, and the availability of air traffic control services.

(3) AIRFIELDS IN THE UNITED STATES THAT SUPPORT BOTH MILITARY AND CIVILIAN AIR OPERATIONS.—The term “airfields in the United

States that support both military and civilian air operations" means the following:

(A) Airports that are designated as joint use facilities pursuant to section 47175 of title 49, United States Code, in which both the military and civil aviation have shared use of the airfield.

(B) Airports used by the military that have a permanent military aviation presence at the airport pursuant to a memorandum of agreement or tenant lease with the airport owner that is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 1739

(Purpose: To require a conflict of interest certification for Inspector General investigations relating to whistleblower retaliation)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CONFLICT OF INTEREST CERTIFICATION FOR INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO WHISTLEBLOWER RETALIATION.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the term "covered employee" means a whistleblower who is an employee of the Department of Defense or a military department, or an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, or subgrantee thereof;

(2) the term "covered investigation" means an investigation carried out by an Inspector General of a military department or the Inspector General of the Department of Defense relating to—

(A) a retaliatory personnel action taken against a member of the Armed Forces under section 1034 of title 10, United States Code; or

(B) any retaliatory action taken against a covered employee; and

(3) the term "military department" means each of the departments described in section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each investigator involved in a covered investigation shall submit to the Inspector General of the Department of Defense or the Inspector General of the military department, as applicable, a certification that there was no conflict of interest between the investigator, any witness involved in the covered investigation, and the covered employee or member of the Armed Forces, as applicable, during the conduct of the covered investigation.

(2) STANDARDIZED FORM.—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall develop a standardized form to be used by each investigator to submit the certification required under paragraph (1).

(3) INVESTIGATIVE FILE.—Each certification submitted under paragraph (1) shall be included in the file of the applicable covered investigation.

AMENDMENT NO. 1744

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility projects for which appropriations were made for fiscal year 2015)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR WHICH AMOUNTS HAVE BEEN APPROPRIATED.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235) appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(A) \$35,000,000 to make seismic corrections to Building 205 in the West Los Angeles Medical Center of the Department in Los Angeles, California, which, according to the Department, is a building that is designated as having an exceptionally high risk of sustaining substantial damage or collapsing during an earthquake;

(B) \$101,900,000 to replace the community living center and mental health facilities of the Department in Long Beach, California, which, according to the Department, are designated as having an exceptionally high risk of sustaining substantial damage or collapsing during an earthquake;

(C) \$187,500,000 to replace the existing spinal cord injury clinic of the Department in San Diego, California, which, according to the Department, is designated as having an extremely high risk of sustaining major damage during an earthquake; and

(D) \$122,400,000 to make renovations to address substantial safety and compliance issues at the medical center of the Department in Canandaigua, New York, and for the construction of a new clinic and community living center at such medical center.

(2) The Department is unable to obligate or expend the amounts described in paragraph (1) because it lacks an explicit authorization by an Act of Congress pursuant to section 8104(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, to carry out the major medical facility projects described in such paragraph.

(3) Among the major medical facility projects described in paragraph (1), three are critical seismic safety projects in California.

(4) Every day that the critical seismic safety projects described in paragraph (3) are delayed puts the lives of veterans and employees of the Department at risk.

(5) According to the United States Geological Survey—

(A) California has a 99 percent chance or greater of experiencing an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater in the next 30 years;

(B) even earthquakes of less severity than magnitude 6.7 can cause life threatening damage to seismically unsafe buildings; and

(C) in California, earthquakes of magnitude 6.0 or greater occur on average once every 1.2 years.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the major medical facility projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs specified in the explanatory statement accompanying the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235) at the locations and in the amounts specified in such explanatory statement, including by obligating and expending such amounts.

AMENDMENT NO. 1781

(Purpose: To improve the report on the strategy to protect United States national security interests in the Arctic region)

On page 528, line 14, insert after "Arctic region" the following: " , as well as among the Armed Forces".

On page 528, line 23, insert after "ture," the following: "communications and domain awareness,".

On page 529, line 5, insert before the period at the end the following: " , including by exploring opportunities for sharing installations and maintenance facilities".

AMENDMENT NO. 1796

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on finding efficiencies within the working capital fund activities of the Department of Defense)

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1005. SENSE OF SENATE ON FINDING EFFICIENCIES WITHIN THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should, through the military departments, continue to find efficiencies within the working capital fund activities of the Department of Defense with specific emphasis on optimizing the existing workload plans of such activities to ensure a strong organic industrial base workforce.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I defer to my colleague from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 1569

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I call for regular order with respect to amendment No. 1569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1921 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1569

(Purpose: To improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats)

Mr. BURR. I send a second-degree amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BURR] proposes an amendment numbered 1921 to amendment No. 1569.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. BURR. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise in support of the national defense authorization bill and would point out to my colleagues that this is a piece of legislation which for half a century has enjoyed bipartisan support—during Republican administrations, Democratic administrations, and during times of majority on the Democratic side and on the Republican side.

Regrettably, last year this Chamber did not take up the NDAA until December—months after it had been approved in committee. I commend Senator Levin, the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for reporting the bill out of his committee during Democratic majorities, and if he had his way, we would have taken up the bill much earlier.

I also want to commend Senator MCCAIN, our current Republican chairman of the Armed Services Committee for again, in a timely way, reporting this bipartisan bill. And then I think commendation is due to the new leadership of this Senate for taking up this bill in a timely fashion in June rather than waiting until December.

It has been said by the distinguished minority leader that taking up this bill

is a waste of time because the President has said he would veto this bill. It is curious that he would say so because this bill funds national security at the amount requested by the President of the United States. I think to people out there listening in the public, it is curious the President would say "I am going to veto a bill" that actually funds security items at the administration's requested level.

I would also point out to my colleagues that this is not the first time the President has issued a veto threat. This happened on the Iran nuclear negotiations bill, where at first the President said: If the House and Senate send me such a bill, I will veto it. But the more we talked about it and the more we brought the American people into the discussion and the more the light was shown on the issue and the American public opinion began to be known, the more popular the idea became in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

At the end of the day, it was unanimous or virtually unanimous in the Foreign Relations Committee that the Senate and the House should be heard on the issue of any negotiations this administration has, as the Secretary of State might have with the Iranian leadership. At the end of the day, it passed overwhelmingly, and the President actually changed his mind. Having said he would veto that Iranian nuclear bill, he changed his mind and sent word that he would, in fact, sign it.

I hope the same thing will happen in this situation. I hope the President will rescind his veto threat and, after we have worked our will and after this bill has gone over to a conference committee with the House of Representatives and we have come up with a compromise between the House and the Senate, I hope the President will, in fact, change his mind and change his position as he did on the Iranian bill and sign it. I do not think it is a waste of time. I think it is critical that we do this.

It is often that we start off on a partisan basis. I have the highest regard for the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. He and I served together in the House of Representatives. It has been my privilege to serve on the committee with the distinguished ranking member for some time. I think he would acknowledge that we started off the defense markup with all Republicans saying they were going to vote for it and with all Democrats saying they would be a "no" vote. But the more we got into that issue and the more Senator MCCAIN began to work with Members on both sides of the aisle and amendments were offered and debate was held, that opposition began to melt away.

At the end of the day, on this bill that is before us today, there were eight Democrats who voted aye in the

committee and only four Democrats who voted no. As I recall, all of the Republicans on the committee voted yes. It was an overwhelmingly bipartisan support of something that started off dividing us, Republicans versus Democrats.

It is important that we continue to do that. The focus should be on our national security priorities. The focus should be on the troops. This bill funds the troops in a very meaningful and a very reform-oriented way. This is necessary under the current times.

I want to quote from an earlier Armed Services hearing we had, wherein Director of National Intelligence James Clapper warned the committee. I will quote the Director of National Intelligence. He said that "unpredictable instability is the new normal." "Unpredictable instability is the new normal."

He pointed out that "last year was the most lethal year for global terrorism in 45 years." It so happens that we have only been keeping statistics on the lethal degree of terrorism for 45 years. In the recorded 45-year history of keeping tabs on this, this is the most lethal year, this past year—tough times, dangerous times.

This was underscored by former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, when he testified at a hearing before the committee earlier this year. He said that "the United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War."

This is a dangerous world. This is a dangerous time. We have a bill that addresses these times, and I think we should move forward with it. The Obama administration may be unwilling to admit that the world is less safe, but there is no denying the extraordinary challenges. I think Members on both sides of the aisle would acknowledge this: ISIS or ISIL, the newly resurgent and aggressive Russia and what they have done in invading Crimea and eastern Ukraine, the havoc across the Middle East in nations such as Yemen and Syria, nations that are collapsing into chaos. These are serious times.

Yet our President said, on the European Continent yesterday, that "we don't have a complete strategy" for dealing with ISIS in Iraq.

This is not a time to block resources our military needs. As a matter of fact, it is a time for us to act as Americans and not as partisans. There are several reasons why passing this bill this month should not be controversial:

First, it would authorize the same amount of funding as requested by the President.

Second, it contains one of the most substantive defense reforms we have seen in years. It would adopt \$10 billion worth of efficiencies that would pave the way for long-term savings at the Department of Defense.

Third, the bill champions greater efficiency by reducing bureaucracy at the Pentagon and reforming the weapons acquisition system. Just because we need to spend more money for defense does not mean we need to spend more money to hire bureaucrats and staffers at the Pentagon.

Fourth, it is very important to point out the reforms in this bill make sure that the men and women who fight for our country, including those who are wounded or who have retired, have the quality of life, health care and support they deserve.

Fifth, this bill would modernize the military retirement system. Something that has been recommended to us by experts in the military and by retired military people. It would not only extend benefits to more servicemembers, but also give them more value. It would give our servicemembers more choice in their retirement system. Too many of our members are being excluded from the current system. Maintaining our All-Volunteer Force requires taking care of those who have chosen to serve.

Let me give a big shout-out and thank-you to Senator MAZIE HIRONO, my ranking member on the Seapower Subcommittee. We have worked closely in the Seapower mark of this legislation. As a matter of fact, I regret that Senator HIRONO and I could not do our two speeches on this bill together. That was our intent, for me to speak as chair and for her to speak as ranking member because we have cooperated so much in our Seapower title.

Our title in the bill addresses shortfalls in the Navy's ability to meet requirements. We have 30 ships and our Navy's amphibious fleet is much smaller than the Marine Corps tells us is required. Last year, the Chief of Naval Operations, ADM Jonathan Greenert, said that more like 50 ships are required if we want to do everything the military is being asked to do. We need to address this and at least move from 30 ships toward that goal of 50 that Admiral Greenert suggested.

This year's NDAA would authorize \$199 million for an additional American-class amphibious assault ship as well as \$80 million in research and development. This sends a powerful message to anyone who would be our adversary. These ships are known as the "Swiss Army Knives" of the sea because they are so versatile and because they respond to so many of the threats, including counterterrorism, piracy, combat missions, and humanitarian crises.

We also recognize the need to modernize our submarine fleet. Again, thank you to Senator HIRONO, the ranking member, for working with us on this. The Seapower Subcommittee is preparing for the eventual construction of the Ohio-class replacement submarine program. This is an expensive

program. It is necessary. It is expensive. We are about the business of providing the necessary funds to mitigate higher costs for the submarine program on our shipbuilding budget.

I am so pleased we addressed these Seapower needs. In addition, we do our best to meet the needs of the National Guard, to support a modern fleet for the Army, for mental health services for our troops and veterans, and the protection for our servicemembers' religious convictions. It is a comprehensive reform bill that ought to have the same sort of bipartisan support we have had for last 50 years.

We need a bill, in conclusion, that takes an honest look at our current challenges and implements necessary reforms. I am pleased to say this bill does so, and I hope we move forward, get past this moment of suiting up in a partisan fashion, and send this bill with an overwhelming vote from the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, it sometimes happens that issues of enormous consequence seem to be ignored and do not get anywhere near the discussion it requires. One such issue which needs to be put on the table that needs to be dealt with and needs to be resolved is the crisis of youth unemployment in America, in general, and specifically among Black and Hispanic youth.

Let me provide you with some new information that I recently received from the Economic Policy Institute, one of the important nonpartisan economic think tanks in our country. What this information tells us is that the level of youth unemployment in this country has reached tragic dimensions, and it is especially tragic for the African-American and Hispanic communities.

The Economic Policy Institute recently analyzed census data on unemployment among young people—those people who are either jobless, those people who have given up looking for work or those people who are working part time when they want to work full time; in other words, what real unemployment is about.

This is what they found. They found that during April of 2014 to March of 2015, the average real unemployment rate for Black high school graduates, ages 17 to 20, was 51.3 percent. Let me repeat. Over the last year, from April 2014 to March of 2015, the average real unemployment rate for Black high school graduates was 51.3 percent. The jobless figure for Hispanics in the same age group was 36.1 percent, and for young White high school graduates the number was 33.8 percent.

This is an issue which cannot be ignored. An entire generation of young

people who are trying to get their lives together, trying to earn some money, and trying to become independent are unable to find work. This is an issue which must be dealt with. Even young Americans with a college degree are finding it increasingly difficult to get a job. The real unemployment rate for young Black college graduates between the ages of 21 and 24 was 23 percent, the figure for Hispanics was 22.4 percent, and the figure for Whites was 12.9 percent.

Today in America, over 5½ million young people have either dropped out of high school or have graduated high school and do not have jobs. It is no great secret that without work, without education, and without hope, people get into trouble, and the result is—and this is not unrelated—that tragically in America today we have more people in jail than any other country on Earth, including China, an authoritarian, Communist country with a population four times our size. How does that happen? How is it that this great Nation has more people in jail than any other country and far more than a Communist, authoritarian society in China, a country that is four times our size?

Today, the United States is 5 percent of the world's population; yet, we have 25 percent of the world's prisoners. Incredibly, over 3 percent of our country's population is under some form of correctional control. According to the NAACP, from 1980 to 2008, the number of people incarcerated in America quadrupled from roughly half a million to 2.3 million people. If current trends continue, the estimate is that one in three Black males born today can expect to spend time in prison during his lifetime.

This is an unspeakable tragedy. This is an issue which has to be put on the table and has to be discussed. And this crisis is not just a destruction of human life, it is also a very costly issue to the taxpayers of our country. In America, we now spend nearly \$200 billion a year on public safety, including \$70 billion on correctional facilities each and every year.

It is beyond comprehension that we as a nation have not focused attention on the fact that millions of our young people are unable to find work or begin their careers in a productive economy. This is an issue which we must deal with—and I know I speak for the Senator from Michigan—and we will make sure this country pays attention to and deals with this issue.

Let me just say that it makes a lot more sense to invest in jobs and education for our young people than to spend incredible amounts of money on jails and incarceration. Let's give these kids a shot at life. Let's give them a chance. Let's not lock them up.

The time is long overdue for us to start investing in our young people, to

help them get the jobs they need, the education they need, and the job training they need so they can be part of the American middle class.

The answer to unemployment and poverty is not and cannot be the mass incarceration of young Americans of all races. It is time to bring hope and economic opportunity to communities throughout this country.

Last week, I introduced legislation with Congressman JOHN CONYERS and Senator DEBBIE STABENOW to provide \$5½ billion to immediately begin funding States and localities throughout this country to employ 1 million young people between the ages of 16 and 24 and provide job training to hundreds of thousands of young Americans.

Some people may say: Well, this is an expensive proposition.

I guarantee that this investment will save money because it costs a heck of a lot more money to put people in jail than to provide them with jobs and education. We will save lives and create taxpayers and a middle class rather than having more and more people in jail.

I just wanted to mention that this is an issue which has to be discussed. I look forward to working with the cosponsor of this legislation, Senator STABENOW, and we will bring attention to this issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, before the Senator from Vermont leaves, I have to say that I am very proud to be a partner with him on this legislation and how critically important it is that we give young people the opportunity to have a job. On the last immigration bill, we were able to add dollars to the bill, which helped to create funding for young people. Youth unemployment is a huge issue, and we need to give them a path forward on jobs, hope, and economic opportunity. I again thank the Senator from Vermont.

Madam President, I also have to say I am very disappointed that Senator REED's amendment was not successful. Unfortunately, it was voted down today on a partisan vote. We all know there are way too many budget gimmicks in this authorization, as important as it is, and what we ought to be doing is making sure all of the security needs of our families—not just those at the Department of Defense but those in other parts of the budget have the adequate resources they need so their families are truly safe.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

I wish to speak specifically about another piece of legislation which will help to ensure our safety, and that is economic safety and security. This is something which also deserves our time and attention, and time is running out right now. We have 52 days before the highway trust fund will be

empty, shut down; 52 days and we have not yet done even one hearing in the Finance Committee. I respectfully ask that our chairman, for whom I have tremendous respect, have hearings and discussions so we can work together and talk about how we are going to fund this bill. We have not yet seen legislation on the floor that will allow us to move forward on a long-term funding bill for economic security.

Our Republican colleagues need to join with us and provide leadership on this issue which affects millions of jobs and, frankly, affects every single American. There was a time when Republicans were the leaders of building our roads, bridges, airports, railroads, and all of our infrastructure, and that came in the form of President Eisenhower, who said in 1952 that “a network of modern roads is as necessary to defense as it is to our national economy and our personal safety.”

We are on the floor talking about legislation to authorize moving forward to support our troops and making sure we are authorizing programs for our national defense. Yet, in 1952 President Eisenhower said that “a network of modern roads is as necessary to our defense as it is to our national economy and our own personal safety.” But in only 52 days, there will be zero in our Nation’s highway trust fund.

By the late 1950s, our interstate highways were responsible for 31 percent of the annual economic growth of our country—an economic engine of our country. Thanks to President Eisenhower’s leadership, our roads in the mid-20th century were the envy of the world. Now we see other countries that want to be like America—a global economic power—and they are rushing to invest in their roads, bridges, airports, railroads, and other infrastructure, countries such as China and Brazil.

China is taking 9 percent of their GDP and using it to invest in jobs, and those things that will allow them to create jobs and be a world economic power. They are wooing businesses there because they have the most modern infrastructure, and frankly, we are playing catchup. There is absolutely no reason that should be happening.

Our European competitors spend twice what we do on transportation and funding for critical roads and bridges and other transportation needs. The Chinese Government spends four times what we are spending right now.

The World Economic Forum’s “Global Competitiveness Report” for 2014 and 2015 ranks America 16th in the quality of roads. We are one spot behind Luxembourg and one spot just ahead of Croatia. Can you imagine? Yay. We are just ahead of Croatia in investing in the future in transportation technology and safety for our roads, bridges, and airports—all of those things which create economic security and, in the words of President Eisenhower, national security.

The World Economic Forum has its own rankings. In 2002, America had the fifth best transportation system in the world. In their most recent rankings, we were 24th.

The American Society of Civil Engineers’ most recent report card for America’s infrastructure—our transportation, roads and bridges—gave us a D on our roads. I don’t think any of us would be happy if our children brought home a report card that had a D on it; yet, that is what we are now seeing in Congress. The report card that we are presenting to the American people has a D on it. It says that 42 percent of major urban highways are congested and that it costs over \$101 billion in wasted time and fuel every year.

One of my constituents recently told me that he hit a pothole on the way to the Detroit Metro Airport, and he had to replace all four tires on his car. He actually went through seven tires in 1 year. That is a lot of money; that is a lot of tires. He went through seven tires in 1 year because of the bad roads in Michigan.

The average Michigan resident spends \$357 a year on repairing the damage to their automobiles caused by broken roads. That is more than twice the amount that average people pay in taxes to go to improving our roads and bridges. It is more than twice what it would take to actually fix our roads and bridges and actually be able to move forward. It is not fair. It is not fair to neglect responsibility to maintain our Nation’s basic roads and bridges and other infrastructure and let the American people pay for that neglect, which is exactly what is happening.

We can’t expect our workers and our companies to compete in the 21st-century global marketplace if they are forced to use 20th-century roads and bridges, and we are on our way to the 19th century. Some places are so crumbled up, we are going from pavement back to the dirt underneath it. It is crazy, and there is no excuse for it.

Every time we pass a short-term patch that goes 1 or 2 or 6 months down the road, we let our workers, businesses, and our families down. Congress needs to step up. We are ready, and we are looking for Republican partners to join with us in a long-term solution. The majority needs to step up.

We have 52 days and counting until the highway trust fund is empty—at zero. We shouldn’t see the majority kick the can down the road again or come up with some kind of short-term suggestion or crazy things such as cutting people’s pensions to pay for roads and bridges. Together, we need to do what the American people expect us to do and sit down and do what has been done over the course of history in the United States: Fund a long-term transportation bill that moves us forward in our economy, jobs, and creates the

kind of competitive edge we have traditionally had in the United States.

A grade of D on roads is an embarrassment. We need our Republican majority to step up with us, because we are waiting. We are anxious to put together a long-term strategy on funding for our roads and bridges. This is pretty basic when we look at the responsibilities that Congress has on behalf of the American people—maintaining airports, railroads, short rail for agriculture, as well as our long distance rail, roads, bridges, and all of the other things that comprise the basic format. We are 52 days away from the highway trust fund going empty.

Let’s get busy. It is time to make sure we are doing the right thing in moving the country forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GAZETTE DAYS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am here on the floor today to celebrate a significant event in our country’s history and in Rhode Island. Every student of American history knows the story of the Boston Tea Party. We all learned about Samuel Adams and the Sons of Liberty dumping chests of tea into Boston Harbor to protest British taxation without representation.

What many students don’t know is that down in Rhode Island, more than a year earlier, a group of Rhode Island patriots made an even harsher challenge to the British Empire one dark night in June of 1772. I am here to tell their story.

The episode began when amid growing tensions with colonists, King George III moved the HMS *Gaspee*, an armed British customs vessel, into Rhode Island’s Narragansett Bay. The *Gaspee* and its captain, Lieutenant William Dudingston, were known for seizing cargo and flagging down ships only to harass, humiliate, and interrogate the colonials. As Nick Bunker, author of the book “An Empire on the Edge” wrote, this harassment did not sit well with Rhode Islanders, who had grown accustomed to a level of freedom unique in that time. “Even by American standards, Rhode Island was an extreme case of popular government.”

The chapter in his book in which he describes this is entitled “‘This Dark Affair’: The *Gaspee* Incident.” Bunker went on to say: “Out of all the colonies, Rhode Island was the one where

the ocean entered most deeply into the lives of the people.” And we wanted it free.

In July of 1663, over 100 years before the *Gaspee* incident, King Charles II had granted a royal charter establishing the colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in New England. And the charter said it was “to hold forth a lively experiment . . . that a most flourishing civil state may stand and best be maintained with full liberty in religious concerns.”

The “lively experiment” in Rhode Island blazed the path for American freedom of religion, a fundamental right of our great Nation. In Rhode Island, what were then considered radical ideologies of freedom ran very deep. A century later, William Dudingston would learn just how deep, as he went about harassing American vessels and confiscating their cargo. “The British Armed Forces have come to regard almost every local merchant as a smuggler and a cheat,” Bunker wrote. Rhode Islanders were fed up with the abuse. Something was bound to give.

In March of 1772, local seamen and traders led by John Brown signed a petition against the *Gaspee*. They brought it to Rhode Island Chief Justice Stephen Hopkins, a political leader in Providence and a relentless advocate for liberty.

Nick Bunker wrote:

For Brown and Hopkins, the only law they recognized was theirs, laid down by their assembly and their local courts. They saw no role in Rhode Island for the English laws that gave the navy its authority.

This is in 1772. Chief Justice Hopkins provided a legal opinion saying that British officers needed to present their orders and commission to Rhode Island’s Governor before entering local waters. Well, Dudingston refused and, indeed, threatened to hang “any man who tried to oppose the *Gaspee*.”

So the fuse was lit. It all came to a head on June 9, 1772. Rhode Island Captain Benjamin Lindsey was sailing to Providence from Newport in his ship, the *Hannah*. He was accosted and ordered to yield for inspection by the *Gaspee*. Well, Captain Lindsey refused. He raced up Narragansett Bay, despite warning shots fired at the *Hannah*.

The *Gaspee* gave chase and Captain Lindsey, who knew the waters of Rhode Island far better than did Dudingston, steered his ship north toward Pawtuxet Cove in Warwick, right over the shallow waters of Namquid Point. There, the lighter *Hannah* shot over the shallows, but the heavier *Gaspee* ran aground and stuck firm.

The British ship and her crew were caught, stranded in a falling tide. They would need to wait many hours for a rising tide to free them again. According to Nick Bunker, as night fell, the *Gaspee* crew turned in, leaving only one seaman on the deck. Spotting an irresponsible opportunity, Captain Lindsey

sailed on to Providence. There he enlisted the help of John Brown, the respected merchant and statesman who had led that petition against the *Gaspee* back in March.

Brown was from one of the most prominent families in the city. He ultimately helped found what we know today as Brown University. Brown and Lindsey rallied a group of Rhode Island patriots at Sabin’s Tavern, down in what is now the East Side of Providence, along the waterfront. Refreshments, no doubt, were served. Refreshed or not, the group resolved to end the *Gaspee*’s menace in Rhode Island waters. That night, those raiders, led by what Nick Bunker called the “maritime elite of Providence,” set out with blackened faces, in long boots, and rowed down the bay with their oars muffled to avoid detection. They made their way to the stranded *Gaspee* and surrounded it.

As Daniel Harrington recounted in a recent op-ed that he wrote in the Providence Journal, “Capt. Abraham Whipple spoke first for the Rhode Islanders, summoning Dudingston: ‘I am sheriff of Kent county, [expletive]. I have a warrant to apprehend you, [expletive]; so surrender, [expletive].’ It was a classic Rhode Island greeting!”

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Harrington’s article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Lieutenant Dudingston, of course, refused Whipple’s demand, and instead ordered his men to fire upon anyone who attempted to board the *Gaspee*. The Rhode Islanders saw their advantage. They outnumbered the British, and they swarmed on the *Gaspee*. Shots rang out in the dark. Lieutenant Dudingston fell wounded in the arm and the thigh. That night in the waters off Warwick, RI, the very first blood in the conflict that was to become the American Revolution was drawn by American arms—a little bit more than just tea over the side into Boston Harbor.

As the patriots commandeered the ship, Brown ordered one of his Rhode Islanders, a physician named John Mawney, to tend to Dudingston’s wounds. Mawney was an able doctor and saved the lieutenant. Brown and Whipple took the captive English crew ashore, and then they returned to the despised *Gaspee* to rid Narragansett Bay of her detested presence once and for all. They set her afire. The blaze spread, reaching the ship’s charges of gunpowder and cannons, setting off explosions like fireworks.

Ultimately, the flames reached the *Gaspee*’s powder magazine, and the resulting blast echoed across Narragansett Bay, as airborne fragments of the *Gaspee* splashed down into the water beneath a moonless sky. Nick Bunker wrote that the British had never seen anything quite like the *Gaspee* affair.

Their attack on the ship amounted to a complete rejection of the empire’s right to rule.

According to Dan Harrington’s op-ed, King George III was furious and offered huge rewards for the capture of the rebels. Inquiries were made and nooses fashioned. But in the end, not one name was produced, as thousands of Rhode Islanders remained true to silence. The site of this historic victory is now named *Gaspee* Point in honor of this incident and the audacious Rhode Islanders who accomplished it.

According to Bunker, the Rhode Island patriots successfully organized “a military operation 3 years ahead of its time, that arose not merely from a private quarrel but also a matrix of ideas”—the ideas of liberty. Rhode Islanders have made a tradition of celebrating the *Gaspee* incident. This year marks the 50th annual *Gaspee* Days celebration in Warwick. Over the years, we celebrate by marching in the annual parade, as we recall the courage of the men who fired the first shots and drew the first blood in the quest for American independence.

I would like to thank the *Gaspee* Days Committee for their continuing efforts to host this annual celebration and my friend, State Representative Joe McNamara, for his work each year in making this event so special. I come to the floor every year at this time to speak about the burning of the *Gaspee*, because as proud as I am of what those brave Rhode Islanders did back in 1772, I am also disappointed that their story has largely been lost to history outside our little State.

I hope these speeches will help new generations to learn about this important American event. In Rhode Island, of course, we will never forget. As Mr. Harrington wrote in his piece in the Providence Journal, “Through the ages, noble Rhode Islanders have named their daughters Hannah in honor of the ship that long ago led a fledgling young country toward independence and helped create the finest nation ever born of man.”

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal, June 2, 2015]

THE GASPEE, THE HERO AND THE DUD

(By Daniel F. Harrington)

Every story needs a good villain, and 243 years ago the British dropped a big one on us. His name was Dudingston. His job? Preventing piracy on Narragansett Bay—or, in layman’s terms, shaking down every merchant he could catch.

Lt. William Dudingston, 31, and his dreaded ship the HMS *Gaspee* arbitrarily halted and often seized the cargo of Rhode Island ships at will. And he did it all in the name of taxation. Think of him as an Internal Revenue Service agent and mob boss rolled into one.

He wore a gold-trimmed cap and had a proclivity for rum.

The governor of Rhode Island repeatedly challenged the Crown to check the lieutenant's brazen misbehavior, but his requests were largely ignored. So on Dudingston went.

Until he met our heroes.

The first was Capt. Benjamin Lindsey, who skippered a sloop called the *Hannah*. He had had enough. Returning from New York on June 9, 1772, he was greeted in Newport with cannon fire from the *Gaspee* after refusing Dudingston's command to strike his flag. Then, trusting "the Dud" knew more about extortion than navigation, Lindsey led him on a four-hour chase up Narragansett Bay. It was the Dud's guns versus Lindsey's guts.

Lindsey skillfully piloted his ship toward Pawtuxet Cove and specifically to a menacing sandbar, trusting the heavy *Gaspee* and its rum-fueled captain would run aground.

They did!

But Lindsey didn't stop there. He sailed north to Providence and informed fellow merchant John Brown about the sitting Dud. At dusk, Brown sent a town crier through the streets of Providence and assembled a raiding party of tavern-friendly professional men.

Rowing to the doomed ship in long boats, the Patriots reached the *Gaspee* around midnight.

Capt. Abraham Whipple spoke first for the Rhode Islanders, summoning Dudingston: "I am sheriff of Kent county, Goddamn you. I have a warrant to apprehend you, Goddamn you; so surrender, Goddamn you." It was a classic Rhode Island greeting!

Then a shot rang out. Dudingston fell when a ball hit him five inches below his navel. "Good God, I am done for!" he cried.

And then a miracle.

As the Dud lay bleeding to death, a raider stepped forward. It was 21-year-old physician—and genius—John Mawney, who performed life-saving surgery on him. Astonished, Dudingston then offered the doctor a gold buckle. Mawney refused it, but accepted a silver one.

The Rhode Islanders then set the *Gaspee* afloat and the warship exploded, lighting up Narragansett Bay as never before—or since.

King George III was furious and offered huge rewards for the capture of the rebels. Inquiries were made and nooses fashioned, but in the end, not one name was produced, as thousands of Rhode Islanders remained true to silence.

The burning of the *Gaspee* steeled the resolve of all the colonies and inspired the Boston Tea Party 18 months later. In 1922, *The New York Times* memorably editorialized that the boldness of the *Gaspee* incident made *The Boston Tea Party* look, by comparison, like a tea party!

Meanwhile, back in Britain, Dudingston would survive court martial for losing his ship, receive a disability pension and live another 45 years and become a rear admiral.

One man remains lost to history.

No one knows what happened to America's first hero, Captain Lindsey. The most wanted man in the world quickly disappeared and dissolved into time. We've never found his resting place—probably because he was buried at sea. So he eludes us still, although some say you can still hear him rousing the *Hannah* when the fog of Narragansett Bay is unusually thick . . .

Not all have forgotten. Through the ages, noble Rhode Islanders have named their daughters *Hannah* in honor of the ship that long ago led a fledgling young country toward independence and helped create the fin-

est nation ever born of man. And her name is still sweet, for it echoes the refrain of liberty and recalls the powerful truth that "God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, we are hopefully going to be able to vote very shortly on an amendment to the NDAA that I have submitted, No. 1901, which speaks to a pretty simple concept that when we spend taxpayer money and 70 percent of the goods that we purchase with taxpayer dollars come through the Defense Department, we should be spending that money on American companies.

We should be using our resources as a nation to purchase things from companies here in the United States. That has been the law on the books since the 1930s. The Buy America Act, for economic and national security reasons, directs the U.S. Government to buy at least 50 percent of the components of any good from U.S. companies. The problem is that over time, loophole after loophole and exception after exception have been built into the Buy America Act, such that today the exceptions really are the rule.

The consequences are pretty dire for American workers. It means that thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of workers have lost their job because work that should have gone to American companies to build components for jet engines, tanks, and submarines are going overseas. But for our national security, we also are faced with issues as well, given the fact that as our supply chain becomes much more internationalized, we are relying on countries that today might be our allies to supply parts but that tomorrow might not. It puts us at risk potentially down the line.

So I am proposing a pretty simple amendment here, which is really just about sunlight. I had previously hoped to push an amendment that would have actually cut down on one of the waivers that is the most egregious. But I am hoping for a consensus on an amendment that would just make clear that we have to get some more information about some of the worst loopholes to the "Buy American" law. The worst of them, and, in fact, the majority of the waivers for the Buy American Act come through one specific waiver.

There are about eight ways to get around buying things in the United States for the U.S. military. But one of them is that if you can prove that the usage of the good is going to be primarily overseas, you can buy that good overseas. Now, that is an understandable exception if you are talking about the purchase of something such as fuel or food that simply does not make sense to import from the United States. But because there is really no

oversight at all on this waiver and because over the last 10 years, having fought two wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, this relatively small loophole, as it appears on the written page, has become an enormous loophole.

So \$17 billion in goods were made overseas, and in 2014, 83 percent of them were done through this particular "Buy America" loophole. So I want to just talk for a second about what some of these waivers are being used to purchase. This is an Opel light-duty cargo van that has been purchased by the U.S. military for a variety of activities. This was not an emergency expenditure. Very clearly, you are buying this van for activities that you can plan for. It is not something that you could not import from the United States.

This contract, which was entered into at the height of the auto crisis, was \$2.9 million in total—\$2.9 million that went to a foreign auto company instead of going to a company in the United States. This is clearly something—a cargo van—not being used on the frontlines of our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan that could have been bought from an American auto company. Ford, Chevrolet, and Chrysler make versions of this van that are produced by American workers.

There were \$39 million worth of waivers for jet engines and gas turbines. There was \$28 million worth of waivers simply for men's clothing. There were \$11 million of waivers that were used for shoes, for men's footwear. So it is clear that these waivers are being used not for goods that are urgently needed in the field that had to be purchased in a place such as Afghanistan or Iraq or in the region but simply to avoid the "Buy American" law.

I want to amend my previous statement. It was not \$17 billion in goods that were bought from foreign firms, it was \$176 billion in manufactured goods that were bought—and services—from foreign firms. So if it were up to me, we would tighten this loophole. We would bring billions of dollars of work back to the United States simply by saying that you have to have an urgent national security need in order to buy the good overseas.

But if it is not urgent, if you are just buying some vans to cart around equipment or people, then you should buy them from the United States. But amendment No. 1901 is a little bit simpler, in that it just requires that we continue to get reports from the Department of Defense detailing the waivers that they have been granted for the "Buy American" law, so that we have a pretty good idea as to how much work we have lost to foreign firms, how many U.S. workers have lost their jobs because taxpayer dollars are going overseas.

It adds a little new wrinkle to these reports so that when it comes to these

waivers, the waiver for goods that are primarily used overseas, which was 83 percent in 2014 of all of the waivers that were granted, we get a little bit more information so that for waivers for contracts over \$5 million—these are pretty big contracts—we know what you are buying, why you need it, and why you are required to buy it overseas.

I think that this information is just sunlight on the waiver process. Again, a waiver process which is sending overseas \$176 billion worth of American taxpayer paid-for jobs should have more information so that we can make decisions. It is funny, when I talk to my constituents and I tell them that I am fighting for the “Buy American” law and that I am fighting to make sure that at least 50 percent of their dollars get spent to buy things from American companies when they are used by the U.S. military, they have a bewildered look on their face because they assume that is the policy of the U.S. Government to begin with.

Why on Earth would our taxpayer dollars be used to buy things overseas?

There are some commonsense reasons why that happens. Obviously, as I said, when you are buying something like food or fuel for the military’s use in Afghanistan or in Iraq, it makes sense to buy that overseas. If you can’t find it in the United States, if there is not a single contractor that makes what you are looking for in the United States, then, by all means, you are going to have to buy that overseas. If there is such a price differential, such an enormous price differential that it is a waste of taxpayer dollars to buy it from American companies—and, frankly, those are fairly minute exceptions—then it makes sense to do a work-around on the “Buy American” law.

But we have seen hundreds of billions of dollars in waivers, waivers that are being used for reasons that you just can’t justify but also through a process that includes really no oversight. On that waiver that allows for goods to be purchased overseas when you can’t find it in the United States, there are examples where a simple Google search could have found the item in the United States, but a waiver was still signed, allowing it to be bought overseas because it wasn’t available here—just no oversight, making sure we are only giving these waivers in the right circumstances.

I have talked a number of times on this floor about a company that folded up shop in Waterbury, CT, a legacy company in the Naugatuck Valley, Ansonia Copper & Brass. It made the copper nickel tubing for the American submarine fleet. It was the only company in the United States that made this particular item.

It is out of business today because of the loopholes in the “Buy American” law. We are now buying our copper

nickel tubing from a foreign company. Now, that put dozens of people out of work in Connecticut, but it also put in jeopardy our national security. If the supplier of this copper nickel tubing, which is not something you can make easily—it requires incredible expertise, complicated machinery. If the country we are getting it from today decides they are not going to supply it to us because they oppose the way in which we are using it, we can’t make it in the United States any longer. You can’t just reassemble the ability to make that particular good, complicated tubing that goes inside one of the most complicated pieces of machinery in the U.S. Navy, a submarine. You can’t just do that overnight. So at the very least, we should be getting all of the information we need to do proper oversight on this process of granting waivers.

I have been pleased at the willingness of Chairman MCCAIN and his staff, along with the ranking member Senator REED, to work with us on this amendment, this sunlight amendment, this disclosure amendment. Hopefully, over the course of today or tomorrow, we will be able to include this in one of the managers’ packages that we adopt on the Senate floor, and it will allow us to have a more robust conversation as to why on Earth we spent U.S. taxpayer dollars on this van, when \$3 million—at the height of the auto crisis—could have gone to an American company making a similar vehicle. That is a conversation that on behalf of the literally hundreds of thousands of American workers who don’t have jobs today because we are spending taxpayer dollars overseas—for their sake, they deserve for us to have that debate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. CASSIDY and Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1531 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

PATIENT FREEDOM ACT

Mr. CASSIDY. I wish to say briefly that I thank Senator COLLINS for her thoughtful review of the Patient Freedom Act, who after our office has probably reviewed it the most and made several substantial changes that have made it better. I also thank her for her speech, which was a very thoughtful critique of why we are replacing ObamaCare—not because it is the President’s bill but because of things that she described, where people have an incentive not to earn more money and a penalty if they do, which goes against the American values that if you work hard you can be more successful.

It should not be that the Federal Government is discouraging that. I thank her for her thoughtful speech, her thoughtful comments, and her great input into the final product.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

EXPORT OF AMERICAN LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, for years, we have witnessed Vladimir Putin, the President of Russia, wreak havoc across Europe. Putin has invaded and carved up free, independent, and democratic countries, such as Georgia and Ukraine. He has bullied our friends in the European Union. He has intimidated our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO. A principal weapon of Putin’s has been Russia’s energy supplies—specifically, natural gas. Putin has used Russia’s natural gas to extort, to threaten, and to coerce our allies and our partners. He has repeatedly shut off natural gas supplies to Ukraine and has retaliated against countries that have come to Ukraine’s aid.

So 21 countries—21 countries—import more than 40 percent of their natural gas from Russia. Of these 21 nations, 13 are members of NATO and 5 of these NATO members import nearly 100 percent of their gas from Russia.

I recently returned from Eastern Europe. Our NATO allies and European partners are desperate to find alternative sources of natural gas. They are seeking to develop their own natural gas resources. But amazingly, Putin is funding activists who oppose hydraulic fracturing in Europe.

It is clear that Putin wants to keep our NATO allies dependent on Russian energy. Our NATO allies have publicly called on Congress to help them access America’s natural gas. We can do that by adopting my amendment, No. 1582. My amendment would help countries such as Ukraine, our NATO allies, and others access America’s vast supplies of natural gas. Specifically, it would ensure that the Secretary of Energy makes timely decisions on applications

to export Liquefied Natural Gas, or LNG.

Under current law, exports of LNG to countries such as our NATO allies are presumed to be in the public interest, unless the Secretary finds otherwise. But over the last several years, the Secretary's decisionmaking process has been, at best, unpredictable. My amendment would fix that. Specifically, my amendment would require the Secretary to approve or disapprove LNG export applications within 45 days after the environmental review process is complete.

My amendment would ensure that legal challenges to LNG export projects are resolved expeditiously. It would also require exporters to publicly disclose the countries to which LNG has been delivered.

In January of this year, the energy committee held a hearing on legislation that is identical to my amendment. At that hearing, the Department of Energy testified that my legislation is "a solution we will be able to comply with."

I am encouraged by DOD's support for this legislation. I am also encouraged by the support of the National Association of Manufacturers and others who testified that LNG exports would create thousands of jobs across America and help reduce our Nation's trade deficit.

The United States is the world's largest producer of natural gas. We have more than enough natural gas to meet our own needs and use our gas to bring about positive change throughout the world.

Do not take my word for it. Listen to what the Obama administration had to say. In February of this year, President Obama's Council of Economic Advisers stated that "an increase in U.S. exports of natural gas . . . would have a number of mostly beneficial effects on . . . employment, U.S. geopolitical security, and the environment."

The President's economic advisers said that LNG exports would create tens of thousands of jobs in the United States, jobs that "would arise . . . in natural gas production[,] manufacturing [and] a range of sectors, including . . . infrastructure investment, and transportation."

The President's economic advisers also stated that U.S. LNG exports would have "a positive geopolitical impact for the United States." Specifically, they explained that U.S. LNG "builds liquidity in the global natural gas market, and reduces European dependence on the current primary suppliers, Russia and Iran."

Again, these are not my words. This is from the White House.

Mr. President, Congress has a choice: We can watch Putin use natural gas as a weapon against our allies and partners or we can take a meaningful step to help our friends.

My amendment boosts the security of our NATO allies and friends around the world, and it does so through a peaceful means. It doesn't spend American tax dollars and all the while will help to grow America's economy. It is a commonsense amendment, and I ask all of the Members to support it.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

SRI LANKA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about recent developments in Sri Lanka where the new government of President Maithrapala Sirisena has taken several important and encouraging steps to promote good governance, human rights, and reconciliation since his election on January 8.

Among the government's initial accomplishments are the adoption of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, which curtails the extensive powers enjoyed by the executive and vests more power in the Parliament, limits the Presidential term to 5 years instead of 6, allows the President to hold office only for two terms instead of an unlimited number of terms, and provides for a Constitutional Council to make appointments to independent commissions on the judiciary, police, public service, elections, and audit, instead of the President as was previously the case. In addition, the right to information has been included as a fundamental right in the Constitution.

Sri Lanka's Foreign Minister Mangala Samaraweera has wisely called the attention of the Parliament to the need to review the individuals and entities that were listed under a U.N. regulation pursuant to U.N. Security Council Resolution 1373, adopted shortly after the 9/11 attacks. The regulation was used to ban several Tamil diaspora groups for their alleged links to the LTTE. However, the new government reportedly believes that some individuals and organizations may have been wrongly accused of terrorist links when they were merely advocating in support of their rights. The government intends to review the list in the interest of reconciliation and reaffirming its commitment to freedom of expression.

I am also encouraged that the government has revived its relationship with the United Nations, including

with the U.N. Human Rights Council, and has invited the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights to visit Sri Lanka. I hope such a visit takes place soon.

The Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence visited Sri Lanka in March-April 2015, and I understand that the Working Group on Enforced and Involuntary Disappearances will visit Sri Lanka in August.

For years, impunity for serious crimes has been the norm in Sri Lanka. The government is working to establish what it describes as a "domestic mechanism" to deal with accountability for human rights violations. A purely domestic mechanism, however, is not likely to be sufficient. The Sri Lankan people, the United States and other governments, the United Nations, and international human rights groups have long called for justice for the victims of atrocities committed by the armed forces and the LTTE during the 30-year conflict. It is essential that the justice process is not only about truth telling, but is a credible, independent mechanism with authority to investigate, prosecute, and appropriately punish those responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity, on both sides.

It is also important to the development of a credible accountability mechanism and to the success of this endeavor that Sri Lankan officials consult with local civil society organizations, including the families of the war's victims. They should also invite international bodies, such as the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, to take part in this process, to provide technical assistance as well as substantive input and help with prosecutorial work, evidence-gathering, and judicial decision-making. A hybrid mechanism, with international experts involved at the prosecutorial and judicial level, will help ensure that the failings and cynicism associated with past domestic accountability mechanisms are not repeated.

I am told that the government intends to work with humanitarian organizations on the issue of missing persons, including forensics, and to resolve the cases of remaining detainees. The United States and other international groups could assist this important humanitarian effort.

Under the government of former President Mahinda Rajapaksa, Armed Forces day was "Victory Day", a divisive, provocative celebration for the Sinhalese majority. President Sirisena, in his Armed Forces Day speech on May 19, said the policy of the new government will be "development and reconciliation", making clear the government's recognition that development projects alone will not heal the wounds and scars of the past. He also affirmed

that the reconciliation process must involve truth seeking, justice, eliminating fear and suspicion among all communities and building trust among them, as well as the rebuilding of infrastructure. He expressed confidence that the Armed Forces would now dedicate themselves to the government's policy on reconciliation.

The return of land in the north and east currently occupied by the Armed Forces, and the resettlement of Tamils displaced by the war and the provision of basic services, is an urgent necessity. Some land in the east that had been allocated by the previous government for infrastructure projects has been released by President Sirisena for the resettlement of the displaced, and a small amount of land in the north has been provided to civilians who were uprooted by the war. But this is only a beginning. Sri Lanka is at peace, so it is time for the Armed Forces to return land, support the resettlement of families, and focus on external threats rather than domestic policing.

Unlike the previous government which vilified its critics and locked up after sham trials journalists who exposed corruption, President Sirisena has taken steps to reaffirm freedom of the press by unblocking media websites, inviting exiled journalists to return to the country, and ensuring freedom of expression for the media to operate without fear of reprisal.

Under the previous government, Sri Lanka's judicial system was politicized, manipulated, and corrupted. The new government is taking steps to reestablish the independence of the judiciary, which is fundamental to any democracy. Also significant was the appointment of the Chief Justice who is from the minority Tamil community immediately after the election of the new government.

The government has committed to fight corruption and ensure accountability for financial crimes even for the most influential and powerful individuals, to end impunity at any level. It has established a Stolen Assets Recovery Task Force for this purpose. The United States is prepared to assist these efforts and those of civil society to combat corruption.

These are very encouraging steps for which we should commend President Sirisena. They should have been carried out by the previous government, but instead former President Rajapaksa and his brothers Basil and Gotabhaya, and their close associates, sought to dismantle the institutions of democracy, subvert the rule of law, and enrich themselves. Rather than support reconciliation, they encouraged corruption and exacerbated ethnic, religious, and political divisions.

Of course, these are only first steps, and there have been others that raise questions about the government's intentions. For example, MG Jagath

Dias, who was appointed the new Army Chief of Staff, commanded a regiment that took part in the final battles of the war that were marked by widespread abuses including summary executions of prisoners and in which countless civilians died, reportedly from government artillery shelling. If the Sri Lankan government is serious about addressing the crimes of the past it will need to take up allegations against senior officers like General Dias. Failing to address the role of senior military commanders, in particular those who still serve, would seriously weaken the government's credibility.

Most immediately, the government's challenge is to hold parliamentary elections as soon as possible. Once a new Parliament is in place the processes of reconciliation, reconstruction, reform, and accountability can proceed apace.

After the elections, President Sirisena's government will need to work closely with the United Nations on plans to address the legacy of past abuses. The U.N. Human Rights Council is expected to take up this issue in its September session in Geneva. Thus, the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights needs to release its report before then, as called for by the U.N. Human Rights Council, with recommendations for Sri Lanka and the international community on how best to achieve accountability in Sri Lanka. The government should wait until the U.N. report is issued before finalizing its own plans.

Secretary of State Kerry's visit to Sri Lanka just 4 months after President Sirisena's election was not only symbolic of the revival of relations between our countries, but also illustrative of the Sri Lankan Government's efforts to realign its foreign relations more broadly. Over the last 6 years, the Obama administration has demonstrated leadership within the international community in addressing a range of issues in Sri Lanka. The administration's policy should follow the same trajectory and continue to play a leadership role.

Likewise, the U.S. Congress has long sought to support democracy, development, human rights, and the rule of law in Sri Lanka. A close friend of mine, the late James W. Spain, one of our most able diplomats, served as our Ambassador in Colombo from 1985 to 1988. He was a devoted friend of Sri Lanka. I look forward to doing what I can to assist the Secretary and the Sirisena government, on behalf of all the people of Sri Lanka, in the months ahead.

IRAQ WAR'S IMPACT ON CURRENT NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have the benefit of looking through the lens of history to learn from past mistakes

in the hopes of making more informed decisions for the future. No example is more relevant today than the unintended effects of the 2003 invasion of Iraq, and their bearing on the threats of today. I opposed that war from the beginning, and we have paid, and continue to pay, a tremendous price—in American lives, in the unfathomable expense of taxpayer dollars, and in the escalation of strife in that region, and beyond.

There is no doubt that the terrorists of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, ISIL, have emerged from Al Qaeda in Iraq, seizing upon instability, weak institutions, ethnic fractions, and general hostility toward Western forces that resulted from the post-9/11 Iraq invasion. Our personnel, allies, and interests abroad face significant threats from this terrorist group, which have arisen out of the ill-conceived invasion of Iraq.

We can be proud of the bravery, dedication, and sacrifice of our soldiers and their families. They are not at fault for the complex situation in which we now find ourselves. They served our Nation dutifully, and for that we are grateful. Rather, it serves as a reminder that policymakers cannot act recklessly—especially when taking military action. As we continue to address the very real threat that is ISIL, it is astounding to me how far in the past the hard lessons we learned now appear to be to some commentators and policymakers.

I ask unanimous consent that a perceptive and well-written analysis on this subject, written by the distinguished journalist and former foreign correspondent Barrie Dunsmore, that was published in the Rutland Herald and the Montpelier (Barre) Times Argus on May 24, 2015, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rutland Herald and the Montpelier (Barre) Times Argus; May 24, 2015]

SHORT MEMORIES

(By Barrie Dunsmore)

"I am running because I think the world is falling apart," Sen. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina said this past week. Senator Graham is not alone among the many aspiring Republican presidential candidates. Not only do they want us to believe the world is falling apart. They also want us to believe it's not their fault.

As Robert Costa wrote in the Washington Post, "One by one, nearly a dozen GOP hopefuls took the stage (in Des Moines Iowa) for a Lincoln dinner, each different in style and stature but all joining a rising Republican chorus that lays blame for the Islamic State terrorist group squarely at the feet of President Barack Obama." Senator Lindsey Graham said to cheers, "If you fought in Iraq, it worked. It's not your fault it's going to hell. It's Obama's fault."

The Islamic State is but one of the Middle East's problems of recent years. The hopes for a more democratic region engendered by

the Arab Spring, have been dashed. Egypt is now more of a military dictatorship than it was under President Hosni Mubarak. Without dictator Muammar Gaddafi, Libya is now awash with weapons, without a functioning government and ruled by tribes. Syria is still in the throes of a three year unresolved civil war, with an estimated 150,000 dead. As Iran and Saudi Arabia violently vie for dominance in Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Yemen, indisputably the Middle East is more unstable than it was seven years ago.

Yet just as the world economy was in a deep depression after the market crash of '08, when Obama took office so too was the Middle East in turmoil—mostly because of the 2003 American invasion of Iraq.

As they seek to shift the blame of Iraq, which just last year conservative pundit George Will wrote was “the worst foreign policy decision in U.S. history,” Republicans are asking us to forget the past. I don't doubt that some already have. In the era of Twitter, YouTube and Instagram, seven years may seem like an eternity. But not everyone will forget.

Former Florida Governor Jeb Bush found this out on a recent campaign stop, when Ivy Ziedrich, a Nevada college student confronted him with the charge, “Your brother created ISIS.” Bush's response was, “ISIS didn't exist when my brother was president.”

It is accurate that the name Islamic State was not in use during the George W. Bush presidency. But the movement that later became ISIS was a direct result of the American invasion. That group called itself “al Qaida in Iraq.” It was led by the fanatic Abu Musab al-Zarkawi, and was responsible for hundreds of bombings, kidnappings and beheadings—yes beheadings—in a reign of terror which made Zarqawi the most wanted man in Iraq. His goal was to rid Iraq of foreign forces, and to provoke sectarian conflict between Iraq's Shiite majority and his own Sunni Muslim sect.

Zarqawi was killed in an American bombing raid in 2006. But nine years ago, the Washington Post reported, “Analysts warned that his death may not stem the tide of the insurgency and violence. . . . Zarqawi set up numerous semi-autonomous terrorist cells across Iraq, many of which could continue after his death.”

Indeed they did. And joined by numerous bitter Sunni officers from Saddam Hussein's army, al-Qaida in Iraq eventually morphed into the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS.) Its current leader is an Iraqi named Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, who claims to be the caliph (supreme leader) of the new Islamic State.

But ISIS is by no means the only bi-product of the American invasion of Iraq. When Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and his Sunni dominated regime were overthrown by American military might, there were no happier people than the Shiite mullahs of Iran. Saddam had initiated the bloody eight year Iran-Iraq war. Without Saddam on its border to worry about, Iran was now free to encourage the Iraqi Shiite majority to assume power over their Sunni and Kurdish minorities. Thus a Shiite led Iraq became a major ally of Iran in its power struggle with Sunni Saudi Arabia. And that Sunni-Shiite battle for regional domination is at the root of most of the current sectarian violence in the Middle East.

(This reminds me of the credibly sourced story that surfaced years ago. Evidently after meeting with the president on the eve of the Iraq invasion, one of the Iraqi exiles who strongly encouraged American interven-

tion was nevertheless shocked that Mr. Bush did not seem to understand the difference between Sunnis and Shiites.)

But let's set aside all this troublesome history. What is it that Republicans want to do—in the future—to resolve the problem of the Islamic State?

Most of them apparently feel that in 2016, American voters will want their president to get really tough with ISIS. So far, the rhetoric has been overblown and viable alternatives seem in short supply.

Senator Marco Rubio (R-FLA), when speaking to the Freedom Forum of South Carolina, used a line from the movie “Taken”, in explaining what he would do with the terrorists. “We will look for you. We will find you. And we will kill you.”

Former Senator Rick Santorum of Pennsylvania said at a recent meeting in Iowa, “They want to bring back the 7th century of jihad. So here's my suggestion: We load up our bombers, and we bomb them back to the 7th century.”

Senator Graham and most of the other candidates, seem once again to be under the sway of the same neo-conservative, tough-guy thinking that gave us the Iraq War. Presidential wannabes might want to take a closer look at that war—eight years of fighting, at one point with 162,000 U.S. troops on the ground and substantial air and naval support nearby. The cost was at least \$2 trillion, nearly 4500 Americans killed and hundreds of thousands seriously wounded. Yet with all that military might and its enormous costs, the United States did not prevail.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUT TROOP 6 OF BARRINGTON, RHODE ISLAND

• Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, as the Boy Scout Law tells us, “A Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.” These values are always worth remembering. Even 8 out of 12 is an achievement. We all know people who don't get to six on their best day.

For 50 years, boys and young men have built these important traits under the direction of Boy Scout Troop 6 from Barrington, RI, part of the Narragansett Council of the Boy Scouts of America. The programs and traditions of Troop 6 help Scouts build moral fiber, engender responsible citizenship, and develop maturity and physical fitness.

Over the years, the troop has organized or participated in countless activities that have helped the community at large. Scouts from Troop 6 Barrington carry out a community service project every month, including working with the Barrington Land Conservation Trust to clear hiking trails, contributing food and labor to food drives across New England, and assisting numerous nonprofit organizations throughout Rhode Island.

More than 100 Scouts from Troop 6 have earned the rank of Eagle Scout,

the highest achievement in Scouting. They have distinguished themselves as community leaders, service volunteers, and mentors for their peers.

As Boy Scouts of America president Dr. Robert M. Gates put it last month in his address to the Boys Scouts National Annual Business Meeting, “Every day, in every community in America, scouting is changing the lives of boys and young men teaching them skills and leadership, helping them build character and integrity.” Thanks to its many dedicated leaders, parents, and volunteers, Troop 6 has provided boys in Barrington with valuable tools and lifelong leadership skills for a half century.

I congratulate all the Scouts of Boy Scout Troop 6 and their families on this special anniversary, and I am grateful for their outstanding commitment to their community, to the State of Rhode Island, and to our country.

Mr. President, I ask that a list of Eagle Scouts, Scoutmasters, and committee chairmen of Troop 6 be printed in the RECORD.

The list follows:

EAGLE SCOUTS FROM TROOP 6, BARRINGTON, RHODE ISLAND (1973–2015)

James Pazera, Frederick Kennemar, Norman Mahoney, Kenneth Pazera, Kurt Sorenson, Richard Farynyk, Steven M. Eklund, David Strickland, Brian T. Culhane, Paul H. Ryden, Gerritt D. DeWitt, Gregory J. Amter, Timothy L. Culhane, Jeff D. Sanders, Jeffrey J. DiSandro, Sean M. Davis, Erich G. Stephens, Julio Friedman, John W. Rosevear, Jr., Anthony DeSpirito III.

Dennis J. Wajda, Robert W. Weaver, Kurt Frederick Stephens, David B. Ryden, Kenneth F. Wajda, Bryce T. Hall, Brian H. Darakyan, Arie Daniel Lowenstein, Timothy A. Jarocki, Bryan J. Tamburro, Patrick Dolan Mara, Nathaniel H. Wetherbee, Robert J. Wilbur, Matthew David Mueller, William R. Thompson, Robert Andrew Mueller, Brendan Scott Mara, Scott R. Goff, Jonathan Thomas Belmont, Matthew Anton Steger.

Dereck Glenn Dowler, Peter Anthony DeLuca, James Alberts Charnley, Daniel V. Fitzgerald, Thomas Joseph Jarocki, Paul R. Gladney, Jr., Gregory F. Zavota, Thomas Joseph Peck, Jonathan Flynn Horton, Jonathan Matthew Webb, James Flynn Horton, Donald Lloyd Curtin, Adam Crawley, Sean M. Hackett, Alexander Robert Pease, Michael Anastasia, Alexander G. Raufi, Matthew John Lensing, Robert James Peck, Colin Black.

Patrick James Brickley, Jared Alexander Luther, Shane Barclay VanDeusen, Matthew Paul Maloney, Bradley Russell Holtz, Christopher C. Hoy, Andrew Thies, Joseph M. Codega, Brett Comer, Jonathon Scagos, Benjamin Glatter, Patrick Ryan McAree, Gregory Andrew Wright, Michael Jeffrey Oberg, Steven George Mercer, Ryan Joseph Hurley, Michael Bryan Brooks, Michael Brian Brickley, Christopher W. Halladay, Patrick W. Halladay.

Andrew Hart Dennis, Robert Christopher Preite, Justin Richard Cooper, Perry Tyler Schiff, Peter Southworth Burns, Christopher M. Scagos, Ethan A. Selinger, Christopher Dodd Antonelli, Matthew Evan Gamache, Zachary Lucky N. Luther, Benjamin Mathanie Orrall, Edward Page Codega,

Ethan Philip Greene, Edward W. Mercer, Sean Patrick McMahon, Michael Alan Dupont, Gregory James Niguidula, Zachary D. Mumbauer, Matthew J. Brown, Ian G. Millsbaugh.

Joshua C. Eller, Matthew K. Greene, Dylan A. Vanasse, Marshall M. Heitke, Nicholas K. Sayegh, Andrew R. Anderson, Brandon Purcell, Scott N. Johnson, Alexander Greenberg, Robert B. Sasse, Gregory J. Shea, Jonathan W. Cavanagh, Michael Peck, Eric Goodale, Harry J. Lico, William A. Stockhecker.

SCOUTMASTERS OF TROOP 6, BARRINGTON,
RHODE ISLAND (1965–2015)

William Maney, Rober Litchfield, James Perreault, Thomas Culhane, Karl Stephens, Edward Fitzgerald, Joseph Jarocki, James Halfyard, Cris Brooks, Richard Halladay, Gary DuPont, Dan Mumbauer, Greg Shea.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN OF TROOP 6,
BARRINGTON, RHODE ISLAND (1965–2015)

Roy Ross, Edward Peck, Axel Sorensen, Alan DeWitt, Robert Litchfield, Walter Quertler, Donald Anderson, Joseph Jarocki, Rick Scagos, James Halfyard, Marc Millsbaugh, Mike Morrisette.●

REMEMBERING LAWRENCE GOULD

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, I stand before you today in solemn remembrance of Lawrence Gould, a founding member of Camp Sunshine, which is a truly remarkable and transformative sanctuary for children with life-threatening illnesses and their families. The camp has brought respite, support, hope, and joy to thousands of families for over three decades and will continue to do so for years to come. The State of Maine has lost a man of true integrity; Larry was 84.

Larry was an exceptionally intelligent and hard-working man who found countless successes in life. Equipped with a Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at the age of 24, he went on to become president, chairman, and CEO of M/A-Com, Inc., a Fortune 500 company. After establishing himself as a prominent and distinguished businessman, Larry developed Point Sebago Resort, in Casco, ME—considered the first resort campground in the country.

Upon stepping down as chair of M/A-Com, Inc. in 1983, Larry and his wife Anna sought to share their successes with others and turned their dedication and devotion to charitable endeavors. A year later, Point Sebago Resort opened its doors to 43 children and their families, and the program was met with resounding enthusiasm from its pilot participants. Thus Camp Sunshine was created.

Over the years, more and more medical centers began referring their patients to Camp Sunshine. The camp's extraordinary emotional and medical support played a momentous role in the well-being of the children who spent their summers on the shores of Lake Sebago. As the camp became widely revered in the medical community, Larry knew he needed to expand and find a permanent home for Camp

Sunshine. In 2001, the Goulds donated 24 acres of land adjacent to Point Sebago. Camp Sunshine was now open year-round. Since then, the Goulds have continued to strengthen Camp Sunshine's services while ensuring that their families can attend free of charge.

Larry's idea for a camp that provides respite and psychosocial support for sick children was the first of its kind in the United States and is emblematic of his nature as a visionary philanthropist. His passion for improving the lives of those children and families who have stayed at Camp Sunshine is felt by all who knew him. In continuing to carry out Larry's mission, I am sure that Camp Sunshine's dedicated staff will also carry on his earnest enthusiasm for helping those around him.

Through his tireless efforts, Larry affected countless lives. I am deeply saddened by his passing, but I know that the impact of his work transcends life. His firm devotion to the betterment and care of Camp Sunshine's children will never be forgotten. I, along with all the people of Maine, am thankful for his immeasurable contributions to our State and the Nation.●

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ISAKSON for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

*LaVerne Horton Council, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Information and Technology).

*David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1528. A bill to improve energy savings by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1529. A bill to promote the tracing of firearms used in crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1530. A bill to renew certain Moving to Work agreements for a period of 10 years; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COATS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1531. A bill to reform the provision of health insurance coverage by promoting health savings accounts, State-based alternatives to coverage under the Affordable Care Act, and price transparency, in order to promote a more market-based health care system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REID, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1532. A bill to ensure timely access to affordable birth control for women; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 1533. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1534. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located in Harlingen, Texas, includes a full-service inpatient health care facility, to redesignate such medical center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Res. 195. A resolution designating the Ulysses S. Grant Association as the organization to implement the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant, Civil War General and 2-term President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 196. A resolution designating July 10, 2015, as Collector Car Appreciation Day and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Res. 197. A resolution recognizing the need to improve physical access to many federally funded facilities for all people of the

United States, particularly people with disabilities; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 145

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 145, a bill to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown.

S. 218

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 218, a bill to facilitate emergency medical services personnel training and certification curriculums for veterans.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, *supra*.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 546

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic diseases and conditions that result from diabetes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 705

At the request of Mr. UDALL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 705, a bill to amend section 213 of title 23, United States Code, relating to the Transportation Alternatives Program.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 763

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 763, a bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes.

S. 797

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 797, a bill to amend the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, and for other purposes.

S. 804

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the

Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 1083

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1083, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to provide drug rebates for drugs dispensed to low-income individuals under the Medicare prescription drug benefit program.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term "waters of the United States", and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1316

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1316, a bill to provide for the retention and future use of certain land in Point Spencer, Alaska, to support the mission of the Coast Guard, to convey certain land in Point Spencer to the Bering Straits Native Corporation, to convey certain land in Point Spencer to the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 1380

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1380, a bill to support early learning.

S. 1407

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1407, a bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public land, and for other purposes.

S. 1421

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize a 6-month extension of certain exclusivity periods in the case of approved drugs that are subsequently

approved for a new indication to prevent, diagnose, or treat a rare disease or condition, and for other purposes.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. CON. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 17, a concurrent resolution establishing a joint select committee to address regulatory reform.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1521 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1550

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1550 intended to be

proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1557

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1557 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1558

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1558 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1559

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1559 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1564

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1564 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1584

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1584 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the De-

partment of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1614

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1614 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1615

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1615 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1619

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1619 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1628

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1628 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1647

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1647 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the

Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1652

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1652 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1656

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1656 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1669

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1669 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1690

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1690 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1704

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1704 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for

military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1725

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1725 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1752

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1752 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1798

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1798 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1799

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1799 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1811

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1811 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1855

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1855 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1529. A bill to promote the tracing of firearms used in crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1529

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Crime Gun Tracing Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

Section 1709 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-8) is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively; and

(2) inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated, the following:

"(1) 'Bureau' means the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives."

SEC. 3. INCENTIVES FOR TRACING FIREARMS USED IN CRIMES.

Section 1701 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

"(c) PREFERENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTAIN GRANTS.—In awarding grants under this part, the Attorney General, where feasible—

"(1) may give preferential consideration to an application for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25-percent minimum under subsection (g); and

"(2) shall give preferential consideration to an application submitted by an applicant that has reported all firearms recovered during the previous 12 months by the applicant at a crime scene or during the course of a criminal investigation to the Bureau for the purpose of tracing, or to a State agency that reports such firearms to the Bureau for the purpose of tracing."

SEC. 4. REPORTING OF FIREARM TRACING BY APPLICANTS FOR COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES GRANTS.

Section 1702(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-1(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(12) specify—

“(A) whether the applicant recovered any firearms at a crime scene or during the course of a criminal investigation during the 12 months before the submission of the application;

“(B) the number of firearms described in subparagraph (A);

“(C) the number of firearms described in subparagraph (A) that were reported to the Bureau for tracing, or to a State agency that reports such firearms to the Bureau for tracing; and

“(D) the reason why any firearms described under subparagraph (A) were not reported to the Bureau for tracing, or to a State agency that reports such firearms to the Bureau for tracing.”.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COATS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1531. A bill to reform the provision of health insurance coverage by promoting health savings accounts, State-based alternatives to coverage under the Affordable Care Act, and price transparency, in order to promote a more market-based health care system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, the Supreme Court is about to rule on *King v. Burwell*. This decision is a question of a plain reading of the law, which is that subsidies shall only be given to those who reside in States which have established State exchanges. That is the plain reading of the law. The administration maintains that, no, “States” doesn’t mean “States,” but, rather, it can be an exchange set up either by the State or the Federal Government.

Presuming the Supreme Court decides that a plain reading of the law is correct—that for a resident of a State to receive a subsidy, they have to reside in a State that has established an exchange—there are 37 States in which those currently receiving subsidies will lose their subsidies. This is important because under ObamaCare we have seen a dramatic increase in the cost of health insurance premiums. So many people who formerly would have been able to afford an insurance premium no longer can without the subsidy. What this means for that person in a State such as Louisiana is there will be someone in the middle of chemotherapy who can no longer afford their insurance without a subsidy. The insurance has been made so high because of ObamaCare that that patient is no

longer able to afford her insurance and she is at risk of losing her coverage because the administration illegally implemented the law.

This is where we are going into the Supreme Court decision. Let me kind of now start on a different tack.

The President’s health care law, ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, has continued to be singularly unpopular. A recent ABC poll showed that only 39 percent of Americans approved of the law. That is an alltime low—10 percent lower than it has been.

One can ask why it would be unpopular and why it would be particularly unpopular now. I think the reason it is unpopular in general is that ObamaCare is a coercive Federal Government program, that if you don’t bend your will to the Federal Government, the Federal Government will penalize you. That is not how Americans view their relationship to the Federal Government. We don’t expect the government to tell us what to do. There might be income taxes, which we pay, and there will be drafts in times of war, such as World War II, but in general, aside from those two things, the Federal Government should just stay out of our lives. In this case—ObamaCare—the Federal Government gets right in the middle of that which is most personal, and that is our health care.

I think the reason ObamaCare is particularly unpopular now is because of the premium increases that have resulted because of ObamaCare. Here are some headlines: CNN, “Obamacare sticker shock: Big rate hikes proposed for 2016”; AP, “Many health insurers go big with initial 2016 rate requests”; AP again, “8 Minnesota Health Plans Propose Big Premium Hikes for 2016”; the New York Times, “In Vermont, Frustrations Mount Over Affordable Care Act”; and the Washington Post, “Almost half of Obamacare exchanges face financial struggles in the future.”

In my own State, insurers are asking for 20 percent increases, and this is on top of premium increases that have resulted from the previous few years.

Indeed, the President likes to speak about how health care costs under ObamaCare have mitigated—health care costs. Actually, that began in 2007 before ObamaCare passed. But since ObamaCare passed, it has been true. Health care costs have not risen as they did in the past. Health insurance costs have gone up dramatically. The remarkable story of ObamaCare is that there is now no relationship between health insurance cost and health care cost. The insurance companies, with the regulations imposed by ObamaCare, are charging far more for insurance than one would expect because of the health care costs. Of course, the President chooses to speak of the cost of care, not the cost of premiums, but for the average person, it is the cost of premiums which is making her so frustrated with this law.

That brings us back to *King v. Burwell*. At this point, I am offering today, along with several original co-sponsors, what we call the Patient Freedom Act. We give patients the power which ObamaCare took from them, and we give them the power by lowering the cost. We lower the cost by eliminating the mandates that are part of ObamaCare. We return power over insurance to the States, with the rationale that she who governs best governs closest to those who are governed. The insurance commissioner in that State should be able to decide what the person in their State wishes to have for their policy, not a Washington bureaucrat. And we give patients knowledge. We give them price transparency. They should know the cost of something that is ordered for them before they have the procedure performed as opposed to learning afterward. We give them portability, and we give them protection against preexisting conditions.

I and others—I think the Presiding Officer as well—have campaigned for several cycles that we were going to repeal and replace ObamaCare. In this situation, the Supreme Court will repeal a portion of ObamaCare—not all but a portion—in 37 States, and this is the plan that will replace that portion of ObamaCare which is repealed.

We like to look at it this way. We begin to plant the seeds. Now, in those 37 States, those 8 million people affected by the Obama administration’s illegal implementation of the subsidy law—we make it better for them. We plant the seeds so that over time other aspects and eventually the entirety of ObamaCare will be replaced with something which gives the patient the power as opposed to a Washington bureaucrat.

Let me lay out what we do. *King v. Burwell* goes against the administration. The Supreme Court rules that the law has been implemented illegally. States will then have a choice: They can either establish a State exchange if they wish for the status quo of ObamaCare, the State can do nothing, which means in that State all of ObamaCare goes away for the private insurance market, or they can choose the Patient Freedom Act, which is the market-based reform that we think gives the patient the power and not the bureaucrat.

Now let me compare the two. I mentioned how under the Patient Freedom Act costs are lowered by repealing mandates. For example, under ObamaCare there is an individual mandate with a coercive penalty. The Patient Freedom Act does not have one. There is an employer mandate penalty. Yes, under ObamaCare the employer is penalized; under the Patient Freedom Act, no. There is the Federal essential health benefits mandate. Under ObamaCare, a Washington bureaucrat

tells somebody that which they must purchase. In the Patient Freedom Act, we return that to the State insurance commissioner. We do not have these mandates. I can go on down the list, but the reality is that ObamaCare, coercive mandates; the Patient Freedom Act, no.

The money we make available to the States we take from the tax credits that ObamaCare would give to those in the State—those who are eligible and signed up—we take the Medicaid funding that would be available in the State for Medicaid expansion, and we combine those two for the total allocation that will go to that State.

Now, some would say: Wait a second. The Federal Government should not be in the business of helping people with health insurance. I say the Federal Government is deeply in that business already. If you look under public insurance, there is Medicare, Medicaid, CHIP, VA, TRICARE, and on and on where the Federal Government is providing health care benefits for a substantial portion—over 25 percent—of Americans. These are those Americans who get their insurance through the employer-sponsored insurance, where the employer and the employee can contribute to their insurance but they get a tax break on the purchase. That tax break averages about \$1,700. We are speaking about that remaining group who purchases their insurance for themselves. We lower their cost by equalizing the tax treatment between the two. It is the same sort of tax break that those with the employer-sponsored insurance receive. We will now offer that same tax break to these folks and in so doing achieve that conservative goal of equalizing the tax treatment of those purchasing employer-sponsored insurance as opposed to purchasing on their own.

The funding goes to the patient. I am a doctor. I have been working in a public hospital system for 25 years. I learned working as a physician in both the private setting but also principally in the public hospital setting that whoever controls the dollar has the power.

Now, if it is a bureaucrat who controls that dollar, then the bureaucrat will dictate the type of facility the patient is seen in. If the patient controls the dollar, the hospitals are going to compete for her business, and she dictates the type of facility in which she is seen. So in the Patient Freedom Act, the money goes directly to the patient. It can go through the State. The money can be granted to the State on a per-patient enrolled grant type; and in so doing, the State would then distribute—and there are advantages for the State to do the distribution—or, if the State does not want that responsibility, it can be a Federal tax credit that goes into a health savings account that the patient controls. But either way, the patient controls the dollar.

The patient has the power, not a bureaucrat.

Here is a brief example of how it will work: Here is the health savings deposit that goes into a health savings account. There will be some reforms in the bill that allow the patient to either use it as her contribution—as the employee's contribution on a employer-sponsored plan. She can directly contract with a provider network. She can purchase commercial insurance or, if she does nothing, the State has the option of creating a system, where someone is enrolled unless they choose not to be.

Again, I am going to call upon my experience as a physician. Think of a person who might be schizophrenic, homeless, living beneath a bridge. He is never going to do what ObamaCare mandates, which is to get on the Internet and fill out a 16-page form. It is just not going to happen. I have been there, I have done that. I have been in the ER in the middle of the night when a patient has come in with some acute medical or trauma condition. Under this system, though, the State could have this person enrolled unless they choose not to be.

So with the health savings account, they would have first-dollar coverage for a visit should they decide to go into an outpatient clinic for a foot that was infected. If they have some major issue and they are brought to the hospital, the catastrophic policy would then give them the coverage for that hospitalization but also protect the hospital, the doctors, and other providers from taking a total loss—which, by the way, society ends up paying for—because they have no coverage for that hospitalization. So with this system, we can achieve higher enrollments than are achieved under ObamaCare.

Last, let me talk about one more way in which we think patients will have the power. One, they will have power portability. Every year, in an open enrollment season, if the patient wishes to change plans, she may, without penalty. Secondly, she will be protected against preexisting conditions. The only rating that will be required for premiums will be for geography and age. A 57-year-old will get a bigger credit than a 20-year-old. But aside from age and, again, geography—because it is more expensive to receive care in Manhattan, NY, than Manhattan, KS—that will be the only differences allowed. Lastly, there will be the power of price transparency.

Currently, a woman goes in with her daughter, the doctor orders a CT scan, and the patient has no clue what the cost of that CT scan is. Now, it can be anywhere from \$250 to \$2,500 or more. I pick those numbers because the LA Times had an article a couple years ago, they found that the difference in cash price for CT scans was \$250 to \$2,500. The only way someone could

know is if they were an investigative reporter and able to find out, not if you are a mom with a sick child who needed a CT scan. For me, it is going to be great when the mother can take her smart phone, scan a QR code, and pull up something which says: CT scan \$250 here, \$2,500 there. I am going to make my decision based on some combination of cost, quality, and convenience. I will pick based upon my values on where to go. It is not a Washington bureaucrat, it is a mother who is going to make that decision.

Again, continuous coverage protects those with preexisting conditions, and we mentioned the price transparency. In this way, Republicans will give States the option to choose. Again, they can stay in ObamaCare if they want. They have that option now. They can do nothing, and it goes away if the Supreme Court rules that the subsidies have been implemented illegally or they can go with the Patient Freedom Act—the Patient Freedom Act—which gives patients the power by lowering costs, lowering the cost by eliminating mandates, returning power over insurance back to the commissioners who govern closest to those who actually will be using the insurance, and then giving the patient the power of portability, protection against preexisting conditions, and the power of price transparency.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, let me begin my remarks this evening by commending my friend and colleague the Senator from Louisiana for coming up with a creative and comprehensive health care bill that I am pleased to cosponsor.

As a physician, Senator CASSIDY knows far better than most of us in this body what it is like to deliver health care and has made a real effort to come up with a public policy response in anticipation of the Supreme Court's decision in *King v. Burwell*, which is expected to be handed down later this month. So I thank him for his work and his creativity in tackling a very complex issue.

As I mentioned, later this month, the Court is expected to rule in *King v. Burwell*, a case challenging the availability of premium tax credits under the Affordable Care Act in the 37 States that have not established a State-run health insurance exchange.

If the Supreme Court rules in favor of the plaintiffs, as many experts expect it will, 6.4 million Americans who are now receiving premium tax credits through the federally run exchanges will lose their subsidies, and, as a result, their health insurance may well become unaffordable. This includes almost 61,000 people in my State of Maine.

Such a decision will place responsibility on Congress and the President to work together to protect those individuals. Senator CASSIDY and I believe we

can do this by extending the current subsidies for a transition period, as contemplated by the sense-of-Congress language included in the Patient Freedom Act that we are introducing today.

But the Supreme Court's decision will also invite us to think anew about how to ensure that all Americans have access to affordable, high-quality health care. We can advance this goal by revamping and reforming the Affordable Care Act to improve the quality and affordability of health care while retaining the insurance market reforms that are so important to consumers.

Senator CASSIDY's Patient Freedom Act is precisely the type of new thinking we need. As the title of this bill suggests, the Patient Freedom Act is built on the premise that freeing people to take charge of their health care is superior to the one-size-fits-all approach of ObamaCare. A decision for the plaintiffs in *King v. Burwell* would essentially leave States with two options, absent congressional action. They could either set up a State-run exchange to ensure that their residents have access to the Affordable Care Act subsidies or do nothing and allow their residents to lose these ObamaCare subsidies. Under Senator CASSIDY's bill, however, States with federally run exchanges would have a third option. They would have the choice of participating in the new Patient Freedom Act.

Participating in the Patient Freedom Act would allow States to structure their health insurance market without an individual mandate or an employer mandate or many of the other expensive mandates under ObamaCare. In return, States would have to offer their citizens a basic health insurance plan that would include first-dollar coverage through a health savings account, basic prescription drug coverage, a high-deductible health plan to protect enrollees against medical bankruptcy, coverage for preexisting conditions—a good provision of the current law that we would retain—coverage through a parent's plan for children up to age 26—another good provision of the law that we would retain—and there could be no annual or lifetime limits on insurance claims, again a good provision of the current law that we would retain.

Here is how it would work: The Federal Government would provide funding directly into the health savings accounts of individuals insured through the Patient Freedom Act. These funds would be phased out for higher income individuals. The aggregate funding for these per-patient, per-capita grants would be determined based on the total amount of funding that the Federal Government would have provided in the form of ObamaCare subsidies in each State, plus any funding each

State would have received had they chosen to expand their Medicaid Program, even if, like the State of Maine, they had chosen not to do so.

In addition to Federal funds, individuals and employers could make tax-advantaged contributions to these health savings accounts. The bill even provides for a partial tax credit for very low-income individuals who do receive employer-based coverage, but it would help these workers pay for their deductibles and copays.

Individuals who are insured under the Patient Freedom Act would receive debit cards tied to their health savings accounts, which they could use to purchase a high-deductible health plan to pay directly for medical expenses or pay premiums for a more generous health insurance policy. In addition, health care providers receiving payment from the health savings accounts would be required to publish cash prices for their services, which would add transparency that we desperately need to move toward a more patient-directed health care future.

The promise of patient-directed health care is one of the advantages of this approach, but it has other advantages as well. For example, residents of States that elect this option would no longer face the individual mandate penalty that can cost individuals 2.5 percent of their income and the typical American family of four an estimated \$2,100 next year. It would also codify the elimination of the employer mandate in these States, freeing these employers to add jobs and let their full-time employees work 40 hours a week. ObamaCare has been causing some employers to reduce hours for their employees. The result has been smaller paychecks for those workers.

Perhaps most important, however, the Patient Freedom Act would do away with what the superintendent of insurance in Maine refers to as "wage lock." That is caused by the fact that the subsidies in the ObamaCare exchanges phase out completely at 400 percent of the Federal poverty level. In other words, there is a cliff there. Now, 400 percent of the poverty level is about \$47,000 for an individual and \$64,000 for a couple. Taxpayers who earn just \$1 more than the threshold lose their entire subsidy.

That makes no sense whatsoever. It is one of the major flaws in ObamaCare. Since these subsidies are based upon estimated earnings that are later reconciled through tax returns, Americans are facing onerous tax liabilities and penalties as a consequence.

Let me explain further how this wage-lock occurs, because increasingly Americans are going to be running into this problem. Let me give you an example. Last year, the least expensive premium for a silver plan to cover a 50-year-old individual in Aroostook Coun-

ty, ME, cost \$6,300 through an Affordable Care Act exchange. But that, obviously, is not what most individuals pay. Instead, they receive a subsidy that phases out based on their estimated income. But again, the subsidy completely disappears at a sharp cliff at 400 percent of the Federal poverty level.

An individual whose estimated income is just less than this cliff, say, one that is earning \$46,500, will pay 9.5 percent of his or her income, or \$4,370, for insurance and the rest is covered by the Federal tax credits. But if it turns out that this individual actually made a bit more than 400 percent of the Federal poverty level—let's say the individual made \$47,000—then, he or she would be on the hook for the entire \$6,300 premium. In other words, a 50-year-old who makes just \$500 more than he or she estimated will have to pay \$2,000 more at tax time for health insurance in the exchange.

Think about what this means for a self-employed individual whose income fluctuates not only from year to year but from month to month. This is a financial nightmare to try to figure out.

This cliff does not just affect individuals who get their coverage through the ACA. Cliffs appear over and over in the design of the subsidies under ObamaCare, and couples and families will face them at different levels of income as their household size changes. What will these bait-and-switch health insurance premiums do to incentives to work harder, to earn more, to accept promotions? If you accept a promotion at work and then your income goes over that magic 400 percent of poverty threshold, you are going to lose your entire subsidy. You might well decide to turn down that raise at work or that opportunity to be promoted to a better job. What kind of system has been designed to discourage people from moving ahead in the workplace?

In the State of Maine, so far we have learned that at least 1,000 Maine families have lost their subsidies completely because they were in that situation where their income went over that threshold. Another 1,000 Mainers are finding out that they are losing part of their subsidy and are going to be on the hook for paying more money.

I will say to my colleagues that you are going to start hearing this in your States, and it particularly is going to affect people who are self-employed and who have to estimate what their income is going to be. Through no fault of their own—unless they are going to turn down work—they may well go over the threshold amount and lose their subsidy altogether. Remember, it takes just \$1 in additional earnings at the 400 percent of poverty level to lose your subsidy altogether.

Let me give you an example of a Maine couple who contacted my office. They discovered to their horror that

when they filed their taxes, they had earned more than the threshold and they owed \$13,000 to the IRS for the health insurance they received through the ObamaCare exchange, on top of the \$4,000 that they had been told their exchange coverage would cost.

Imagine finding out that because you worked a little harder, because you earned a bit more money, you now unexpectedly owe an extra \$13,000 to the IRS because you lost your subsidy. The Patient Freedom Act would put an end to the bait-and-switch premiums that are built into the ObamaCare exchanges.

One of the reasons I opposed the Affordable Care Act was that there was nothing affordable about it. I predicted at the time that it would lead to fewer choices and higher insurance costs for many middle-income Americans and small businesses.

A ruling in favor of the plaintiffs in *King v. Burwell* would prompt Congress to protect those who would lose their subsidies, but it would also provide the opportunity to give States the option to replace the Affordable Care Act's poorly crafted mandates with patient-directed reforms that contain costs, provide more choices, and still provide assistance to those who need it most.

The Patient Freedom Act does exactly that. I urge my colleagues to support it.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1534. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located in Harlingen, Texas, includes a full-service inpatient health care facility, to redesignate such medical center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1534

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Treto Garza South Texas Veterans Inpatient Care Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF MEDICAL CENTER OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS IN HARLINGEN, TEXAS, AND INCLUSION OF INPATIENT HEALTH CARE FACILITY AT SUCH MEDICAL CENTER.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The current and future health care needs of veterans residing in South Texas are not being fully met by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) According to recent census data, more than 108,000 veterans reside in South Texas.

(3) Travel times for veterans from the Valley Coastal Bend area from their homes to the nearest hospital of the Department for

acute inpatient health care can exceed six hours.

(4) Even with the significant travel times, veterans from South Texas demonstrate a high demand for health care services from the Department.

(5) Ongoing overseas deployments of members of the Armed Forces from Texas, including members of the Armed Forces on active duty, members of the Texas National Guard, and members of the other reserve components of the Armed Forces, will continue to increase demand for medical services provided by the Department in South Texas.

(6) The Department employs an annual Strategic Capital Investment Planning process to "enable the VA to continually adapt to changes in demographics, medical and information technology, and health care delivery", which results in the development of a multi-year investment plan that determines where gaps in services exist or are projected and develops an appropriate solution to meet those gaps.

(7) According to the Department, final approval of the Strategic Capital Investment Planning priority list serves as the "building block" of the annual budget request for the Department.

(8) Arturo "Treto" Garza, a veteran who served in the Marine Corps, rose to the rank of Sergeant, and served two tours in the Vietnam War, passed away on October 3, 2012.

(9) Treto Garza, who was also a former co-chairman of the Veterans Alliance of the Rio Grande Valley, tirelessly fought to improve health care services for veterans in the Rio Grande Valley, with his efforts successfully leading to the creation of the medical center of the Department located in Harlingen, Texas.

(b) REDESIGNATION OF MEDICAL CENTER IN HARLINGEN, TEXAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located in Harlingen, Texas, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "Treto Garza South Texas Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Center".

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the medical center of the Department referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Treto Garza South Texas Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Center.

(c) REQUIREMENT OF FULL-SERVICE INPATIENT FACILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the Treto Garza South Texas Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Center, as designated under subsection (b), includes a full-service inpatient health care facility of the Department and shall modify the existing facility as necessary to meet that requirement.

(2) PLAN TO EXPAND FACILITY CAPABILITIES.—The Secretary shall include in the annual Strategic Capital Investment Plan of the Department for fiscal year 2016 a project to expand the capabilities of the Treto Garza South Texas Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Center, as so designated, by adding the following:

(A) Inpatient capability for 50 beds with appropriate administrative, clinical, diagnostic, and ancillary services needed for support.

(B) An urgent care center.

(C) The capability to provide a full range of services to meet the health care needs of women veterans.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report detailing a plan to implement the requirements in subsection (c), including an estimate of the cost of required actions and the time necessary for the completion of those actions.

(e) SOUTH TEXAS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "South Texas" means the following counties in Texas: Aransas, Bee, Brooks, Calhoun, Cameron, DeWitt, Dimmit, Duval, Goliad, Hidalgo, Jackson, Jim Hogg, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Kleberg, Nueces, Refugio, San Patricio, Starr, Victoria, Webb, Willacy, Zapata.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 195—DESIGNATING THE ULYSSES S. GRANT ASSOCIATION AS THE ORGANIZATION TO IMPLEMENT THE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE BIRTH OF ULYSSES S. GRANT, CIVIL WAR GENERAL AND 2-TERM PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 195

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant was born in southern Ohio on April 27, 1822, to Jesse Grant and Hannah Simpson Grant;

Whereas the first line of the memoirs of Ulysses S. Grant proudly states: "My Family is American, and has been for generations, in all its branches, direct and collateral.";

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant attended school in Georgetown, Ohio, graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1843, and entered the United States Army;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant served in a variety of military posts from the Atlantic Coast to the Pacific Coast, including posts in New York, Michigan, and California, and a post at the famous Jefferson Barracks in Missouri;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant distinguished himself in combat during the Mexican-American War and worked tirelessly to succeed in civilian life;

Whereas, as a civilian farmer in Missouri, Ulysses S. Grant—

(1) met and married his wife, Julia Dent, for whom Ulysses S. Grant built a home named Hardscrabble;

(2) worked alongside slaves and emancipated the only slave that Ulysses S. Grant owned; and

(3) continued to own land while Ulysses S. Grant was President;

Whereas when the Civil War erupted, Ulysses S. Grant left Galena, Illinois to rejoin the United States Army, gained the colonelcy of the 21st Illinois Volunteer Regiment, and began his meteoric military rise;

Whereas during the Civil War, Ulysses S. Grant led troops in numerous victorious battles including—

(1) in Tennessee, at Forts Henry and Donelson and at Shiloh and Chattanooga; and

(2) in Mississippi, at Vicksburg;

Whereas President Abraham Lincoln chose Ulysses S. Grant to be Commanding General during the Civil War, and in that role Ulysses S. Grant revolutionized warfare in Virginia to preserve the Union;

Whereas in gratitude, the people of the United States twice elected Ulysses S. Grant President of the United States;

Whereas during his Presidency from 1869 to 1877, Ulysses S. Grant worked valiantly to help former slaves become full citizens and became the first modern President of the United States;

Whereas after leaving the Presidency, Ulysses S. Grant became the first President of the United States to tour the world;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant established a foreign policy that the United States followed into the 20th century and beyond;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant authored his memoirs, the most significant piece of 19th-century nonfiction, while courageously battling cancer, which eventually took his voice and his life but did not silence the noble words that he left as a legacy;

Whereas the Ulysses S. Grant Association was founded during the Centennial of the Civil War in 1962 by the leading historians of that era and the Civil War Centennial Commissions of New York, Illinois, and Ohio, 3 States where Ulysses S. Grant lived;

Whereas, in the years since it was founded in 1962, the Ulysses S. Grant Association—

(1) has produced 32 volumes of “The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant”, the major source for the study of the life of Ulysses S. Grant and the 19th century in which he lived; and

(2) has worked toward the publication of the first scholarly edition of the memoirs of Ulysses S. Grant, which as of May 2015, is nearing completion;

Whereas the Ulysses S. Grant Association was first headquartered at the Ohio Historical Society located on the campus of Ohio State University, later moved to Southern Illinois University, and relocated in 2008 to Mississippi State University; and

Whereas in 2012, the Ulysses S. Grant Association established the Ulysses S. Grant Presidential Library, the world center for Ulysses S. Grant scholars and tourists: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) proclaims 2022 as the Bicentennial year for the celebration of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant, military leader and President;

(2) designates the Ulysses S. Grant Association, housed at the Ulysses S. Grant Presidential Library on the grounds of Mississippi State University, as the designated institution for organizing and leading the celebration of the bicentennial; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to join in that bicentennial celebration to honor Ulysses S. Grant, one of the major historical figures of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 196—DESIGNATING JULY 10, 2015, AS COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following reso-

lution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 196

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the United States and supports wholeheartedly all activities involved in the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of such vintage works of art;

Whereas automotive restoration provides well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have become part of the popular culture of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 10, 2015, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day”; and

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations of Collector Car Appreciation Day that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people about the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

SENATE RESOLUTION 197—RECOGNIZING THE NEED TO IMPROVE PHYSICAL ACCESS TO MANY FEDERALLY FUNDED FACILITIES FOR ALL PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, PARTICULARLY PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 197

Whereas, in 2012, nearly 20 percent of the civilian population in the United States reported having a disability;

Whereas, in 2012, 16 percent of veterans, amounting to more than 3,500,000 people, received service-related disability benefits;

Whereas, in 2011, the percentage of working-age people in the United States who reported having a work limitation due to a disability was 7 percent, which is a 20-year high;

Whereas the Act entitled “An Act to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped”, approved August 12, 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as the “Architectural Barriers Act of

1968”), was enacted to ensure that certain federally funded facilities are designed and constructed to be accessible to people with disabilities and requires that physically handicapped people have ready access to, and use of, post offices and other Federal facilities;

Whereas automatic doors, though not mandated by either the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 or the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), provide a greater degree of self-sufficiency and dignity for people with disabilities and the elderly, who may have limited strength to open a manually operated door;

Whereas a report commissioned by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (referred to in this preamble as the “Access Board”), an independent Federal agency created to ensure access to federally funded facilities for people with disabilities, recommends that all new buildings for use by the public should have at least one automated door at an accessible entrance, except for small buildings where adding such doors may be a financial hardship for the owners of the buildings;

Whereas States and municipalities have begun to recognize the importance of automatic doors in improving accessibility;

Whereas the laws of the State of Connecticut require automatic doors in certain shopping malls and retail businesses, the laws of the State of Delaware require automatic doors or calling devices for newly constructed places of accommodation, and the laws of the District of Columbia have a similar requirement;

Whereas the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service, published by the General Services Administration, requires automation of at least one exterior door for all newly constructed or renovated facilities managed by the General Services Administration, including post offices;

Whereas from 2006 to 2011, 71 percent of the complaints received by the Access Board regarding the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 concerned a post office or other facility of the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the United States Postal Service employs approximately 522,000 people, making it the second-largest civilian employer in the United States;

Whereas approximately 3,200,000 people visit 1 of the 31,857 post offices in the United States each day; and

Whereas the United States was founded on principles of equality and freedom, and these principles require that all people, including people with disabilities, are able to engage as equal members of society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the immense hardships that people with disabilities in the United States must overcome every day;

(2) reaffirms its support of the Act entitled “An Act to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped”, approved August 12, 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.), commonly known as the “Architectural Barriers Act of 1968”, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), and encourages full compliance with such Acts;

(3) recommends that the United States Postal Service and Federal agencies install power-assisted doors at post offices and other federally funded facilities, respectively, to ensure equal access for all people of the United States; and

(4) pledges to continue to work to identify and remove the barriers that prevent all people of the United States from having equal access to the services provided by the Federal Government.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1870. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1871. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1872. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1873. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1874. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1875. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1876. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1877. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1878. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1879. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1880. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1881. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1882. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1883. Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to

be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1884. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1885. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1886. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1887. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1888. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1889. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1890. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1891. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1892. Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1893. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1894. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1895. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1896. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1897. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1898. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1899. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1900. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1901. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1902. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1903. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1904. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1905. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. COTTON, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1906. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1907. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1908. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1909. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1910. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1911. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1912. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1913. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1914. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1915. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1965. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1966. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1967. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1968. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1969. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1970. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1971. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1972. Mr. SESSIONS (for Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1973. Mr. SESSIONS (for Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1870. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1283. PROHIBITION ON DEPLOYMENT OF GROUND COMBAT TROOPS IN IRAQ AND SYRIA.

No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used to support the deployment of the United States Armed Forces for the purpose of ground combat operations in Iraq or Syria, except as necessary—

(1) for the protection or rescue of members of the United States Armed Forces or United States citizens from imminent danger posed by ISIL; or

(2) to conduct missions not intended to result in ground combat operations by United States forces, such as—

- (A) intelligence collection and sharing;
- (B) enabling kinetic strikes;
- (C) operational planning; or
- (D) other forms of advice and assistance to forces fighting ISIL in Iraq or Syria.

SA 1871. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 818, strike “and the congressional defense committees” on line 25 and all that follows through page 819, line 3, and insert “, the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the assistance provided by the owner’s agent to the Secretary under that subsection with respect to oversight of the contract described in subsection (b), and shall make that report available to the public.”.

SA 1872. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DOMESTIC REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT REFORM AND MODERNIZATION.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION.**—The term “community-based organization” means a nonprofit organization providing a variety of social, health, educational and community services to a population that includes refugees resettled into the United States.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement in the Department of Health and Human Services.

(3) **NATIONAL RESETTLEMENT AGENCIES.**—The term “national resettlement agencies” means voluntary agencies contracting with the Department of State to provide sponsorship and initial resettlement services to refugees entering the United States.

(b) **ASSESSMENT OF REFUGEE DOMESTIC RESETTLEMENT PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study regarding the effectiveness of the domestic refugee resettlement programs operated by the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

(2) **MATTERS TO BE STUDIED.**—In the study required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall determine and analyze—

(A) how the Office of Refugee Resettlement defines self-sufficiency and integration and if these definitions adequately represent refugees’ needs in the United States;

(B) the effectiveness of Office of Refugee Resettlement programs in helping refugees to meet self-sufficiency and integration;

(C) technological solutions for consistently tracking secondary migration, including opportunities for interagency data sharing;

(D) the Office of Refugee Resettlement’s budgetary resources and project the amount of additional resources needed to fully address the unmet needs of refugees with regard to self-sufficiency and integration;

(E) the role of community-based organizations in serving refugees in areas experiencing a high number of new refugee arrivals;

(F) how community-based organizations can be better utilized and supported in the Federal domestic resettlement process;

(G) recertification processes for high-skilled refugees, specifically considering how to decrease barriers for Special Immigrant Visa holders to use their skills; and

(H) recommended statutory changes to improve the Office of Refugee Resettlement and the domestic refugee program in relation to the matters analyzed under subparagraphs (A) through (G).

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the results of the study required under this subsection.

(c) REFUGEE ASSISTANCE.—

(1) **ASSISTANCE MADE AVAILABLE TO SECONDARY MIGRANTS.**—Section 412(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) The Director shall ensure that assistance under this section is provided to refugees who are secondary migrants and meet all other eligibility requirements for such assistance.”.

(2) **REPORT ON SECONDARY MIGRATION.**—Section 412(a)(3) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(a)(3)) is amended—

(A) by inserting “(A)” after “(3)”;

(B) by striking “periodic” and inserting “annual”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) At the end of each fiscal year, the Director shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

“(i) States experiencing departures and arrivals due to secondary migration;

“(ii) likely reasons for migration;

“(iii) the impact of secondary migration on States hosting secondary migrants;

“(iv) the availability of social services for secondary migrants in those States; and

“(v) unmet needs of those secondary migrants.”.

(3) **AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING.**—Section 412(c)(1)(B) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(c)(1)(B)) is amended—

(A) by inserting “a combination of—” after “based on”;

(B) by striking “the total number” and inserting the following:

“(i) the total number”; and

(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following:

“(ii) the total number of all other eligible populations served by the Office during the period described who are residing in the State as of the beginning of the fiscal year; and

“(iii) projections on the number and nature of incoming refugees and other populations served by the Office during the subsequent fiscal year.”.

(4) **NOTICE AND RULEMAKING.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and not later than 30 days before

the effective date set forth in paragraph (5), the Director shall—

(A) issue a proposed rule for a new formula by which grants and contracts are to be allocated pursuant to the amendments made by paragraph (3); and

(B) solicit public comment regarding such proposed rule.

(5) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall become effective on the first day of the first fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **RESETTLEMENT DATA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall expand the Office of Refugee Resettlement's data analysis, collection, and sharing activities in accordance with the requirements set forth in paragraphs (2) through (5).

(2) **DATA ON MENTAL AND PHYSICAL MEDICAL CASES.**—The Director shall—

(A) coordinate with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, national resettlement agencies, community-based organizations, and State refugee health programs to track national and State trends on refugees arriving with Class A medical conditions and other urgent medical needs;

(B) examine the information sharing process, from country of arrival through refugee resettlement, to determine if access to additional mental health data could—

(i) help determine placements; and

(ii) enable agencies to better prepare to meet refugee mental health needs; and

(C) in collecting information under this paragraph, utilize initial refugee health screening data, including—

(i) a history of severe trauma, torture, mental health symptoms, depression, anxiety, and posttraumatic stress disorder recorded during domestic and international health screenings; and

(ii) Refugee Medical Assistance utilization rate data.

(3) **DATA ON HOUSING NEEDS.**—The Director shall partner with State refugee programs, community-based organizations, and national resettlement agencies to collect data relating to the housing needs of refugees, including—

(A) the number of refugees who have become homeless; and

(B) the number of refugees who are at severe risk of becoming homeless.

(4) **DATA ON REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY.**—The Director shall gather longitudinal information relating to refugee self-sufficiency, integration, and employment status during the 2-year period beginning 1 year after the date on which the refugees arrived in the United States.

(5) **AVAILABILITY OF DATA.**—The Director shall annually—

(A) update the data collected under this subsection; and

(B) submit a report to Congress that contains the updated data.

(e) **GUIDANCE REGARDING REFUGEE PLACEMENT DECISIONS.**—

(1) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary of State shall provide guidance to national resettlement agencies and State refugee coordinators on consultation with local stakeholders pertaining to refugee resettlement.

(2) **BEST PRACTICES.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in collaboration with the Secretary of State, shall collect best practices related to the implementation of the guidance on stakeholder consultation on refugee resettlement from voluntary agencies and State refugee coordinators and disseminate such best practices to such agencies and coordinators.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section (except for the amendments made by subsection (c)) shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1873. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. SECURE ENERGY INNOVATION PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop metrics for assessing the costs, risks, and benefits associated with secure energy projects. The metrics shall take into account financial and operational costs and risks associated with sustained losses of power resulting from natural or man-made disasters or attacks that impact military installations.

(b) **METRICS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop metrics for assessing the costs, risks, and benefits associated with secure energy projects. The metrics shall take into account financial and operational costs and risks associated with sustained losses of power resulting from natural or man-made disasters or attacks that impact military installations.

SA 1874. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 706. INCLUSION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES NOT SUBJECTED OR EXPOSED TO OPERATIONAL RISK FACTORS IN REQUIRED MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT.

Section 1074m(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Secretary determines that” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“(A) the member completes a mental health assessment under section 1074n of this title during any of the time periods specified under such subparagraphs; or

“(B) the Secretary determines that providing a mental health assessment under this section to the member during such time periods would remove the member from forward deployment or put members or operational objectives at risk.”.

SA 1875. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016

for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON EXPANDING ACCESS TO POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE BY INDIVIDUALS WITH POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER OR TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Not later than January 31, 2016, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly—

(1) complete a study on the feasibility of enabling individuals entitled to educational assistance under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, who have post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury to pursue a program of education with such assistance on a less than full-time but more than half-time basis; and

(2) submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the study carried out under paragraph (1), which shall include the findings of the secretaries and recommendations for such legislative or administrative action as the secretaries consider appropriate.

SA 1876. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. 593. REPORT ON EXEMPTION FROM FURLOUGH DURING A LAPSE IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR POSITIONS FILLED BY INDIVIDUALS ENGAGED IN MILITARY EQUIPMENT AND WEAPON SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the exemption from furlough during a lapse in appropriations for positions filled by individuals engaged in military equipment and weapon system maintenance within the Department of Defense, including the position of military technician (dual status) and positions of field and depot level maintenance and engineers.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of the Department of Defense positions described in subsection (a), and the personnel, that were exempted from furlough during the most recent lapse in appropriations for the Department.

(2) An analysis of positions filled by individuals engaged in military equipment and weapon system maintenance within the Department, and the personnel, that were not

exempted from the furlough described in paragraph (1).

(3) A cost analysis of the exemption of positions from furlough as described in paragraph (1).

SA 1877. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 119. REPORT ON POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO THE INDUSTRIAL BASE OF DELAYING OVERHAUL OF USS GEORGE WASHINGTON (CVN-73).

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report detailing the potential impacts to the industrial base if the July 2017 start date for the refueling and complex overhaul (RCOH) of the USS GEORGE WASHINGTON (CVN-73) is delayed by six months, one year, or two years. The report shall assume the Navy and industrial base have at least 18 months prior notice of the delay.

SA 1878. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . THIRD-PARTY SERVICE PROVIDERS.

Section 487(a)(20) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)(20)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, an institution may provide payment, based on the amount of tuition generated by the institution from student enrollment, to a third-party entity that provides a set of services to the institution that includes student recruitment services, regardless of whether the third-party entity is affiliated with an institution that provides educational services other than the institution providing such payment, if—

"(A) the third-party entity is not affiliated with the institution providing such payment;

"(B) the third-party entity does not make compensation payments to its employees that are prohibited under this paragraph;

"(C) the set of services provided to the institution by the third-party entity include services in addition to student recruitment services, and the institution does not pay the third-party entity solely or separately for student recruitment services provided by the third-party entity; and

"(D) any student recruitment information available to the third-party entity, including personally identifiable information, will not be used by, shared with, or sold to any other person or entity, including any institution that is affiliated with the third-party entity."

SA 1879. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. MINIMUM WAGE APPLICABLE TO AMERICAN SAMOA.

Section 8103(b)(2)(C) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206(b)(2)(C)) note) is amended—

(1) by striking "and 2014" and inserting "2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017"; and

(2) by striking "triennial report required" and inserting "triennial report required to be submitted in 2017".

SA 1880. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 607, strike "submit to the congressional defense committees" and insert "in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, submit to the congressional defense committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives".

SA 1881. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 682, beginning on line 8, strike "Committees" and all that follows through line 11 and insert the following: "Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report set-

ting forth the policy developed pursuant to subsection (a)."

SA 1882. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 58, strike lines 14 through 17 and insert the following:

services of the Centers;

"(C) enhance capabilities by reducing the cost and improving the performance and efficiency of executing laboratory missions; and

"(D) expand commercial business ventures based on the core competencies of a Center, as determined by the director of the Center, to promote technology transfer.

SA 1883. Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States has been engaged in military operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL) since August 8, 2014.

(2) Thousands of members of the United States Armed Forces have been deployed to support military operations against ISIL in Iraq and Syria.

(3) The United States has conducted over 3,400 airstrikes against ISIL as of June 2015.

(4) The United States has spent more than \$2,600,000,000 American taxpayer dollars on this war as of June 2015—a number that continues to rise by approximately \$9,000,000 per day.

(5) Tragically, members of the Armed Forces have been killed in Operation Inherent Resolve, and United States hostages have been killed by ISIL in barbaric ways.

(6) The most solemn duty and responsibility Congress has is the authority, under article 1, section 8 of the Constitution, to "declare war".

(7) While Congress has authorized appropriations for Operation Inherent Resolve, and authorized the training of anti-ISIL forces in Syria, Congress has taken no formal action to approve Operation Inherent Resolve.

(8) In testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Special Presidential Envoy for the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL agreed that congressional authorization of Operation Inherent Resolve is important for reinforcing

the leadership of the United States with our coalition partners.

(9) President Barack Obama submitted an authorization for use of military force against ISIL in February 2015.

(10) Congress has a duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force against ISIL and to engage in a debate about whether it is in the nation's best interest to order United States troops to risk their lives in this mission.

(11) The American public deserves a congressional debate to educate them about the national security interests at stake and the advisability of this war.

(12) Authorizing Operation Inherent Resolve would send a strong message to our coalition partners and to our adversaries that the United States is united in the fight against ISIL and speaks with one voice in confronting ISIL.

SA 1884. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1283. MESSAGING PLAN FOR THE INTERNET TO COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM ABROAD.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Violent extremist groups abroad increasingly use social media and other information technologies to intimidate, recruit, radicalize, and raise funds.

(2) The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) has expertly exploited social media to spread its propaganda, intimidate its opposition, raise money, and recruit others into its ranks.

(3) The United States strategy to defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant must include a campaign to counter digital media to degrade and defeat the social media propaganda and recruitment networks of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

(4) This effort must include the empowering of moderate local voices and other non-United States attributed messaging to challenge the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant through a coordinated and integrated Government-wide strategy online.

(b) MESSAGING PLAN.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and other appropriate public and private sector stakeholders, develop and implement a coordinated messaging plan for the Internet, including elements described in subsection (a)(4), to counter propaganda and recruitment media disseminated by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and associated violent extremist groups abroad.

SA 1885. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016

for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 314. AUTHORIZATION FOR RESEARCH TO IMPROVE MILITARY VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY TO INCREASE FUEL ECONOMY OR REDUCE FUEL CONSUMPTION OF MILITARY GROUND VEHICLES USED IN COMBAT.

(a) RESEARCH AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and in collaboration with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, may carry out research to improve military ground vehicle technology to increase fuel economy or reduce fuel consumption of military ground vehicles used in combat.

(b) PREVIOUS SUCCESSES.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that research carried out under subsection (a) takes into account the successes of, and lessons learned during, previous Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and private sector efforts to identify, assess, develop, demonstrate, and prototype technologies that support increasing fuel economy or decreasing fuel consumption of military ground vehicles, while balancing survivability, in furtherance of military missions.

SA 1886. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 263, strike lines 6 through 13 and insert the following:

(1) in subsection (e)(3)(A), by striking “in the United States”; and

SA 1887. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XIV, add the following:

SEC. 1409. ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS, WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS, FOR THE DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 1401 is hereby increased by

\$322,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for working capital funds, Defense Commissary Agency, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 is hereby decreased by \$322,000,000, with the amount of the decrease to be applied to amounts available for operation and maintenance as specified in the funding table in section 4301 and achieved by limiting excessive and redundant purchases of spare parts.

SA 1888. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 564, after line 25, add the following:

(d) REPORT.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “covered employee” has the meaning given that term in section 1599e of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1).

(2) CONTENTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report regarding covered employees hired into a probationary status during the 10-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act, which shall include the number of covered employees—

(A) hired during the period;

(B) whose appointment became final after the probationary period;

(C) who were subject to disciplinary action or termination during the 5-year period beginning on the date on which the appointment of the covered employee became final;

(D) who were subject to disciplinary action during the probationary period; and

(E) who were terminated before the appointment of the covered employee became final.

SA 1889. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1040. REAFFIRMATION OF THE PROHIBITION ON TORTURE.

(a) LIMITATION ON INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES TO THOSE IN THE ARMY FIELD MANUAL.—

(1) ARMY FIELD MANUAL 2-22.3 DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “Army Field Manual 2-22.3” means the Army Field Manual 2-22.3 entitled “Human Intelligence Collector Operations” in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act or any similar successor Army Field Manual.

(2) RESTRICTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual described in subparagraph (B) shall not be subjected to any interrogation technique or approach, or any treatment related to interrogation, that is not authorized by and listed in the Army Field Manual 2-22.3.

(B) INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this subparagraph is an individual who is—

(i) in the custody or under the effective control of an officer, employee, or other agent of the United States Government; or

(ii) detained within a facility owned, operated, or controlled by a department or agency of the United States, in any armed conflict.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—Interrogation techniques, approaches, and treatments described in Army Field Manual 2-22.3 shall be implemented strictly in accord with the principles, processes, conditions, and limitations prescribed by Army Field Manual 2-22.3.

(4) AGENCIES OTHER THAN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—If a process required by Army Field Manual 2-22.3, such as a requirement of approval by a specified Department of Defense official, is inapposite to a department or an agency other than the Department of Defense, the head of such department or agency shall ensure that a process that is substantially equivalent to the process prescribed by Army Field Manual 2-22.3 for the Department of Defense is utilized by all officers, employees, or other agents of such department or agency.

(5) INTERROGATION BY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this subsection shall preclude an officer, employee, or other agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other Federal law enforcement agency from continuing to use authorized, non-coercive techniques of interrogation that are designed to elicit voluntary statements and do not involve the use of force, threats, or promises.

(6) UPDATE OF THE ARMY FIELD MANUAL.—

(A) REQUIREMENT TO UPDATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and once every three years thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall complete a thorough review of Army Field Manual 2-22.3, and revise Army Field Manual 2-22.3, as necessary to ensure that Army Field Manual 2-22.3 complies with the legal obligations of the United States and reflects current, evidence-based, best practices for interrogation that are designed to elicit reliable and voluntary statements and do not involve the use or threat of force.

(ii) AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.—Army Field Manual 2-22.3 shall remain available to the public and any revisions to the Army Field Manual 2-22.3 adopted by the Secretary of Defense shall be made available to the public 30 days prior to the date the revisions take effect.

(B) REPORT ON BEST PRACTICES OF INTERROGATIONS.—

(i) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the interagency body established pursuant to Executive Order 13491 (commonly known as the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group) shall submit to the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, the Attorney General, and other appropriate officials a report on current, evidence-based, best practices for interrogation that are designed to elicit reliable

and voluntary statements and do not involve the use of force.

(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report required by clause (i) may include recommendations for revisions to Army Field Manual 2-22.3 based on the body of research commissioned by the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group.

(iii) AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.—Not later than 30 days after the report required by clause (i) is submitted such report shall be made available to the public.

(b) INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS ACCESS TO DETAINEES.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The head of any department or agency of the United States Government shall provide the International Committee of the Red Cross with notification of, and prompt access to, any individual detained in any armed conflict in the custody or under the effective control of an officer, employee, contractor, subcontractor, or other agent of the United States Government or detained within a facility owned, operated, or effectively controlled by a department, agency, contractor, or subcontractor of the United States Government, consistent with Department of Defense regulations and policies.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to create or otherwise imply the authority to detain; or

(B) to limit or otherwise affect any other individual rights or state obligations which may arise under United States law or international agreements to which the United States is a party, including the Geneva Conventions, or to state all of the situations under which notification to and access for the International Committee of the Red Cross is required or allowed.

SA 1890. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 213, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(3) PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BAH FOR CERTAIN OTHER MARRIED MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the amount of basic allowance for housing payable to a member of the uniformed services under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, shall not be reduced by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) unless—

(A) the member and the member's spouse undergo a permanent change of station requiring a change of residence;

(B) the member and the member's spouse move into or commence living in on-base housing; or

SA 1891. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe

military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1242. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IRAN NEGOTIATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) President Barack Obama and administration officials have routinely spoken about taking a hard line when dealing with Iran on the subject of their nuclear program and related sanctions.

(2) On September 25, 2012, in a speech to the United Nations General Assembly, President Obama stated: "Make no mistake: A nuclear-armed Iran is not a challenge that can be contained . . . the United States will do what we must to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon."

(3) On April 2, 2015, in an address in the Rose Garden, President Obama stated that "Iran has also agreed to the most robust and intrusive inspections and transparency regime," and declared, "This deal was not based on trust. It's based on unprecedented verification."

(4) On April 2, 2015, in an interview with Andrea Mitchell of NBC, in Lausanne, Switzerland, Secretary of State John Kerry when asked, "Mr. Secretary, President Obama said if Iran cheats, we will know it. How can you be so sure? They've cheated before"; stated, "Well, we have extraordinary, extensive verification measures that have not been applied before. We will have state-of-the-art television cameras within centrifuge production facilities. We will have cradle-to-grave tracking of uranium—uranium from the mine to the mill to the yellowcake to gas to the centrifuge to out and where it goes in spent fuel. So we have—that is an amazing amount—and we have a new dispute process which will allow us to be able to finalize access where we need it."

(5) April 8, 2015, on the "PBS NewsHour," Secretary Kerry said that in any final agreement, Iran would also have to resolve outstanding questions with the International Atomic Energy Agency over suspected military dimensions of the nuclear program. "It will be part of a final agreement," he said. "It has to be."

(6) Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, has routinely spoken out openly against the United States and any sanctions against Iran's nuclear program.

(7) On April 9, 2015, the Wall Street Journal, in response to the nuclear deal, reported, "The 75-year-old cleric also said Iran's government and security forces wouldn't permit outside inspections of the country's military sites, which are officially nonnuclear but where United Nations investigators suspect Tehran conducted tests related to atomic weapons development."

(8) On May 20, 2015, in a graduation speech at the Imam Hussein Military University in Tehran, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei ruled out allowing international inspectors to interview Iranian nuclear scientists as part of any potential deal on its nuclear program, and reiterated that "regarding inspections, we have said that we will not let foreigners inspect any military center".

(9) The stated positions of the United States requiring "robust and intrusive" inspections of Iran's nuclear sites and any other sites where nuclear activities may be

carried out or may have been conducted previously is essential to any effective agreement that would provide relief from sanctions.

(10) The public statements of Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and other top Iranian leaders suggest they may refuse to grant such inspections as are required to ensure the nuclear agreement is complied with.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Government of Iran's stated opposition to inspections represents decisive questions and suggest a verifiable agreement may be unachievable; and

(2) no nuclear agreement with Iran that does not include robust inspections and proper verification of all Iran's nuclear programs and related military installations and access to nuclear supporting scientists should be accepted.

SA 1892. Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. CLARIFICATION OF PRESUMPTIONS OF EXPOSURE FOR VETERANS WHO SERVED IN VICINITY OF REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM.

(a) COMPENSATION.—Subsections (a)(1) and (f) of section 1116 of title 38, United States Code, are amended by inserting “(including the territorial seas of such Republic)” after “served in the Republic of Vietnam” each place it appears.

(b) HEALTH CARE.—Section 1710(e)(4) of such title is amended by inserting “(including the territorial seas of such Republic)” after “served on active duty in the Republic of Vietnam”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect as of September 25, 1985.

(d) OFFSET.—Increased Government expenditures resulting from enactment of this section shall be paid from savings achieved by section 605 of this Act.

SA 1893. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RECRUITING SEPARATING SERVICE MEMBERS AS CUSTOMS AND BORDER PATROL OFFICERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Customs and Border Protection Officers at United States ports of entry carry out critical law enforcement duties associated with screening foreign visitors, returning United States citizens, and imported cargo entering the United States;

(2) it is in the national interest for United States ports of entry to be adequately staffed with Customs and Border Protection Officers in a timely fashion, including meeting the congressionally mandated staffing level of 23,775 officers for fiscal year 2015;

(3) an estimated 250,000 to 300,000 members of the Armed Forces separate from military service every year; and

(4) recruiting efforts and expedited hiring procedures should be undertaken to ensure that individuals separating from military service are aware of, and partake in, opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection Officer positions.

(b) EXPEDITED HIRING OF APPROPRIATE SEPARATING SERVICE MEMBERS.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSFERABLE QUALIFICATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, shall jointly identify Military Occupational Safety Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, and Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators and Coast Guard Competencies that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(2) HIRING.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider hiring qualified candidates with the Military Occupational Safety Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, and Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators identified as transferable under paragraph (1) who are eligible for veterans recruitment appointment authorized under section 4214 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) ESTABLISHING A PROGRAM FOR RECRUITING SERVICE MEMBERS SEPARATING FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICER VACANCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish a program to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The program established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) include Customs and Border Protection Officer opportunities in relevant job assistance efforts under the Transition Assistance Program;

(B) place Customs and Border Protection Officers at recruiting events and jobs fairs involving members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service;

(C) provide opportunities for local U.S. Customs and Border Protection field offices to partner with military bases in the region;

(D) conduct outreach efforts to educate members of the Armed Forces with Military Occupational Safety Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, and Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection Officers;

(E) require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to work cooperatively to identify shared activities and opportunities for reciprocity related to steps in hiring U.S. Customs and Border Patrol officers with the goal of minimizing the time required to hire qualified applicants;

(F) require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to work cooperatively to ensure the streamlined interagency transfer of relevant background investigations and security clearances; and

(G) include such other elements as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service are aware of opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection Officer positions.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and December 31 of each year thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes a description and assessment of the program established under subsection (c).

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a detailed description of the program established under subsection (c), including—

(i) programmatic elements;

(ii) goals associated with those elements; and

(iii) a description of how the elements and goals will assist in meeting statutorily mandated staffing levels and agency hiring benchmarks;

(B) a detailed description of the program elements that have been implemented under subsection (c);

(C) a detailed summary of the actions taken under subsection (c) to implement such program elements;

(D) the number of separating service members made aware of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies;

(E) the Military Occupational Safety Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, and Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators identified as transferable under subsection (b)(1) and a rationale for such identifications;

(F) the number of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies filled with separating service members;

(G) the number of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies filled with separating service members under Veterans' Recruitment Appointment authorized under the Veterans Employment Opportunity Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-339); and

(H) the results of any evaluations or considerations of additional elements included or not included in the program established under subsection (c).

(e) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

(1) as superseding, altering, or amending existing Federal veterans' hiring preferences or Federal hiring authorities; or

(2) to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts to carry out this section.

SA 1894. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. SENSE OF SENATE ON SECRETARY OF DEFENSE REVIEW OF SECTION 504 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, REGARDING ENLISTING CERTAIN ALIENS IN THE ARMED FORCES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, for the purpose of making a determination and authorization pursuant to subsection (b)(2) of such section regarding the enlistment in the Armed Forces of aliens who—

- (1) were unlawfully present in the United States on December 31, 2011;
- (2) have been continuously present in the United States since that date;
- (3) were younger than 16 years of age on the date the aliens initially entered the United States; and
- (4) disregarding such unlawful status, are otherwise eligible for original enlistment in a regular component of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

SA 1895. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE ENLISTMENT OF CERTAIN ALIENS IN THE ARMED FORCES ON MILITARY READINESS.

(a) **EVALUATION REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall evaluate—

- (1) whether permitting covered aliens to enlist in the Armed Forces could expand the pool of potential enlistees in the Armed Forces; and
- (2) how making covered aliens eligible for enlistment in the Armed Forces would impact military readiness.

(b) **COVERED ALIENS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered aliens” means aliens who—

- (1) were unlawfully present in the United States on December 31, 2011;
- (2) have been continuously present in the United States since that date;
- (3) were younger than 16 years of age on the date the aliens initially entered the United States; and
- (4) disregarding such unlawful status, are otherwise eligible for original enlistment in a regular component of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

SA 1896. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON THE ROLE OF THE MINISTRY OF THE REVOLUTIONARY ARMED FORCES AND THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR IN CUBA IN THE ECONOMY AND FOREIGN RELATIONS SHIPS OF CUBA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the President shall submit a report to Congress that describes the role of the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces and the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Cuba with respect to the economy of Cuba.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify the entities that the United States considers to be owned, operated, or controlled (in whole or in part) by—
 - (A) the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces or the Ministry of the Interior of Cuba; or
 - (B) any senior member of the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces or the Ministry of the Interior of Cuba;
- (2) include an assessment of the business dealings with countries and entities outside of Cuba that are conducted by—

(A) either of the entities identified under paragraph (1)(A); or

(B) officers of such entities; and

(3) include an assessment of the relationship of the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces and the Ministry of the Interior of Cuba with the militaries of foreign countries, including whether either Cuban Ministry has—

(A) conducted any joint training, exercises, financial dealings, or weapons purchases or sales with such foreign militaries; or

(B) provided advisors to such foreign militaries.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SA 1897. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 558. ADDITIONAL RECIPIENTS OF CONFIDENTIAL DISCLOSURES OF SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE ARMED FORCES THAT DO NOT TRIGGER AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION.

(a) **ADDITIONAL RECIPIENTS.**—Section 1565b(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is modified by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(D) The Senators representing the State in which the victim resides, and the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives representing the district in which the victim resides.

“(E) A Special Victims’ Counsel pursuant to section 1044e of this title.”.

(b) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall revise the regulations required by section 1565b(b) of title 10, United States Code, to establish procedures to ensure that Members of Congress can engage with the Department of Defense on behalf of a mem-

ber of the Armed Forces who is a victim of sexual assault, pursuant to a request for assistance from the victim to such Member of Congress, in a confidential manner. Under the regulations as so revised, neither a request by a victim to a Member of Congress for assistance nor subsequent engagement with the victim by such Member of Congress shall jeopardize the Restricted status of any report filed by the victim in connection with the sexual assault.

SA 1898. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. NOTICE REGARDING MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON STUDENT LOANS UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

Section 105 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 515) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) **STUDENT LOANS.**—Each servicer of a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under Part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq., 1087a et seq., 1087aa et seq.) shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which a servicemember with a student loan serviced by such servicer that is subject to subsection (a) of section 207 begins a period of military service, notify such servicemember of the servicemember’s rights under this act.”.

SA 1899. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

The table in section 2614(b) is amended by adding after the item relating to Camp Smith, New York, the following new item:

Puerto Rico.	Gurabo	Readiness Center ...	\$14,218,000
--------------	--------------	----------------------	--------------

SA 1900. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe

military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1103 and insert the following:

SEC. 1103. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE "NEW BEGINNINGS" PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND WORKFORCE INCENTIVE SYSTEM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) required the Department of Defense to institute a fair, credible, and transparent performance appraisal system, given the name "New Beginnings", for employees which—

(A) links employee bonuses and other performance-based action to employee performance appraisals;

(B) ensured ongoing performance feedback and dialogue among supervisors, managers, and employees throughout the appraisal period, with timetables for review; and

(C) developed performance assistance plans to give employees formal training, on-the-job training, counseling, mentoring, and other assistance.

(2) The military components and Defense Agencies of the Department are currently reviewing the proposed "New Beginnings" performance management and workforce incentive system developed in response to section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

(3) The Department anticipates it will begin implementation of the "New Beginnings" performance management and workforce incentive system in April 2016.

(4) The authority in section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 provided the Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, flexibilities in promulgating regulations to redesign the procedures which are applied by the Department in making appointments to positions within the competitive service in order to—

(A) better meet mission needs;

(B) respond to manager needs and the needs of applicants;

(C) produce high-quality applicants;

(D) support timely decisions;

(E) uphold appointments based on merit system principles; and

(F) promote competitive job offers.

(5) In implementing the "New Beginnings" performance management and workforce incentive system, section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 requires the Secretary to comply with veterans' preference requirements.

(6) Among the criteria for the "New Beginnings" performance management and workforce incentive system authorized by section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the Secretary is required to—

(A) adhere to merit principles;

(B) include a means for ensuring employee involvement (for bargaining unit employees, through their exclusive representatives) in the design and implementation of the performance management and workforce incentive system;

(C) provide for adequate training and retraining for supervisors, managers, and employees in the implementation and operation of the performance management and workforce incentive system;

(D) develop a comprehensive management succession program to provide training to employees to develop managers for the Department and a program to provide training to supervisors on actions, options, and strategies a supervisor may use in administering the performance management and workforce incentive system;

(E) include effective transparency and accountability measures and safeguards to ensure that the management of the performance management and workforce incentive system is fair, credible, and equitable, including appropriate independent reasonableness reviews, internal assessments, and employee surveys;

(F) utilize the annual strategic workforce plan required by section 115b of title 10, United States Code; and

(G) ensure that adequate resources are allocated for the design, implementation, and administration of the performance management and workforce incentive system.

(7) Section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 also requires the Secretary to develop a program of training—to be completed by a supervisor every three years—on the actions, options, and strategies a supervisor may use in—

(A) developing and discussing relevant goals and objectives with employees, communicating and discussing progress relative to performance goals and objectives, and conducting performance appraisals;

(B) mentoring and motivating employees, and improving employee performance and productivity;

(C) fostering a work environment characterized by fairness, respect, equal opportunity, and attention to the quality of the work of employees;

(D) effectively managing employees with unacceptable performance;

(E) addressing reports of a hostile work environment, reprisal, or harassment of or by another supervisor or employee; and

(F) allowing experienced supervisors to mentor new supervisors by sharing knowledge and advice in areas such as communication, critical thinking, responsibility, flexibility, motivating employees, teamwork, leadership, and professional development, and pointing out strengths and areas of development.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should proceed with the collaborative work with employee representatives on the "New Beginnings" performance management and workforce incentive system and begin implementation of the new system at the earliest possible date.

SA 1901. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. ANNUAL REPORT ON FOREIGN PROCUREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 2338. Reporting on foreign purchases

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the end of fiscal year 2016, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional defense committees a report listing specific procurements by the Department of Defense in that fiscal year of articles, materials, or supplies valued greater than \$5,000,000, indexed to inflation, using the exception under section 8302(a)(2)(A) of title 41. This report may be submitted as part of the report required under section 8305 of such title.

"(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2337 the following new item:

"2338. Reporting on foreign purchases."

SA 1902. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON GAMBLING AND PROBLEM GAMBLING BEHAVIOR AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on gaming facilities at military installations and problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) With respect to gaming facilities at military installations, disaggregated by each branch of the Armed Forces—

(A) the number, type, and location of such gaming facilities;

(B) the total amount of cash flow through such gaming facilities; and

(C) the amount of revenue generated by such gaming facilities for morale, welfare, and recreation programs of the Department of Defense.

(2) An assessment of the prevalence of and particular risks for problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces, including such recommendations for policies and programs to be carried out by the Department to address problem gambling as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) An assessment of the ability and capacity of military health care personnel to adequately diagnose and provide dedicated treatment for problem gambling, including—

(A) a comparison of treatment programs of the Department for alcohol abuse, illegal substance abuse, and tobacco addiction with

treatment programs of the Department for problem gambling; and

(B) an assessment of whether additional training for military health care personnel on providing treatment for problem gambling would be beneficial.

(4) An assessment of the financial counseling and related services that are available to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents who are impacted by problem gambling.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1903. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1024. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR POLAR ICEBREAKERS.

(a) MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT.—Subject to section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy shall enter into multiyear contracts for the procurement of three heavy polar icebreakers and any systems and equipment associated with those vessels.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR ADVANCE PROCUREMENT.—The Secretary may enter into one or more contracts, beginning in fiscal year 2016, for advance procurement associated with the vessels, systems, and equipment for which authorization to enter into a multiyear contract is provided under subsection (a).

(c) CONDITION FOR OUT-YEAR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.—A contract entered into under subsection (a) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2016 is subject to the availability of appropriations or funds for that purpose for such later fiscal year.

(d) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall enter into a memorandum of agreement establishing a process by which the Coast Guard, in concurrence with the Navy, shall—

(1) identify the vessel specifications, capabilities, systems, equipment, and other details required for the design of heavy polar icebreakers capable of fulfilling Navy and Coast Guard mission requirements, with the Coast Guard, as the sole operator of United

States Government polar icebreaking assets, retaining final decision authority in the establishment of vessel requirements;

(2) oversee the construction of heavy polar icebreakers authorized to be procured under this section; and

(3) to the extent not adequately addressed in the 1965 Revised Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Treasury on the Operation of Icebreakers, transfer heavy polar icebreakers procured through contracts authorized under this section from the Navy to the Coast Guard to be maintained and operated by the Coast Guard.

SA 1904. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. PROGRAM TO COMMEMORATE THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER.

(a) FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(A) At the end of World War I, Congressman Hamilton Fish championed legislation to create a national focus for Americans to honor the memory of all people who served in the Armed Forces, but especially for those who died unknown and lost to history. The legislation created the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Since that time, the remains of a single unknown member of the Armed Forces from World War II and from the Korean War have been entombed at the same memorial. (The remains of an unknown Vietnam War veteran were subsequently identified and removed from the Tomb).

(B) These additions transformed the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier into a transcendent place of honor and reflection. Now known as the Tomb of the Unknowns, the Tomb represents that one place where every American can go to honor every member of our country who has ever worn the uniform of the Nation. Today at the Tomb, American citizens and citizens from other countries come daily to remember and honor the ideals of sacrifice and service.

(C) The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier was formally consecrated on November 11, 1921. Now is the time to prepare for the 100th anniversary of the consecration of the Tomb.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this section is to provide for the conduct of a formal program to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the consecration of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, including authorizing private sector efforts to create nation-wide commemorations on the day of the Washington National Commemoration of the Tomb.

(b) COMMEMORATIVE PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may conduct a program to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the consecration of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. In conducting the commemorative program, the Secretary shall coordinate, support, and facilitate other programs and activities of the Federal Government, State, and local governments,

and other persons and organizations in commemoration of the Tomb.

(c) SCHEDULE.—The Secretary of Defense shall determine the schedule of major events and priority of efforts for the commemorative program in order to ensure achievement of the objectives specified in subsection (d).

(d) COMMEMORATIVE ACTIVITIES AND OBJECTIVES.—The commemorative program may include activities and ceremonies to achieve the following objectives:

(1) To honor the commitment of the United States to never forget or forsake the members of the Armed Forces who served and sacrificed for our Country, including personnel who were held as prisoners of war or listed as missing in action, and to thank and honor the families of these veterans.

(2) To highlight the service of the Armed Forces in times of war or armed conflict and the contributions of Federal agencies and governmental and nongovernmental organizations that served with, or in support of, the Armed Forces.

(3) To pay tribute to the contributions made on the home front by the people of the United States in times of war or armed conflict.

(4) To educate the American public about service and sacrifice on behalf of the United States and the principles that define and unite the United States.

(5) To recognize the contributions and sacrifices made by the allies of the United States during times of war or armed conflict.

(6) To apply the advances in technology to communicate the activities at the Tomb of the Unknowns to people across the United States.

(7) To facilitate the participation of the American people in the centennial commemoration of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

(8) To educate the youth of America on the importance of our citizens' commitment of service and sacrifice to secure and to keep safe, now and in the future, and on America's founding principles and promise of freedom for all who abide in the United States.

(e) NAMES AND SYMBOLS.—The Secretary shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name “The United States of America Tomb of the Unknown Soldier Commemoration”, and such seal, emblems, and badges incorporating such name as the Secretary may lawfully adopt. Nothing in this section may be construed to supersede rights that are established or vested before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) COMMEMORATIVE FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.—Upon the commencement of the commemorative program, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish on the books of the Treasury an account to be known as the “Tomb of the Unknown Soldier Commemoration Fund” (in this section referred to as the “Fund”). The Fund shall be administered by the Secretary of Defense.

(2) DEPOSITS.—Subject to paragraph (3), there shall be deposited into the Fund the following:

(A) Amounts appropriated to the Fund.

(B) Proceeds derived from the use by the Secretary of the exclusive rights described in subsection (e).

(C) Donations made in support of the commemorative program by private and corporate donors.

(D) Any other amounts authorized to deposit into the Fund by law.

(3) LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES.—Total contributions from the Federal Government to the Fund may not exceed \$5,000,000.

(4) **USE OF FUND.**—Amounts in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary of Defense only for the purpose of conducting the commemorative program. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations regarding the use of the Fund as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(5) **AVAILABILITY.**—Amounts in the Fund shall remain available until expended.

(6) **TREATMENT OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.**—Any unobligated amounts in the Fund as of the end of the commemorative period specified in subsection (b) shall remain in the Fund until transferred by law.

(7) **BUDGET REQUEST.**—The Secretary of Defense may establish a separate budget line for the commemorative program. In the budget justification materials submitted by the Secretary in support of the budget of the President for any fiscal year for which the Secretary establishes the separate budget line, the Secretary shall—

(A) identify and explain any amounts expended for the commemorative program in the fiscal year preceding the budget request;

(B) identify and explain the amounts being requested to support the commemorative program for the fiscal year of the budget request; and

(C) present a current summary of the fiscal status of the Fund.

(g) **ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTARY SERVICES.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT SERVICES.**—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may accept from any person voluntary services to be provided in furtherance of the commemorative program. The Secretary shall prohibit the solicitation of any voluntary services if the nature or circumstances of such solicitation would compromise the integrity or the appearance of integrity of any program of the Department of Defense or of any individual involved in the program.

(2) **REIMBURSEMENT OF INCIDENTAL EXPENSES.**—The Secretary may provide for reimbursement of incidental expenses incurred by a person providing voluntary services under this subsection. The Secretary shall determine which expenses are eligible for reimbursement under this paragraph.

(h) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the end of the commemorative program, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report containing an accounting of the following:

(1) All of the amounts deposited into and expended from the Fund.

(2) Any other amounts expended pursuant to this section.

(3) Any unobligated funds remaining in the Fund as of the date of the report.

SA 1905. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. COTTON, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. 593. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF EFFORTS TO SLOW THE GROWTH OF PERSONNEL COSTS ON JUNIOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES.

Congress—

(1) remains concerned about the cumulative impact of Department of Defense efforts to slow the growth of personnel costs on junior enlisted personnel of the Armed Forces and their families; and

(2) encourages the Department to specifically consider these impacts when developing legislative proposals for consideration by Congress.

SA 1906. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. ASSESSMENT OF EFFECT OF BETTER BUYING POWER 3.0 INITIATIVE ON INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) **ASSESSMENT ON CHANGES MADE TO BETTER.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the Better Buying Power 3.0 initiative and its management of independent research and development activities by contractors of the Department of Defense.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the implementation of Better Buying Power 3.0 and how it balances the need for management of reimbursement of Department contractor independent research and development costs with the need to preserve the independence of a contractor to choose which technologies to pursue in its independent research and development program.

(2) An assessment of the costs, risks and benefits of proposed changes to the current guidelines of the Department for authorizing independent research and development by contractors and reimbursing such contractors for expenses relating to such independent research and development.

(3) Recommendations for legislative or administrative action to improve the ways in which the Department authorizes independent research and development by contractors of the Department and reimburses such contractors for expenses relating to such independent research and development.

SA 1907. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such

fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

(c) **RE-ENGINEING STUDY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Air Force shall submit their B-52 re-engine analysis to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1908. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT OMBUDSMAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The small business offices in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military departments shall serve as intermediaries between small businesses and contracting officials prior to the award of contracts in cases where a small business prospective contractor notifies the small business office that it has reason to believe that the contracting process has been modified to preclude a small business from bidding on the contract or would give another contractor an unfair competitive advantage.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude a contractor from exercising the right to initiate a bid protest under a contract.

SA 1909. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. STUDY ON RADIATION EXPOSURE FROM ATOMIC TESTING CLEANUP ON THE ENEWETAK ATOLL.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Energy, the Director of the National Cancer Institute, and such others as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate, conduct a study on radiation exposure from the atomic testing cleanup that occurred on the Enewetak Atoll during the period of years beginning with 1977 and ending with 1980.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A determination of the amount of radiation that members of the Armed Forces and civilians were exposed to as a result of the atomic testing cleanup that described in subsection (a), especially with respect to those

who were located on Runit Island during such cleanup.

(2) Identification of the effects of the exposure described in paragraph (1).

(3) An estimate of the number of surviving veterans and other civilians who were exposed as described in paragraph (1).

SA 1910. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 417. CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AUTHORITY RELATING TO ALLOCATIONS TO STATES OF AUTHORIZED NUMBERS OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) MANDATORY REVIEW AND AUTHORIZED REDUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau—

(A) shall review each fiscal year the number of members of the Army National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States serving in each State; and

(B) if the Chief of the National Guard Bureau makes the determination described in paragraph (2) with respect to a State in a fiscal year, may reduce the number of members of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States, as applicable, to be allocated to serve in such State during the succeeding fiscal years.

(2) DETERMINATION.—A determination described in this paragraph is a determination with respect to a State that, during any three of the five fiscal years ending in the fiscal year in which such determination is made, the number of members of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States serving in such State is or was fewer than the number authorized for the applicable fiscal year

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF REDUCTIONS.—In administering reductions under subsection (a)(1)(B), the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall seek to ensure that—

(1) the number of members of the Army National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States serving in each State each fiscal year is commensurate with the National Guard force structure in such State during such fiscal year; and

(2) the number of members of the National Guard serving on full-time duty for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the National Guard serving in each State during each fiscal year is commensurate with the National Guard force structure in such State during such fiscal year.

SA 1911. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to author-

ize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEFINITION OF AND POLICY REGARDING SOFTWARE SUSTAINMENT.

(a) REPORT ON ASSESSMENT OF DEFINITION AND POLICY.—Not later than March 15, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the President pro tempore of the Senate a report setting forth an assessment, obtained by the Secretary for purposes of the report, on the definition used by the Department of Defense for and the policy of the Department regarding software maintenance, particularly with respect to the totality of the term “software sustainment” in the definition of “depot-level maintenance and repair” under section 2460 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall be conducted by a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), or another appropriate independent entity with expertise in matters described in subsection (a), selected by the Secretary for purposes of the assessment.

(c) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall address, with respect to software and weapon systems of the Department of Defense (including space systems), each of the following:

(A) Fiscal ramifications of current programs with regard to the size, scope, and cost of software to the program's overall budget, including embedded and support software, percentage of weapon systems' functionality controlled by software, and reliance on proprietary data, processes, and components.

(B) Legal status of the Department in regards to adhering to section 2464(a)(1) of such title with respect to ensuring a ready and controlled source of maintenance and sustainment on software for its weapon systems.

(C) Operational risks and reduction to materiel readiness of current Department weapon systems related to software costs, delays, re-work, integration and functional testing, defects, and documentation errors.

(D) Other matters as identified by the Secretary.

(2) ADDITIONAL MATTERS.—For each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall include review and analysis regarding sole-source contracts, range of competition, rights in technical data, public and private capabilities, integration lab initial costs and sustaining operations, and total obligation authority costs of software, disaggregated by armed service, for the Department.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide the independent entity described in subsection (b) with timely access to appropriate information, data, resources, and analysis so that the entity may conduct a thorough and independent assessment as required under such subsection.

SA 1912. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1614. STRATEGY FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERAGENCY REVIEW OF THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY OVERHEAD SATELLITE ARCHITECTURE.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR STRATEGY.—The Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall develop a strategy, with milestones and benchmarks, to ensure that there is a comprehensive interagency review of policies and practices for planning and acquiring national security satellite systems and architectures, including capabilities of commercial systems and partner countries, consistent with the National Space Policy issued on June 28, 2010, and section 1601 of this Act. Such strategy shall, where applicable, account for the unique missions and authorities vested in the Department of Defense and the intelligence community.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall ensure that the United States national security overhead satellite architecture—

(1) meets the needs of the United States in peace time and is resilient in war time;

(2) responsibly stewards the taxpayers' dollars;

(3) accurately takes into account cost and performance tradeoffs;

(4) meets realistic requirements;

(5) produces excellence, innovation, competition, and a robust industrial base;

(6) aims to produce innovative satellite systems in less than 5 years that are able to leverage common, standardized design elements and commercially available technologies;

(7) takes advantage of rapid advances in commercial technology, innovation, and commercial-like acquisition practices;

(8) is open to innovative concepts such as distributed, disaggregated architectures that could allow for better resiliency, reconstitution, replenishment, and rapid technological refresh; and

(9) emphasizes deterrence and recognizes the importance of offensive and defensive space control capabilities.

(c) REPORT ON STRATEGY.—Not later than February 28, 2016, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall report to the congressional defense committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives on the strategy required by subsection (a).

SA 1913. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016

for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE INSPECTION AND GRADING PROGRAM.

(a) **FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008.**—Effective June 18, 2008, section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) is repealed.

(b) **AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014.**—Effective February 7, 2014, section 12106 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79; 128 Stat. 981) is repealed.

(c) **APPLICATION.**—The Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if the provisions of law struck by this section had not been enacted.

SA 1914. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 1002, insert the following:

SEC. 1002A. AUDIT READINESS OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Article 1, Section 9 of the Constitution of the United States requires of the agencies of the Federal Government, including the Department of Defense, that “a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time”.

(2) Congress passed a series of laws in the 1990s, beginning with the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, to require that all Government agencies and departments obtain opinions on their financial statements.

(3) On September 10, 2001, former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, stated that “[a]ccording to some estimates, we cannot track \$2,300,000,000 in transactions. We cannot share information from floor to floor in this building because it’s stored on dozens of technological systems that are inaccessible or incompatible”.

(4) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 codified a statutory requirement that the Department of Defense financial statements be validated as ready for audit not later than September 30, 2017.

(5) On April 21, 2015, the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that “I have long been skeptical of the ability of the Department to achieve the statutory timeline for producing auditable financial statements”.

(6) In September 2010, the Government Accountability Office stated that past expendi-

tures by the Department of Defense of \$5,800,000,000 to improve financial information, and billions of dollars more of anticipated expenditures on new information technology systems for that purpose, may not suffice to achieve full audit readiness of the financial statement of the Department.

(7) During his confirmation hearing in 2015, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter submitted testimony stating that “[i]t is time that DoD finally lives up to its moral and legal obligation to be accountable to those who pay its bills. I intend to do everything we can—including holding people to account—to get this done”.

(8) The financial management practices of the Department of Defense have been on the “High Risk” list of the Government Accountability Office since 1995. As a result of poor financial management, the Department is unable to “control costs; ensure basic accountability; anticipate future costs and claims on the budget; measure performance; maintain funds control; and prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse”.

(b) **FINANCIAL AUDIT FUND.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a fund to be known as the “Financial Audit Fund” (in this section referred to as the “Fund”) for the purpose of supporting initiatives, programs, and activities that will assist the organizations, components, and elements of the Department of Defense in—

(1) improving the audit readiness of the financial statements of such organizations, components, and elements;

(2) obtaining unmodified audit opinions of the financial statements of such organizations, components, and elements; and

(3) maintaining unmodified audit opinions of the financial statements of such organizations, components, and elements.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—Amounts in the Fund shall include the following:

(1) Amounts appropriated to the Fund.

(2) Amounts transferred to the Fund under subsection (e).

(3) Any other amounts authorized for transfer or deposit into the Fund by law.

(d) **AVAILABILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts in the Fund shall be available for initiatives, programs, and activities described in subsection (b) that are approved by the Secretary to support and maintain the audit readiness of the financial statement of the organizations, components, and elements of the Department of Defense.

(2) **TRANSFER.**—Amounts in the Fund may be transferred to any other account of the Department in order to fund initiatives, programs, and activities described in paragraph (1). Any amounts transferred from the Fund to an account shall be merged with amounts in the account to which transferred and shall be available subject to the same terms and conditions as amounts in such account, except that amounts so transferred shall remain available until expended. The authority to transfer amounts under this paragraph is in addition to any other authority of the Secretary to transfer amounts by law.

(3) **PRIORITY.**—In approving initiatives, programs, and activities to be funded with amounts in the Fund, the Secretary shall accord a priority to initiatives, programs, and activities that are designed to maintain unmodified audit opinions of financial statement of organizations, components, and elements of the Department that have previously obtained unmodified audit opinions of their financial statements.

(e) **FAILURE TO ACHIEVE AUDIT READINESS.**—

(1) **REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AVAILABLE.**—Subject to paragraph (2), if during any fiscal year after fiscal year 2017 the Secretary determines that an organization, component, or element of the Department has not achieved audit readiness of its financial statements for the calendar year ending during such fiscal year—

(A) the amount available to such organization, component, or element for the fiscal year in which such determination is made shall be equal to—

(i) the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such organization, component, or element for the fiscal year, minus

(ii) an amount equal to 0.5 percent of the amount described in clause (i); and

(B) the Secretary shall deposit in the Fund pursuant to subsection (b)(2) all amounts unavailable to organizations, components, and elements of the Department in the fiscal year pursuant to determinations made under subparagraph (A).

(2) **INAPPLICABILITY TO AMOUNTS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL.**—Any reduction applicable to an organization, component, or element of the Department under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year shall not apply to amounts, if any, available to such organization, component, or element for the fiscal year for military personnel.

SA 1915. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERAGENCY COOPERATION FOR THE UNITED STATES NORTHERN COMMAND.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Commander of United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that since September 11, 2001, “resurgent state actors have invested in new capabilities that make North America vulnerable in ways not seen in a generation” and particularly that the “unpredictable cascading impacts of a cyberspace attack have the potential to easily outpace those of a natural disaster”.

(2) The Joint Cyber Center was established in the United States Northern Command to integrate cybersecurity efforts into headquarters missions by improving situational awareness in the cyber domain, improving the defense of the networks of the Command, and providing cyber consequence response and recovery support to civil authorities.

(3) The responsibilities of United States Northern Command for homeland defense (including countering illegal drugs and combating transnational organized crime) and defense support of civil authorities (including domestic disaster relief operations during wildfires, hurricanes, earthquakes, and floods) depend on interagency partnerships and cooperation.

(4) During the past fire season, Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard C-130 aircraft equipped with the United States Forest Service Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System made 132 airdrops, releasing nearly 250,000 gallons of fire retardant to combat wildfires.

(5) The regional partnership of United States Northern Command with Mexico and the Bahamas in combating the trafficking of illegal drugs and persons and in training law enforcement and disaster relief personnel depends on cooperation with other agencies of the United States Government such as the Department of State, Department of Homeland Security, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(6) The Commander of United States Northern Command is also the Commander of the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), the bi-national command with Canada. For more than 57 years, the United States has partnered with our vital ally to the north to provide aerospace warning, aerospace defense, and maritime warning in defense of North America. Since September 11, 2001, North American Aerospace Defense Command fighters have responded to more than 5,000 possible air threats in the United States and flown more than 62,500 sorties in defense of our homeland. Successful execution on the North American Aerospace Defense Command mission relies heavily on timely communication and seamless integration with numerous agencies of the United States Government such as the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Homeland Security, and Federal law enforcement agencies.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) continued interagency cooperation is vital to the successful discharge of the missions of the United States Northern Command, including homeland defense, cybersecurity, counterterrorism, counterdrug efforts, and defense support of civil authorities; and

(2) the United States Northern Command should continue its efforts to integrate cyberspace operations into its contingency plans and training exercises to understand better how cyber-attacks could be mitigated or prevented and how other Federal and State government partners can effectively respond should such attacks occur.

SA 1916. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DESIGNATION OF CONSTRUCTION AGENT FOR CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall seek to enter into an agreement subject to subsections (b), (c), and (e) of section 1535 of title 31, United States Code, with the Army Corps of Engineers or another entity of the Federal Government to serve, on a reimbursable basis, as the con-

struction agent on all construction projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs specifically authorized by Congress after the date of the enactment of this Act that involve a total expenditure of more than \$100,000,000, excluding any acquisition by exchange.

(b) AGREEMENT.—Under the agreement entered into under subsection (a), the construction agent shall provide design, procurement, and construction management services for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of facilities of the Department.

SA 1917. Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. REPORT ON USE OF DEMAND RESPONSE PROGRAMS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the use of demand response programs at military installations.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of the progress made in identifying installations where the use of demand response can be economically beneficial to the Department of Defense.

(2) A description of challenges to participation in demand response programs.

(3) A description of effective incentives for the participation of installations in these programs, including options for installations to gain access to the funds they earn for their participation.

(4) An assessment of possibilities for future expansion of demand response participation by the Department.

(5) An assessment of methods for receiving direct payments from utilities, independent system operators, and third party aggregators for participation in demand response programs and utilizing these payments for energy-related purposes at the participating installations.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex as necessary.

SA 1918. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . JUDICIAL REVIEW OF VISA REVOCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)) is amended by striking “There shall be no means of judicial review” and all that follows and inserting the following: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, no court has jurisdiction to review a revocation under this subsection or to hear any claim arising from such a revocation.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) apply to all visas issued before, on, or after such date; and

(3) apply to any claim pending on, or filed after, the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1919. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle ____—Safe Communities

SEC. ____ 1. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Keep Our Communities Safe Act of 2015”.

SEC. ____ 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Constitutional rights should be upheld and protected;

(2) Congress intends to uphold the Constitutional principle of due process; and

(3) due process of the law is a right afforded to everyone in the United States.

SEC. ____ 3. DETERMINATION OF DANGEROUS ALIENS DURING REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.

Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” each place such term appears (except in the second place it appears in subsection (a)) and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security or” before “the Attorney General—”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “conditional parole” and inserting “recognizance”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “PAROLE” and inserting “RECOGNIZANCE”; and

(B) by striking “parole” and inserting “recognizance”;

(4) in subsection (c)(1), by striking the undesignated matter following subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“any time after the alien is released, without regard to whether an alien is released related to any activity, offense, or conviction described in this paragraph; to whether the alien is released on parole, supervised release, or probation; or to whether the alien may be arrested or imprisoned again for the same offense. If the activity described in this

paragraph does not result in the alien being taken into custody by any person other than the Secretary, then when the alien is brought to the attention of the Secretary or when the Secretary determines it is practical to take such alien into custody, the Secretary shall take such alien into custody.”;

(5) in subsection (e), by striking “Attorney General’s” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security’s”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **LENGTH OF DETENTION.**—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an alien may be detained under this section for any period, without limitation, except as provided in subsection (h), until the alien is subject to a final order of removal.

“(2) The length of detention under this section shall not affect a detention under section 241.

“(g) **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.**—(1) The Attorney General’s review of the Secretary’s custody determinations under subsection (a) shall be limited to whether the alien may be detained, released on bond (of at least \$1,500 with security approved by the Secretary), or released with no bond. Any review involving an alien described in paragraph (2)(D) shall be limited to a determination of whether the alien is properly included in such category.

“(2) The Attorney General shall review the Secretary’s custody determinations for the following classes of aliens:

“(A) Aliens in exclusion proceedings.

“(B) Aliens described in section 212(a)(3) or 237(a)(4).

“(C) Aliens described in subsection (c).

“(D) Aliens in deportation proceedings subject to section 242(a)(2) (as in effect between April 24, 1996 and April 1, 1997).

“(h) **RELEASE ON BOND.**—(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), an alien detained under subsection (a) may seek release on bond.

“(2) No bond may be granted under this subsection except to an alien who establishes, by clear and convincing evidence, that the alien is not a flight risk or a risk to another person or the community.

“(3) No alien detained under subsection (c) may seek release on bond.”.

SEC. 4. ALIENS ORDERED REMOVED.

Section 241(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears, except for the first place it appears in paragraph (4)(B)(i), and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting the following:

“(B) **BEGINNING OF PERIOD.**—The removal period begins on the latest of—

“(i) the date on which the order of removal becomes administratively final;

“(ii) the date on which the alien is taken into such custody if the alien is not in the custody of the Secretary on the date on which the order of removal becomes administratively final; and

“(iii) the date on which the alien is taken into the custody of the Secretary after the alien is released from detention or confinement if the alien is detained or confined (except for an immigration process) on the date on which the order of removal becomes administratively final.

“(C) **SUSPENSION OF PERIOD.**—

“(i) **EXTENSION.**—The removal period shall be extended beyond a period of 90 days and the Secretary may, in the Secretary’s sole discretion, keep the alien in detention during such extended period, if—

“(I) the alien fails or refuses to make all reasonable efforts to comply with the removal order, or to fully cooperate with the Secretary’s efforts to establish the alien’s identity and carry out the removal order, including making timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to the alien’s departure or conspires or acts to prevent the alien’s removal that is subject to an order of removal;

“(II) a court, the Board of Immigration Appeals, or an immigration judge orders a stay of removal of an alien who is subject to an administratively final order of removal;

“(III) the Secretary transfers custody of the alien pursuant to law to another Federal agency or a State or local government agency in connection with the official duties of such agency; or

“(IV) a court or the Board of Immigration Appeals orders a remand to an immigration judge or the Board of Immigration Appeals, during the time period when the case is pending a decision on remand (with the removal period beginning anew on the date that the alien is ordered removed on remand).

“(ii) **RENEWAL.**—If the removal period has been extended under clause (i), a new removal period shall be deemed to have begun on the date on which—

“(I) the alien makes all reasonable efforts to comply with the removal order, or to fully cooperate with the Secretary’s efforts to establish the alien’s identity and carry out the removal order;

“(II) the stay of removal is no longer in effect; or

“(III) the alien is returned to the custody of the Secretary.

“(iii) **MANDATORY DETENTION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS.**—The Secretary shall keep an alien described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 236(c)(1) in detention during the extended period described in clause (i).

“(iv) **SOLE FORM OF RELIEF.**—An alien may only seek relief from detention under this subparagraph by filing an application for a writ of habeas corpus in accordance with chapter 153 of title 28, United States Code. No alien whose period of detention is extended under this subparagraph shall have the right to seek release on bond.”;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or is not detained pursuant to paragraph (6)” after “the removal period”; and

(B) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) to obey reasonable restrictions on the alien’s conduct or activities that the Secretary prescribes for the alien—

“(i) to prevent the alien from absconding;

“(ii) for the protection of the community; or

“(iii) for other purposes related to the enforcement of immigration laws.”;

(4) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “subparagraph (B)”;

(5) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

“(6) **ADDITIONAL RULES FOR DETENTION OR RELEASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS.**—

“(A) **DETENTION REVIEW PROCESS FOR COOPERATIVE ALIENS ESTABLISHED.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish an administrative review process to determine whether an alien who is not otherwise subject to mandatory detention, who has made all reasonable efforts to comply with a removal order and to cooperate fully with the Secretary’s ef-

forts to establish the alien’s identity and carry out the removal order, including making timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to the alien’s departure, and who has not conspired or acted to prevent removal should be detained or released on conditions.

“(ii) **DETERMINATION.**—The Secretary shall make a determination whether to release an alien after the removal period in accordance with subparagraph (B), which—

“(I) shall include consideration of any evidence submitted by the alien; and

“(II) may include consideration of any other evidence, including—

“(aa) any information or assistance provided by the Secretary of State or other Federal official; and

“(bb) any other information available to the Secretary of Homeland Security pertaining to the ability to remove the alien.

“(B) **AUTHORITY TO DETAIN BEYOND REMOVAL PERIOD.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security may continue to detain an alien for 90 days beyond the removal period (including any extension of the removal period under paragraph (1)(C)). An alien whose detention is extended under this subparagraph shall not have the right to seek release on bond.

“(ii) **SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES.**—The Secretary may continue to detain an alien beyond the 90 days authorized under clause (i)—

“(I) until the alien is removed, if the Secretary determines that there is a significant likelihood that the alien—

“(aa) will be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future;

“(bb) would be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future; or

“(cc) would have been removed if the alien had not—

“(AA) failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to comply with the removal order;

“(BB) failed or refused to cooperate fully with the Secretary’s efforts to establish the alien’s identity and carry out the removal order, including making timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to the alien’s departure; or

“(CC) conspired or acted to prevent removal;

“(II) until the alien is removed, if the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies in writing—

“(aa) in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, that the alien has a highly contagious disease that poses a threat to public safety;

“(bb) after receipt of a written recommendation from the Secretary of State, that release of the alien is likely to have serious adverse foreign policy consequences for the United States;

“(cc) based on information available to the Secretary of Homeland Security (including classified, sensitive, or national security information, and without regard to the grounds upon which the alien was ordered removed), that there is reason to believe that the release of the alien would threaten the national security of the United States; or

“(dd) that the release of the alien will threaten the safety of the community or any person, conditions of release cannot reasonably be expected to ensure the safety of the community or of any person; and

“(AA) the alien has been convicted of 1 or more aggravated felonies (as defined in section 101(a)(43)(A)) or of 1 or more crimes

identified by the Secretary of Homeland Security by regulation, or of 1 or more attempts or conspiracies to commit any such aggravated felonies or such identified crimes, if the aggregate term of imprisonment for such attempts or conspiracies is at least 5 years; or

“(BB) the alien has committed 1 or more crimes of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code, but not including a purely political offense) and, because of a mental condition or personality disorder and behavior associated with that condition or disorder, the alien is likely to engage in acts of violence in the future; or

“(III) pending a certification under subclause (II), if the Secretary of Homeland Security has initiated the administrative review process not later than 30 days after the expiration of the removal period (including any extension of the removal period under paragraph (1)(C)).

“(iii) NO RIGHT TO BOND HEARING.—An alien whose detention is extended under this subparagraph shall not have a right to seek release on bond, including by reason of a certification under clause (ii)(II).

“(C) RENEWAL AND DELEGATION OF CERTIFICATION.—

“(i) RENEWAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may renew a certification under subparagraph (B)(ii)(II) every 6 months after providing an opportunity for the alien to request reconsideration of the certification and to submit documents or other evidence in support of that request. If the Secretary does not renew a certification, the Secretary may not continue to detain the alien under subparagraph (B)(ii)(II).

“(ii) DELEGATION.—Notwithstanding section 103, the Secretary may not delegate the authority to make or renew a certification described in item (bb), (cc), or (dd) of subparagraph (B)(ii)(II) below the level of the Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

“(iii) HEARING.—The Secretary may request that the Attorney General or the Attorney General’s designee provide for a hearing to make the determination described in subparagraph (B)(ii)(II)(dd)(BB).

“(D) RELEASE ON CONDITIONS.—If it is determined that an alien should be released from detention by a Federal court, the Board of Immigration Appeals, or if an immigration judge orders a stay of removal, the Secretary of Homeland Security may impose conditions on release in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(E) REDETENTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, without any limitations other than those specified in this section, may detain any alien subject to a final removal order who is released from custody if—

“(I) removal becomes likely in the reasonably foreseeable future;

“(II) the alien fails to comply with the conditions of release or to continue to satisfy the conditions described in subparagraph (A); or

“(III) upon reconsideration, the Secretary determines that the alien can be detained under subparagraph (B).

“(ii) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any alien returned to custody pursuant to this subparagraph as if the removal period terminated on the day of the redetention.

“(F) REVIEW OF DETERMINATIONS BY SECRETARY.—A determination by the Secretary under this paragraph shall not be subject to review by any other agency.”.

SEC. 5. SEVERABILITY.

If any of the provisions of this subtitle, any amendment made by this subtitle, or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid for any reason, the remainder of this subtitle, the amendments made by this subtitle, and the application of the provisions and amendments made by this subtitle to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected by such holding.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) APPREHENSION AND DETENTION OF ALIENS.—The amendments made by section 3 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by section 3, shall apply to any alien in detention under the provisions of such section on or after such date of enactment.

(b) ALIENS ORDERED REMOVED.—The amendments made by section 4 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to—

(1) all aliens subject to a final administrative removal, deportation, or exclusion order that was issued before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) acts and conditions occurring or existing before, on, or after such date of enactment.

SA 1920. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle E-Verify

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act”.

SEC. 2. PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 401(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by striking “Unless the Congress otherwise provides, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall terminate a pilot program on September 30, 2015.”.

SEC. 3. MANDATORY USE OF E-VERIFY.

(a) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Section 402(e)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—Each department and agency of the Federal Government shall participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “, that conducts hiring in a State” and all that follows and inserting “shall participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section.”.

(b) FEDERAL CONTRACTORS; CRITICAL EMPLOYERS.—Section 402(e) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) UNITED STATES CONTRACTORS.—Any person, employer, or other entity that enters into a contract with the Federal Government shall participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section.

“(3) DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL EMPLOYERS.—Not later than 7 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(A) conduct an assessment of employers that are critical to the homeland security or national security needs of the United States;

“(B) designate and publish a list of employers and classes of employers that are deemed to be critical pursuant to the assessment conducted under subparagraph (A); and

“(C) require that critical employers designated pursuant to subparagraph (B) participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section not later than 30 days after the Secretary makes such designation.”.

(c) ALL EMPLOYERS.—Section 402 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, as amended by this section, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) MANDATORY PARTICIPATION IN E-VERIFY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), all employers in the United States shall participate in E-Verify, with respect to all employees recruited, referred, or hired by such employer on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(2) USE OF CONTRACT LABOR.—Any employer who uses a contract, subcontract, or exchange to obtain the labor of an individual in the United States shall certify in such contract, subcontract, or exchange that the employer uses E-Verify. If such certification is not included in a contract, subcontract, or exchange, the employer shall be deemed to have violated paragraph (1).

“(3) INTERIM MANDATORY PARTICIPATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the date set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall require any employer or class of employers to participate in E-Verify, with respect to all employees recruited, referred, or hired by such employer if the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe that the employer is or has been engaged in a material violation of section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a).

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 14 days before an employer or class of employers is required to begin participating in E-Verify pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide such employer or class of employers with—

“(i) written notification of such requirement; and

“(ii) appropriate training materials to facilitate compliance with such requirement.”.

SEC. 4. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 402(e)(5) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), as redesignated by section 3(b)(1), is amended to read as follows:

“(5) CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE.—If a person or other entity that is required to participate in E-Verify fails to

comply with the requirements under this title with respect to an individual—

“(A) such failure shall be treated as a violation of section 274A(a)(1)(B) with respect to such individual; and

“(B) a rebuttable presumption is created that the person or entity has violated section 274A(a)(1)(A).”.

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “, subject to paragraph (10),” after “in an amount”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “not less than \$250 and not more than \$2,000” and inserting “not less than \$2,500 and not more than \$5,000”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “not less than \$2,000 and not more than \$5,000” and inserting “not less than \$5,000 and not more than \$10,000”;

(iv) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking “not less than \$3,000 and not more than \$10,000” and inserting “not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$25,000”; and

(v) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) may require the person or entity to take such other remedial action as is appropriate.”;

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by inserting “, subject to paragraphs (10) through (12),” after “in an amount”;

(ii) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$1,000”;

(iii) by striking “\$1,000” and inserting “\$25,000”;

(iv) by striking “the size of the business of the employer being charged, the good faith of the employer” and inserting “the good faith of the employer being charged”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following: “Failure by a person or entity to utilize the employment eligibility verification system as required by law, or providing information to the system that the person or entity knows or reasonably believes to be false, shall be treated as a violation of subsection (a)(1)(A).”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) EXEMPTION FROM PENALTY.—In the case of imposition of a civil penalty under paragraph (4)(A) with respect to a violation of paragraph (1)(A) or (2) of subsection (a) for hiring or continuation of employment or recruitment or referral by person or entity and in the case of imposition of a civil penalty under paragraph (5) for a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) for hiring or recruitment or referral by a person or entity, the penalty otherwise imposed may be waived or reduced if the violator establishes that the violator acted in good faith.

“(11) AUTHORITY TO DEBAR EMPLOYERS FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a person or entity is determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be a repeat violator of paragraph (1)(A) or (2) of subsection (a), or is convicted of a crime under this section, such person or entity may be considered for debarment from the receipt of Federal contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements in accordance with the debarment standards and pursuant to the debarment procedures set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(B) DOES NOT HAVE CONTRACT, GRANT, AGREEMENT.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General wishes to have a person or entity considered for debarment in accordance with this paragraph, and

such an person or entity does not hold a Federal contract, grant or cooperative agreement, the Secretary or Attorney General shall refer the matter to the Administrator of General Services to determine whether to list the person or entity on the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement, and if so, for what duration and under what scope.

“(C) HAS CONTRACT, GRANT, AGREEMENT.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General wishes to have a person or entity considered for debarment in accordance with this paragraph, and such person or entity holds a Federal contract, grant or cooperative agreement, the Secretary or Attorney General shall advise all agencies or departments holding a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with the person or entity of the Government's interest in having the person or entity considered for debarment, and after soliciting and considering the views of all such agencies and departments, the Secretary or Attorney General may waive the operation of this paragraph or refer the matter to any appropriate lead agency to determine whether to list the person or entity on the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement, and if so, for what duration and under what scope.

“(D) REVIEW.—Any decision to debar a person or entity under in accordance with this paragraph shall be reviewable pursuant to part 9.4 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.”; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Any person or entity which engages in a pattern or practice of violations of subsection (a)(1) or (2) shall be fined not more than \$15,000 for each unauthorized alien with respect to which such a violation occurs, imprisoned for not less than 1 year and not more than 10 years, or both, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Federal law relating to fine levels.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”.

SEC. 5. PREEMPTION; LIABILITY.

Section 402 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), as amended by this subtitle, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) LIMITATION ON STATE AUTHORITY.—

“(1) PREEMPTION.—A State or local government may not prohibit a person or other entity from verifying the employment authorization of new hires or current employees through E-Verify.

“(2) LIABILITY.—A person or other entity that participates in E-Verify may not be held liable under any Federal, State, or local law for any employment-related action taken with respect to the wrongful termination of an individual in good faith reliance on information provided through E-Verify.”.

SEC. 6. EXPANDED USE OF E-VERIFY.

Section 403(a)(3)(A) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) BEFORE HIRING.—The person or other entity may verify the employment eligibility of an individual through E-Verify before the individual is hired, recruited, or referred if the individual consents to such verification. If an employer receives a tentative nonconfirmation for an individual, the employer shall comply with procedures prescribed by the Secretary, including—

“(I) providing the individual employees with private, written notification of the finding and written referral instructions;

“(II) allowing the individual to contest the finding; and

“(III) not taking adverse action against the individual if the individual chooses to contest the finding.

“(ii) AFTER EMPLOYMENT OFFER.—The person or other entity shall verify the employment eligibility of an individual through E-Verify not later than 3 days after the date of the hiring, recruitment, or referral, as the case may be.

“(iii) EXISTING EMPLOYEES.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act, the Secretary shall require all employers to use E-Verify to verify the identity and employment eligibility of any individual who has not been previously verified by the employer through E-Verify.”.

SEC. 7. REVERIFICATION.

Section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) REVERIFICATION.—Each person or other entity participating in E-Verify shall use the E-Verify confirmation system to reverify the work authorization of any individual not later than 3 days after the date on which such individual's employment authorization is scheduled to expire (as indicated by the Secretary or the documents provided to the employer pursuant to section 274A(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(b))), in accordance with the procedures set forth in this subsection and section 402.”.

SEC. 8. HOLDING EMPLOYERS ACCOUNTABLE.

(a) CONSEQUENCES OF NONCONFIRMATION.—Section 403(a)(4)(C) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) CONSEQUENCES OF NONCONFIRMATION.—

“(i) TERMINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—If the person or other entity receives a final nonconfirmation regarding an individual, the employer shall immediately—

“(I) terminate the employment, recruitment, or referral of the individual; and

“(II) submit to the Secretary any information relating to the individual that the Secretary determines would assist the Secretary in enforcing or administering United States immigration laws.

“(ii) CONSEQUENCE OF CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT.—If the person or other entity continues to employ, recruit, or refer the individual after receiving final nonconfirmation, a rebuttable presumption is created that the employer has violated section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a).”.

(b) INTERAGENCY NONCONFIRMATION REPORT.—Section 405 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) INTERAGENCY NONCONFIRMATION REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services shall submit a weekly report to the Assistant Secretary of Immigration and Customs Enforcement that includes, for each individual who receives final nonconfirmation through E-Verify—

“(A) the name of such individual;

“(B) his or her Social Security number or alien file number;

“(C) the name and contact information for his or her current employer; and

“(D) any other critical information that the Assistant Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(2) USE OF WEEKLY REPORT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall use information provided under paragraph (1) to enforce compliance of the United States immigration laws.”.

SEC. 9. INFORMATION SHARING.

The Commissioner of Social Security, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly establish a program to share information among such agencies that may or could lead to the identification of unauthorized aliens (as defined in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act), including any no-match letter and any information in the earnings suspense file.

SEC. 10. FORM I-9 PROCESS.

Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to Congress that contains recommendations for—

(1) modifying and simplifying the process by which employers are required to complete and retain a Form I-9 for each employee pursuant to section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a); and

(2) eliminating the process described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 11. ALGORITHM.

Section 404(d) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) DESIGN AND OPERATION OF SYSTEM.—E-Verify shall be designed and operated—

“(1) to maximize its reliability and ease of use by employers;

“(2) to insulate and protect the privacy and security of the underlying information;

“(3) to maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to prevent unauthorized disclosure of personal information;

“(4) to respond accurately to all inquiries made by employers on whether individuals are authorized to be employed;

“(5) to register any times when E-Verify is unable to receive inquiries;

“(6) to allow for auditing use of the system to detect fraud and identify theft;

“(7) to preserve the security of the information in all of the system by—

“(A) developing and using algorithms to detect potential identity theft, such as multiple uses of the same identifying information or documents;

“(B) developing and using algorithms to detect misuse of the system by employers and employees;

“(C) developing capabilities to detect anomalies in the use of the system that may indicate potential fraud or misuse of the system; and

“(D) auditing documents and information submitted by potential employees to employers, including authority to conduct interviews with employers and employees;

“(8) to confirm identity and work authorization through verification of records maintained by the Secretary, other Federal departments, States, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or an outlying possession of the United States, as determined necessary by the Secretary, including—

“(A) records maintained by the Social Security Administration;

“(B) birth and death records maintained by vital statistics agencies of any State or other jurisdiction in the United States;

“(C) passport and visa records (including photographs) maintained by the Department of State; and

“(D) State driver's license or identity card information (including photographs) maintained by State department of motor vehicles;

“(9) to electronically confirm the issuance of the employment authorization or identity document; and

“(10) to display the digital photograph that the issuer placed on the document so that the employer can compare the photograph displayed to the photograph on the document presented by the employee or, in exceptional cases, if a photograph is not available from the issuer, to provide for a temporary alternative procedure, specified by the Secretary, for confirming the authenticity of the document.”.

SEC. 12. IDENTITY THEFT.

Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(7), by striking “of another person” and inserting “that is not his or her own”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by adding “or” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) to facilitate or assist in harboring or hiring unauthorized workers in violation of section 274, 274A, or 274C of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324, 1324a, and 1324c).”.

SEC. 13. SMALL BUSINESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 403 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) SMALL BUSINESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of the Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act, the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services shall establish a demonstration program that assists small businesses in rural areas or areas without internet capabilities to verify the employment eligibility of newly hired employees solely through the use of publicly accessible internet terminals.”.

SA 1921. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. McCain) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1569 proposed by Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. Boxer) to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike line 2 and all that follows and insert the following:

TITLE XVII—CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING

SECTION 1701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015”.

SEC. 1702. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) ANTITRUST LAWS.—The term “antitrust laws” —

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 1 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12);

(B) includes section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that section 5 of that Act applies to unfair methods of competition; and

(C) includes any State law that has the same intent and effect as the laws under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(3) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The term “appropriate Federal entities” means the following:

(A) The Department of Commerce.

(B) The Department of Defense.

(C) The Department of Energy.

(D) The Department of Homeland Security.

(E) The Department of Justice.

(F) The Department of the Treasury.

(G) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(4) CYBERSECURITY PURPOSE.—The term “cybersecurity purpose” means the purpose of protecting an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system from a cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability.

(5) CYBERSECURITY THREAT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “cybersecurity threat” means an action, not protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, on or through an information system that may result in an unauthorized effort to adversely impact the security, availability, confidentiality, or integrity of an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “cybersecurity threat” does not include any action that solely involves a violation of a consumer term of service or a consumer licensing agreement.

(6) CYBER THREAT INDICATOR.—The term “cyber threat indicator” means information that is necessary to describe or identify—

(A) malicious reconnaissance, including anomalous patterns of communications that appear to be transmitted for the purpose of gathering technical information related to a cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability;

(B) a method of defeating a security control or exploitation of a security vulnerability;

(C) a security vulnerability, including anomalous activity that appears to indicate the existence of a security vulnerability;

(D) a method of causing a user with legitimate access to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system to unwittingly enable the defeat of a security control or exploitation of a security vulnerability;

(E) malicious cyber command and control;

(F) the actual or potential harm caused by an incident, including a description of the information exfiltrated as a result of a particular cybersecurity threat;

(G) any other attribute of a cybersecurity threat, if disclosure of such attribute is not otherwise prohibited by law; or

(H) any combination thereof.

(7) DEFENSIVE MEASURE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “defensive measure” means an action, device, procedure, signature, technique, or other measure applied to an information system or information

that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system that detects, prevents, or mitigates a known or suspected cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “defensive measure” does not include a measure that destroys, renders unusable, or substantially harms an information system or data on an information system not belonging to—

(i) the private entity operating the measure; or

(ii) another entity or Federal entity that is authorized to provide consent and has provided consent to that private entity for operation of such measure.

(8) ENTITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “entity” means any private entity, non-Federal government agency or department, or State, tribal, or local government (including a political subdivision, department, or component thereof).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “entity” includes a government agency or department of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(C) EXCLUSION.—The term “entity” does not include a foreign power as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(9) FEDERAL ENTITY.—The term “Federal entity” means a department or agency of the United States or any component of such department or agency.

(10) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term “information system”—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) includes industrial control systems, such as supervisory control and data acquisition systems, distributed control systems, and programmable logic controllers.

(11) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term “local government” means any borough, city, county, parish, town, township, village, or other political subdivision of a State.

(12) MALICIOUS CYBER COMMAND AND CONTROL.—The term “malicious cyber command and control” means a method for unauthorized remote identification of, access to, or use of, an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(13) MALICIOUS RECONNAISSANCE.—The term “malicious reconnaissance” means a method for actively probing or passively monitoring an information system for the purpose of discerning security vulnerabilities of the information system, if such method is associated with a known or suspected cybersecurity threat.

(14) MONITOR.—The term “monitor” means to acquire, identify, or scan, or to possess, information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(15) PRIVATE ENTITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term “private entity” includes a State, tribal, or local government performing electric utility services.

(C) EXCLUSION.—The term “private entity” does not include a foreign power as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(16) SECURITY CONTROL.—The term “security control” means the management, operational, and technical controls used to protect against an unauthorized effort to adversely affect the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of an information system or its information.

(17) SECURITY VULNERABILITY.—The term “security vulnerability” means any attribute of hardware, software, process, or procedure that could enable or facilitate the defeat of a security control.

(18) TRIBAL.—The term “tribal” has the meaning given the term “Indian tribe” in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

SEC. 1703. SHARING OF INFORMATION BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the protection of classified information, intelligence sources and methods, and privacy and civil liberties, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and promulgate procedures to facilitate and promote—

(1) the timely sharing of classified cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government with cleared representatives of relevant entities;

(2) the timely sharing with relevant entities of cyber threat indicators or information in the possession of the Federal Government that may be declassified and shared at an unclassified level;

(3) the sharing with relevant entities, or the public if appropriate, of unclassified, including controlled unclassified, cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government; and

(4) the sharing with entities, if appropriate, of information in the possession of the Federal Government about cybersecurity threats to such entities to prevent or mitigate adverse effects from such cybersecurity threats.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The procedures developed and promulgated under subsection (a) shall—

(A) ensure the Federal Government has and maintains the capability to share cyber threat indicators in real time consistent with the protection of classified information;

(B) incorporate, to the greatest extent practicable, existing processes and existing roles and responsibilities of Federal and non-Federal entities for information sharing by the Federal Government, including sector specific information sharing and analysis centers;

(C) include procedures for notifying entities that have received a cyber threat indicator from a Federal entity under this title that is known or determined to be in error or in contravention of the requirements of this title or another provision of Federal law or policy of such error or contravention;

(D) include requirements for Federal entities receiving cyber threat indicators or defensive measures to implement and utilize security controls to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures; and

(E) include procedures that require a Federal entity, prior to the sharing of a cyber threat indicator—

(i) to review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator contains any information that such Federal entity knows at the time of sharing to be

personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(ii) to implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(2) COORDINATION.—In developing the procedures required under this section, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General shall coordinate with appropriate Federal entities, including the National Laboratories (as defined in section 1702 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801)), to ensure that effective protocols are implemented that will facilitate and promote the sharing of cyber threat indicators by the Federal Government in a timely manner.

(c) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall submit to Congress the procedures required by subsection (a).

SEC. 1704. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PREVENTING, DETECTING, ANALYZING, AND MITIGATING CYBERSECURITY THREATS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR MONITORING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a private entity may, for cybersecurity purposes, monitor—

(A) an information system of such private entity;

(B) an information system of another entity, upon the authorization and written consent of such other entity;

(C) an information system of a Federal entity, upon the authorization and written consent of an authorized representative of the Federal entity; and

(D) information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system monitored by the private entity under this paragraph.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the monitoring of an information system, or the use of any information obtained through such monitoring, other than as provided in this title; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR OPERATION OF DEFENSIVE MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a private entity may, for cybersecurity purposes, operate a defensive measure that is applied to—

(A) an information system of such private entity in order to protect the rights or property of the private entity;

(B) an information system of another entity upon written consent of such entity for operation of such defensive measure to protect the rights or property of such entity; and

(C) an information system of a Federal entity upon written consent of an authorized representative of such Federal entity for operation of such defensive measure to protect the rights or property of the Federal Government.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the use of a defensive measure other than as provided in this subsection; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(c) AUTHORIZATION FOR SHARING OR RECEIVING CYBER THREAT INDICATORS OR DEFENSIVE MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, an entity may, for the purposes permitted under this title and consistent with the protection of classified information, share with, or receive from, any other entity or the Federal Government a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

(2) LAWFUL RESTRICTION.—An entity receiving a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure from another entity or Federal entity shall comply with otherwise lawful restrictions placed on the sharing or use of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure by the sharing entity or Federal entity.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the sharing or receiving of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure other than as provided in this subsection; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(d) PROTECTION AND USE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) SECURITY OF INFORMATION.—An entity monitoring an information system, operating a defensive measure, or providing or receiving a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure under this section shall implement and utilize a security control to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

(2) REMOVAL OF CERTAIN PERSONAL INFORMATION.—An entity sharing a cyber threat indicator pursuant to this title shall, prior to such sharing—

(A) review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator contains any information that the entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(B) implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any information contained within such indicator that the entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(3) USE OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND DEFENSIVE MEASURES BY ENTITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with this title, a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure shared or received under this section may, for cybersecurity purposes—

(i) be used by an entity to monitor or operate a defensive measure on—

(I) an information system of the entity; or

(II) an information system of another entity or a Federal entity upon the written consent of that other entity or that Federal entity; and

(ii) be otherwise used, retained, and further shared by an entity subject to—

(I) an otherwise lawful restriction placed by the sharing entity or Federal entity on such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure; or

(II) an otherwise applicable provision of law.

(B) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the use of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure other than as provided in this section.

(4) USE OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS BY STATE, TRIBAL, OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—

(A) LAW ENFORCEMENT USE.—

(i) PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a cyber threat indicator shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this section may, with the prior

written consent of the entity sharing such indicator, be used by a State, tribal, or local government for the purpose of preventing, investigating, or prosecuting any of the offenses described in section 1705(d)(5)(A)(vi).

(ii) ORAL CONSENT.—If exigent circumstances prevent obtaining written consent under clause (i), such consent may be provided orally with subsequent documentation of the consent.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—A cyber threat indicator shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this section shall be—

(i) deemed voluntarily shared information; and

(ii) exempt from disclosure under any State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure of information or records.

(C) STATE, TRIBAL, AND LOCAL REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this title shall not be directly used by any State, tribal, or local government to regulate, including an enforcement action, the lawful activity of any entity, including an activity relating to monitoring, operating a defensive measure, or sharing of a cyber threat indicator.

(ii) REGULATORY AUTHORITY SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO PREVENTION OR MITIGATION OF CYBERSECURITY THREATS.—A cyber threat indicator or defensive measures shared as described in clause (i) may, consistent with a State, tribal, or local government regulatory authority specifically relating to the prevention or mitigation of cybersecurity threats to information systems, inform the development or implementation of a regulation relating to such information systems.

(e) ANTITRUST EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 1708(e), it shall not be considered a violation of any provision of antitrust laws for 2 or more private entities to exchange or provide a cyber threat indicator, or assistance relating to the prevention, investigation, or mitigation of a cybersecurity threat, for cybersecurity purposes under this title.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only to information that is exchanged or assistance provided in order to assist with—

(A) facilitating the prevention, investigation, or mitigation of a cybersecurity threat to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system; or

(B) communicating or disclosing a cyber threat indicator to help prevent, investigate, or mitigate the effect of a cybersecurity threat to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(f) NO RIGHT OR BENEFIT.—The sharing of a cyber threat indicator with an entity under this title shall not create a right or benefit to similar information by such entity or any other entity.

SEC. 1705. SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND DEFENSIVE MEASURES WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

(1) INTERIM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and submit to Congress interim policies and procedures relating to the receipt of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures by the Federal Government.

(2) FINAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, promulgate final policies and procedures relating to the receipt of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures by the Federal Government.

(3) REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Consistent with the guidelines required by subsection (b), the policies and procedures developed and promulgated under this subsection shall—

(A) ensure that cyber threat indicators are shared with the Federal Government by any entity pursuant to section 1704(c) through the real-time process described in subsection (c) of this section—

(i) are shared in an automated manner with all of the appropriate Federal entities;

(ii) are not subject to any delay, modification, or any other action that could impede real-time receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

(iii) may be provided to other Federal entities;

(B) ensure that cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government by any entity pursuant to section 1704 in a manner other than the real-time process described in subsection (c) of this section—

(i) are shared as quickly as operationally practicable with all of the appropriate Federal entities;

(ii) are not subject to any unnecessary delay, interference, or any other action that could impede receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

(iii) may be provided to other Federal entities;

(C) consistent with this title, any other applicable provisions of law, and the fair information practice principles set forth in appendix A of the document entitled “National Strategy for Trusted Identities in Cyberspace” and published by the President in April 2011, govern the retention, use, and dissemination by the Federal Government of cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this title, including the extent, if any, to which such cyber threat indicators may be used by the Federal Government; and

(D) ensure there is—

(i) an audit capability; and

(ii) appropriate sanctions in place for officers, employees, or agents of a Federal entity who knowingly and willfully conduct activities under this title in an unauthorized manner.

(4) GUIDELINES FOR ENTITIES SHARING CYBER THREAT INDICATORS WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall develop and make publicly available guidance to assist entities and promote sharing of cyber threat indicators with Federal entities under this title.

(B) CONTENTS.—The guidelines developed and made publicly available under subparagraph (A) shall include guidance on the following:

(i) Identification of types of information that would qualify as a cyber threat indicator under this title that would be unlikely to include personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(ii) Identification of types of information protected under otherwise applicable privacy laws that are unlikely to be directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(iii) Such other matters as the Attorney General considers appropriate for entities sharing cyber threat indicators with Federal entities under this title.

(b) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—

(1) GUIDELINES OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1), develop, submit to Congress, and make available to the public interim guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this title.

(2) FINAL GUIDELINES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1) and such private entities with industry expertise as the Attorney General considers relevant, promulgate final guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this title.

(B) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers and private entities described in subparagraph (A), periodically review the guidelines promulgated under subparagraph (A).

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines required by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, consistent with the need to protect information systems from cybersecurity threats and mitigate cybersecurity threats—

(A) limit the impact on privacy and civil liberties of activities by the Federal Government under this title;

(B) limit the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons, including by establishing—

(i) a process for the timely destruction of such information that is known not to be directly related to uses authorized under this title; and

(ii) specific limitations on the length of any period in which a cyber threat indicator may be retained;

(C) include requirements to safeguard cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons from unauthorized access or acquisition, including appropriate sanctions for activities by officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Government in contravention of such guidelines;

(D) include procedures for notifying entities and Federal entities if information received pursuant to this section is known or determined by a Federal entity receiving such information not to constitute a cyber threat indicator;

(E) protect the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons to the greatest extent practicable and require recipients to be informed that such indicators may only be used for purposes authorized under this title; and

(F) include steps that may be needed so that dissemination of cyber threat indicators is consistent with the protection of classified and other sensitive national security information.

(c) CAPABILITY AND PROCESS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and implement a capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security that—

(A) shall accept from any entity in real time cyber threat indicators and defensive measures, pursuant to this section;

(B) shall, upon submittal of the certification under paragraph (2) that such capability and process fully and effectively operates as described in such paragraph, be the process by which the Federal Government receives cyber threat indicators and defensive measures under this title that are shared by a private entity with the Federal Government through electronic mail or media, an interactive form on an Internet website, or a real time, automated process between information systems except—

(i) communications between a Federal entity and a private entity regarding a previously shared cyber threat indicator; and

(ii) communications by a regulated entity with such entity's Federal regulatory authority regarding a cybersecurity threat;

(C) ensures that all of the appropriate Federal entities receive in an automated manner such cyber threat indicators shared through the real-time process within the Department of Homeland Security;

(D) is in compliance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by this section; and

(E) does not limit or prohibit otherwise lawful disclosures of communications, records, or other information, including—

(i) reporting of known or suspected criminal activity, by an entity to any other entity or a Federal entity;

(ii) voluntary or legally compelled participation in a Federal investigation; and

(iii) providing cyber threat indicators or defensive measures as part of a statutory or authorized contractual requirement.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 10 days prior to the implementation of the capability and process required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, certify to Congress whether such capability and process fully and effectively operates—

(A) as the process by which the Federal Government receives from any entity a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure under this title; and

(B) in accordance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines developed under this section.

(3) PUBLIC NOTICE AND ACCESS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure there is public notice of, and access to, the capability and process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) so that—

(A) any entity may share cyber threat indicators and defensive measures through such process with the Federal Government; and

(B) all of the appropriate Federal entities receive such cyber threat indicators and defensive measures in real time with receipt through the process within the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The process developed and implemented under paragraph

(1) shall ensure that other Federal entities receive in a timely manner any cyber threat indicators and defensive measures shared with the Federal Government through such process.

(5) REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report on the development and implementation of the capability and process required by paragraph (1), including a description of such capability and process and the public notice of, and access to, such process.

(B) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) INFORMATION SHARED WITH OR PROVIDED TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(1) NO WAIVER OF PRIVILEGE OR PROTECTION.—The provision of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures to the Federal Government under this title shall not constitute a waiver of any applicable privilege or protection provided by law, including trade secret protection.

(2) PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Consistent with section 1704(c)(2), a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure provided by an entity to the Federal Government under this title shall be considered the commercial, financial, and proprietary information of such entity when so designated by the originating entity or a third party acting in accordance with the written authorization of the originating entity.

(3) EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall be—

(A) deemed voluntarily shared information and exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure of information or records; and

(B) withheld, without discretion, from the public under section 552(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local provision of law requiring disclosure of information or records.

(4) EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.—The provision of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure to the Federal Government under this title shall not be subject to a rule of any Federal agency or department or any judicial doctrine regarding ex parte communications with a decisionmaking official.

(5) DISCLOSURE, RETENTION, AND USE.—

(A) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title may be disclosed to, retained by, and used by, consistent with otherwise applicable provisions of Federal law, any Federal agency or department, component, officer, employee, or agent of the Federal Government solely for—

(i) a cybersecurity purpose;

(ii) the purpose of identifying a cybersecurity threat, including the source of such cybersecurity threat, or a security vulnerability;

(iii) the purpose of identifying a cybersecurity threat involving the use of an information system by a foreign adversary or terrorist;

(iv) the purpose of responding to, or otherwise preventing or mitigating, an imminent threat of death, serious bodily harm, or serious economic harm, including a terrorist act or a use of a weapon of mass destruction;

(v) the purpose of responding to, or otherwise preventing or mitigating, a serious threat to a minor, including sexual exploitation and threats to physical safety; or

(vi) the purpose of preventing, investigating, disrupting, or prosecuting an offense arising out of a threat described in clause (iv) or any of the offenses listed in—

(I) section 3559(c)(2)(F) of title 18, United States Code (relating to serious violent felonies);

(II) sections 1028 through 1030 of such title (relating to fraud and identity theft);

(III) chapter 37 of such title (relating to espionage and censorship); and

(IV) chapter 90 of such title (relating to protection of trade secrets).

(B) **PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.**—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall not be disclosed to, retained by, or used by any Federal agency or department for any use not permitted under subparagraph (A).

(C) **PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.**—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall be retained, used, and disseminated by the Federal Government—

(i) in accordance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by subsections (a) and (b);

(ii) in a manner that protects from unauthorized use or disclosure any cyber threat indicators that may contain personal information of or identifying specific persons; and

(iii) in a manner that protects the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying a specific person.

(D) **FEDERAL REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall not be directly used by any Federal, State, tribal, or local government to regulate, including an enforcement action, the lawful activities of any entity, including activities relating to monitoring, operating defensive measures, or sharing cyber threat indicators.

(ii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

(I) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO PREVENTION OR MITIGATION OF CYBERSECURITY THREATS.**—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title may, consistent with Federal or State regulatory authority specifically relating to the prevention or mitigation of cybersecurity threats to information systems, inform the development or implementation of regulations relating to such information systems.

(II) **PROCEDURES DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED UNDER THIS TITLE.**—Clause (i) shall not apply to procedures developed and implemented under this title.

SEC. 1706. PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY.

(a) **MONITORING OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS.**—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any private entity, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for the monitoring of information systems and information under section 1704(a) that is conducted in accordance with this title.

(b) **SHARING OR RECEIPT OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS.**—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any entity, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for the sharing or receipt of cyber threat indicators or defensive measures under section 1704(c) if—

(1) such sharing or receipt is conducted in accordance with this title; and

(2) in a case in which a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure is shared with the

Federal Government, the cyber threat indicator or defensive measure is shared in a manner that is consistent with section 1705(c)(1)(B) and the sharing or receipt, as the case may be, occurs after the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the interim policies and procedures are submitted to Congress under section 1705(a)(1); or

(B) the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title.

(c) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to require dismissal of a cause of action against an entity that has engaged in gross negligence or willful misconduct in the course of conducting activities authorized by this title; or

(2) to undermine or limit the availability of otherwise applicable common law or statutory defenses.

SEC. 1707. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) **BIENNIAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this title, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the heads of the appropriate Federal entities shall jointly submit and the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Inspector General of the Department of Energy, in consultation with the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, shall jointly submit to Congress a detailed report concerning the implementation of this title.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the sufficiency of the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by section 1705 in ensuring that cyber threat indicators are shared effectively and responsibly within the Federal Government.

(B) An evaluation of the effectiveness of real-time information sharing through the capability and process developed under section 1705(c), including any impediments to such real-time sharing.

(C) An assessment of the sufficiency of the procedures developed under section 1703 in ensuring that cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government are shared in a timely and adequate manner with appropriate entities, or, if appropriate, are made publicly available.

(D) An assessment of whether cyber threat indicators have been properly classified and an accounting of the number of security clearances authorized by the Federal Government for the purposes of this title.

(E) A review of the type of cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this title, including the following:

(i) The degree to which such information may impact the privacy and civil liberties of specific persons.

(ii) A quantitative and qualitative assessment of the impact of the sharing of such cyber threat indicators with the Federal Government on privacy and civil liberties of specific persons.

(iii) The adequacy of any steps taken by the Federal Government to reduce such impact.

(F) A review of actions taken by the Federal Government based on cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this title, including the appropriateness of any subsequent use or dissemination

of such cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity under section 1705.

(G) A description of any significant violations of the requirements of this title by the Federal Government.

(H) A summary of the number and type of entities that received classified cyber threat indicators from the Federal Government under this title and an evaluation of the risks and benefits of sharing such cyber threat indicators.

(3) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) may include recommendations for improvements or modifications to the authorities and processes under this title.

(4) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) **REPORTS ON PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.**—

(1) **BIENNIAL REPORT FROM PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this title and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board shall submit to Congress and the President a report providing—

(A) an assessment of the effect on privacy and civil liberties by the type of activities carried out under this title; and

(B) an assessment of the sufficiency of the policies, procedures, and guidelines established pursuant to section 1705 in addressing concerns relating to privacy and civil liberties.

(2) **BIENNIAL REPORT OF INSPECTORS GENERAL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this title and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Inspector General of the Department of Energy shall, in consultation with the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, jointly submit to Congress a report on the receipt, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures that have been shared with Federal entities under this title.

(B) **CONTENTS.**—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) A review of the types of cyber threat indicators shared with Federal entities.

(ii) A review of the actions taken by Federal entities as a result of the receipt of such cyber threat indicators.

(iii) A list of Federal entities receiving such cyber threat indicators.

(iv) A review of the sharing of such cyber threat indicators among Federal entities to identify inappropriate barriers to sharing information.

(3) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Each report submitted under this subsection may include such recommendations as the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (1), or the Inspectors General referred to in paragraph (2)(A), with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (2), may have for improvements or modifications to the authorities under this title.

(4) **FORM.**—Each report required under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1708. CONSTRUCTION AND PREEMPTION.

(a) OTHERWISE LAWFUL DISCLOSURES.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to limit or prohibit otherwise lawful disclosures of communications, records, or other information, including reporting of known or suspected criminal activity, by an entity to any other entity or the Federal Government under this title; or

(2) to limit or prohibit otherwise lawful use of such disclosures by any Federal entity, even when such otherwise lawful disclosures duplicate or replicate disclosures made under this title.

(b) WHISTLE BLOWER PROTECTIONS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit or limit the disclosure of information protected under section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse, or public health or safety threats), section 7211 of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures to Congress), section 1034 of title 10, United States Code (governing disclosure to Congress by members of the military), section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3234) (governing disclosure by employees of elements of the intelligence community), or any similar provision of Federal or State law.

(c) PROTECTION OF SOURCES AND METHODS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) as creating any immunity against, or otherwise affecting, any action brought by the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to enforce any law, executive order, or procedure governing the appropriate handling, disclosure, or use of classified information;

(2) to affect the conduct of authorized law enforcement or intelligence activities; or

(3) to modify the authority of a department or agency of the Federal Government to protect classified information and sources and methods and the national security of the United States.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect any requirement under any other provision of law for an entity to provide information to the Federal Government.

(e) PROHIBITED CONDUCT.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to permit price-fixing, allocating a market between competitors, monopolizing or attempting to monopolize a market, boycotting, or exchanges of price or cost information, customer lists, or information regarding future competitive planning.

(f) INFORMATION SHARING RELATIONSHIPS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to limit or modify an existing information sharing relationship;

(2) to prohibit a new information sharing relationship;

(3) to require a new information sharing relationship between any entity and the Federal Government; or

(4) to require the use of the capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security developed under section 1705(c).

(g) PRESERVATION OF CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to amend, repeal, or supersede any current or future contractual agreement, terms of service agreement, or other contractual relationship between any entities, or between any entity and a Federal entity; or

(2) to abrogate trade secret or intellectual property rights of any entity or Federal entity.

(h) ANTI-TASKING RESTRICTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to permit the Federal Government—

(1) to require an entity to provide information to the Federal Government;

(2) to condition the sharing of cyber threat indicators with an entity on such entity's provision of cyber threat indicators to the Federal Government; or

(3) to condition the award of any Federal grant, contract, or purchase on the provision of a cyber threat indicator to a Federal entity.

(i) NO LIABILITY FOR NON-PARTICIPATION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to subject any entity to liability for choosing not to engage in the voluntary activities authorized in this title.

(j) USE AND RETENTION OF INFORMATION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize, or to modify any existing authority of, a department or agency of the Federal Government to retain or use any information shared under this title for any use other than permitted in this title.

(k) FEDERAL PREEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title supersedes any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State that restricts or otherwise expressly regulates an activity authorized under this title.

(2) STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to supersede any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State concerning the use of authorized law enforcement practices and procedures.

(l) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to authorize the promulgation of any regulations not specifically authorized by this title;

(2) to establish or limit any regulatory authority not specifically established or limited under this title; or

(3) to authorize regulatory actions that would duplicate or conflict with regulatory requirements, mandatory standards, or related processes under another provision of Federal law.

(m) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO RESPOND TO CYBER ATTACKS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense to develop, prepare, coordinate, or, when authorized by the President to do so, conduct a military cyber operation in response to a malicious cyber activity carried out against the United States or a United States person by a foreign government or an organization sponsored by a foreign government or a terrorist organization.

SEC. 1709. REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY THREATS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of other appropriate elements of the intelligence community, shall submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report on cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the current intelligence sharing and cooperation relationships of the United States with other countries regarding cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches, directed against the United States and which threaten the United States national security interests and economy and intellectual property, specifically identifying the relative utility of such relationships, which elements

of the intelligence community participate in such relationships, and whether and how such relationships could be improved.

(2) A list and an assessment of the countries and nonstate actors that are the primary threats of carrying out a cybersecurity threat, including a cyber attack, theft, or data breach, against the United States and which threaten the United States national security, economy, and intellectual property.

(3) A description of the extent to which the capabilities of the United States Government to respond to or prevent cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, or data breaches, directed against the United States private sector are degraded by a delay in the prompt notification by private entities of such threats or cyber attacks, theft, and breaches.

(4) An assessment of additional technologies or capabilities that would enhance the ability of the United States to prevent and to respond to cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches.

(5) An assessment of any technologies or practices utilized by the private sector that could be rapidly fielded to assist the intelligence community in preventing and responding to cybersecurity threats.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be made available in classified and unclassified forms.

(d) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

SEC. 1710. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) PUBLIC INFORMATION.—Section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking “wells.” and inserting “wells; or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) information shared with or provided to the Federal Government pursuant to the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.”

(b) MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION CONCERNING PENETRATIONS OF DEFENSE CONTRACTOR NETWORKS.—Section 941(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) is amended by inserting at the end the following: “The Secretary may share such information with other Federal entities if such information consists of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures and such information is shared consistent with the policies and procedures promulgated by the Attorney General under section 1705 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.”

SEC. 1711. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE MILITARY CHILD CARE SYSTEM AND PROVIDERS OF CHILD CARE SERVICES AND YOUTH PROGRAM SERVICES FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS.

(a) EMPLOYEES OF MILITARY CHILD CARE SYSTEM.—Section 1792 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.—The criminal background check of child care employees under this section that is required pursuant to section 231 of the Crime Control

Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13041) shall be conducted pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in accordance with the provisions of section 658H of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858f)."

(b) PROVIDERS OF CHILD CARE SERVICES AND YOUTH PROGRAM SERVICES.—Section 1798 of such title is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

"(c) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.—A provider of child care services or youth program services may not provide such services under this section unless such provider complies with the requirements for criminal background checks under section 658H of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858f) for the State in which such services are provided."

(c) FUNDING.—Amounts for activities required by reason of the amendments made by this section during fiscal year 2016 shall be derived from amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program as specified in the funding tables in section 4301.

SA 1922. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS RESEARCH PROGRAM.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO DEVELOP AND DEPLOY UAS TECHNOLOGIES.—The Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall work in conjunction with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the heads of other Federal agencies, existing UAS test sites and centers of excellence designated by the Federal Aviation Administration, the private sector, and academia on the research and development of technologies to safely detect, identify, and classify potentially threatening UAS in the national air space and to develop mitigation technologies—

(1) to ensure that, as the commercial use of UAS technologies increases and such technologies are safely integrated into the national air space, the United States is taking full advantage of existing and developmental technologies to detect, identify, classify, track, and counteract potentially threatening UAS, including in and around restricted and controlled air space, such as airports, military training areas, National Special Security Events, and sensitive national security locations; and

(2) to contribute to the development of intelligence, reconnaissance, and surveillance capabilities for national security over widely dispersed and expansive territories.

(b) UAS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "UAS" means unmanned aerial systems.

SA 1923. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1283. FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

(a) PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND REPORTING.—Section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) PLAN REQUIREMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall develop a plan for the purpose of negotiating and entering into one or more free trade agreements with all eligible sub-Saharan African countries. The plan shall identify the 10 to 15 eligible sub-Saharan African countries or groups of such countries that are most ready for a free trade agreement with the United States.

"(2) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required by paragraph (1) shall include, for each eligible sub-Saharan African country, the following:

"(A) The steps each such country needs to be equipped and ready to enter into a free trade agreement with the United States, including the effective implementation of the WTO Agreements and the development of a bilateral investment treaty.

"(B) Milestones for accomplishing each step identified in subparagraph (A) for each such country, with the goal of establishing a free trade agreement with each such country not later than 10 years after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

"(C) A description of the resources required to assist each such country in accomplishing each milestone described in subparagraph (B).

"(D) The extent to which steps described in subparagraph (A), the milestones described in subparagraph (B), and resources described in subparagraph (C) may be accomplished through regional or subregional organizations in sub-Saharan Africa, including the East African Community, the Economic Community of West African States, the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa, and the Economic Community of Central African States.

"(E) Procedures to ensure the following:

"(i) Adequate consultation with Congress and the private sector during the negotiations.

"(ii) Consultation with Congress regarding all matters relating to implementation of the agreement or agreements.

"(iii) Approval by Congress of the agreement or agreements.

"(iv) Adequate consultations with the relevant African governments and African regional and subregional intergovernmental organizations during the negotiation of the agreement or agreements.

"(3) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, and every 5 years thereafter, the President shall prepare and submit to Congress a report containing the plan developed pursuant to paragraph (1).

"(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

"(A) ELIGIBLE SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term 'eligible sub-Saharan African country' means a country designated as an eligible sub-Saharan African country under section 104.

"(B) WTO.—The term 'WTO' means the World Trade Organization.

"(C) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term 'WTO Agreement' has the meaning given that term in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)).

"(D) WTO AGREEMENTS.—The term 'WTO Agreements' means the WTO Agreement and agreements annexed to that Agreement."

(b) COORDINATION OF USAID WITH FREE TRADE AGREEMENT POLICY.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to the United States Agency for International Development under section 496 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293) after the date of the enactment of this Act may be used, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative—

(A) to assist eligible countries, including by deploying resources to such countries, in addressing the steps and milestones identified in the plan developed under subsection (d) of section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723), as added by subsection (a); and

(B) to assist eligible countries in the implementation of the commitments of those countries under agreements with the United States and the WTO Agreements (as defined in subsection (d)(4) of such section 116).

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ELIGIBLE COUNTRY.—The term "eligible country" means a sub-Saharan African country that receives—

(i) benefits under for the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.); and

(ii) funding from the United States Agency for International Development.

(B) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term "sub-Saharan African country" has the meaning given that term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3706).

(c) COORDINATION WITH MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION.—After the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall consult and coordinate with the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation regarding countries that have entered into a Millennium Challenge Compact pursuant to section 609 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7708) that have been declared eligible to enter into such a Compact for the purpose of developing and carrying out the plan required by subsection (d) of section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723), as added by subsection (a).

SA 1924. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the

Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. EXEMPTION OF INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS FROM EMPLOYER MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) CERTAIN INDIAN EMPLOYERS.—The term ‘applicable large employer’ does not include—

“(i) any Indian tribal government (as defined in section 7701(a)(40)), or

“(ii) any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian tribe (as defined in section 45A(c)(6)).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2014

SA 1925. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. PLAN FOR DEFEATING THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report detailing a realistic plan to confront, degrade, and defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant first in Iraq and Syria and then in any country where its forces or allies are operating.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) realistic, well-substantiated estimates of timeframes, resources required, expected allies, and anticipated obstacles; and

(2) clear definitions of milestones, metrics of success, and personal accountability.

SA 1926. Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 492, line 2, after “Appropriations,” insert “the Committee on the Judiciary.”

On page 492, line 5, after “Appropriations,” insert “the Committee on the Judiciary.”

On page 500, line 21, after “Appropriations,” insert “the Committee on the Judiciary.”

On page 500, line 24, after “Appropriations,” insert “the Committee on the Judiciary.”

On page 509, line 8, after “Appropriations,” insert “the Committee on the Judiciary.”

On page 509, line 11, after “Appropriations,” insert “the Committee on the Judiciary.”

On page 512, line 11, after “Appropriations,” insert “the Committee on the Judiciary.”

On page 512, line 16, after “Appropriations,” insert “the Committee on the Judiciary.”

On page 514, line 14, after “Appropriations,” insert “the Committee on the Judiciary.”

On page 514, line 18, after “Appropriations,” insert “the Committee on the Judiciary.”

SA 1927. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 515. AUTHORITY TO ORDER UNITS AND MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE TO ACTIVE DUTY FOR PREPLANNED MISSIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “When the Secretary”;

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated—

(A) by inserting “or the military department” after “a combatant command”;

(B) by inserting “or any individual member of the Selected Reserve,” after “(title).”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) Support provided under paragraph (1) may include the following:

“(A) Support to a geographic combatant command or other combatant command for which regular forces are inadequate at the time such support is provided, including support to training exercises sponsored by the combatant command and non-combat missions related to a named operation.

“(B) Support to a military department for non-combat missions for which regular forces are inadequate at the time such support is provided, including support to training exercises sponsored by the military department and non-combat missions related to a named operation.”

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii) and redesignating the margins of such clauses, as so redesignated, four ems from the left margin;

(2) by striking “if—” and inserting “if—

“(A) both—”;

(3) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) the military department to which the unit or individual members are assigned re-

programs funds in the fiscal year in which support is provided in order to provide for the manpower and associated costs of the members ordered to active duty.”

(c) TREATMENT OF MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such section is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (f) through (i) as subsections (g) through (j), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f):

“(f) TREATMENT OF MEMBERS.—Any member ordered to active duty pursuant to this section shall be entitled while on and in connection with such duty to the benefits to which members of the Ready Reserve are entitled while on and in connection with duty to which ordered pursuant to section 12302 of this title.”

(2) RETIRED PAY FOR NON-REGULAR SERVICE.—Section 12731(f)(2)(B)(i) of such title is amended by inserting “or 12304b” after “12301(d)”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to members of the Selected Reserve ordered to active duty pursuant to section 12304b of title 10, United States Code, on or after that date.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 12304b of such title is further amended—

(1) in subsections (d) and (e), by inserting “or member” after “any unit”; and

(2) in subsection (h), as redesignated by subsection (c)(1) of this section, by inserting “or members” after “which units”.

(e) HEADING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) HEADING AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§ 12304b. Selected Reserve: order to active duty for preplanned missions in support of the combatant commands and the military departments”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1209 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 12304b and inserting the following new item:

“12304b. Selected Reserve: order to active duty for preplanned missions in support of the combatant commands and the military departments.”

(f) EXCLUSION FROM DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—The Office of Management and Budget shall not include amounts appropriated for manpower costs or associated costs of performing duty under the amendments to section 12304b of title 10, United States Code, made by this section in determining whether there has been a breach of the discretionary spending limits under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) during any fiscal year.

SA 1928. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

(c) RE-ENGINEING STUDY.—the Air Force shall submit their B-52 re-engine analysis to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1929. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 535.

SA 1930. Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 530, line 11, insert “, since November 1, 2013,” before “have been transferred”.

SA 1931. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU ON THE ABILITY OF THE NATIONAL GUARD TO MEET ITS MISSIONS.

Section 10504(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “The Chief of the National Guard Bureau”;

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by striking “, through the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force,”;

(3) by striking the second sentence; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) Each report shall include the following:

“(A) An assessment, prepared in conjunction with the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force, of the ability of the National Guard to carry out its Federal missions.

“(B) An assessment, prepared in conjunction with the chief executive officers of the States and territories, of the ability of the National Guard to carry out emergency support functions of the National Response Framework.

“(3) Each report may be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.”.

SA 1932. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 510, line 25, strike “, in unclassified form,”.

On page 511, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(3) Whether, as of the date of the report, the basis for the first designation or assessment remains valid.

On page 511, beginning on line 21, strike “and the designation or assessment to which changed” and insert “, the designation or assessment to which changed, and information on, and a justification for, the change in the designation or assessment”.

On page 512, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

(c) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SA 1933. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON CREDENTIALING OF PHYSICIANS SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE ARMED FORCES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the full credentialing process for a member of the Armed Forces on active duty serving as a physician, including any uniform standards used throughout the Department of Defense for such process; and

(2) the feasibility and advisability of the Department of Veterans Affairs recognizing a credential issued under such process in order to facilitate the transition of such member to employment in the Department of Veterans Affairs upon the retirement, separation, or release of such member from the Armed Forces.

SA 1934. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the

Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON SHARING OF PHYSICIAN WORKFORCE AMONG DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the use and efficacy of memoranda of understanding entered into between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs that allow for the sharing of physicians between each such Department.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Information on—

(A) the location of each physician shared by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, including the name of the facility or facilities at which the physician works;

(B) the specialty, if any, of each physician described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) the purpose, if any, stated by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for sharing each physician described in subparagraph (A).

(2) The total number of physicians shared by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, disaggregated by Department.

(3) A description of the administrative actions required to be taken by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure the sharing of scheduling records and medical records between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for physicians shared between each such Department.

(4) The impact of sharing physicians on wait times and patient loads at each medical facility of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(5) An assessment of the policies of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs that hinder the sharing of physicians between each such Department.

(6) An identification of any excess capacity among physicians of the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SA 1935. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 209, line 19, strike “1.3 percent” and insert “2.3 percent”.

On page 210, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

(d) FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE IN AMOUNT FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 421 is hereby increased by the amount necessary to provide an increase in military basic pay

under subsection (b) by 2.3 percent rather than 1.3 percent, with the amount to be available for military personnel to provide such increase.

(2) **OFFSET.**—The aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by this division, other than the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 421, is hereby reduced by the amount necessary to provide an increase in military basic pay under subsection (b) by 2.3 percent rather than 1.3 percent, with the amount of the reduction to be achieved by terminating funding for projects determined to be low-priority projects by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

SA 1936. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1040. LIMITATION OF THE TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—No portion of the land or water listed by Article I of the United States-Cuba Agreements and Treaty of 1934 shall be transferred to the Government of Cuba, unless—

(1) a democratically-elected Government of Cuba and the United States Government mutually agree to new lease terms for such land or water;

(2) the elections of the Government of Cuba were—

(A) free and fair;

(B) conducted under internationally recognized observers; and

(C) carried out so that opposition parties had ample time to organize and campaign using full access media available to every candidate;

(3) the Government of Cuba has committed itself to constitutional change that would ensure regular free and fair elections;

(4) the Government of Cuba has made a public commitment to respect, and is respecting, internationally recognized human rights and basic democratic freedoms;

(5) the President certifies to Congress that Cuba is no longer a state sponsor of terrorism and no longer harbors members of recognized foreign terrorist organizations; and

(6) the Secretary of Defense certifies that the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, is not advantageous to United States national security or to the operation of the Navy and the Coast Guard in the Caribbean Sea.

(b) **CONTINUATION OF CURRENT LEASE.**—It shall be the policy of the United States to continue to lease the land or waterways that encompass the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, unless the criteria set out in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) are met.

SEC. 1040A. LIMITATION ON MODIFICATION OR ABANDONMENT OF LEASED LAND AND WATER CONTAINING UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—The United States may not modify the 45 square mile lease of land or waterways that encompass the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, unless—

(1) the President notifies Congress not later than 90 days prior to the proposed modification of such lease; and

(2) after such notification, Congress enacts a law authorizing a modification of such lease.

(b) **RETENTION.**—The United States may not abandon any portion of the land or water that contains the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, unless—

(1) the President notifies Congress not less than 90 days prior to the proposed abandonment of such land or water; and

(2) after such notification, Congress enacts a law authorizing such abandonment.

(c) **NO NEW GRANT OF AUTHORITY.**—This section may not be construed to grant the President any authority not already provided by the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6021 et seq.).

SA 1937. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 210, strike lines 9 through 12 and insert the following:

(a) **MODIFICATION OF PERCENTAGE USABLE.**—Section 403(b)(3)(B) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking “may not exceed one percent.” and inserting “may not exceed the following:

“(i) In the case of members in pay grades E-5 and above, five percent.

“(ii) In the case of members in pay grades E-1 through E-4—

“(I) one percent; or

“(II) if the Secretary determines that one percent would result in a monthly amount of basic allowance for housing for such area for such members that is greater than the monthly amount of basic allowance for housing for such area for members in pay grade E-5, the lesser of—

“(aa) five percent; or

“(bb) a percent (determined by the Secretary) such that the monthly amount of basic allowance for housing for such area for members in pay grades E-1 through E-4 is equal to the monthly amount of basic allowance for housing for such area for members in pay grade E-5 minus \$1”.

(b) **FUNDING.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 421 for military personnel is hereby increased by \$75,000,000.

(c) **OFFSET.**—The aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by division A is hereby reduced by \$75,000,000, with the amount of the reduction to be achieved through anticipated foreign

currency gains in addition to any other anticipated foreign currency gains specified in the funding tables in division D.

SA 1938. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. REPORT ON ARMY ACQUISITION STRATEGY FOR THE TACTICAL NETWORK MODERNIZATION AND TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION SYSTEM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the Army's acquisition strategy for the Tactical Network Modernization and Transportable Tactical Command Communications Terrestrial Transmission System.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An explanation of the rationale for delaying the TriLOS radio modernization until the fiscal year 2018-2020 period.

(2) An estimate of the total costs associated with delaying the modernization with regard to costs associated with additional prototyping and Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (IOT&E).

(3) An assessment of the GRC-245C immediate utilization potential to meet the program objectives required by Expeditionary Signal Battalions (ESBs) and Army units to meet the TriLOS radio modernization as defined in the requirements for a Terrestrial Transmission System outlined in the operational requirements of the G-3/5/7 Directed Requirement and Transmission Capabilities Production Document (CPD).

SA 1939. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. TRAVEL ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AIRCRAFT ON A SPACE-AVAILABLE BASIS FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND THE RESERVES.

(a) **ELIGIBILITY.**—Subsection (c) of section 2641b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

“(5) Members of the reserve components not otherwise eligible for travel under the program pursuant to this subsection.”.

(b) CONDITIONS.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) in the case of members eligible for travel under the program pursuant to subsection (c)(5)—

“(A) travel under the program shall be available on all contract flights operated by the Department of Defense for the transportation of passengers;

“(B) in the case of travel on any military or contract aircraft traveling from outside the continental United States (OCONUS) to the continental United States (CONUS), eligibility shall cease at the first point of entry to the continental United States; and

“(C) in the case of travel on any military or contract aircraft traveling from the continental United States to outside the continental United States, eligibility shall cease at the first point of entry outside the continental United States.”.

SA 1940. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2822. LAND CONVEYANCE, CAMPION AIR FORCE RADAR STATION, GALENA, ALASKA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey, without consideration, to the Town of Galena, Alaska (in this section referred to as the “Town”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to real property, including improvements thereon, at the former Campion Air Force Station, Alaska, as further described in subsection (b), for the purpose of permitting the Town to use the conveyed property for public purposes.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) consists of approximately 1290 acres of the approximately 1613 acres of land withdrawn under Public Land Order 843 for use by the Secretary of the Air Force as the former Campion Air Force Station. The portions of the former Air Force Station that are not authorized to be conveyed under subsection (a) are those portions that are subject to environmental land use restrictions or are currently undergoing environmental remediation by the Secretary of the Air Force.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior on the exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) and conditions to be included in the conveyance that are necessary to protect human health and the environment.

(d) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall require the Town to cover all costs (except costs for environmental remediation of the property) to be incurred by the Secretary of the Air Force and by the Secretary of the Interior, or to reimburse the appropriate Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under this section, including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the appropriate Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the Town.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—

(A) SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.—Amounts received by the Secretary of the Air Force as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited, at the option of the Secretary, to the appropriation, fund, or account from which the expenses were paid, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available to the Secretary for the purposes for which the expenses were paid. Amounts so credited shall be merged with funds in such appropriation, fund, or account and shall be available for the same purposes and subject to the same limitations as the funds with which merged.

(B) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Amounts received by the Secretary of the Interior as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited, at the option of the Secretary, to the appropriation, fund, or account from which the expenses were paid, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available to the Secretary for the purposes for which the expenses were paid. Amounts so credited shall be merged with funds in such appropriation, fund, or account and shall be available for the same purposes and subject to the same limitations as the funds with which merged.

(e) CONVEYANCE AGREEMENT.—The conveyance of public land under this section shall be accomplished using a quit claim deed or other legal instrument and upon terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of the Air Force, after consulting with the Secretary of the Interior, and the Town, including such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Air Force, after consulting with the Secretary of the Interior, considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SA 1941. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ANNUAL MENTAL HEALTH SCREENINGS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the annual mental health assessment for members of the Armed Forces provided

under section 1074n of title 10, United States Code, may be improved by providing members undergoing such an assessment with a record of events, including non-combat related events, to substantiate latent mental health issues that appear months or years after the causal incident;

(2) some members may not know how to request help with mental health concerns in connection with such assessment and not all health care providers fully discuss mental health concerns during such assessment;

(3) the majority of mild traumatic brain injury inducing incidents are not diagnosed during combat deployment, so when symptoms do appear, there may be no mechanism for health care providers to link the injury back to the causal incident;

(4) the provision of such assessment may not recognize incidents described in paragraph (3) unless the member provides information regarding those incidents to a health care provider;

(5) when latent mental health symptoms appear after a member is discharged, the member may not be eligible to receive treatment from the Department of Veterans Affairs without a record of causal justification;

(6) the Secretary of Defense has an obligation to identify as quickly and efficiently as possible without disrupting military readiness the mental health concerns that persist among members of the Armed Forces unbeknownst to those members and the health care providers of those members; and

(7) the Department of Defense and the Defense Health Agency are currently developing a standardized periodic health assessment tool that incorporates a screening for depression, post-traumatic stress, substance use, and risk for suicide through a person-to-person dialogue using the same question set used for mental health assessments provided to members of the Armed Forces undergoing deployment.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of mental health assessments provided to members of the Armed Forces under section 1074n of title 10, United States Code, that includes a description of—

(1) the reliability of such assessments;

(2) any significant changes in mental health concerns among members of the Armed Forces as a result of such assessments;

(3) any areas in which the provision of such assessments to members of the Armed Forces needs to improve; and

(4) such additional information as the Secretary considers necessary relating to mental health screening and treatment of members of the Armed Forces.

SA 1942. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . RETURN OF HUMAN REMAINS BY THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF HEALTH AND MEDICINE.

The National Museum of Health and Medicine shall facilitate the relocation of the human cranium that is in the possession of the National Museum of Health and Medicine and that is associated with the Mountain Meadows Massacre of 1857 for interment at the Mountain Meadows grave site.

SA 1943. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ASSESSMENT OF THE ABILITY OF INDUSTRIAL BASE TO MANUFACTURE ANCHOR AND MOORING CHAIN.

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an assessment of the ability of the industrial base to manufacture and support anchor and mooring chain for the Department of Defense.

(b) **SCOPE.**—In conducting the assessment required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall examine the potential cost, schedule, and performance impacts if procurement of the anchor and mooring chain described in such subsection were limited to manufacturers in the National Technology and Industrial Base.

(c) **DETERMINATION REQUIRED.**—Upon completion of the assessment required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make a determination whether manufacturers of the anchor and mooring chain described in such subsection should be included in the National Technology and Industrial Base.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than February 15, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report including the results of the assessment required under subsection (a) and the determination required under subsection (c).

SA 1944. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. REFORM AND IMPROVEMENT OF PERSONNEL SECURITY, INSIDER THREAT DETECTION AND PREVENTION, AND PHYSICAL SECURITY.

(a) **PERSONNEL SECURITY AND INSIDER THREAT PROTECTION IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**—

(1) **PLANS AND SCHEDULES.**—Consistent with the Memorandum of the Secretary of Defense dated March 18, 2014, regarding the rec-

ommendations of the reviews of the Washington Navy Yard shooting, the Secretary of Defense shall develop plans and schedules—

(A) to implement a continuous evaluation capability for the national security population for which clearance adjudications are conducted by the Department of Defense Central Adjudication Facility, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(B) to produce a Department-wide insider threat strategy and implementation plan, which includes—

(i) resourcing for the Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center (DITMAC) and component insider threat programs, and

(ii) alignment of insider threat protection programs with continuous evaluation capabilities and processes for personnel security;

(C) to centralize the authority, accountability, and programmatic integration responsibilities, including fiscal control, for personnel security and insider threat protection under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(D) to align the Department's consolidated Central Adjudication Facility under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(E) to develop a defense security enterprise reform investment strategy to ensure a consistent, long-term focus on funding to strengthen all of the Department's security and insider threat programs, policies, functions, and information technology capabilities, including detecting threat behaviors conveyed in the cyber domain, in a manner that keeps pace with evolving threats and risks;

(F) to resource and expedite deployment of the Identity Management Enterprise Services Architecture (IMESA); and

(G) to implement the recommendations contained in the study conducted by the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation required by section 907 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 1564 note), including, specifically, the recommendations to centrally manage and regulate Department of Defense requests for personnel security background investigations.

(2) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the plans and schedules required under paragraph (1).

(b) **PHYSICAL AND LOGICAL ACCESS.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Secretary of Defense shall define physical and logical access standards, capabilities, and processes applicable to all personnel with access to Department of Defense installations and information technology systems, including—

(A) periodic or regularized background or records checks appropriate to the type of physical or logical access involved, the security level, the category of individuals authorized, and the level of access to be granted;

(B) standards and methods for verifying the identity of individuals seeking access; and

(C) electronic attribute-based access controls that are appropriate for the type of access and facility or information technology system involved;

(2) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chair of the Per-

formance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and the Administrator of General Services, and in consultation with representatives from organizations representing Federal and contractor employees who each have access to more than 1 secured facility, shall design a capability to share and apply electronic identity information across the Government to enable real-time, risk-managed physical and logical access decisions; and

(3) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in conjunction with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and in consultation with representatives from organizations representing Federal and contractor employees who each have access to more than 1 secured facility, shall establish investigative and adjudicative standards for the periodic or regularized reevaluation of the eligibility of an individual to retain credentials issued pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004), as appropriate, but not less frequently than the authorization period of the issued credentials.

(c) **SECURITY ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) formalize the Security, Suitability, and Credentialing Line of Business;

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committee that describes plans—

(A) for oversight by the Office of Management and Budget of activities of the executive branch of the Government for personnel security, suitability, and credentialing;

(B) to designate enterprise shared services to optimize investments;

(C) to define and implement data standards to support common electronic access to critical Government records; and

(D) to reduce the burden placed on Government data providers by centralizing requests for records access and ensuring proper sharing of the data with appropriate investigative and adjudicative elements.

(d) **RECIPROCITY MANAGEMENT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of Defense, shall enhance the Central Verification System to—

(1) serve as the reciprocity management system for the Government; and

(2) ensure that the Central Verification System is aligned with continuous evaluation and other enterprise reform initiatives.

(e) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly develop a plan to—

(1) implement the Security Executive Agent Directive on common, standardized employee and contractor security reporting requirements;

(2) establish and implement uniform reporting requirements for employees and Federal contractors, according to risk, relative to the safety of the workforce and protection of the most sensitive information of the Government; and

(3) ensure that reported information is shared appropriately.

(f) ACCESS TO CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER PURPOSES.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 9101(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) The terms ‘Security Executive Agent’ and ‘Suitability Executive Agent’ mean the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent, respectively, established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.”.

(2) COVERED AGENCIES.—Section 9101(a)(6) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) The Department of Homeland Security.

“(H) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

“(I) An Executive agency that—

“(i) is authorized to conduct background investigations under a Federal statute; or

“(ii) is delegated authority to conduct background investigations in accordance with procedures established by the Security Executive Agent or the Suitability Executive Agent under subsection (b) or (c)(iv) of section 2.3 of Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

“(J) A contractor that conducts a background investigation on behalf of an agency described in subparagraphs (A) through (I).”.

(3) APPLICABLE PURPOSES OF INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “the head of”;

(ii) by inserting “all” before “criminal history record information”; and

(iii) by striking “for the purpose of determining eligibility for any of the following:” and inserting “, in accordance with Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Suitability Executive Agent and Security Executive Agent, for the purpose of—

“(A) determining eligibility for—”;

(C) in clause (i), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Access” and inserting “access”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(D) in clause (ii), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Assignment” and inserting “assignment”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting “or positions”;

(E) in clause (iii), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Acceptance” and inserting “acceptance”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(F) in clause (iv), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Appointment” and inserting “appointment”;

(ii) by striking “or a critical or sensitive position”; and

(iii) by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) conducting a basic suitability or fitness assessment for Federal or contractor employees, using Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent in accordance with—

“(i) Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto; and

“(ii) the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum ‘Assignment of Functions Re-

lating to Coverage of Contractor Employee Fitness in the Federal Investigative Standards’, dated December 6, 2012;

“(C) credentialing under the Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004); and

“(D) Federal Aviation Administration checks required under—

“(i) the Federal Aviation Administration Drug Enforcement Assistance Act of 1988 (subtitle E of title VII of Public Law 100-690; 102 Stat. 4424) and the amendments made by that Act; or

“(ii) section 44710 of title 49.”.

(4) BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC SEARCHES.—Section 9101(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2)(A) A State central criminal history record depository shall allow a covered agency to conduct both biometric and biographic searches of criminal history record information.

“(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Bureau of Investigation from requiring a request for criminal history record information to be accompanied by the fingerprints of the individual who is the subject of the request.”.

(5) USE OF MOST COST-EFFECTIVE SYSTEM.—Section 9101(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) If a criminal justice agency is able to provide the same information through more than 1 system described in paragraph (1), a covered agency may request information under subsection (b) from the criminal justice agency, and require the criminal justice agency to provide the information, using the system that is most cost-effective for the Federal Government.”.

(6) SEALED OR EXPUNGED RECORDS; JUVENILE RECORDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 9101(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: “, and includes any analogous juvenile records”; and

(ii) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “The term includes those records of a State or locality sealed pursuant to law if such records are accessible by State and local criminal justice agencies for the purpose of conducting background checks.”.

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not uniformly reject applicants for employment with the Federal Government or Federal contractors based on—

(i) sealed or expunged criminal records; or

(ii) juvenile records.

(7) INTERACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES ABROAD.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Upon request by a covered agency and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this section, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Overseas Citizens Services shall make available criminal history record information collected by the Deputy Assistant Secretary with respect to an individual who is under investigation by the covered agency regarding any interaction of the individual with a law enforcement agency or intelligence agency of a foreign country.”.

(8) CLARIFICATION OF SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTRACTORS CONDUCTING BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this subsection, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) If a contractor described in subsection (a)(6)(J) uses an automated information de-

livery system to request criminal history record information, the contractor shall comply with any necessary security requirements for access to that system.”.

(9) CLARIFICATION REGARDING ADVERSE ACTIONS.—Section 7512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or”;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period and inserting “, or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) a suitability action taken by the Office under regulations prescribed by the Office, subject to the rules prescribed by the President under this title for the administration of the competitive service.”.

(10) ANNUAL REPORT BY SUITABILITY AND SECURITY CLEARANCE PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY COUNCIL.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this subsection, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) The Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, an annual report that—

“(1) describes efforts of the Council to integrate Federal, State, and local systems for sharing criminal history record information;

“(2) analyzes the extent and effectiveness of Federal education programs regarding criminal history record information;

“(3) provides an update on the implementation of best practices for sharing criminal history record information, including ongoing limitations experienced by investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency with respect to access to State and local criminal history record information; and

“(4) provides a description of limitations on the sharing of information relevant to a background investigation, other than criminal history record information, between—

“(A) investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency; and

“(B) State and local law enforcement agencies.”.

(11) GAO REPORT ON ENHANCING INTEROPERABILITY AND REDUCING REDUNDANCY IN FEDERAL CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION ACCESS CONTROL, BACKGROUND CHECK, AND CREDENTIALING STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the background check, access control, and credentialing requirements of Federal programs for the protection of critical infrastructure and key resources.

(B) CONTENTS.—The Comptroller General shall include in the report required under subparagraph (A)—

(i) a summary of the major characteristics of each such Federal program, including the types of infrastructure and resources covered;

(ii) a comparison of the requirements, whether mandatory or voluntary in nature,

for regulated entities under each such program to—

(I) conduct background checks on employees, contractors, and other individuals;

(II) adjudicate the results of a background check, including the utilization of a standardized set of disqualifying offenses or the consideration of minor, non-violent, or juvenile offenses; and

(III) establish access control systems to deter unauthorized access, or provide a security credential for any level of access to a covered facility or resource;

(iii) a review of any efforts that the Screening Coordination Office of the Department of Homeland Security has undertaken or plans to undertake to harmonize or standardize background check, access control, or credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs overseen by the Department; and

(iv) recommendations, developed in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, regarding—

(I) enhancing the interoperability of security credentials across critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(II) eliminating the need for redundant background checks or credentials across existing critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(III) harmonizing, where appropriate, the standards for identifying potentially disqualifying criminal offenses and the weight assigned to minor, nonviolent, or juvenile offenses in adjudicating the results of a completed background check; and

(IV) the development of common, risk-based standards with respect to the background check, access control, and security credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(C) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the term “Performance Accountability Council” means the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

SA 1945. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 123, strike line 9 and insert the following:

(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 7,300.

SA 1946. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 30, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 33, line 13, and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research and development, design, construction, procurement or advanced procurement of materials for the Littoral Combat Ships designated as LCS 33 or subsequent, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of the Navy submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives each of the following:

(1) A Capabilities Based Assessment or equivalent report to assess capability gaps and associated capability requirements and risks for the upgraded Littoral Combat Ship, which is proposed to commence with LCS 33. This assessment or equivalent report shall conform with the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System, including Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3170.01H.

(2) A certification that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council has validated an updated Capabilities Development Document for the upgraded Littoral Combat Ship.

(3) A report describing the upgraded Littoral Combat Ship modernization, which shall, at a minimum, include the following elements:

(A) A description of capabilities that the LCS program delivers, and a description of how these relate to the characteristics of the future joint force identified in the Capstone Concept for Joint Operations, concept of operations, and integrated architecture documents.

(B) A summary of analyses and studies conducted on LCS modernization.

(C) A concept of operations for LCS modernization ships at the operational level and tactical level describing how they integrate and synchronize with joint and combined forces to achieve the Joint Force Commander's intent.

(D) A description of threat systems of potential adversaries that are projected or assessed to reach initial operational capability within 15 years against which the lethality and survivability of the LCS should be determined.

(E) A plan and timeline for LCS modernization program execution.

(F) A description of system capabilities required for LCS modernization, including key performance parameters and key system attributes.

(G) A plan for family of systems or systems of systems synchronization.

(H) A plan for information technology and national security systems supportability.

(I) A plan for intelligence supportability.

(J) A plan for electromagnetic environmental effects (E3) and spectrum supportability.

(K) A description of assets required to achieve initial operational capability (IOC) of an LCS modernization increment.

(L) A schedule and initial operational capability and full operational capability definitions.

(M) A description of doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership, education, personnel, facilities, and policy considerations.

(N) A description of other system attributes.

(4) A plan for future periodic combat systems upgrades, which are necessary to ensure relevant capability throughout the Littoral Combat Ship or Frigate class service lives, using the process described in paragraph (3).

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of the Navy may waive the funding limitation under subsection (a) upon submission of a determination to Congress that—

(1) application of the limitation would impede the timely acquisition of LCS 33 or subsequent ships in a manner that would undermine the national security of the United States; and

(2) application of the limitation would result in a gap in production or additional procurement costs;

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (b) shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to not submit the information required under paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a).

SA 1947. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CLARIFICATION ON PROHIBITION ON SEARCHING OF COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS TO CONDUCT WARRANTLESS SEARCHES FOR THE COMMUNICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PERSONS.

Section 702(b) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and indenting such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, an additional two ems from the left margin;

(2) by striking “An acquisition” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An acquisition”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CLARIFICATION ON PROHIBITION ON SEARCHING OF COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PERSONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), no officer or employee of the United States may conduct a search of a collection of communications acquired under this section in an effort to find communications of a particular United States person (other than a corporation).

“(B) CONCURRENT AUTHORIZATION AND EXCEPTION FOR EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a search for communications related to a particular United States person if—

“(i) such United States person is the subject of an order or emergency authorization

authorizing electronic surveillance or physical search under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of this Act, or under title 18, United States Code, for the effective period of that order;

“(ii) the entity carrying out the search has a reasonable belief that the life or safety of such United States person is threatened and the information is sought for the purpose of assisting that person; or

“(iii) such United States person has consented to the search.”.

SA 1948. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The 2015 National Security Strategy states that climate change is “an urgent and growing threat to our national security”.

(2) The 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review describes long-term strategies and initiatives for the Department of Defense and states that—

(A) “the pressures caused by climate change will influence resource competition while placing additional burdens on economies, societies, and governance institutions around the world”; and

(B) the effects of climate change are “threat multipliers” that aggravate stressors abroad that can “enable terrorist activity and other violence”.

(3) The 2014 Department of Defense Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap asserts that climate change will “be felt across the full range of Department activities, including plans, operations, training, infrastructure, and acquisition” and that among the potential effects of climate change are—

(A) “instability within and among other nations”;;

(B) “decreased training/testing land-carrying capacity to support current testing and training rotation types or levels”;;

(C) “increased inundation, erosion, and flooding damage” to Department of Defense infrastructure; and

(D) “reduced availability of or access to the materials, resources, and industrial infrastructure needed to manufacture the Department’s weapon systems and supplies”.

(4) The 2014 United States Government Accountability Office report entitled “Climate Change Adaptation: DOD Can Improve Infrastructure Planning and Processes to Better Account for Potential Impacts” assessed 15 sites at defense installations in the United States for vulnerability to the effects of climate change. The report found that climate change could affect Department of Defense readiness and fiscal exposure in the following ways:

(A) “According to DOD officials, the combination of thawing permafrost, decreasing sea ice, and rising sea levels on the Alaskan

coast has increased coastal erosion at several Air Force radar early warning and communication installations”.

(B) “Impacts on DOD’s infrastructure from this erosion have included damaged roads, seawalls, and runways”.

(C) “Officials on a Navy installation told GAO that sea level rise and resulting storm surge are the two largest threats to their waterfront infrastructure”.

(D) “Officials provided examples of impacts from reduced precipitation—such as drought and wildfire risk—and identified potential mission vulnerabilities—such as reduced live-fire training”.

(5) The 2014 CNA Corporation released a report entitled “National Security Risks and the Accelerating Risks of Climate Change”. The report by the Corporation, the Military Advisory Board of which was comprised of 15 generals and admirals retired from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps, found that—

(A) “climate change impacts are already accelerating instability in vulnerable areas of the world and are serving as catalysts for conflict”; and

(B) “actions by the United States and the international community have been insufficient to adapt to the challenges associated with projected climate change”.

(6) The Military Advisory Board also wrote that “[w]e are dismayed that discussions of climate change have become so polarizing and have receded from the arena of informed public discourse and debate. Political posturing and budgetary woes cannot be allowed to inhibit discussion and debate over what so many believe to be a salient national security concern for our Nation”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national security interests of the United States to assess, plan for, and mitigate the security and strategic implications of climate change.

SA 1949. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. REPORT ON FEASIBILITY AND ADVISABILITY OF ESTABLISHING PERMANENT FOREIGN DISASTER ASSISTANCE FORCE WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the commander of each combatant command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility and advisability of establishing a permanent command structure along with permanently assigned forces (from either the active duty or reserve components) to respond to requests for foreign disaster assistance.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) should include a description of—

(1) the funding mechanism and amount required to stand up and sustain a foreign assistance disaster force;

(2) the authorities and policies related to the role of the Department of Defense in foreign disaster assistance;

(3) the organizational and functional requirements of establishing a foreign disaster assistance force; and

(4) the requisite skills, experience, and training needed to sustain an effective disaster assistance response force that would be tasked with—

(A) planning and executing disaster response missions;

(B) coordinating with the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and international and nongovernmental partners; and

(C) training partner countries in preparedness and response.

SA 1950. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 419, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 420, line 3 and insert the following:

(2) establish a process by which the contractor may appeal a determination by a contracting officer that an earlier determination was made in error or was based on inadequate information to the head of contracting for the agency; and

(3) establish a process by which a commercial item determination can be revoked in cases where the contracting officer has determined that an item may no longer meet the definition of a commercial item and through a price-reasonableness determination it is found that the Department of Defense would pay more for the item than it had previously or another source could provide a similar item for a lower price.

SA 1951. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. TREATMENT OF HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING SYSTEMS AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL LABORATORIES AS NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.

(a) TREATMENT AS NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—Consistent with the exceptions to certain requirements under subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, applicable to national security systems, high-

performance computing (HPC) systems at Department of Defense and Department of Energy laboratories shall, as national security systems, be exempt from requirements under section 11319 of title 40, United States Code.

(b) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—The head of each relevant agency shall develop procedures to ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has access to all necessary and appropriate information on HPC programs and investments to fulfill the Chief Information Officer's duties.

SA 1952. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1628. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CYBER WARFARE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) As an instrument of power, information is a powerful tool to influence, disrupt, corrupt, or usurp an adversary's ability to make and share decisions.

(2) Within the information environment, actions taken in cyberspace are increasingly part of the battlefield.

(3) State and non-state adversaries deliver propaganda through publicly available social media capabilities.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) military information support operations should support Department of Defense communications efforts and act to augment efforts to degrade adversary combat power, reduce recruitment, minimize collateral damage, and maximize local support for operations; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense should develop advanced concepts to degrade adversary organizations using both traditional and emerging forms of communication and information related-capabilities.

SA 1953. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 535 and insert the following:
SEC. 535. LIMITATION ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE WHILE RECEIVING POST-9/11 EDUCATION ASSISTANCE.

Section 8525 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) except for an individual described in subsection (c), an educational assistance allowance under chapter 33 of title 38.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) An individual described in this subsection is an individual—

“(1) who is otherwise entitled to compensation under this subchapter;

“(2) who is an individual described in section 3311(b) of title 38; and

“(3)(A) who—

“(i) did not voluntary separate from service in the Armed Forces or the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (including through a reduction in force); and

“(ii) was discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable; or

“(B) who—

“(i) voluntary separated from service in the Armed Forces or the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

“(ii) was employed after such separation from such service; and

“(iii) was terminated from such employment other than for cause due to misconduct connected with work.”.

SA 1954. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 3115 and insert the following:

SEC. 3115. HANFORD WASTE TREATMENT AND IMMOBILIZATION PLANT CONTRACT OVERSIGHT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle C of title XLIV of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 4446. HANFORD WASTE TREATMENT AND IMMOBILIZATION PLANT CONTRACT OVERSIGHT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the Secretary of Energy shall arrange to have an owner's representative assist in carrying out the oversight responsibilities of the Department of Energy with respect to the contract described in subsection (b). The owner's representative shall report to the Office of River Protection of the Department of Energy.

“(b) **CONTRACT DESCRIBED.**—The contract described in this subsection is the contract between the Office of River Protection of the Department of Energy and Bechtel National, Inc. or its successor relating to the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (contract number DE-AC27-01RV14136).

“(c) **DUTIES.**—The duties of the owner's representative under subsection (a) may include the following:

“(1) Assisting the Department of Energy with performing design, construction, commissioning, nuclear safety, and operability oversight of each facility covered by the contract described in subsection (b).

“(2) Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, assisting the Department of Energy to ensure that the preliminary documented safety analyses for the Low-Activity Waste Vitrification Facility, the Balance of Facilities, and the Analytical Laboratory covered by the contract described in subsection (b) meet the requirements of all applicable regulations and orders of the Department of Energy as required by the contract.

“(d) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the assistance provided by the owner's representative to the Department of Energy under subsection (a) with respect to the contract described in subsection (b).

“(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) An identification of any instance of the contractor not meeting the requirements of the applicable regulations or orders of the Department of Energy as required by the contract described in subsection (b) and the plan for and status of correcting any such instance.

“(B) Information on the status of and the plan for resolving significant unresolved technical issues at the Low-Activity Waste Vitrification Facility, the Balance of Facilities, and the Analytical Laboratory.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘contractor’ means Bechtel National, Inc. or its successor.

“(2) The terms ‘preliminary documented safety analysis’ has the meaning given that term in section 830.3 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar ruling or regulation).

“(3) The term ‘owner's representative’ means a third-party entity with expertise in nuclear design, construction, commissioning, and safety management and without any contractual relationship with the contractor.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Atomic Energy Defense Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4445 the following new item:

“Sec. 4446. Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant contract oversight.”.

SA 1955. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. PILOT PROGRAM ON INTEGRATION OF CERTAIN NON-MEDICAL REPORTS AND RECORDS INTO THE MEDICAL RECORD OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination

with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall commence the conduct of a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of integrating into the medical record of a member of the Armed Forces non-medical reports and records of the Department of Defense relating to the member that are relevant to the medical condition of the member.

(b) PARTICIPATION IN PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) UNIT BASIS.—Members of the Armed Forces shall participate in the pilot program on a unit basis.

(2) PARTICIPATION BY EACH ARMED FORCE.—The units participating in the pilot program shall include not less than one unit of the regular component, and of each reserve component, of each Armed Force selected by the Secretary of Defense for purposes of the pilot program.

(c) REPORTS AND RECORDS USED.—The non-medical reports and records to be integrated by the Secretary under the pilot program shall include the following:

(1) Unit combat action or significant action reports.

(2) Reports or records relating to accident, injury, or mortality investigations.

(3) Reports or records relating to sexual assault investigations conducted by military criminal investigation services.

(4) Such other reports or records as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly consider appropriate for purposes of the pilot program.

(d) EXCEPTION.—If the Secretary of Defense determines that carrying out the pilot program with respect to a particular unit is no longer feasible or advisable because of the operational necessity of the Department of Defense or because it would create an unreasonable burden on the Department, the Secretary—

(1) shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress; and

(2) may, not earlier than 30 days after such notification, terminate carrying out the pilot program with respect to such unit.

(e) PROTECTION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall ensure that any sensitive, classified, or personally identifiable information included in a report or record integrated by the Secretary of Defense under the pilot program is protected from disclosure in accordance with all laws applicable to such information.

(f) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate on the date that is one year after the commencement of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(g) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on—

(A) the units selected for participation in the pilot program;

(B) the guidance provided to such units in carrying out the pilot program; and

(C) the methods to be used by the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the pilot program.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the termination of the pilot program under subsection (f), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the pilot program.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of integrating into the medical record of a member of the Armed Forces non-medical reports and records of the Department of Defense relating to the member that are relevant to the medical condition of the member.

(ii) The number and types of non-medical reports and records that were integrated into the medical records of members of the Armed Forces under the pilot program.

(iii) A summary of the activities of the units during the period in which the pilot program was carried out.

(iv) Such other information and metrics relating to the pilot program as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly consider appropriate.

(h) FUNDING.—Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the pilot program shall be derived from amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense for purposes of honoring members of the Armed Forces at sporting events.

(i) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1956. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1116. PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 306 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 186) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In appointing employees to positions in the Directorate of Science and Technology, the Secretary shall have the hiring and management authorities described in section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (5 U.S.C. 3104 note; Public Law 105-261) (referred to in this subsection as ‘section 1101’).

“(2) TERM OF APPOINTMENTS.—The term of appointments for employees under subsection (c)(1) of section 1101 may not exceed 5 years before the granting of any extension under subsection (c)(2) of that section.

“(3) TERMINATION.—The authority under this subsection shall terminate on the date on which the authority to carry out the program under section 1101 terminates under section 1101(e)(1).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 307(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 187(b)) is amended by—

(1) striking paragraph (6); and

(2) redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendments made by this section shall be construed to limit the authority granted

under paragraph (6) of section 307(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 187(b)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1957. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 712, line 24, strike “Act,” and all that follows “Security,” on page 713, line 1, and insert “Act, consistent with section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 149), the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with”.

On page 713, line 12, insert “of Defense” after “Secretary”.

On page 714, line 13, insert “of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense” after “Secretary”.

On page 714, line 19, strike “Department of Defense” and insert “United States”.

On page 714, line 23, insert “full spectrum of cyber defense and mitigation capabilities available to the Federal Government, including the” before “National”.

On page 715, line 6, insert “of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense” after “Secretary”.

On page 715, lines 7 and 8, strike “is required to coordinate under subsection (a)” and insert “of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense are required to coordinate under subsection (a) to leverage existing National Cyber Exercise programs, such as the Department of Homeland Security Biennial Cyber Storm Program and”.

SA 1958. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON USE BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF PEER-TO-PEER SUPPORT NETWORKS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should use peer-to-peer support networks that are staffed 24 hours per day and seven days per week by veterans to provide counseling in a confidential environment to active duty members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

SA 1959. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the

Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DESIGNATION OF MEDICAL CENTER OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS IN HARLINGEN, TEXAS, AND INCLUSION OF INPATIENT HEALTH CARE FACILITY AT SUCH MEDICAL CENTER.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The current and future health care needs of veterans residing in South Texas are not being fully met by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) According to recent census data, more than 108,000 veterans reside in South Texas.

(3) Travel times for veterans from the Valley Coastal Bend area from their homes to the nearest hospital of the Department for acute inpatient health care can exceed six hours.

(4) Even with the significant travel times, veterans from South Texas demonstrate a high demand for health care services from the Department.

(5) Ongoing overseas deployments of members of the Armed Forces from Texas, including members of the Armed Forces on active duty, members of the Texas National Guard, and members of the other reserve components of the Armed Forces, will continue to increase demand for medical services provided by the Department in South Texas.

(6) The Department employs an annual Strategic Capital Investment Planning process to “enable the VA to continually adapt to changes in demographics, medical and information technology, and health care delivery”, which results in the development of a multi-year investment plan that determines where gaps in services exist or are projected and develops an appropriate solution to meet those gaps.

(7) According to the Department, final approval of the Strategic Capital Investment Planning priority list serves as the “building block” of the annual budget request for the Department.

(8) Arturo “Treto” Garza, a veteran who served in the Marine Corps, rose to the rank of Sergeant, and served two tours in the Vietnam War, passed away on October 3, 2012.

(9) Treto Garza, who was also a former co-chairman of the Veterans Alliance of the Rio Grande Valley, tirelessly fought to improve health care services for veterans in the Rio Grande Valley, with his efforts successfully leading to the creation of the medical center of the Department located in Harlingen, Texas.

(b) REDESIGNATION OF MEDICAL CENTER IN HARLINGEN, TEXAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located in Harlingen, Texas, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the “Treto Garza South Texas Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Center”.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the medical center of the Department referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Treto Garza South Texas Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Center.

(c) REQUIREMENT OF FULL-SERVICE INPATIENT FACILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the Treto Garza South Texas Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Center, as designated under subsection (b), includes a full-service inpatient health care facility of the Department and shall modify the existing facility as necessary to meet that requirement.

(2) PLAN TO EXPAND FACILITY CAPABILITIES.—The Secretary shall include in the annual Strategic Capital Investment Plan of the Department for fiscal year 2016 a project to expand the capabilities of the Treto Garza South Texas Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Center, as so designated, by adding the following:

(A) Inpatient capability for 50 beds with appropriate administrative, clinical, diagnostic, and ancillary services needed for support.

(B) An urgent care center.

(C) The capability to provide a full range of services to meet the health care needs of women veterans.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report detailing a plan to implement the requirements in subsection (c), including an estimate of the cost of required actions and the time necessary for the completion of those actions.

(e) SOUTH TEXAS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “South Texas” means the following counties in Texas: Aransas, Bee, Brooks, Calhoun, Cameron, DeWitt, Dimmit, Duval, Goliad, Hidalgo, Jackson, Jim Hogg, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Kleberg, Nueces, Refugio, San Patricio, Starr, Victoria, Webb, Willacy, Zapata.

SA 1960. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 832. PREFERENCE FOR FIRM FIXED PRICE CONTRACTS FOR FOREIGN MILITARY SALES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PREFERENCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement shall be revised to establish a preference for firm fixed price contracts for foreign military sales.

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The preference established pursuant to subsection (a) shall include a waiver that may be exercised by the military service’s acquisition executive responsible or the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics if such official or the Under Secretary certifies that a different contract type is more appropriate and in the best interest of the United States.

SA 1961. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment

intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY PROCUREMENTS INVOLVING SMALL PURCHASES.

Subsection (f) of section 604b of the American Recovery and Investment Act of 2009 (6 U.S.C. 453b) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PURCHASES.—Subsection (a) does not apply to purchases for amounts not greater than \$150,000.”.

SA 1962. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 832. PROCUREMENTS INVOLVING SMALL PURCHASES.

(a) PROCUREMENTS OF CERTAIN ARTICLES.—Subsection (h) of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(h) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PURCHASES.—Subsection (a) does not apply to purchases for amounts not greater than \$150,000.”.

(b) PROCUREMENTS OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS.—Subsection (f) of section 2533b of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(f) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PURCHASES.—Subsection (a) does not apply to purchases for amounts not greater than \$150,000.”.

SA 1963. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1614. REPORT ON FEASIBILITY, COSTS, AND COST SAVINGS OF ALLOWING FOR COMMERCIAL APPLICATIONS OF EXCESS BALLISTIC MISSILE SOLID ROCKET MOTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States

shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing—

(1) the feasibility of permitting excess ballistic missile solid rocket motors, including excess ballistic missile solid rocket motors from the Minotaur launch vehicle, to be made available for commercial applications;

(2) the costs of, and the cost savings anticipated to result from, making such motors available for commercial applications;

(3) the effects of making such motors available for commercial applications on programs of the Department of Defense; and

(4) any implications of making such motors available for commercial applications for the international obligations of the United States.

(b) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

SA 1964. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. PRIORITY ENROLLMENT FOR VETERANS IN CERTAIN COURSES OF EDUCATION.

(a) **PRIORITY ENROLLMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 36 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3680A the following new section:

“§3680B. Priority enrollment in certain courses

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 3672(b)(2)(A) of this title or any other provision of law, with respect to an educational assistance program provided for in chapter 30, 31, 32, 33, or 35 of this title or chapter 1606 or 1607 of title 10, if an educational institution administers a priority enrollment system that allows certain students to enroll in courses earlier than other students, the Secretary or a State approving agency may not approve a program of education offered by such institution unless such institution allows a covered individual to enroll in courses at the earliest possible time pursuant to such priority enrollment system.

“(b) **COVERED INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘covered individual’ means an individual using educational assistance under chapter 30, 31, 32, 33, or 35 of this title or chapter 1606 or 1607 of title 10, including—

“(1) a veteran;

“(2) a member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty or a member of a reserve component (including the National Guard);

“(3) a dependent to whom such assistance has been transferred pursuant to section 3319 of this title; and

“(4) any other individual using such assistance.

“(c) **DISAPPROVAL.**—An educational institution described in subsection (a) that has a program of education approved for purposes of this chapter and fails to meet the requirements of such subsection shall be immediately disapproved by the Secretary or the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with section 3679 of this title.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3680A the following new item:

“3680B. Priority enrollment in certain courses.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Section 3680B of such title, as added by subsection (a)(1), shall take effect on August 1, 2017.

SA 1965. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN NEW REQUIREMENTS BASED ON DETERMINATIONS OF COST-EFFICIENCY.

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Chapter 146 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2463 the following new section:

“§2463a. Assignment of certain new requirements based on determinations of cost-efficiency

“(a) **ASSIGNMENTS BASED ON DETERMINATIONS OF COST-EFFICIENCY.**—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subject to subsection (b), the assignment of performance of a new requirement by the Department of Defense to members of the armed forces, civilian employees, or contractors shall be based on a determination of which sector of the Department’s workforce can perform the new requirement in the most cost-efficient manner, based on an analysis of the costs to the Federal Government in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction 7041.04 (‘Estimating and Comparing the Full Costs of Civilian and Active Duty Military Manpower and Contract Support’) or successor guidance, consistent with the needs of the Department with respect to factors other than cost, including quality, reliability, and timeliness.

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of a new requirement that is inherently governmental, closely associated with inherently governmental functions, critical, or required by law to be performed by members of the armed forces or Department of Defense civilian employees.

“(3) Nothing in this section may be construed as affecting the requirements of the Department of Defense under policies and procedures established by the Secretary of Defense under section 129a of this title for determining the most appropriate and cost-efficient mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel to perform the mission of the Department of Defense.

“(b) **WAIVER DURING AN EMERGENCY OR EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.**—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) for a specific new requirement in the event of an emer-

gency or exigent circumstances, as long as the head of an agency, within 60 days of exercising the waiver, submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives notice of the specific new requirement involved, where such new requirement is being performed, and the date on which it would be practical to subject such new requirement to the requirements of subsection (a).

“(c) **PROVISIONS RELATING TO ASSIGNMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.**—If a new requirement is assigned to a Department of Defense civilian employee consistent with the requirements of this section—

“(1) the Secretary of Defense may not—

“(A) impose any constraint or limitation on the size of the civilian workforce in terms of man years, end strength, full-time equivalent positions, or maximum number of employees; or

“(B) require offsetting funding for civilian pay or benefits or require a reduction in civilian full-time equivalents or civilian end-strengths; and

“(2) the Secretary may assign performance of such requirement without regard to whether the employee is a temporary, term, or permanent employee.

“(d) **NEW REQUIREMENT DESCRIBED.**—For purposes of this section, a new requirement is an activity or function that is not being performed, as of the date of consideration for assignment of performance under this section, by military personnel, civilian personnel, or contractor personnel at a Department of Defense component, organization, installation, or other entity. For purposes of the preceding sentence, an activity or function that is performed at such an entity and that is re-engineered, reorganized, modernized, upgraded, expanded, or changed to become more efficient but is still essentially providing the same service shall not be considered a new requirement.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2463 the following new item:

“2463a. Assignment of certain new requirements based on determinations of cost-efficiency.”.

SA 1966. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON CARE FOR ALZHEIMER’S DISEASE AND RELATED DEMENTIAS UNDER TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(A) Alzheimer’s disease is a progressive and ultimately fatal neurodegenerative disease with no known cure and is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States.

(B) Only 45 percent of people with Alzheimer’s disease or their caregivers report ever being told of the diagnosis.

(C) Accumulating evidence suggests a strong link between head injury and future risk of Alzheimer's disease.

(D) During the years of conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Defense and Veterans Brain Injury Center reports 327,299 documented cases of traumatic brain injury among active duty members of the Armed Forces.

(E) Care planning can improve health outcomes for both the diagnosed individual and caregivers of those individuals.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) covered beneficiaries diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia and their families should have access to a comprehensive care planning session from the Department of Defense;

(B) the Secretary of Defense should take appropriate action to provide eligible individuals with a care planning session with respect to diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia; and

(C) the care planning session should include, at minimum, a comprehensive care plan, information on the diagnosis and treatment options, and information on relevant medical and community services.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on care planning services for Alzheimer's disease and related dementias for all members of the Armed Forces and covered beneficiaries.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description and assessment of care planning services for Alzheimer's disease and related dementias currently provided for members of the Armed Forces and covered beneficiaries, including access to care, scope of available care, availability of specialty care, and use of care planning sessions with beneficiaries and caregivers.

(B) An assessment of the incidence and prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias during the five-year period preceding the submittal of the report for members of the Armed Forces and covered beneficiaries.

(C) A description of how the Department of Defense would implement a service for members of the Armed Forces and covered beneficiaries who are diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia that provides a one-time care planning session to a beneficiary and caregivers of the beneficiary to design a comprehensive care plan that includes information about the diagnosis, medical and non-medical options for ongoing treatment, and available services and support.

(c) COVERED BENEFICIARIES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "covered beneficiaries" has the meaning given that term in section 1072(5) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 1967. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe

military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 904. GUIDELINES FOR CONVERSION OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY CIVILIAN OR CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL TO PERFORMANCE BY MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Section 129a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS BY MILITARY PERSONNEL.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), no functions performed by civilian personnel or contractors may be converted to performance by military personnel unless—

"(A) there is a direct link between the functions to be performed and a military occupational specialty; and

"(B) the conversion to performance by military personnel is cost effective, based on Department of Defense instruction 7041.04 (or any successor administrative regulation, directive, or policy).

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following functions:

"(A) Functions required by law or regulation to be performed by military personnel.

"(B) Functions related to—

"(i) missions involving operation risks and combatant status under the law of war;

"(ii) specialized collective and individual training requiring military-unique knowledge and skills based on recent operational experience;

"(iii) independent advice to senior civilian leadership in the Department of Defense requiring military-unique knowledge and skills based on recent operational experience; and

"(iv) command and control arrangements under chapter 47 of this title (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

"(3) A function being performed by civilian personnel or contractors may not be—

"(A) modified, reorganized, divided, expanded, or in any way changed for the purpose of exempting a conversion of the function from the requirements of this subsection; or

"(B) converted to performance by military personnel because of a civilian personnel ceiling.

"(4) A conversion of performance is covered by this subsection only if the conversion changes performance of a function designated for performance by civilian personnel or contractors to performance by military personnel for a period in excess of 30 days.

"(5) The requirements of this subsection may be waived by the head of an agency for a specific function in the event of an emergency or exigent circumstances if the head of the agency notifies the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the specific function designated for performance by civilian personnel or contractors will instead be performed by military personnel because of an emergency or exigent circumstances. The period of any waiver under this paragraph with respect to a specific function may not exceed 90 days."

SA 1968. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016

for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 597, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON CERTAIN ASSISTANCE.—Section 1204(e) of such Act is amended by striking "the congressional defense committees" and inserting "the appropriate committees of Congress specified in subsection (g)(2)".

On page 600, line 6, strike "in coordination with the Secretary of State" and insert "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State".

On page 600, beginning on line 21, strike "the congressional defense committees" and insert "the appropriate committees of Congress".

On page 601, line 20, strike "the congressional defense committees" and insert "the appropriate committees of Congress".

On page 602, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

(3) An assessment by the Department of State of the impact of such support on internal security and stability in the countries provided support.

On page 602, strike lines 12 through 15 and insert the following:

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term "logistic support, supplies, and services" has the meaning given that term in section 2350(1) of title 10, United States Code.

On page 606, line 15, insert "the Secretary of State and" before "the Director of National Intelligence".

On page 606, beginning on line 21, strike "the congressional defense committees" and insert "the appropriate committees of Congress".

On page 607, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

On page 607, beginning on line 12, strike "the congressional defense committees" and insert "the appropriate committees of Congress".

On page 608, after line 22, add the following:

(e) CONCURRENCE OF SECRETARY OF STATE REQUIRED IN USE OF AUTHORITY.—Subsections (a) and (b)(1) of section 1209 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 are each amended by striking "in coordination with the Secretary of

State" and inserting "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State".

(f) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

On page 621, after line 22, add the following:

(e) CONCURRENCE OF SECRETARY OF STATE REQUIRED IN USE OF AUTHORITY.—Subsections (a) and (b)(1) of section 1236 of such Act (128 Stat. 3558) are each amended by striking "in coordination with the Secretary of State" and inserting "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State".

On page 625, beginning on line 19, strike "the Committee on Armed Services" and all that follows through "of the House of Representatives" on line 22 and insert "the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives".

On page 626, beginning 16, strike "the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives" and insert "the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives".

On page 634, line 21, strike "in coordination with the Secretary of State" and insert "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State".

On page 640, beginning on line 19, strike "the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives" and insert "the appropriate committees of Congress".

On page 641, strike lines 4 through 11, and insert the following:

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term "incremental expenses" means the reasonable and proper cost of the goods and services that are consumed by a country as a direct result of that country's participation in training under the authority of this section, including rations, fuel, training ammunition, and transportation. Such term does not include pay, allowances, and other normal costs of a country's personnel.

On page 642, beginning on line 25, strike "in consultation with the Secretary of State" and insert "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State".

On page 643, beginning on line 1, strike "the congressional defense committees" and insert "the appropriate committees of Congress".

On page 644, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

On page 652, line 20, insert after "the Secretary of Defense" the following: "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State".

On page 654, line 12, strike "the congressional defense committees" and insert "the appropriate committees of Congress".

On page 655, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

(h) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

On page 661, beginning on line 24, strike "in consultation with the Secretary of State" and insert "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State".

On page 663, beginning on line 11, strike "in consultation with the Secretary of State" and insert "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State".

On page 677 between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(c) INCLUSION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEES IN REPORTS.—Section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 is amended—

(1) in subsections (e) and (g), by striking "the congressional defense committees" and insert "the appropriate committees of Congress";

(2) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection (h):

"(h) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'appropriate committees of Congress' means—

"(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

"(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.".

On page 682, beginning on line 8, strike "the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives" and insert "the appropriate committees of Congress".

On page 682, beginning on line 16, strike "the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives" and insert "the appropriate committees of Congress".

On page 683, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(4) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1969. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PRESERVING THE INTEGRITY OF THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 32(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(G) PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF CREDIT TO CERTAIN IMMIGRANTS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any alien not described in clause (ii), no credit shall be allowed under this section for any taxable year.

"(ii) AUTHORIZED ALIENS.—An alien is described in this clause if such alien—

"(I) is lawfully admitted for permanent residence,

"(II) otherwise has lawful status and is authorized to be employed in the United States pursuant to an affirmative grant of such authority under the immigration laws, or

"(III) is otherwise lawfully present in the United States, but only if such lawful presence is based on an affirmative grant of withholding of removal pursuant to section 214(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(b)(3)) or an affirmative grant of withholding or deferral of removal pursuant to Article 3 of the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, done at New York December 10, 1984.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SA 1970. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle ____—PROTECTION OF CHILDREN

SEC. ____ 1. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Protection of Children Act of 2015".

SEC. ____ 2. REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by amending the heading to read as follows: "RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.";

(ii) in subparagraph (A);

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States”;

(II) in clause (i), by inserting “and” at the end;

(III) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(IV) by striking clause (iii);

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “(8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) may—” and inserting “(8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.)—”;

(II) in clause (i), by inserting before “permit such child to withdraw” the following: “may”; and

(III) in clause (ii), by inserting before “return such child” the following: “shall”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by amending the heading to read as follows: “AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.”; and

(II) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “The Secretary of State shall negotiate agreements between the United States and countries contiguous to the United States” and inserting “The Secretary of State may negotiate agreements between the United States and any foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(D)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “, except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous country subject to the exceptions under subsection (a)(2),” and inserting “who does not meet the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)”; and

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, which shall include a hearing before an immigration judge not later than 14 days after being screened under paragraph (4)”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting before the semicolon the following: “believed not to meet the criteria listed in subsection (a)(2)(A)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the period the following: “and does not meet the criteria listed in subsection (a)(2)(A)”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “an unaccompanied alien child in custody shall” and all that follows, and inserting the following: “an unaccompanied alien child in custody—

“(A) in the case of a child who does not meet the criteria listed in subsection (a)(2)(A), shall transfer the custody of such child to the Secretary of Health and Human Services not later than 30 days after determining that such child is an unaccompanied alien child who does not meet such criteria; or

“(B) in the case of child who meets the criteria listed in subsection (a)(2)(A), may transfer the custody of such child to the Secretary of Health and Human Services after determining that such child is an unaccompanied alien child who meets such criteria.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting at the end the following:

“(D) INFORMATION ABOUT INDIVIDUALS WITH WHOM CHILDREN ARE PLACED.—

“(i) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO HOMELAND SECURITY.—Before placing a child with an individual, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide to the Secretary of Homeland Security, regarding the individual with whom the child will be placed, the following information:

“(I) The name of the individual.

“(II) The social security number of the individual.

“(III) The date of birth of the individual.

“(IV) The location of the individual’s residence where the child will be placed.

“(V) The immigration status of the individual, if known.

“(VI) Contact information for the individual.

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case of a child who was apprehended on or after June 15, 2012, and before the date of the enactment of the Protection of Children Act of 2015, who the Secretary of Health and Human Services placed with an individual, the Secretary shall provide the information listed in clause (i) to the Secretary of Homeland Security not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Protection of Children Act of 2015.

“(iii) ACTIVITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—Not later than 30 days after receiving the information listed in clause (i), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(I) in the case that the immigration status of an individual with whom a child is placed is unknown, investigate the immigration status of that individual; and

“(II) upon determining that an individual with whom a child is placed is unlawfully present in the United States, initiate removal proceedings pursuant to chapter 4 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.)”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by inserting after “to the greatest extent practicable” the following: “(at no expense to the Government)”; and

(ii) by striking “have counsel to represent them” and inserting “have access to counsel to represent them”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any unauthorized alien child apprehended on or after June 15, 2012.

SEC. 3. SPECIAL IMMIGRANT JUVENILE STATUS FOR IMMIGRANTS UNABLE TO REUNITE WITH EITHER PARENT.

Section 101(a)(27)(J)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(J)(i)) is amended by striking “1 or both of the immigrant’s parents” and inserting “either of the immigrant’s parents”.

SEC. 4. JURISDICTION OF ASYLUM APPLICATIONS.

Section 208(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

SA 1971. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle Asylum Reform and Border Protection

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Asylum Reform and Border Protection Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF INTENT REGARDING TAXPAYER-PROVIDED COUNSEL.

Section 292 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1362) is amended—

(1) by striking “(at no expense to the Government)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in no instance shall the Government bear any expense for counsel for any person in removal proceedings or in any appeal proceedings before the Attorney General from any such removal proceedings.”.

SEC. 3. SPECIAL IMMIGRANT JUVENILE VISAS.

Section 101(a)(27)(J)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(J)(i)) is amended by striking “and whose reunification with 1 or both of the immigrant’s parents is not viable due” and inserting “and who cannot be reunified with either of the immigrant’s parents due”.

SEC. 4. CREDIBLE FEAR INTERVIEWS.

Section 235(b)(1)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(B)(v)) is amended by striking “208.” and inserting “208, and it is more probable than not that the statements made by the alien in support of the alien’s claim are true.”.

SEC. 5. RECORDING EXPEDITED REMOVAL AND CREDIBLE FEAR INTERVIEWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish quality assurance procedures and take steps to effectively ensure that questions by employees of the Department of Homeland Security exercising expedited removal authority under section 235(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)) are asked in a uniform manner, and that both these questions and the answers provided in response to them are recorded in a uniform fashion.

(b) FACTORS RELATING TO SWORN STATEMENTS.—Where practicable, any sworn or signed written statement taken of an alien as part of the record of a proceeding under section 235(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(A)) shall be accompanied by a recording of the interview which served as the basis for that sworn statement.

(c) INTERPRETERS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that a competent interpreter, not affiliated with the government of the country from which the alien may claim asylum, is used when the interviewing officer does not speak a language understood by the alien and there is no other Federal, State, or local government employee available who is able to interpret effectively, accurately, and impartially.

(d) RECORDINGS IN IMMIGRATION PROCEEDINGS.—Recordings of interviews of aliens subject to expedited removal shall be included in the record of proceeding and shall be considered as evidence in any further proceedings involving the alien.

(e) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to create any right, benefit, trust, or responsibility, whether substantive or procedural, enforceable in law or equity by a party against the United States, its departments, agencies, instrumentalities, entities, officers, employees, or agents, or any person, nor does this section create any right of review in any administrative, judicial, or other proceeding.

SEC. 6. PAROLE REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) HUMANITARIAN AND PUBLIC INTEREST PAROLE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this paragraph and section 214(f)(2),

the Secretary of Homeland Security, in the sole discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, may on a case-by-case basis parole an alien into the United States temporarily, under such conditions as the Secretary of Homeland Security may prescribe, only—

“(i) for an urgent humanitarian reason (as described under subparagraph (B)); or

“(ii) for a reason deemed strictly in the public interest (as described under subparagraph (C)).

“(B) HUMANITARIAN PAROLE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may parole an alien based on an urgent humanitarian reason described in this subparagraph only if—

“(i) the alien has a medical emergency and the alien cannot obtain necessary treatment in the foreign state in which the alien is residing or the medical emergency is life-threatening and there is insufficient time for the alien to be admitted through the normal visa process;

“(ii) the alien is needed in the United States in order to donate an organ or other tissue for transplant into a close family member;

“(iii) the alien has a close family member in the United States whose death is imminent and the alien could not arrive in the United States in time to see such family member alive if the alien were to be admitted through the normal visa process;

“(iv) the alien is a lawful applicant for adjustment of status under section 245; or

“(v) the alien was lawfully granted status under section 208 or lawfully admitted under section 207.

“(C) PUBLIC INTEREST PAROLE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may parole an alien based on a reason deemed strictly in the public interest described in this subparagraph only if the alien has assisted the United States Government in a matter, such as a criminal investigation, espionage, or other similar law enforcement activity, and either the alien's presence in the United States is required by the Government or the alien's life would be threatened if the alien were not permitted to come to the United States.

“(D) LIMITATION ON THE USE OF PAROLE AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not use the parole authority under this paragraph to permit to come to the United States aliens who have applied for and have been found to be ineligible for refugee status or any alien to whom the provisions of this paragraph do not apply.

“(E) PAROLE NOT AN ADMISSION.—Parole of an alien under this paragraph shall not be considered an admission of the alien into the United States. When the purposes of the parole of an alien have been served, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the alien shall immediately return or be returned to the custody from which the alien was paroled and the alien shall be considered for admission to the United States on the same basis as other similarly situated applicants for admission.

“(F) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate describing the number and categories of aliens paroled into the United States under this paragraph. Each such report shall contain information and data concerning the number and categories of aliens paroled, the duration of parole, and the current status of aliens paroled during the preceding fiscal year.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on

the first day of the first month beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON PAROLE PROCEDURES AND STANDARDIZATION OF PAROLE PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly conduct a review, and submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives regarding the effectiveness of parole and custody determination procedures applicable to aliens who have established a credible fear of persecution and are awaiting a final determination regarding their asylum claim by the immigration courts. The report shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of the rate at which release from detention (including release on parole) is granted to aliens who have established a credible fear of persecution and are awaiting a final determination regarding their asylum claim by the immigration courts throughout the United States, and any disparity that exists between locations or geographical areas, including explanation of the reasons for this disparity and what actions are being taken to have consistent and uniform application of the standards for granting parole.

(2) An analysis of the effect of the procedures and policies applied with respect to parole and custody determinations both by the Attorney General and the Secretary on the alien's pursuit of their asylum claim before an immigration court.

(3) An analysis of the effectiveness of the procedures and policies applied with respect to parole and custody determinations both by the Attorney General and the Secretary in securing the alien's presence at the immigration court proceedings.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) should include—

(1) recommendations with respect to whether the existing parole and custody determination procedures applicable to aliens who have established a credible fear of persecution and are awaiting a final determination regarding their asylum claim by the immigration courts—

(A) respect the interests of aliens; and

(B) ensure the presence of the aliens at the immigration court proceedings; and

(2) an assessment on corresponding failure to appear rates, in absentia orders, and absconders.

SEC. 8. UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILD DEFINED.

Section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the term ‘unaccompanied alien child’—

“(A) means an alien who—

“(i) has no lawful immigration status in the United States;

“(ii) has not attained 18 years of age; and

“(iii) with respect to whom—

“(I) there is no parent or legal guardian in the United States;

“(II) no parent or legal guardian in the United States is available to provide care and physical custody; or

“(III) no sibling over 18 years of age, aunt, uncle, grandparent, or cousin over 18 years of age is available to provide care and physical custody; except that

“(B) such term shall cease to include an alien if at any time a parent, legal guardian, sibling over 18 years of age, aunt, uncle,

grandparent, or cousin over 18 years of age of the alien is found in the United States and is available to provide care and physical custody (and the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall revoke accordingly any prior designation of the alien under this paragraph).”.

SEC. 9. MODIFICATIONS TO PREFERENTIAL AVAILABILITY FOR ASYLUM FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN MINORS.

Section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a)(2)(E); and

(2) by striking subsection (b)(3)(C).

SEC. 10. NOTIFICATION AND TRANSFER OF CUSTODY REGARDING UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN MINORS.

Section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “48 hours” and inserting “7 days”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “72 hours” and inserting “30 days”.

SEC. 11. INFORMATION SHARING BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall share with the Secretary of Homeland Security any information requested on a child who has been determined to be an unaccompanied alien child and who is or has been in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, including the location of the child and any person to whom custody of the child has been transferred, for any legitimate law enforcement objective, including enforcement of the immigration laws.”.

SEC. 12. SAFE THIRD COUNTRY.

Section 208(a)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”; and

(2) by striking “removed, pursuant to a bilateral or multilateral agreement, to” and inserting “removed to”.

SEC. 13. ADDITIONAL IMMIGRATION JUDGES AND ICE PROSECUTORS.

(a) EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, in each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, the Attorney General shall increase by not less than 50 the number of positions for full-time immigration judges within the Executive Office for Immigration Review above the number of such positions for which funds were allotted for fiscal year 2014.

(b) IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT OFFICE OF THE PRINCIPAL LEGAL ADVISOR.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, in each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2017, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall increase by not less than 60 the number of positions for full-time trial attorneys within the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Office of the Principal Legal Advisor above the number of such positions for which funds were allotted for fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 14. MINORS IN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CUSTODY.

Section 235(c)(2)(A) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)(2)(A))

is amended by striking the last two sentences.

SEC. 15. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATION.

(a) **SUSPENSION OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary of State shall immediately suspend all foreign assistance, including under United States Agency for International Development programs, the Central American Regional Security Initiative, or the International Narcotic Control Law Enforcement program, to any large sending country that—

(1) refuses to negotiate an agreement under section 235(a)(2) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(2)); or

(2) refuses to accept from the United States repatriated unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))) who are nationals or residents of the sending country.

(b) **USE OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATION.**—The Secretary of State shall provide any additional foreign assistance from the United States that such Secretary determines is needed to implement an agreement under section 235(a)(2) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(2)) or safely to repatriate or reintegrate nationals or residents of a large sending country without increasing the total quantity of foreign assistance to such country. Such country may use any earlier foreign assistance for the purpose of repatriation or implementation of any agreement under such section 235(a)(2).

(c) **DEFINITION OF LARGE SENDING PROGRAM.**—In this section, the term “large sending country” means—

(1) any country which was the country of nationality or last habitual residence for 1,000 or more unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))) who entered the United States in a single fiscal year in any of the prior 3 fiscal years; and

(2) any other country which the Secretary of Homeland Security deems appropriate.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to any unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))) apprehended on or after such date.

SEC. 16. REPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, with assistance from the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on efforts to improve repatriation programs for unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))). Such reports shall include the following:

(1) The average time that such a child is detained after apprehension until removal.

(2) The number of such children detained improperly beyond the required time periods under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)).

(3) A statement of the funds used to effectuate the repatriation of such children, in-

cluding any funds that were reallocated from foreign assistance accounts as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to any unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))) apprehended on or after such date.

SEC. 17. WITHHOLDING OF REMOVAL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 241(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following:

“The burden of proof shall be on the alien to establish that the alien’s life or freedom would be threatened in that country, and that race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion would be at least one central reason for such threat.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “In determining whether an alien has demonstrated that the alien’s life or freedom would be threatened for a reason described in subparagraph (A),” and inserting “For purposes of this paragraph.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on May 11, 2005, and shall apply to applications for withholding of removal made on or after such date.

SEC. 18. GROSS VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) **INADMISSIBILITY OF CERTAIN ALIENS.**—Section 212(a)(3)(E)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(E)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(iii) **COMMISSION OF ACTS OF TORTURE, EXTRAJUDICIAL KILLINGS, WAR CRIMES, OR WIDESPREAD OR SYSTEMATIC ATTACKS ON CIVILIANS.**—Any alien who planned, ordered, assisted, aided and abetted, committed, or otherwise participated in, including through command responsibility and without regard to motivation or intent, the commission of—

“(I) any act of torture (as defined in section 2340 of title 18, United States Code);

“(II) any extrajudicial killing (as defined in section 3(a) of the Torture Victim Protection Act of 1991 (28 U.S.C. 1350 note)) under color of law of any foreign nation;

“(III) a war crime (as defined in section 2441 of title 18, United States Code); or

“(IV) a widespread or systematic attack directed against a civilian population, with knowledge of the attack, murder, extermination, enslavement, forcible transfer of population, arbitrary detention, rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, or any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity;

“(V) persecution on political racial, national, ethnic, cultural, religious, or gender grounds;

“(VI) enforced disappearance of persons; or

“(VII) other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering or serious bodily or mental injury, is inadmissible.”.

(b) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO VISA RECORDS.**—The President may make public, without regard to the requirements under section 222(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(f)), with respect to confidentiality of records pertaining to the issuance or refusal of visas or permits to enter the United States, the names of aliens deemed inadmissible on the basis of section

212(a)(3)(E)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by subsection (a).

SEC. 19. FIRM RESETTLEMENT.

Section 208(b)(2)(A)(vi) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(2)(A)(vi)) is amended by striking “States.” and inserting “States, which shall be considered demonstrated by evidence that the alien can live in such country (in any legal status) without fear of persecution.”.

SEC. 20. TERMINATION OF ASYLUM STATUS PURSUANT TO RETURN TO HOME COUNTRY.

(a) **TERMINATION OF STATUS.**—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), any alien who is granted asylum or refugee status under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), who, without a compelling reason as determined by the Secretary, subsequently returns to the country of such alien’s nationality or, in the case of an alien having no nationality, returns to any country in which such alien last habitually resided, and who applied for such status because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution in that country on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion, shall have his or her status terminated.

(b) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary has discretion to waive subsection (a) if it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the alien had a compelling reason for the return. The waiver may be sought prior to departure from the United States or upon return.

(c) **EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS FROM CUBA.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply to an alien who is eligible for adjustment to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence pursuant to the Cuban Adjustment Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-732).

SEC. 21. ASYLUM CASES FOR HOME SCHOOLERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 101(a)(42) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of determinations under this Act, a person who has been persecuted for failure or refusal to comply with any law or regulation that prevents the exercise of the individual right of that person to direct the upbringing and education of a child of that person (including any law or regulation preventing home-schooling), or for other resistance to such a law or regulation, shall be deemed to have been persecuted on account of membership in a particular social group, and a person who has a well founded fear that he or she will be subject to persecution for such failure, refusal, or resistance shall be deemed to have a well founded fear of persecution on account of membership in a particular social group.”.

(b) **NUMERICAL LIMITATION.**—Section 207(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) For any fiscal year, not more than 500 aliens may be admitted under this section, or granted asylum under section 208, pursuant to a determination under section 101(a)(42) that the alien is described in the final sentence of section 101(a)(42) (as added by section 21 of the Asylum Reform and Border Protection Act of 2015).”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to failure or refusal to comply with a law or regulation, or other resistance to a law or regulation, occurring before, on, or after such date.

(2) NUMERICAL LIMITATION.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall take effect beginning on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 22. NOTICE CONCERNING FRIVOLOUS ASYLUM APPLICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208(d)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(d)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security or” before “the Attorney General”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and of the consequences, under paragraph (6), of knowingly filing a frivolous application for asylum”;

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) ensure that a written warning appears on the asylum application advising the alien of the consequences of filing a frivolous application.”; and

(5) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“The written warning referred to in subparagraph (C) shall serve as notice to the alien of the consequences of filing a frivolous application.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 208(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(d)(6)) is amended by striking “paragraph (4)(A)” and inserting “paragraph (4)(C)”.

SEC. 23. TERMINATION OF ASYLUM STATUS.

Section 208(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) If an alien’s asylum status is subject to termination under paragraph (2), the immigration judge shall first determine whether the conditions specified under paragraph (2) have been met, and if so, terminate the alien’s asylum status before considering whether the alien is eligible for adjustment of status under section 209.”.

SA 1972. Mr. SESSIONS (for Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. CITIZENSHIP AT BIRTH FOR CERTAIN PERSONS BORN IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “The following”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (a) through (h) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively, and indenting such paragraphs, as redesignated, an additional 2 ems to the right; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) DEFINITION.—Acknowledging the right of birthright citizenship established by section 1 of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, a person born in the United States shall be considered ‘sub-

ject to the jurisdiction’ of the United States for purposes of subsection (a)(1) only if the person is born in the United States and at least 1 of the person’s parents is—

“(1) a citizen or national of the United States;

“(2) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States whose residence is in the United States; or

“(3) an alien performing active service in the armed forces (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code).”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(3) may not be construed to affect the citizenship or nationality status of any person born before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section or any amendment made by this section, or any application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act and the application of the provision or amendment to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

SA 1973. Mr. SESSIONS (for Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. REPEAL OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 504(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2);

(2) by striking “(1)”;

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 9, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 9, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 9, 2015, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Transportation Security Administration: First-Hand and Government Watchdog Accounts of Agency Challenges.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 9, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 9, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Shaun Easley, a Defense fellow serving on my staff, during consideration of the bill H.R. 1735, the Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, it is my privilege to ask unanimous consent that Capt. Matthew T. Reeder, a U.S. Marine Corps national security fellow in Senator AYOTTE’s office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kathleen Perry, a fellow in my office, be granted the privileges of the floor during the consideration of H.R. 1735, the Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that CDR Eddie Pilcher, the defense legislative fellow assigned to my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the calendar year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 77; that the nomination be confirmed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no

intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Anthony C. Funkhouser
Brig. Gen. Donald E. Jackson, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Kent D. Savre

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 196, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 196) designating July 10, 2015, as Collector Car Appreciation Day and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 196) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RECOGNIZING THE NEED TO IMPROVE PHYSICAL ACCESS TO MANY FEDERALLY FUNDED FACILITIES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 197, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

A resolution (S. Res. 197) recognizing the need to improve physical access to many fed-

erally funded facilities for all people of the United States, particularly people with disabilities.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 197) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

GRASSROOTS RURAL AND SMALL COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEMS ASSISTANCE ACT

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 83, S. 611, and Calendar No. 84, S. 653, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 611) to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 653) to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 611) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 611

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Grassroots Rural and Small Community Water Systems Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 (Public Law 104-182) authorized technical assistance for small and rural communities to assist those communities in complying with regulations promulgated pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(2) technical assistance and compliance training—

(A) ensures that Federal regulations do not overwhelm the resources of small and rural communities; and

(B) provides small and rural communities lacking technical resources with the necessary skills to improve and protect water resources;

(3) across the United States, more than 90 percent of the community water systems serve a population of less than 10,000 individuals;

(4) small and rural communities have the greatest difficulty providing safe, affordable public drinking water and wastewater services due to limited economies of scale and lack of technical expertise; and

(5) in addition to being the main source of compliance assistance, small and rural water technical assistance has been the main source of emergency response assistance in small and rural communities.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) to assist small and rural communities most effectively, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should prioritize the types of technical assistance that are most beneficial to those communities, based on input from those communities; and

(2) local support is the key to making Federal assistance initiatives work in small and rural communities to the maximum benefit.

SEC. 4. FUNDING PRIORITIES.

Section 1442(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-1(e)) is amended—

(1) by designating the first through seventh sentences as paragraphs (1) through (7), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (5) (as so designated), by striking "1997 through 2003" and inserting "2015 through 2020"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(8) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may use amounts made available to carry out this section to provide grants or cooperative agreements to nonprofit organizations that provide to small public water systems onsite technical assistance, circuit-rider technical assistance programs, multistate, regional technical assistance programs, onsite and regional training, assistance with implementing source water protection plans, and assistance with implementing monitoring plans, rules, regulations, and water security enhancements.

"(B) PREFERENCE.—To ensure that technical assistance funding is used in a manner that is most beneficial to the small and rural communities of a State, the Administrator shall give preference under this paragraph to nonprofit organizations that, as determined by the Administrator, are the most qualified and experienced in providing training and technical assistance to small public water systems and that the small community water systems in that State find to be the most beneficial and effective.

"(C) LIMITATION.—No grant or cooperative agreement provided or otherwise made available under this section may be used for litigation pursuant to section 1449."

The bill (S. 653) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 653

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Water Resources Research Amendments Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.—Section 102 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10301) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (9) as paragraphs (8) through (10), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated), by striking “and” at the end; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) additional research is required into increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of new and existing treatment works through alternative approaches, including—

“(A) nonstructural alternatives;

“(B) decentralized approaches;

“(C) energy use efficiency;

“(D) water use efficiency; and

“(E) actions to extract energy from wastewater.”;

(b) CLARIFICATION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—Section 104(b)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “water-related phenomena” and inserting “water resources”; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”.

(c) COMPLIANCE REPORT.—Section 104(c) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(c) From the” and inserting the following:

“(c) GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—From the”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than December 31 of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a report regarding the compliance of each funding recipient with this sub-

section for the immediately preceding fiscal year.”.

(d) EVALUATION OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 104 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303) is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) EVALUATION OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a careful and detailed evaluation of each institute at least once every 3 years to determine—

“(A) the quality and relevance of the water resources research of the institute;

“(B) the effectiveness of the institute at producing measured results and applied water supply research; and

“(C) whether the effectiveness of the institute as an institution for planning, conducting, and arranging for research warrants continued support under this section.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON FURTHER SUPPORT.—If, as a result of an evaluation under paragraph (1), the Secretary determines that an institute does not qualify for further support under this section, no further grants to the institute may be provided until the qualifications of the institute are reestablished to the satisfaction of the Secretary.”.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 104(f)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(f)(1)) is amended by striking “\$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “\$7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020”.

(f) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS WHERE RESEARCH FOCUSED ON WATER PROBLEMS OF INTERSTATE NATURE.—Section 104(g)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(g)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “\$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “\$1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020”.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2015

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Sen-

ate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 10; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the time be equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the second half; finally, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:34 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 10, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9, 2015:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ANTHONY C. FUNKHOUSER
BRIG. GEN. DONALD E. JACKSON, JR.
BRIG. GEN. KENT D. SAVRE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 9, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 9, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BLAKE FARENTHOLD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

THE TRUTH IS WHAT CAN SAVE AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the House floor today to express my thanks to Senator RAND PAUL for his 11-hour filibuster of the PATRIOT Act reauthorization on May 31.

I voted against the USA FREEDOM Act, which would have reauthorized the PATRIOT Act, because the NSA spying program allows for the Federal Government to gather bulk private data on law-abiding American citizens, a clear violation of the Fourth Amendment.

I also commend Senator PAUL for his courageous statement a couple of weeks ago. He said: "ISIS exists and grew stronger because the hawks in our party gave arms indiscriminately, and most of those arms were snatched by ISIS. They"—the hawks in our party—"created these people."

Unfortunately, Louisiana's Governor, Bobby Jindal, criticized my friend Senator PAUL by saying he is "unsuited to be Commander in Chief." It is obvious

Governor Jindal does not know about the manipulation of intelligence that led us into the Iraq war.

In a 2006 article for Time magazine, Lieutenant General Greg Newbold, whom I met with shortly after he wrote the article, stated: "From 2000 until 2002, I was a Marine Corps Lieutenant General and Director of Operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After 9/11, I was a witness and, therefore, a party to the actions that led us to the invasion of Iraq, an unnecessary war. Inside the military family, I made no secret of my view that the zealots' rationale for war made no sense."

Later in the article, Lieutenant General Newbold states: "The distortion of intelligence in the buildup to the war led us to the unnecessary war in Iraq."

The distortion of intelligence, Mr. Speaker, is what led us to that war in Iraq.

Last month, when Governor Jeb Bush justified his brother's war in Iraq, my friend Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson, who was chief of staff to former Secretary of State Colin Powell, appeared on MSNBC's "The Ed Show," where Wilkerson said: "The intelligence was fixed, and everyone should know that by now. It was a failure of the intelligence agencies, but it was also a failure of the political people who manipulated the intelligence failure to their own benefit. It destroyed the balance of power in the Gulf and produced what we have today: the chaos we have today; al Qaeda in Iraq—never there until we invaded; ISIS—never there until we invaded; the mess we have in Yemen. Everything that's happening in the Middle East today can be attributed to our having destroyed the balance of power that we had carefully maintained for half a century with the invasion in 2003. It was a disaster."

Thank you, Lawrence Wilkerson, for telling the truth.

Like Colonel Wilkerson said, everyone knows the intelligence was manipulated to trick the American people and the Congress into thinking the Iraq war was necessary. In fact, it was not, and it created the vacuum of power that exists today and that ISIS takes advantage of.

Also, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, as I have a poster here of the Air Force removing an American hero from the plane in a flag-draped coffin: because of that unnecessary war in Iraq, we lost over 4,000 Americans; because of that unnecessary war in Iraq, we had over 30,000 wounded.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank our men and women

in uniform, their families, and the families who gave a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I also would like to say: Thank you, Senator PAUL, for standing up for the truth. The truth is what can save America. Thank you, Senator PAUL.

REMEMBERING JOHN NASH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 2015, the world lost one of the brightest mathematicians of the 20th century. John Nash, Jr., and his wife, Alicia, were tragically killed in a car accident, and I offer my sincerest condolences to their family.

John Nash, Jr., was born in Bluefield, West Virginia, on June 13, 1928. At a young age, he displayed immense intelligence and an affinity for mathematics. Many may know Dr. Nash's story from the movie, "A Beautiful Mind," where he was portrayed by actor Russell Crowe, but many are unaware of the groundbreaking impacts he had in the field of mathematics and economics.

In 1994, Dr. Nash shared a Nobel Prize in economics for his work on game theory. Dr. Nash's work developed the concept of an equilibrium in non-cooperative games that has come to be known as the Nash equilibrium. Today, economics students across the world are familiar with Dr. Nash's contributions to the field of economics, studying the Nash equilibrium and game theory exclusively.

He revolutionized economics, and his work will have lasting impacts in business, sports, politics, and is even applicable to nuclear deterrence theories. Dr. Nash's work in pure mathematics is just as important and revolutionary as his work on game theory.

Dr. John Nash was not only a genius, he was also an advocate for those suffering from mental health issues. As many who have seen the film know, Dr. Nash suffered from mental illness. He used his struggles as a way to help others with mental health problems, becoming a staunch supporter for awareness and outreach for those with mental health issues.

Dr. Nash's advocacy work and brilliance will be missed by so many. This Saturday would have been John Nash's 87th birthday. Dr. Nash was clearly taken from us too soon, but his work and his advocacy will live on. The best

way we can honor his legacy is to continue his fight for treatment, for education, and for dignity for those facing mental health issues and their families.

OPPOSING THE AMERICAN INNOVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to alert my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, and I would like to alert the American people that there is a monstrous piece of legislation that will do great damage to our country and to the welfare of the American people making its way through the Judiciary Committee.

In fact, the Judiciary Committee will have a markup this Thursday of what is called the American Innovation Act, H.R. 9. This, in reality, is the anti-innovation act. It is one of the most egregious examples of crony capitalism that I have witnessed in this body as I have been here for the last 26 years.

This legislation uses a legitimate problem, which is frivolous lawsuits, and then portends to solve that problem by dramatically restricting the right of all Americans to sue in order to address those who have violated their rights in the name of usurping those who have been called patent trolls. A patent troll is someone who has purchased the right for a patent from an inventor and now has that property right himself. In the name of restricting those patent trolls from enforcing the right that they have bought from the inventor, they are dramatically restricting those people, both the inventors and anyone else who owns these intellectual property rights known as patents.

Early provisions of this bill, and almost every provision of this bill, make it more difficult for the inventor to protect himself against the theft of huge corporations. And there you go; huge, multinational corporations are seeking to destroy America's patent system.

I have been fighting this for 25 years. They have been fighting it because they want to take the property of American inventors, and they don't want to pay for it—surprise, surprise. So they passed legislation in the name of stopping frivolous lawsuits that prevent people with legitimate lawsuits from actually obtaining the justice they deserve. This will undercut American innovation. It will destroy the individual inventors.

Almost every American university now has come out opposed to this because they have found that the result of this bill, by restricting the people's right to actually defend their own intellectual property rights, will under-

mine the value—dramatically decrease the value—of patents, which will mean people won't invest in patents, which means the universities now have less resources. Who will benefit? Large corporations, multinational corporations with no loyalty to the United States will then have the power to take from our inventors their inventions.

This is a game changer for American innovation. It is the anti-innovation act. I ask my colleagues to please pay attention to H.R. 9. Don't let them push this over. Don't let this crony capitalism being done using a decoy, meaning the patent trolls, get away from the fact that they are actually trying to destroy the system for legitimate inventors.

As I say, I have been fighting this for 25 years. We have seen this in many forms. The last time, the decoy was submarine patentors. This time it is patent trolls.

The fact is that none of this is an excuse to dramatically decrease the ability of our inventors to own what the Constitution gives them: a 15- to 17-year period where they own what they invented; thus, they can make a profit from it. This would have destroyed all of the young inventors that made such a difference in the American way of life.

We will not be prosperous and we will not be secure unless the American people have the right to the own their intellectual property, unless the inventors that are the basis of many of our new industries know that they will control their patent and that some big corporation won't just come along and steal it.

This goes so far as to limit and to say that, for example, one of the provisions in the bill, if an inventor sues a major company that has stolen his or her patent, well, not only now will the inventor be liable for the costs of the litigation, but anybody who has invested in his patent will then be liable for those court costs. Who the heck will ever invest in an inventor when he is up against a megacorporation? No, we should not be permitting the theft of the intellectual property rights of our inventors.

I would ask my colleagues to pay attention to H.R. 9. I would ask the American people to get ahold of your Congressman and make sure he understands how heinous this bill is that has already, as I say, been opposed by every major university in this country and, of course, every group of inventors in this country.

If it was the Innovation Act, as the title would suggest, why would the inventors be against it?

I would ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 9 as it is marked up in the Judiciary Committee this coming Thursday.

FREE TRADE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am a big proponent and supporter of free trade. I think the American workforce is so productive. I think that American businesses and our industries are so productive and so innovative that we can compete in the global markets. I am confident that our innovation and that our workforce can compete and we can win, when given an opportunity, again, to compete in global markets.

At home, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has determined that the State of Louisiana is the top export State in the United States. In fact, one out of every five jobs in our State is tied back to our waterways, and that is because we are home to 5 of the top 15 ports in the United States.

□ 1215

We have an awful lot to export at home. We have a huge petrochemical industry, one of the largest ones in the United States. Large agriculture—in fact, over half the grains from the Midwest from American farms come down through our port system and are then exported around the country, around the world.

We are home to all six class I rail lines, only one of two places in the United States that actually has all six class I rail lines in our State.

Free trade can be good for America; it can be good for our country, good for our businesses, good for our families, if it is fair trade, and that is where my concerns come in, is our ability to compete fairly.

The President said: “High-standard trade helps level the playing field for American workers”—“high-standard trade helps level the playing field.” The problem is that, when you compare the cost of compliance in the United States with environmental policies, with tax policies, and with labor regulations, it is not a level playing field in the United States. In fact, it is extraordinarily out of balance.

The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that in 2012 alone, that the American workforce wasted 4.2 billion hours just complying with regulations, 4.2 billion. The Competitive Enterprise Institute estimates that \$1.88 trillion in lost economic productivity and higher prices were experienced by the American workforce and by American families across the country, again, \$1.88 trillion in 2014.

CEI also did a study that estimated that, for every small business in the United States, for each employee that small business has, that they pay over \$11,000 a year just complying with Federal regulations. If the total cost of the aggregate cost of Federal regulations were at GDP—were at gross domestic

product—it would rank behind Russia's economy and just ahead of India's economy. There are extraordinary costs. In fact, it is a backdoor way to tax our families.

Eighty-eight percent of the manufacturers in the United States, according to a survey done by NAM, 88 percent identified Federal regulations as being their top concern in regard to their ability to compete on a level playing field.

If you take, for example, tax compliance alone, tax policies are going to cost \$1.7 trillion over the next 10 years, as proposed by the current administration, \$1.7 trillion on top of all of these other extraordinary costs that I have covered to date.

One of the huge costs that we have in the environmental world is the ozone standard. There has been a proposal to change the ozone standard. Some have said that the ozone standard being proposed, Yellowstone National Park couldn't comply with; yet they want the State of Louisiana, where I represent, to comply with this new ozone standard.

When we had the top—or one of the top petrochemical industries in the United States, that standard is estimated to cost perhaps—it is estimated to be the most expensive Federal regulation in history. It could cost over \$2 trillion to comply with the regulation—over \$140 billion per year it could cost to comply with the regulation. In our home State of Louisiana alone, nearly 34,000 jobs are estimated to be lost on an annual basis.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proponent of the environment. I spent years and years of my life, of my career, working to restore the environment, working to restore the ecological function of south Louisiana, of our coastal area, of our fisheries, and of our wetlands. I am a big proponent of the environment.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that, as we move forward with free trade, under the policies being put forth by this administration, American workers are going to have their hands tied behind their back in the cost of complying with environmental regulation, the cost of complying with the expensive tax regulation in the United States, and the cost of extraordinary labor regulation.

I will say in closing, Mr. Speaker, I am a proponent of free trade, but it must be fair trade.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the days grow warmer throughout our land, major legislative issues loom with the potential of warmer debate and disagreement.

Bless the Members of the people's House with the graces they need to engage one another as colleagues of the 114th Congress, entrusted by America's citizens to forge solutions to the major issues facing our time, be they in agriculture, transportation, or areas of national security.

Grant to each an extra measure of wisdom and magnanimity that all might work together for a better future for our great Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CYBERATTACK STANDARDS STUDY ACT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, recent cyber attacks targeting the personal data of Americans make it clear cyber is a new domain of warfare that threatens personal information, financial security, and the physical safety of our citizens. Last week, millions more were affected when the Office of Personnel Management's network was compromised.

This complicated nature of cyber defense means we need a clear standard of measurement for assessing the damage of attacks on our citizens and to affected computer systems and devices. It is for this reason that I have introduced the Cyberattack Standards Study Act today to instruct the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the FBI, and the Secretary of Defense, to define a method of quantifying cyber incidents for the purpose of determining a response.

Recent cyber attacks are a sobering reminder that Congress, all government agencies, and private companies and citizens need to work together to better protect our public and private networks now.

I appreciate the research of legislative director Taylor Andreae and military fellow Major Jacob Barton for their service in providing the ability to establish this legislation.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

SUPPORT THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well, once again, the Republican leadership in Congress is bringing us to the brink, this time by endangering hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs by threatening the Export-Import Bank.

The Export-Import Bank gives American manufacturers the tools that they need to sell U.S. goods overseas. That is direct and real support for American businesses and real jobs for American workers, and it is all at no cost to the taxpayers.

For ideological reasons, this Bank could close by June 30 if Congress does not act. It is more of the same of this sort of reckless brinksmanship and irresponsible behavior that we have seen from the Republican leadership in Congress.

One might ask: Why would you threaten hundreds of thousands of

American jobs just to make an ideological point? If you want to make a point, send a letter; don't threaten the American worker to pursue an extreme ideological agenda.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Let's end the political games. Let's get back to the work we were sent here to do and support the Export-Import Bank and our small businesses and the hard-working Americans that depend upon that.

HONORING DR. RICHARD HELTON

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fellow Hoosier, Dr. Richard Helton, the retiring president of Vincennes University.

Few have exemplified the university's timeless motto, "Learn in order to serve," more clearly than Dr. Helton. Under his dynamic leadership, this 214-year-old institution founded by our ninth President, William Henry Harrison, has become a cutting-edge center for career and technical education that offers students tangible, employable skills and an opportunity for lifelong growth.

Throughout his career, Dr. Helton has maintained a commitment to public education that has positively impacted the lives of countless students. Our State has benefited greatly from his vision and will forever be indebted for his service.

Best wishes to Dick and Cindy Helton in the future ahead.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as of today, we have only 11 more legislative days to act in order to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Reauthorizing the Bank is common sense. Sadly, however, the opponents of the Bank are operating out of ideological fervor, not on facts. We should be here dealing with and solving real problems, not endangering American jobs with fantastical ideology.

The truth of the matter is that the Bank is a vital free market economic engine for our manufacturers, for exporters, and job creators. Last year alone, the Bank financed \$4 billion worth of exports in my home State of Texas, supporting thousands of hard-working Americans.

We cannot and should not let the Bank expire. Let's put an end to this nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I want to vote in our House of Representatives on this issue.

WORLD WAR II VETERAN SERGEANT HARRISON DOYLE

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to talk about one of my heroic constituents, World War II veteran Sergeant Harrison Doyle.

Sergeant Doyle was assigned the task of recreating maps as a cartographer based on the remains of destroyed Nazi maps and aerial photography.

Sergeant Doyle served in three theaters, including the Battle of the Bulge. His contributions were crucial in recreating the topography into maps that were used to win the Battle of the Bulge.

Dedicated caseworkers in my office were able to help him recover lost personnel records. They worked tirelessly to get Sergeant Doyle's personnel records and medals, including the European-African-Middle East Campaign with Bronze Star attachment to give him the recognition he deserves.

I am honored to represent Sergeant Doyle. Helping heroes like him and any constituents being stonewalled by a Federal agency makes this job more meaningful.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1502

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2088) to amend the United States Grain Standards Act to improve in-

spection services performed at export elevators at export port locations, to reauthorize certain authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under such Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2088

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States Grain Standards Act Reauthorization Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT.

(a) POLICY AND PURPOSE OF ACT.—Section 2(b) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 74(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "to both domestic and foreign buyers" and inserting "responsive to the purchase specifications of domestic and foreign buyers";

(2) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (2);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting "; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) to provide an accurate, reliable, consistently available, and cost-effective official grain inspection and weighing system."

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) MAJOR DISASTER DEFINED.—Section 3 of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 75) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(aa) The term 'major disaster' has the meaning given that term in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), except that the term includes a severe weather incident causing a region-wide interruption of government services."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3 of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 75) is further amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (a), by striking "otherwise—" and inserting "otherwise";

(B) by striking "the term" at the beginning of each paragraph (other than paragraphs (n) and (t)) and inserting "The term";

(C) in paragraph (i)—

(i) by striking "Act (the term)" and inserting "Act. The term"; and

(ii) by striking ";"; and inserting a period;

(D) in paragraphs (n) and (t), by striking "the terms" and inserting "The terms";

(E) in paragraph (o)—

(i) by striking "personnel (the term)" and inserting "personnel. The term"; and

(ii) by striking ";"; and inserting a period;

(F) in paragraph (s), by striking "the verb" and inserting "The verb";

(G) in paragraph (x)—

(i) by striking "conveyance (the terms)" and inserting "conveyance. The terms"; and

(ii) by striking "accordingly"; and inserting "accordingly.";

(H) by striking the semicolon at the end of each paragraph (other than paragraphs (i), (o), (x), and (y)) and inserting a period; and

(I) in paragraph (y), by striking "; and" and inserting a period.

(c) OFFICIAL INSPECTION AND WEIGHING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) DISCRETIONARY WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Section 5(a)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 77(a)(1)) is amended in the first proviso by striking "may waive

the foregoing requirement in emergency” and inserting “shall promptly waive the foregoing requirement in the event of an emergency, a major disaster,”.

(2) **WEIGHING REQUIREMENTS AT EXPORT ELEVATORS.**—Section 5(a)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 77(a)(2)) is amended by striking “intracompany shipments of grain into an export elevator by any mode of transportation, grain transferred into an export elevator by transportation modes other than barge,” and inserting “shipments of grain into an export elevator by any mode of transportation”.

(d) **DELEGATION OF OFFICIAL INSPECTION AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZED INSPECTION PERSONNEL AT EXPORT ELEVATORS AT EXPORT PORT LOCATIONS.**—Paragraph (1) of section 7(e) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection, the Secretary shall cause official inspection at export elevators at export port locations, for all grain required or authorized to be inspected by this Act, to be performed—

“(A) by official inspection personnel employed by the Secretary; or

“(B) by other persons under contract with the Secretary as provided in section 8 of this Act.”.

(2) **DELEGATION TO STATE AGENCIES.**—Section 7(e) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “, meets the criteria” and all that follows through “the Secretary may delegate” and inserting “and meets the criteria specified in subsection (f)(1)(A) of this section, the Secretary may delegate”;

(ii) by striking “at export port locations within the State, including export port locations” and inserting “at export elevators at export port locations within the State, including at export elevators at export port locations”; and

(iii) in the last sentence, by striking “Any such delegation” and inserting “The delegation under this paragraph of authority to conduct official inspection services shall be for a term not to exceed five years, and may be renewed thereafter in accordance with this subsection, except that any such delegation”;

(B) by transferring paragraph (4) to the end of subsection (f), redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (5), and, in such paragraph, by striking “or subsection (f)” and inserting “or subsection (e)”; and

(C) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(3) Prior to delegating authority to a State agency for the performance of official inspection services at export elevators at export port locations pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Secretary shall comply with the following:

“(A) Upon receipt of an application from a State agency requesting the delegation of authority to perform official inspection services on behalf of the Secretary, publish notice of the application in the Federal Register and provide a minimum 30-day comment period on the application.

“(B) Evaluate the comments received under subparagraph (A) with respect to an application and conduct an investigation to determine whether the State agency that submitted the application and its personnel are qualified to perform official inspection services on behalf of the Secretary. In conducting the investigation, the Secretary shall consult with, and review the available

files of the Department of Justice, the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture, and the Government Accountability Office.

“(C) Make findings based on the results of the investigation and consideration of public comments received.

“(D) Publish a notice in the Federal Register announcing whether the State agency has been delegated the authority to perform official inspection services at export elevators at export port locations on behalf of the Secretary, and the basis upon which the Secretary has made the decision.

“(4)(A) Except in the case of a major disaster, if a State agency that has been delegated the authority to perform official inspection services at export elevators at export port locations on behalf of the Secretary fails to perform such official services, the Secretary shall submit to Congress, within 90 days after the first day on which inspection services were not performed by the delegated State agency, a report containing—

“(i) the reasons for the State agency’s failure; and

“(ii) the rationale as to whether or not the Secretary will permit the State agency to retain its delegated authority.

“(B) A State agency may request that the delegation of inspection authority to the agency be canceled by providing written notice to the Secretary at least 90 days in advance of the requested cancellation date.

“(C) If a State agency that has been delegated the authority under paragraph (2) of this subsection to perform official inspection services at an export elevator at an export port location on behalf of the Secretary intends to temporarily discontinue such official inspection services or weighing services for any reason, except in the case of a major disaster, the State agency shall notify the Secretary in writing of its intention to do so at least 72 hours in advance of the discontinuation date. The receipt of such prior notice shall be considered by the Secretary as a mitigating factor in determining whether to maintain or revoke the delegation of authority to the State agency.”.

(3) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—(A) Section 7(f)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(f)(1)) is amended by striking “other than at export port locations” and inserting “(other than at an export elevator at an export port location)”.

(B) Section 16(d) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 87e(d)) is amended by striking “The Office of Investigation of the Department of Agriculture (or such other organization or agency within the Department of Agriculture which may be delegated the authority, in lieu thereof, to conduct investigations on behalf of the Department of Agriculture)” and inserting “The Office of Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture”.

(4) **EVALUATION OF CURRENT DELEGATIONS.**—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall complete a review of each State agency that, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, has been delegated inspection authority under section 7(e) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(e)) and determine if the State agency is qualified to continue to perform official inspection services at export elevators at export port locations on behalf of the Secretary under such section, as amended by this subsection. The Secretary shall conduct the review subject to the requirements of section 7(e) of the United States Grain

Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(e)), as amended by this subsection, and a State agency determined to be qualified to continue to perform such official inspection services shall be subject thereafter to such requirements.

(e) **CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS.**—Section 7(e) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(e)) is further amended by inserting after paragraph (4), as added by subsection (d), the following new paragraphs:

“(5) Except in the case of a major disaster, the Secretary shall cause official inspections at an export elevator at an export port location—

“(A) to be performed without interruption by official inspection personnel employed by the Secretary or by a State agency delegated such authority under paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

“(B) if interrupted, to be resumed at the export elevator by utilizing official inspection personnel employed by the Secretary or by another delegated State agency as provided under paragraph (2) of this subsection as follows:

“(i) Within six hours after the interruption, if the interruption is caused by a State agency delegated such authority under this subsection and the Secretary received advance notice of the interruption pursuant to paragraph (4)(C) of this subsection.

“(ii) Within 12 hours after the interruption, if the State agency failed to provide the required advance notice of the interruption.

“(6)(A) If the Secretary is unable to restore official inspection services within the applicable time period required by paragraph (5)(B) of this subsection, the interested person requesting such services at the export elevator at an export port location shall be authorized to utilize official inspection personnel, as provided under section 8 of the Act, employed by another State agency delegated authority under paragraph (2) of this subsection or designated under subsection (f)(1) of this section.

“(B) A delegated or designated State agency providing inspection services under subparagraph (A) may, at its discretion, provide such services for a period of up to 90 days from the date on which the services are initiated, after which time the Secretary may restore official inspection services using official inspection personnel employed by the Secretary or a State agency delegated such authority under this subsection, if available. The State agency shall notify the Secretary in writing of its intention to discontinue inspection services under subparagraph (A) at least 72 hours in advance of the discontinuation date.

“(7) Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall make available to the public, including pursuant to a website maintained by the Secretary, a list of all delegated States and all official agencies authorized to perform official inspections on behalf of the Secretary. This list shall include the name, contact information, and category of authority granted. The Secretary shall update the list at least semiannually.”.

(f) **GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES FOR OFFICIAL AGENCIES.**—

(1) **OFFICIAL INSPECTION AUTHORITY.**—Section 7(f)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(f)(2)) is amended by striking “the Secretary may” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: “the Secretary shall allow a designated official agency to cross boundary lines to carry out inspections in another geographic area if—

“(A) the current designated official agency for that geographic area is unable to provide inspection services in a timely manner;

“(B) a person requesting inspection services in that geographic area requests a probe inspection on a barge-lot basis; or

“(C) the current official agency for that geographic area agrees in writing with the adjacent official agency to waive the current geographic area restriction at the request of the applicant for service.”.

(2) **WEIGHING AUTHORITY.**—Section 7A(i)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79a(i)(2)) is amended by striking “the Secretary may” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: “the Secretary shall allow a designated official agency to cross boundary lines to carry out weighing in another geographic area if—

“(A) the current designated official agency for that geographic area is unable to provide weighing services in a timely manner; or

“(B) the current official agency for that geographic area agrees in writing with the adjacent official agency to waive the current geographic area restriction at the request of the applicant for service.”.

(g) **DURATION OF DESIGNATIONS OF OFFICIAL AGENCIES.**—Section 7(g)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(g)(1)) is amended by striking “triennially” and inserting “every five years”.

(h) **INSPECTION FEES.**—

(1) **COLLECTION AND AMOUNTS.**—Section 7(j)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(j)(1)) is amended—

(A) by inserting “(A)” after “(1)”;

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) For official inspections and weighing at an export elevator at an export port location performed by the Secretary, performed by a State agency delegated the authority to perform official inspection services at the export elevator on behalf of the Secretary, or performed by a State agency utilized as authorized by subsection (e)(6)(A), the portion of the fees based upon export tonnage shall be based upon a rolling five-year average of export tonnage volumes. In order to maintain an operating reserve of between three to six months, the Secretary shall adjust such fees at least annually.”.

(2) **DURATION OF AUTHORITY.**—Section 7(j)(4) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(j)(4)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2020”.

(i) **OFFICIAL WEIGHING OR SUPERVISION AT LOCATIONS WHERE OFFICIAL INSPECTION IS PROVIDED OTHER THAN BY THE SECRETARY.**—Section 7A(c)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79a(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “with respect to export port locations” and inserting “with respect to an export elevator at an export port location”; and

(2) in the last sentence by striking “subsection (g) of section 7” and inserting “subsection (e) and (g) of section 7”.

(j) **COLLECTION OF FEES FOR WEIGHING SERVICES.**—Section 7A(l)(3) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79a(l)(2)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2020”.

(k) **LIMITATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY COSTS.**—Section 7D of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79d) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(l) **ISSUANCE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **DURATION.**—Section 8(b) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 84(b)) is amended by striking “triennially” and inserting “every five years”.

(2) **PERSONS WHO MAY BE HIRED AS OFFICIAL INSPECTION PERSONNEL.**—Section 8(e) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 84(e)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(on the date of enactment of the United States Grain Standards Act of 1976)”;

(B) by striking “the United States Grain Standards Act” and inserting “this Act”; and

(C) by striking “, on the date of enactment of the United States Grain Standards Act of 1976, was performing” and inserting “performs”.

(m) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 19 of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 87h) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(n) **EXPIRATION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—Section 21(e) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 87j(e)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2020”.

(o) **TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.**—Section 17B(b) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 87f-2(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “notwithstanding the provisions of section 812 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, as added by the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c-3)” and inserting “notwithstanding section 602 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5712)”;

(2) by striking “or the Secretary”.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and rise today in support of H.R. 2088, the United States Grain Standards Act Reauthorization Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly 100 years, the United States Grain Standards Act has been the cornerstone of the vibrant grain trade, both domestically and internationally. This law is relied upon not only by exporters and domestic shippers but the entire U.S. agricultural sector.

The law establishes official marketing standards and procedures for the inspection and weighing of grains and oilseeds, and I would like to underscore the importance this law has played in establishing value and price-discovery in the grain and oilseed marketplace.

Many of the provisions in this current law are set to expire on September 30 of this year. A lapse in authorization would disrupt export weighing and grading services, imposing heavy bur-

dens on farmers, merchants, traders, inspectors and, ultimately, consumers. We should not delay in passing this reauthorization.

I cannot emphasize enough: it is imperative that these inspections and weighing services are provided in a reliable, uninterrupted, consistent, and cost-effective manner. To ensure that we fulfill this obligation, we must provide a safeguard to ensure we avoid disruptions in service like the one that took place last year in Washington State.

The Washington State Department of Agriculture currently provides inspection and weighing services for grain intended for export at the Port of Vancouver. USDA's Federal Grain Inspection Service has delegated this responsibility to the Washington State Department of Agriculture. In the event that the Washington State Department of Agriculture cannot provide services for any reason, then the Federal Government, through FGIS inspectors, are statutorily required to step in and resume inspection and weighing services.

That is not what happened last summer. Amid an ongoing labor dispute, WSDA discontinued services. In statements issued at the time, WSDA, the State-based program, acknowledged they withheld inspection services because of their belief that “the continued provision of inspection services appears to be unhelpful in leading to a foreseeable resolution” of the labor dispute.

Instead of fulfilling their statutory obligation, the leadership of the USDA politicized this situation when the agency also declined to fulfill its statutory responsibility to resume inspection and grain and weighing services. Services were eventually restored, but not before significant costs accrued to all parties involved.

We have worked hard to gain access to overseas markets. We are shooting ourselves in the foot when we cannot ship our products to these markets because State and Federal agencies are unable or unwilling to comply with their obligations. The inability to ship our grain because there are no inspectors at a facility does a disservice to our farmers, and it harms our economy.

To address this situation, we could have been punitive. In fact, there were some who would have preferred that we do just that. But that is not what we have done and had no interest in doing. We simply want a safeguard mechanism to avoid this situation being repeated.

To do that, we worked with the State of Washington delegation, the Washington State Department of Agriculture, labor unions, the grain trade industry, and USDA. What we developed was a bipartisan consensus on a workable safeguard provision.

I am pleased with this work product, and I appreciate the help and support

of Ranking Member PETERSON, Subcommittee Chairman CRAWFORD, and Subcommittee Ranking Member WALZ, as well as Representatives from Washington State, both on and off the committee, for their advice and counsel as we developed this legislation.

H.R. 2088 provides a certainty to American agriculture, and I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I, too, rise in support of the U.S. Grain Standards Act Reauthorization Act, H.R. 2088.

I would like to, first of all, thank the chairmen of the full committee and of the subcommittee, both of whom provided great leadership, provided the necessary space to get all parties together, and then provided for a final product that meets all of the necessary requirements that you heard the chairman talk about.

I think it is well known that U.S. grain producers produce the highest quality grain in the world. It is the inspections of them, the gold standard of assuring that quality, backed by the Federal Government, that allows us to continue this trade. I think no one here wants to see any interruption to that service. No one here wants to see any lowering of the quality that we have.

So this piece of legislation, I think, in the best tradition of the Agriculture Committee and this House, was a true, bipartisan compromise. It was working to find working solutions that made those things happen, and I would urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

This is how we are supposed to do business. This honors those producers of our grain and makes sure that business and capital flow correctly, and it makes sure that there are standards in place to ensure that our buyers of U.S. grain know that they are getting the world's highest quality product.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this and certainly want to thank the ranking member of the full committee as well and my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, who serves as the ranking member on our subcommittee.

This is a great piece of bipartisan legislation. As has been noted here, this is about 100 years since this has been signed into law, and the grain trade has thrived over that century. GSA has supported its evolution by providing a backbone of stability relied upon by exporters, shippers, farmers, and, of course, consumers.

With the farm economy and so many of our constituents relying on the ability of grain and oilseeds to get to market, it is critical that we act to provide stability for the grain trade, like we are doing here today.

This legislation accomplishes that goal in the following two ways. Many of the provisions in current law are set to expire on September 30 of this year. A lapse in that authorization would disrupt the current grain inspections process; therefore, Congress should not delay in passing its reauthorization. The House is getting its job done well ahead of schedule by considering this bill today, and I hope my colleagues in the Senate will act soon as well.

Secondly, this legislation provides stability by ensuring we can avoid disruptions like that which took place last year in Washington State, which was alluded to earlier by the chairman. Last summer, the Washington State Department of Agriculture discontinued its export inspections amid an ongoing labor dispute. Since labor disputes do happen from time to time, this kind of situation was anticipated by our predecessors, which is why current law provides a mechanism for USDA to step in and provide inspection services in the event of a disruption.

However, the dispute devolved into a political situation in which the Secretary of Agriculture declined to use his discretionary authority to maintain inspections. While inspection services were eventually restored, it is critical we avoid a repeat of that unfortunate decision.

Fortunately, the Agriculture Committee arrived at a bipartisan consensus and found a way to avoid any future disruptions to the grain trade by giving the industry more control of its own destiny.

I urge support from my colleagues for this vital legislation. I thank the committee for all of its hard work to move this bill forward.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, again, I have no further speakers on my side. I can't stress enough my thanks for working this out. It was, at times, a somewhat delicate situation, but leadership from my friends on the Republican side, bringing in folks, all engaged parties in this, helped us find a great compromise.

I, too, would urge our colleagues in the Senate to take up this piece of legislation, move it forward, and give certainty to those producers who feed, clothe, and power the world. I urge our colleagues here, let's just pass this thing and get further work done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues' comments, both the ranking member as well as the chairman of the subcommittee. We did work in a bipar-

tisan manner. We worked out the differences of the bill, came up with a good work product. It is worthy of the system.

I would like to, again, emphasize, as my colleague from Arkansas did, we are actually getting this done ahead of time. These rules aren't out-of-date yet. And so I would encourage my colleagues in the Senate to follow our example and get it done quickly so we can get this to the President's desk. I urge support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2088, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANDATORY PRICE REPORTING ACT OF 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2051) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2051

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF LIVESTOCK MANDATORY REPORTING.

(a) *EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.*—Section 260 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1636i) is amended by striking "September 30, 2015" and inserting "September 30, 2020".

(b) *EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.*—Section 212(12)(C) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635a(12)(C)) is amended by inserting "including any day on which any Department employee is on shutdown or emergency furlough as a result of a lapse in appropriations" after "conduct business".

(c) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—Section 942 of the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999 (7 U.S.C. 1635 note; Public Law 106-78) is amended by striking "September 30, 2015" and inserting "September 30, 2020".

SEC. 3. SWINE REPORTING.

(a) *DEFINITIONS.*—Section 231 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635i) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (22) as paragraphs (10) through (23), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

"(9) *NEGOTIATED FORMULA PURCHASE.*—The term 'negotiated formula purchase' means a purchase of swine by a packer from a producer under which—

“(A) the pricing mechanism is a formula price for which the formula is determined by negotiation on a lot-by-lot basis; and

“(B) the swine are scheduled for delivery to the packer not later than 14 days after the date on which the formula is negotiated and swine are committed to the packer.”;

(3) in paragraph (12)(A) (as so redesignated), by inserting “negotiated formula purchase,” after “pork market formula purchase,”; and

(4) in paragraph (23) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) a negotiated formula purchase; and”.

(b) **DAILY REPORTING.**—Section 232(c) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635)(c) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

“(ii) **PRICE DISTRIBUTIONS.**—The information published by the Secretary under clause (i) shall include—

“(I) a distribution of net prices in the range between and including the lowest net price and the highest net price reported;

“(II) a delineation of the number of barrows and gilts at each reported price level or, at the option of the Secretary, the number of barrows and gilts within each of a series of reasonable price bands within the range of prices; and

“(III) the total number and weighted average price of barrows and gilts purchased through negotiated purchases and negotiated formula purchases.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) **LATE IN THE DAY REPORT INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall include in the morning report and the afternoon report for the following day any information required to be reported under subparagraph (A) that is obtained after the time of the reporting day specified in such subparagraph.”.

SEC. 4. LAMB REPORTING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise section 59.300 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, so that—

(1) the definition of the term “importer”—

(A) includes only those importers that imported an average of 1,000 metric tons of lamb meat products per year during the immediately preceding 4 calendar years; and

(B) may include any person that does not meet the requirement referred to in subparagraph (A), if the Secretary determines that the person should be considered an importer based on their volume of lamb imports; and

(2) the definition of the term “packer”—

(A) applies to any entity with 50 percent or more ownership in a facility;

(B) includes a federally inspected lamb processing plant which slaughtered or processed the equivalent of an average of 35,000 head of lambs per year during the immediately preceding 5 calendar years; and

(C) may include any other lamb processing plant that did not meet the requirement referred to in subparagraph (B), if the Secretary determines that the processing plant should be considered a packer after considering its capacity.

SEC. 5. STUDY ON LIVESTOCK MANDATORY REPORTING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Agricultural Marketing Service in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Economist and in consultation with cattle, swine, and lamb producers, packers, and other market participants, shall conduct a study on the program of information regarding the

marketing of cattle, swine, lambs, and products of such livestock under subtitle B of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635 et seq.). Such study shall—

(1) analyze current marketing practices in the cattle, swine, and lamb markets;

(2) identify legislative or regulatory recommendations made by cattle, swine, and lamb producers, packers, and other market participants to ensure that information provided under such program—

(A) can be readily understood by producers, packers, and other market participants;

(B) reflects current marketing practices; and

(C) is relevant and useful to producers, packers, and other market participants;

(3) analyze the price and supply information reporting services of the Department of Agriculture related to cattle, swine, and lamb; and

(4) address any other issues that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than January 1, 2020, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2051, the Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2015.

I want to begin by thanking my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee, Ranking Member PETERSON and Congressman ROUZER, for joining me in introducing this legislation. I am especially appreciative of Mr. ROUZER's work as subcommittee chairman in holding a hearing to foster discussions that led to this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2051 is a bill to reauthorize the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999. This bill, like the underlying act and each subsequent reauthorization, has been the result of dialogue and consensus between livestock producers and other industry participants.

I would like to extend my gratitude to our Nation's livestock producers, capably represented by their trade associations—the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, the National Pork Producers Council, and the American Sheep Industry Association—for their hard work and dedication on this effort.

We fully understand that government mandates, like price reporting, can be

onerous, and that not all industry participants may fully embrace this program.

That said, it is apparent that over the preceding 16 years, mandatory reporting has become an essential tool that allows for greater transparency and price discovery within the livestock industry, especially as the industry continues to evolve.

This reauthorization contains a number of industry-specific modifications proposed by the pork producers and sheep producers. We, likewise, include a provision that responds generally to industry concern regarding USDA's arbitrary decision to shut this mandatory program down for several days during the lapse in appropriations that occurred in 2013, while other mandatory programs were deemed essential.

Following extensive negotiations, the cattlemen have opted to support a simple reauthorization without any statutory modifications. I appreciate their hard work and look forward to continuing to work with them on future improvements that they may choose to pursue.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple, bipartisan reauthorization that represents consensus among industry participants. I urge Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I would say let's hope that what you see is a pattern developing here: smart, bipartisan legislation passed in a timely fashion to make sure this country's business goes on uninterrupted.

You heard it from the chairman, these programs are important for producers, who rely on access to transparent, accurate, and timely market information. The bill makes an important change to mandatory price reporting by making it an “essential” government program.

As you also heard, the 2013 government shutdown disrupted price reporting. This designation will ensure that, if we ever find ourselves in that situation again, price reporting will continue on. This is the very least we can do for the hard-working folks who are out there. It gives our producers the certainty that it will be there. It is the right thing to do. Again, it is smart; it is bipartisan; it is timely. And I would urge my colleagues not only to support this, but to make this a habit in much of what we do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his good and hard work on this important piece of legislation.

As chairman of the Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee in which the Mandatory Price Reporting Act originated, I too want to thank the stakeholders for their hard work in coming together on the provisions of this bill.

Mandatory price reporting was developed in response to changing markets, with an increasing number of animals being sold with little information publicly accessible. As these structural changes continued, livestock producers requested that price reporting be made mandatory.

Even today, livestock markets are continuing to evolve, and it was the goal and intent of the committee to bring all parties together to strike a balance that promotes fairness, transparency, and stability in the market. No one knows how to make this process work better than those directly involved, and I appreciate the willingness of these stakeholders to work together with the committee to craft this legislation.

I also look forward to working with our Senate colleagues to continue the tradition of a healthy dialogue between both Chambers of Congress, producers, and packers on this reauthorization so that we can make sure that the requested modifications are executed as smoothly as possible.

In closing, I would like to again thank Chairman CONAWAY, Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON, and the committee staff for their tremendous help and guidance.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to my colleagues, and I appreciate their support.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I too want to thank my colleagues across the aisle as well as colleagues on the committee with me, but I also was remiss earlier in not thanking the dedicated staff of the Ag Committee that worked on the grain standards bill and the group that has worked on this one as well.

We are blessed. Our country is blessed to have dedicated professionals on both sides of the aisle and the committee staff who do a great job working together, trying to avoid the kind of partisanship that sometimes permeates this body.

Again, I rise in support of this mandatory price reporting reauthorization. I will remind my colleagues that this does not expire until September 30 of this year. We are actually ahead of the curve and would commend this process to the House on other important issues like that. I ask my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2051, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2394) to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2394

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Forest Foundation Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MATCHING FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROJECT EXPENSES.—Section 405(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j–3(b)) is amended by striking “for a period of five years beginning October 1, 1992” and inserting “during fiscal years 2016 through 2018”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 410(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j–8(b)) is amended by striking “during the five-year period” and all that follows through “\$1,000,000 annually” and inserting “there are authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018”.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) AGENT.—Section 404(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j–2(b)) is amended by striking “under this paragraph” and inserting “by subsection (a)(4)”.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 407(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j–5(b)) is amended by striking the comma after “The Foundation shall”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2394, the National Forest Foundation Reauthorization Act of 2015.

The National Forest Foundation has a simple mission: bring people together to restore and enhance our national forests and grasslands. Through the foundation, we are able to leverage private and Federal dollars to support our Nation's great forests in a variety of ways. These include: planting trees, preserving wildlife habitat, surveying streams, restoring and maintaining trails, and the list goes on.

In recent years, the foundation has leveraged funds at over a four to one ratio and plans to continue on this success to raise at least \$125 million for forest restoration activities.

Since its charter in 1993, the foundation has been essential in helping to meet the challenges the National Forest System faces. Accomplishments include: over 14,000 miles of trail restored or maintained; nearly 4.4 million trees and shrubs planted; more than 500,000 acres of fuel reduction completed or planned; over 120,000 people volunteered more than 1.5 million hours with an estimated value of \$34 million; over 46,000 youth employed or engaged; approximately 80,000 acres of invasive weeds treated; over 117,000 acres of wildlife habitat restored or maintained; and more than 3,000 miles of streams surveyed or restored.

The foundation has also taken it upon itself to educate and engage the American public on the importance of our national forests as well as the natural resources found within them. It is an integral component in keeping our national forests—such as the Allegheny national forest, in my district, and dozens of other national forests around the country—viable and thriving for years to come.

Simply put, the National Forest Foundation works, and this is a commonsense reauthorization. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his work on this legislation and also for his work and dedication on the Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee, which we lead together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. The National Forest Foundation Reauthorization Act will allow the public-private partnership responsible for the stewardship and management of our national forests and grasslands to continue.

This legislation would reauthorize the National Forest Foundation's matching funds program. This important program brings non-Federal partners and stakeholders together to keep our forests healthy and less prone to fire. In practice, this has generated more than \$4 for our forests for every Federal dollar invested.

I have seen the benefits of this program in my own district. Since 2010, the New Mexico Wilderness Alliance has received grants from the National Forest Foundation to assist the Forest Service in conducting surveys and data collection on the wilderness areas within the New Mexico national forests. This data has helped the Forest Service combat invasive species and improve forest health in the Cibola, Carson, and Santa Fe National Forests.

Our national forests are in dire need of this type of management and restoration in order to maintain valuable ecosystems and prevent devastating and costly wildfires.

New Mexico, like many other States in the Southwest, has been experiencing severe drought; and, as a result, we have had record-breaking fires that have burned hundreds of thousands of acres and have caused millions of dollars in damage.

While we have seen some recent improvements, long-term projections indicate that drought conditions will worsen and spread to more States across the country. We must ensure that this program, which prevents costly and, oftentimes, irreparable damage to communities, personal property, and wildlife habitat, receives continued support. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the ranking member for her leadership and support on this bill and, quite frankly, on everything we do as a part of our Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers on this bill. I urge all Members to join me in support of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we vote on the bipartisan bill, H.R. 2394, in the House today, I would like to acknowledge the positive impact that our National Forest System has had in my home state of Michigan and throughout our great nation. Comprised of the United States Forest Service and the non-profit National Forest Foundation, our National Forest system encompasses 193 million acres of wilderness. These forests nourish a variety of animal and plant species, provide a wide array of recreational opportunities, and pump \$13.5 billion annually into the U.S. economy.

I am encouraged to see the bipartisan consensus around preserving our forests. In Michigan, the work done by the National Forest System has helped preserve two different habitats. In the Hiawatha National Forest on Michigan's Upper Peninsula, workers helped plant more than 96,000 White Pine, Northern Red Oak and Hemlock trees to replenish the disappearing forest in 2012. Additionally, the national forest system helped lead a coalition to repair the disappearing habitat of the Kirtland's Warbler. In 2011, Forest workers planted 180,000 Jack Pine seedlings to help re-populate that species of tree, which is re-

quired for the Warbler to produce its offspring. Now, thanks to their efforts, the Kirtland's Warbler population is much more robust within the Huron and Manistee National Forests.

The important contributions made by the National Forest Foundation must not be overlooked, and I wholeheartedly support the program's reauthorization. Our forests are an incredible economic, environmental, and recreational resource for our country. We must remain steadfast and continue the work of preserving these forests and all of the majestic wonders contained within them for not only those alive today, but for all future generations of Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2394, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2289.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2289.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1526

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

I want to start by thanking Chairman AUSTIN SCOTT and Ranking Member DAVID SCOTT of the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee. They have done a tremendous job over the past few months working on these issues. They have held three hearings on reauthorization, listening to testimony from end users, financial intermediaries, and even the commissioners themselves. Without their work, we would not have been able to move this bill today.

H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, does exactly what the name suggests: it provides relief from unnecessary red tape for the businesses that "make things" in our country.

End users are the businesses that provide Americans with food, clothing, transportation, electricity, heat, and much, much more. Companies that produce, consume, and transport the commodities that make modern life possible use futures and swaps markets to reduce the uncertainties that their businesses face. Farmers hedge their crops in the spring so that they know what price they will get paid in the fall. Utilities hedge the price of energy so they can charge customers at a steady rate. Manufacturers hedge the cost of steel, energy, and other inputs to lock in prices as they work to fill their orders.

The fact is, no end user played any part in the financial crisis of 2008, and no end user poses a systemic risk to U.S. derivatives markets. Yet, as the Agriculture Committee heard in countless hours of testimony, it is now more difficult and more expensive for farmers, ranchers, processors, manufacturers, merchandisers, and other end users to manage their risks than it was 5 years ago.

To address their concerns, H.R. 2289 makes targeted reforms to the Commodity Exchange Act that fall into three broad categories: consumer protections, commission reforms, and end-user relief.

Title I of the bill protects customers and the margin funds they deposit at their FCMs by codifying critical changes made in the wake of the collapse and bankruptcy of both MF Global and Peregrine Financial.

Title II makes meaningful reforms to the operations of the Commission to improve the agency's deliberative process. In doing so, it also requires the Commission to conduct more robust cost-benefit analysis to help get future rulemakings right the first time and to avoid the endless cycle of re-proposing and delaying unworkable rules.

Finally, title III fixes numerous problems faced directly by end users who

rely on derivatives markets. From unnecessary recordkeeping burdens, to improperly categorizing physical transactions as swaps, to narrowing the bona fide hedge definition, CFTC rules have discouraged exactly the kind of prudent risk management activities Congress intended to protect with the end-users exemptions in the Dodd-Frank bill.

These regulatory burdens present challenges to American businesses and will cost them significant capital to comply with, unless Congress acts to provide the relief.

Title VII of Dodd-Frank sought to require that most swaps, one, be executed on an electronic exchange to ensure price transparency; two, be subject to initial and variation margin and central clearing through the lifetime of the transaction, to ensure performance on the obligation for counterparties; and, last, to be reported to a central repository to ensure that regulators have an accurate picture of the entire marketplace at any one point in time.

□ 1530

H.R. 2289 does not roll back a single core tenet of title VII. It does not change the execution, clearing, margining, and reporting framework set up by the act. In fact, not a single witness who appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture ever asked us to upend these principles. But what they did ask for were fixes to portions of the statute that didn't work as intended, to provide more flexibility in complying with the rules when they impaired end users' ability to hedge, and to bring more certainty to the Commission and how it operates. That is exactly what H.R. 2289 provides.

Similar to the CFTC reauthorization bill passed by the House with overwhelming bipartisan support last Congress, the Commodity End-User Relief Act makes narrowly targeted changes to the Commodity Exchange Act. This legislation offers meaningful improvements for market participants without undermining the basic tenets of title VII. I am proud that the committee has again put together a bill that has earned the bipartisan support of our members because it provides the right relief to the right people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

JUNE 8, 2015.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned organizations represent a very broad cross-section of U.S. production agriculture and agribusiness. We urge you to cast an affirmative vote on H.R. 2289, the "Commodity End-User Relief Act," when it moves to the floor for consideration.

This legislation contains a number of important provisions for agricultural and agribusiness hedgers who use futures and swaps to manage their business and production risks. Some, but certainly not all, of the bill's important provisions include:

Sections 101-103—Codify important customer protections to help prevent another MF Global situation.

Section 104—Provides a permanent solution to the residual interest problem that would have put more customer funds at risk—and potentially driven farmers, ranchers and small hedgers out of futures markets—by forcing pre-margining of their hedge accounts.

Section 308—Relief from burdensome and technologically infeasible recordkeeping requirements in commodity markets.

Section 310—Requires the CFTC to conduct a study and issue a rule before reducing the de minimis threshold for swap dealer registration in order to make sure that doing so would not harm market liquidity and end-user access to markets.

Section 313—Confirms the intent of Dodd-Frank that anticipatory hedging is considered bona fide hedging activity.

Thank you in advance for your support of this bill that is so important to U.S. farmers, ranchers, hedgers and futures customers.

Sincerely,

Agribusiness Association of Iowa; Agribusiness Council of Indiana/Indiana Grain and Feed Association; American Cotton Shippers Association; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Feed Industry Association; American Soybean Association; Commodity Markets Council; Grain and Feed Association of Illinois; Kansas Grain and Feed Association; Michigan Agri-Business Association; Michigan Bean Shippers Association; Minnesota Grain and Feed Association; Missouri Agribusiness Association; National Cattlemen's Beef Association; National Corn Growers Association; National Cotton Council; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Grain and Feed Association; National Pork Producers Council; Nebraska Grain and Feed Association; North American Export Grain Association; North Dakota Grain Dealers Association; Northeast Agribusiness and Feed Alliance; Ohio Agribusiness Association; Oklahoma Grain and Feed Association; Pacific Northwest Grain and Feed Association; Rocky Mountain Agribusiness Association; Southeast Minnesota Grain and Feed Dealers Association; South Dakota Grain and Feed Association; Tennessee Feed and Grain Association; Texas Grain and Feed Association; USA Rice Federation; Wisconsin Agribusiness Association.

JUNE 5, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the largest manufacturing association in the United States representing manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states, supports provisions in the Commodity End User Relief Act (H.R. 2289), to clarify that non-financial companies, like manufacturers, that use derivatives to manage business risk will not be subject to onerous and harmful regulatory requirements.

Manufacturers use derivatives to manage and mitigate against fluctuations in commodity prices and currency and interest rates. The NAM worked to include provisions in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (P.L. 111-203) to protect manufacturers' use of over-the-counter derivatives. We continue to work to

ensure that, as Dodd-Frank is implemented, end-users do not face undue burdens. Imposing unnecessary regulation on end-users would limit their ability to use these important risk management tools, increasing costs and negatively impacting business investment, U.S. competitiveness and job growth.

Provisions included in H.R. 2289 would ensure that non-financial end-users trading through a centralized treasury unit ("CTU") are covered by the end-user clearing exemption provided by the Dodd-Frank Act. Without the clarification on CTUs, non-financial end-users may be swept into costly clearing requirements meant for financial entities, simply because they use a CTU to manage internal and external trading to mitigate risk within a corporate entity—an industry "best practice".

The CFTC reauthorization also includes an NAM-supported provision that requires the CFTC to take an affirmative action before lowering the swap dealer de minimis threshold. Without this provision, the de minimis level of swap dealing automatically drops from the \$8 billion to \$3 billion in the near future, sweeping some manufacturers into bank-like regulatory requirements.

Almost five years after the enactment of Dodd-Frank, implementation of the Act is well underway and deadlines for compliance with various regulations are looming. End-users remain extremely concerned about the lack of clarity on the CTU issue and the automatic drop in the de minimis threshold for swap dealing among other issues. Thank you in advance for supporting provisions in H.R. 2289 to ensure that derivatives regulation is focused on needed areas, and not on imposing unnecessary regulatory burdens on manufacturers.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY COLEMAN.

MAY 11, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

Hon. COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Agri-
culture, Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY AND RANKING MEMBER PETERSON: As the House prepares to vote on and reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) oversight of the futures and swaps markets, the National Corn Growers Association (NCGA) and the Natural Gas Supply Association (NGSA) wish to express support for the end user provisions in the CFTC reauthorization bill which will help to ensure that corn and natural gas markets are able to function efficiently.

Specifically, NCGA and NGSA support the provision which will provide relief for end-users using physical contracts with volumetric optionality and ensure that non-financial, physical energy delivery agreements are not regulated as swaps.

Founded in 1957, NCGA represents more than 40,000 dues-paying corn farmers nationwide. NCGA and its 48 affiliated state organizations work together to create and increase opportunities for their members and their industry.

Established in 1965, NGSA encourages the use of natural gas within a balanced national energy policy, and promotes the benefits of competitive markets, thus encouraging increased supply and the reliable and efficient delivery of natural gas to U.S. customers.

Because of the potential for the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer

JUNE 2, 2015.

Protection Act of 2010 (the Dodd-Frank Act or the Act) to impede what are and have been healthy, competitive, and resilient corn and natural gas markets, NCGA and NGSA played an active role in the shaping of the Act during its passage and have continued this role in ensuring the Act's successful implementation by the CFTC.

The CEA as amended by the Dodd-Frank Act excludes forward contracts and includes options in commodities in the definition of "swap." This raises the practical question of how to treat forward contracts containing terms that provide for some form of flexibility in delivered volumes, i.e., "embedded optionality."

Flexibility in the terms of physical commodity forward contracts is essential in everyday commerce given the commercial uncertainties that exist in commodity delivery and receipt. One important form of such flexibility involves the volumes to be transacted in a forward contract. This flexibility is necessary because parties cannot always accurately predict the required or optimal amounts of physical commodities to meet their business needs and objectives. The CFTC refers to this flexibility as "volumetric optionality" and has formulated rules that suggest that the CFTC will regulate forward contracts with such "optionality" as swaps.

Volumetric optionality is a contractual tool used in the physical commodity industry to "right size" physical delivery. The ability to appropriately size a physical commodity delivery via a contractual tool facilitates market efficiency because it allows commercial market participants to adjust delivery volumes seamlessly in response to changes in supply and demand requirements at the time of delivery. Volumetric optionality is a delivery tool that mitigates the uncertainty inherent in any physical commodity contract, making both parties aware of potential delivery variability embedded within the intent to deliver. Thus, volumetric optionality in a physical forward contract allows commercial uncertainties to be accommodated up front, providing a process for orderly physical delivery and settlement even in the absence of precision in the delivery volume. Importantly, the intent to physically deliver remains despite the variability in final delivery terms.

In August of 2012, the CFTC issued the final rule further defining the term "swap," Final Rule, Further Definition of "Swap," et al., 77 Fed. Reg. 48, 208 (August 13, 2012) (Swap Definition Final Rule or Final Rule). As part of the definition of swap, the Final Rule provides an interpretation that an agreement, contract or transaction with embedded optionality falls within the forward exclusion when seven criteria are met. The seventh criterion or element requires that:

7. The exercise or non-exercise of the embedded volumetric optionality is based primarily on physical factors, or regulatory requirements, that are outside the control of the parties and are influencing demand for, or supply of, the nonfinancial commodity.

In the Final Rule, the Commission specifically requested comments on whether this seventh element is necessary, appropriate and sufficiently clear and unambiguous. On October 12, 2012, NCGA and NGSA submitted written comments to the CFTC highlighting the market uncertainty that the new seven-criterion test creates in light of very clear statutory language stating that contracts with the intent to physically deliver are physical forward contracts. Specifically, NCGA and NGSA asked the Commission to

affirm that the seven criteria identified in the Final Rule are simply illustrative of certain common characteristics in forward contracts with embedded optionality, and thus, a safe harbor instead of requirements for satisfaction of the forward contract exclusion.

NCGA and NGSA recognize the Commission's interest in retaining the ability to regulate physical contracts with embedded options as swaps if "intent to physically deliver" is not genuine and simply crafted to evade regulation. However, in this case, the Commission has created so much ambiguity in the applicability of the forward-contract exclusion that market participants may be reluctant to use volumetric optionality in their forward contracting. Consequently, the regulatory uncertainty caused by the seven-criterion test compromises the viability of a physical commodity market delivery tool that is critical to market efficiency. The forward-contract exclusion should not be implemented in a way that limits its usefulness to catching bad actors at the expense of physical market efficiency.

The definition of swap has far-reaching effects beyond physical market efficiency. Determining what is and is not a swap impacts the calculation of notional amount and thus, which entities are swap dealers. It also impacts the application of position limits and the appropriate scope of the bona fide hedge exemption, clearing requirements, reporting requirements and capital and margin requirements. In short, the definition of swap is the heart and soul of the end-user protections.

The October 12, 2012 NCGA and NGSA request for clarity regarding the Commission's expected application of the seven-criterion test remains unanswered. In light of the lingering uncertainty created by the seven-criterion test, clarity regarding the applicability of the forward-contract exclusion to volumetric options embedded within a physical contract has become essential to commodity producers and consumers. Given the importance of the definition of swap to implementation of so many other Dodd-Frank-Act-related CFTC regulations, clarity is crucial to the sound implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act. This regulatory uncertainty has complicated sound implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act and risks harming commodity market efficiency. The CFTC is contemplating some clarifying language on volumetric optionality which would be welcome news. Regardless of the CFTC's clarification, however, the implementation uncertainty that has persisted for the last four years illustrates the need for legislative changes.

The swap definition is fundamental to implementation of the CFTC's new Dodd-Frank rules and consequently to the on-going availability of cost-effective risk management tools. However, if the definition is too broad, it can bring in common commercial agreements that have no relationship to the types of transactions that the Dodd-Frank Act was intended to regulate. Market participants demonstrating the potential to exercise physical delivery or a history of physical delivery must have confidence in the forward-contract exclusion from the definition of a swap.

NCGA and NGSA are committed to working with you to achieve a positive outcome that both protects the integrity of commodity markets and ensures the continued availability of cost effective hedging tools.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL CORN GROWERS ASSOCIATION.

NATURAL GAS SUPPLY ASSOCIATION.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representa-
tives, Washington, DC.

Hon. COLLIN PETERSON,
Ranking Member, House Agriculture Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, LEADER PELOSI, CHAIRMAN CONAWAY, AND RANKING MEMBER PETERSON: On behalf of the member companies of the Edison Electric Institute (EEI), I want to express our strong support for H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act. Key provisions in the legislation provide additional certainty and clarify congressional intent on a number of issues of significant importance to EEI members.

EEI is the association of U.S. investor-owned utilities, international affiliates and industry associates worldwide. Our members provide electricity for 220 million Americans, directly employ more than a half-million workers, and operate in all 50 states. With approximately \$90 billion in annual capital expenditures, the electric utility industry is responsible for providing reliable, affordable, and increasingly clean electricity that powers the economy and enhances the lives of all Americans.

EEI members are non-financial entities that participate in the physical commodity market and rely on swaps and futures contracts primarily to hedge and mitigate their commercial risk. The goal of our member companies is to provide their customers with reliable electric service at affordable and stable rates, which has a direct and significant impact on literally every area of the U.S. economy. Since wholesale electricity and natural gas historically have been two of the most volatile commodity groups, our member companies place a strong emphasis on managing the price volatility inherent in these wholesale commodity markets to the benefit of their customers. The derivatives market has proven to be an extremely effective tool in insulating our customers from this risk and price volatility. In sum, our members are the quintessential commercial end-users of swaps. As such, regulations that make effective risk management options more costly for end-users of swaps will likely result in higher and more volatile energy prices for retail, commercial, and industrial customers. H.R. 2289 goes a long way in providing much needed regulatory relief and even greater clarity to the compliance landscape facing EEI and the entire end-user community going forward.

Thank you for your leadership on these important issues. We look forward to working with you to advance this legislation through the House.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. KUHN.

MAY 12, 2015.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of
Representatives, Longworth House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY: The American Gas Association strongly supports the Commodity End User Relief Act, a bill to reauthorize the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) that would improve Commodity Future Trading Commission (CFTC) operations and provide much-needed marketplace certainty

and regulatory relief for natural gas utilities and the American homes and businesses to which they deliver natural gas.

The American Gas Association (AGA), founded in 1918, represents more than 200 local energy companies that deliver clean natural gas throughout the United States. There are more than 71 million residential, commercial and industrial natural gas customers in the U.S., of which 94 percent—over 68 million customers—receive their gas from AGA members. AGA is an advocate for natural gas utility companies and their customers and provides a broad range of programs and services for member natural gas pipelines, marketers, gatherers, international natural gas companies and industry associates. Today, natural gas meets more than one-fourth of the United States' energy needs.

The Commodity End User Relief Act will help the CFTC become a more responsive and well-equipped regulator. Commercial market participants currently lack basic procedural opportunities to hold the CFTC accountable for arbitrary and capricious actions. The lack of good process is self-evident in the haphazard pattern of rulemaking and non-rule "guidance" issued by the Commissioners or staff. Just yesterday, the CFTC answered a critical industry question about whether "swaps" (financial derivatives) include non-financial natural gas delivery contracts through an "Interpretation" rather than through formal regulation. Even this action is five months late: The CFTC asked for comments on this draft in November 2014 and closed the comment period in December 2014. The goal was to provide time-sensitive response to market participants. And yet, it took five months to finalize.

The Commodity End User Relief Act will help fix several problems described above—changes that can neither be made by the CFTC's evolving leadership nor by revisions to internal rules.

1. Direct Review in Federal Appellate Courts: The bill would allow the federal appellate courts to directly review CFTC rules, replacing the protracted and expensive trial court process currently in effect as the default rule for judicial review. This change will not increase litigation nor will it disrupt the CFTC. Rather, it will incentivize the CFTC to write better rules and avoid challenge altogether. Also, any inevitable legal challenges will be more swiftly decided by appellate courts, benefitting the regulator and the regulated community. All of the key federal rulemaking agencies are subject to direct appellate review—including the Securities Exchange Commission and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. There is no logical justification to treat the CFTC differently.

2. Strict Compliance with the Administrative Procedures Act (APA): The CFTC's administrative process suffers from vague and varying levels of compliance with federal procedural laws. Strict compliance with federal laws requiring due process and notice should not be contingent on how the Commission leadership directs staff, shares information among Commissioners, or chooses between a legal rule, non-binding guidance, or interpretation for resolving a public concern. This bill would eliminate subjectivity and require strict compliance with the APA and Executive Orders that instruct agencies to ensure public notice-and-comment on rules or guidance that have legally-binding effects.

3. Give the CFTC Comprehensive Authority to Exempt End-Users' Physical Contracts

from "Swaps" and "Options" Regulation: The CFTC undertook a tortuous four-year path of issuing interim final rules, policy guidance, and no-action letters, to arrive yesterday at yet another "interpretation" regarding how much of the physical marketplace will not be regulated as "swaps". In the interim, gas utilities have seen their physical gas counterparties (natural gas suppliers) exit the marketplace. Those that remain, offer less flexible and more costly contracting terms to avoid any confusion generated by CFTC policies that suggest these physical transactions are "swaps". In the past year alone, many AGA members' counterparties have abstained from providing the physical delivery flexibility that is needed to manage customer demand during hard winters and cold snaps. For AGA's rate-regulated utilities, cost increases for flexible gas supplies are passed directly to consumers.

Yesterday's interpretation does help clarify the morass of regulatory guidance that the CFTC has issued in prior years. However, confusion remains as at least two Commissioners disagree about what the CFTC has actually accomplished (see statements from CFTC Chairman Massad and Commissioner Bowen). Natural gas utilities cannot afford to wait any longer for policy clarity because energy consumers are paying the price for the CFTC's confusion. The Commodity End User Relief Act will definitively clarify that non-financial energy delivery agreements, that ensure physical delivery of natural gas to homes and businesses, will not be treated by the CFTC as speculative, financial instruments. The bill will help restore liquidity to the physical energy marketplace, which gas utilities rely on to mitigate commercial risk on behalf of consumers.

Congress certainly did not intend to provide the CFTC a tremendous regulatory mandate without giving it the necessary guidance and authority to do its job. Furthermore, Congress did not intend for the CEA to constrain liquidity in the physical natural gas marketplace, create business-changing impacts on regulated natural gas utilities, or increase the costs of reliable service for natural gas consumers. As such, AGA supports the Commodity End User Relief Act because it provides the CFTC the tools necessary to be a responsive regulator and restores the regulatory confidence that natural gas utilities rely on to procure natural gas supplies at the lowest reasonable cost for the benefit of America's natural gas consumers.

Sincerely,

DAVE MCCURDY,
President and CEO,
American Gas Association.

JUNE 8, 2015.

Re End-User Support for Passage of Derivatives End-User Clarifications in H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The Coalition for Derivatives End-Users represents the views of companies that employ derivatives primarily to manage risks associated with their businesses. Hundreds of companies and business associations have been active in the Coalition, seeking strong, effective and fair regulation of derivatives markets that brings transparency and mitigates the risk of another systemic collapse while not unduly burdening American businesses and harming job growth. The Coalition supports H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, which

incorporates vital legislation aimed at protecting derivatives end-users.

In particular, the Coalition strongly supports the bill's inclusion of the language of H.R. 1317, the Derivatives End-User Clarification Act, sponsored by Representatives Moore, Stivers, Fudge and Gibson. H.R. 1317 is a narrowly targeted bill providing much-needed clarification that certain swap transactions with centralized treasury units ("CTUs") of non-financial end-users are exempt from clearing requirements and fixes a language glitch in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "Dodd-Frank Act") that denies some end-users that employ CTUs the clearing exception that Congress passed specifically for them.

A Coalition survey of chief financial officers and corporate treasurers found that nearly half of the respondents use CTUs to execute over-the-counter derivatives. The Coalition is encouraged that the House of Representatives last year passed this CTU language (H.R. 5471/S. 2976) by voice vote, reflecting the fact that CTUs are a best practice among corporate treasurers and their use should be encouraged, not penalized.

While the Commodity Futures Trading Commission has issued no-action relief allowing some end-users to use the clearing exception, the relief does not fix the problematic language in the Dodd-Frank Act. This language, which also is referenced in regulatory proposals on margin, places corporate boards in the difficult position of approving decisions not to clear trades based on a staff letter indicating that the law will not be enforced against the company.

It also is important to note that international regulators often look to U.S. rules—but not no-action letters—when developing their regulations. Unless we fix the underlying problem in the Dodd-Frank Act, our denial of clearing relief to end-users with CTUs may be propagated overseas.

Throughout the legislative and regulatory process surrounding the Dodd-Frank Act, the Coalition has supported efforts to increase transparency in the derivatives markets and enhance financial stability for the U.S. economy through thoughtful new regulation while avoiding needless costs. We urge you to support the efforts to move this essential clarification in H.R. 2289.

Sincerely,

COALITION FOR DERIVATIVES END-USERS.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this legislation because it will roll back important financial regulations and interfere with the CFTC's ability to do its work. I am very concerned that H.R. 2289 will open the door to the types of things that created the financial mess that we are just beginning to get ourselves out of.

So let me be clear. I don't have an issue with many of the provisions that are relevant to end-user protections. In fact, the Dodd-Frank bill that I helped write states very clearly that end users were not the problem, and the CFTC has been very receptive to that fact and taken that into consideration as they have adopted rules.

One of my biggest concerns in this bill is the new cost-benefit analysis. This is, in my opinion, all cost and not a lot of benefit unless you are one of

the nine big banks who, as far as I am concerned, have not learned a thing from the financial crisis. This not only adds an unneeded layer of government bureaucracy; it opens the doors to lawsuits from major banks seeking to delay or completely derail CFTC rulemakings.

I also have serious concerns with the trouble that will be caused by section 314, the cross-border section of this bill.

Chairman Massad has been negotiating extensively and in good faith with our European counterparts to harmonize their rules with ours. I have talked to the Chairman a number of times about this, and he has assured me and it has been independently verified that they are 85 percent of the way to getting a deal in this area. This provision in my opinion will cut the negotiators off at the knees. I am worried that this provision will take us back to where we were and what was happening prior to the financial crash. The big banks at that time that have offices both in London and New York were playing us against each other, getting the United States to water down rules by threatening to move their business elsewhere and vice versa, and that was verified on committee trips that we took over to Europe and in discussions with their regulators.

The cost-benefit requirement, as I said, along with the cross-border rule, will cost \$45 billion over 5 years, according to the CBO. And again, this is a cost that I believe doesn't have a whole lot of benefit.

H.R. 2289 has a whole host of other problems. The bill unravels the transparency provided by Dodd-Frank, slows down CFTC staff ability to respond to industry concerns, mucks up the Commission's ability to issue guidance if rules need updating or clarification, and relitigates a disagreement between former commissioners that has no place in this bill.

This is a bad bill that can't be fixed. It should be defeated by the House. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2289.

Mr. Chairman, I have a statement from the administration where they have indicated their displeasure with this bill and the fact that they are going to recommend vetoing it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 2289—COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT
(Rep. Conaway, R-TX, June 2, 2015)

The Administration is firmly committed to strengthening the Nation's financial system through the implementation of key reforms to safeguard derivatives markets and ensure a stronger and fairer financial system for investors and consumers. The full benefit to the Nation's citizens and the economy cannot be realized unless the entities charged with establishing and enforcing the rules of the road have the resources to do so.

The Administration strongly opposes the passage of H.R. 2289 because it undermines the efficient functioning of the Commodity

Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) by imposing a number of organizational and procedural changes and would undercut efforts taken by the CFTC over the last year to address end-user concerns. H.R. 2289 also offers no solution to address the persistent inadequacy of the agency's finding. The CFTC is one of only two Federal financial regulators funded through annual discretionary appropriations, and the funding the Congress has provided for it over the past five years has failed to keep pace with the increasing complexity of the Nation's financial markets. The changes proposed in H.R. 2289 would hinder the ability of the CFTC to operate effectively, thereby threatening the financial security of the middle class by encouraging the same kind of risky, irresponsible behavior that led to the great recession.

Prior to enactment of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, the derivatives markets were largely unregulated. Losses connected to derivatives rippled through that hidden network, playing a central role in the financial crisis. Wall Street Reform resulted in significant expansion of the CFTC's responsibilities, establishing a framework for standardized over-the-counter derivatives to be traded on regulated platforms and centrally cleared, and for data to be reported to repositories to increase transparency and price discovery. The changes proposed in H.R. 2289 would hinder the CFTC's progress in successfully implementing these critical responsibilities and would unnecessarily disrupt the effective management and operation of the agency without providing the more robust and reliable funding that the agency needs.

In order to respond quickly to market events and market participants, the CFTC needs funding commensurate with its evolving oversight framework. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to authorize fee funding for the CFTC as proposed in the FY 2016 Budget request, a shift that would directly reduce the deficit. User fees were first proposed in the President's Budget by the Reagan Administration more than 30 years ago and have been supported by every Democratic and Republican Administration since that time. Fee funding would shift CFTC costs from the general taxpayer to the primary beneficiaries of the CFTC's oversight in a manner that maintains the efficiency, competitiveness, and financial integrity of the Nation's futures, options, and swaps markets, and supports market access for smaller market participants hedging or mitigating commercial or agricultural risk.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2289, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I remind my colleagues that the cost-benefit analysis provisions that are in this bill are remarkably similar to the bill last year, which garnered overwhelming support, including support out of the Agriculture Committee itself. Cost-benefit analysis is an important tool for any regulatory agency to have at its disposal to be able to use. This agency did not use the cost-benefit analysis rule that was in place because it was so weak and toothless that they just basically gave lip service to it, according to their own IG.

The cost-benefit analysis in this bill mirrors in most instances President

Obama's executive order from January 2011 that required all nonindependent agencies to conduct cost-benefit analysis in a transparent manner to get to better rules in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Chairman CONAWAY, for allowing me to speak today.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

End users, such as our ranchers, farmers, manufacturers, and public utilities, face risks that they have no control over on a daily basis. For years now, they have used tools available to manage risks like volatile markets or changing interest rates, such as a farmer who uses futures contracts to establish a guaranteed price to offset the risk of a decrease in crop value before harvest or a grain company using derivatives to hedge commercial risks associated with buying wheat from a farmer. This is part of day-to-day operations that allow them to do their jobs and provide products in an affordable and accessible manner. However, the implementation of Dodd-Frank placed a number of costly burdens on our end users that limit their ability to use these tools.

It is important that we do all we can to erase this unintended and excessive red tape. One measure included in this bill today will do just that, which is my Public Power Risk Management Act, which passed with the full support of the House last year. Again, it is included in the bill today.

There are over 2,000 publicly owned utilities across the United States, including one in my district in the city of Redding, that have used swaps to manage their risk for years. However, Dodd-Frank put them at a major disadvantage to private utilities by limiting their ability to negotiate with swap dealers.

This bill would level the playing field permanently and ensure the 47 million Americans who rely on public power for electricity will not see their rates increase due to unnecessary regulatory policies. Our farmers, ranchers, and small businesses who pose no systemic risk to our financial system and certainly did not cause the financial crisis should not have to face costly bureaucratic overreach from policies originally intended to protect them in the first place.

I thank Chairman CONAWAY for his leadership on this bill. Let's help our agriculture community by passing this commonsense piece of legislation.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member of the subcommittee of jurisdiction over this bill, I would like to address the

three major areas of contention here. We have put a lot of time, a lot of work in this over the years.

First, we want to deal with, as Mr. PETERSON brought up, some of his concerns and share how we are responding to that. I am a sponsor of this bill. We have worked on it. It is a similar bill to what we had before. The first area I want to deal with is cross border, and then I will go to cost-benefit analysis, and then end users.

What is important for the House and the people of this Nation to understand is that we operate in a global market, and our United States financial system is best served with deep financial liquidity. But if global regulations are not well harmonized, are not well coordinated, or we have good cross-border access, then these global markets will fragment into separate regulatory jurisdictions and become far less liquid, to the detriment of the United States financial system.

We know now that the derivatives swaps market is about an \$815 trillion piece of the economy, and we must not—and I am sure we will not—put our financial system of the United States at a disadvantage on the world stage. By passing this bill, we will not do that. If we delay it again, we will be putting our financial system at a disadvantage on the stage.

Let me deal with the first concern that has been brought up. The claim that our legislation subverts the CFTC's authority to regulate foreign derivatives, this is flat-out false because at no point is an entity of the United States person able to escape U.S. rules that the CFTC, itself, has deemed equivalent. Let me read section 314 that has been referred to. In section (b)(2)(A) of 314, it clearly states that only the CFTC can make sure that foreign entities, regulations are comparable to the United States. At no point do we yield the power of the CFTC to any foreign entity unless the CFTC makes sure that that foreign entity has equivalent rules to our Nation.

Now, let me go to the claim that we are making it harder to challenge the cross border in 314. We are doing no such thing. It is important that if there is a country, if there is anybody in the world that wants to challenge, that wants to have a way of challenging the ruling of the CFTC, it is in our best interest to make sure that they go through a petition process, and the petition process is there to give the CFTC ample time—180 days—to review the challenge and be able to respond appropriately. And after the Commission makes its decision, we request them to report to the Congress. Now, how is that making it harder? As a matter of fact, it is making it easier and more transparent.

Now, the concern about the bill's attempts to rein in the CFTC's capacity to impose certain rules on Wall Street

trades, this concern refers to what we refer to as U.S. persons and location tests. At no time, Mr. Chairman, does our bill state that U.S. persons are not subject to U.S. rules. Individuals and transactions are still allowed to be carved in definitions and, thus, subject to the same rules, the same tests, and regulations. And our own Commissioner Bowen, who is a Democrat serving on the CFTC, stated before my subcommittee, "risk should be about risk and not about location." Tests should be about where the risk is, instead of where someone wrote something on a piece of paper.

Now let me deal with the business that our bill creates a presumption that each of the eight foreign jurisdictions with the largest swaps markets automatically have swap rules that are considered to be comparable to and as comprehensive as the United States requirements. Yes, they are correct, but that presumption comes only after the CFTC makes sure that those eight foreign markets have comparable rules to us. Here is what it says in section 1: "The Commission shall determine, by rule or by order, whether the swaps regulatory requirements of foreign jurisdictions are comparable to and as comprehensive as United States requirements."

I rest my case.

But now, Mr. Chairman, I want to turn to what is the most important cross-border issue, this business with the European Union. The European Union is discriminating against the United States.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. The European Union is denying our country status in terms of equivalency of rules. Historically, we have always had that. But what is very interesting is they have already given this standing to jurisdictions that have the same regime as ours.

Why is that?

Something very strange is going on in the European Union. They are discriminating against our financial system when they will go ahead and approve other regimes that are equal to ours but not ours.

Why is this a terrible thing?

Because, Mr. Chairman, our clearinghouses can't do business in Europe if we are not qualified, if we do not have that equivalency. So by taking that equivalency away, they are keeping our clearinghouses and our businesses from being able to be used there because the other market participants will go elsewhere rather than come and do business with us.

There are millions of dollars at stake here, so we have got to certainly deal with that.

□ 1545

Mr. Chairman, I do want to say something about this cost-benefit analysis because this is not all truth is being told here. This cost-benefit analysis is being put on because it has the way of being able to make us more efficient.

Mr. PETERSON brought up the point of litigation; that is a legitimate concern, but here is what we did: we accepted and approved an amendment by Democratic Representative DELBENE and some Republicans to make sure that the CFTC's back door is protected. The amendment clearly states that the court must uphold the decision of the CFTC unless there has been an abuse of discretion.

In a court of law, abuse is a high threshold to attain.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. This is important, Mr. Chairman. I have got my name on this bill. I have put the work and time into this bill. It is important that I give the reasons why I am supporting this bill.

Now, this amendment says, as I said before, that a court must uphold the decision of the CFTC unless there has been an abuse of discretion. In a court of law, abuse is a high threshold to attain. If a firm wants to challenge the CFTC, they know right off that they better have beyond compelling facts to prove it.

The CFTC's abuse of power is a discretion. We are letting anyone know who would dare to pursue litigation against the CFTC that they better think twice.

Now, about the funding, Mr. Chairman, perhaps this cost analysis can help us build a case to take to the Appropriations Committee to get more money. The President has appropriately asked for more money for the CFTC.

Year after year after year, I have been asking for more money, but I do believe that if we put the cost-benefit analysis in there—and, again, Mr. Chairman, we have a section in there where this cost-benefit analysis would be more succinct if it is done with an economist. Cost benefit is an economic issue, a financial issue; an economist should be doing that, not a lawyer.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if we pass this bill, we will be taking a great step forward to be able to put our CFTC on the world stage to be able to negotiate the rules and regulations for the United States of America from a position of strength, not weakness. This is a very delicate time for us, and we are losing respect.

Look at the EU; look at how other nations are treating us. Could it be, Mr. Chairman, that we are losing this respect largely because in a way by

continuing year after year—this is the third year of not reauthorizing CFTC—by us doing that, we are not respecting ourselves, Mr. Chairman?

Now, finally, Mr. Chairman, I do want to say this one thing about the end users. This is a very important piece of this bill. They can't wait another 3 years. They need this relief right away, and we need to do and be able to get them out of an identification of being a financial institution.

Let me tell you why that is. End users are businesses who use a single entity that allows their company to centralize functions such as credit and risk; however, when the banking laws come in on finance, they put them in that category.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I enter into the RECORD a statement from the Chamber of Commerce and would like to read a couple of paragraphs from that.

"This bill also takes a practical approach to address one of the most problematic areas of regulatory implementation in the global derivatives market: cross-border harmonization. Many end users operate internationally and are struggling to meet the changing demands of multiple, conflicting, and sometimes duplicative regulatory regimes. H.R. 2289 would require the CFTC to move quickly to make substituted compliance determinations that would significantly reduce needless complexity and uncertainty for U.S. businesses, without reducing market transparency.

The Chamber also supports provisions in this bill intended to promote transparency and accountability in the CFTC's rulemaking process, including a requirement to conduct a cost-benefit analysis for new rules, and the establishment of an Office of the Chief Economist to support such analysis. Cost-benefit analysis has been a fundamental tool of effective government for more than three decades, and these requirements would help protect Main Street businesses, investors, and consumers from some of the unintended consequences of regulation."

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Washington, DC, June 8, 2015.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, strongly supports H.R. 2289, the "Commodity End-User Relief Act," a bipartisan bill that would reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). This bill also includes a number of important reforms designed to promote smart regulation, enhance

accountability at the CFTC, and protect Main Street businesses from onerous and unintended derivatives regulation.

The Chamber is particularly supportive of provisions in H.R. 2289 that would help preserve the ability of commercial end users to manage their financial risks by using derivatives. This bill includes a critical fix that would ensure non-financial companies would be protected from burdensome and unnecessary regulations, consistent with Congress's clear intent under the Dodd-Frank Act almost five years ago. Non-financial companies that use centralized treasury units to manage their enterprise-wide risk should not be penalized for adopting this risk reducing structure, and H.R. 2289 acknowledges and would address this issue.

This bill also takes a practical approach to address one of the most problematic areas of regulatory implementation in the global derivatives market: cross-border harmonization. Many end users operate internationally and are struggling to meet the changing demands of multiple, conflicting, and sometimes duplicative regulatory regimes. H.R. 2289 would require the CFTC to move quickly to make substituted compliance determinations that would significantly reduce needless complexity and uncertainty for U.S. businesses, without reducing market transparency.

The Chamber also supports provisions in this bill intended to promote transparency and accountability in the CFTC's rulemaking process, including a requirement to conduct a cost-benefit analysis for new rules, and the establishment of an Office of the Chief Economist to support such analysis. Cost-benefit analysis has been a fundamental tool of effective government for more than three decades, and these requirements would help protect Main Street businesses, investors, and consumers from some of the unintended consequences of regulation.

Additionally, H.R. 2289 contains a number of sensible provisions that would promote principles of good governance, including providing market participants with better Commission oversight regarding "no action" letters issued by the CFTC staff, and a requirement that the CFTC develop internal risk control mechanisms in order to protect sensitive market data. These are common sense measures that would help make the CFTC a more effective and accountable regulator, and the Chamber appreciates their inclusion in this bill.

The Chamber strongly urges you to support H.R. 2289 and may consider including votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CONAWAY for his leadership on this issue.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

The use of derivatives is an important tool that farmers, agribusinesses, and manufacturers in my district use to hedge the risks that come with doing their business. Because of the risk of price movements and commodities, such as corn and soybeans, these end users use derivatives to ensure they and their customers aren't negatively impacted by sudden changes in prices.

The CFTC has an important role in overseeing these end users, who responsibly use derivatives to hedge. Unfortunately, following the passage of Dodd-Frank in 2010, many of these responsible hedgers, including farmers right in my congressional district in central and southwestern Illinois, have been impacted by these new regulations that often treat them as speculators. Mr. Chairman, farmers aren't speculators. Farmers didn't cause the global financial crisis, and farmers shouldn't be treated like they did.

This bill includes language that I authored to address regulations that could directly increase transportation prices for consumers back home. Additionally, the final bill includes an amendment I offered at committee that removes unnecessary and duplicative regulations created by the CFTC that require certain registered investment companies, such as mutual funds, to be regulated by both the SEC and the CFTC.

This language, which was adopted unanimously in the committee, removes this duplicative burden in a manner that would not undermine investor protection because these companies would still be regulated by the SEC.

This bill is an important and necessary opportunity for Congress to use the reauthorization process as a means to improve the regulatory environment and the impact it has on responsible market participants, as well as exchanges like the CME Group, which is headquartered in my home State of Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the committee's work on this bill. I want to express my appreciation for the work of Chairman CONAWAY and what he has done to get us here, as well as Chairman AUSTIN SCOTT and Ranking Member DAVID SCOTT of the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee.

This is an important bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill; yet again, this bill deliberately sets out to weaken one of our most important financial regulators, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

It fails to address the CFTC's biggest challenge, its flawed funding mechanism. It prioritizes Wall Street special interests over the economic security of our Nation's families.

This bill is a recipe for another financial disaster like the one that led to the Great Recession and cost nearly 9 million American jobs.

Americans are tired of casino banking and speculation. They want big

banks and oil speculators held accountable. They want to increase the transparency of our markets, prevent market failures, and avoid future bailouts. That is the CFTC's job.

This bill takes us in the wrong direction. Instead of helping the CFTC fulfill its mandate in an increasingly complex global financial sector, the bill throws up roadblock after roadblock.

The CFTC is one of only two Federal financial regulators completely reliant upon the general fund. The Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Housing Finance Agency, and a host of others all collect user fees, so should the CFTC.

This is not a partisan proposition. The first President to propose user-fee funding for the CFTC was Ronald Reagan. Every President since then, Republican or Democrat, has done the same.

User fees would directly reduce the deficit while securing CFTC's funding for the long term. That is even more important now that the agency's responsibilities have been expanded in response to the bad behavior that created the financial crisis.

I submitted an amendment that would have dealt with this problem, but the majority refused to allow it to be heard.

We must avoid at all costs a return to the conditions that allowed the Great Recession to happen, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to remind or at least acknowledge to the committee that CFTC's funding is up 49 percent since 2010 when the Dodd-Frank bill was presented, 49 percent increase in funding.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and the current chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CONAWAY for yielding me this time and thank him for his leadership on this important legislation.

I rise today to support H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, a bill to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

As we have heard today, the CFTC's mission is to foster a transparent, balanced, and functional marketplace. However, uncertainty and delays in the marketplace mean higher prices for families and small businesses across America. As the committee charged with ensuring the oversight of our commodity markets, it is our duty to ensure that those markets are functioning properly.

For the last several years, the Agriculture Committee, through the strong

leadership of former Chairman FRANK LUCAS and current Chairman MIKE CONAWAY, has done an excellent job of educating Congress and the American public about the importance of our commodity markets and the need for a strong reauthorization of the CFTC.

I was also pleased to work closely with the Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit's Chairman AUSTIN SCOTT on this legislation. He and his staff have been leading an open and transparent process that involved all stakeholder groups and took input from across the country.

In an effort to help the CFTC achieve its mission, I worked with the committee and the CFTC to craft an amendment which was adopted in committee to address the issue of manufacturers being able to take timely delivery of aluminum for production at a fair price. These manufacturers support a broad set of industries from common drink cans to airplane parts.

The persistence of long, disruptive market queues for the delivery of aluminum at warehouses in the United States, licensed overseas, has attracted considerable concern for end users and the consumers of products which many Americans utilize on a daily basis.

My provision will prevent the unreasonable delay of delivery of such commodities stored in warehouses, which can cost end-user companies increased storage fees, potentially higher prices due to supply and demand implications from improper exchange contract design, and result in uneconomic commodity prices.

Specifically, the amendment directs the CFTC to report to Congress regarding the ongoing review of foreign board of trade applications of metal exchanges and the status of its negotiations with foreign regulators regarding aluminum warehousing.

Such status reports shall inform the CFTC in determining foreign boards of trade status for metals exchange applications, and such determination shall be made no later than September 30, 2016.

In closing, I would like to again applaud Chairman CONAWAY and subcommittee Chairman SCOTT for their hard work to get this bill to the floor today. This bipartisan bill takes steps to improve consumer protections for farmers and ranchers, as well as implementing reforms, to ensure a more balanced regulatory approach that will help our markets thrive.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With all due respect to my colleagues who have been claiming that the bill does this and does that, there are a lot of groups that have a different view.

There are over two-hundred-and-some groups that disagree with how the impacts of these bills were going to affect the markets, including the

chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, who are the people who actually have to administer this law.

□ 1600

And we have a letter from the chairman that has a completely different point of view than Mr. SCOTT has and others in terms of how this will impact the situation. According to the chairman, you know, he is opposed to this. He says: "I believe that many of the provisions in this bill before the committee are either unnecessary or impose requirements on the Commission that would make it harder to fulfill their mission. The bill limits the agency's ability to respond quickly to both market events and market participants. It will make it more difficult for us to make adjustments to rules and achieve greater global harmonization of swaps rules. With respect to the provisions pertaining to commercial end users' concerns, the agency has sufficient authority to address the goals outlined in the legislation and in most cases has already done so."

He also states: "I have concerns that title II of the bill includes language that would complicate the agency's longstanding statutory requirements to consider costs and benefits in its rulemaking, imposing additional, unworkable standards and creating confusion that is likely to lead to more lawsuits instead of policy grounded in data-driven analysis. Had this language been in effect, it would have been harder for the agency to positively respond over the past 10 months to market participants' concerns. Title II also imposes procedural requirements on the agency that, to my knowledge, are not followed by any other independent agency. These changes would make it difficult to manage the agency and to ensure accountability and could weaken the Commission for administrations to come."

So there is a disagreement of opinion about how this bill will actually impact the marketplace and how it will actually work. And if, as was claimed, it wasn't going to have any effect, I would be here supporting it.

In my opinion, this is going to have significant impacts on the way the Commission does its work, and I think it is going to do more harm than good.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is left on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Apparently, I have a speaker coming, but she is not here yet, so we could wrap up, I guess.

Mr. CONAWAY. I am prepared to close if you are, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, I think I made clear my position. I was hoping that we could work out a bill here that could have support across the board, but I just think that there are areas we have gone into with this bill that are going to cause more harm than good, and I think it is not a good bill. It is not the kind of bill that we need to give the Commission the reauthorization that they need to do their job, so I ask my colleagues to oppose the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

It should come as no surprise that those who are being regulated have a difference of opinion with the folks proposing regulations. In this instance, the roles are actually reversed.

Tim Massad is a good guy, a good friend of mine, and an individual I look forward to working with. He doesn't want to change the deal he has got.

Well, if you look back at all the testimony that has been delivered throughout all of our hearings, most of the folks on the regulated side, the end users, the banks, the brokers, the SEFs, everybody else, they didn't like what the CFTC was doing to them. So the CFTC was able to power through the objections, and I would like for us to do the same thing, because what we have asked the CFTC to do is rational, straightforward stuff with respect to the changes at the operations of the Committee itself.

Over the past 4 years, the Committee on Agriculture has heard dozens of witnesses testify about the upheaval end users have been facing while trying to use derivatives markets in the wake of the postcrisis financial reforms. While this Congress took affirmative steps in Dodd-Frank to protect end users from harm, today it is clear there is still work to be done.

It isn't enough to simply raise these issues and hope that the CFTC will take care of them for us. For one, sometimes they cannot. There are numerous small oversights in the statute that have huge implications for end users that we correct in this legislation.

The CEA prevents many end users from claiming their exemption because they conduct their hedging activity out of an affiliate specifically created to manage risks throughout the entire corporate enterprise. The Commission can't fix this req.

The CEA requires foreign regulators to indemnify the CFTC, even though that is a legal concept that does not exist in many foreign legal jurisdictions. The Commission can't fix it.

Currently, the CEA defines some utility companies as financial entities, stripping them of their status as end users. The Commission can't fix that.

The core principles of SEFs were lifted almost word for word from the core principles for future exchanges, even

though SEFs and future exchanges operate completely differently and SEFs cannot perform many of the functions of a futures exchange. The Commission can't fix this.

Certainly, the Commission can and has tried to paper over these problems by issuing staff letters explaining how it would deal with incongruities of the law, but this isn't good enough. We know the problems, and we should fix them.

Sometimes, though, the problem isn't the statute. There are a number of end users that we have heard testimony about which the CFTC will not fix because the Commission simply disagrees with Congress about how to apply the law. We know these problems, too.

The Commission has promulgated a rule that reduces the transaction threshold, which triggers the requirement to register as a swap dealer from \$8 billion to \$3 billion, a 60 percent decline, while they are still studying the matter. We require that the CFTC complete the study and have a public vote on the matter before that automatic decrease occurs.

The Commission has proposed a new and significantly narrower method of granting bona fide hedge exemptions, upending longstanding hedging conventions for market participants. This proposal is also dramatically more labor intensive for the Commission to implement than the current process. We should insist that historic hedging practices be protected.

The Commission has dramatically expanded the recordkeeping requirements, requiring businesses to trade only for themselves and have no fiduciary obligations to customers to retain any record that would lead to a trade. This requirement demands that end users retain emails, texts, phone messages, and other records in which a potential trade or hedge was simply contemplated or discussed. We should clearly spell out that end users need only retain written records for actual transactions.

The challenges facing businesses that hedge their risks in derivative markets are real, and we have an opportunity today to fix some of those problems. Every dollar that a business can save by better managing risks is a dollar available to grow its business, to pay higher wages, to protect investors, or to lower the costs to consumers.

Over the past week, over 40 organizations representing thousands of American businesses have voiced their support for the important reforms of the Commodity End-User Relief Act. Businesses from agriculture producers, to major manufacturers, to public utilities need every tool available to manage their businesses and reduce the uncertainties they face each and every day.

I urge my colleagues to support the Commodity End-User Relief Act to pro-

tect these companies and to ensure that they have the tools they need to compete in a global economy. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2289.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2289. The bill would obstruct our cop on the Wall Street beat, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, from doing its job. The CFTC is charged with fostering open, transparent, competitive, and financially sound markets, mitigates systemic risk, and protects market participants, consumers, and the public from fraud, manipulation, and abusive practices related to derivatives. In sum, the CFTC protects farmers, manufacturers, municipalities, pension funds and retirees but would be thwarted from doing so if H.R. 2289 is enacted.

In the wake of the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression, Congress passed Wall Street Reform—and gave our derivatives regulator the authority necessary to oversee previously unregulated transactions in which parties agree to exchange—or “swap”—the risks of one financial instrument with another. The most notorious of these are credit-default swaps, made famous by AIG and which fueled the 2008 crisis, bankrupted millions of homeowners and cost taxpayers trillions of dollars.

Nevertheless, under the guise of reauthorizing the CFTC, Republicans are proposing a bill that undermines its regulatory authority, imposes new procedural requirements on an overburdened and underfunded agency, and ultimately hamstring the Commission's ability to protect the American people.

This bill imposes heavy administrative hurdles and new litigation risks on the CFTC by requiring the agency to conduct a cost-benefit analysis slanted towards industry—a tactic that has been pushed in the past by opponents of financial reform to prevent, delay or weaken any rules implementing the Dodd-Frank Act.

The bill also makes it much more difficult for the CFTC to regulate and oversee derivatives transactions involving the foreign operations of megabanks like Citigroup, JP Morgan, and Bank of America. Earlier this Congress, Republicans overreached when they tried to pass a provision weakening the Volcker Rule's ban on banks taking bets with taxpayer dollars. H.R. 2289 is cut from the same cloth—instead allowing these same institutions to avoid U.S. law by setting up shop in a foreign jurisdiction, even though the risk may still be borne by U.S. taxpayers. There is even a provision in this bill that absurdly directs the CFTC to ignore the physical location of a bank's swap trader when determining whether the derivative was conducted inside the United States for purposes of applying U.S. law.

And all of this is done without providing one red cent to pay for these new burdens. CBO estimates that this bill costs at least \$45 million, but the Republicans wouldn't even let the House consider an amendment to pay for it, offered by Representative DELAUNO. The result is that H.R. 2289 will deplete the CFTC's modest resources currently spent enforcing against fraud.

But don't take my word for it. The Commission's own Chairman says the bill makes it

harder for the CFTC to fulfill its mission and creates “unintended loopholes and uncertainties.” The White House says the bill “[threatens] the financial security of the middle class.” And public interest groups, such as the Consumer Federation of America, and some industry groups, have weighed in as well, voicing their strong opposition to the bill.

While not necessarily surprising, Republicans on the Agricultural Committee refused to work with Ranking Member PETERSON to improve this bill—despite his deep commitment to making the Commission work better for farmers, ranchers and manufacturers. Even though several of the megabanks that directly benefit from H.R. 2289 pled guilty to manipulating our foreign exchange markets, Republicans also rejected my amendment, which sought to ensure that these banks’ admissions of violating our laws have real collateral consequences and are not merely symbolic.

Ultimately, this legislation is part of an ongoing, multifaceted Republican effort to undercut financial reform laws and regulations that protect consumers, investors and the economy. That’s why it should come as no surprise that Koch Industries, for instance, spent \$2.8 million lobbying to ensure the passage of this bill alone. The playbook is well-known: create huge loopholes and carve-outs for special interests, while simultaneously underfunding the cop with the authority to ensure compliance with the law.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “No” on this bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, just yesterday, I signed a letter with five other Ranking Members on this side of the aisle in opposition to this poorly conceived Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) Reauthorization bill—which is also opposed by the Obama Administration, CFTC Chairman Massad, and a whole host of consumer groups.

For those who aren’t familiar with it, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) has a very important job: it regulates the futures and options markets in the agricultural sector, including commodity-related derivatives. While there’s no question that the appropriate use of these financial instruments can help farmers and commercial end users hedge their commercial risk, recent history clearly demonstrates that the unregulated abuse of these kinds of products can distort markets, hurt consumers and put our entire economy at risk. The CFTC’s authority was allowed to expire in 2013, so its reauthorization is long overdue. Having said that, today’s legislation has multiple major defects. I will briefly describe three.

First, Title II of H.R. 2289 imposes new bureaucratic requirements on an agency whose activities are already governed by the Commodity Exchange Act, the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Congressional Review Act, and the Regulatory Flexibility Act. With all due respect, the bureaucracy does not need more bureaucracy. In this case, it simply needs to do its job policing our financial markets. If enacted into law, Title II of this bill would undermine the CFTC’s ability to do its job and subject the commission to unnecessary and costly litigation risk.

Second, Title III of H.R. 2289 requires a complex new rulemaking for our international

derivatives markets. While I support the goal of harmonizing global rules in this area, this provision of the bill interferes with the CFTC’s ongoing negotiations to achieve that objective and instead substitutes and attempts to predetermine the majority’s preferred outcome for those negotiations. In my judgment, the CFTC should be allowed to complete its negotiations unfettered by the dictates of this legislation.

Finally, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that all of the additional requirements placed on the CFTC by this legislation will require 30 new employees at a cost of \$45 million over the next five years—a cost this bill does not even attempt to pay for. Moreover, an amendment to permit the CFTC to collect user fees to close that gap and help pay for the CFTC’s operations was not even afforded the opportunity for an up or down vote on the floor of the House today.

Mr. Chair, the reauthorization of the CFTC is an important subject, worthy of a far more thoughtful bill than we are being asked to consider today. I strongly urge a no vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

I firmly believe this legislation represents the kind of thoughtful and bipartisan approach to policy-making that is often lacking in Washington.

It represents simple good governance by reauthorizing the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, which has been operating without authorization since 2013.

The bill includes needed reforms to clarify Congressional intent, minimize regulatory burdens, and most importantly, preserve the ability of necessary risk management markets to serve those who need them.

The Agriculture Committee, specifically the Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit of which I serve as Chairman, heard diverse perspectives from end-users, market participants, and regulators through many hours of testimony on this reauthorization earlier this year.

That testimony, coupled with testimony from numerous other hearings at the subcommittee and full committee level over the course of the last two Congresses, was instrumental in drafting the legislation before us today.

Time and again, we have heard how end-users, who were not the cause of the financial crisis, have been the collateral damage of Dodd-Frank’s reforms. These end-users are our farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and electric and gas utilities, and they rely on the derivatives markets to manage their risk, and, thereby keep consumer costs low.

The cost of unnecessary regulatory burdens on these end-users, and the uncertainty these regulations cause, will ultimately be borne by American citizens in my district and in districts around the country. Therefore, it is essential that we provide them with much-needed relief and clarity.

This legislation includes several such end-user relief provisions. It requires the Commission to vote to change the current threshold for the swap dealer de minimis exception, rather than the automatic and arbitrary reduction slated to occur in December 2017.

It also preserves end users’ ability to hedge against anticipated business risks under the definition of a bona fide hedge transaction, provides common sense record-keeping relief for grain elevators, farmers, and other commercial market participants, and clarifies the exclusion of contracts with volumetric optionality from the definition of a swap.

Additionally, this legislation codifies several new regulatory customer protections, borne out of lessons learned from the Peregrine Financial and MF Global failures.

Finally, it makes important reforms to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, including the creation of a new Office of the Chief Economist and a more stringent requirement for cost benefit analysis of proposed rules.

With this legislation, we have the opportunity to ease the regulatory burden on those who use the derivatives markets, not to speculate, but to hedge risk. Ultimately, this bill is about protecting the American producer and the American consumer.

I want to close by thanking Chairman CONAWAY for his strong leadership on the House Committee on Agriculture. His thoughtful and bipartisan approach to policy-making is reflected in the legislation before us today.

Additionally, I want to thank the Ranking Member on the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee and my colleague from Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT, who has been a steady partner throughout this effort.

We have worked diligently to produce legislation that provides needed reforms to ensure our regulatory framework protects the integrity of our markets while not limiting the ability of end users to access these tools to conduct their business.

I am proud to support H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation.

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Chair, I rise in full support of H.R. 2289—The Commodity End-User Relief Act—and thank Chairman CONAWAY for his leadership on this issue. Mr. Chair, H.R. 2289 brings needed regulatory relief to farmers, ranchers, and individuals across rural America.

In my district, agriculture is the single largest sector of the economy and in the state is second only to tourism. Many folks in rural parts of my state are exposed to the unique risks associated with volatile agricultural markets. Because of this farmers and ranchers need financial tools that allow them to mitigate these risks. This bill will bring that certainty.

Additionally, municipal utility services and co-operative energy suppliers meet nearly all of my district’s electricity needs. These groups rely heavily on risk mitigation provided by this bill. If the federal government overly regulates the use of risk mitigation, industries and constituents within my district will see hikes in their monthly energy bills.

H.R. 2289 will allow American business to run as intended without new burdensome regulations and red-tape from bureaucratic government agencies. Most importantly this bill allows the American economy to do what it does best producing the world’s food and fiber while supplying affordable energy.

I congratulate Chairman CONAWAY on a well crafted bill and a thorough committee process

and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the underlying bill.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-18. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2289

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Commodity End-User Relief Act”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—CUSTOMER PROTECTIONS

Sec. 101. Enhanced protections for futures customers.

Sec. 102. Electronic confirmation of customer funds.

Sec. 103. Notice and certifications providing additional customer protections.

Sec. 104. Futures commission merchant compliance.

Sec. 105. Certainty for futures customers and market participants.

TITLE II—COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION REFORMS

Sec. 201. Extension of operations.

Sec. 202. Consideration by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders.

Sec. 203. Division directors.

Sec. 204. Office of the Chief Economist.

Sec. 205. Procedures governing actions taken by Commission staff.

Sec. 206. Strategic technology plan.

Sec. 207. Internal risk controls.

Sec. 208. Subpoena duration and renewal.

Sec. 209. Applicability of notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act to guidance voted on by the Commission.

Sec. 210. Judicial review of Commission rules.

Sec. 211. GAO study on use of Commission resources.

Sec. 212. Disclosure of required data of other registered entities.

Sec. 213. Report on status of any application of metals exchange to register as a foreign board of trade; deadline for action on application.

TITLE III—END-USER RELIEF

Sec. 301. Relief for hedgers utilizing centralized risk management practices.

Sec. 302. Indemnification requirements.

Sec. 303. Transactions with utility special entities.

Sec. 304. Utility special entity defined.

Sec. 305. Utility operations-related swap.

Sec. 306. End-users not treated as financial entities.

Sec. 307. Reporting of illiquid swaps so as to not disadvantage certain non-financial end-users.

Sec. 308. Relief for grain elevator operators, farmers, agricultural counterparties, and commercial market participants.

Sec. 309. Relief for end-users who use physical contracts with volumetric optionality.

Sec. 310. Commission vote required before automatic change of swap dealer de minimis level.

Sec. 311. Capital requirements for non-bank swap dealers.

Sec. 312. Harmonization with the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act.

Sec. 313. Bona fide hedge defined to protect end-user risk management needs.

Sec. 314. Cross-border regulation of derivatives transactions.

Sec. 315. Exemption of qualified charitable organizations from designation and regulation as commodity pool operators.

Sec. 316. Small bank holding company clearing exemption.

Sec. 317. Core principle certainty.

Sec. 318. Treatment of Federal Home Loan Bank products.

Sec. 319. Treatment of certain funds.

TITLE IV—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

Sec. 401. Correction of references.

Sec. 402. Elimination of obsolete references to dealer options.

Sec. 403. Updated trade data publication requirement.

Sec. 404. Flexibility for registered entities.

Sec. 405. Elimination of obsolete references to electronic trading facilities.

Sec. 406. Elimination of obsolete reference to alternative swap execution facilities.

Sec. 407. Elimination of redundant references to types of registered entities.

Sec. 408. Clarification of Commission authority over swaps trading.

Sec. 409. Elimination of obsolete reference to the Commodity Exchange Commission.

Sec. 410. Elimination of obsolete references to derivative transaction execution facilities.

Sec. 411. Elimination of obsolete references to exempt boards of trade.

Sec. 412. Elimination of report due in 1986.

Sec. 413. Compliance report flexibility.

Sec. 414. Miscellaneous corrections.

TITLE I—CUSTOMER PROTECTIONS

SEC. 101. ENHANCED PROTECTIONS FOR FUTURES CUSTOMERS.

Section 17 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 21) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) A registered futures association shall—

“(1) require each member of the association that is a futures commission merchant to maintain written policies and procedures regarding the maintenance of—

“(A) the residual interest of the member, as described in section 1.23 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, in any customer segregated funds account of the member, as identified in section 1.20 of such title, and in any foreign futures and foreign options customer secured amount funds account of the member, as identified in section 30.7 of such title; and

“(B) the residual interest of the member, as described in section 22.2(e)(4) of such title, in any cleared swaps customer collateral account of the member, as identified in section 22.2 of such title; and

“(2) establish rules to govern the withdrawal, transfer or disbursement by any member of the

association, that is a futures commission merchant, of the member's residual interest in customer segregated funds as provided in such section 1.20, in foreign futures and foreign options customer secured amount funds, identified as provided in such section 30.7, and from a cleared swaps customer collateral, identified as provided in such section 22.2.”.

SEC. 102. ELECTRONIC CONFIRMATION OF CUSTOMER FUNDS.

Section 17 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 21), as amended by section 101 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(t) A registered futures association shall require any member of the association that is a futures commission merchant to—

“(1) use an electronic system or systems to report financial and operational information to the association or another party designated by the registered futures association, including information related to customer segregated funds, foreign futures and foreign options customer secured amount funds accounts, and cleared swaps customer collateral, in accordance with such terms, conditions, documentation standards, and regular time intervals as are established by the registered futures association; and

“(2) instruct each depository, including any bank, trust company, derivatives clearing organization, or futures commission merchant, holding customer segregated funds under section 1.20 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, foreign futures and foreign options customer secured amount funds under section 30.7 of such title, or cleared swap customer funds under section 22.2 of such title, to report balances in the futures commission merchant's section 1.20 customer segregated funds, section 30.7 foreign futures and foreign options customer secured amount funds, and section 22.2 cleared swap customer funds, to the registered futures association or another party designated by the registered futures association, in the form, manner, and interval prescribed by the registered futures association; and

“(3) hold section 1.20 customer segregated funds, section 30.7 foreign futures and foreign options customer secured amount funds and section 22.2 cleared swaps customer funds in a depository that reports the balances in these accounts of the futures commission merchant held at the depository to the registered futures association or another party designated by the registered futures association in the form, manner, and interval prescribed by the registered futures association.”.

SEC. 103. NOTICE AND CERTIFICATIONS PROVIDING ADDITIONAL CUSTOMER PROTECTIONS.

Section 17 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 21), as amended by sections 101 and 102 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(u) A futures commission merchant that has adjusted net capital in an amount less than the amount required by regulations established by the Commission or a self-regulatory organization of which the futures commission merchant is a member shall immediately notify the Commission and the self-regulatory organization of this occurrence.

“(v) A futures commission merchant that does not hold a sufficient amount of funds in segregated accounts for futures customers under section 1.20 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, in foreign futures and foreign options secured amount accounts for foreign futures and foreign options secured amount customers under section 30.7 of such title, or in segregated accounts for cleared swap customers under section 22.2 of such title, as required by regulations established by the Commission or a self-regulatory organization of which the futures commission

merchant is a member, shall immediately notify the Commission and the self-regulatory organization of this occurrence.

“(w) Within such time period established by the Commission after the end of each fiscal year, a futures commission merchant shall file with the Commission a report from the chief compliance officer of the futures commission merchant containing an assessment of the internal compliance programs of the futures commission merchant.”.

SEC. 104. FUTURES COMMISSION MERCHANT COMPLIANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4d(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6d(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B);

(2) by inserting “(1)” before “It shall be unlawful”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) Any rules or regulations requiring a futures commission merchant to maintain a residual interest in accounts held for the benefit of customers in amounts at least sufficient to exceed the sum of all uncollected margin deficits of such customers shall provide that a futures commission merchant shall meet its residual interest requirement as of the end of each business day calculated as of the close of business on the previous business day.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 4d(h) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6d(h)) is amended by striking “Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2)” and inserting “Notwithstanding subsection (a)(1)(B)”.

SEC. 105. CERTAINTY FOR FUTURES CUSTOMERS AND MARKET PARTICIPANTS.

Section 20(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 24(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) that cash, securities, or other property of the estate of a commodity broker, including the trading or operating accounts of the commodity broker and commodities held in inventory by the commodity broker, shall be included in customer property, subject to any otherwise unavoidable security interest, or otherwise unavoidable contractual offset or netting rights of creditors (including rights set forth in a rule or bylaw of a derivatives clearing organization or a clearing agency) in respect of such property, but only to the extent that the property that is otherwise customer property is insufficient to satisfy the net equity claims of public customers (as such term may be defined by the Commission by rule or regulation) of the commodity broker.”.

TITLE II—COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION REFORMS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF OPERATIONS.

Section 12(d) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 16(d)) is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2019”.

SEC. 202. CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION OF THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF ITS REGULATIONS AND ORDERS.

Section 15(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 19(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before promulgating a regulation under this Act or issuing an order (except as provided in paragraph (3)), the Commission, through the Office of the Chief Economist, shall assess and publish in the regulation or order the costs and benefits, both qualitative and quantitative, of the proposed regulation or order, and the proposed regulation or order shall state its statutory justification.

“(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In making a reasoned determination of the costs and the benefits, the Commission shall evaluate—

“(A) considerations of protection of market participants and the public;

“(B) considerations of the efficiency, competitiveness, and financial integrity of futures and swaps markets;

“(C) considerations of the impact on market liquidity in the futures and swaps markets;

“(D) considerations of price discovery;

“(E) considerations of sound risk management practices;

“(F) available alternatives to direct regulation;

“(G) the degree and nature of the risks posed by various activities within the scope of its jurisdiction;

“(H) the costs of complying with the proposed regulation or order by all regulated entities, including a methodology for quantifying the costs (recognizing that some costs are difficult to quantify);

“(I) whether the proposed regulation or order is inconsistent, incompatible, or duplicative of other Federal regulations or orders;

“(J) the cost to the Commission of implementing the proposed regulation or order by the Commission staff, including a methodology for quantifying the costs;

“(K) whether, in choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, those approaches maximize net benefits (including potential economic and other benefits, distributive impacts, and equity); and

“(L) other public interest considerations.”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Notwithstanding section 24(d), a court shall affirm a Commission assessment of costs and benefits under this subsection, unless the court finds the assessment to be an abuse of discretion.”.

SEC. 203. DIVISION DIRECTORS.

Section 2(a)(6)(C) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(6)(C)) is amended by inserting “, and the heads of the units shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission” before the period.

SEC. 204. OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ECONOMIST.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(17) **OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ECONOMIST.**—

“(A) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Commission the Office of the Chief Economist.

“(B) **HEAD.**—The Office of the Chief Economist shall be headed by the Chief Economist, who shall be appointed by the Commission and serve at the pleasure of the Commission.

“(C) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Chief Economist shall report directly to the Commission and perform such functions and duties as the Commission may prescribe.

“(D) **PROFESSIONAL STAFF.**—The Commission shall appoint such other economists as may be necessary to assist the Chief Economist in performing such economic analysis, regulatory cost-benefit analysis, or research any member of the Commission may request.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 2(a)(6)(A) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(6)(A)) is amended by striking “(4) and (5) of this subsection” and inserting “(4), (5), and (17)”.

SEC. 205. PROCEDURES GOVERNING ACTIONS TAKEN BY COMMISSION STAFF.

Section 2(a)(12) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(12)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(12) The” and inserting the following:

“(12) **RULES AND REGULATIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the other provisions of this paragraph, the”; and

(2) by adding after and below the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) **NOTICE TO COMMISSIONERS.**—The Commission shall develop and publish internal procedures governing the issuance by any division or office of the Commission of any response to a formal, written request or petition from any member of the public for an exemptive, a no-action, or an interpretive letter and such procedures shall provide that the commissioners be provided with the final version of the matter to be issued with sufficient notice to review the matter prior to its issuance.”.

SEC. 206. STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY PLAN.

Section 2(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)), as amended by section 204(a) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(18) **STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY PLAN.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Every 5 years, the Commission shall develop and submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a detailed plan focused on the acquisition and use of technology by the Commission.

“(B) **CONTENTS.**—The plan shall—

“(i) include for each related division or office a detailed technology strategy focused on market surveillance and risk detection, market data collection, aggregation, interpretation, standardization, harmonization, normalization, validation, streamlining or other data analytic processes, and internal management and protection of data collected by the Commission, including a detailed accounting of how the funds provided for technology will be used and the priorities that will apply in the use of the funds; and

“(ii) set forth annual goals to be accomplished and annual budgets needed to accomplish the goals.”.

SEC. 207. INTERNAL RISK CONTROLS.

Section 2(a)(12) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(12)), as amended by section 205 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **INTERNAL RISK CONTROLS.**—The Commission, in consultation with the Chief Economist, shall develop comprehensive internal risk control mechanisms to safeguard and govern the storage of all market data by the Commission, all market data sharing agreements of the Commission, and all academic research performed at the Commission using market data.”.

SEC. 208. SUBPOENA DURATION AND RENEWAL.

Section 6(c)(5) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 9(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(5) SUBPOENA.—For” and inserting the following:

“(5) **SUBPOENA.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For”; and

(2) by adding after and below the end the following:

“(B) **OMNIBUS ORDERS OF INVESTIGATION.**—

“(i) **DURATION AND RENEWAL.**—An omnibus order of investigation shall not be for an indefinite duration and may be renewed only by Commission action.

“(ii) **DEFINITION.**—In clause (i), the term ‘omnibus order of investigation’ means an order of the Commission authorizing 1 or more members of the Commission or its staff to issue subpoenas under subparagraph (A) to multiple persons in relation to a particular subject matter area.”.

SEC. 209. APPLICABILITY OF NOTICE AND COMMENT REQUIREMENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT TO GUIDANCE VOTED ON BY THE COMMISSION.

Section 2(a)(12) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(12)), as amended by sections 205 and 207 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **APPLICABILITY OF NOTICE AND COMMENT RULES TO GUIDANCE VOTED ON BY THE COMMISSION.**—The notice and comment requirements of

section 553 of title 5, United States Code, shall also apply with respect to any Commission statement or guidance, including interpretive rules, general statements of policy, or rules of Commission organization, procedure, or practice, that has the effect of implementing, interpreting or prescribing law or policy and that is voted on by the Commission.”.

SEC. 210. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF COMMISSION RULES.

The Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 24. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF COMMISSION RULES.

“(a) A person adversely affected by a rule of the Commission promulgated under this Act may obtain review of the rule in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit where the party resides or has the principal place of business, by filing in the court, within 60 days after publication in the Federal Register of the entry of the rule, a written petition requesting that the rule be set aside.

“(b) A copy of the petition shall be transmitted forthwith by the clerk of the court to an officer designated by the Commission for that purpose. Thereupon the Commission shall file in the court the record on which the rule complained of is entered, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code, and the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

“(c) On the filing of the petition, the court has jurisdiction, which becomes exclusive on the filing of the record, to affirm and enforce or to set aside the rule in whole or in part.

“(d) The court shall affirm and enforce the rule unless the Commission’s action in promulgating the rule is found to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right; or without observance of procedure required by law.”.

SEC. 211. GAO STUDY ON USE OF COMMISSION RESOURCES.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the resources of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission that—

(1) assesses whether the resources of the Commission are sufficient to enable the Commission to effectively carry out the duties of the Commission;

(2) examines the expenditures of the Commission on hardware, software, and analytical processes designed to protect customers in the areas of—

(A) market surveillance and risk detection; and

(B) market data collection, aggregation, interpretation, standardization, harmonization, and streamlining;

(3) analyzes the additional workload undertaken by the Commission, and ascertains where self-regulatory organizations could be more effectively utilized; and

(4) examines existing and emerging post-trade risk reduction services in the swaps market, the notional amount of risk reduction transactions provided by the services, and the effects the services have on financial stability, including—

(A) market surveillance and risk detection;

(B) market data collection, aggregation, interpretation, standardization, harmonization, and streamlining; and

(C) oversight and compliance work by market participants and regulators.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of

Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that contains the results of the study required by subsection (a).

SEC. 212. DISCLOSURE OF REQUIRED DATA OF OTHER REGISTERED ENTITIES.

Section 8 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) **DISCLOSURE OF REQUIRED DATA OF OTHER REGISTERED ENTITIES.**—

“(1) Except as provided in this subsection, the Commission may not be compelled to disclose any proprietary information provided to the Commission, except that nothing in this subsection—

“(A) authorizes the Commission to withhold information from Congress; or

“(B) prevents the Commission from—

“(i) complying with a request for information from any other Federal department or agency, any State or political subdivision thereof, or any foreign government or any department, agency, or political subdivision thereof requesting the report or information for purposes within the scope of its jurisdiction, upon an agreement of confidentiality to protect the information in a manner consistent with this paragraph and subsection (e); or

“(ii) making a disclosure made pursuant to a court order in connection with an administrative or judicial proceeding brought under this Act, in any receivership proceeding involving a receiver appointed in a judicial proceeding brought under this Act, or in any bankruptcy proceeding in which the Commission has intervened or in which the Commission has the right to appear and be heard under title 11 of the United States Code.

“(2) Any proprietary information of a commodity trading advisor or commodity pool operator ascertained by the Commission in connection with Form CPO-PQR, Form CTA-PR, and any successor forms thereto, shall be subject to the same limitations on public disclosure, as any facts ascertained during an investigation, as provided by subsection (a); provided, however, that the Commission shall not be precluded from publishing aggregate information compiled from such forms, to the extent such aggregate information does not identify any individual person or firm, or such person’s proprietary information.

“(3) For purposes of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, this subsection, and the information contemplated herein, shall be considered a statute described in subsection (b)(3)(B) of such section 552.

“(4) For purposes of the definition of proprietary information in paragraph (5), the records and reports of any client account or commodity pool to which a commodity trading advisor or commodity pool operator registered under this title provides services that are filed with the Commission on Form CPO-PQR, CTA-PR, and any successor forms thereto, shall be deemed to be the records and reports of the commodity trading advisor or commodity pool operator, respectively.

“(5) For purposes of this section, proprietary information of a commodity trading advisor or commodity pool operator includes sensitive, non-public information regarding—

“(A) the commodity trading advisor, commodity pool operator or the trading strategies of the commodity trading advisor or commodity pool operator;

“(B) analytical or research methodologies of a commodity trading advisor or commodity pool operator;

“(C) trading data of a commodity trading advisor or commodity pool operator; and

“(D) computer hardware or software containing intellectual property of a commodity trading advisor or commodity pool operator.”.

SEC. 213. REPORT ON STATUS OF ANY APPLICATION OF METALS EXCHANGE TO REGISTER AS A FOREIGN BOARD OF TRADE; DEADLINE FOR ACTION ON APPLICATION.

(a) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall submit to the Congress a written report on—

(1) the status of the review by the Commission of any application submitted by a metals exchange to register with the Commission under section 4(b)(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act; and

(2) the status of Commission negotiations with foreign regulators regarding aluminum warehousing.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR ACTION.**—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Commission shall take action on any such application submitted to the Commission on or before August 14, 2012.

TITLE III—END-USER RELIEF

SEC. 301. RELIEF FOR HEDGERS UTILIZING CENTRALIZED RISK MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.**—Section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(h)(7)(D)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under subparagraph (A) (including an affiliate entity predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the hedge or mitigation of such commercial risk is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism must be utilized.”.

(2) **SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 AMENDMENT.**—Section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c-3(g)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under paragraph (1) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the security-based swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the hedge or mitigation of such commercial risk is addressed by entering into a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism must be utilized.”.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF CREDIT SUPPORT MEASURE REQUIREMENT.**—The requirements in section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act and section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (a), requiring that a credit support measure or other mechanism be utilized if the transfer of commercial risk referred to in such sections is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant or a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, as appropriate, shall not apply with respect to swaps or security-based swaps, as appropriate, entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. INDEMNIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **DERIVATIVES CLEARING ORGANIZATIONS.**—Section 5b(k)(5) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7a-1(k)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) **CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.**—Before the Commission may share information with any entity described in paragraph (4), the Commission shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 8 relating to the information on swap transactions that is provided.”.

(b) **SWAP DATA REPOSITORIES.**—Section 21(d) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 24a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.**—Before the swap data repository may share information with any entity described in subsection (c)(7), the swap data repository shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 8 relating to the information on swap transactions that is provided.”.

(c) **SECURITY-BASED SWAP DATA REPOSITORIES.**—Section 13(n)(5)(H) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(n)(5)(H)) is amended to read as follows:

“(H) **CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.**—Before the security-based swap data repository may share information with any entity described in subparagraph (G), the security-based swap data repository shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 24 relating to the information on security-based swap transactions that is provided.”.

SEC. 303. TRANSACTIONS WITH UTILITY SPECIAL ENTITIES.

Section 1a(49) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(49)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) **CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH A UTILITY SPECIAL ENTITY.**—

“(i) Transactions in utility operations-related swaps shall be reported pursuant to section 4r.

“(ii) In making a determination to exempt pursuant to subparagraph (D), the Commission shall treat a utility operations-related swap entered into with a utility special entity, as defined in section 4s(h)(2)(D), as if it were entered into with an entity that is not a special entity, as defined in section 4s(h)(2)(C).”.

SEC. 304. UTILITY SPECIAL ENTITY DEFINED.

Section 4s(h)(2) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(h)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **UTILITY SPECIAL ENTITY.**—For purposes of this Act, the term ‘utility special entity’ means a special entity, or any instrumentality, department, or corporation of or established by a State or political subdivision of a State, that—

“(i) owns or operates, or anticipates owning or operating, an electric or natural gas facility or an electric or natural gas operation;

“(ii) supplies, or anticipates supplying, natural gas and or electric energy to another utility special entity;

“(iii) has, or anticipates having, public service obligations under Federal, State, or local law or regulation to deliver electric energy or natural gas service to customers; or

“(iv) is a Federal power marketing agency, as defined in section 3 of the Federal Power Act.”.

SEC. 305. UTILITY OPERATIONS-RELATED SWAP.

(a) **SWAP FURTHER DEFINED.**—Section 1a(47)(A)(iii) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(47)(A)(iii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subclause (XXI);

(2) by adding “and” at the end of subclause (XXII); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(XXIII) a utility operations-related swap;”.

(b) **UTILITY OPERATIONS-RELATED SWAP DEFINED.**—Section 1a of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(52) **UTILITY OPERATIONS-RELATED SWAP.**—The term ‘utility operations-related swap’ means a swap that—

“(A) is entered into by a utility to hedge or mitigate a commercial risk;

“(B) is not a contract, agreement, or transaction based on, derived on, or referencing—

“(i) an interest rate, credit, equity, or currency asset class; or

“(ii) except as used for fuel for electric energy generation, a metal, agricultural commodity, or crude oil or gasoline commodity of any grade; or

“(iii) any other commodity or category of commodities identified for this purpose in a rule or order adopted by the Commission in consultation with the appropriate Federal and State regulatory commissions; and

“(C) is associated with—

“(i) the generation, production, purchase, or sale of natural gas or electric energy, the supply of natural gas or electric energy to a utility, or the delivery of natural gas or electric energy service to utility customers;

“(ii) fuel supply for the facilities or operations of a utility;

“(iii) compliance with an electric system reliability obligation;

“(iv) compliance with an energy, energy efficiency, conservation, or renewable energy or environmental statute, regulation, or government order applicable to a utility; or

“(v) any other electric energy or natural gas swap to which a utility is a party.”.

SEC. 306. END-USERS NOT TREATED AS FINANCIAL ENTITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2(h)(7)(C)(iii) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(h)(7)(C)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(iii) **LIMITATION.**—Such definition shall not include an entity—

“(I) whose primary business is providing financing, and who uses derivatives for the purpose of hedging underlying commercial risks related to interest rate and foreign currency exposures, 90 percent or more of which arise from financing that facilitates the purchase or lease of products, 90 percent or more of which are manufactured by the parent company or another subsidiary of the parent company; or

“(II) who is not supervised by a prudential regulator, and is not described in any of subclauses (I) through (VII) of clause (i), and—

“(aa) is a commercial market participant; or

“(bb) enters into swaps, contracts for future delivery, and other derivatives on behalf of, or to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of, whether directly or in the aggregate, affiliates that are not so supervised or described.”.

(b) COMMERCIAL MARKET PARTICIPANT DEFINED.

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1a of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1a), as amended by section 305(b) of this Act, is amended by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (52) as paragraphs (9) through (53), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) **COMMERCIAL MARKET PARTICIPANT.**—The term ‘commercial market participant’ means any producer, processor, merchant, or commercial user of an exempt or agricultural commodity, or the products or byproducts of such a commodity.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 1a of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1a) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (18) (as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “(18)(A)” and inserting “(19)(A)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A)(vii) of paragraph (19) (as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection), in the matter following subclause (III), by striking “(17)(A)” and inserting “(18)(A)”.

(B) Section 4(c)(1)(A)(i)(I) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6(c)(1)(A)(i)(I)) is amended by striking

“(7), paragraph (18)(A)(vii)(III), paragraphs (23), (24), (31), (32), (38), (39), (41), (42), (46), (47), (48), and (49)” and inserting “(8), paragraph (19)(A)(vii)(III), paragraphs (24), (25), (32), (33), (39), (40), (42), (43), (47), (48), (49), and (50)”.

(C) Section 4q(a)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6o-1(a)(1)) is amended by striking “1a(9)” and inserting “1a(10)”.

(D) Section 4s(f)(1)(D) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(f)(1)(D)) is amended by striking “1a(47)(A)(v)” and inserting “1a(48)(A)(v)”.

(E) Section 4s(h)(5)(A)(i) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(h)(5)(A)(i)) is amended by striking “1a(18)” and inserting “1a(19)”.

(F) Section 4t(b)(1)(C) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6t(b)(1)(C)) is amended by striking “1a(47)(A)(v)” and inserting “1a(48)(A)(v)”.

(G) Section 5(d)(23) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7(d)(23)) is amended by striking “1a(47)(A)(v)” and inserting “1a(48)(A)(v)”.

(H) Section 5(e)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7(e)(1)) is amended by striking “1a(9)” and inserting “1a(10)”.

(I) Section 5b(k)(3)(A) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7a-1(k)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “1a(47)(A)(v)” and inserting “1a(48)(A)(v)”.

(J) Section 5h(f)(10)(A)(iii) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7b-3(f)(10)(A)(iii)) is amended by striking “1a(47)(A)(v)” and inserting “1a(48)(A)(v)”.

(K) Section 21(f)(4)(C) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 24a(f)(4)(C)) is amended by striking “1a(48)” and inserting “1a(49)”.

SEC. 307. REPORTING OF ILLIQUID SWAPS SO AS TO NOT DISADVANTAGE CERTAIN NON-FINANCIAL END-USERS.

Section 2(a)(13) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(13)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “The Commission” and inserting “Except as provided in subparagraph (D), the Commission”; and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (E) through (H), respectively, and inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) **REQUIREMENTS FOR SWAP TRANSACTIONS IN ILLIQUID MARKETS.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (C):

“(i) The Commission shall provide by rule for the public reporting of swap transactions, including price and volume data, in illiquid markets that are not cleared and entered into by a non-financial entity that is hedging or mitigating commercial risk in accordance with subsection (h)(7)(A).

“(ii) The Commission shall ensure that the swap transaction information referred to in clause (i) of this subparagraph is available to the public no sooner than 30 days after the swap transaction has been executed or at such later date as the Commission determines appropriate to protect the identity of participants and positions in illiquid markets and to prevent the elimination or reduction of market liquidity.

“(iii) In this subparagraph, the term ‘illiquid markets’ means any market in which the volume and frequency of trading in swaps is at such a level as to allow identification of individual market participants.”.

SEC. 308. RELIEF FOR GRAIN ELEVATOR OPERATORS, FARMERS, AGRICULTURAL COUNTERPARTIES, AND COMMERCIAL MARKET PARTICIPANTS.

The Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 4t the following:

“SEC. 4u. RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO NON-REGISTERED MEMBERS OF CERTAIN REGISTERED ENTITIES.

“Except as provided in section 4(a)(3), a member of a designated contract market or a swap execution facility that is not registered with the Commission and not required to be registered with the Commission in any capacity shall satisfy the recordkeeping requirements of this Act

and any recordkeeping rule, order, or regulation under this Act by maintaining a written record of each transaction in a contract for future delivery, option on a future, swap, swaption, trade option, or related cash or forward transaction. The written record shall be sufficient if it includes the final agreement between the parties and the material economic terms of the transaction.”.

SEC. 309. RELIEF FOR END-USERS WHO USE PHYSICAL CONTRACTS WITH VOLUMETRIC OPTIONALITY.

Section 1a(47)(B)(ii) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(47)(B)(ii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(ii) any purchase or sale of a nonfinancial commodity or security for deferred shipment or delivery, so long as the transaction is intended to be physically settled, including any stand-alone or embedded option for which exercise results in a physical delivery obligation;”.

SEC. 310. COMMISSION VOTE REQUIRED BEFORE AUTOMATIC CHANGE OF SWAP DEALER DE MINIMIS LEVEL.

Section 1a(49)(D) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(49)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking all that precedes “shall exempt” and inserting the following:

“(D) EXCEPTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commission”; and

(2) by adding after and below the end the following new clause:

“(ii) DE MINIMIS QUANTITY.—The de minimis quantity of swap dealing described in clause (i) shall be set at a quantity of \$8,000,000,000, and may be amended or changed only through a new affirmative action of the Commission undertaken by rule or regulation.”.

SEC. 311. CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR NON-BANK SWAP DEALERS.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT.—Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “shall” and inserting the following: “and the Securities and Exchange Commission, in consultation with the prudential regulators, shall jointly”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(D)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “shall, to the maximum extent practicable,” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) FINANCIAL MODELS.—To the extent that swap dealers and major swap participants that are banks are permitted to use financial models approved by the prudential regulators or the Securities and Exchange Commission to calculate minimum capital requirements and minimum initial and variation margin requirements, including the use of non-cash collateral, the Commission shall, in consultation with the prudential regulators and the Securities and Exchange Commission, permit the use of comparable financial models by swap dealers and major swap participants that are not banks.”.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-10(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “shall” and inserting the following: “and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, in consultation with the prudential regulators, shall jointly”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(D)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “shall, to the maximum extent practicable,” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) FINANCIAL MODELS.—To the extent that security-based swap dealers and major security-based swap participants that are banks are permitted to use financial models approved by the prudential regulators or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to calculate minimum cap-

ital requirements and minimum initial and variation margin requirements, including the use of non-cash collateral, the Commission shall, in consultation with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, permit the use of comparable financial models by security-based swap dealers and major security-based swap participants that are not banks.”.

SEC. 312. HARMONIZATION WITH THE JUMPSTART OUR BUSINESS STARTUPS ACT.

Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall—

(1) revise section 4.7(b) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), to read as follows:

“(b) Relief available to commodity pool operators. Upon filing the notice required by paragraph (d) of this section, and subject to compliance with the conditions specified in paragraph (d) of this section, any registered commodity pool operator who sells participations in a pool solely to qualified eligible persons in an offering which qualifies for exemption from the registration requirements of the Securities Act pursuant to section 4(2) of that Act or pursuant to Regulation S, 17 CFR 230.901 et seq., and any bank registered as a commodity pool operator in connection with a pool that is a collective trust fund whose securities are exempt from registration under the Securities Act pursuant to section 3(a)(2) of that Act and are sold solely to qualified eligible persons, may claim any or all of the following relief with respect to such pool:”; and

(2) revise section 4.13(a)(3)(i) of such title to read as follows:

“(i) Interests in the pool are exempt from registration under the Securities Act of 1933, and such interests are offered and sold pursuant to section 4 of the Securities Act of 1933 and the regulations thereunder;”.

SEC. 313. BONA FIDE HEDGE DEFINED TO PROTECT END-USER RISK MANAGEMENT NEEDS.

Section 4a(c) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by striking “future for which” and inserting “future, to be determined by the Commission, for which either an appropriate swap is available or”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (a)(2)” and all that follows through “position as” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (5) of subsection (a) for swaps, contracts of sale for future delivery, or options on the contracts or commodities, a bona fide hedging transaction or position is”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “of risks” and inserting “or management of current or anticipated risks”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The Commission may further define, by rule or regulation, what constitutes a bona fide hedging transaction, provided that the rule or regulation is consistent with the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).”.

SEC. 314. CROSS-BORDER REGULATION OF DERIVATIVES TRANSACTIONS.

(a) RULEMAKING REQUIRED.—Within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall issue a rule that addresses—

(1) the nature of the connections to the United States that require a non-U.S. person to register as a swap dealer or a major swap participant under the Commodity Exchange Act and the regulations issued under such Act;

(2) which of the United States swaps requirements apply to the swap activities of non-U.S.

persons and U.S. persons and their branches, agencies, subsidiaries, and affiliates outside of the United States, and the extent to which the requirements apply; and

(3) the circumstances under which a U.S. person or non-U.S. person in compliance with the swaps regulatory requirements of a foreign jurisdiction shall be exempt from United States swaps requirements.

(b) CONTENT OF THE RULE.—

(1) CRITERIA.—In the rule, the Commission shall establish criteria for determining that 1 or more categories of the swaps regulatory requirements of a foreign jurisdiction are comparable to and as comprehensive as United States swaps requirements. The criteria shall include—

(A) the scope and objectives of the swaps regulatory requirements of the foreign jurisdiction;

(B) the effectiveness of the supervisory compliance program administered;

(C) the enforcement authority exercised by the foreign jurisdiction; and

(D) such other factors as the Commission, by rule, determines to be necessary or appropriate in the public interest.

(2) COMPARABILITY.—In the rule, the Commission shall—

(A) provide that any non-U.S. person or any transaction between two non-U.S. persons shall be exempt from United States swaps requirements if the person or transaction is in compliance with the swaps regulatory requirements of a foreign jurisdiction which the Commission has determined to be comparable to and as comprehensive as United States swaps requirements; and

(B) set forth the circumstances in which a U.S. person or a transaction between a U.S. person and a non-U.S. person shall be exempt from United States swaps requirements if the person or transaction is in compliance with the swaps regulatory requirements of a foreign jurisdiction which the Commission has determined to be comparable to and as comprehensive as United States swaps requirements.

(3) OUTCOMES-BASED COMPARISON.—In developing and applying the criteria, the Commission shall emphasize the results and outcomes of, rather than the design and construction of, foreign swaps regulatory requirements.

(4) RISK-BASED RULEMAKING.—In the rule, the Commission shall not take into account, for the purposes of determining the applicability of United States swaps requirements, the location of personnel that arrange, negotiate, or execute swaps.

(5) No part of any rulemaking under this section shall limit the Commission's antifraud or antimarket manipulation authority.

(c) APPLICATION OF THE RULE.—

(1) ASSESSMENTS OF FOREIGN JURISDICTIONS.—Beginning on the date on which a final rule is issued under this section, the Commission shall begin to assess the swaps regulatory requirements of foreign jurisdictions, in the order the Commission determines appropriate, in accordance with the criteria established pursuant to subsection (b)(1). Following each assessment, the Commission shall determine, by rule or by order, whether the swaps regulatory requirements of the foreign jurisdiction are comparable to and as comprehensive as United States swaps requirements.

(2) SUBSTITUTED COMPLIANCE FOR UNASSESSED MAJOR MARKETS.—Beginning 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) the swaps regulatory requirements of each of the 8 foreign jurisdictions with the largest swaps markets, as calculated by notional value during the 12-month period ending with such date of enactment, except those with respect to which a determination has been made under paragraph (1), shall be considered to be comparable to and as comprehensive as United States swaps requirements; and

(B) a non-U.S. person or a transaction between 2 non-U.S. persons shall be exempt from United States swaps requirements if the person or transaction is in compliance with the swaps regulatory requirements of any of such unexcepted foreign jurisdictions.

(3) **SUSPENSION OF SUBSTITUTED COMPLIANCE.**—If the Commission determines, by rule or by order, that—

(A) the swaps regulatory requirements of a foreign jurisdiction are not comparable to and as comprehensive as United States swaps requirements, using the categories and criteria established under subsection (b)(1);

(B) the foreign jurisdiction does not exempt from its swaps regulatory requirements U.S. persons who are in compliance with United States swaps requirements; or

(C) the foreign jurisdiction is not providing equivalent recognition of, or substituted compliance for, registered entities (as defined in section 1a(41) of the Commodity Exchange Act) domiciled in the United States, the Commission may suspend, in whole or in part, a determination made under paragraph (1) or a consideration granted under paragraph (2).

(d) **PETITION FOR REVIEW OF FOREIGN JURISDICTION PRACTICES.**—A registered entity, commercial market participant (as defined in section 1a(7) of the Commodity Exchange Act), or Commission registrant (within the meaning of such Act) who petitions the Commission to make or change a determination under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(3) of this section shall be entitled to expedited consideration of the petition. A petition shall include any evidence or other supporting materials to justify why the petitioner believes the Commission should make or change the determination. Petitions under this section shall be considered by the Commission any time following the enactment of this Act. Within 180 days after receipt of a petition for a rulemaking under this section, the Commission shall take final action on the petition. Within 90 days after receipt of a petition to issue an order or change an order issued under this section, the Commission shall take final action on the petition.

(e) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—If the Commission makes a determination described in this section through an order, the Commission shall articulate the basis for the determination in a written report published in the Federal Register and transmitted to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate within 15 days of the determination. The determination shall not be effective until 15 days after the committees receive the report.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this Act and for purposes of the rules issued pursuant to this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) **U.S. PERSON.**—The term “U.S. person”—

(A) means—

(i) any natural person resident in the United States;

(ii) any partnership, corporation, trust, or other legal person organized or incorporated under the laws of the United States or having its principal place of business in the United States;

(iii) any account (whether discretionary or non-discretionary) of a U.S. person; and

(iv) any other person as the Commission may further define to more effectively carry out the purposes of this section; and

(B) does not include the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Bank, the United Nations, their agencies or pension plans, or any other similar international organizations or their agencies or pension plans.

(2) **UNITED STATES SWAPS REQUIREMENTS.**—The term “United States swaps requirements” means the provisions relating to swaps contained in the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a et seq.) that were added by title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 8301 et seq.) and any rules or regulations prescribed by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission pursuant to such provisions.

(3) **FOREIGN JURISDICTION.**—The term “foreign jurisdiction” means any national or supranational political entity with common rules governing swaps transactions.

(4) **SWAPS REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.**—The term “swaps regulatory requirements” means any provisions of law, and any rules or regulations pursuant to the provisions, governing swaps transactions or the counterparties to swaps transactions.

(g) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 4(c)(1)(A) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6(c)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “or except as necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Commodity End-User Relief Act,” after “to grant exemptions.”.

SEC. 315. EXEMPTION OF QUALIFIED CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS FROM DESIGNATION AND REGULATION AS COMMODITY POOL OPERATORS.

(a) **EXCLUSION FROM DEFINITION OF COMMODITY POOL.**—Section 1a(10) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(10)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **EXCLUSION.**—The term ‘commodity pool’ shall not include any investment trust, syndicate, or similar form of enterprise excluded from the definition of ‘investment company’ pursuant to sections 3(c)(10) or 3(c)(14) of the Investment Company Act of 1940.”.

(b) **INAPPLICABILITY OF PROHIBITION ON USE OF INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE BY UNREGISTERED COMMODITY TRADING ADVISOR.**—Section 4m of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6m) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the 2nd sentence, by inserting “: Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any commodity trading advisor that is: (A) a charitable organization, as defined in section 3(c)(10)(D) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, or a trustee, director, officer, employee, or volunteer of such a charitable organization acting within the scope of the employment or duties of the person with the organization, whose trading advice is provided only to, or with respect to, 1 or more of the following: (i) any such charitable organization, or (ii) an investment trust, syndicate or similar form of enterprise excluded from the definition of ‘investment company’ pursuant to section 3(c)(10) of the Investment Company Act of 1940; or (B) any plan, company, or account described in section 3(c)(14) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, any person or entity who establishes or maintains such a plan, company, or account, or any trustee, director, officer, employee, or volunteer for any of the foregoing plans, persons, or entities acting within the scope of the employment or duties of the person with the organization, whose trading advice is provided only to, or with respect to, any investment trust, syndicate, or similar form of enterprise excluded from the definition of ‘investment company’ pursuant to section 3(c)(14) of the Investment Company Act of 1940” before the period; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **DISCLOSURE CONCERNING EXCLUDED CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS.**—The operator of or advisor to any investment trust, syndicate, or similar form of enterprise excluded from the definition of ‘commodity pool’ by reason of section 1a(10)(C) of this Act pursuant to section 3(c)(10) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 shall provide disclosure in accordance with section 7(e) of the Investment Company Act of 1940.”.

SEC. 316. SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY CLEARING EXEMPTION.

Section 2(h)(7)(C) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(h)(7)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) **HOLDING COMPANIES.**—A determination made by the Commission under clause (ii) shall, with respect to small banks and savings associations, also apply to their respective bank holding company (as defined in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956), or savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act of 1933), if the total consolidated assets of the holding company are no greater than the asset threshold set by the Commission in determining small bank and savings association eligibility under clause (ii).”.

SEC. 317. CORE PRINCIPLE CERTAINTY.

Section 5h(f) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7b–3(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting “except as described in this subsection,” after “Commission by rule or regulation”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) have reasonable discretion in establishing and enforcing its rules related to trade practice surveillance, market surveillance, real-time marketing monitoring, and audit trail given that a swap execution facility may offer a trading system or platform to execute or trade swaps through any means of interstate commerce. A swap execution facility shall be responsible for monitoring trading in swaps only on its own facility.”;

(3) in paragraph (4)(B), by adding at the end the following: “A swap execution facility shall be responsible for monitoring trading in swaps only on its own facility.”;

(4) in paragraph (6)(B)—
(A) by striking “shall—” and all that follows through “compliance with the” and insert “shall monitor the trading activity on its facility for compliance with any”;

(B) by striking “or through”;

(C) by adding at the end the following: “A swap execution facility shall be responsible for monitoring positions only on its own facility.”;

(5) in paragraph (8), by striking “to liquidate” and all that follows and inserting “to suspend or curtail trading in a swap on its own facility.”;

(6) in paragraph (13)(B), by striking “1-year period, as calculated on a rolling basis” and inserting “90-day period, as calculated on a rolling basis, or conduct an orderly wind-down of its operations, whichever is greater”;

(7) in paragraph (15)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by adding at the end the following: “The individual may also perform other responsibilities for the swap execution facility.”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting “, a committee of the board,” after “directly to the board”;

(ii) by striking clauses (iii) through (v) and inserting the following:

“(iii) establish and administer policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to resolve any conflicts of interest that may arise;

“(iv) establish and administer policies and procedures that reasonably ensure compliance with this Act and the rules and regulations issued under this Act, including rules prescribed by the Commission pursuant to this section; and”;

(iii) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (v);

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking “(B)(vi)” and inserting “(B)(v)”;

(D) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking “In accordance with rules prescribed by the Commission, the” and inserting “The”;

(II) by striking “and sign”; and

(ii) in clause (ii)—

(I) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “or senior officer” after “officer”;

(II) by amending subclause (I) to read as follows:

“(I) submit each report described in clause (i) to the Commission; and”; and

(III) in subclause (II), by inserting “materially” before “accurate”.

SEC. 318. TREATMENT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK PRODUCTS.

(a) Section 1a(2) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and”;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) is the Federal Housing Finance Agency for any Federal Home Loan Bank (as defined in section 2 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act).”.

(b) Section 402(a) of the Legal Certainty for Bank Products Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 27(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) any Federal Home Loan Bank (as defined in section 2 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act).”.

SEC. 319. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN FUNDS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE DEFINITION OF COMMODITY POOL OPERATOR.—Section 1a(11) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(11)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C)(i) The term ‘commodity pool operator’ does not include a person who serves as an investment adviser to an investment company registered pursuant to section 8 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 or a subsidiary of such a company, if the investment company or subsidiary invests, reinvests, owns, holds, or trades in commodity interests limited to only financial commodity interests.

“(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph only, the term ‘financial commodity interest’ means a futures contract, an option on a futures contract, or a swap, involving a commodity that is not an exempt commodity or an agricultural commodity, including any index of financial commodity interests, whether cash settled or involving physical delivery.

“(iii) For purposes of this subparagraph only, the term ‘commodity’ does not include a security issued by a real estate investment trust, business development company, or issuer of asset-backed securities, including any index of such securities.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO THE DEFINITION OF COMMODITY TRADING ADVISOR.—Section 1a(12) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(12)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) The term ‘commodity trading advisor’ does not include a person who serves as an investment adviser to an investment company registered pursuant to section 8 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 or a subsidiary of such a company, if the commodity trading advice relates only to a financial commodity interest, as defined in paragraph (11)(C)(ii) of this section. For purposes of this subparagraph only, the term ‘commodity’ does not include a security issued by a real estate investment trust, business development company, or issuer of asset-backed securities, including any index of such securities.”.

TITLE IV—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 401. CORRECTION OF REFERENCES.

(a) Section 2(h)(8)(A)(ii) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(h)(8)(A)(ii)) is amended

by striking “5h(f) of this Act” and inserting “5h(g)”.

(b) Section 5c(c)(5)(C)(i) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7a-2(c)(5)(C)(i)) is amended by striking “1a(2)(i)” and inserting “1a(19)(i)”.

(c) Section 23(f) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 26(f)) is amended by striking “section 7064” and inserting “section 706”.

SEC. 402. ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REFERENCES TO DEALER OPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4c of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6c) is amended by striking subsections (d) and (e) and redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 2(d) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(d)) is amended by striking “(g) of” and inserting “(e) of”.

(2) Section 4f(a)(4)(A)(i) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6f(a)(4)(A)(i)) is amended by striking “(d), (e), and (g)” and inserting “and (e)”.

(3) Section 4k(5)(A) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6k(5)(A)) is amended by striking “(d), (e), and (g)” and inserting “and (e)”.

(4) Section 5f(b)(1)(A) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7b-1(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “, (e) and (g)” and inserting “and (e)”.

(5) Section 9(a)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 13(a)(2)) is amended by striking “through (e)” and inserting “and (c)”.

SEC. 403. UPDATED TRADE DATA PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT.

Section 4g(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6g(e)) is amended by striking “exchange” and inserting “each designated contract market and swap execution facility”.

SEC. 404. FLEXIBILITY FOR REGISTERED ENTITIES.

Section 5c(b) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7a-2(b)) is amended by striking “contract market, derivatives transaction execution facility, or electronic trading facility” each place it appears and inserting “registered entity”.

SEC. 405. ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REFERENCES TO ELECTRONIC TRADING FACILITIES.

(a) Section 1a(18)(A)(x) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(18)(A)(x)) is amended by striking “(other than an electronic trading facility with respect to a significant price discovery contract)”.

(b) Section 1a(40) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(40)) is amended—

(1) by adding “and” at the end of subparagraph (D); and

(2) by striking all that follows “section 21” and inserting a period.

(c) Section 4a(e) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6a(e)) is amended—

(1) in the 1st sentence—

(A) by striking “or by any electronic trading facility”;

(B) by striking “or on an electronic trading facility”; and

(C) by striking “or electronic trading facility” each place it appears; and

(2) in the 2nd sentence, by striking “or electronic trading facility with respect to a significant price discovery contract”.

(d) Section 4g(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6g(a)) is amended by striking “any significant price discovery contract traded or executed on an electronic trading facility or”.

(e) Section 4i(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6i(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “, or any significant price discovery contract traded or executed on an electronic trading facility or any agreement, contract, or transaction that is treated by a derivatives clearing organization, whether registered or not registered, as fungible with a significant price discovery contract”; and

(2) by striking “or electronic trading facility”

(f) Section 6(b) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8(b)) is amended by striking “or electronic trading facility” each place it appears.

(g) Section 12(e)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 16(e)(2)) is amended by striking “in the case of—” and all that follows and inserting “in the case of an agreement, contract, or transaction that is excluded from this Act under section 2(c) or 2(f) of this Act or title IV of the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000, or exempted under section 4(c) of this Act (regardless of whether any such agreement, contract, or transaction is otherwise subject to this Act).”.

SEC. 406. ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REFERENCE TO ALTERNATIVE SWAP EXECUTION FACILITIES.

Section 5h(h) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7b-3(h)) is amended by striking “alternative” before “swap”.

SEC. 407. ELIMINATION OF REDUNDANT REFERENCES TO TYPES OF REGISTERED ENTITIES.

Section 6b of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 13a) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “as set forth in sections 5 through 5c”.

SEC. 408. CLARIFICATION OF COMMISSION AUTHORITY OVER SWAPS TRADING.

Section 8a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by inserting “the protection of swaps traders and to assure fair dealing in swaps, for” after “appropriate for”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “swaps or” after “conditions in”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “or swaps” after “future delivery”; and

(2) in paragraph (9)—

(A) by inserting “swap or” after “or liquidation of any”; and

(B) by inserting “swap or” after “margin levels on any”.

SEC. 409. ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REFERENCE TO THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE COMMISSION.

Section 13(c) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 13c(c)) is amended by striking “or the Commission”.

SEC. 410. ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REFERENCES TO DERIVATIVE TRANSACTION EXECUTION FACILITIES.

(a) Section 1a(12)(B)(vi) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(12)(B)(vi)) is amended by striking “derivatives transaction execution facility” and inserting “swap execution facility”.

(b) Section 1a(34) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(34)) is amended by striking “or derivatives transaction execution facility” each place it appears.

(c) Section 1a(35)(B)(iii)(I) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(35)(B)(iii)(I)) is amended by striking “or registered derivatives transaction execution facility”.

(d) Section 2(a)(1)(C)(ii) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(C)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “, or register a derivatives transaction execution facility that trades or executes”; and

(2) by striking “, and no derivatives transaction execution facility shall trade or execute such contracts of sale (or options on such contracts) for future delivery”; and

(3) by striking “or the derivatives transaction execution facility”.

(e) Section 2(a)(1)(C)(v)(I) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(C)(v)(I)) is amended by striking “, or any derivatives transaction execution facility on which such contract or option is traded.”.

(f) Section 2(a)(1)(C)(v)(II) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(C)(v)(II)) is amended by striking “or derivatives transaction execution facility” each place it appears.

(g) Section 2(a)(1)(C)(v)(V) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(C)(v)(V)) is amended by striking

"or registered derivatives transaction execution facility".

(h) Section 2(a)(1)(D)(i) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(D)(i)) is amended in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(1) by striking "in, or register a derivatives transaction execution facility"; and

(2) by striking "or registered as a derivatives transaction execution facility for,".

(i) Section 2(a)(1)(D)(i)(IV) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(D)(i)(IV)) is amended by striking "registered derivatives transaction execution facility," each place it appears.

(j) Section 2(a)(1)(D)(ii)(I) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(D)(ii)(I)) is amended to read as follows:

"(I) the transaction is conducted on or subject to the rules of a board of trade that has been designated by the Commission as a contract market in such security futures product; or".

(k) Section 2(a)(1)(D)(ii)(II) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(D)(ii)(II)) is amended by striking "or registered derivatives transaction execution facility".

(l) Section 2(a)(1)(D)(ii)(III) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(D)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking "or registered derivatives transaction execution facility member".

(m) Section 2(a)(9)(B)(ii) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(9)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking "or registration" each place it appears;

(2) by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facility" each place it appears;

(3) by striking "or register";

(4) by striking "registering,";

(5) by striking "or registering," each place it appears; and

(6) by striking "registration,".

(n) Section 2(c)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(c)(2)) is amended by striking "or a derivatives transaction execution facility" each place it appears.

(o) Section 4(a)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6(a)(1)) is amended by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facility" each place it appears.

(p) Section 4(c)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "or registered" after "designated"; and

(2) by striking "or derivative transaction execution facility".

(q) Section 4a(a)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6a(a)(1)) is amended by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facilities" each place it appears.

(r) Section 4a(e) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6a(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking "derivatives transaction execution facility," each place it appears; and

(2) by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facility".

(s) Section 4c(g) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6c(g)) is amended by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facility" each place it appears.

(t) Section 4d of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6d) is amended by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facility" each place it appears.

(u) Section 4e of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6e) is amended by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facility".

(v) Section 4f(b) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6f(b)) is amended by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facility" each place it appears.

(w) Section 4i of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6i) is amended by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facility".

(x) Section 4j(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6j(a)) is amended by striking "and registered derivatives transaction execution facility".

(y) Section 4p(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6p(a)) is amended by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facilities".

(z) Section 4p(b) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6p(b)) is amended by striking "derivatives transaction execution facility".

(aa) Section 5c(f) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7a-2(f)) is amended by striking "and registered derivatives transaction execution facility".

(bb) Section 5c(f)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7a-2(f)(1)) is amended by striking "or registered derivatives transaction execution facility".

(cc) Section 6 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8) is amended—

(1) by striking "or registered";

(2) by striking "or derivatives transaction execution facility" each place it appears; and

(3) by striking "or registration" each place it appears.

(dd) Section 6a(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 10a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "or registered";

(2) by striking "or a derivatives transaction execution facility"; and

(3) by inserting "shall" before "exclude".

(ee) Section 6a(b) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 10a(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking "or registered"; and

(2) by striking "or a derivatives transaction execution facility".

(ff) Section 6d(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 13a-2(1)) is amended by striking "derivatives transaction execution facility".

SEC. 411. ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REFERENCES TO EXEMPT BOARDS OF TRADE.

(a) Section 1a(18)(A)(x) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(18)(A)(x)) is amended by striking "or an exempt board of trade".

(b) Section 12(e)(1)(B)(i) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 16(e)(1)(B)(i)) is amended by striking "or exempt board of trade".

SEC. 412. ELIMINATION OF REPORT DUE IN 1986.

Section 26 of the Futures Trading Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 16a) is amended by striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

SEC. 413. COMPLIANCE REPORT FLEXIBILITY.

Section 4s(k)(3)(B) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(k)(3)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) REQUIREMENTS.—A compliance report under subparagraph (A) shall—

"(i) include a certification that, under penalty of law, the compliance report is materially accurate and complete; and

"(ii) be furnished at such time as the Commission determines by rule, regulation, or order, to be appropriate.".

SEC. 414. MISCELLANEOUS CORRECTIONS.

(a) Section 1a(12)(A)(i)(II) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(12)(A)(i)(II)) is amended by adding at the end a semicolon.

(b) Section 2(a)(1)(C)(ii)(III) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(C)(ii)(III)) is amended by moving the provision 2 ems to the right.

(c) Section 2(a)(1)(C)(iii) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(C)(iii)) is amended by moving the provision 2 ems to the right.

(d) Section 2(a)(1)(C)(iv) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(C)(iv)) is amended by striking "under or" and inserting "under".

(e) Section 2(a)(1)(C)(v) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(C)(v)) is amended by moving the provision 2 ems to the right.

(f) Section 2(a)(1)(C)(v)(VI) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(C)(v)(VI)) is amended by striking "III" and inserting "(III)".

(g) Section 2(c)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(c)(1)) is amended by striking the 2nd comma.

(h) Section 4(c)(3)(H) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6(c)(3)(H)) is amended by striking "state" and inserting "State".

(i) Section 4c(c) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6c(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Commission shall issue regulations to continue to permit the trading of options on

contract markets under such terms and conditions that the Commission from time to time may prescribe.".

(j) Section 4d(b) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6d(b)) is amended by striking "paragraph (2) of this section" and inserting "subsection (a)(2)".

(k) Section 4f(c)(3)(A) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6f(c)(3)(A)) is amended by striking the 1st comma.

(l) Section 4f(c)(4)(A) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6f(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking "in developing" and inserting "In developing".

(m) Section 4f(c)(4)(B) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6f(c)(4)(B)) is amended by striking "1817(a)" and inserting "1817(a)".

(n) Section 5 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7) is amended by redesignating subsections (c) through (e) as subsections (b) through (d), respectively.

(o) Section 5b of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7a-1) is amended by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (j).

(p) Section 5f(b)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7b-1(b)(1)) is amended by striking "section 5f" and inserting "this section".

(q) Section 6(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8(a)) is amended by striking "the the" and inserting "the".

(r) Section 8a of such Act (7 U.S.C. 12a) is amended in each of paragraphs (1)(E) and (3)(B) by striking "Investors" and inserting "Investor".

(s) Section 9(a)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 13(a)(2)) is amended by striking "subsection 4c" and inserting "section 4c".

(t) Section 12(b)(4) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 16(b)(4)) is amended by moving the provision 2 ems to the left.

(u) Section 14(a)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 18(a)(2)) is amended by moving the provision 2 ems to the left.

(v) Section 17(b)(9)(D) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 21(b)(9)(D)) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting a period.

(w) Section 17(b)(10)(C)(ii) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 21(b)(10)(C)(ii)) is amended by striking "and" at the end.

(x) Section 17(b)(11) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 21(b)(11)) is amended by striking the period and inserting a semicolon.

(y) Section 17(b)(12) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 21(b)(12)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(A)"; and

(2) by striking the period and inserting "and".

(z) Section 17(b)(13) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 21(b)(13)) is amended by striking "A" and inserting "a".

(aa) Section 17 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 21) is amended by redesignating subsection (q), as added by section 233(5) of Public Law 97-444, and subsection (r) as subsections (r) and (s), respectively.

(bb) Section 22(b)(3) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 25(b)(3)) is amended by striking "of registered" and inserting "of a registered".

(cc) Section 22(b)(4) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 25(b)(4)) is amended by inserting a comma after "entity".

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-136. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-136.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 7, strike “(s)” and insert “(t)”.

Page 4, line 15, strike “(t)” and insert “(u)”.

Page 6, line 9, strike “(u)” and insert “(v)”.

Page 6, line 16, strike “(v)” and insert “(w)”.

Page 7, line 4, strike “(w)” and insert “(x)”.

Page 12, line 10, strike “(17)” and insert “(16)”.

Page 13, line 6, strike “(17)” and insert “(16)”.

Page 14, line 8, strike “(18)” and insert “(17)”.

Page 30, line 18, strike “or”.

Page 33, line 12, strike “(8)” and insert “(7)”.

Page 33, line 13, strike “(9)” and insert “(8)”.

Page 38, line 8, strike “1a(47)(B)(ii)” and insert “1a(48)(B)(ii)”.

Page 38, line 9, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 38, line 21, strike “1a(49)(D)” and insert “1a(50)(D)”.

Page 38, line 22, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 52, line 15, strike “1a(10)” and insert “1a(11)”.

Page 52, line 16, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 55, line 13, strike “subsection,” and insert “subsection”.

Page 56, line 11, insert “and” after the semicolon.

Page 56, strike line 12.

Page 56, line 13, strike “(C)” and insert “(B)”.

Page 59, line 16, strike “1a(11)” and insert “1a(12)”.

Page 59, line 17, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 60, line 18, strike “1a(12)” and insert “1a(13)”.

Page 60, line 19, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act,” after “(7 U.S.C. 1a(12))”.

Page 61, line 3, strike “(11)(C)(ii)” and insert “(12)(C)(ii)”.

Page 62, line 7, strike “(d),” and insert “, (d),”.

Page 62, line 10, strike “(d),” and insert “, (d),”.

Page 62, line 13, strike “(e)” and insert “(e),”.

Page 63, line 9, strike “1a(18)(A)(x)” and insert “1a(19)(A)(x)”.

Page 63, line 10, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 63, line 13, strike “1a(40)” and insert “1a(41)”.

Page 63, line 14, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 64, line 10, strike “4i(a)” and insert “4i”.

Page 64, line 10, strike “6i(a)” and insert “6i”.

Page 66, line 18, strike “1a(12)(B)(vi)” and insert “1a(13)(B)(vi)”.

Page 66, line 19, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 66, line 22, strike “1a(34)” and insert “1a(35)”.

Page 66, line 22, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 67, line 1, strike “1a(35)(B)(iii)(I)” and insert “1a(36)(B)(iii)(I)”.

Page 67, line 2, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 69, strike lines 6 through 9 and insert the following:

(4) by striking “, registering,”; and

(5) by striking “registration.”.

Page 69, line 12, strike “each place it appears”.

Page 69, line 20, strike “derivative” and insert “derivatives”.

Page 69, strike lines 22 through 24 and insert the following:

(q) Section 4a(a)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6a(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or derivatives transaction execution facilities”; and

(2) by striking “or derivatives transaction execution facility”.

Page 70, line 7, strike “4c(g)” and insert “4c(e)”.

Page 70, line 7, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 402(a) of this Act.”.

Page 71, line 21, strike “before ‘exclude’.” and insert “before ‘exclude’ the first place it appears.”.

Page 72, line 8, strike “1a(18)(A)(x)” and insert “1a(19)(A)(x)”.

Page 72, line 9, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 73, line 5, strike “1a(12)(A)(i)(II)” and insert “1a(13)(A)(i)(II)”.

Page 73, line 6, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as so redesignated by section 306(b)(1) of this Act.”.

Page 75, line 7, strike “(1)(E)” and insert “(2)(E)”.

Page 76, line 6, after the parenthetical phrase, insert “, as amended by sections 101 through 103 of this Act.”.

Page 76, beginning on line 8, strike “subsection (r) as subsections (r) and (s)” and insert “subsections (s) through (w) as subsections (r) through (x)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 288, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment corrects the technical errors found by legislative counsel in the process of preparing the Ramseyer for the reported bill, including section, subsection, and paragraph references, punctuation, and pluralization. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-136.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-136.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-136.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 27, strike line 4 and all that follows through page 28, line 2, and insert the following:

(b) SWAP DATA REPOSITORIES.—Section 21 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 24a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(7)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “all” and inserting “swap”; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “(iv) other foreign authorities; and”; and

(2) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.—Before the swap data repository may share information with any entity described in subsection (c)(7), the swap data repository shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 8 relating to the information on swap transactions that is provided.”.

(c) SECURITY-BASED SWAP DATA REPOSITORIES.—Section 13(n)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 25 (15 U.S.C. 78m(n)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “all” and inserting “security-based swap”; and

(B) in subclause (v)—

(i) in subclause (II), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in subclause (III), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following: “(IV) other foreign authorities.”; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (H) and inserting the following:

“(H) CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.—Before the security-based swap data repository may share information with any entity described in subparagraph (G), the security-based swap data repository shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 24 relating to the information on security-based swap transactions that is provided.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if enacted on July 21, 2010.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 288, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple. It really seeks to harmonize the regulatory regime for both the security- and commodity-based swaps. I am so pleased to be joined on

a bipartisan basis with Representatives RICK CRAWFORD, BILL HUIZENGA, and SEAN PATRICK MALONEY in offering this amendment.

As we all know, Mr. Chairman, the regulation of the swaps market is under the jurisdiction of both the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. As such, legislation that amends the swap regulation must be addressed in both the securities law and the Commodity Exchange Act.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked with Chairman HENSARLING, Ranking Member WATERS, and the Committee on Financial Services, and we have offered the same language to amend the securities law section of a bill. This amendment in committee, Mr. Chairman, was adopted by a voice vote.

This amendment makes the same minor change to the Commodity Exchange Act section so that the regulatory regime is the same for both security- and commodity-based swaps.

This section of H.R. 2289 mirrors legislation, H.R. 1847, sponsored by Representative CRAWFORD and has enjoyed broad bipartisan support and passed both the Committee on Financial Services and Committee on Agriculture without controversy and with the support and blessing of the SEC.

So why the amendment? Foreign regulators and some industry participants reached out to the SEC seeking to tighten the language to narrow the requirement to share data to clarify that swap data repositories are only required to share data related to the swap trade.

The amendment will in no way weaken swap regulation or inhibit the aggregation of swap data; rather, the amendment will make a narrow modification to protect market participant information. This change is supported by both industry and the SEC.

This bill has global impact on swap participants and regulators, so I think it is important to get it right. I applaud the SEC for working with industry to refine the bill, and I want to thank the chairman and ranking members of both the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Agriculture for working with me on this amendment and to the sponsor and cosponsors of this legislation for also working with me for their support on this amendment.

I do have some concerns about the underlying bill. The cost-benefit analysis, I think, will hamper the regulatory ability of the CFTC, but I do urge the adoption of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the cosponsors of this amendment. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for introducing the amendment and the cosponsors—Ms. MOORE, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MALONEY—for joining me in efforts to help bring transparency to the global swap markets.

While I may not agree with every position in the Dodd-Frank law, today, I believe we are working towards its bipartisan goal of giving regulators the tools they need to improve systemic risk mitigation in global financial markets.

I think everyone agrees that the lack of transparency into the over-the-counter derivatives market escalated the financial crisis of 2008. In order to provide market transparency, the Dodd-Frank law requires posttrade reporting to swap data repositories, or SDRs, so that regulators and market participants have access to real-time market data that will help identify systemic risk in the financial system.

So far, we have made great strides in reaching this goal, but unfortunately, a provision in the law threatens to undermine our progress unless we fix it.

Currently, Dodd-Frank includes a provision requiring a foreign regulator to indemnify a U.S.-based SDR for any expenses arising from litigation relating to a request for market data. Although well intentioned, the effect has been a reluctance of foreign regulators to comply, which threatens to fragment global data on swap markets and making it harder for regulators to see a complete picture of the marketplace.

Without effective coordination between international regulators and SDRs, monitoring and mitigating global systemic risk is severely limited. H.R. 2289 includes a bipartisan provision that removes the indemnification provisions in Dodd-Frank.

This provision received broad bipartisan support when it came to the floor as a stand-alone last year, passing the House by a vote of 420-2. Additionally, both the CFTC and the SEC support the fix.

This amendment makes a small technical change to make clear that only swap data can be shared with foreign regulators. It will ensure that regulators will have access to a global set of swap market data, which is essential to maintaining the highest degree of market transparency and systemic risk mitigation.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for introducing the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), and I rise in full support of her amendment, but I join Ranking Member PETERSON in his opposition of the bill before us.

Although reauthorization of the Commodity Exchange Act is an important endeavor, this legislation rolls back critical Dodd-Frank reforms and places unnecessary restrictions on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The changes proposed in this underlying bill would stifle the Commission's capacities to respond to a rapidly changing market and would add unneeded layers of government bureaucracy.

The underlying bill, H.R. 2289, threatens the financial stability of hard-working Americans by encouraging the same type of risky behavior that led to the recession just 7 years ago.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Moore amendment. However, I urge my colleagues to use great caution and join me in voting against the underlying bill.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I don't oppose the amendment. It does improve the bill. We appreciate that. I am looking forward to supporting the amendment. I would also expect support on the underlying bill itself.

We have had a good discussion on why this bill is the right answer, bringing the right relief to the right people at the right time and does not do the things that have been spoken of in terms of rolling back Dodd-Frank.

This is a very light touch on Dodd-Frank, and it improves a bill that I don't think anybody would argue is perfect, but maybe they do argue that Dodd-Frank is perfect. I don't think it is perfect, and it does need these light touches.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman. I would urge adoption of the amendment, as well as support of the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI
The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-136.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 2, strike "and".

Page 24, line 4, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 24, after line 4, insert the following:

(3) the status of consultations with all United States market participants including major producers and consumers.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 288, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Congressman GOODLATTE and Chairman CONAWAY for their continued leadership in support of my amendment.

My amendment today would encourage the CFTC to keep both U.S. producers and users of aluminum firmly in mind as they proceed in their work. We might take it for granted, but aluminum is part of our everyday life. It is used in everything from food packaging to commercial buildings and homes to automotive and air transportation.

In my home State of Indiana, aluminum is home to 10,000 industry jobs that account for over \$5 billion in economic activity every year. About 1,800 of those workers are employed at an integrated facility in southern Indiana that boasts the largest operating smelter in the United States and is one of eight still in use in the country.

My amendment would require the CFTC provide this body with an update of the status of its consultations with U.S. producers and consumers of aluminum. To better protect the thousands of workers in my district and businesses and consumers across the country, we must ensure the CFTC is operating in a transparent manner where the rules are designed to help fair and open price discovery.

It is imperative that everyone who participates in the physical aluminum market have confidence in the system, and my amendment will ensure the protection of our workers, businesses, and consumers.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. Does any Member claim time in opposition? If not, the gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Indiana has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

As someone who has worked very hard to ensure that this CFTC reauthorization process is transparent for commodity purchasers, users, and the markets that facilitate these transactions, I was pleased to work with Mrs. WALORSKI on her amendment to

bring further transparency and openness to the issue of aluminum warehousing.

Her amendment would clarify that the bill's required report on the status of any application of metal exchange to register as a foreign board of trade should also include the status of consultations with all U.S. market participants, including major producers and consumers.

I applaud her for offering this targeted amendment to improve the underlying legislation and help everyone in the aluminum market have the best information possible to strengthen aluminum supplies and bring the best cost for consumers, helping to create jobs and grow our economy.

I support her amendment.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS OUT OF SEQUENCE DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2289, COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2289, pursuant to House Resolution 288, amendment Nos. 2 and 3 printed in House Report 114-136 may be considered out of sequence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2289.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1630

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-136 offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-136.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as the designee of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS).

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, after line 6, insert the following:

(C) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Commodity Futures Trading Commission should take all appropriate actions to encourage applications for positions in the Office of the Chief Economist from members of minority groups, women, disabled persons, and veterans.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 288, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very straightforward. It simply urges the CFTC Office of the Chief Economist to encourage applicants for employment by members of minority groups, women, disabled persons, and veterans.

This is a basic standard that I believe every corporation and Federal agency in America should and is willing to strive to meet. Our government is stronger when its workforce reflects the rich diversity of the American people, and this is especially true when it comes to our financial regulatory agencies.

In the years preceding the financial crash, CFTC and the SEC fell down on the job. Their failures helped set the stage for the crushing recession that followed, an economic downturn that disproportionately impacted communities of color.

In the wake of this crisis, Dodd-Frank wisely established the Offices of Minority and Women Inclusion to promote diversity at the Nation's financial regulators and to ensure that the interests of women and minorities would be protected by these agencies.

I was pleased when, earlier this month, six regulatory bodies came together to announce the creation of joint standards for assessing the diversity practices of the financial institutions they oversee.

Though long overdue, this is a critical step forward that will help to promote a more inclusive financial industry. While CFTC did not participate in crafting these standards, I hope that by passing this amendment today we can send a clear message that Congress expects the agency to demonstrate a strong commitment to diversity and inclusion moving forward.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is narrowly crafted, but it promotes a far-reaching goal, advancing the fundamentally American principles of equal opportunity for all.

I urge all Members to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the amendment, as I said. The CFTC in fact does have an office of diversity and inclusion and has three people employed there to work at this very important issue.

I would like to put in the RECORD a statement from Chairman Massad. He says:

Our greatest resource is our employees, and each of us plays a role in ensuring that we recognize the benefits of the differences and the diversity that we bring to our environment.

The protections provided by the Equal Opportunity Act extend to everything we do at the agency, be it recruitment, hiring, appraisal systems, promotions, training and career development programs, or any other actions . . . All persons should be afforded equal employment opportunities at the Commission in an environment in which they can do their best.

I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. TAKAI

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-136.

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 4, strike "and".

Page 15, line 7, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 15, after line 7, insert the following:

"(iii) include a summary of any plan of action and milestones to address any known information security vulnerability, as identified pursuant to a widely accepted industry or Government standard, including—

"(I) specific information about the industry or Government standard used to identify the known information security vulnerability;

"(II) a detailed time line with specific deadlines for addressing the known information security vulnerability; and

"(III) an update of any such time line and the rationale for any deviation from the time line."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 288, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is simple and would help to address cyber vulnerabilities for stored government information at the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

As the bill is currently written, section 206 would require the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to come up with a 5-year plan on technology acquisition. My amendment would add reporting requirements to Congress on plans of actions and milestones for any known information security vulnerability.

My amendment would include a detailed timeline with specific deadlines for addressing the known threats to make sure we get any threat dealt with and solved in a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen recently that cybersecurity is a serious threat to our security, where just last week the personal information of over 4 million Federal employees was compromised. This was one of the largest known cyber attacks on Federal networks in our history and only further underscores the necessity of this amendment.

As we know, this threat is very real. Networks are being attacked constantly by a variety of different actors and for different reasons. For example, there is evidence that our financial institutions have been targeted, and other actors are out to steal one of the best drivers that we have of our economic growth: intellectual property.

Cybersecurity is a problem that the entire government needs to address. The CFTC will be storing very sensitive information, and they should have a plan to place privacy safeguards on this information when storing government data.

If we are going to discuss budgeting for technology acquisition, we should

also be discussing looking at information security vulnerabilities, a plan to address them, and have reporting requirements along the way.

This amendment is common sense, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of the substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 288, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PERMANENT INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 235) to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 235

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act”.

SEC. 2. PERMANENT MORATORIUM ON INTERNET ACCESS TAXES AND MULTIPLE AND DISCRIMINATORY TAXES ON ELECTRONIC COMMERCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1101(a) of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (47 U.S.C. 151 note) is amended by striking “during the period beginning November 1, 2003, and ending October 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxes imposed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 235, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The clock is ticking down on a key law that protects Internet freedom. On October 1, 2015, a temporary moratorium on State taxation of Internet access will expire.

In 1998, Congress temporarily banned State and local governments from newly taxing Internet access or placing multiple or discriminatory taxes on Internet commerce. With minor modifications, this ban was extended five times, with enormous bipartisan support. The most recent extension passed in 2014.

If the moratorium is not renewed, the potential tax burden on consumers will be substantial. The average tax rate on communications services in 2007 was 13.5 percent, more than twice the average rate on all other goods and services. The FCC’s recent reclassification of the Internet as a telecom service emboldens States to apply these telecom taxes to Internet access immediately, should ITFA lapse.

To make matters worse, this tax is regressive. Low-income households pay 10 times as much in communications taxes as high-income households as a share of income.

The Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act converts the moratorium into

a permanent ban—on which consumers, innovators, and investors can permanently rely—by simply striking the 2015 end date.

This legislation prevents a surprise tax hike on Americans’ critical services this fall. It also maintains unfettered access to one of the most unique gateways to knowledge and engines of self-improvement in all of human history.

□ 1645

This is not an exaggeration. During the 2007 renewal of the moratorium, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony that more than 75 percent of the remarkable productivity growth that increased jobs and income between 1995 and 2007 was due to investment in telecommunications networks technology and the information transported across them.

Everyone in Silicon Valley knows Max Levchin’s story. He came to America from the Soviet Union at age 16. He had \$300 in his pocket, and he learned English by watching an old TV set he hauled out of a dumpster and repaired. Ten years later, he sold PayPal, a well-known Internet payments platform he cofounded, for \$1.5 billion.

That is the greatness of the Internet. It is a liberating technology that is a vast meritocracy. It does not care how you look or where you come from. It offers opportunity to anyone willing to invest time and effort.

That is precisely why Congress has worked assiduously for 16 years to keep Internet access tax-free. Now we must act again, once and for all.

The Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act has 188 cosponsors. Identical legislation passed last year on suspension by a voice vote.

Nevertheless, small pockets of resistance remain. They argue that the Internet is no longer a fledgling technology in need of protection. But it is precisely the ubiquity of the Internet that counsels for a permanent extension. It has become an indispensable gateway to scientific, educational, and economic opportunities.

It is the platform that turned Max Levchin from an impoverished immigrant into a billionaire. The case for permanent Internet tax-free access to this gateway technology is stronger today than it ever has been.

It is important to note that PITFA does not address the issue of State taxes on remote sales made over the Internet. It merely prevents Internet access taxes and unfair multiple or discriminatory taxes on e-commerce, whether inside the taxing State or without.

That said, the committee is also eager to proceed with legislation that levels the playing field between traditional and online retailers without letting States tax and regulate beyond their borders. Productive discussions continue.

I would like to specifically thank Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CHABOT, Subcommittee Chairman MARINO, and Subcommittee Ranking Member COHEN for their work on and support of this legislation.

This bipartisan legislation is about giving every American unfettered access to the Internet, which is the modern gateway to the American Dream. I urge all of my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have often worked, in the Judiciary Committee, as Mr. GOODLATTE has so noted, because of the bipartisan leadership, including the offerer of this bill, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), in a bipartisan manner as it deals with this new phenomena, and when I say “new phenomena,” continually changing phenomena, the Internet and the entire world of social media and the new technologies that we face today in communications.

So, I am always eager to find common ground and would have liked to have done so as we worked together on this very important bill, H.R. 235.

As a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, and as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, coming from Houston, I rise with great concern on H.R. 235, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act.

When originally enacted in 1998, the Internet Tax Freedom Act established a temporary moratorium on multiple discriminatory taxation of the Internet, as well as new taxes on Internet access. This moratorium, however, is due to expire on October 1 of this year.

Since 1998, Congress has extended the moratorium on a temporary basis. The bill before us, H.R. 235, will make that moratorium permanent.

Unfortunately, in doing so, H.R. 235 also ends the act’s grandfather protection for States that imposed such taxes prior to the act’s enactment. There lies the crux of the problem: intrusion into individual States’ authority dealing with taxation and providing them with a bridge of revenue.

H.R. 235 is problematic for several reasons. First, Congress, instead of supporting this seriously flawed legislation, should be focusing on meaningful ways to help State and local governments, taxpayers, and local retailers. The House can do that by addressing the remote sales tax issue.

In addition to extending the expiring moratorium on a temporary basis, the House should take up and send to the Senate legislation that would give States the authority to collect sales taxes from remote sellers. Such a proposal would incentivize remote sellers to collect and remit such taxes, as well as require States to simplify several procedures that would benefit retailers.

Such legislation would enable States and local governments to collect more than \$23 billion in estimated uncollected sales taxes each year.

The measure would also help level the playing field for local retailers who must collect sales taxes when they compete with out-of-state businesses that do not collect these taxes. Retail competitors should be able to compete fairly with their Internet counterparts, at least with respect to sales tax policy.

Now, I do know that a lot of our businesses are taking to the Internet, and I applaud that. But before I came here today I spoke before at least 100-plus small businesses. I can tell you that they are worth considering, for many of them are in bricks-and-mortar, and they are small businesses trying to increase their revenue and trying to employ a number of employees. We should thank them for the energy that they provide to the economy.

I believe the House should do its part and address the remote sales tax disparity before the end of this Congress.

Second, this legislation will severely impact the immediate revenues for the grandfather-protected States and all States progressively in the long term.

The CBO, for example, estimates that this bill will cost certain States several hundred million dollars annually in lost revenues.

Indeed, the Federation of Tax Administrators has estimated that the bill will cause the grandfather-protected States to lose at least \$500 million in lost revenue.

For my home State of Texas, enactment of this bill will result in a revenue loss of \$358 million, and Texas will not be alone in those losses annually.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as senior member of the House Judiciary Committee; as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; and as the representative from Houston, I rise in opposition to H.R. 235, the "Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act."

When originally enacted in 1998, the Internet Tax Freedom Act established a temporary moratorium on multiple and discriminatory taxation of the Internet as well as new taxes on Internet access.

This moratorium, however, is due to expire on October 1st, of this year.

Since 1998, Congress has extended the moratorium on a temporary basis. The bill before us, H.R. 235 will make that moratorium permanent.

Unfortunately, in doing so, H.R. 235 also ends the Act's grandfather protections for states that imposed such taxes prior to the Act's enactment date.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 235 is problematic for several reasons.

First, Congress, instead of supporting this seriously flawed legislation, should be focusing on meaningful ways to help state and local governments, taxpayers, and local retailers.

The House can do that by addressing the remote sales tax issue.

In addition to extending the expiring moratorium on a temporary basis, the House should take up and send to the Senate legislation that would give states the authority to collect sales taxes from remote sellers.

Such a proposal would incentivize remote sellers to collect and remit sales taxes as well as require states to simplify several procedures that would benefit retailers.

Such legislation would enable states and local governments to collect more than \$23 billion in estimated uncollected sales taxes each year.

The measure would also help level the playing field for local retailers—who must collect sales taxes—when they compete with out-of-state businesses that do not collect these taxes.

Retail competitors should be able to compete fairly with their Internet counterparts at least with respect to sales tax policy.

The House should do its part and address the remote sales tax disparity before the end of this Congress.

Second, this legislation will severely impact the immediate revenues for the grandfather-protected states and all states progressively in the long term.

The Congressional Budget Office, for example, estimates that this bill will cost certain states "several hundred million dollars annually" in lost revenues.

Indeed, the Federation of Tax Administrators has estimated that the bill will cause the grandfather-protected states to lose at least \$500 million in lost revenue annually.

For my home state of Texas, enactment of this bill will result in a revenue loss of \$358 million per year. Texas will not be alone in these losses, annually: Wisconsin will lose about \$127 million, Ohio will lose about \$65 million, and South Dakota will lose about \$13 million.

Should this bill become law, state and local governments will have to choose whether they will cut essential government services—such as educating our children, maintaining needed transportation infrastructure, and providing essential public health and safety services—or shift the tax burden onto other taxpayers through increased property, income, and sales taxes.

Meanwhile, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has estimated that the permanent moratorium will deny the non-grandfathered states of almost \$6.5 billion in potential state and local sales tax revenues each year in perpetuity.

H.R. 235 will burden taxpayers, while excluding an entire industry from paying their fair share of taxes.

Finally, this bill ignores the fundamental nature of the Internet.

The original moratorium was intentionally made temporary to ensure that Congress, industry, and state and local governments would be able to monitor the issue and make adjustments where necessary to accommodate new technologies and market realities.

The Act was intended as a temporary measure to assist and nurture the fledgling Internet that—back in 1998—was still in its commercial infancy. Yet, this bill ignores the significantly changed environment of today's Internet.

The bill's supporters continue to believe that the Internet still is in need of extraordinary protection in the form of exemption from all state taxation.

But, the Internet of 2015 is drastically different from its 1998 predecessor. And, surely the Internet and its attendant technology will continue to evolve.

Permanently extending the tax moratorium severely limits Congress's ability to revisit and make any necessary adjustments.

Simply put, a permanent moratorium is unwise.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 235.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE, not only for yielding me this time but also for his leadership on promoting and pushing for this bill.

The Internet is an essential component of our economy. It drives innovation, job creation, and has resulted in a higher standard of living for virtually every American.

The bill before us today provides certainty to Americans by making the current law of the land permanent and protecting access to the Internet against new taxes.

Mr. Speaker, there is common ground in this Chamber today. We all agree that the Internet is an essential part of our lives and an incredibly powerful tool for communication, education, and job creation. Let's not make accessing the Internet more costly and more difficult.

The Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, H.R. 235, makes the current law of the land permanent and protects access to the Internet from new taxes, and that is why I would urge my colleagues to support the bill.

The Internet, it is essential to our everyday lives. Americans use it to run small businesses, to do research, to apply for jobs, to listen to music, to communicate with friends and family, to check the weather and the traffic, and for so many other things.

Since 1998, Congress has made sure that access to the Internet remains tax-free. Unfortunately, this protection expires in October, at which point taxes could go up on every American who wants to get online.

Now is the time to make sure that this policy remains permanent. Now is the time to protect access to the Internet.

So I want to again thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE, for his leadership on this issue. Let's make sure that access to the Internet stays tax-free. That is the way it is under the existing law. What we are trying to do is to make that

permanent. I would urge my colleagues to do that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the longstanding author of this legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 235, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act.

Now, whether it is communication, commerce, business, education, research, access to the Internet is today an integral part of the everyday life of millions of Americans and people around the world. And we take great pride in this because this is an American invention.

Just this month, the GAO released a new report which found that broadband affordability continues to be the most frequently identified barrier to adoption.

Now, this whole issue of taxation for access to the Internet, this is not the collection of taxes across State lines. That is another issue.

There are over 10,000 taxing agencies in the United States today. Imagine if we, you, your constituents, everyone in the country who uses the Internet has to pay for access to the Internet every time they go to use it, that they would be taxed on that.

So, the temporary, or the moratorium bill that we have, now this one makes it permanent. This is a bipartisan effort. Over 200 cosponsors in the Congress are on it.

We want to encourage expanded broadband adoption. If you tax it, you are going to shrink it. And I think in the communities that are of lower economic means, this is going to hurt them even more.

We need to do everything we can to ensure that Internet access is universally affordable. This bill is an important component of that effort by permanently eliminating the taxation of Internet access.

The current moratorium, as my colleagues have said, expires October 1, and we want to be ahead of that to keep the door open, but no taxation to access.

I want to salute the chairman, Chairman GOODLATTE. We are good friends. We have worked on other efforts.

As I said, this bill has nearly 200 bipartisan cosponsors and strong support of the communications, Internet, and e-commerce industries. So I would urge all of my colleagues to support this, and understand that, from the ground up, we want to expand the use of broadband in our country for every community. Whether they are poor, whether they are rural, whether they are in a city, whether they are middle class individuals, we don't want to weigh the Internet down with taxation of average people in this country. It

would really be unfair, and I think it would smother the Internet as we know it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have only one speaker remaining. I believe I have the right to close, so if the gentlewoman has additional speakers, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), who is the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee's Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Subcommittee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for providing the time, and I want to thank her for her good work.

I also want to thank the chairman of the committee for bringing this bipartisan bill, which is bipartisan. I signed on to this bill, I guess, with Representative ESHOO and maybe Representative GOODLATTE, back in 2007 because it is my belief that the Internet is a necessity, and it is a necessity in minority communities who need that outreach to information, whether it is educational or commercial, to reach out and be a part of the society. Without the Internet, you can't do that.

Now, the gentlewoman from Texas and my State, Tennessee, neither have an income tax, and therefore, our governments rely on taxes that tend to be regressive. I think Tennessee is the most regressive State in the country on its taxes, very high sales tax.

And the local governments will reach out for anything they can find to tax to make up for the fact that our State doesn't have a progressive tax base.

□ 1700

I want to protect my constituents against regressive taxes at all levels and protect them against taxes that might limit their potentiality of getting access to the World Wide Web and information they need.

So I am proud to be a sponsor of this, to work with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), with whom I have worked on so many bills together, trying to get the Delta Queen going back down the river and all these other things, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman on the Judiciary Committee. I thank them for their work and hope they will all vote for this in a bipartisan fashion. I hope the Senate will, as they did on the USA FREEDOM Act, follow the lead of the House and show that the House leads.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, let me again say that in the Judiciary Committee, we have consistently worked together on issues dealing with the Internet, continue to work together on issues dealing with

innovation, so I would hope as this bill makes its way to the Senate we will find an opportunity to work together again.

But I want to make mention of the fact that in addition to Texas, Wisconsin will lose about \$127 million, Ohio will lose about \$65 million, and South Dakota will lose about \$13 million. Should this bill become law, State and local governments will have to choose whether they will cut essential government services, such as educating our children, maintaining needed transportation infrastructure, and providing essential public health and safety services, or shift the tax burden onto other taxpayers to increase property income and sales taxes.

Now let me be very clear: I am not interested in taxing the Internet. I am interested in the process that most States are utilizing. It is the purchase of items that juxtapose against those who have bricks and mortar, and particularly small businesses.

Meanwhile, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has estimated that the permanent moratorium will deny the non-grandfathered States of almost \$6.5 billion in potential State and local sales tax revenue—sales tax, not access to the Internet.

H.R. 235 will burden taxpayers while excluding an entire industry from paying their fair share of taxes. I want this industry to grow, and, again, I do not want taxing on access. You can be on the Internet from morning until the early sunrise again, the next day. But for those States who have worked and worked with our committee, trying to find a pathway forward, I would like to see us find a compromise.

Finally, this bill ignores the fundamental nature of the Internet. The original moratorium was intentionally made temporary to ensure Congress, industry, and State and local governments would be able to monitor the issue and make adjustments where necessary to accommodate new technologies and market realities, such as acts. The act was intended as a temporary measure to assist and nurture the fledgling Internet that back in 1998 was still in its commercial infancy, yet this bill ignores the significantly changed environment of today's Internet.

The bill's supporters continue to believe that the Internet still is in need of extraordinary protection in the form of exemptions from State taxation, but the Internet of 2015 is drastically different from 1998. It is standing on its own two legs. It is not a toddler. It is a full-grown adult.

Permanently extending the tax moratorium severely limits Congress' ability to revisit and make any necessary adjustments, though I hope we will.

Simply put, the permanent moratorium is unwise, and I urge my colleagues to consider the problems of

H.R. 235. H.R. 235, I think, should be addressing these issues dealing with the many who have opposed it.

Let me, as I close, mention that the National Governors Association recently introduced the following statement: "The National Governors Association is disappointed that the House Judiciary Committee is moving to make the Internet access tax moratorium permanent."

NGA STATEMENT REGARDING INTERNET ACCESS TAX

[For Immediate Release, June 17, 2014]

WASHINGTON—The National Governors Association today released the following statement regarding the Internet access tax moratorium:

"The National Governors Association (NGA) is disappointed that the House Judiciary Committee is moving to make the Internet access tax moratorium permanent.

"Federal prohibitions on state taxing authority are contrary to federalism and the sovereign authority of states to structure and manage their own fiscal systems.

"NGA encourages the committee instead to act to address the disparity between Main Street retailers and online sellers regarding the collection of state and local sales taxes. Leveling the playing field for all retailers is a priority for governors, consistent with federalism and the best opportunity for states, Congress and the business community to work together."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would like to make note that I came from local government, so I have a letter signed by representatives of the National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, International City/County Management Association, Government Finance Officers Association, and the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors. In part, they simply say that they are writing on behalf of local governments: "We urge you to oppose the legislation. . . . The most recent estimates provided by the Congressional Budget Office," they write, "indicate that, if enacted, H.R. 3086 would cost State and local governments hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenues."

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, INTERNATIONAL CITY/COUNTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS

July 8, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of local governments across the nation, our organizations write to express our continuing opposition to H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act. We urge you to oppose the legislation when it is considered on the House floor.

The most recent estimates provided by the Congressional Budget Office indicate that, if enacted, H.R. 3086 would cost state and local governments hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenues. These are revenues that local governments rely upon to fund essential services in their communities, including

well-trained firefighters and police officers; schools, parks, community centers and libraries to support youth; retirement security for dedicated career employees; and continued investments to fix aging infrastructure.

In addition, now that Internet access is ubiquitous and its use generates scores of billions of dollars in revenue annually, it no longer justifies protection from state and local taxation. When the law was first enacted in 1998, the Internet access and commerce industries were in their infancy and only beginning to be significantly available to households. The intent of the moratorium was to give the then-nascent Internet industry time to grow and become established. However, even at that time, Congress recognized that the ban should not be permanent.

Finally, as the telecommunications and cable service industries transition to broadband, the scope of what the ITFA immunizes from state and local taxation is rapidly expanding. Over time, the ITFA would arbitrarily exempt this fast growing, prosperous sector of the economy from taxation, and unfairly shift the burden of supporting essential local services onto other businesses and residents in a community.

For all of these reasons, we urge you to vote against the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, H.R. 3086.

Sincerely,

Matthew D. Chase, Executive Director, National Association of Counties;

Clarence E. Anthony, Executive Director, National League of Cities;

Tom Cochran, Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors;

Robert J. O'Neill, Executive Director, International City/County Management Association;

Jeffrey L. Esser, Executive Director, Government Finance Officers Association;

Stephen Traylor, Executive Director, National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to be very clear: I am here, as many Members are, to extend our hand of friendship for the protection of the Internet and the question of sales on the Internet. I hope we will be able to do that. I ask my colleagues to consider the failings of the present bill and to, in its present form, oppose it.

TO MEMBERS OF THE TEXAS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: As some of you already know, this bill would make permanent the Internet Tax Freedom Act and, importantly for Texas, would repeal the existing grandfather clause that has been in place since the original passage of the Act in 1998 that has allowed Texas to impose sales and use taxes on Internet access services at the state and local level.

The Texas legislature just finished its regular session on June 1, and while it decided to cut property and franchise taxes, it chose to maintain the sales and use tax imposed on these services and anticipates receiving that revenue during the next two year budget cycle.

The estimated revenue loss to the state and local jurisdictions if the grandfather is not extended is as follows:

State: \$280 million
City: 51
Transit: 18
County: 5
Special districts: 4
Total: \$358 million (per year)

Please feel free to get in touch with me if you need input from the Comptroller's office

on this or any other state/local tax bills that come before the House.

Thanks,

NANCY L. PROSSER,
Special Counsel to the
Deputy Comptroller,
Texas Comptroller of
Public Accounts.

JUNE 8, 2015.

LABOR UNIONS OPPOSE H.R. 235 (PITFA) BAN ON STATE & LOCAL GOVERNMENT TAXES ON INTERNET ACCESS.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We, the undersigned labor unions, oppose a federal ban on the authority of state and local governments to impose taxes on internet access. We strenuously oppose the "Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act" (H.R. 235), which would ban these internet access taxes permanently. This type of federal tax preemption is typically unwarranted because it restricts state and local government taxing authority unnecessarily, narrows the tax base, and often leads to harmful unintended consequences. In this case, the internet's huge economic value, its vast and expanding importance to daily life, and the vague statutory definition of "internet access" makes this particular carve out especially troubling and likely to cause fiscal problems. By restricting state and local taxing authority, this bill reduces the ability of state and local governments to raise funds to invest in needed infrastructure, education, health care, job training, and other vital public services.

While a short-term ban is less troubling than a permanent ban, any ban remains problematic and harmful to state and local government finances. Ideally, the existing temporary ban should be allowed to expire as scheduled on September 30, 2015. As new internet-based technology and related applications increasingly affect our daily lives and rapidly transform our economy, we are extremely wary of a ban that is permanent. Congress should be extremely cautious before supporting a permanent tax exemption for internet access. Moreover, it would set harmful, inappropriate, and costly precedents that could spillover into other sectors of our economy.

Years ago, some opined the internet needed time to grow because it was weak, tiny, or immature. In contrast, today's internet is an enormously powerful driver of our economy, a central part of our daily lives, and an enormously valuable well developed industry. As the internet continues providing new transformative services to businesses and consumers, its importance to America's economy grows. Prohibiting these taxes would unfairly exempt this economic sector from contributing to our common well being and communities. In addition, this unneeded and undeserved carve out would unfairly shift its share of taxes to other services, sectors, and stakeholders. There is no reason to exempt internet providers and users from state and local government taxes.

Our labor unions urge you to oppose the "Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act" (H.R. 235) and any similar ban on state and local government taxes on internet access.

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO); American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers (AFT); Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU); Communications Workers of America (CWA); Department for Professional Employees, AFL-CIO (DPE); International Association of

Fire Fighters (IAFF); International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE); International Union of Police Associations (IUPA); National Education Association (NEA); Service Employees International Union (SEIU); International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The last thing the American people need is another tax bill at their door come October. If the ban lapses, State telecommunications taxes could take effect, and those rates are already too high. Basic economics teaches that, as price rises, demand falls.

Former White House Chief Economist Austan Goolsbee estimated that a tax that increased the price of Internet access by 1 percent would reduce demand for Internet access by 2.75 percent. This bill ensures that access to the Internet—this unparalleled engine of social mobility—remains tax-free. That is why this bill is so overwhelmingly popular. Nevertheless, I believe it is proper to counter the criticisms of the small pockets of resistance that remain.

The opponents' chief argument is that the bill would cost the States \$6.5 billion annually. This argument confuses an out-of-pocket loss with prevention of a gain. States cannot currently tax Internet access, so they will suffer no actual revenue loss. The only out-of-pocket loss would be to taxpayers in 44 States who will owe an additional \$6.5 billion annually should it expire. They will have to pay taxes that they don't have to pay now.

Nevertheless, some of our colleagues would prefer to extend the moratorium temporarily rather than permanently. That is simply inefficient. The moratorium has been periodically renewed by enormous bipartisan margins in both Houses for 16 years. No serious expectations are being upset by codifying what everyone knows is the case: the moratorium is not going away.

The grandfathers will be eliminated, but that only affects six States that have had more than enough time to transition to other sources of revenue, which was the original intent of the grandfather clauses. If those States still need more time, I am open to working with the Senate on a final phaseout.

Opponents also argue that PITFA creates unequal treatment of similar services. The example given is landline phone service, which is taxable, versus Skype which, under PITFA, is accessible tax-free. But this happens because Skype's basic service is free; Skype's paid service is taxable. Indeed, PITFA specifically provides that Internet phone service is taxable.

More importantly, this neutrality argument conflates a service with the access to it.

The toll road on the way to the shopping mall is not the same as the sales tax paid at the mall. PITFA is neutral because Skype's paid service remains taxable, just like landline service.

True, there is no tax on Skype's basic service because it is free, but that is the function of Skype's revenue model, not a different tax treatment of the same service.

This legislation has enormous bipartisan support precisely because Members on both sides of the aisle already understand the flaws in these objections. I catalog them here merely to complete the record.

This is a great issue for the Congress to move forward on in a bipartisan fashion that will help to create jobs and economic growth and foster continued greater access to the unparalleled opportunities that Internet access provides. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 235.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN CULTURAL EXCHANGE JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 889) to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 889

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act".

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY OF FOREIGN STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1605 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY FOR CERTAIN ART EXHIBITION ACTIVITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

"(A) a work is imported into the United States from any foreign country pursuant to an agreement that provides for the temporary exhibition or display of such work entered into between a foreign state that is the owner or custodian of such work and the United States or one or more cultural or educational institutions within the United States,

"(B) the President, or the President's designee, has determined, in accordance with

subsection (a) of Public Law 89-259 (22 U.S.C. 2459(a)), that such work is of cultural significance and the temporary exhibition or display of such work is in the national interest, and

"(C) the notice thereof has been published in accordance with subsection (a) of Public Law 89-259 (22 U.S.C. 2459(a)), any activity in the United States of such foreign state, or of any carrier, that is associated with the temporary exhibition or display of such work shall not be considered to be commercial activity by such foreign state for purposes of subsection (a)(3).

"(2) NAZI-ERA CLAIMS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in any case asserting jurisdiction under subsection (a)(3) in which rights in property taken in violation of international law are in issue within the meaning of that subsection and—

"(A) the property at issue is the work described in paragraph (1);

"(B) the action is based upon a claim that such work was taken in connection with the acts of a covered government during the covered period;

"(C) the court determines that the activity associated with the exhibition or display is commercial activity, as that term is defined in section 1603(d); and

"(D) a determination under subparagraph (C) is necessary for the court to exercise jurisdiction over the foreign state under subsection (a)(3).

"(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'work' means a work of art or other object of cultural significance;

"(B) the term 'covered government' means—

"(i) the Government of Germany during the covered period;

"(ii) any government in any area in Europe that was occupied by the military forces of the Government of Germany during the covered period;

"(iii) any government in Europe that was established with the assistance or cooperation of the Government of Germany during the covered period; and

"(iv) any government in Europe that was an ally of the Government of Germany during the covered period; and

"(C) the term 'covered period' means the period beginning on January 30, 1933, and ending on May 8, 1945."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to any civil action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 889, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for introducing this legislation and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for their support as well.

The Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act strengthens the ability of U.S. museums and educational institutions to borrow foreign-government-owned artwork and cultural artifacts for temporary exhibition or display in the United States.

The United States has long recognized the importance of encouraging the cultural exchange of ideas through exhibitions of artworks and other artifacts loaned from other countries. These exchanges expose Americans to other cultures and foster understanding between people of different nationalities, languages, religions, and races.

Unfortunately, the future success of cultural exchanges is severely threatened by a disconnect between the Immunity from Seizure Act and the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

Loans of artwork and cultural objects depend on foreign lenders having confidence that the items they loan will be returned and that the loan will not open them up to lawsuits in U.S. courts.

For 40 years, the Immunity from Seizure Act provided foreign government lenders with this confidence. However, rulings in several recent Federal cases have undermined the protection provided by this law. In these decisions, the Federal courts have held that the Immunity from Seizure Act does not preempt the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. The effect has been to open foreign governments up to the jurisdiction of U.S. courts simply because they loaned artwork or cultural objects to an American museum or educational institution.

This has significantly impeded the ability of U.S. institutions to borrow foreign-government-owned items. It has also resulted in cultural exchanges being curtailed as foreign governments have become hesitant to permit their cultural property to travel to the United States.

This bill addresses this situation. It provides that if the State Department grants immunity to a loan of artwork or cultural objects from the Immunity from Seizure Act, then the loan cannot subject a foreign government to the jurisdiction of U.S. courts under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

This is very narrow legislation. It only applies to one of many grounds for jurisdiction under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, and it requires the State Department to grant the artwork immunity before its provisions apply. Moreover, in order to preserve the claims of the victims of the Nazi

government and its allies during World War II, the bill has an exception for claims brought by these victims.

If we want to encourage foreign governments to continue to lend artwork and other artifacts, we must enact this legislation. Without the protections this bill provides, foreign governments will avoid the risk of lending their cultural items to American museums and educational institutions, and the American public will lose the opportunity to view and appreciate these cultural objects from abroad.

Last Congress, this legislation passed the House with broad bipartisan support by a vote of 388-4. I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this bill. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 889, the Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act.

This bill makes a modest but important amendment to the "expropriation exception" of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976. Specifically, it ensures that foreign states are immune from suits for damages concerning the ownership of cultural property when three particularly important ingredients are present: one, that the property is in the United States pursuant to an agreement between the foreign state and the U.S. or a U.S.-based cultural or educational institution; two, the President has granted the work at issue immunity from seizure pursuant to the Immunity from Seizure Act; and three, that the President's grant of immunity from seizure is published in the Federal Register. All three of those conditions must be met.

The expropriation exception remains available to all claims concerning misappropriated cultural property to which these factual circumstances do not apply.

I would not support this bill if it did not contain a sufficient exception for claims arising from artwork stolen by the Nazis, their allies, and their affiliates.

H.R. 889 has such an exception, ensuring that victims of Nazi art theft continue to have the opportunity to pursue justice in court. This exception is appropriate and important in light of the sheer scale and the particularly concerted efforts of the Nazis to seize artwork and other cultural property from their victims.

A movie that was directed and starred in by George Clooney called "The Monuments Men" brought to America's attention, really, the extreme depth to which the Nazis went to confiscate art, steal art, and try to keep it for their own uses and for the future of what they saw as a Nazi world.

□ 1715

In that film, American soldiers were shown in extreme danger to themselves

in great heroic acts to locate and save that artwork for generations to come. In fact, those particular survivors will be given a Congressional Gold Medal for their work.

Another recent film, "Woman in Gold," tells the story of Maria Altmann. It surrounds compensation for artwork stolen by the Nazis and has been highlighted recently in the theatres.

Mrs. Altmann's effort to retrieve works by Gustav Klimt that the Nazis had taken from her uncle in Austria in the thirties led to an important Supreme Court decision that held that the expropriation exception applied to claims arising prior to the FSIA's enactment in 1976, which allowed Nazi-era victims to file suit for damages in Federal court.

It is critical to note that the bill sponsors worked with the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany to revise the Nazi-era exception to ensure that it was broad enough to be a meaningful exception. As a result, the conference has stated, for itself and for the American Jewish community, that it will not oppose the bill.

I also note that all of the FSIA's other exceptions to sovereign immunity remain available to potential plaintiffs with claims concerning the ownership of cultural property.

In particular, I note this bill does nothing to affect the attempts of Chabad to seek enforcement of its 2011 judgment against Russia, both because such judgment would predate the effective date of this bill and because it was not predicated on the loan of any artwork to the U.S., meaning this bill would not have any effect in that case even if it had been in effect in 2011.

To the extent it may be necessary, I would encourage consideration of adding clarifying language that this bill does nothing to affect enforcement of an already entered judgment.

H.R. 89 is narrowly tailored to ensure that it provides for just enough immunity to encourage foreign states to lend their cultural property to American museums and universities, accordingly, then, to the American people, young people and older, for temporary exhibits and displays without protecting more than we intend to protect.

The bill ensures that works that have already been granted immunity from seizure by the President, pursuant to the Immunity from Seizure Act, are also immune from suits for damages, which is in keeping with the act's purpose in encouraging foreign countries to lend their works to American institutions without fear of litigation based on the act of lending these works.

In essence, if you believe in art, you like art, you think people should see art, and you like your museums, you ought to be for this bill. That is why I thank Representative STEVE CHABOT,

Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, and Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS for their leadership on this issue and for allowing me to manage this time and be part of this initiative.

I would urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, and also Mr. COHEN of Tennessee for their leadership in cosponsoring this legislation.

As Mr. COHEN had mentioned earlier, he and I have found a number of pieces of legislation which we have been able to support together in a bipartisan manner, such as the Delta Queen, which we are still working on. I would like to think that we can look forward to other pieces of legislation down the road to work together on, again in a bipartisan manner. There is a lot better chance you can get things accomplished in this House if you do that. He has reached out, and I certainly appreciate that.

H.R. 889, which I authored, is simple, straightforward legislation that restores American museums the protections of the Immunities from Seizures Act and clarifies the relationship that that act and the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act share. This bill would revise existing law to clarify that the temporary importation of artwork is not legally considered commercial activity and assure foreign government lenders that if they are granted immunity from seizures, their loan of artwork and artifacts will not subject them to the jurisdiction of U.S. courts and lawsuits and disputes about that property, so that it is much more likely that they will allow their artifacts and artworks to come here and then be enjoyed by the American public.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the immunity provided under this bill does not apply to artwork taken in violation of international law, as was already mentioned by both Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. COHEN, in particular, to those pieces of art seized during World War II by the Nazi government or by the Nazi government's allies or impact ongoing cases to get the Russians to return a collection of sacred Jewish books and manuscripts claimed by the Chabad movement.

By enacting the Immunity from Seizure Act, Congress recognized that cultural exchanges produce substantial benefits for the United States, both artistically and diplomatically. Foreign lending has and should continue to aid cultural understanding and increase public exposure to archeological artifacts.

However, for artwork and cultural objects owned by foreign governments, the intent of the Immunity from Seizure Act is being frustrated by the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. Some interpretations of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act have exposed foreign governments to the jurisdiction of U.S. courts based solely upon the temporary importation into the U.S. of foreign-government-owned artwork. According to the American Association of Museum Directors, this has led, on several occasions, to foreign governments declining to exchange artwork and cultural objects with the United States for temporary exhibits.

In a recent survey of 38 museums across the U.S., it was found that, over the past 5 years, these museums had 1,000 pieces denied to showcase here in the United States for very questionable reasons. These were works that museum curators reasonably believed would be loaned to their museum for special exhibits. Therefore, in order to continue the exchange of foreign-government-owned art and reaffirm our country's commitment to the promotion of foreign lending to American museums, Congress needs to clarify the relationship between the two acts I already referred to: the Immunity from Seizure Act and the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. That is what this legislation does.

This is a relatively minor change to the law, but it will provide enormous cultural benefits by ensuring that museums, like the Cincinnati Museum Center and the Cincinnati Art Museum and other similar museums throughout the State of Ohio and across the country, may continue to present first-class exhibits that educate the public on cultural heritage and artwork from all over the globe. Through enactment of this legislation, we can secure foreign lending to American museums and ensure that foreign art lenders are not entangled in unnecessary litigation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is supported by the Association of Art Museum Directors, which represents 240 museums, including the Smithsonian and several within my district and all across the country.

Last Congress, this body showed overwhelming support for this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation once again. I also urge our colleagues in the other body to swiftly move similar legislation through their Chamber. Again I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS and Mr. COHEN for their support.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHABOT,

and Mr. COHEN for their great work on this instructive legislation. My appreciation for the Judiciary Committee is how we clarify the law, and in this instance the subcommittee has brought two conflicting legal tenets as relate to statutes and clarified them. So I want to celebrate it because it is directly impacting on the Nation's museums and educational institutions. Let me cite some in my congressional district.

Texas Southern University has an African American history museum. It is a beautiful display. This legislation will allow a small entity that could not stand under a lawsuit to be able to secure international gifts which they have received without the burden of litigation.

In the early stages of my career in Congress, I represented, extensively, Houston's museum district: the Museum of Foreign Arts, with an outstanding curator, museum director; the Children's Museum; the Health Museum; and the Museum of Natural Science. All of those have the tendency to receive these international gifts and also be subjected, potentially, because of the conflict to seizure.

In particular, I remember working with the Museum of Fine Arts, maybe one of my greatest early opportunities of service, and to help them bring the Russian jewels to Houston, Texas. It was a long, long journey, not because of the distance but because of the conflicting laws and the entanglement of imports and protection of the jewels. I remember being at the dock receiving those jewels after a long wait. Just imagine if there had been this potential of seizure, which there was, but that there was the glaring opportunity there for seizure and it had occurred. What would have happened to this great art exchange and, as well, to what we were doing in Houston?

Let me close by saying, Mr. Speaker, I want to support this bill extensively, and it will help all of these institutions across America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 889, the "Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act."

H.R. 889 makes a modest but important amendment to the "expropriation exception" of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976. Specifically, it ensures that foreign states are immune from suits for damages concerning the ownership of cultural property when: that property is in the United States pursuant to an agreement between the foreign state and the U.S. or a U.S.-based cultural or educational institution; the President has granted the work at issue immunity from seizure pursuant to the Immunity from Seizure Act; and the President's grant of immunity from seizure is published in the Federal Register.

The expropriation exception remains available to all claims concerning misappropriated cultural property to which these factual circumstances do not apply.

I would not support this bill if it did not contain a sufficient exception for claims arising

from artwork stolen by the Nazis, their allies, and their affiliates.

H.R. 889 has just such an exception, ensuring that victims of Nazi art theft continue to have the opportunity to pursue justice in court.

This exception is appropriate in light of the sheer scale and the particularly concerted efforts of the Nazis to seize artwork and other cultural property from their victims.

The particular sensitivity surrounding compensation for artwork stolen by the Nazis has been highlighted in recent months by the motion picture *Woman in Gold*, which tells the story of Maria Altmann.

Mrs. Altmann's efforts to retrieve works by Gustav Klimt that the Nazis had taken from uncle in Austria in the 1930's led to an important Supreme Court decision that held that the expropriation exception applied to claims arising prior to the FSIA's enactment in 1976, which allowed Nazi-era victims to file suit for damages in federal court.

It is also critical to note that the bill's sponsors worked with the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany to revise the Nazi-era exception to ensure that it was broad enough to be a meaningful exception.

As a result, the Conference has stated, for itself and for the American Jewish Committee, that it will not oppose this bill.

I also note that all of the FSIA's other exceptions to sovereign immunity remain available to potential plaintiffs with claims concerning the ownership of cultural property.

In particular, I note that this bill does nothing to affect the attempts by Chabad to seek enforcement of its 2011 judgment against Russia, both because such judgment would predate the effective date of this bill and because it was not predicated on the loan of any artwork to the U.S., meaning that this bill would not effect that case even if it had been in effect in 2011.

To the extent it may be necessary, I would encourage consideration of adding clarifying language that this bill does nothing to affect enforcement of an already-entered judgment.

H.R. 889 is narrowly tailored to ensure that it provides for just enough immunity to encourage foreign states to lend their cultural property to American museums and universities for temporary exhibits and displays without protecting more than we intend to protect.

I recognize that some people may instinctively recoil at the idea of any bill that grants any level of immunity to a foreign state when ownership of a work of art or other cultural object is at issue.

But I would not support a bill that foreclosed all possibility of redress for such people.

And, H.R. 889 does not do that.

It simply ensures that works that have already been granted immunity from seizure by the President pursuant to the Immunity from Seizure Act are also immune from suits for damages, which is in keeping with the Act's purpose of encouraging foreign countries to lend their works to American institutions without fear of litigation based on the act of lending those works.

I thank Representative STEVE CHABOT, Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, and Committee Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Jr. for their leadership on this issue and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I would like to recognize Lafayette and Washington. The *Hermione*, the boat that brought Lafayette to Washington, a replica thereof, has just come to Virginia, and there is a recognition of that at Mount Vernon tonight. I think we should recognize their portraits here. They helped this country become free from the shackles of Great Britain and become the great country we are.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 889.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 295) supporting local law enforcement agencies in their continued work to serve our communities, and supporting their use of body worn cameras to promote transparency to protect both citizens and officers alike.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 295

Whereas the United States Department of Justice issued a report titled, "Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras", which details a number of benefits of body-worn cameras, including—

- (1) increased transparency and citizen views of police legitimacy;
- (2) improved behavior and civility among both police officers and citizens; and
- (3) increased evidentiary benefits that expedite resolution of citizen complaints or lawsuits and improving evidence for arrest and prosecution; and

Whereas the University of Cambridge's Institute of Criminology conducted a 12-month study on the use of body-worn cameras used by law enforcement in the United Kingdom and estimated that the cameras led to a 50 percent reduction in use of force, and in addition, complaints against police fell approximately by 90 percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

- (1) recognizes all law enforcement agencies and officers for their tireless work to protect us and make our communities safer;
- (2) recognizes the potential for the use of body-worn cameras by on-duty law enforcement officers to improve community relations, increase transparency, and protect both citizens and police; and
- (3) encourages State and local law enforcement agencies to consider the use of body-

worn cameras, including policies and protocols to handle privacy, storage, and other relevant concerns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Res. 295, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for introducing this resolution and commend them for their work on this important issue.

Policing is an inherently dangerous job. Our law enforcement officers deserve our gratitude for the work they do on a daily basis to make sure that our streets are safe, the most helpless in our communities are protected, and those who commit crimes are brought to justice.

I am very concerned that force is used appropriately and that police officers are taking appropriate steps to protect innocent civilians when they make encounters. There is increasing unrest in our urban communities about policing.

I am also concerned with the repeated targeting of our police and law enforcement personnel. Last week, a terror suspect believed to be plotting to behead a Boston officer was killed in a confrontation with Boston police. Last month, two police officers were killed by criminals hoping to become cop killers. Officers Dean and Tate, responding to a routine traffic stop in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, were gunned down by a group of five men.

□ 1730

This comes on the heels of more widely known murders last year of Officers Ramos and Liu in New York, who were reportedly targeted by a man looking to kill a police officer.

It is clear that we must find a better way for our police and citizens to interact both in everyday situations and when more difficult circumstances arise. In May, the Judiciary Committee held a very informative and productive hearing on policing in the 21st Century, where we looked at many of these issues, including the use of body-worn cameras by police officers.

Body-worn cameras present an opportunity to strengthen police and citizens' interactions, but there are many issues surrounding the use of body-worn cameras that should be addressed by legislators, law enforcement, and the general public before Congress or State legislatures mandate widespread use of this technology.

We must be cognizant of the cost and resources associated not just with outfitting officers with body-worn cameras, but with the regulations, training, and compliance associated with their use. We should also be aware of the costs and privacy implications associated with storing the footage of body-worn cameras.

Police routinely interact with crime victims, including minors, and members of the general public. Would all of these interactions be recorded and stored by law enforcement agencies? For how long? Who would have access to this information? For instance, could it be obtained in a civil suit, a divorce or custody case, or as part of a Freedom of Information Act request?

If an officer exercises his or her discretion to turn off a camera, it is possible the courts would impose an adverse inference against the government if a defendant then argued that something improper happened while the camera was not filming. The courts could also impose an adverse inference if there is a technical or storage glitch that interferes with taping or access to the video.

Society must also decide if it wants this technology recording us on a constant basis. Last week, the President signed the House-passed USA FREEDOM Act into law, which ended bulk metadata collection by the NSA.

We should exercise caution before mandating use of a technology that has the potential to gather and store information about Americans, many of them innocent civilians, based simply on a person's interaction with a police officer.

Body-worn police cameras can serve an important purpose in improving interactions between law enforcement and the general public and be a valuable source of evidence of wrongdoing; but we, as lawmakers and as a society, must ensure that this technology is used appropriately.

We have achieved this before when addressing the use of police dashboard cameras, but we must now do so again in a situation that is potentially much more intrusive.

Several police departments have already begun using body-worn cameras, and various pilot programs are also underway. Their successes and pitfalls will be instructive as we explore expanded use of this technology.

I once again thank the gentleman from Texas for his work on this resolution and also applaud the work of our law enforcement officers nationwide.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to support this resolution and to thank my colleagues for putting forward H. Res. 295, particularly Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. CLAY and Mr. CLEAVER—both of whom represent the Missouri area—and a number of other Members who have joined in on sponsoring this legislation.

I like this because it is a kick-start to what Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, have been talking about, and what we have talked about, criminal justice reform.

As we well know, we in the Judiciary Committee are receiving information. We are listening to Members; we are obviously listening to Members who are committed and dedicated, and we are committed to criminal justice reform.

This is the right kind of kick-start to be able to put on minds of individuals that we know that this effort of criminal justice reform requires the communication and cooperation of our law enforcement officers and as well to recognize the vitality and the importance of communities who have argued Black lives matter—or they have just argued that lives matter, which they do.

Let me, first of all, join Mr. GOODLATTE on acknowledging the tragedy of police shootings. Whether or not it was the heinous shootings in New York on two occasions and probably more or whether or not it was a recent incident in Houston, Texas, when a valiant officer was mowed down by a fleeing felon, or any number of incidents that have caught our men and women in the line of fire—and their families have seen their service, their life, and their contributions snuffed out by violence—that is not something that we applaud and we certainly abhor.

I believe the language in this resolution gives us the sense of Congress that allows us to recognize all law enforcement agencies and officers, thanking them for their tireless work to protect us and make our communities safer, and recognize the potential for the use of body-worn cameras by on-duty law enforcement officers, to improve community relations, increase transparency, and protect both citizens and police.

I will assure you that the Judiciary Committee will thoughtfully look at legislation that fits squarely on the framework of this taking into consideration many concerns and encourages State and local law enforcement agencies to consider the use of body-worn cameras, including policies and protocols, to handle privacy, storage, and other relevant issues.

I am glad those are recognized because we are a country of laws, and we recognize the civil liberties and civil rights of all citizens.

As we discuss this legislation, however, I want to emphasize the importance of the timing. It is time for comprehensive policing and criminal justice reform. We are witnessing a sea change unlike many others with support for this great cause spanning the ideological and party divide. We in the Judiciary Committee have spoken about it and are finding common ways to work together.

In the area of policing, the problems revealed by several of the more notorious incidents involving the use of lethal force against unarmed citizens have captured the attention of the Nation over the past few months and demonstrates a critical need for a national response.

Law enforcement officers individually will indicate training is a key element of this. Any response to these tragic events must go hand in hand with a holistic view of criminal justice reform. It will do us no good to be able to point at one group and not try to help another, so I am very grateful that my State, the State of Texas, has contributed to this dialogue and most recently in grand jury reform.

As I have joined with my colleagues to acknowledge and celebrate law enforcement and encourage the move forward on criminal justice reform, I am grateful to again do it today, but we should also look at a vast array of opportunities.

Sentencing and prison reform should be on our agenda. One such proposal would give the Federal Bureau of Prisons the discretion to release nonviolent prisoners who served at least half of their sentence, are 45 or more years old, and who have not been disciplined for a violent offense. This would not only alleviate some prison overcrowding, but it would dip into the \$75 billion that we are paying for incarceration.

Congress should also look at the fact in the Federal system that right now we give 47 days for 54 days of good time. If we did one for one, it would be an opportunity to save millions of dollars, at least \$41 million; and 4,000 persons would be able to be lifted who would be able to be rehabilitated.

One of the more difficult parts of coming into the criminal justice system is the journey of coming out of it. Where an individual has paid his or her debt, the process of reentering society is paid with tremendous and often insurmountable obstacles.

I have drafted legislation that will allow those with a criminal conviction to have a fair chance to compete for jobs with Federal agencies and contractors. This "ban the box" measure delays a potential employer's inquiry into the applicant's criminal history until later in the hiring process. Employers can still ask, but pushing the inquiry into a later stage in the process where you have seen whether this person is ready and able to have a job.

Again, this resolution speaks about our view and affection for our law enforcement and adding more tools. Each of us have had wonderful experiences with those men and women who serve.

Mr. Speaker, the time for comprehensive policing and criminal justice reform has arrived. We are witnessing a sea shift unlike any others, with support for this great cause spanning the ideological and party divide.

In the area of policing, the problems revealed by several of the more notorious incidents involving the use of lethal force against unarmed citizens has captured the attention of the nation over the past few months and demonstrates the critical need for a national response.

And any response to these tragic events must go hand-in-hand with changes to the entirety of our criminal justice system.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee; as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; and as a Representative from Houston, let me extend my thanks to the Congressman from my home state of Texas for contributing to the discussion of this very important and timely issue.

Just as I have joined with him in Houston before—to acknowledge and celebrate law enforcement and to encourage and move forward criminal justice reform—I am grateful to do so again today.

The very fact that this measure is on the floor today is a great indicator that Congress is ready for comprehensive criminal justice and policing reform.

This is why I am looking at reforms that will address all aspects of our criminal justice system and drafting legislation accordingly.

One such proposal would give the Bureau of Prisons discretion to release nonviolent prisoners who have served at least half their sentence, are 45 or more years old, and who have not been disciplined for violent conduct while in prison.

This would not only alleviate some prison over-crowding, it would result in substantial cost savings by removing the expensive medical care for older prisoners.

By including a clarification of the federal prisoner good time credit law, the cost savings of this proposal is even more significant. Congress intended for all federal prisoners to be eligible for 54 days of good time credit, not 47 days as currently interpreted by the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

This small change—just one week per year—will not only reflect our original intent, it will save at least \$41 million annually.

One of the most difficult parts of coming into the criminal justice system is the journey of coming out of it.

For an individual who has paid his or her debt, the process of re-entering society is paved with tremendous, and often insurmountable, obstacles.

I have drafted legislation that will allow those with a criminal conviction to have a fair chance to compete for jobs with federal agencies and contractors. This “ban-the-box” measure delays a potential employer’s inquiry into the applicant’s criminal history until later in the hiring process.

Employers can still ask—but pushing the inquiry until a later stage in the process allows

applicants to get a foot in the door and be considered at the early stage on their merits alone.

Many studies, including one released by the Journal of Adolescent Health, demonstrate that the adolescent brain continues to develop as young persons mature well into their 20s. Yet, we begin holding our young offenders accountable as adults when they reach the age of 18, 16, and sometimes even earlier. And we send them off to what many describe as “criminal college.”

This is why I am developing legislation that will provide judges with new and different options when a young offender comes before them. These options will give judges discretion to tailor a punishment to that young offender’s needs.

And, when sending a young offender to prison is necessary, my legislation will ensure that the Bureau of Prisons separates these young offenders out from the rest of the prison population and provides specialized programs for their needs. This will put young offenders on a path for change, not one of crime.

It is not enough to improve the system of criminal justice, we must also address the unnecessary loss of life that can result from police and civilian interactions. Reform must take a step towards increasing trust between our communities and law enforcement.

This is why I am developing legislation that will provide law enforcement agencies with the funding and assistance to put in place the policies, protocols, and training programs in accord with national accreditation standards.

But rebuilding the trust in this relationship also requires greater transparency when government responds to incidents involving the use of lethal force against unarmed citizens.

This is why I have drafted legislation that provides incentives and support for jurisdictions to bring in an independent investigation and prosecution team for an unbiased review of such incidents.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time on this debate.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), the author of this legislation.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to stand in the well of the House and have an opportunity to advocate on behalf of the constituents of the Ninth Congressional District. Today is no exception.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand here in support of bipartisan legislation, legislation that encourages law enforcement to use body cameras. This legislation is legislation that I am proud to say has received a good deal of support and a good deal of consideration and deliberation.

I would like to thank the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, for his assistance in bringing this legislation forward. Of course, the Honorable NANCY PELOSI must be given kudos as well. I thank her for allowing the legislation to come forward and assisting.

The Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER, I want to thank him because we had a conversation concerning this legislation. Of course, the chairperson of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable BOB GOODLATTE, he and I have had an opportunity to talk through this legislation, and I am eternally grateful for the consideration that you have given, sir, and I thank you.

I also would like to thank the dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS. He has been here on so many occasions when legislation that is exceedingly important has been passed upon and has been a voice, a voice on all of these issues through the years. I am proud to say that I had an opportunity to speak to him about this legislation.

Of course, I want to thank Mr. TED POE of Texas. He and I came to Congress together, and we worked together. This is a piece of legislation that he was the first to sign onto, H. Res. 295.

Mr. EMANUEL CLEAVER of Missouri, he and I have worked together to shepherd this from the very beginning, and he is still a part of it. He is not here tonight, but he is with us on this legislation. I am proud to say he is a friend, and he has been a partner throughout the effort to bring this legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER, he has been a friend in this; Mr. CLAY of Missouri; Mr. YODER of Kansas; and, of course, Ms. CLARKE of New York—all friends and all supportive of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as has been indicated, is the beginning. I don’t see it as the end of a process. I see it as more of a preamble with the Constitution to follow. I see it as a lawyer might see an opening statement with the closing statement yet to come.

Of course, as a Christian, I see it as a part of Genesis, with many revelations yet to come. It is a good first step, and it is a good step in the right direction. I don’t see it as the end of the process, but I do want to commend and thank those who have helped us to get to this point.

I would cite now, if I may, a Justice Department report. This report styled “Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras” found that body-worn cameras increased transparency. People have the opportunity to see what actually took place. It makes a difference because this will increase police legitimacy.

Officers don’t have to get into disputes about what actually occurred. The empirical evidence is there by way of the camera’s eye.

It will improve citizen and police behavior. Once the camera is on and once people know that it is on—that is both citizens and police officers—their behavior tends to be adjusted such that we get better results.

It will improve effective prosecution. This is evidence that can be introduced

into court. When it is introduced, it can help effectuate positive results.

Another study, a study from the University of Cambridge, its Institute of Criminology, after a 12-month study, found a 50 percent reduction in the use of force as a result of body cameras, a 50 percent reduction in use of force, a 90 percent reduction in complaints against police officers as a result of body cameras being utilized.

Of course, there is a final study that I will cite in Rialto, California. This report from Rialto, California, indicates that, after 1 year of use of body cameras, there was a 60 percent reduction in the use of force and an 88 percent reduction in complaints against police officers.

The evidence is in. It is clear that these body cameras do provide an opportunity for us to have the transparency we need, for us to provide legitimacy for both police officers and citizenry but, more importantly, to reduce the complaints that we see emanating from scenes that are disputed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

□ 1745

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, we see a reduction in complaints. As we view the many incidents that have occurred around the country, there is no question that there is a divide. I believe that these body cameras can span the chasm across the divide and make a difference in the perception that we have in the way our police and our communities interact with each other.

I am proud to be a sponsor, and I am proud to have the cosponsors that we have. I am proud that the chairperson of the Judiciary Committee has signed onto this and that the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee is on board.

I want to thank my colleague from Houston, Texas, the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who has served on the Judiciary Committee for many, many years, and I am most appreciative that she, too, finds favor with this piece of legislation. I am honored that she is on the floor tonight to shepherd it through, and I pray that my colleagues all will support what I believe to be a piece of legislation that can span the chasm between the police and the community in a most positive way.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers remaining, and I am prepared to yield back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume as I am the final speaker.

First of all, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his very eloquent explanation of this legislation. Let me add my appreciation as well to Chairman

GOODLATTE, to Ranking Member CONYERS, and to Chairman SENSENBRENNER. It is certainly my pleasure to manage and to work with this legislation, in the purpose of this legislation.

I close with just a few points that I feel compelled to comment on. As I do so, I am not giving all of the names of those fallen. As I have indicated, we tragically buried an HPD officer just a couple of weeks ago and, of course, officers in Mississippi, officers in New Mexico, in Omaha, Nebraska, and in Pennsylvania, among others. We recognize that we are challenged and that we must find that common ground. Again, I note that this kick start will help us to look at comprehensive criminal justice reform.

Let me just add one last point on the young offenders issue that may be somewhat similar to the video that has now imploded across the airwaves of America in McKinney, Texas. One study dealing with young offenders or individual adolescents includes a report by the Journal of Adolescent Health which demonstrates that the adolescent brain continues to develop as young persons mature well into their twenties; yet we begin holding our young offenders accountable as adults when they reach the age of 18 and sometimes earlier, and we send them off to what many describe as a criminal college. So I am hoping that we will have legislation that can address by science the concept, if you will, of how we treat those from 18 to 24.

This legislation allows us to build on policing and community trust. I am looking forward to working with law enforcement agencies with the funding and assistance to put in place the policies and protocols dealing with training, deescalation, accreditation. That is, of course, something that we hope to be working on with the full Judiciary Committee.

There are some stark differences of treatment between two cities—the city of Charleston, South Carolina, where a tragic incident occurred and where the city responded immediately, and the city of Cleveland, where a tragic incident occurred and where the city did not respond immediately.

Then, this past weekend, we saw confusing footage, I think, that dealt with teenagers at a pool party. We know that police were called. We know that this party was, really, a party of girls who happened to be African American, and we understand that some boys, who tend to like to find girls, came and may have caused somewhat of a disturbance. The reason I think it is important as we discuss this legislation is that the bill does indicate our appreciation for law enforcement. My words say that this will allow us to kick-start and look at issues where we can work together to get along. But as the video indicates, we see a scattering of

young people, and we see a number of foul-mouthed comments being made coming from one particular officer. They are quotes I will not offer to repeat on this floor.

I submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, an article from *The Atlantic* as, I think, this is a testament to how we can work to avoid this kind of public incident.

[From the *Atlantic*, June 8, 2015]

(By Yoni Appelbaum)

On Friday, a large group of teens gathered for a pool party in the city of McKinney, Texas. Shortly thereafter, someone called the police. And by Sunday night, as footage of the police response spread across the internet, the McKinney Police Department announced it was placing Eric Casebolt, the patrol supervisor shown in the video, on administrative leave.

It is the latest in a string of incidents of police using apparently excessive force against African Americans that has captured public attention. And it took place at a communal pool—where, for more than a century, conflicts over race and class have often surfaced.

The video shows a foul-mouthed police corporal telling the young men he encounters to get down, and the young women to take off, although far more obscenely. When several seated young men appear to ask, politely, for permission to leave, he explodes at them: “Don’t make me fucking run around here with thirty pounds of goddamn gear in the sun because you want to screw around out here.” The corporal was white. The young people he detained were, almost without exception, black.

The video next shows him repeatedly cursing at a group of young women, telling them to move on. Then he wrestles one to the ground. As bystanders react in horror, and several rush toward the young woman as if to her assistance, he draws his sidearm. They flee. He returns to the teenager, wrestles her back down, forces her face into the ground, and places both knees on her back.

The McKinney police said, in a statement, that they were called to respond to the Craig Ranch North Community Pool for a report of “a disturbance involving multiple juveniles at the location, who do not live in the area or have permission to be there, refusing to leave.” They added that additional calls reported fighting, and that when the crowd refused to comply with the first responding officers, nine additional units were deployed.

The mayor, Brian Loughmiller, described himself as “disturbed and concerned,” and the police chief vowed “a complete, and thorough, investigation.”

Like many flourishing American suburbs, McKinney has struggled with questions of equity and diversity. The city is among the fastest-growing in America, and its residents hail from a wide range of backgrounds. Formal, legal segregation is a thing of the past. Yet stark divides persist.

In 2009, McKinney was forced to settle a lawsuit alleging that it was blocking the development of affordable housing suitable for tenants with Section 8 vouchers in the more affluent western portion of the city. East of Highway 75, according to the lawsuit, McKinney is 49 percent white; to its west, McKinney is 86 percent white. The plaintiffs alleged that the city and its housing authority were “willing to negotiate for and provide low-income housing units in east McKinney, but not west McKinney, which amounts to illegal racial steering.”

All three of the city's public pools lie to the east of Highway 75. Craig Ranch, where the pool party took place, lies well to its west. BuzzFeed reports that the fight broke out when an adult woman told the teens to go back to "Section 8 housing."

Craig Ranch North is the oldest residential portion of a 2,200 acre master-planned community. "The neighborhood is made up of single-family homes," says the developer's website, "and includes a community center with two pools, a park and a playground." Private developments like Craig Ranch now routinely include pools, often paid for by dues to homeowners' associations, and governed by their rules. But that, in itself, represents a remarkable shift.

At their inception, communal swimming pools were public, egalitarian spaces. Most early public pools in America aimed more for hygiene than relaxation, open on alternate days to men and women. In the North, at least, they served bathers without regard for race. But in the 1920s, as public swimming pools proliferated, they became sites of leisure and recreation. Alarmed at the sight of women and men of different races swimming together, public officials moved to impose rigid segregation.

As African Americans fought for desegregation in the 1950s, public pools became frequent battlefields. In Marshall, Texas, for example, in 1957, a young man backed by the NAACP sued to force the integration of a brand-new swimming pool. When the judge made it clear the city would lose, citizens voted 1,758-89 to have the city sell all of its recreational facilities rather than integrate them. The pool was sold to a local Lions' Club, which was able to operate it as a whites-only private facility.

The decisions of other communities were rarely so transparent, but the trend was unmistakable. Before 1950, Americans went swimming as often as they went to the movies, but they did so in public pools. There were relatively few club pools, and private pools were markers of extraordinary wealth. Over the next half-century, though, the number of private in-ground pools increased from roughly 2,500 to more than four million. The declining cost of pool construction, improved technology, and suburbanization all played important roles. But then, so did desegregation. As historian Jeff Wiltse argues in his 2007 book, *Contested Waters: A Social History of Swimming Pools in America*:

Although many whites abandoned desegregated public pools, most did not stop swimming. Instead, they built private pools, both club and residential, and swam in them. . . . Suburbanites organized private club pools rather than fund public pools because club pools enabled them to control the class and racial composition of swimmers, whereas public pools did not.

Today, that complicated legacy persists across the United States. The public pools of mid-century—with their sandy beaches, manicured lawns, and well-tended facilities—are vanishingly rare. Those sorts of amenities are now generally found behind closed gates, funded by club fees or homeowners' dues, and not by tax dollars. And they are open to those who can afford to live in such subdivisions, but not to their neighbors just down the road.

Whatever took place in McKinney on Friday, it occurred against this backdrop of the privatization of once-public facilities, giving residents the expectation of control over who sunbathes or doggie-paddles alongside them. Even if some of the teens were residents, and others possessed valid guest passes, as some

insisted they did, the presence of "multiple juveniles . . . who do not live in the area" clearly triggered alarm. Several adults at the pool reportedly placed calls to the police. And none of the adult residents shown in the video appeared to manifest concern that the police response had gone too far, nor that its violence was disproportionate to the alleged offense.

To the contrary. Someone placed a sign by the pool on Sunday afternoon. It read, simply: "Thank you McKinney Police for keeping us safe."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is not dealing with a vast group of protesters, which, ultimately, did occur in the last 24 hours in that area. This is dealing with youngsters. Many of us raise children and send them to pools and various camps, and we hope they will be well, but this is understanding the whole level of law enforcement. Again, I believe it is time for the Congress to re-create the criminal justice system.

Juveniles are naturally fearful of authority and lack maturity when faced with fearful events. Running is the natural instinct of most youth, and in this case, the youth attempted to leave when the police approached to disperse the crowd. Then the police chased, shooting a Taser. When the officer confronted the young girl with aggression, other youth attempted to help her—that is, teenagers—who were also threatened with force by the officers. These children received mixed messages. Establishing trusting relationships between youth and police officers is of the utmost responsibility.

What I would say is that the outrage and the expressions of a community and parents came about because we were not talking to each other, because actions did not track what those young people were doing in McKinney. They were being teenagers. They were running. They may have had the incidences of misbehavior, and, frankly, they could have been handled in a way that the misbehavior could have been addressed.

Why now?

Again, I opened with the remarks that we now have an opportunity to kick-start this wonderful discussion of criminal justice reform. Wonderful? Yes, because, in America, we are a nation of civilians and law. The civilian law enforcement is made up of those who implement those laws, but the Constitution reigns as well. I look forward to working with the chairman and the ranking member and all of the Members of this body and the Judiciary Committee for a very constructive journey on letting the American people know that we hear their pain, that we respect those who uphold the law, and that we are going to work constructively to do that.

I left Houston while talking to a police officer. I know he is not listening, but let me just simply say thank you for the service that you give. Hope-

fully, he will hear this and will know that we are committed to working together in this Congress. I ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 295.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for their hard work on this, for coming to see me and others on our side of the aisle about this important issue, and for working with us on getting the language straight in this resolution in order to make sure that we are properly encouraging this exploration while also taking into account the issues that arise with the use of body cameras.

I want to thank the ranking member and the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CONYERS, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. JACKSON LEE, for their work on this as well. I also want to thank all of the staff involved.

This is an important issue, and it will help to inform us as we move ahead on a number of issues related to criminal justice reform. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we vote on H. Res. 295, I would like to address the need for body cameras worn by on-duty law enforcement.

As a result of the influx of controversial reports citing alleged inappropriate behavior by police officers, body cameras will provide more transparency in what can be otherwise confounding cases. In instances like the Walter Scott shooting, the McKinney incident, and the Trayvon Martin case, video footage from a body-worn camera may have provided critical, tangible evidence regarding the events that transpired. Such technology has the capability to reduce the number of complaints of excessive use of force by officers. It also provides the power to dismiss officers from false, malicious complaints. Additionally, footage from body cameras can be utilized as a teaching tool in which officers review video in an attempt to learn from their mistakes and improve their performance. Both exemplary and inappropriate police behavior can be analyzed in order to build greater trust between law enforcement and the communities they are tasked with serving.

Furthermore, there are studies that show improved behavior occurs with both police officers and potential suspects when both parties know they are being recorded. Detroit's significantly higher crime rate when compared with the U.S. average makes this topic of particular concern to me and my District. The violent crime rate in 2012 was nearly six times that of the U.S. average. The implementation of body cameras will help ensure the safety of my constituents by recording interactions between officers and civilians. I urge support for this bill for the protection and interests of all involved.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman GREEN for this bipartisan legislation to reform our nation's law enforcement policies

and procedures by promoting transparency while protecting citizens and officers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 295.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 171, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—246

Abraham	Bishop (UT)	Byrne
Aderholt	Black	Calvert
Allen	Blackburn	Carter (GA)
Amash	Blum	Carter (TX)
Amodei	Bost	Chabot
Ashford	Boustany	Chaffetz
Babin	Brady (TX)	Clawson (FL)
Barletta	Brat	Coffman
Barr	Bridenstine	Cole
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Benishek	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Bilirakis	Buchanan	Comstock
Bishop (GA)	Bucshon	Conaway
Bishop (MI)	Burgess	Cook

Costa	Jolly	Roby
Costello (PA)	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Cramer	Joyce	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher
Cuellar	King (IA)	Rokita
Culberson	King (NY)	Rooney (FL)
Curbeo (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Rodney	Kline	Roskam
Denham	Knight	Ross
Dent	Labrador	Rothfus
DeSantis	LaMalfa	Rouzer
DesJarlais	Lance	Royce
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Russell
Dold	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Donovan	Long	Salmon
Duffy	Loudermilk	Sanford
Duncan (SC)	Love	Scalise
Ellmers (NC)	Lucas	Schrader
Emmer (MN)	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Farenthold	MacArthur	Scott, Austin
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Scott, David
Fleischmann	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	Massie	Sessions
Flores	McCarthy	Shimkus
Forbes	McCaul	Shuster
Fortenberry	McClintock	Simpson
Fox	McHenry	Sinema
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Smith (MO)
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Smith (NE)
Garrett	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)
Gibbs	McSally	Smith (TX)
Gibson	Meadows	Stefanik
Gohmert	Meehan	Stewart
Goodlatte	Messer	Stivers
Gosar	Mica	Stutzman
Gowdy	Miller (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Graham	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Granger	Moolenaar	Tiberi
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Tipton
Graves (LA)	Mullin	Trott
Graves (MO)	Mulvaney	Turner
Griffith	Murphy (FL)	Upton
Grothman	Murphy (PA)	Valadao
Guinta	Neugebauer	Wagner
Guthrie	Newhouse	Walberg
Hanna	Noem	Walden
Hardy	Nugent	Walker
Harper	Nunes	Walorski
Harris	Olson	Walters, Mimi
Hartzler	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Heck (NV)	Palmer	Webster (FL)
Hensarling	Paulsen	Wenstrup
Herrera Beutler	Pearce	Westerman
Hice, Jody B.	Perry	Westmoreland
Hill	Pittenger	Whitfield
Holding	Pitts	Williams
Hudson	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Huelskamp	Poliquin	Wittman
Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo	Womack
Hultgren	Posey	Yoder
Hunter	Price, Tom	Yoho
Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe	Young (AK)
Hurt (VA)	Reed	Young (IA)
Issa	Reichert	Young (IN)
Jenkins (KS)	Renacci	Zeldin
Jenkins (WV)	Ribble	Zinke
Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	
Johnson, Sam	Rigell	

NAYS—171

Aguilar	Clarke (NY)	Engel
Beatty	Clay	Eshoo
Becerra	Clyburn	Esty
Bera	Cohen	Farr
Beyer	Connolly	Fattah
Blumenauer	Conyers	Foster
Bonamici	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Courtney	Fudge
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Gabbard
Brown (FL)	Cummings	Galleo
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Garamendi
Bustos	Davis, Danny	Grayson
Butterfield	DeGette	Green, Al
Capps	Delaney	Green, Gene
Capuano	DeLauro	Grijalva
Carney	DeBene	Gutiérrez
Carson (IN)	DeSaulnier	Hahn
Cartwright	Deutch	Hastings
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael F.	Higgins
Chu, Judy	Duckworth	Himes
Cicilline	Edwards	Hinojosa
Clark (MA)	Ellison	Honda
		Hoyer

Huffman	McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta
Israel	McGovern	Sarbanes
Jackson Lee	McNerney	Schakowsky
Jeffries	Meeks	Schiff
Johnson (GA)	Meng	Scott (VA)
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Serrano
Jones	Moulton	Sewell (AL)
Kaptur	Nadler	Sherman
Keating	Napolitano	Sires
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Slaughter
Kennedy	Nolan	Smith (WA)
Kildee	Norcross	Speier
Kilmer	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)
Kind	Pallone	Takai
Kirkpatrick	Pascarell	Takano
Kuster	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Langevin	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Titus
Larson (CT)	Peters	Tonko
Lawrence	Peterson	Torres
Lee	Pingree	Tsongas
Levin	Pocan	Van Hollen
Lewis	Polis	Veasey
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Vela
Lipinski	Quigley	Velázquez
Loeback	Rangel	Visclosky
Lofgren	Rice (NY)	Walz
Lowenthal	Richmond	Wasserman
Lowey	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
Lujan, Ben Ray	Ruiz	Waters, Maxine
(NM)	Ruppersberger	Watson Coleman
Lynch	Rush	Welch
Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (FL)
Matsui	Sánchez, Linda T.	Yarmuth
McCollum		

NOT VOTING—15

Adams	Doggett	Lummis
Bass	Duncan (TN)	Maloney,
Buck	Fincher	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Lamborn	Vargas
Cleaver	Lujan Grisham	Woodall
DeFazio	(NM)	

□ 1857

Messrs. CARNEY, HUFFMAN, CUMMINGS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. VEASEY, and Mrs. BEATTY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GIBSON, DUNCAN of South Carolina, and COSTA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 309, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,

The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from The Honorable C. Delbert Hosemann, Jr., Mississippi Secretary of State, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held June 2, 2015, the Honorable Trent Kelly was elected Representative to Congress for the First Congressional District, State of Mississippi.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

Re Unofficial Results—First Congressional
Special Runoff Election

KAREN L. HAAS,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MS. HAAS, Per your request, enclosed please find a copy of unofficial results for the Special Runoff Election held on Tuesday, June 2, 2015, for Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of Mississippi. To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no challenge to this election. The State of Mississippi does not require nor receive "unofficial results" from all counties and, at this time, we have only received unofficial results from four (4) counties. The attached numbers were obtained through The Daily Journal, Tupelo, Mississippi. The outcome of the election does not appear in doubt and we anticipate Mr. Trent Kelly will be certified.

The deadline for counties included in the First Congressional District to transmit certified election results to our office is 5:00 p.m. on June 12, 2015. As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all counties involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please call Kim Turner, Assistant Secretary of State at (601) 359-5137 or Amanda Frusha, Director of Elections Compliance at (601) 359-5213.

Sincerely,

C. DELBERT HOSEMANN, Jr.,
Mississippi Secretary of State.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE TRENT KELLY, OF MISSISSIPPI, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable TRENT KELLY, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the Mississippi delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 114th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE TRENT KELLY TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, friends and colleagues, I have the honor of welcoming the new representative from Mississippi's First Congressional District. For me, that means he will be representing the neighboring district in the northeast corner of the State, which most of you are familiar with; but also, for others, this means that he will be representing the birthplace of Elvis Presley.

TRENT KELLY is from the little-known town of Slatton, Mississippi. The local folk call it Salt-illo, population 3,393. He knows the district well, having served as district attorney for the largest judicial district in that area. Representative KELLY has also served in our Nation's military and has spent 29 years in the Mississippi National Guard.

Representative KELLY will be serving out the term of our dear former colleague Alan Nunnelee, who passed away in February. As he steps into his seat, we hope that he will follow Alan's example of service and dedication to the people of Mississippi.

Our colleague GREGG HARPER will now join me in welcoming our friend from Lee County, Mississippi.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor and pleasure to welcome the newest Member of this body, Congressman TRENT KELLY.

I am confident that TRENT KELLY will carry on the legacy of his predecessor, our late colleague, Representative Alan Nunnelee, one of impeccable constituent services and an unyielding commitment to this country and her citizens.

I look forward to working with Representative KELLY as he serves the First Congressional District and the people of the great State of Mississippi.

Congressman, I am so honored to stand here and welcome you to the floor of the House of Representatives.

TRENT KELLY.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman THOMPSON, Congressman HARPER, and the rest of the Mississippi delegation; and, most importantly, thank you, God.

I would also like to thank Senator WICKER and Senator COCHRAN, who are present.

Thank you to my family, which would include my mother and my wife and my three children and my brother, who cannot be here.

Thank you to my friends who are in the gallery above.

Thank you to the citizens of the First Congressional District of Mississippi and to my fellow Members.

I am humbled and honored to be able to serve this great Nation in this capacity.

Thank you, and God bless you, each and every one.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Mississippi, the whole number of the House is 434.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RE- LATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2577.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) kindly take the chair.

□ 1907

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. HOLDING (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 4, 2015, an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 156, line 15.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 7 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment by Mr. POSEY of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

Amendment by Mr. POSEY of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. POSEY of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time of any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS.
BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 259, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

AYES—163

Allen	Guinta	Palazzo
Amash	Guthrie	Palmer
Babin	Hardy	Paulsen
Barr	Harper	Pearce
Barton	Harris	Perry
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Pittenger
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)
Black	Hill	Poliquin
Blackburn	Holding	Polis
Blum	Hudson	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Price, Tom
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Ratcliffe
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Ribble
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Brooks (IN)	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Buchson	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Jones	Royce
Chabot	Jordan	Russell
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Salmon
Coffman	Kline	Sanford
Collins (GA)	Knight	Scalise
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Schweikert
Conaway	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Cook	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Cooper	Latta	Sessions
Crawford	Long	Shuster
Culberson	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
DeSantis	Love	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Duffy	Lummis	Stewart
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Stutzman
Farenthold	Massie	Thornberry
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Upton
Fleming	McCaul	Wagner
Flores	McClintock	Walberg
Forbes	McHenry	Walker
Fox	McMorris	Walorski
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Garrett	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Messer	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Mica	Westerman
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Williams
Gosar	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Gowdy	Moolenaar	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Graves (LA)	Mulvaney	Young (IA)
Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)	Young (IN)
Griffith	Neugebauer	Zinke
Grothman	Olson	

NOES—259

Graham	Graham	Payne
Granger	Granger	Pelosi
Agullar	Grayson	Perlmutter
Amodei	Green, Al	Peters
Ashford	Green, Gene	Peterson
Barletta	Grijalva	Pingree
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pocan
Beatty	Hahn	Posey
Becerra	Hanna	Price (NC)
Benishek	Hastings	Quigley
Bera	Heck (NV)	Rangel
Beyer	Heck (WA)	Reed
Bishop (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Blumenauer	Higgins	Renacci
Bonamici	Himes	Rice (NY)
Bost	Hinojosa	Richmond
Boustany	Honda	Rigell
Boyle, Brendan	Hoyer	Roby
F.	Huffman	Rogers (KY)
Brady (PA)	Israel	Rooney (FL)
Brown (FL)	Jackson Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownley (CA)	Jeffries	Roskam
Bustos	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Calvert	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Capps	Jolly	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Joyce	Rush
Carney	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Katko	Sanchez, Linda
Cartwright	Keating	T.
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Ciциlline	Kildee	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clay	King (NY)	Scott, David
Clyburn	Kinzinger (IL)	Serrano
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (AL)
Cole	Kuster	Sherman
Comstock	Langevin	Shimkus
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Simpson
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sinema
Costa	Lawrence	Sires
Costello (PA)	Lee	Slaughter
Courtney	Levin	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Crenshaw	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Crowley	Lipinski	Stefanik
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Stivers
Cummings	Loeb sack	Swalwell (CA)
Rice (SC)	Loftgren	Takai
Roe (TN)	Lowenthal	Takano
Rogers (AL)	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
Rohrabacher	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (MS)
Rokita	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (PA)
Rothfus	(NM)	Tiberi
Rouzer	Luján, Ben Ray	Tipton
Royce	(NM)	Titus
Russell	Lynch	Tonko
Ryan (WI)	MacArthur	Torres
Salmon	Maloney, Sean	Trott
Sanford	Marino	Tsongas
Scalise	Matsui	Turner
Schweikert	McCollum	Valadao
Scott, Austin	McDermott	Van Hollen
Sensenbrenner	McGovern	Vargas
Sessions	McKinley	Veasey
Shuster	McNerney	Vela
Smith (MO)	McSally	Velázquez
Smith (NE)	Meehan	Visclosky
Smith (TX)	Meeks	Walden
Stewart	Meng	Walz
Stutzman	Moore	Wasserman
Thornberry	Moulton	Schultz
Upton	Mullin	Waters, Maxine
Wagner	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Walberg	Nadler	Webster (FL)
Walker	Napolitano	Welch
Walorski	Neal	Westmoreland
Walters, Mimi	Newhouse	Whitfield
Weber (TX)	Noem	Wilson (FL)
Wenstrup	Nolan	Womack
Westerman	Norcross	Yarmuth
Williams	Nugent	Yoder
Wilson (SC)	Nunes	Young (AK)
Wittman	O'Rourke	Zeldin
Yoho	Pallone	
Young (IA)	Pascrell	
Young (IN)		
Zinke		

NOT VOTING—11

Adams	DeFazio	Lamborn
Buck	Doggett	Maloney,
Cárdenas	Duncan (TN)	Carolyn
Cleaver	Fincher	Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1911

Mr. BARR changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 193, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

AYES—229

Abraham	DeSantis	Huizenga (MI)
Aderholt	DesJarlais	Hultgren
Allen	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Amash	Donovan	Hurd (TX)
Babin	Duffy	Hurt (VA)
Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Barr	Ellmers (NC)	Jenkins (KS)
Barton	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (WV)
Benishek	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (MI)	Fleischmann	Jolly
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	Jones
Black	Flores	Jordan
Blackburn	Forbes	Joyce
Blum	Fortenberry	Katko
Bost	Fox	Kelly (MS)
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Brat	Garrett	King (NY)
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Kinzinger (IL)
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	Kline
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	Knight
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Labrador
Bucshon	Gosar	LaMalfa
Burgess	Gowdy	Lance
Byrne	Granger	Latta
Calvert	Graves (GA)	Long
Carter (GA)	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Carter (TX)	Graves (MO)	Love
Chabot	Griffith	Lucas
Chaffetz	Grothman	Luetkemeyer
Clawson (FL)	Guinta	Lummis
Coffman	Guthrie	MacArthur
Cole	Hanna	Marchant
Collins (GA)	Hardy	Marino
Collins (NY)	Harper	Massie
Comstock	Harris	McCarthy
Conaway	Hartzler	McCaul
Cook	Heck (NV)	McClintock
Costello (PA)	Hensarling	McHenry
Cramer	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
Crawford	Hice, Jody B.	McMorris
Crenshaw	Hill	Rodgers
Culberson	Holding	McSally
Denham	Hudson	Meehan
Dent	Huelskamp	Messer

Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moonenar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble

NOES—193

Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart

Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Adams
Buck
Cárdenas
Cleaver

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch

DeFazio
Doggett
Duncan (TN)
Fincher

Lamborn
Maloney,
Carolyn
Woodall

NOT VOTING—11

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1916

Mr. SERRANO changed his vote from
“aye” to “no.”

Mr. MEEHAN changed his vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 136, noes 286,
not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—136

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Elmiers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)

Gibbs
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grothman
Guinta
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant

Massie
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moonenar
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin

Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tipton

Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland

NOES—286

Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick

Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy

Williams
Wilson (SC)
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)
Zinke

McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik

Swalwell (CA)	Upton	Wasserman
Takai	Valadao	Schultz
Takano	Van Hollen	Waters, Maxine
Thompson (CA)	Vargas	Watson Coleman
Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Welch
Thornberry	Vela	Whitfield
Tiberi	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)
Titus	Visclosky	Wittman
Tonko	Walden	Womack
Torres	Walorski	Yarmuth
Trott	Walters, Mimi	Young (AK)
Tsongas	Walz	Young (IA)
Turner		Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Adams	DeFazio	Lamborn
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Maloney,
Cárdenas	Fincher	Carolyn
Cleaver	Granger	Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1919

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 260, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

AYES—163

Abraham	Dent	Jenkins (KS)
Aderholt	DeSantis	Johnson (OH)
Allen	DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam
Amash	Duffy	Jones
Babin	Duncan (SC)	Jordan
Barr	Ellmers (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Barton	Emmer (MN)	King (IA)
Benishek	Fleming	Kline
Bilirakis	Flores	Knight
Bishop (MI)	Forbes	Labrador
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	LaMalfa
Black	Garrett	Latta
Blackburn	Gibbs	Long
Blum	Gohmert	Loudermilk
Boustany	Goodlatte	Love
Brady (TX)	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Brat	Gowdy	Lummis
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Brooks (AL)	Griffith	Massie
Brooks (IN)	Grothman	McCarthy
Burgess	Guinta	McCauley
Carter (GA)	Guthrie	McClintock
Chabot	Hartzler	McHenry
Chaffetz	Hensarling	McKinley
Clawson (FL)	Herrera Beutler	McMorris
Coffman	Hice, Jody B.	Rodgers
Cole	Hill	McSally
Collins (GA)	Holding	Meadows
Collins (NY)	Hudson	Messer
Conaway	Huelskamp	Miller (FL)
Cook	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (MI)
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Mooney (WV)
Cramer	Hunter	Mullin
Crawford	Hurt (VA)	Mulvaney
Culberson	Issa	Murphy (FL)

Neugebauer	Roe (TN)
Noem	Rooney (FL)
Nugent	Roskam
Nunes	Rothfus
Olson	Royce
Palmer	Russell
Paulsen	Ryan (WI)
Pearce	Salmon
Perry	Sanford
Pittenger	Schweikert
Pitts	Scott, Austin
Poe (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Poliquin	Sessions
Pompeo	Smith (MO)
Posey	Smith (NE)
Price, Tom	Smith (TX)
Ratcliffe	Stewart
Renacci	Stutzman
Ribble	Tipton
Roby	Trott

NOES—260

Aguilar	Farenthold
Amodei	Farr
Ashford	Fattah
Barletta	Fitzpatrick
Bass	Fleischmann
Beatty	Fortenberry
Becerra	Foster
Bera	Fox
Beyer	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Fudge
Bonamici	Gabbard
Bost	Gallego
Boyle, Brendan	Garamendi
F.	Gibson
Brady (PA)	Graham
Brown (FL)	Granger
Brownley (CA)	Graves (LA)
Buchanan	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Grayson
Bustos	Green, Al
Butterfield	Green, Gene
Byrne	Grijalva
Calvert	Gutiérrez
Capps	Hahn
Capuano	Hanna
Carney	Hardy
Carson (IN)	Harper
Carter (TX)	Harris
Cartwright	Hastings
Castor (FL)	Heck (NV)
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)
Chu, Judy	Higgins
Cicilline	Himes
Clark (MA)	Hinojosa
Clarke (NY)	Honda
Clay	Hoyer
Clyburn	Huffman
Cohen	Hurd (TX)
Comstock	Israel
Connolly	Jackson Lee
Conyers	Jeffries
Cooper	Jenkins (WV)
Costa	Johnson (GA)
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.
Crenshaw	Jolly
Crowley	Joyce
Cuellar	Kaptur
Cummings	Katko
Curbelo (FL)	Keating
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)
Davis, Danny	Kelly (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Kennedy
DeGette	Kildee
DeLaney	Kilmer
DeLauro	Kind
DelBene	King (NY)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)
DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick
Deutch	Kuster
Diaz-Balart	Lance
Dingell	Langevin
Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Dold	Larson (CT)
Doonan	Lawrence
Doyle, Michael	Lee
F.	Levin
Duckworth	Lewis
Edwards	Lieu, Ted
Ellison	Lipinski
Engel	LoBiondo
Eshoo	Loeb
Esty	Lofgren

Wagner	Serrano
Walberg	Sewell (AL)
Walden	Sherman
Walker	Shimkus
Walters, Mimi	Shuster
Weber (TX)	Simpson
Webster (FL)	Sinema
Wenstrup	Sires
Westerman	Slaughter
Westmoreland	Smith (NJ)
Williams	Smith (WA)
Wilson (SC)	Speier
Wittman	Stefanik
Womack	Stivers
Yoho	Swalwell (CA)
Young (AK)	Takai
Young (IA)	
Young (IN)	
Zinke	

Takano	Vela
Thompson (CA)	Velázquez
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky
Thompson (PA)	Walorski
Thornberry	Walz
Tiberi	Wasserman
Titus	Schultz
Tonko	Waters, Maxine
Torres	Watson Coleman
Tsongas	Welch
Turner	Whitfield
Upton	Wilson (FL)
Valadao	Yarmuth
Van Hollen	Yoder
Vargas	Zeldin
Veasey	

NOT VOTING—10

Adams	DeFazio	Maloney,
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Fincher	Woodall
Cleaver	Lamborn	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1923

Mr. COLE changed his vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 218, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

AYES—205

Abraham	Chaffetz	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Clawson (FL)	Gosar
Allen	Coffman	Gowdy
Amash	Collins (GA)	Granger
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)
Babin	Conaway	Graves (LA)
Barletta	Cook	Graves (MO)
Barr	Costello (PA)	Griffith
Barton	Crawford	Grothman
Benishek	Crenshaw	Guinta
Bilirakis	Culberson	Guthrie
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Hardy
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Harris
Black	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Blum	Duffy	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Brat	Ellmers (NC)	Hice, Jody B.
Bridenstine	Emmer (MN)	Hill
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Holding
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Hudson
Buchanan	Fleming	Huelskamp
Bucshon	Flores	Huizenga (MI)
Burgess	Forbes	Hultgren
Byrne	Fox	Hunter
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Hurd (TX)
Carter (GA)	Garrett	Hurt (VA)
Carter (TX)	Gibbs	Issa
Chabot	Gohmert	Jenkins (KS)

Johnson (OH)	Mulvaney	Sanford	Peterson	Schrader	Torres	Hurt (VA)	Mulvaney	Scalise
Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Scalise	Pingree	Scott (VA)	Tsongas	Issa	Neugebauer	Schweikert
Jolly	Newhouse	Schweikert	Pocan	Scott, David	Turner	Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Scott, Austin
Jones	Noem	Scott, Austin	Polis	Serrano	Van Hollen	Johnson, Sam	Noem	Sensenbrenner
Jordan	Nugent	Sensenbrenner	Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Vargas	Jolly	Nugent	Sessions
Kelly (MS)	Nunes	Sessions	Quigley	Sherman	Veasey	Jones	Nunes	Simpson
Kelly (PA)	Olson	Shimkus	Rangel	Shuster	Vela	Jordan	Olson	Smith (MO)
King (IA)	Palazzo	Simpson	Reed	Sinema	Velázquez	Kelly (MS)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
Kinzinger (IL)	Palmer	Smith (MO)	Rice (NY)	Sires	Visclosky	King (IA)	Palmer	Smith (TX)
Kline	Paulsen	Smith (NE)	Richmond	Slaughter	Walz	Kline	Paulsen	Stewart
Knight	Pearce	Smith (TX)	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Wasserman	Knight	Pearce	Stivers
Labrador	Perry	Stewart	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Schultz	Labrador	Perry	Stutzman
LaMalfa	Pittenger	Stivers	Ruiz	Speier	Waters, Maxine	LaMalfa	Pittenger	Thornberry
Latta	Pitts	Stutzman	Ruppersberger	Stefanik	Watson Coleman	Latta	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Long	Poe (TX)	Thornberry	Rush	Swalwell (CA)	Welch	Long	Poliquin	Tipton
Loudermilk	Poliquin	Tiberi	Ryan (OH)	Takai	Westerman	Loudermilk	Pompeo	Trott
Love	Pompeo	Tipton	Sánchez, Linda	Takano	Wilson (FL)	Love	Posey	Valadao
Lucas	Posey	Trott	T.	Thompson (CA)	Womack	Luetkemeyer	Price, Tom	Wagner
Luetkemeyer	Price, Tom	Trotter	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth	Lummis	Ratcliffe	Walberg
Lummi	Ratcliffe	Upton	Sarbanes	Thompson (PA)	Zeldin	Marino	Renacci	Walker
MacArthur	Reichert	Walberg	Schakowsky	Titus	Zinke	Massie	Rice (SC)	Walorski
Marchant	Renacci	Walden	Schiff	Adams	DeFazio	McCarthy	Rigell	Walters, Mimi
Marino	Ribble	Walker		Buck	Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)
Massie	Rice (SC)	Walorski		Cárdenas	Fincher	McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
McCarthy	Rigell	Walters, Mimi		Cleaver	Lamborn	McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland
McCaul	Roby	Weber (TX)				McMorris	Rohrabacher	Williams
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Webster (FL)				Rodgers	Rokita	Wilson (SC)
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup				McSally	Rooney (FL)	Wittman
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland				Meadows	Roskam	Womack
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Whitfield				Meehan	Rouzer	Yoder
McSally	Rokita	Williams				Messer	Royce	Yoho
Meadows	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (SC)				Mica	Russell	Young (AK)
Meehan	Roskam	Wittman				Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Young (IA)
Messner	Ross	Yoder				Miller (MI)	Salmon	Young (IN)
Mica	Rothfus	Yoho				Mooney (WV)	Sanford	
Miller (FL)	Rouzer	Young (AK)						
Miller (MI)	Royce	Young (IA)						
Moolenaar	Russell	Young (IN)						
Mooney (WV)	Ryan (WI)							
Mullin	Salmon							

NOT VOTING—10

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1926

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 186, noes 237,
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

AYES—186

NOES—218								
Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)	Abraham	Chaffetz	Garrett	Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Keating
Ashford	Deutch	Kennedy	Aderholt	Clawson (FL)	Gibbs	Amodei	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
Bass	Dingell	Kildee	Allen	Coffman	Gohmert	Ashford	Dingell	Kelly (PA)
Beatty	Doggett	Kilmer	Amash	Collins (GA)	Goodlatte	Barletta	Doggett	Kennedy
Becerra	Dold	Kind	Babin	Collins (NY)	Gosar	Bass	Dold	Kildee
Bera	Donovan	King (NY)	Barr	Conaway	Granger	Beatty	Donovan	Kilmer
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Kirkpatrick	Barton	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)	Becerra	Doyle, Michael	Kind
Bishop (GA)	F.	Kuster	Benishkek	Crawford	Graves (LA)	Bera	F.	King (NY)
Blumenauer	Duckworth	Lance	Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Guinta	Beyer	Duckworth	Kinzinger (IL)
Bonamici	Edwards	Langevin	Bishop (MI)	Culberson	Guthrie	Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Kirkpatrick
Bost	Ellison	Larsen (WA)	Bishop (UT)	Dent	Hardy	Blumenauer	Ellison	Kuster
Boustany	Engel	Larson (CT)	Blum	DeSantis	Harris	Bonamici	Engel	Lance
Boyle, Brendan	Eshoo	Lawrence	Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Heck (NV)	Bost	Eshoo	Langevin
F.	Esty	Lee	Brat	Duffy	Hensarling	Boustany	Esty	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Farr	Levin	Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler	Boyle, Brendan	Farr	Larson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Lewis	Brooks (AL)	Ellmers (NC)	Hice, Jody B.	F.	Fattah	Lawrence
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lieu, Ted	Brooks (IN)	Emmer (MN)	Hill	Brady (PA)	Fitzpatrick	Lee
Bustos	Fortenberry	Lipinski	Buchanan	Farenthold	Holding	Brown (FL)	Fortenberry	Levin
Butterfield	Foster	LoBiondo	Bucshon	Fleischmann	Hudson	Brownley (CA)	Foster	Lewis
Capps	Frankel (FL)	Loeb sack	Burgess	Fleming	Huelskamp	Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren	Byrne	Flóres	Huizenga (MI)	Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Carney	Fudge	Lowenthal	Carter (GA)	Forbes	Hultgren	Calvert	Fudge	LoBiondo
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lowe	Carter (TX)	Fox	Hunter	Capps	Gabbard	Loeb sack
Cartwright	Gallo	Lujan Grisham	Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Hurd (TX)	Capuano	Gallo	Lofgren
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	(NM)				Carney	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Castro (TX)	Gibson	Luján, Ben Ray				Carson (IN)	Gibson	Lowe
Chu, Judy	Graham	(NM)				Cartwright	Graham	Lucas
Cicilline	Grayson	Lynch				Castor (FL)	Grayson	Lujan Grisham
Clark (MA)	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean				Castro (TX)	Green, Al	(NM)
Clarke (NY)	Green, Gene	Matsui				Chu, Judy	Green, Gene	Luján, Ben Ray
Clay	Grijalva	McCollum				Cicilline	Griffith	(NM)
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	McDermott				Clark (MA)	Grijalva	Lynch
Cohen	Hahn	McGovern				Clarke (NY)	Grothman	MacArthur
Cole	Hanna	McKinley				Clay	Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean
Comstock	Harper	McNerney				Clyburn	Hahn	Matsui
Connolly	Hastings	Meeks				Cohen	Hanna	McCollum
Conyers	Heck (WA)	Meng				Cole	Harper	McDermott
Cooper	Higgins	Moulton				Comstock	Hartzer	McGovern
Costa	Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)				Connolly	Hastings	McKinley
Courtney	Honda	Murphy (PA)				Conyers	Heck (WA)	McNerney
Cramer	Hoyer	Nadler				Cooper	Higgins	Meeks
Crowley	Huffman	Napolitano				Costa	Himes	Meng
Cuellar	Israel	Neal				Courtney	Hinojosa	Moolenaar
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Nolan				Cramer	Honda	Moore
Curbelo (FL)	Jeffries	Norcross				Crowley	Hoyer	Moulton
Davis (CA)	Jenkins (WV)	O'Rourke				Cuellar	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Pallone				Cummings	Israel	Murphy (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell				Curbelo (FL)	Jackson Lee	Nadler
DeGette	Joyce	Payne				Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Napolitano
Delaney	Kaptur	Pelosi				Davis, Danny	Jenkins (KS)	Neal
DeLauro	Katko	Perlmutter				Davis, Rodney	Johnson (WV)	Nolan
DelBene	Keating	Peters				DeGette	Johnson (GA)	Norcross
Denham						Delaney	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
						DeLauro	Joyce	Pallone
						DelBene	Kaptur	Pascarell
						Denham	Katko	Payne

NOES—237

Keating	Kelly (IL)	Kelly (PA)	Kennedy	Kildee	Kilmer	Kind	King (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Kirkpatrick	Kuster	Lance	Langevin	Larsen (WA)	Larson (CT)	Lawrence	Lee	Levin	Lewis	Lieu, Ted	Lipinski	LoBiondo	Loeb sack	Lofgren	Lowenthal	Lowe	Lucas	Lujan Grisham	(NM)	Luján, Ben Ray	(NM)	Lynch	MacArthur	Maloney, Sean	Matsui	McCollum	McDermott	McGovern	McKinley	McNerney	Meeks	Meng	Moolenaar	Moore	Moulton	Murphy (FL)	Murphy (PA)	Nadler	Napolitano	Neal	Nolan	Norcross	O'Rourke	Pallone	Pascarell	Payne
---------	------------	------------	---------	--------	--------	------	-----------	----------------	-------------	--------	-------	----------	-------------	-------------	----------	-----	-------	-------	-----------	----------	----------	-----------	---------	-----------	------	-------	---------------	------	----------------	------	-------	-----------	---------------	--------	----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	-------	------	-----------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	--------	------------	------	-------	----------	----------	---------	-----------	-------

Pelosi	Sanchez, Loretta	Titus	Hastings	Lummis	Sánchez, Linda	Palazzo	Rothfus	Trott
Perlmutter	Sarbanes	Tonko	Heck (WA)	Lynch	T.	Palmer	Rouzer	Turner
Peters	Schakowsky	Torres	Higgins	Massie	Sanchez, Loretta	Paulsen	Royce	Upton
Peterson	Schiff	Tsongas	Himes	Matsui	Sarbanes	Pearce	Ruppersberger	Valadao
Pingree	Schrader	Turner	Hinojosa	McCollum	Schakowsky	Perlmutter	Russell	Veasey
Pitts	Scott (VA)	Upton	Honda	McDermott	Schiff	Perry	Ryan (WI)	Vela
Pocan	Scott, David	Van Hollen	Hoyer	McGovern	Scott (VA)	Pingree	Salmon	Wagner
Polis	Serrano	Vargas	Huffman	McNerney	Scott, David	Pittenger	Sanford	Walberg
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Veasey	Israel	Meeks	Sensenbrenner	Pitts	Scalise	Walden
Quigley	Sherman	Vela	Jackson Lee	Meng	Serrano	Poe (TX)	Schrader	Walker
Rangel	Shimkus	Velázquez	Jeffries	Moulton	Sewell (AL)	Poliquin	Schweikert	Walorski
Reed	Shuster	Visclosky	Jones	Murphy (FL)	Sherman	Pompeo	Scott, Austin	Walters, Mimi
Reichert	Sinema	Walden	Jordan	Nadler	Sinema	Posey	Sessions	Waters, Maxine
Rice (NY)	Sires	Walz	Kaptur	Napolitano	Slaughter	Price, Tom	Shimkus	Watson Coleman
Richmond	Slaughter	Wasserman	Keating	Newhouse	Smith (WA)	Ratcliffe	Shuster	Weber (TX)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Schultz	Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Speier	Reed	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Ross	Smith (WA)	Waters, Maxine	Kennedy	Payne	Swalwell (CA)	Reichert	Sires	Wenstrup
Rothfus	Speier	Watson Coleman	Kildee	Norcross	Takano	Renacci	Smith (MO)	Westerman
Roybal-Allard	Stefanik	Welch	Kilmer	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)	Ribble	Smith (NE)	Westmoreland
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	Westerman	Kind	Pallone	Thompson (MS)	Rice (NY)	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Ruppersberger	Takal	Whitfield	Kirkpatrick	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)	Rice (SC)	Smith (TX)	Wilson (FL)
Rush	Takano	Wilson (FL)	Kuster	Payne	Tonko	Rigell	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)
Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth	Langevin	Pelosi	Tsongas	Roby	Stewart	Wittman
Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)	Zeldin	Larson (CT)	Peters	Van Hollen	Roe (TN)	Stivers	Womack
T.	Thompson (PA)	Zinke	Lee	Peterson	Vargas	Rogers (AL)	Stutzman	Yarmuth
			Levin	Pocan	Velázquez	Rogers (KY)	Takai	Yoder
			Lieu, Ted	Polis	Visclosky	Rohrabacher	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
			Loeb sack	Price (NC)	Walz	Rokita	Thornberry	Young (IA)
			Lowfren	Quigley	Wasserman	Rooney (FL)	Tiberi	Young (IN)
			Lowenthal	Rangel	Schultz	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton	Zinke
			Lowe y	Richmond	Welch	Roskam	Torres	
			Lujan Grisham	Roybal-Allard	Whitfield	Ross		
			(NM)	Ruiz	Yoho			
			Luján, Ben Ray	Rush	Zeldin			
			(NM)	Ryan (OH)				

NOT VOTING—10

Adams	DeFazio	Maloney,
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Fincher	Woodall
Cleaver	Lamborn	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1930

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 266, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

AYES—157

Aguilar	Castro (TX)	Dingell
Ashford	Chu, Judy	Doggett
Bass	Cicilline	Duncan (SC)
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Edwards
Becerra	Clay	Ellison
Beyer	Clyburn	Engel
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Eshoo
Blum	Conyers	Esty
Blumenauer	Cooper	Farr
Bonamici	Courtney	Foster
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
F.	Culberson	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (AL)	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Gabbard
Bustos	DeGette	Gallego
Butterfield	Delaney	Garamendi
Capps	DeLauro	Grayson
Capuano	DelBene	Green, Gene
Carney	DeSaulnier	Gutiérrez
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Hahn

Abraham	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (GA)
Aderholt	Dold	Johnson (OH)
Allen	Donovan	Johnson, E. B.
Amash	Doyle, Michael	Johnson, Sam
Amodei	F.	Jolly
Babin	Duckworth	Joyce
Barletta	Duffy	Katko
Barr	Ellmers (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Barton	Emmer (MN)	Kelly (PA)
Benishek	Farenthold	King (IA)
Bera	Fattah	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Kinzing (IL)
Bishop (MI)	Fleischmann	Kline
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	Knight
Black	Flores	Labrador
Blackburn	Forbes	LaMalfa
Bost	Fortenberry	Lance
Boustany	Fox	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Brady (TX)	Garrett	Lawrence
Brat	Gibbs	Lewis
Bridenstine	Gibson	Lipinski
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Brown (FL)	Goodlatte	Long
Buchanan	Gosar	Loudermilk
Bucshon	Gowdy	Love
Burgess	Graham	Lucas
Byrne	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Calvert	Graves (GA)	MacArthur
Carson (IN)	Graves (LA)	Maloney, Sean
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Carter (TX)	Green, Al	Marino
Cartwright	Griffith	McCarthy
Chabot	Grijalva	McCaul
Chaffetz	Grothman	McClintock
Clarke (NY)	Guinta	McHenry
Clawson (FL)	Guthrie	McKinley
Coffman	Hanna	McMorris
Cohen	Hardy	Rodgers
Cole	Harper	McSally
Collins (GA)	Harris	Meadows
Collins (NY)	Hartzler	Meehan
Comstock	Heck (NV)	Messer
Conaway	Hensarling	Mica
Cook	Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)
Costa	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (MI)
Costello (PA)	Hill	Moolenaar
Cramer	Holding	Mooney (WV)
Crawford	Hudson	Moore
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Mullin
Cuellar	Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney
Cummings	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
Curbello (FL)	Hunter	Neal
Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)	Neugebauer
Denham	Hurt (VA)	Noem
Dent	Issa	Nugent
DeSantis	Jenkins (KS)	Nunes
DesJarlais	Jenkins (WV)	Olson

NOES—266

Johnson (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam	Jolly	Joyce
Katko	Kelly (MS)	Kelly (PA)
King (IA)	King (NY)	Kinzing (IL)
Kline	Knight	Labrador
LaMalfa	Lance	Larsen (WA)
Latta	Lawrence	Lewis
Lipinski	LoBiondo	Long
Loudermilk	Love	Lucas
Luetkemeyer	MacArthur	Maloney, Sean
Marchant	Marino	McCarthy
McCaul	McClintock	McHenry
McKinley	McMorris	Rodgers
McSally	Meadows	Meehan
Messer	Mica	Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)	Moolenaar	Mooney (WV)
Moore	Mullin	Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)	Neal	Neugebauer
Noem	Nugent	Nunes
Olson		

NOT VOTING—10

Adams	DeFazio	Maloney,
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Fincher	Woodall
Cleaver	Lamborn	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1934

Messrs. CONYERS, JORDAN, and GUTIÉRREZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 148, noes 275, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—148

Abraham	Blum	Coffman
Allen	Boustany	Collins (GA)
Amash	Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)
Babin	Brat	Conaway
Barr	Bridenstine	Cook
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Crawford
Benishek	Brooks (IN)	DeSantis
Bilirakis	Burgess	DesJarlais
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Duffy
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Black	Chaffetz	Ellmers (NC)
Blackburn	Clawson (FL)	Emmer (MN)

Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer

Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Rothfus

Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Tipton
Trott
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)

Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
McShane
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napollitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires

Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Viscosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Zeldin
Zinke

Burgess
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)

Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey

Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Tipton
Trott
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Weber (TX)
Nugent
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)

NOES—275

Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)

Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna

Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)

Adams
Buck
Cárdenas
Cleaver

NOT VOTING—10

DeFazio
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Lamborn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1939

Mr. FORBES changed his vote from
“aye” to “no.”
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) on
which further proceedings were post-
poned and on which the noes prevailed
by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 134, noes 287,
not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

AYES—134

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barr
Bartons

Benish
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn

Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)

Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar

NOES—287

Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva

Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Loftgren
Lowenthal

Lowey	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Lucas	Pocan	Smith (WA)
Lujan Grisham	Polis	Speier
(NM)	Price (NC)	Stefanik
Lujan, Ben Ray	Quigley	Stivers
(NM)	Rangel	Swalwell (CA)
Lynch	Reed	Takai
MacArthur	Reichert	Takano
Maloney, Sean	Ribble	Thompson (CA)
Marino	Rice (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Matsui	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)
McCaul	Richmond	Thornberry
McCollum	Rigell	Tiberi
McDermott	Roby	Titus
McGovern	Rogers (AL)	Tonko
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Torres
McNerney	Rokita	Tsongas
McSally	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Meehan	Roskam	Upton
Meeks	Ross	Valadao
Meng	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen
Mica	Ruiz	Vargas
Moore	Ruppersberger	Veasey
Moulton	Rush	Vela
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez
Murphy (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Visclosky
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda	Walorski
Napolitano	T.	Walters, Mimi
Neal	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz
Newhouse	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Noem	Schakowsky	Schultz
Nolan	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Norcross	Schrader	Watson Coleman
Nunes	Scott (VA)	Welch
Palazzo	Scott, David	Whitfield
Pallone	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Pascarella	Sewell (AL)	Wittman
Payne	Sherman	Womack
Pelosi	Shimkus	Yarmuth
Perlmutter	Shuster	Young (AK)
Perry	Simpson	Young (IN)
Peters	Sinema	Zeldin
Peterson	Sires	Zinke
Pingree	Slaughter	

NOT VOTING—12

Adams	Duncan (TN)	McMorris
Buck	Fincher	Rodgers
Cárdenas	Lamborn	O'Rourke
Cleaver	Maloney,	Woodall
DeFazio	Carolyn	

□ 1944

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I was unavoidably detained on account of a flight delay. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 309, "aye" on rollcall vote 310, "aye" on rollcall vote 311, "aye" on rollcall vote 312, "aye" on rollcall vote 313, "aye" on rollcall vote 314, "aye" on rollcall vote 315, "nay" on rollcall vote 316, "aye" on rollcall vote 317, and "aye" on rollcall vote 318.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1945

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2685, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2393, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-145) on the resolution (H. Res. 303) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 198

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Congressman AMASH be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 198.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2577, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2577.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1949

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and re-

lated agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 156, line 15.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank him for his great work on this appropriations bill.

Madam Chairman, for over 20 years I have been a staunch advocate for reducing aircraft noise over northern New Jersey. I have attended dozens of public hearings and meetings with officials from the FAA and responded to thousands of calls from constituents whose lives have been affected by increased aircraft noise.

While the safety of airplane passengers is paramount and the vitality of our air transport system is important, people on the ground have a right to a quality of life with a minimum exposure to air noise overhead.

Despite spending over \$70 million in taxpayer dollars on the New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia airspace redesign project, time and time again the Federal Aviation Administration has turned a deaf ear to the tremendous impact air noise has had over northern New Jersey. I recently wrote two letters to the FAA to bring my constituent concerns directly to Administrator Michael Huerta's attention. To date, these letters and my constituents' pleas for help have gone unanswered.

As the FAA proceeds with the New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia airspace redesign, they must factor air noise into their calculations. I look forward to working with the chairman to ensure that this is done.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I want to again thank the gentleman for raising this important issue. I appreciate his dedication to ensuring that his constituents' air noise concerns are adequately addressed by the FAA.

Again, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 4. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to establish any asset management position (including any account executive, senior account executive, and troubled asset specialist position, as such positions are described in the Field Resource Manual (Wave 1) entitled "Transformation: Multifamily for Tomorrow" of the Department of Housing and Urban Development) of the Office of Multifamily Housing of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or newly hire an employee for any asset management position, that is located at a Core office (as such term is used in such Field Resource Manual) before filling each such asset management position that is located at a Non-Core office (as such term is used in such Field Resource Manual) and has been vacated since October 1, 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment regarding HUD's multifamily transformation plan. I will ultimately withdraw this amendment because I know that there will be Republican opposition, but I think it is important for me to speak out against the ill-advised plan.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is currently in the process of a major consolidation of its multifamily offices, which it has dubbed the multifamily transformation plan. I have been vocal in my skepticism of HUD's assurances that this plan will bring about significant savings without impacting program delivery.

In fact, last year this House approved an amendment to the fiscal year 2015 appropriations bill that required HUD to follow a transformation plan that maintains asset management staff in its field offices. I fought for this amendment because I believe strongly that HUD's plan to consolidate the important function of asset management from 17 hubs overseeing 50 field offices into just 5 hub locations and 7 satellite offices would significantly impair program delivery without resulting in significant cost savings.

Asset management is a hands-on job which calls for an intimate knowledge of the local housing market and frequently requires staff to make on-site visits to troubled properties. That is why it is so important to have asset management staff in local field offices to respond to local needs.

Unfortunately, I have been hearing from advocates that HUD has been failing to replace vacancies in asset management positions in field offices and is only hiring new asset management staff in hub locations. This is unacceptable. There are already two field offices that have completely shuttered be-

cause they have no working staff. In Los Angeles, we have already lost 15 asset management staff who have not been replaced.

My amendment would ensure that HUD prioritizes the hiring of asset management staff in local field offices for vacancies that occur in the next fiscal year instead of continuing to consolidate this important function to a select few hub and satellite locations. It would help ensure that our multifamily field offices remain open and operating at current staffing levels. Without this amendment, local multifamily offices will continue to have more vacancies that go unfilled.

I regretfully ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . . . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of subpart E of part 5 of the regulations of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (24 C.F.R. Part 5, Subpart E; relating to restrictions on assistance to noncitizens).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, my amendment simply ensures that no funds can be used to circumvent current law which prevents illegal immigrants from obtaining housing assistance. Spending should be prioritized based on the needs of American taxpaying citizens, not those who are residing in our country illegally.

Constituents back in my district and throughout the country work hard every day, and their needs should not play second fiddle to those of immigrants who broke our laws and came into this country illegally.

With the continued efforts by some in this country to disregard the rule of law, much to the detriment of taxpaying Americans, I truly believe this amendment is necessary to clarify and reinforce the intent of Congress as it pertains to housing assistance providing via HUD.

This is a simple, commonsense amendment that shows the hard-working American citizens that we are serious when it comes to spending their tax dollars and that we will not use their hard-earned money to prioritize and reward those who break our laws. I

urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support the rule of law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I do oppose this amendment. On the face of it, it simply restates existing regulations, but I fear there is another motive at play, that is, an anti-immigrant agenda.

Let me explain what I mean. This amendment feeds into the widely held misperception that many undocumented individuals are, in fact, obtaining Federal benefits despite restrictions—verification procedures—specifically designed to prohibit such activity.

We must not allow this appropriations bill to become a platform to denigrate immigrants in this country or to score political points at their expense. We need real solutions. We need to actually fix our broken immigration system. We shouldn't be wasting valuable floor time on amendments such as these. We would be better served by moving comprehensive immigration reform, fully debating it in this Chamber.

□ 2000

We are ready to do that. We can pass comprehensive immigration reform, if the Speaker would bring it to the floor, this very week. Until then, I would ask restraint on amendments that in no way alter existing law and regulation and only serve to stir controversy, reinforce prejudices, and distract us from the business at hand.

I urge defeat of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, this amendment is strictly about the rule of law and following the rule of law. I agree we shouldn't have to debate immigration here. This is not about this. This is about following the rule of law.

At this point, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Chair, this amendment has nothing to do with being anti-immigrant. In fact, the gentleman's comments play into that accusation. This is entirely incorrect and inappropriate. In fact, it reminds me of a comment a President made from right up there at that podium that no illegal aliens would get ObamaCare. Somebody thought that was not true and said so. It turns out it was not true. They have gotten it.

I went home and talked to a number of people that were in and around Walmart this weekend—immigrants, people that are here legally, and they can't find work and they need help. They did everything to come here legally and properly—Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, African Americans, Anglo Americans—and they just need help.

I would submit, if we are going to be true to the oath we took to our Constitution and the laws which uphold our Constitution, we need to be about helping those that are under our care, those who have come legally.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I appreciate him doing it. It is a pro-immigrant amendment for immigrants that will come legally, and there are plenty of those here.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, to the ranking member, I would love to have that discussion down the road about responsible immigration reform, and I think we need to have that. The American people expect it. They deserve it, and I look forward to having that.

In the meantime, this is just a commonsense amendment that strictly puts the emphasis on following the rule of law, and I think all Americans, regardless of what side of the aisle, would stand supporting the Constitution, the very document that we all took an oath to.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 5309 of title 49, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the ranking member, Mr. PRICE, and his staff, as well as the chairman, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for their work on something that is very close and near and dear to many Members' hearts. It certainly is close to mine.

The Jackson Lee amendment was passed last year. I am grateful to have the opportunity this year to restate the fact that this amendment indicates that none of the funds made available by this act under the heading "Federal Transit Administration: Transit Formula Grants" may be used in contravention of section 5309.

This is, as I said, an amendment identical to the Jackson Lee amendment. Might I just briefly speak to this amendment. It affirms the importance to the Nation of projects that create economic development, particularly in the transportation area.

It particularly says that the Secretary of Transportation may make grants under this section to State and local governments; it has the authority to assist in financing capital projects, small start-up projects, including the acquisition of real property.

The key is that these grants under State and local authority can undertake capital projects, which means that, when local governments propose their projects, the Secretary has the authority to go forward. Nothing can contravene that authority.

It is well documented that nothing enhances the competitiveness of a Nation in this increasingly globalized economy than investments in transportation and infrastructure capital projects.

I will include an article about transportation dated March 31, 2015, into the RECORD.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Mar. 31, 2015]

STUDY FINDS HOUSTON TRAFFIC CONGESTION WORSENING

(By Dug Begley)

As workday commutes go, Raj Dada's isn't terrible. He lives east of Jersey Village, an easy drive from the freeway. His off-ramp from Interstate 10 puts him practically in front of his job near Bunker Hill.

In each of the past three years, though, the daily drive has gotten worse, Dada said.

"I leave earlier than I used to," he said Monday morning as he stopped for gas near his office. "Even on weekends, it's taking longer to get around all the construction and traffic."

It's a common dilemma for Houston motorists. Congestion in Houston increased sharply from 2013 to 2014, according to a report released Tuesday by TomTom, developer of the mapping and traffic data fed to phones and other GPS devices.

Analysts said trips in the region on average last year took 25 percent longer than they would have in free-flowing conditions, compared with 21 percent longer in 2013.

This means that a hypothetical 30-minute, congestion-free trip, on average, takes about 52 minutes at peak commuting times. For an entire year, it means drivers waste 85 hours—more than 3.5 days—plodding along the highways and streets of Houston.

It's the first increase in TomTom's traffic index for Houston in four years after three consecutive years of slight declines.

Growing cities with robust economies tend to experience the biggest increases in traffic. Oil price dips notwithstanding, Houston certainly fits the bill, said Tony Voigt, the program manager for the Texas A&M Transportation Institute's Houston office.

Voigt said local analysis supports the conclusion in the TomTom report: More local streets and highways are more congested for more hours of the day. Even weekend trips to some spots—notably retail corridors—can be increasingly time-consuming.

"This is a result of more people living here as compared to two or three years ago and our economy being very active and healthy," Voigt said.

Nick Cohn, senior traffic expert for TomTom, said the opposite is true in places where job prospects are not as strong, based on the company's worldwide traffic research. "In Moscow, where there has really been an economic slowdown and gas prices are up, there has been a slowdown," Cohn said.

Moscow and other international cities continue to experience traffic far worse than cities in the U.S. In the United States, Houston ranked 12th-worst among major cities for traffic, compared to 85th worldwide.

News that 11 other American cities have worse congestion isn't comforting to Houston drivers.

"It's terrible," said Debbie Curry, 60, a lifelong Houstonian. "Traffic in this city has gotten worse. When I moved (to western Houston) I thought it would get better. It did for a little while; now it's as bad as it's ever been."

Reasons why Houston drivers spend so much of their time in traffic vary, but most theories circle back to explosive growth.

"Some of the congestion on U.S. 290 and on (Loop 610 North) is, of course, construction-related," Voigt said. "But what we are really seeing is travel demand is greater overall, and this is causing the peak congestion periods to spread out."

Peak commutes, once contained to two hours each in the morning and evening, are spreading to three and sometimes four hours. Though it means more days when traffic is heavy for longer periods, the gradual growth of peak commuting periods isn't all bad, Cohn said.

"It means at least when possible they are being flexible with those work-to-home and home-to-work trips," Cohn said, noting that an alternative could be a more compressed—but more severe—peak commuting period.

Houston-area officials have a long list of road-widening projects planned over the next decade, along with some transit growth. Suburban areas, notably Conroe and The Woodlands, are exploring their own transit options. It's a pattern across the U.S., Cohn said.

Each city faces different obstacles, Cohn said. Houston's lack of density could make transit less effective, but public transportation remains a critical part of any congestion relief as roads dominate.

Many municipalities, state transportation officials and counties in the area have made "significant requests for roadway dollars," said Houston Councilman Stephen Costello, chairman of the Transportation Policy Council of the Houston-Galveston Area Council.

Those projects are not just about relieving traffic now, but about building before it gets worse, Costello said.

Any improvements are constrained by funding, which federal and state lawmakers have been slow to deliver. Federal officials remain at an impasse about a long-term transportation bill, and many have shown reluctance to increase federal highway spending. Texas voters last year approved \$1.7 billion for state highways, leaving about \$3.3 billion in additional money needed, according to the Texas A&M Transportation Institute.

That funding shortfall has many, especially officials in suburban Houston, worried as their traffic worsens and projects crawl toward completion, said West University Place Mayor Bob Fry.

"I think outside (Loop 610) is going to be worse for traffic than inside the Loop," Fry said. "Inside is built out, and it's not going to get worse like it is outside."

In the urban core, Fry said, transit is the important investment. He said Metro's upcoming redesign of bus service will "help quite a bit."

PERSONAL CHOICE

With projects slow to take shape, Cohn said drivers might see the best results by using an increasing and improving array of traffic information available to them. Houston's TranStar system—a partnership of Houston, Harris County, the Texas Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Transit Authority—is one of the largest and most comprehensive real-time traffic systems in the country.

"There used to be a big difference between what the highway authority has and what real-time traffic systems have," Cohn said. "It is more of a unified service now."

When a motorist finds alternate routes to avoid congestion, it helps not just that driver but also others because one less vehicle is clogging up the problem spot.

Reliance on the information, and better personal planning, might be the best relief for traffic now.

"I don't think drivers can sit back and wait for some big infrastructure project," he said.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 5, 2013]

CONGESTION A CONSTANT FOR HOUSTON COMMUTERS

(By Dug Begley)

Houston region has been rated as having the sixth worst commute in the nation based on hours of delay.

The good news is that traffic congestion isn't getting much worse in the Houston area. The bad news is it was pretty bad to begin with.

Houston commuters continue to endure some of the worst traffic delays in the country, according to the 2012 Urban Mobility Report released Tuesday by the Texas A&M Transportation Commission. Area drivers wasted more than two days a year, on average, in traffic congestion, costing them each \$1,090 in lost time and fuel.

And it's unlikely to get any better, researchers and public officials say.

"I think as rapidly as this area is growing, (the challenge) is just trying to stay where we are," Harris County Judge Ed Emmett said of the traffic congestion.

Planned toll projects on U.S. 290 and eventually Interstate 45 will help ease traffic, just as the Katy Freeway managed lanes did in 2008, Emmett said.

Drivers take the congestion in stride and devise their own strategies to deal with the hassle. Roger Wilson, 54, takes a park and ride bus from Katy, but his co-worker Brad Steele, 39, drives in from Spring. Over lunch Monday, both claimed their method was best.

"Yeah, you get to read or sleep," Steele told Wilson, "but I would rather have my car."

But as long as Houston attracts jobs, and those jobs attract workers, commuting hassles will persist, said Tim Lomax, a co-author of the mobility report.

"We're hitting the limits of improving traffic by widening the roads," said Stephen Klineberg, co-director of the Kinder Center for Urban Research at Rice University.

With 4 million people in Harris County, and another 1 million coming in the next 20 years, the region will embrace new development patterns that reduce the need for driving—but on its own terms and without abandoning the car, Klineberg said.

"Suburban areas are developing town centers and walkable urbanist developments," Klineberg said, pointing to developments in The Woodlands, Sugar Land and Pearland.

DRIVERS ADAPTING

The new patterns follow years of steady outward growth, leading to greater distances between homes and workplaces.

Based on the mobility report, in 1982 drivers spent about 22 hours each year stuck in congestion, a figure that has increased almost every year since. Traffic congestion peaked in 2008 at 55 hours, the same year two carpool/toll lanes along I-10 opened between downtown and Katy. The lanes took five years to complete and cost \$2.8 billion.

But some of the best ways to reduce congestion are less costly. As Houston drivers have acclimated to rush-hour traffic jams, they've become more adept at saving themselves time.

"People are adjusting when they leave," Lomax said, noting resources that provide real-time traffic information. As smartphones and computers become more common, and workdays come with greater flexibility for some people to work from home, commuters can adjust to less-stressful drive times.

Thus, even though they have the sixth-worst commute in the country based on hours of delay, the region's drivers rank 21st on a new calculation that determines how much extra time drivers have to build into their trips. The new measure, called the freeway planning time index, shows drivers don't have to build in as much extra time as others, because planning and good freeway clearance rates by tow trucks keep roads moving, Lomax said.

Public transit can provide some relief, but with jobs in Houston divided among a dozen or so job areas, it's hard for public transit to carry everyone where they need to go efficiently, Lomax said.

Still, drivers and elected officials said traffic congestion is spreading farther from the urban core and growing.

TRUCKING HURT

"I think within the next two years it is going to get worse," said Liberty County Commissioner Norman Brown, who said traffic is already worsening for some Dayton-area drivers.

Some congestion on the region's fringes is the result of trucking and manufacturing, Brown said. The mobility report found congestion accounted for \$646 million in cost to businesses reliant on trucking in 2011, up from \$490 million in 2007.

Emmett said the shipping growth demonstrates the need for investment in rail and other methods to move goods.

Lomax said congestion caused by flourishing truck business can be a good problem to have.

"Economic recession seems to be the one foolproof way of controlling congestion," Lomax said. "But nobody's saying that is a solution."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Just to emphasize, finally, whether it is seaways, dams, highways, or tollways, whether it involves other modes of transportation, transportation projects are major engines driving the economy. That is why we are here on the floor. It is important for the local communities to be drivers of that. The metropolitan regions will not be able to maintain economic vitality without this investment.

Finally, the Jackson Lee amendment clearly speaks to the global aspects of the Secretary of Transportation having the ability to work with our local and State governments.

I ask my colleagues to join me in restating that the Secretary of Transportation has authority to work with local and State entities on the proposed projects that they have and for these projects to continue to grow and develop to ease traffic congestion.

Madam Chair, Let me thank Subcommittee Chairman DIAZ-BALART and Ranking Member PRICE for their leadership on this important legislation and for the opportunity to explain my amendment.

The Jackson Lee Amendment adds at the end of the bill the following new section providing that:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Federal Transit Administration—Transit Formula Grants" may be used in contravention of section 5309 of title 49, United States Code.

This amendment is identical to the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 4775, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act for FY2015 adopted by the House last year by voice vote.

In particular, the Jackson Lee affirms the importance to the nation of projects that create economic development, particularly in the transportation area.

Pursuant to section 5309 of title 49, the Secretary of Transportation may make grants under this section to State and local government the authority to assist in financing capital projects, small startup projects, including the acquisition of real property.

This section further supports capacity improvements, including double tracking, and it specifically relates to work that deals with projects on approved transportation plans.

That is key; section 5309 of title 49 grants to State and local governments the authority to undertake capital projects, which means that when local governments propose their projects, the Secretary has the authority to go forward on them.

It's instructive to consider what some of the nation's leading transportation and economic development organizations have to say about the importance and economic impact of investments in local light rail capital projects.

It is well documented that nothing enhances the competitiveness of a nation in this increasingly globalized economy than investments in transportation infrastructure capital projects.

Whether it is the seaways, dams, highways, or tollways, and whether it involves other modes of transportation, transportation projects are major engines driving the economy.

And it is important for the local community to be the drivers of that.

Metropolitan regions will not be able to maintain its economic vitality without the ability to create and preserve infrastructure that supports the movement of people and goods throughout our country.

The Jackson Lee Amendment clearly speaks to the global aspect of the Secretary of Transportation having the ability to work with our local and State governments.

Houston is the fourth most populous city in the country; but unlike other large cities, we have struggled to have an effective mass transit system.

Over many decades Houston's mass transit policy was to build more highways with more lanes to carry more drivers to and from work.

The city of Houston has changed course and is now pursuing Mass transit options that include light rail.

This decision to invest in light rail was and is strongly supported by Houstonians by their votes in a 2003 referendum and by their increased usage of light rail service made possible in part by transportation appropriations bills.

Specifically, Harris County voters passed a massive referendum proposal that was to set the stage for transit for the next 20 years.

It included a first stage of four light rail lines, to be completed by 2012, and a master plan for a 65-mile system to be completed by 2025.

An April 2014 report by the Houston METRO on weekly ridership states that 44,267 used Houston's light rail service, which represented a 6,096 or 16% increase in ridership from April of the previous year.

This increase in light rail usage outpaced ridership of other forms of mass transit in the city of Houston: metro bus had a 2.3% increase over April 2013; metro bus-local had a 1.3% increase over April 2013; and Metro bus-Park and ride had a 8.0% increase over April 2013.

In a story published February 5, 2013, the Houston Chronicle reported on the congestion Houston drivers face under daily commute to and from work.

According to the Chronicle article, in 2011 Houston commuters continue to enjoy some of the worst traffic delays in the country, and Houston area drivers wasted more than two days a year, on average, in traffic congestion, costing them each \$1,090 in lost time and fuel.

Today, those figures have increased to 3.5 days a year wasted in traffic congestion, costing them each \$1,850 in lost time and fuel.

To put it in simpler and starker terms: A driver in Houston could see 154 movies this year or purchase 21 tickets to a home Texans game with the money wasted because of poorly maintained or traffic-clogged roads.

Expanded light rail is critical to Houston's plan to meet its transportation and environmental challenges, ease its traffic congestion, and improve its air quality.

Places most likely to see immediate benefit from light rail in Houston are the 50,000 students that attend the University of Houston and Texas Southern University.

Funds made available under this deal should be available to support local government decisions of the Houston Metropolitan Transit Authority and the city of Houston to expand rail service.

When we put our minds to it, we can get things done.

In Houston, we built a port 50 miles from the ocean, created the world's greatest medical center in the middle of open prairie, and convinced the federal government to base its astronauts in a hurricane zone 870 miles from the launch pad.

Each of those achievements shares a common element: elected officials have advocated, built public support, and brought the agencies together.

Members of Congress should respect the decisions of state and local governments when it comes to deciding how they will spend funding made available for public transportation under this appropriations bill.

I ask my colleagues to again support the Jackson Lee Amendment and affirm the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to work with local governments to develop local transit projects that will relieve traffic congestion, efficiently move people and goods, create jobs and maintain America's status as the leading economy in the world.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide financial assistance in contravention of section 214(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 1436a(d)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Chair, America recently blew through the \$18 trillion debt mark. America's Comptroller General warns that America's debt path is unsustainable.

In short, Washington's financial irresponsibility threatens America with a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy that risks destroying the America our ancestors sacrificed so much to build.

With this impending financial crisis as a backdrop, I ask the House of Representatives to have the courage, to have the backbone, to be financially responsible. The House can do that in part by adopting my amendment that eliminates Federal Government housing subsidies for illegal aliens.

How big is this problem? Census Bureau data analyzed by the Center for Immigration Studies in 2012 reflects that at least 130,000 households headed by self-identifying illegal aliens live in public or subsidized housing. That is potentially hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars being illegally taken by illegal aliens with the tacit or open consent or even the encouragement of the United States Government.

Think about that for a moment. While American families struggle to make ends meet, while America faces a debilitating and destructive insolvency and bankruptcy, while American families and lawful immigrants are being forced to wait in line for public housing, this administration ignores the law to spend potentially hundreds of

millions of taxpayer dollars subsidizing illegal aliens, thereby encouraging their illegal conduct.

Madam Chair, my amendment is simple. It prohibits funding to subsidized housing in violation of section 214(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act that, for clarity, bars HUD from providing taxpayer assistance for the benefit of an applicant "before immigration documentation is presented and verified" by DHS' automated Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements system or a subsequent successful appeal.

Unfortunately, this administration ignores the law and permits illegal aliens to move into public housing before the legality of their status is finally determined.

Also, unfortunately, the administrative and legal process being what it is, it takes as much as 2 years to evict illegal alien tenants after their illegal alien status is discovered.

Madam Chair, it is unacceptable that, in a time of out-of-control United States debt and deficit, HUD violates the law to give limited public housing benefits to illegal aliens, rather than needy American citizens and lawful immigrants.

Madam Chair, I urge the adoption of my amendment that, first, denies public housing subsidies to illegal aliens; and, second, underscores the sense of Congress that the law must be obeyed and that it is wrong to use public housing subsidies to reward illegal aliens for their illegal conduct.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Once again, we have an amendment that, on its face, simply restates existing law. In fact, the gentleman offering the amendment has acknowledged that existing law categorically prohibits HUD benefits from going to undocumented persons.

What is going on here? What is lurking beneath the surface? I fear something is. An anti-immigrant agenda based on fear and prejudice would appear to be the answer.

We are feeding into widely held misconceptions that so many undocumented immigrants are seeking and receiving Federal benefits, that Federal programs, Federal dollars, are being abused and misused.

Well, we do need to have a remedy for our broken immigration system. As I said earlier, a comprehensive immigration reform bill, bipartisan, passed the Senate last Congress. It could be placed on this floor tomorrow and pass overwhelmingly. That doesn't appear to be happening. Instead, what we have is this drumbeat of measures that are denigrating the immigrant community.

We need to have some restraint in this body on such amendments. They don't alter existing law. They do, I am afraid, though, stir controversy. They reinforce prejudice and stereotypes. They distract us from the business at hand.

I think it is an unworthy amendment. I urge my colleagues to reject it, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think it is important to just kind of always try to lower the decibels as much as we can.

This amendment, as both gentlemen have said, does not change current law. It doesn't change current HUD policies. It merely restates current law. I don't, frankly, see a reason to have the amendment. Likewise, I don't see a big reason to oppose the amendment that just, again, restates current law. I ask all sides to try to lower the rhetoric on this issue. This amendment does not change anything.

As the ranking member knows, I have been involved in trying to get immigration reform for a long, long time and have worked with a number of Republicans and Democrats. I will tell you that both sides have had opportunities to get it done, and neither side got it done when they had the opportunity to get it done. I am hoping that we will be able to get it done.

□ 2015

But this is not the time and place to have that debate. So, again, while I don't see the need for this amendment, I don't see what the issue is of objecting to an amendment that, in essence, does absolutely nothing.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for allowing me some of his time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I find it interesting and somewhat perplexing how my good friend across the aisle talks about an anti-immigrant agenda appealing to fear and prejudice.

It seems that whenever we start talking about border security and lawful immigration, the race card is played. And I would submit that that is because, in part, there is an absence of rational sound public policy for the position taken.

Let's emphasize something. America has, far and away, the most generous lawful immigration policy in the world. No nation is as compassionate with respect to lawful immigrants as the United States of America is, and I challenge anyone to say different.

I wish that this kind of amendment was not necessary, but when you have an executive branch that has shown

itself to be willingly lawless, to the point that two Federal judges, one in Pennsylvania and one in Texas, have had to render a decision trying to force this administration to obey the law, then I would submit, Madam Chair, that it is important to have these kinds of amendments to also deny the funding that otherwise would be used for that lawless conduct.

I ask for support of the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that required all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternative fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the President's memorandum by prohibiting funds in this act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles unless that purchase is made in accord with the President's memorandum.

I have submitted identical amendments to 17 different appropriations bills over the past few years, and every time they have been accepted by both the majority and the minority. I hope my amendment will receive similar support today.

Global oil prices are down. We no longer pay \$147 per barrel. But despite increased production here in the United States, the global price of oil is still largely determined by OPEC.

Spikes in oil prices have profound repercussions for our economy. The primary reason is that our cars and trucks run only on petroleum. We can change that with alternative technologies that exist today.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America, over 635,000 vehicles. More than 6,000 of these vehicles are within the jurisdiction of this bill, being used by the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. People there can drive to a gas station and choose whether to fill their vehicle with gasoline or with ethanol and also possible blends as well. They make their choice based on cost or whatever criteria they deem important.

So I want the same choice for America's consumers. That is why I am proposing a bill in Congress, as I have done many times in the past, which will provide for cars built in America to be able to run on a fuel instead of, or in addition to, gasoline. If they can do it in Brazil, we can do it here, and it would cost less than \$100 per car to do.

So, in conclusion, expanding the role these alternative technologies play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage that foreign-government-controlled oil companies hold over Americans. It will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers.

I urge that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

In conclusion, I would just say that energy policy is something that is really important, and we can take a very small step tonight to move closer to energy independence and protecting the American consumer. I would urge all my colleagues on both sides, as they have in the past, to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HULTGREN

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Aviation Administration for the bio-data assessment in the hiring of Air Traffic Control Specialists.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment, which

defunds a troubling hiring test put forth by the FAA which has led to cheating and questionable hiring practices for air traffic controllers.

The intent of my amendment is not to slow hiring, but to stop the FAA's use of a discredited gatekeeper hiring test.

I represent more than 270 air traffic controllers in Illinois' 14th Congressional District. More than a year ago, the FAA made an inexplicable and obscure change to its longstanding hiring practices, with few details given about how the changes would be implemented and with little advance warning.

Setting aside its decades-long process by which qualified Collegiate Training Initiative students and military veterans were given preference in hiring, the FAA implemented a new biographical questionnaire, or Bio Q, which contains such questions as, "How many sports did you play in high school?"

With no way to know what a right answer is, how to improve on the test, or what their final score was, many otherwise highly qualified applicants failed, after spending countless resources and time training to become air traffic controllers.

The new procedures caused the agency to divert the hiring process around highly qualified, CTI-certified trainees and experienced veterans, jeopardizing air travel safety in favor of off-the-street hires, some of whom have little experience or ambition.

Since then, the FAA has been under fire following a six-month investigation which uncovered that FAA or aviation-related employees may have assisted in giving potential air traffic controller recruits special access to answers on the Bio Q to help them gain jobs with the FAA.

This cheating is greatly disturbing and jeopardizes any shred of credibility of the Bio Q that it had any accurate or fair test to determine who should be an air traffic controller.

Yet, we are now finding out that the cheating may run deeper than first reported, possibly with knowledge at the highest levels of the FAA.

If additional FAA or aviation-related employees helped applicants cheat on the Bio Q, it is imperative that we expose those responsible and determine how widespread and systemic the misconduct is.

I have urged Congress to compel the FAA to appear before the American people to get to the bottom of this troubling discovery. These investigations uncover just how discredited the Bio Q is in any hiring process.

But until we get answers to these questions, like who knew about the cheating, when did they know about it, and how did they cover it up, we cannot let the FAA employ people unfairly using the highly flawed Bio Q as a gatekeeper.

In addition, we still don't know what will happen to those who have either

failed the Bio Q, aged out of the hiring process, or both.

Disqualifying highly trained, certified graduates and military veterans because they did or did not play sports in high school is ridiculous. This amendment would restrict funding for the Bio Q, stopping its use by the FAA.

When you climb into an airliner, you trust the pilot, the crew, and the air traffic controllers will keep you safe. I have introduced H.R. 1964, the Air Traffic Controllers Hiring Act of 2015, to reverse the effects of the FAA's policy, restore safety and confidence to air travel, and to make sure we have the best and brightest in our control towers.

I have hopes that this legislation can move quickly through the House and have urged the Transportation Committee to hold a hearing on the bill. Now that Aviation Subcommittee Chairman LOBIONDO has cosponsored the legislation, I am looking forward to the committee's consideration.

Until then, this amendment will help restore some sanity back to the FAA.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work on this amendment and on the bill.

As the gentleman said, early last year, the FAA switched course on its hiring process by moving from the AT-SAT, which was a tried-and-true, knowledge-based test, to a bio-data assessment. The change had a tremendous impact on the 36 Air Traffic Collegiate Training Initiative schools.

I have one of the best of these schools in my district, Lewis University. Lewis 2 years ago won the Loening Trophy as the best aviation program in the Nation.

Maybe students chose to attend Lewis and these other schools because of the advantages that CTI schools provided under the old hiring system. They decided at a young age to enroll in a program fostered by the FAA and were given the opportunity to excel on the AT-SAT, which was unfairly pulled out from under them.

Madam Chair, this amendment is a step in the right direction towards fixing the misguided policy change that had a negative impact on students and the universities that invested significant resources in training our future generations of air traffic controllers.

But I need to emphasize that this amendment should not come at the cost of slowing down the hiring of air traffic controllers. We have already suffered from a hiring and training slowdown and cannot afford further delays to staffing an essential safety function of the FAA.

Our hard-working air traffic controllers are already understaffed, and Con-

gress must ensure that we are increasing their ranks quickly and with well-trained air traffic controllers.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. HULTGREN. I thank my colleague from Illinois, and I would also urge my colleagues to support this passage and to make sure that we continue to have the safest air traffic control towers in the world.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I very reluctantly, actually, claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I actually understand and, frankly, listened very intently to the gentleman's concerns, and I actually want to work with him to make sure that nothing is used that is absolutely arbitrarily, or frankly, totally unfair. And so I think the gentleman's concerns are very, very valid.

At this time, however, and that is why I say "very reluctantly" have to oppose, because, again, at this moment, I am concerned, hearing the other gentleman from Illinois mention the fact that we want to make sure that we don't slow down the hiring of the air traffic controllers. We need to hire another 1,500 new controllers in 2016.

So I not only appreciate the gentleman's concerns, but I, in fact, potentially could share a lot of his concerns.

But again, reluctantly at this time, because I am concerned about potentially slowing down the hiring of new controllers, I reluctantly have to oppose his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act for Amtrak capital grants may be used for projects off the Northeast Corridor until the level of capital spending by Amtrak for capital projects on the Northeast Corridor during fiscal year 2016 equals the amount of Amtrak's profits from Northeast Corridor operations during fiscal year 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 2030

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chair, before I begin my comments, I would like to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART and Ranking Member PRICE for all of their diligent work on this bill.

My amendment seeks to prioritize investment in Amtrak's Northeast Corridor, which is its most heavily traveled route, by ensuring that operating profits that are earned there stay there.

Last year, Amtrak's Northeast Corridor line earned nearly \$500 million in operating profit. More than 100,000 Americans get on a train that travels along the Northeast Corridor every day, but instead of reinvesting those dollars into improvements in the line's infrastructure, much of that money was sent across the country, used to subsidize money-losing, long-distance Amtrak routes. This has left Amtrak's most heavily traveled route less funded, and it has delayed needed improvements to Amtrak's only line that actually turns a profit.

This amendment will fix that. It will ensure that the dollars Amtrak earns along the Northeast Corridor are invested into improvements in the line's infrastructure. It will make travel along Amtrak's most heavily used route safer, and it will also do so without adding to the taxpayers' burden.

This amendment will codify the principle that was passed in the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act, and I might add that that was approved with more than 300 votes in this House earlier this year. This tracks that same principle. And that legislation passed with the leadership of my friend and fellow Pennsylvanian, Chairman BILL SHUSTER, which requires that Amtrak direct capital investments into the Northeast Corridor, where it is needed most.

Madam Chair, more than 11 million Americans rode an Amtrak train between Boston and Washington last year. Many more used rail lines like SEPTA or Metro-North, operating on tracks owned by Amtrak, to get to work every day. The tragic derailment in my own area of Philadelphia last month has shown that there is a desperate need to improve the line and strengthen capital investments in the region.

This amendment will ensure Amtrak makes smart investment decisions and directs capital spending where it is needed most. It will help Amtrak tackle the backlog of capital projects that plague the Northeast Corridor. It will reduce delays. It will mean safer, more efficient travel for millions of Ameri-

cans who rely on Amtrak's Northeast Corridor every year. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, there is a lot of work that goes into this bill and there is a lot of work that goes into the amendments, but I will tell you that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has worked nonstop to find real solutions to deal with making sure that Amtrak is safe and, in particular, that the Northeast Corridor is as viable and as safe as possible. So I just must commend the gentleman for his hard work, for the way that he has just worked this issue day in, day out to get to the point where we are today.

Mr. MEEHAN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I wish to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I too want to commend my colleague for offering this amendment. I understand his intent. There are significant capital needs on the busy Northeast Corridor. It is Amtrak's busiest and most successful corridor. It is a fundamental flaw of this bill that we are unable to provide for the kind of investments that the service in that corridor warrants and, indeed, that the service of Amtrak nationwide warrants.

But the effect of this amendment, I fear, in the environment of inadequate investment, this would provide a much-needed boost in investment in the Northeast Corridor. It may be still not enough, but it would do so at the expense of the rest of the Amtrak network, and that should give us pause when we consider this amendment.

The amendment would require Amtrak to spend at least \$1.2 billion—the annual amount of Northeast Corridor revenues—on Northeast Corridor capital projects before they could spend any of their Federal capital funding elsewhere. This would have the effect of halting all capital projects that are not on the Northeast Corridor, including all information technology, upgraded safety technology, until very late in the fiscal year at the earliest, and possibly longer, should projects on the Northeast Corridor not be ready to advance. This would also hinder Amtrak's ability to manage State and long-distance service.

I know that all of these consequences are probably not my colleague's intent, but it does demonstrate the types of consequences that we need to consider when making such a policy change. I ask colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chair, before I close my comments, I think it is important to recognize that the same principle has already been adopted by 318 Members of this body, including a near unanimous vote by my colleague from the other side of the aisle, his colleagues on that side of the aisle.

I will also say that I am not sure that the gentleman understands the actual effect of the bill. It simply is to reinvest the profits that are made on the Northeast Corridor. These are being made by the investments that are being made by the taxpaying people who are purchasing those tickets. We can still look for ways to fund other parts of the system around the country where they can earn their investments on merit.

We are asking, in light of the fact that this is a line which is so heavily used, the priorities be placed where they are most needed.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue, implement, or enforce the proposed regulation by the Federal Aviation Administration entitled "Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems" (FAA-2015-0150) without consideration of the use of small unmanned aircraft systems for agricultural operations, as defined in 14 CFR 21.25(b)(1).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chairwoman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Chair, I rise today to introduce an amendment on an important topic that will undoubtedly have a growing impact not just on our Nation's agricultural sector, but on our economy as a whole.

The use of unmanned aerial vehicles, or UAVs, has enormous possibilities for

our economy, whether it is providing cost-effective means to deliver packages, photographing housing for Realtors, broadcasting sports games, assisting law enforcement with tracking criminals, or providing mobile WiFi hubs for Internet access. However, one vastly underconsidered outcome for UAV technology is that it could potentially transform our Nation's agricultural sector.

Ideas have been considered using UAVs to survey cropland, to determine property lines, or to help plan for planting, spraying, watering, or harvesting of crops; however, the potential applications are even greater. Depending on how this technology evolves, UAVs may be equipped with special cameras to determine if crops are dry and need extra water and where and how much should be applied. They may also be used to apply pesticides or fertilizers with precision to ensure that too little or too much isn't being used. And depending on their sophistication, someday, UAVs may even be used to harvest the food we grow.

The potential applications don't just stop there, though. In my district last year, we experienced the worst forest fire in Washington State history, consuming hundreds of thousands of acres. In the future, first responders, the Forest Service, and other stakeholders may be able to use UAVs to monitor the spread of fire to get people out of harm's way or to better predict where to best apply water and fire retardants. They could even help with identifying dry or overgrown areas in advance to help stakeholders know where treatment is needed, which could prevent fires in the first place.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the steps the FAA has taken in releasing draft rules regarding UAVs and that the FAA has been more agreeable in allowing testing of UAVs for commercial purposes.

While I understand that safety and privacy are enormous concerns being considered by the FAA, it is also important that we do not fall behind other nations in utilizing this technology, which are currently developing and innovating in this industry more rapidly than we are here in the United States.

Madam Chair, my amendment today is simple. It merely limits FAA's rule-making on UAVs if the rules do not take into consideration agricultural applications of UAVs in the rule-making process.

I appreciate the work the FAA is doing on this matter, and I hope the final rules that are expected later this year generously allow for the safe testing and commercial use of UAVs, ensuring the amazing agricultural prospects for these technologies are well considered in the process.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue, implement, or enforce regulations by the Federal Aviation Administration entitled "operations and certification of small unmanned aircraft systems" (FAA-2015-0150) in contravention to 14 CFR 21.25(b)(1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Washington and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Chair, in my previous comments, I addressed this amendment, which is in order, and I would just submit those comments to be used for this particular amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule entitled "Implementation of the Fair Housing Act's Discriminatory Effects Standard", published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Register on February 15, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 11460; Docket No. FR-5508-F-02).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 2045

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, I rise today, as I have done in the past, to offer an amendment that attempts to restore some sanity, fairness, and certainty to our housing market. My amendment would undo harmful economic actions taken by the administration that weaken credit availability and job creation. You see, the Department's final rule implementing the Fair Housing Act's discriminatory effects standard establishes regulations promoting the use of a legal theory known as disparate impact.

What is disparate impact? Disparate impact liability allows the government to allege discrimination on the basis of race or other factors based solely on statistical analyses that find disproportionate results among different groups of people and—get this—regardless of any evidence of any actual discriminatory actions or intent. Let me point that out again—regardless of any evidence of actual discrimination.

If, for example, a mortgage lender uses a completely nondiscriminatory standard to assess credit risk, such as maybe a debt-to-income ratio, they can still be found to have discriminated if the data shows different loan approval rates for different groups of consumers.

So real and actual discrimination must be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. I think that is something everyone here can agree on. But under the example that I just laid out, that lender could even have specific antidiscriminatory practices in play, in other words, he would have rules in his business in place, but still be found liable under this theory.

Predictably, by creating a presumption of discrimination, this rule will result in a perverse regulatory scheme where lenders, insurers, and landlords would effectively be required to intentionally discriminate among different classes of borrowers. Why? Just to protect themselves from becoming entangled in the regulatory pretzel-like logic of this administration.

So if we specifically consider the examples of homeowner insurance commonly considered factors, including an applicant's claim history, construction material, the presence or absence of a security system, the distance to the firehouse, well, they could be barred if they were found to result in creating a statistical disparity for a class defined by race or ethnicity or gender.

You see, sound risk-based lending insurance underwriting and pricing that unintentionally results in a statistical disparate outcome, that is not discrimination; rather, accurate risk identification and classification is absolutely essential to the lending of insurance businesses.

In addition to being unfair and unwise, the HUD rule is also unnecessary. Why? Because protected class characteristics are already prohibited from consideration in the risk assessment process.

You see, State law already prohibits insurers from recording race, for example. The HUD rule requiring race considerations there turns on its head and violates these laws. You see, all 50 States in this country have antidiscriminatory provisions in their housing insurance regulations, and there is no claim that these have been insufficient. The Federal Government, therefore, should be encouraging sound business practices, not punishing them to utilize them.

We have seen what risky lending practices can do to our economy already. Although I believe the Supreme Court will strike down disparate impact theory, we should do all we can in our power to rein in an administration policy that will increase the cost and undermine the availability of credit throughout the economy.

Now, to this Chamber's credit, let me point out, this House recently passed my amendment to the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill that would prevent the DOJ from using this very same theory.

I hope that we will continue to take a stand against this flawed logic and theory and promote sound business practices.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I wish to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would nullify a critical enforcement tool that has been used, for example, to rule against discrimination and racially discriminatory zoning requirements, practices that exclude families with children from housing, discrimination by lenders, zoning requirements that discriminate against group homes housing individuals with disabilities. It is a critical enforcement tool, and it would be a very, very bad mistake to pass this amendment.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I am very surprised that this amendment is being brought by my friend, Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. GARRETT's amendment seeks to empower HUD's efforts in enforcing the Fair Housing Act in such a way that relies on the disparate impact doctrine. It weakens our ability to protect Americans from discriminatory policies that deny them access to quality housing, quality neighborhood schools, and other resources.

The disparate impact doctrine is a very effective legal tool that has been used for decades to address seemingly neutral policies that have the effect of discriminating against protected classes.

The disparate impact doctrine provides legal redress for victims of hidden discrimination. It ensures that women cannot be evicted from their apartments solely because they were victims of domestic violence, and it ensures that veterans with disabilities are not barred from living in certain places solely because of the lack of ac-

commodations for their disability. This amendment ignores the realities of harmful discrimination in our Nation today, and it would eliminate well-established, decades-old protections for American families.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), another outstanding Financial Services member.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, this amendment would absolutely, totally, and completely allow discrimination against our veterans. If you are a veteran and you need a service animal and if there is an area that is set aside with no pets allowed, that service animal can become a pet. We cannot allow veterans to be discriminated against.

With reference to this amendment being a theory, all 11 circuit courts have upheld it. It is not a theory. It is a standard. It is a standard that the courts adhere to, and it is a standard we ought not abrogate. We must continue.

I am absolutely, totally, and completely opposed to this amendment, and I beg that my colleagues would go on record as being opposed to it as well.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I am wary of considering an amendment on a rule and regulation that is currently pending before the Supreme Court. The sponsor of the amendment is a good man, but I would hope that we would wait for the Court to issue its ruling and then the committee of jurisdiction can properly debate and consider what, if any, legislative action should be taken. For those reasons, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I strenuously urge all Members to vote "no" on this particular amendment.

The fact is that residential segregation in this country has limited opportunities for people for so many years. And I don't mean segregation just in terms of race—people who are excluded because of race, because of gender, because of all types of reasons.

If we say that disparate impact has no place, then we will be precluded from looking into how disparity just causes people to have different chances to live the American Dream. We will be consigned to having to find a smoking gun or intent before we can take action to try to make this country fairer and more open.

This is a very bad amendment, and I urge all Members to vote "no."

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman said, "The fact is." Well, everything we have heard for the last 5 minutes as the facts has absolutely nothing to do with this bill. This bill has nothing to do with vets and service animals. This bill has nothing to do with domestic violence and women not being able to be in the house. This has nothing to do with any of the weakening of State standards whatsoever.

This bill basically simply says that, if a lender to you says that you live in a wooden house versus a stone house, there might be different rates for your insurance. It says that, if your house is miles from a fire department and your house is right next to the firehouse, there might be different rates for the insurance and the mortgages and the loans you get on that house. Those are not discriminatory practices. Those are reasonable practices that businesses enter into. It has nothing to do with all of the examples just given.

This bill says we should continue to go after and prosecute when there is evidence of discrimination and intentional discrimination. This bill will not end that. This bill will not end your ability to look into the examples the last gentleman just raised. It would simply say that businesses should be allowed to use standard rationales in their risk analysis, whether it is debt-to-income ratio or construction materials and the like.

For those reasons, along with the other reasons I have already said and the host of organizations that support this legislation, and that this House just passed last week on the CJS bill, we should do so again tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code,

in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term "Fair Labor Standards Act" and such disposition is listed as "willful" or "repeated".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, this amendment simply says that the United States Government should not give appropriations and pay contracts for people or companies who have been found to have willful or repeated violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. In other words, if you have repeatedly and willfully stolen the wages of workers and you have a Federal contract, then you are not the kind of contractor who the American people, through the U.S. Congress, want to do business with.

No hard-working American should ever have to worry that her employer will refuse to pay her when she works overtime or take money out of her paycheck, especially if she works for a Federal contractor. The practice is known as wage theft. Right now, Federal contractors who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act are still allowed to apply for Federal contracts.

This amendment, which my colleagues from the Progressive Caucus join me in, will ensure that funds may not be used to enter into a contract with a government contractor that willfully or repeatedly violates the Fair Labor Standards Act. The amendment ensures that those in violation of the law do not get taxpayer support and should not get the rewards that other good contractors receive.

It is important to point out to Members contemplating this amendment that, if you are a contractor who pays your workers on time, who does what you are supposed to do, who has avoided willful violations and repeated violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, you should not, as a good contractor, have to compete with somebody who gets a competitive advantage by stealing the pay of their workers. We should have good contractors competing for contracts, not contractors who make willful, repeated violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This amendment relies upon violations reported to the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System.

□ 2100

That system looks back 5 years to review criminal, civil, or administrative agency actions which have a final disposition.

This amendment differs from previous amendments that I have offered similar to it because it targets actors who willfully or repeatedly engage in wage theft. The amendment would en-

sure that a single inadvertent violation would not disqualify a contractor, but it would show clearly that someone who had made repeated and willful violations would not be able to benefit from the contract.

I urge Members to vote in favor of this particular amendment because a penny worked for and a penny earned must be a penny paid; particularly when that penny is derived from a company with a Federal contract, we have a right to believe that we are going to be treated in an honest way.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I want to commend my friend from Minnesota for offering this amendment. Every worker is entitled to receive pay, fair pay, for the hours they work. We know, unfortunately, there are employers, as the gentleman has stated, who refuse to pay for overtime, who make their employees work off the clock, who refuse to pay the minimum wage. These things go on.

The least we can do is take steps to ensure that those employers don't receive new Federal contracts. That is what the gentleman's amendment does. I commend him for offering it and urge colleagues to support him.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman for the support for this amendment.

Let me just point out a few things for Members contemplating this amendment.

An important think tank looked at this question and found that in total, the average low-wage worker loses a stunning \$2,600 a year in unpaid wages, representing about 15 percent of their earned income.

One thing that I believe Democrats and Republicans can agree on is that, if you break your back on the job all day long trying to earn a living and you don't get paid what you are supposed to get paid and your check is light, we all have to agree that that is wrong.

I expect to have an all green board up there because to do otherwise would say that you want to stand on the side of the wage thieves, the ones who are willfully and repeatedly making violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I think that, as the United States Congress, we should stand together and say a penny worked is a penny that is going to be paid, and we are going to insist upon it.

Finally, I just want to say that breaking the law is a bipartisan problem. Nobody can stand with the contractors who do this. It is one thing to underpay your workers in a way that is consistent with the law by paying them the Federal minimum wage

rate—I want to raise it; we may not agree on that—but for sure, we have got to agree that, for people who work for Federal contractors, we have got to insist that the contractors who pay these workers even less than they have earned should not benefit from a Federal contract.

To help the workers, we have to do this, and to help the honest Federal contractors, we have to do this.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, the gentleman's amendment is obviously very well intentioned.

However, the amendment, as drafted, is so broad that, for example, a contractor could be excluded for something as minor as failing to display a poster in a break room. Again, it is well intentioned.

We have to remember something. We fund a lot of contracts in this bill, everything from phone service to the computer systems that ensure an orderly and efficient air space. Potentially, this amendment could eliminate a number of those transportation-industry-dependent contracts.

Nobody wants to allow for lawbreaking; but, because it is so broadly drafted, the unintended consequences, I think, that folks could be caught in this are a lot more than I think many folks understand.

Again, though it is a well-intentioned amendment, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER OF MINNESOTA

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any enrichment as defined in Appendix A to part 611 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, for any New Start grant request.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman

from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I rise to address an issue that is playing a role in crippling America's transportation system by driving our deficits and exacerbating the need for bailouts of the highway trust fund. As we debate how to fund transportation, one of the most vital functions of government, this body is being forced to make hard choices.

I want to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART, the ranking member, and the members of the subcommittee for their work on bringing this appropriations bill to the floor. Their work is definitely appreciated by me and my constituents. That said, it is inconceivable to me that, as we kick the can on a long-term transportation authorization bill, we continue to allow frivolous spending on transit projects.

As important as New Starts transit projects are to my State and my district, one would think that every last available dollar would go towards ensuring transit New Starts have the funding needed to make a line operational and as cost effective as possible.

Madam Chair, that is not what is happening. Within Federal grant applications, extras are being included that can dramatically raise the cost of transit New Starts.

Excessive enrichments such as artwork, landscaping, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements such as sidewalks, paths, plazas, site and station furniture, site lighting, signage, public artwork, bike facilities, and permanent fencing are included in the overall grant application.

Even more shocking is that the Federal Transit Administration doesn't include these extra costs into the cost-effective measurements for the overall cost of the project which serves to deceive taxpayers and Congress as to the project's real price tag.

Madam Chair, in my district alone, I have cities that have placed a moratorium on new business development due to severe transportation issues. It is insane to me and my constituents that we blindly spend money on the niceties rather than prioritize funds for the necessities.

There are numerous reasons that our Federal highway trust fund continues to run deficits and we will continue to have that debate; but one place that we can agree, certainly, is that Federal taxpayers should absolutely not be paying for things like artwork, furniture, lighting, and bike racks while transportation projects remain unfinished across America.

I understand the need and desire for transit projects—I have them in my district—which is why I have offered this amendment. We should make

funds available to ensure more Federal dollars go to what the hard-working taxpayers who fund these accounts expect, transit projects, rather than expensive add-ons that are driving deficits in our transit accounts.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, in considering this amendment, it is important to be very clear about what the amendment means when it refers to enrichments.

This refers to improvements to a transit project like a sidewalk, paths, plazas, lighting, and signage, things that can help individuals in utilizing transportation infrastructure and ensure that they do so in safety.

Unfortunately, Madam Chair, there are approximately 4,000 pedestrian deaths, comprising 14 percent of overall traffic fatalities each year. These enrichments are just the kinds of projects that could help reduce the risk for pedestrians, for bicyclers, and other users of our systems.

Now, the gentleman offering this amendment is just bordering on ridicule when he talks about site lighting. Really, site lighting? What is more important to promoting safety, promoting visibility, and discouraging those who would prey on individuals than site lighting?

Site lighting is extremely important in improving general safety in public places. It is incredibly important for protecting individuals against crime, including harassment and assault. That is what we are talking about here.

Now, the amount of funding that goes towards such enrichments is small relative to other expenditures, but it is a commonsense way that we can enhance our transportation projects, we can broaden their use, and, above all, we can ensure that they are safe for all users.

It is an unwise amendment, Madam Chair, and I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have the utmost respect for my colleague from North Carolina, but he actually makes the argument for the amendment as opposed to opposed to it.

Yes, it reduces risk for bicyclists and pedestrians when you talk about signage, when you talk about certain lighting, when you talk about certain enhancements that are add-ons to the

project that the Federal Government and the Federal taxpayer dollars are intended to fund.

The Federal taxpayer dollars should be going to the transit project that it is intended for, instead of all the extras. The local authorities should be responsible for those.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. It is a clear-cut amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BASS

Ms. BASS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the spending reduction account), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Transit Administration to implement, administer, or enforce section 18.36(c)(2) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, for construction hiring purposes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BASS. Madam Chair, as the economy continues to recover, 8.5 million Americans are still unemployed. Meanwhile, the effectiveness of local transportation agencies to spur job creation in their local communities is unnecessarily obstructed by restrictive Department of Transportation policies.

Limiting the ability of local officials to contribute to targeted job growth is detrimental to local economies across the United States, especially in communities where many remain jobless.

Local hiring and procurement policies have helped to provide quality job opportunities to residents in communities hardest hit by the economic downturn.

My local hire amendment is designed to help spur local job creation through federally funded transportation projects nationally.

My amendment would prevent the Department of Transportation from issuing regulations that prevent local hiring. Specifically, it would limit the regulations and burdens placed on local governmental agencies, preserve the competition and cost-effectiveness mandates in our current rules that

govern Federal transit grants, and give local transportation agencies the necessary flexibility to apply geographically targeted preferences when making hiring decisions for federally funded transit and highway projects.

It is important to note that this local hire amendment does not require transportation agencies to implement local hiring policies. It simply gives local leaders the opportunity to do so if they determine it is in the best interest of their communities.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment. It will reduce burdensome regulations and spur local job creation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. BASS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to institute an administrative or civil action (as defined in section 47107 of title 49, United States Code) against the sponsor of the East Hampton Airport in East Hampton, NY.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Chair, I am proud to represent a district that is home to some of the most scenic destinations in the country, and all forms of transportation are part of our tourism economy. Yet, with the high season upon us, many of my constituents are finding themselves bewildered by actions of the FAA. Federal agencies ought to stand by their word and keep their commitments to Members of Congress and to the citizens we represent.

In 2012, the FAA made assurances to my predecessor that, in light of a 2005 court settlement between the FAA and a community group, the town of East Hampton, New York, would not be subject to certain regulations after December 31, 2014, when certain grant assurances expired and, thus, could adopt restrictions on the use of their airport without FAA approval.

The FAA has written that the town can proceed on certain course and not fear FAA reprisal for their actions. Earlier this spring, the democratically elected town board passed a set of airport regulations—all predicated on the FAA's written assurance to not take negative action against the town. Re-

cently, however, the FAA has started wavering.

I am offering this amendment, which is 100 percent consistent with the prior written assurance made by the FAA. This amendment will hold the FAA to its word on this critical local issue, a local issue that should have a local solution—bring all sides to the table to improve the quality of life on the East End this high season.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this effort. The people of the East End communities across Long Island and around America deserve straight answers and follow-through from government agencies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I do this, though, simply to express some concerns about this amendment and others like it that we have heard over the course of this debate.

I do have some concerns about limiting flight path options for the FAA in a piecemeal fashion from the floor of the House. The FAA needs to have appropriate flexibility to use flight paths in the wisest ways, particularly if there are safety risks for incoming or outgoing aircraft. I do think, however, that the FAA needs to take note and be more responsive to the concerns that have been raised in these limitation amendments, and there have been several this evening and in the prior days of this debate.

I also want to observe that the FAA's authorization expires at the end of the fiscal year. Now, as I mentioned in the debate last week, our colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee are exploring options to reform the FAA, including separating the FAA from the Department of Transportation, allowing it more independence over the use of its resources.

I would say this is an important time to encourage caution, to encourage our colleagues to think very carefully about a more independent FAA, one that does not have to rely on annual appropriations. Would it be as attentive to concerns such as those raised by communities and by our colleagues here tonight? We ought to move very cautiously in this area.

I strongly urge the FAA Administrator, in observing this parade of limitation amendments, to take note to ensure that the FAA is more attentive to the concerns that are raised by communities when developing their new flight procedures.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his comments. Certainly, concerns within the First Congressional District of New York are the reason this amendment is being offered. I strongly

urge my colleagues to support this important amendment so as to ensure that these local issues have local control.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 156, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SEC. 416. Notwithstanding Mortgagee Letter 2015-12 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (dated April 30, 2015) or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(1) implement the Mortgagee Optional Election (MOE) Assignment for home equity conversion mortgages (as set forth in Mortgagee Letter 2015-03, dated January 29, 2015), allowing additional flexibility for non-borrowing spouses to meet its requirements; and

(2) provide for a 5-year delay in foreclosure in the case of any other home equity conversion mortgage that—

(A) has an FHA Case Number assigned before August 4, 2014; and

(B) has a last surviving borrower who has died and who has a non-borrowing surviving spouse who does not qualify for the Mortgagee Optional Election and who, but for the death of such borrowing spouse, would be able to remain in the dwelling subject to the mortgage.

Mr. LEWIS (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2577.

When I was first elected in 1987, Congress created the first nationwide Home Equity Conversion Mortgage program. Also known as reverse mortgages, these loans differ from traditional mortgages and have very good intentions. They are designed to help seniors stay in their homes by using the values of their properties as a means for living more stable and independent lives. Since the borrowers must be 62 years of age or older, lenders often advise some borrowers to remove younger spouses from the titles. This allows them to be eligible for the program or to qualify for greater loans.

Unfortunately, Madam Chair, many seniors are experiencing challenges in the program's actual operation.

For example, a citizen in my district, Mrs. Helen Griffin, reached out to my office last year. She and her husband took out a reverse mortgage on their home. In order to qualify, she agreed to be taken off the title. The lender promised that she could be added back on the title at a later date if they refinanced. Unfortunately, she and her husband had no idea how expensive refinancing would be. Like so many others, Mrs. Griffin was now in a dangerous financial situation. Upon the reverse mortgage borrower's death, a surviving spouse is required to pay the full balance due on the loan—or 95 percent of the value of the property—simply to remain in their home.

My amendment would protect people like Mrs. Griffin and allow them more time to protect themselves from foreclosure. I think we must do everything in our power to inform and protect unknowing senior couples from the danger of not only losing their loved ones but also their nest eggs.

Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida and his staff for working so hard on this legislation and for making a commitment to this issue. I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman to make sure that we do all that we can to realize the full goal of this important program.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for high-speed rail in the State of California or for the California High-Speed Rail Authority, nor may any be used by the Federal Railroad Administration to administer a grant agreement with the California High-Speed Rail Authority that contains a tapered matching requirement.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Chair, once again, I am here one more year, offering another amendment to end this incredible waste of taxpayer dollars.

I have been clear about my position on high-speed rail. High-speed rail has a future in the United States. It just

can't be done as it is being done in California—\$70 billion over budget and completely changed from the proposition that the voters originally voted on. If the Governor and the Obama administration are committed to bringing this high-speed rail to fruition, then it should go back before the voters and actually uphold the will of the voters.

This is a case study. If you want to get it wrong, if you want to end high-speed rail across the Nation, then go ahead and continue to waste dollars in California on a project that continues to have many different flaws. This authority in California is not only demolishing homes, but it is demolishing businesses. The only way they can continue to get right-of-way is through eminent domain—slashing farms, tearing down businesses, and now kicking people out of their homes.

Today, it was announced that, instead of ending the initial construction segment in the outskirts of Bakersfield, the rail work will now stop just north of Shafter—a full 8 miles of what the original segment was—with still no operating segment that will allow people to travel from one end of the State to the other or even from one end of the valley to the other. Currently, if you ride Amtrak from north to south, you have to get off in Bakersfield, get on a bus, go over the mountains, and take that bus until it hits rail in the LA area. Now we are going to have a bus in Shafter. This just doesn't make any sense. They continue to change over and over again.

In the wake of Amtrak accident 188 and with the incredible focus on safety that is necessary to pass PTC across the country, why wouldn't we take high-speed rail dollars and actually fix the safety improvements that need to be done in California? Where is the commitment to safety? Let's fix the positive train control and make sure that our trains in California are safe, and let's end this project that continues to waste taxpayer dollars.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, this amendment is a new twist on an amendment that the gentleman from California has been offering over the last few years. The net result, however, is the same. It would stop the development of California high-speed rail in its tracks, so to speak.

The amendment would prevent the Federal Railroad Administration from administering the funding that California received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. This would have the effect of preventing the FRA staff from providing routine project delivery oversight or invoicing on all of the environmental work funded under the grant agreement.

Do we want the Federal Government to conduct oversight on the projects that receive Federal funding?

Furthermore, with the Recovery Act funds set to expire at the end of fiscal year 2017, the amendment would make it virtually impossible for the California High-Speed Rail Authority to spend all of its funding by the deadline. It would put the completion of the project in grave jeopardy. In January, Governor Brown and other California leaders came together to mark the commencement of construction for California's high-speed rail project. The project is expected to create 20,000 jobs per year.

I include for the RECORD two letters—one from industry and one from labor groups. Both support the California high-speed rail project.

MAY 12, 2015.

Hon. MARIO DIAZ-BALART,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington DC.

Hon. DAVID E. PRICE,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington DC.

We are writing to voice our strong support for public works investment, including recent efforts to develop, construct and deliver high-speed intercity passenger rail service for the first time in American history. Specifically, we oppose the inclusion of harmful riders in the fiscal year (FY) 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act that would target or impede efforts to construct any specific high-speed rail projects, including the California High-Speed Rail program.

American public works infrastructure is at an inflection point, and this will be a pivotal year as the U.S. Congress deliberates Federal highway, transit, rail and aviation policy bills, and debates how to fund Federal transportation programs that will meet our Nation's future mobility needs. Meanwhile, the State of California, in partnership with the Federal government, has made significant investments in intercity high-speed passenger rail. In January, the California High-Speed Rail Authority (the Authority) hosted a "Groundbreaking Ceremony" for the California High-Speed Rail program to mark the commencement of sustained construction, which will accelerate this year and create 20,000 jobs annually for the next five years. Additionally, the bids on the Authority's first two construction contracts, valued at almost \$2.2 billion, came in significantly under budget.

To date, the State of California has committed the majority of the funding that has been committed to build the program's initial operating section. And last year, the Authority secured the ongoing appropriation of 25 percent of all future California State Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund auction proceeds for the high-speed rail program—a dedicated revenue stream capable of producing hundreds of millions of dollars annually for direct funding or financing. The private sector is now also exhibiting a great deal of interest in investing in the program.

We believe that America is a country with bold vision that does big things, and we believe that robust investment in infrastructure benefits our industry and the American

public. Congressional efforts to impede new public works projects in any one state send the wrong message to local, state and private sector investors in every state who are willing to invest in sorely needed new infrastructure projects in any mode of transportation.

Moreover, the California High-Speed Rail program represents the first ever effort to build an intercity high-speed passenger rail system in this country. California is at the forefront of developing an entirely new American industry where investments in and the development of new technologies, manufacturing capabilities, and innovative business practices will create high-skilled, good paying jobs and benefit American public works for decades. The Authority is also operating under a Community Benefits Agreement with skilled building trades and contractors to promote training and apprenticeship programs and provide opportunities for disadvantaged workers. Halting or impeding this seminal program at its outset will set our industry back and jeopardize thousands of new middle-class jobs.

We believe that the California High-Speed Rail program may serve as model of a Federal, state, industry and labor partnership that creates jobs, links economies and communities, preserves our environment and builds a sustainable future. Therefore, we respectfully oppose the inclusion of harmful riders in the fiscal year (FY) 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act that would target or impede efforts to construct any specific high-speed rail project, including the California High-Speed Rail program.

American Train Dispatchers Association; Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood of Railway Signalmen; International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers; International Union of Operating Engineers; North America's Building Trades Unions; SMART Transportation Division; State Building and Construction Trades Council of California; Transportation Communications International Union; Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO; Transport Workers Union International; UNITE HERE!

JUNE 1, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS, Chair,
Hon. JACK REED, Ranking Member,
Subcommittee on Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington DC.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND REED: As you prepare to consider the Senate's version of the fiscal year (FY) 2016 "THUD" appropriations bill, we are writing to ask you to avoid using the measure to set up roadblocks to transportation investment. Specifically, we wanted to make you aware of policy language contained in the House version of the FY 2016 THUD bill that seeks to block federal approvals for the California high speed rail program.

In January, Governor Jerry Brown and other California leaders commemorated the beginning of construction on the nation's largest infrastructure project: a high-speed railroad connecting Southern and Northern California through the Central Valley. This program, in which the state will be the primary funder, will bring together public and private funds to create a transformative investment for California and the nation. During construction, the program will create 20,000 jobs per year. After it is open, it will

help ensure a sustainable and growing economic future for California.

By including language in its appropriations bill intended to withhold federal support and approvals for the project, the House is sending a message to all the states that major infrastructure projects—even after receiving federal grants and multiple federal approvals—are at risk of being halted in their tracks based on political considerations in Washington, DC.

In a May 11 letter to House appropriators, OMB Director Shaun Donovan also expressed the Administration's opposition to the language in the House bill dealing with the California High-Speed Rail program.

We believe that the California high speed rail program will serve as model of a Federal, state, industry and labor partnership that creates jobs, links economies and communities, preserves our environment and builds a sustainable future. Therefore, we respectfully request that your subcommittee produce a bill free of any harmful riders in the FY 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act that would impede efforts to construct any specific high-speed rail project, including the California High-Speed Rail program.

Thank you for your attention to our views.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF
ENGINEERING COMPANIES.
AMERICAN PUBLIC
TRANSPORTATION
ASSOCIATION.
AMERICAN ROAD AND
TRANSPORTATION
BUILDERS ASSOCIATION.
ASSOCIATION OF
INDEPENDENT PASSENGER
RAIL OPERATORS.
RAILWAY SUPPLY
INSTITUTE.
U.S. HIGH SPEED RAIL
ASSOCIATION.

□ 2130

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The administration has been very clear that it strongly opposes provisions in this bill that would restrict the development of high-speed rail. Moreover, the California congressional delegation has overwhelmingly opposed these restrictive riders in the past, and I am happy to stand with them again tonight, urging my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. DENHAM, for his hard work on curtailing this waste of taxpayer money.

Here are just a few of the headlines currently on the Internet about California's high-speed rail project: "Why California's High-Speed Rail is Off Track"; "High-Speed Rail Brings Fears of Gutted Communities and Noise"; "High-Speed Rail Foes Cite Noise, Property Value Concerns"; "Protesters Rail Against High-Speed Rail Route Proposal"; "High-Speed Rail Opponents Expected to Converge at LA Meeting"; finally, "What an Unholy

Mess This California Bullet Train Meeting is Going to Be."

This is all reflected in southern California planning for a route that isn't even planned yet; yet billions of dollars of the California taxpayers—but even more importantly, in this body, Federal taxpayer dollars—are being planned and spent and will be spent if we don't stop this here tonight for a route, for a plan, for a project that isn't even a plan.

You couldn't send astronauts into outer space without a plan to bring them back, yet they are hell-bent on this project to spend the money as fast as they can without having any idea where the route is going to go; and we are seeing people all over California protest it, for a project that has tripled in price from what the voters saw as Prop 1A just 7 years ago. Yet here we are 7 years later with a groundbreaking that consists of knocking down some of the houses and buildings without any track being laid, without a real project they can actually count on being a true route under Prop 1A from San Francisco to Los Angeles. We need to put a stop to this now.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Chair, as you have heard, this project is \$70 billion over budget. It has a shortfall of \$87 billion. If my colleagues in California, if the minority party of this body would like to continue on with this project, then where is the \$87 billion? I don't see a proposal from them, nor do I see a proposal from the Governor for \$87 billion.

We have priorities in the State. As you may know, we are going through a big drought in California. We would love to create the jobs. Let's utilize the billions of dollars that would be spent on high-speed rail over the next several decades on water projects that would actually help our infrastructure, our agriculture, as well as people throughout California.

There is a good way to spend taxpayer dollars. This is not it. We cannot afford to leave the next generation with an \$87 billion hole that will continue to not only put California in further debt, but will continue to show that our priorities are misguided.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

Mr. PETERS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order 11246 (relating to Equal Employment Opportunity).

Mr. PETERS (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent

that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Madam Chair, no American should be fired, denied a job or a place to live for being who they are or because of whom they love. Every American deserves to be treated equally and with dignity.

My amendment would make a simple change to the text of the bill but make an important difference in the lives of LGBT Americans across the country. President Obama signed an executive order in July 2014 to prohibit Federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity against their employees or those seeking employment. This amendment would affirm that order by ensuring that no funds in the bill are used to conflict with the President's rule. It would demonstrate to the American people that Congress supports fairness and equality for all.

Today, only 18 States and the District of Columbia have nondiscrimination protections for LGBT communities in sexual orientation and gender identity in both employment and housing. That means that in a number of States an LGBT individual can get married in the morning and fired from his or her job or denied an application in the afternoon for no other reason than the change in marital status. That is unacceptable. As a country that believes in equality for all people, we must do better.

June is Pride Month, and in cities and towns across the country, millions of Americans will celebrate the vibrant diversity of the LGBT communities who are enriching our society. As we look forward toward full nondiscrimination, we can help provide at least a small window of equality for all members of the LGBT community by passing this amendment. I urge my colleagues to stand on the side of equality and against discrimination and support this amendment.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I simply want to commend him for offering this amendment and offer my enthusiastic support.

In various ways, we ensure that the Federal Government doesn't pay sub-

standard wages, doesn't do other things that are detrimental in the workplace or that set a low bar, set a low standard. This amendment adds to that, I think, in a very constructive way. It adds to worker protections by preventing any company that does business with the Government from firing employees based on who they are and whom they love.

I commend the gentleman. It is a fine amendment. I hope colleagues will support it.

Mr. PETERS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

Mr. MULLIN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce subpart B of part 750 of title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, regarding signs for service clubs and religious notices as defined in section 153(p) of such part.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, churches and civic groups are in danger of being forced to tear down their informational highway signs. Some of these signs have stood for decades. The current law states that religious and civic groups can no longer have signs larger than 8 square feet. That is 2 feet by 4 feet. However, "Free Coffee" signs in the same law are unlimited in size.

My amendment would allow churches and civic organizations to keep their signs that are larger than 8 square feet. This is a reasonable amendment. It would be beneficial to the safety of the traveling public and allow our Federal Government to focus its resources on more critical infrastructure uses. We need to be focusing on repairing our roads and bridges, not tearing down church signs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, this amendment would suspend

enforcement of rules governing the size of billboards for religious organizations and service clubs. These rules have been in place for a long time—since 1975.

As I understand it, the gentleman is seeking to increase the allowable size of billboards for religious organizations and service clubs from 8 square feet to 32 square feet. This isn't the appropriate place to deal with this issue. We have barely heard of it before it was offered. We certainly haven't had extensive deliberations, haven't heard from State authorities, local authorities, people who have a stake in this. It needs to be reviewed and debated within the context of the surface transportation authorization.

The authorizing committees are in the midst of working on the new authorization bill right now. That is where I would suggest the gentleman might want to take his concerns. This is not the place here tonight. I urge colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), my colleague.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Madam Chair, I rise today to give my very strong support to this amendment offered by my colleague from Oklahoma.

The Federal Government creates a regulation. That regulation says that, if you are a church or if you are a civic group or if you are some kind of community organization, you are limited in the size of your sign to 8 square feet, 2 feet by 4 feet; however, if you are a billboard company, you can have 25 feet by 60 feet. This is discrimination against churches and civic groups that I think is inappropriate.

I would also say that the State of Oklahoma has weighed in. The State of Oklahoma would like to regulate the signs in the State of Oklahoma. I think that is absolutely not only appropriate, but I think it is constitutional that the State have the right to regulate the signs in its own State.

Here is the sad part that I would like to let people know and understand. If the State of Oklahoma chooses not to enforce this Federal regulation that is discriminatory, then the State of Oklahoma risks losing 10 percent of its Federal funding for roads. This is the Federal Government using Oklahoma taxpayer dollars against the State of Oklahoma. It is Federal bullying.

This amendment offered by my colleague from Oklahoma is a good amendment. I fully support it, and I highly recommend my colleagues support it.

Mr. MULLIN. Our churches and our civic organizations have better ways to spend their limited resources than tearing down signs. Our States would have more time on their hands to be looking at our roads and bridges if they didn't have to go out and enforce a law

that our State doesn't even want. If we could simply be focusing on the important issues, like our roads and our bridges, not wasting Federal dollars and State dollars on enforcing an out-of-date law, this wouldn't even simply be an issue.

I would urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

Mr. GROTHMAN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Housing Programs—Project-Based Rental Assistance" may be used for any family who is not an elderly family or a disabled family (as such terms are defined in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)) and who was not receiving project-based rental assistance under section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f) as of October 1, 2015, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is reduced by \$300,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 2145

Mr. GROTHMAN. The first thing we should look at when we look at this budget is cost, and this is one program that is going up in cost. We are still in a position in this budget in which we anticipate borrowing about 14 percent. We have the \$18 trillion debt.

This amendment will reduce the cost in this budget by \$300 million, which by itself is nothing to sneeze at, but the real reason for this amendment is the perverse incentives in Section 8 and other tenant-based rental assistance programs.

All of these programs are conditioned upon, first, having little or no income. It is wrong to encourage people not to work. As I get around my district, I find so many employers who cannot find employees today, in part, because they feel it pays better not to work.

Secondly, and more importantly, this program, like so many other programs designed to help poor people, has a huge marriage penalty associated with it. In order to get this low-income housing, it almost encourages one—it does encourage one—to have children without a mother and father at home. To continue this program or even expand this program to more people is to just destroy the moral fiber of America.

This amendment is tailored to not include or not reduce low-income housing for the elderly or disabled. I am aware of the fact that we have people in this country on Social Security maybe making \$500 a month, and they may find it very difficult to find anywhere else to live, so I am not chipping away at that part of the program.

I will give you an example. In my district, I talked to someone who ran one of these low-income projects—not Section 8, but more of a project-based one—and they were very proud of what nice, low-income housing it was. It was very nice, very generous. They pointed out the only thing you needed to do to get these apartments for \$25 a month was to not have a job. Now, can you imagine anything so foolish as to encourage people to not have a job?

In any event, I hope this amendment passes. I hope there is nobody else in this room who would have any objection to this commonsense amendment designed to restore the moral fiber that made America great.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, if there is an air of familiarity about this amendment and what the gentleman has just said about his amendment, listeners may want to tune in and remind themselves of virtually this same amendment being offered last week.

I should begin by saying that tenant-based Section 8 housing—a program, by the way, that conservatives should love because it is market based and the tenants pay a substantial portion of their income in rent—tenant-based Section 8 housing in this bill is just barely held even, with more or less level funding. Of course, other things in the bill are treated much worse.

The gentleman apparently thinks there is too much money in this bill, too much investment, with thousands on waiting lists across this country. This amendment would certainly increase those waiting lists.

Now, last week, it was \$614 million cut; this week, it is a \$300 million cut—so not quite as many people would be evicted. This week, the gentleman is saying that the elderly and the disabled would not be evicted. Who does that leave? It leaves everybody else; it leaves working families.

I ask anyone in this body to go to their local community house authority and ask about those waiting lists. Ask how many people are waiting for a roof over their head who are willing to work, willing to participate in financing, but need a leg up, the kind of support that tenant-based and project-based Section 8 represents.

It escapes me why the gentleman would offer this amendment in a bill that is already at rock bottom.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, just as we did last week, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. I do not give up hope that, by the time this budget rolls around next year, you see the wisdom of the amendment.

I think a lot of people get confused when they find waiting lists for this sort of program. If you are handing out apartments for \$25 a month, of course, there are going to be waiting lists; so that is not surprising. Even then, there are certain areas in my State, in my district, where they are trying to find people who are not in the local area to fill these units because there is an excess of units.

Nevertheless, I think you want to think about the perverse incentives you have in a program in which, the more you work, the more your rent goes up. In order to get in, in the first place, you almost can't work at all; and, secondly, what the long-term effect on our society is if you would tell somebody that, if they raise a child out of wedlock, you get a free, air-conditioned, maybe two-bedroom, two-bath apartment, but if you get married to somebody with a job, you lose that apartment—is that the type of incentive we want for the next generation?

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Public and Indian Housing Programs—Tenant-Based Rental Assistance" may be used for any family who is not an elderly family or a disabled family (as such terms are defined in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)) and who was not receiving tenant-based rental assistance under section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f) as of October 1, 2015, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is reduced, the amount specified under such heading for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts is reduced, and the amount specified under such heading for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program is reduced, by \$300,000,000, \$210,000,000, and \$90,000,000, respectively.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. I think all we talked about in that last amendment

applies to this amendment, with one additional thing that people should find offensive, because here we are dealing with project-based rental assistance.

Not only are we encouraging some people not to work very hard, not only are we encouraging people not to raise children in an old-fashioned nuclear family, we are also kind of having a strong element of corporate welfare here, too, which is something I don't care for.

Over time, we have this kind of industry growing up in which you operate low-income housing. In some ways, I assume people are entering into it because it is more profitable than a pure, free market sort of thing; and I would think that people who are opposed to corporate welfare ought to be opposed to it for that reason as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, here we go again with, once again, a reprisal of the amendment offered last week and rejected.

The amendment offered tonight separates that amendment in two: tenant-based Section 8, project-based Section 8.

The argument does apply, I think, to any of this assisted housing. It behooves us to reflect on some numbers, I think. On any given night, 575,000 of our constituents are homeless, absolutely homeless. That is 50,000 veterans, by the way.

They get on these waiting lists for these Section 8 projects, and the waiting lists often have thousands of names. They finally get into Section 8. They are paying a large proportion of their income in rent. They are struggling to get a leg up and struggle to find jobs.

By the way, how likely is one to find a job if one is homeless? If you are talking about self-reliance, isn't it better to have a roof over your head and have some of the basics of life so you can go out and seek work?

Evictions, we are talking about evictions here. How does kicking out children and how does kicking out families promote marriage, for goodness' sake? How does it promote wedlock? How does it promote self-reliance? It is likely to promote destitution and desperation.

We are a better country than this. I plead with colleagues, look at this amendment closely. Think about what we stand for. Think about the fact that this bill is already inadequate. Let's not make it worse.

Reject this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. First of all, I would like to clarify something in the amendment. The amendment does not apply

to people who were receiving rental assistance—and neither did the other amendment—prior to October 1 of this year. It is not a matter of kicking people out; it is a matter of not putting any further people on.

Furthermore, I think we have to discuss how generous this benefit is. There are so many people in our society who are living with parents, living with other family members, living with roommates, and working to afford that rent. To give somebody a freestanding apartment—some of these are very nice apartments, two-bedroom, two-bath, air-conditioned apartments—without having to work at all to receive that apartment is just a horrible incentive.

I would ask the gentleman to go back in his district and talk to people who live in the neighborhoods where they have these subsidized projects. One of the things I find is that sometimes people who live in maybe high-end areas and are not familiar with these get confused.

I think, if you talk to people who know people who live in this subsidized housing, you will have no problem finding many anecdotes of people who are clearly not hurting materially; and, in order to keep their subsidies going, they cannot work, work harder, or get raises. Above all, they can't get married.

I think you have to ask yourself whether we ought to continue these programs that are around year after year after year or whether it is high time to look at these programs; change the underlying qualifications; change the time limits; change the amount that has to be paid; and, quite frankly, also sometimes look at the very generous accommodations that the government is providing, quite frankly, more generous accommodations than a lot of people who are working quite hard have.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to acquire a camera for the purpose of collecting or storing vehicle license plate numbers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, this amendment reflects a simple principle. The

government does not and should not have unchecked power to track American citizens.

There are many very legitimate reasons to observe license plates using camera technology. Every day in America, law enforcement drives through neighborhoods looking for stolen cars. Cameras and computers identify the number of that plate and run it against a database to see if it is stolen.

□ 2200

But again, there is no reason to store that data. The bulk collection of the location of every American's automobile is well beyond a reasonable standard. It is a difficult one, but it is simple in this case.

The Federal Government should not provide money for cameras that indiscriminately bulk collect information on where you are at all times. I hope that this amendment will spark a healthy dialogue similar to the one we had on the PATRIOT Act, one in which we agreed that with a court order you can collect this kind of data, with a court order you can seek it, with a known database of stolen cars or wanted criminals, you can compare a camera image.

But the simple collection, in bulk, of your location of your car, 24 hours a day, using thousands, tens of thousands or perhaps millions of cameras, is far too "1984" for Members of this body or the American people.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, this amendment is well-intentioned, I realize, but I think it is an overreach and certainly not appropriate for this appropriations bill.

Records of license plate information can serve as a helpful clue to investigators. They can produce leads in criminal cases. This information is also used routinely by law enforcement and by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to help find missing children.

I understand there are legitimate privacy concerns. I share those concerns. But there is already a Federal law that governs the use of such data. The data is not used to track citizens in real time, despite what some assert.

Putting restrictions on law enforcement's ability to obtain and use this license plate information without really fully exploring the facts or giving due consideration to the consequences, this needs to be done by the appropriate committees. But doing it here tonight seems risky and unreasonable, actually, to expect us to legislate on this matter in the context of this appropriations bill.

Madam Chair, I will insert into the RECORD a letter from the Fraternal

Order of Police and other law enforcement entities asking Congress not to limit the use of this information.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL
ORDER OF POLICE,
February 23, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY M. REID,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL, MR. SPEAKER, SENATOR REID AND REPRESENTATIVE PELOSI: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to express our concern about continued efforts to portray automated license plate recognition (ALPR) as an ongoing, national real-time tracking system operated by law enforcement. This is emphatically not the case.

We believe that there is a fundamental misunderstanding as to how ALPR technology is deployed and used by law enforcement and other public safety agencies. Many people, including members of Congress, are under the impression that this technology is being used by our national security apparatus to geotrack our citizens and monitor their movements. Indeed, a Dear Colleague letter circulated last year in support of an amendment defunding this technology was entitled, "Stop NSA-like geotracking of innocent Americans."

This is not the case. To begin with, ALPR data is simply a photograph of a vehicle's license plate in a public place at a particular point in time. Geotracking is the use of Global Positioning System (GPS) data to track over time the movement of a specific electronic device capable of emitting GPS location information. Conversely, ALPR data is collected anonymously without personally identifying information. A government agency with access to ALPR data may connect that data to personal information from a State's vehicle registration system, but if they do so without a legitimate law enforcement or public safety purpose, then they are in violation of the Drivers' Privacy Protection Act. Any other use of the data would be an unjustifiable violation of privacy and Federal law.

Thousands of local, State and Federal law enforcement agencies use ALPR data every day to generate leads in criminal investigations, apprehend murderers, respond to Amber and Silver alerts, find missing children, recover stolen vehicles, and protect our borders. Even something as simple as the use of cameras at traffic lights and toll booths has a beneficial impact on the safety of our roadways.

The FOP would also submit that the only difference between the use of ALPR technology and an officer taking down license plate information along with the time, date and location is the efficiency by which the data is collected. Every State in the Republic mandates that every vehicle have a mounted and clearly visible license plate for the specific purpose of contributing to public safety, whether the data is collected by a fellow citizen, law enforcement officer or camera.

With these facts in mind, it is our hope that Congress will recognize the substantial benefits this technology makes to public safety and oppose any legislation or amendment that would restrict the use of ALPR by law enforcement.

On behalf of the more than 335,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I thank you for your consideration of our views. If I can provide any further information about law enforcement's use of ALPR technology, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

MARCH 9, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, LEADER PELOSI, LEADER MCCONNELL, AND LEADER REID: We are deeply concerned about efforts to portray automated license plate recognition (ALPR) technology as a national real-time tracking capability for law enforcement. The fact is that this technology and the data it generates is not used to track people in real time. ALPR is used every day to generate investigative leads that help law enforcement solve murders, rapes, and serial property crimes, recover abducted children, detect drug and human trafficking rings, find stolen vehicles, apprehend violent criminal alien fugitives, and support terrorism investigations.

There is a misconception of continuous government tracking of individuals using ALPR information. This has led to attempts to curtail law enforcement's use of the technology without a proper and fair effort to truly understand the anonymous nature of the data, how it is used, and how it is protected.

We are seeing harmful proposals—appropriations amendments and legislation—to restrict or completely ban law enforcement's use of ALPR technology and data without any effort to truly understand the issue. Yet, any review would make clear that the value of this technology is beyond question, and that protections against mis-use of the data by law enforcement are already in place. That is one of the reasons why critics are hard-pressed to identify any actual instances of mis-use.

If legislative efforts to curtail ALPR use are successful, federal, state, and local law enforcement's ability to investigate crimes will be significantly impacted given the extensive use of the technology today.

We call on Congress to foster a reasonable and transparent discussion about ALPR. We believe strong measures can be taken to ensure citizens' privacy while enabling law enforcement investigators to take advantage of the technology. Strict data access controls, mandatory auditing of all use of ALPR systems, and regular reporting on the use of the technology and data prevent misuse of the capability while enabling law enforcement to make productive use of it. Adoption and enforcement of strong policies on the use of ALPR and other technologies by individual law enforcement agencies would also help.

We strongly urge members of the House and Senate to understand and recognize the substantial daily benefits of this technology to protect the public and investigate dangerous criminals. We urge opposition to any bill or amendment that would restrict the

use of ALPR without full consideration of the issue.

Sincerely,

J. Thomas Manger, Chief of Police, Montgomery County Police Department, President, Major Cities Chiefs Police Association; Chief Richard Beary, President, International Association of Chiefs of Police; Mike Sena, Director, Northern California Regional Intelligence Center, President, National Fusion Center Association; Ronald C. Sloan, Director, Colorado Bureau of Investigation, President, Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies; Sheriff Donny Youngblood, President, Major County Sheriffs' Association; Bob Bushman, President, National Narcotic Officers' Associations' Coalition; Jonathan Thompson, Executive Director, National Sheriffs' Association; William Johnson, Executive Director, National Association of Police Organizations; Mike Moore, President, National District Attorneys Association; Andrews Matthews, Chairman, National Troopers Coalition.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, in closing, I respect the gentleman's opinion, but we are not legislating on this appropriations bill. What we are doing is determining that the relevant committees of jurisdiction have not authorized broad collection of data of the American people.

The committees of jurisdiction have not authorized this sort of proactive tracking of people because, at some point, someday there may be a reason to use that database. So, in fact, it is perfectly appropriate not to spend the money, not to authorize the money until or unless the authorizing committees have made a thorough decision of what should be authorized and what safeguards need to be in order.

So my amendment will simply limit, until such time as a legislating amendment or authorization from a committee can, in fact, ensure that we both authorize law enforcement to collect and protect the privacy of American citizens because, ultimately, these are the taxpayer dollars of the American citizens and the privacy embodied in the Constitution and guaranteed to every citizen.

Therefore, I insist that Members consider voting for an amendment that recognizes, just as the minority clearly said, we have not yet had a debate on the basis under which we should pay for the bulk collection against the American people without their permission or safeguards of their rights.

I urge support for the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, we are coming to the end of several days of floor debate on the 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill.

I want to, again, express my appreciation to Chairman DIAZ-BALART, subcommittee members from both sides of the aisle, and our remarkable, dedicated staff for all the hard work that has gone into this bill and for the orderly and civil character of our floor deliberations.

I very much wish that all of this work and all of our efforts at cooperation were being more adequately rewarded, but they are not. And that is not the chairman's fault. It is the fault of the majority's profoundly misguided and flawed budget policy, a policy that has left this bill a mere shadow of what it should be and has decimated the investments a great country should be making.

Make no mistake, Madam Chair, our roads, our highways are crumbling. One out of every nine bridges in this country is structurally deficient and in need of repair or replacement.

Americans spend the equivalent of one work week a year sitting in congestion caused by overcrowded highways. The capital backlog for our transit systems is nearly \$78 billion.

And make no mistake, our public housing resources don't meet the basic needs of millions of vulnerable and low-income Americans. On any given night, 575,000 of our constituents, including more than 50,000 veterans, are homeless. The maintenance backlog for public housing approaches \$25 billion.

Madam Chair, this is a defining crisis for our generation. This bill, which is intended to help improve housing and transportation options and create jobs for hard-working American families, will, instead, dig the hole deeper by cutting everything from safety programs to transportation construction grants to maintenance budgets for public housing.

It would be bad enough if the cuts were limited to our transportation and housing systems, but Republicans have taken the same shortsighted approach with each of this year's domestic appropriations bills.

Unfortunately, the majority has targeted domestic appropriations to bear the entire brunt of deficit reduction. That means deep cuts, not just to our transportation and housing infrastructure but also to research support, programs that make college more affordable, the very things that make this country the envy of the world.

Meanwhile, the majority lacks the courage to address the real drivers of

the deficit, which I think most Members of this Chamber realize are tax expenditures and entitlement spending.

In the 1990s, we achieved budget surpluses as the result of concerted bipartisan efforts to balance the budget through a comprehensive approach. We actually paid off \$400 billion of the national debt.

Until we have a similar budget agreement this year, one that sets responsible funding and revenue levels across the board, we cannot write a bill that addresses our country's crumbling roads and bridges, that brings our rail system up to first-world standards, or that provides shelter for America's elderly, disabled, and other vulnerable populations.

In fact, we cannot make any of the investments that we simply have to make to continue as the greatest country in the world. So I implore my colleagues to vote "no" on this shortsighted, irresponsible bill, but beyond that, to consider the long-term consequences of the fiscal course we are on. We simply have to make a correction for our country's sake.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I want to thank the ranking member, first, for his kind words towards me right now but, more importantly, for his willingness to work with me, to spend the time, the effort. Both he and his staff, the committee staff, have, frankly, worked awfully hard on making sure we do the best job that we can, and I am grateful for that.

I just very briefly want to just mention that this bill, this is a bill that prioritizes funding and funds our country's priorities. It is a balanced bill.

And very important, Madam Chair, this is a bill, that, yes, it does not raise taxes.

Now, I know that a lot of folks have talked about the President's requests and the President's requests. And the President's requests for this area are much higher in many areas than what this bill is funding.

But let's remember a couple of things. The President has massive taxes, tax increases in his proposals, number one. And also, that this bill adheres to not only the budget that was passed by Congress, House and Senate, but this bill adheres to the law, the law that was passed by Congress and signed by the President of the United States, the so-called "sequester" law.

So if we go above and beyond that level, which some people, I guess, don't remember, it is fake. It gets sequestered.

So, Madam Chair, again, I thank the ranking member for his hard work.

This is a balanced bill. It is a good bill. It is a responsible bill. It pays and

funds the priorities of this great country. And I am going to ask for our colleagues to give us a favorable vote on this fine bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. YOHIO of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

Amendment by Mr. HULTGREN of Illinois.

Amendment by Mr. MEEHAN of Pennsylvania.

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. PETERS of California.

Amendment by Mr. ISSA of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHIO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—244

Abraham	Byrne	Duffy
Aderholt	Calvert	Duncan (SC)
Allen	Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Amash	Carter (TX)	Ellmers (NC)
Amodei	Chabot	Emmer (MN)
Babin	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Barletta	Clawson (FL)	Fitzpatrick
Barr	Coffman	Fleischmann
Barton	Cole	Fleming
Benishek	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Bishop (MI)	Comstock	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Fox
Black	Cook	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Costello (PA)	Frelinghuysen
Blum	Cramer	Garrett
Bost	Crawford	Gibbs
Boustany	Crenshaw	Gibson
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Gohmert
Brat	Culberson	Goodlatte
Bridenstine	Curbelo (FL)	Gosar
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Granger
Buchanan	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Buck	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)
Bucshon	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Burgess	Donovan	Griffith

Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie

McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meesarling
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer

NOES—181

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes

Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Mica
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley

Adams
Becerra
Cárdenas

Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier

NOT VOTING—8

Cleaver
DeFazio
Fincher

□ 2237

Messrs. NORCROSS and CONNOLLY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. CALVERT and NUNES changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 180, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

AYES—246

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine

Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)

Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Hurt (VA)
Maloney,
Carolyn

Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Lummis
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski

LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

NOES—180

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly

Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick

Kuster	Norcross	Scott, David	DelBene	Joyce	Price, Tom	Hoyer	McSally	Scott (VA)
Langevin	O'Rourke	Serrano	Dent	Katko	Ratcliffe	Huffman	Meehan	Scott, David
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Sewell (AL)	DeSantis	Kelly (MS)	Reed	Israel	Meeks	Serrano
Larson (CT)	Pascarella	Sherman	DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Jackson Lee	Messer	Sewell (AL)
Lawrence	Payne	Sires	Dingell	King (IA)	Ribble	Jeffries	Miller (MI)	Sherman
Lee	Pelosi	Slaughter	Donovan	King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Johnson (GA)	Moore	Shuster
Levin	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)	Duckworth	Kline	Rigell	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Sires
Lewis	Peters	Speier	Duffy	Knight	Roby	Johnson, Sam	Napolitano	Slaughter
Lieu, Ted	Peterson	Swalwell (CA)	Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Roe (TN)	Kaptur	Neal	Smith (WA)
Loeb sack	Pingree	Takai	Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Rokita	Keating	Newhouse	Speier
Lofgren	Pocan	Takano	Edwards	Lamborn	Rooney (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)
Lowenthal	Polis	Thompson (CA)	Ellmers (NC)	Lance	Roskam	Kennedy	O'Rourke	Takai
Lowey	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)	Emmer (MN)	Latta	Ross	Kildee	Pallone	Takano
Lujan Grisham	Quigley	Titus	Eshoo	Lipinski	Rothfus	Kilmer	Pascarella	Thompson (CA)
(NM)	Rangel	Tonko	Esty	LoBiondo	Rouzer	Kind	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Luján, Ben Ray	Reichert	Torres	Farenthold	Long	Royce	Kinzinger (IL)	Pelosi	Tiberi
(NM)	Rice (NY)	Tsongas	Farr	Loudermilk	Ruiz	Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Titus
Matsui	Richmond	Van Hollen	Fitzpatrick	Love	Russell	Kuster	Polis	Tonko
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Vargas	Fleischmann	Lucas	Ryan (OH)	Langevin	Price (NC)	Torres
McDermott	Ruiz	Veasey	Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)	Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Trott
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Vela	Flores	Lummis	Salmon	Larson (CT)	Rangel	Tsongas
McNerney	Rush	Velázquez	Forbes	Lynch	Sanford	Lawrence	Reichert	Turner
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky	Fortenberry	MacArthur	Scalise	Lee	Rice (NY)	Upton
Meng	Sánchez, Linda	Walz	Foster	Maloney, Sean	Schweikert	Levin	Richmond	Valadao
Moore	T.	Wasserman	Fox	Marchant	Scott, Austin	Lewis	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
Moulton	Sanchez, Loretta	Schultz	Frankel (FL)	Marino	Sensenbrenner	Lieu, Ted	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
Murphy (FL)	Sarbanes	Waters, Maxine	Franks (AZ)	Massie	Sessions	Loeb sack	Rohrabacher	Veasey
Nadler	Schakowsky	Watson Coleman	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy	Shimkus	Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen	Vela
Napolitano	Schiff	Welch	Garrett	McCauley	Simpson	Roybal-Allard	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
Neal	Schrader	Wilson (FL)	Gibbs	McClintock	Sinema	Lowey	Rush	Visclosky
Nolan	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth	Gibson	McCollum	Smith (MO)	Lujan Grisham	Sánchez, Linda	Walters, Mimi
			Gohmert	McHenry	Smith (NE)	(NM)	T.	Waters, Maxine
			Goodlatte	McMorris	Smith (NJ)	Luján, Ben Ray	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson Coleman
			Gosar	Rodgers	Smith (TX)	Matsui	Sarbanes	Welch
			Gowdy	McNerney	Stefanik	McDermott	Schakowsky	Westmoreland
			Graves (GA)	Meadows	Stewart	McGovern	Schiff	Wilson (FL)
			Graves (LA)	Meng	Stivers	McKinley	Schrader	Yarmuth
			Graves (MO)	Mica	Stutzman			
			Griffith	Miller (FL)	Thompson (PA)			
			Grothman	Moore (WV)	Thornberry			
			Guinta	Moolenaar	Tipton			
			Guthrie	Mooney (WV)	Wagner			
			Gutiérrez	Mullin	Walberg			
			Hardy	Mulvaney	Walden			
			Harper	Murphy (FL)	Walker			
			Harris	Murphy (PA)	Walorski			
			Hartzler	Neugebauer	Walz			
			Hastings	Noem	Wasserman			
			Hensarling	Nolan	Schultz			
			Herrera Beutler	Nugent	Weber (TX)			
			Hice, Jody B.	Nunes	Webster (FL)			
			Hill	Olson	Wenstrup			
			Holding	Palazzo	Westerman			
			Hudson	Palmer	Whitfield			
			Huelskamp	Paulsen	Williams			
			Huizenga (MI)	Pearce	Wilson (SC)			
			Hultgren	Perlmutter	Wittman			
			Hunter	Perry	Womack			
			Hurd (TX)	Peters	Woodall			
			Hurt (VA)	Peterson	Yoder			
			Issa	Pingree	Yoho			
			Jenkins (KS)	Pittenger	Young (AK)			
			Jenkins (WV)	Pitts	Young (IA)			
			Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Young (IN)			
			Jolly	Poliquin	Zeldin			
			Jones	Pompeo	Zinke			
			Jordan	Posey				

NOT VOTING—7

Adams Cleaver Maloney,
Becerra DeFazio Carolyn
Cárdenas Fincher

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2242

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HULTGREN

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind Members these are 2-minute votes.

The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 186, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

AYES—240

Abraham	Bost	Chabot
Aderholt	Boustany	Chaffetz
Allen	Brady (TX)	Clawson (FL)
Amash	Brat	Coffman
Amodei	Bridenstine	Cole
Ashford	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Babin	Buchanan	Comstock
Barletta	Buck	Conaway
Barr	Bucshon	Cook
Bishop (UT)	Burgess	Courtney
Black	Bustos	Cramer
Blackburn	Byrne	Crawford
Blum	Calvert	Crowley
Bonamici	Carter (GA)	Davis, Rodney

Aguilar	Chu, Judy	Diaz-Balart
Barton	Cicilline	Doggett
Bass	Clark (MA)	Dold
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Doyle, Michael
Benishek	Clay	F.
Bera	Clyburn	Ellison
Beyer	Cohen	Engel
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Fattah
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Fudge
Bishop (MI)	Conyers	Gabbard
Blumenauer	Cooper	Gallego
Boyle, Brendan	Costa	Garamendi
F.	Costello (PA)	Graham
Brady (PA)	Crenshaw	Granger
Brooks (IN)	Cuellar	Grayson
Brown (FL)	Culberson	Green, Al
Brownley (CA)	Cummings	Green, Gene
Butterfield	Curbelo (FL)	Grijalva
Capps	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Capuano	Davis, Danny	Hanna
Carney	DeGette	Heck (NV)
Carson (IN)	Delaney	Heck (WA)
Carter (TX)	DeLauro	Higgins
Cartwright	Denham	Himes
Castor (FL)	DeSaulnier	Hinojosa
Castro (TX)	Deutch	Honda

NOES—186

NOT VOTING—7

Adams Cleaver Maloney,
Becerra DeFazio Carolyn
Cárdenas Fincher

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2247

Ms. WILSON of Florida changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mses. EDWARDS, SINEMA, Messrs. MOULTON and JENKINS of West Virginia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 227, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

AYES—199

Abraham	Amash	Barletta
Aderholt	Amodei	Barr
Allen	Babin	Benishek

Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Cook
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curbelo (FL)
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Esty
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Guinta
Guthrie

NOES—227

Aguilar
Ashford
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline

Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Hill
Himes
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jeffries
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nugent

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Lynch
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)

Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Koyce
Kuster
LaMalfa
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott

Adams
Becerra
Cárdenas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2251

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 195, not voting 7, as follows:

McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rokita
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes

NOT VOTING—7

Cleaver
DeFazio
Fincher

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (IN)
Zinke

Maloney,
Carolyn

[Roll No. 323]

AYES—231

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta

NOES—195

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney

Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen

Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur

Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sánchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Becerra
Cárdenas

Cleaver
DeFazio
Fincher

Maloney,
Carolyn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2254

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLI-
SON) on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 182, noes 243,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

AYES—182

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan

Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sánchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—243

Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson

Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk

Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Adams
Becerra
Cárdenas

Cleaver
DeFazio
Fincher

Maloney,
Carolyn
Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2257

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER OF MINNESOTA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Minnesota (Mr.
EMMER) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 214, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—212

Abraham	Guinta	Poe (TX)
Aderholt	Guthrie	Poliquin
Allen	Hanna	Pompeo
Amash	Hardy	Posey
Babin	Harris	Price, Tom
Barletta	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Barr	Heck (NV)	Reed
Barton	Hensarling	Reichert
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rice (SC)
Black	Hudson	Rigell
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Roby
Blum	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Bost	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Rohrabacher
Brat	Hurt (VA)	Rokita
Bridenstine	Issa	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Buck	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Bucshon	Jones	Rothfus
Burgess	Jordan	Rouzer
Byrne	Katko	Royce
Calvert	Kelly (MS)	Russell
Carter (GA)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX)	Kline	Salmon
Chabot	Knight	Sanford
Chaffetz	Labrador	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Coffman	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Cole	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Latta	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Long	Shinkus
Conaway	Loudermilk	Shuster
Cook	Love	Simpson
Cramer	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Curbelo (FL)	Massie	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	McCarthy	Stewart
Denham	McCaul	Stivers
Dent	McClintock	Stutzman
DeSantis	McHenry	Thornberry
DesJarlais	McMorris	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	Rodgers	Tipton
Duffy	McSally	Trott
Duncan (SC)	Meadows	Upton
Duncan (TN)	Messer	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	Mica	Wagner
Emmer (MN)	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Farenthold	Miller (MI)	Walden
Fleischmann	Moolenaar	Walker
Fleming	Mooney (WV)	Walorski
Flores	Mullin	Walters, Mimi
Forbes	Mulvaney	Weber (TX)
Fox	Neugebauer	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Newhouse	Westerman
Garrett	Noem	Westmoreland
Gibbs	Nugent	Williams
Gohmert	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Olson	Wittman
Gosar	Palazzo	Womack
Gowdy	Palmer	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Paulsen	Yoder
Graves (LA)	Pearce	Yoho
Graves (MO)	Perry	Young (IA)
Griffith	Pittenger	Young (IN)
Grothman	Pitts	Zinke

NOES—214

Aguilar	Brady (PA)	Chu, Judy
Amodei	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Ashford	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bass	Buchanan	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Bustos	Clay
Benishek	Butterfield	Clyburn
Bera	Capps	Cohen
Beyer	Capuano	Comstock
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cooper
Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)	Costa
F.	Castro (TX)	Costello (PA)

Courtney	Joyce
Crowley	Kaptur
Cuellar	Keating
Cummings	Kelly (IL)
Davis (CA)	Kelly (PA)
Davis, Danny	Kennedy
DeGette	Kildee
Delaney	Kilmer
DeLauro	Kind
DelBene	King (NY)
DeSaulnier	Kinzinger (IL)
Deutch	Kirkpatrick
Dingell	Kuster
Doggett	Langevin
Dold	Larsen (WA)
Donovan	Larson (CT)
Doyle, Michael	Lawrence
F.	Lee
Duckworth	Levin
Edwards	Lewis
Ellison	Lieu, Ted
Engel	Lipinski
Eshoo	LoBiondo
Esty	Loeb
Farr	Lofgren
Fattah	Lowenthal
Fitzpatrick	Lowe
Fortenberry	Lujan Grisham
Foster	(NM)
Frankel (FL)	Lujan, Ben Ray
Frelinghuysen	(NM)
Fudge	Lynch
Gabbard	MacArthur
Gallego	Maloney, Sean
Garamendi	Marino
Gibson	Matsui
Graham	McCollum
Granger	McDermott
Grayson	McGovern
Green, Al	McKinley
Green, Gene	McNerney
Grijalva	Meehan
Gutiérrez	Meeks
Hahn	Meng
Harper	Moore
Hastings	Moulton
Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Higgins	Murphy (PA)
Hill	Nadler
Himes	Napolitano
Hinojosa	Neal
Honda	Nolan
Hoyer	Norcross
Huffman	O'Rourke
Israel	Pallone
Jackson Lee	Pascarella
Jeffries	Payne
Jenkins (KS)	Pelosi
Johnson (GA)	Perlmuter
Johnson, E. B.	Peters
Jolly	Peterson

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Cleaver	Maloney,
Becerra	DeFazio	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Fincher	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2301

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 184, answered “present” 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—241

Aguilar	Gibson	Pallone
Amash	Graham	Pascarella
Ashford	Grayson	Paulsen
Bass	Green, Al	Payne
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Benishek	Grijalva	Perlmuter
Bera	Guinta	Peters
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pingree
Blumenauer	Hanna	Pocan
Bonamici	Hastings	Poliquin
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (NV)	Polis
F.	Heck (WA)	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Quigley
Brooks (IN)	Himes	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Reed
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Reichert
Bucshon	Hoyer	Renacci
Bustos	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Hurd (TX)	Richmond
Calvert	Israel	Rigell
Capps	Issa	Rohrabacher
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rokita
Carney	Jeffries	Rooney (FL)
Carson (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Royce
Castro (TX)	Jolly	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Joyce	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kaptur	Rush
Clark (MA)	Katko	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Ryan (WI)
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kennedy	T.
Coffman	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Connolly	Kind	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kinzinger (IL)	Schiff
Cook	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cooper	Knight	Scott (VA)
Costa	Kuster	Scott, David
Costello (PA)	Lance	Serrano
Courtney	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sinema
Cummings	Lawrence	
Curbelo (FL)	Lee	
Davis (CA)	Levin	
Davis, Danny	Lewis	
Davis, Rodney	Lieu, Ted	
DeGette	LoBiondo	
Delaney	Loeb	
DeLauro	Lofgren	
DelBene	Lowenthal	
Denham	Lowe	
Dent	Lujan Grisham	
DeSaulnier	(NM)	
Deutch	Lujan, Ben Ray	
Diaz-Balart	(NM)	
Dingell	Lynch	
Doggett	MacArthur	
Dold	Maloney, Sean	
Donovan	Matsui	
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	
F.	McDermott	
Duckworth	McGovern	
Duffy	McKinley	
Edwards	McNerney	
Ellison	McSally	
Emmer (MN)	Meehan	
Engel	Meeks	
Eshoo	Meng	
Esty	Messer	
Farr	Moore	
Fattah	Moulton	
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (FL)	
Foster	Nadler	
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	
Frelinghuysen	Neal	
Fudge	Newhouse	
Gabbard	Nolan	
Gallego	Norcross	
Garamendi	O'Rourke	

NOES—184

Abraham	Grothman	Pearce
Aderholt	Guthrie	Perry
Allen	Hardy	Pittenger
Amodei	Harper	Pitts
Babin	Harris	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Hartzler	Pompeo
Barr	Hensarling	Posey
Barton	Herrera Beutler	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rice (SC)
Black	Hudson	Roby
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Blum	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Boustany	Hunter	Roskam
Brady (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Ross
Brat	Jenkins (KS)	Rothfus
Bridenstine	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Brooks (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Buchanan	Jones	Salmon
Buck	Jordan	Sanford
Burgess	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Byrne	Kelly (PA)	Stutzman
Carter (GA)	King (IA)	Schwikert
Carter (TX)	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Chaffetz	Labrador	Sessions
Clawson (FL)	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Cole	Lamborn	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Latta	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Long	Smith (MO)
Comstock	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Love	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Crenshaw	Lummis	Stivers
Culberson	Marchant	Stutzman
DeSantis	Marino	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	Massie	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Trott
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Turner
Farenthold	McHenry	Wagner
Fleischmann	McMorris	Walberg
Fleming	Rodgers	Walker
Flores	Meadows	Walorski
Forbes	Mica	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Welch
Fox	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Westerman
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Westmoreland
Gibbs	Mullin	Whitfield
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Williams
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gosar	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gowdy	Noem	Womack
Granger	Nugent	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Nunes	Yoder
Graves (LA)	Olson	Yoho
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Griffith	Palmer	Young (IA)
		Young (IN)
		Zeldin
		Zinke

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Cleaver	Maloney,
Becerra	DeFazio	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Fincher	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2305

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 297, noes 129, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

AYES—297

Abraham	Fleischmann	Lujan Grisham
Aderholt	Fleming	(NM)
Allen	Flores	Luján, Ben Ray
Amash	Forbes	(NM)
Amodei	Fortenberry	Lummis
Babin	Fox	Marchant
Barr	Franks (AZ)	Marino
Barton	Gabbard	Massie
Benishek	Garrett	Matsui
Bera	Gibbs	McCarthy
Bilirakis	Gibson	McCaul
Bishop (MI)	Gohmert	McClintock
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	McCollum
Black	Gowdy	McGovern
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Blum	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Bost	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Boustany	Grayson	Rodgers
Brady (TX)	Green, Al	McSally
Brat	Green, Gene	Meadows
Bridenstine	Griffith	Messer
Brooks (AL)	Grijalva	Mica
Brownley (CA)	Grothman	Miller (FL)
Buchanan	Guinta	Miller (MI)
Buck	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Bucshon	Gutiérrez	Mooney (WV)
Burgess	Hanna	Moore
Bustos	Moulton	Mullin
Butterfield	Harper	Mulvaney
Byrne	Harris	Murphy (PA)
Calvert	Hartzler	Neal
Capuano	Heck (NV)	Neugebauer
Carter (GA)	Hensarling	Newhouse
Carter (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Noem
Castro (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Nolan
Chabot	Hill	Norcross
Clark (MA)	Hinojosa	Nugent
Clarke (NY)	Holding	Nunes
Clawson (FL)	Hudson	O'Rourke
Clay	Huelskamp	Olson
Coffman	Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo
Cohen	Hultgren	Palmer
Cole	Hunter	Pascrell
Collins (GA)	Hurt (VA)	Paulsen
Collins (NY)	Issa	Pearce
Conaway	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Connolly	Jeffries	Perry
Conyers	Jenkins (KS)	Peterson
Cook	Jenkins (WV)	Pingree
Costa	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Costello (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Courtney	Jones	Poe (TX)
Cramer	Jordan	Poliquin
Crawford	Joyce	Polis
Crenshaw	Kaptur	Pompeo
Culberson	Keating	Posey
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Price, Tom
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Ratcliffe
DeGette	King (IA)	Reed
DelBene	Kinzinger (IL)	Reichert
Denham	Kline	Renacci
DeSantis	Knight	Ribble
DesJarlais	Kuster	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Richmond
Dingell	LaMalfa	Rigell
Doggett	Lamborn	Roby
Doyle, Michael	Lance	Roe (TN)
F.	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Duffy	Latta	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (SC)	Lieu, Ted	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Rokita
Edwards	Lofgren	Rooney (FL)
Ellison	Long	Roskam
Ellmers (NC)	Loudermilk	Ross
Emmer (MN)	Love	Rothfus
Eshoo	Lucas	Rouzer
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Royce
Fattah		

Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)	Walker
Russell	Speier	Walorski
Ryan (WI)	Stefanik	Walters, Mimi
Salmon	Stewart	Walz
Sánchez, Linda	Stivers	Waters, Maxine
T.	Stutzman	Weber (TX)
Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)	Welch
Sanford	Thompson (MS)	Wenstrup
Scalise	Thompson (PA)	Westerman
Schweikert	Thornberry	Westmoreland
Scott (VA)	Tiberi	Whitfield
Scott, Austin	Tipton	Williams
Sensenbrenner	Titus	Wilson (SC)
Sessions	Trott	Wittman
Shimkus	Turner	Womack
Shuster	Upton	Woodall
Simpson	Valadao	Yoder
Sinema	Vargas	Yoho
Sires	Veasey	Young (AK)
Smith (MO)	Vela	Young (IA)
Smith (NE)	Wagner	Young (IN)
Smith (NJ)	Walberg	Zeldin
Smith (TX)	Walden	Zinke

NOES—129

Aguilar	Frelinghuysen	Meeks
Ashford	Fudge	Meng
Barletta	Gallego	Murphy (FL)
Bass	Garamendi	Nadler
Beatty	Goodlatte	Napolitano
Beyer	Graham	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Granger	Payne
Blumenauer	Hahn	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hastings	Peters
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)	Pocan
F.	Higgins	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Quigley
Brooks (IN)	Honda	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Capps	Huffman	Ros-Lehtinen
Carney	Hurd (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Israel	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Chaffetz	Jolly	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Katko	Schakowsky
Ciциlline	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Clyburn	Kennedy	Schrader
Comstock	Kildee	Scott, David
Cooper	Kilmer	Serrano
Crowley	Kind	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	King (NY)	Sherman
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Takai
Delaney	Lawrence	Takano
DeLauro	Lee	Tonko
Dent	Levin	Torres
DeSaulnier	Lewis	Tsongas
Deutch	Lipinski	Van Hollen
Dold	Loeb sack	Velázquez
Donovan	Lowenthal	Visclosky
Duckworth	Lowe y	Wasserman
Engel	Lynch	Schultz
Esty	MacArthur	Watson Coleman
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Weber (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McDermott	Wilson (FL)
Foster	McNerney	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Meehan	

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Cleaver	Maloney,
Becerra	DeFazio	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Fincher	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2309

Mr. LOWENTHAL changed his vote
from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. DINGELL changed her vote
from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will
read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016”.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, directed her to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DELANEY. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DELANEY. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Delaney moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2577 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the "Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation" account, on page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount relating to capital investments, insert "(increased by \$6,000,000)".

Page 116, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,000,000)".

Mr. DELANEY (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. DELANEY. Madam Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill, which

will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, imagine if this Congress were focused on how the forces of innovation and globalization were changing our economy and making it harder for our businesses to compete, large and small.

Madam Speaker, imagine if this Congress were focused on the fact that, while we are creating jobs, we are increasingly creating two types of jobs—high-skilled jobs, which are reserved for those people with the best educations, and low-skilled, low-paid jobs. Increasingly, we are not creating middle-skilled jobs—the kind of jobs that have supported middle class families for decades.

Madam Speaker, imagine if this Congress were focused on the fact that, while the standard of living of average Americans is going down, the friction in their lives is going up, including the fact that so many of them have longer commutes—overbearing commutes—because of inadequate transportation, commutes that are taking time away from their families and from their communities.

Madam Speaker, if this Congress were focused on those three things, then it would quickly conclude that our top domestic economic priority should be increasing our investment in our infrastructure because this Congress would understand that rebuilding America makes us more competitive. This Congress would understand that a national infrastructure program is the best jobs program we could have because it creates good jobs, and it is sound economics.

□ 2315

This Congress would understand that better infrastructure improves the quality of life of our constituents; and because it has been so bipartisan for so many years, it could be something that unifies us, and it would understand that rebuilding America is not an expense but an investment, and we would probably score it that way dynamically.

But unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that is not the Congress we have here this evening because we are doing precisely the opposite this evening, and we are cutting our investment in infrastructure. When you look at the facts, that is a strange conclusion indeed.

But, Madam Speaker, I am optimistic. I am optimistic that one day, hopefully soon, this Congress can do something transformative around infrastructure and rebuild our country. I believe we can pay for it by fixing our broken international tax system, where we have trillions of dollars trapped overseas, and creating pathways for that money to come back to rebuild our country.

While we wait for that day to happen, Madam Speaker, we still should be doing smart and sensible things to improve our infrastructure. My amendment does that.

My amendment increases funding for Amtrak so they can better implement the positive train control system, which is technology that is proven to make commuter rail trains safer. The National Transportation Safety Board has said that, if this system were in place since 2004, we would have had 30 fewer accidents, including preventing that terrible tragedy that we all stood here and mourned about 30 days ago in Pennsylvania.

So I ask my colleagues to support the amendment to increase funding for Amtrak so that they can better implement smart technology, the positive train control system. Like most investments in infrastructure, it is good for our constituents—in this case, public safety—and it is also a good investment for our country. I urge support of the Democratic motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, this bill that is in front of us funds programs that are the backbone of our economy and the safety net of those who need it. These are issues that we must fund responsibly, adequately, and on time. This bill does precisely just that. It does so after a lengthy, open process. It does so while looking at the individual issues one by one.

I know some people like to criticize this Congress. This is not the Congress—that made "shovel-ready" a joke phrase. This is a Congress who wants to act responsibly, and this bill does just that. It makes the most of what we have. It makes the most of what we have in our coffers. It acknowledges that we can't just simply have everything that everybody wants at a time when we do have to pick priorities, when we have to spend responsibly and wisely. This bill in front of us has no tax increases, Madam Speaker.

Now, let's be very clear: fostering economic growth has always been a top priority in our appropriations bills, and this one is no different. You see, our businesses and communities rely on safe and efficient roads and rails and waterways and airways to facilitate the billions and billions of dollars of commerce that our economy depends on. So we choose to prioritize transportation infrastructure projects that will help improve our Nation as a whole; that will make traveling across the country easier; and, make no mistake, that will also make traveling across country safer, a safer place to travel.

Madam Speaker, from increasing funding for critical agencies like the FAA, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to providing the Federal Railroad Administration with the resources it needs for its safety and research programs, this bill does not sacrifice safety in any way at all, in any shape or form.

Madam Speaker, the other primary responsibility of this bill is to provide for important housing programs. It ensures that our veterans continue to have access to the VASH program. It takes care of our most vulnerable citizens, such as the elderly and people with disabilities. It does that.

Let me just briefly address the specifics of this motion.

We have already taken action on the floor to add \$9 million to Amtrak for inward-facing cameras to improve the safety of Amtrak's operation, but let me say something else. We have spent literally hundreds of hours on this bill. We have done so in a bipartisan way, in an open way. We held six public hearings with agency and department heads—six public hearings. We considered amendments in committee, and we have spent, as all of you know, 3 days on the floor now and considered about 80 amendments on this bill after 3 days in an open, transparent process. It has been an open and transparent process. We have taken amendments on this floor from both sides of the aisle.

So despite, obviously, budgetary constraints, this bill accomplishes all of what it should. We have worked hard at what we had to fund, and we got it done in a smart, purposeful, responsible way, yes.

Let me say something else that this Congress is doing. We are making serious progress on our appropriations bills this year. We are moving ahead faster and through an open process faster than we have in many years, getting the necessary work done in a timely and open and responsible fashion.

So now we have this motion to recommit. What is the purpose of this motion to recommit? Why wasn't it done as an amendment during the 3 days when we were here?

I urge a "no" vote, and let's get this good bill passed out of the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DELANEY. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX,

this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 244, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

AYES—181

Aguilar	Graham	O'Rourke
Ashford	Grayson	Pallone
Bass	Green, Al	Pascarell
Beatty	Green, Gene	Payne
Bera	Grijalva	Pelosi
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Peters
Blumenauer	Hastings	Peterson
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Himes	Polis
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Quigley
Bustos	Hoyer	Rangel
Butterfield	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Capps	Israel	Richmond
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jeffries	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cioccilino	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kuster	Scott, David
Connolly	Langevin	Serrano
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costa	Lawrence	Sinema
Courtney	Lee	Sires
Crowley	Levin	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Loeback	Takai
DeGette	Lofgren	Takano
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Titus
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
Dingell	(NM)	Torres
Doggett	Lynch	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Matsui	Vargas
Edwards	McCollum	Veasey
Ellison	McDermott	Vela
Engel	McGovern	Velázquez
Eshoo	McNerney	Visclosky
Esty	Meeks	Walz
Fattah	Meng	Wasserman
Foster	Moore	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Waters, Maxine
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Gabbard	Nadler	Welch
Gallego	Napolitano	Wilson (CO)
Garamendi	Neal	Yarmuth
	Nolan	
	Norcross	

NOES—244

Abraham	Boustany	Coffman
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Cole
Allen	Brat	Collins (GA)
Amash	Bridenstine	Collins (NY)
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Barletta	Buchanan	Cook
Barr	Buck	Costello (PA)
Barton	Bucshon	Cramer
Benishek	Burgess	Crawford
Bilirakis	Byrne	Crenshaw
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)	Curbelo (FL)
Black	Carter (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Chabot	Denham
Blum	Chaffetz	Dent
Bost	Clawson (FL)	DeSantis

DesJarlais	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Diaz-Balart	Kinzing (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Dold	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Donovan	Knight	Rohrabacher
Duffy	Labrador	Rokita
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rooney (FL)
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Ellmers (NC)	Lance	Roskam
Emmer (MN)	Latta	Ross
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Fitzpatrick	Long	Rouzer
Fleischmann	Loudermilk	Royce
Fleming	Love	Russell
Flores	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Salmon
Fortenberry	Lummis	Sanford
Fox	MacArthur	Scalise
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Schweikert
Frelinghuysen	Marino	Scott, Austin
Garrett	Massie	Sensenbrenner
Gibbs	McCarthy	Sessions
Gibson	McCaul	Shimkus
Gohmert	McClintock	Shuster
Goodlatte	McHenry	Simpson
Gosar	McKinley	Smith (MO)
Gowdy	McMorris	Smith (NE)
Granger	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)
Graves (GA)	McSally	Smith (TX)
Graves (LA)	Meadows	Stefanik
Graves (MO)	Meehan	Stewart
Griffith	Messer	Stivers
Grothman	Mica	Stutzman
Guinta	Miller (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Hanna	Moolenaar	Tiberi
Hardy	Mooney (WV)	Tipton
Harper	Mullin	Trott
Harris	Mulvaney	Turner
Hartzler	Murphy (PA)	Upton
Heck (NV)	Neugebauer	Valadao
Hensarling	Newhouse	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Noem	Walberg
Hice, Jody B.	Nugent	Walden
Hill	Nunes	Walker
Holding	Olson	Walorski
Hudson	Palazzo	Walters, Mimi
Huelskamp	Palmer	Weber (TX)
Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen	Webster (FL)
Hultgren	Pearce	Wenstrup
Hunter	Perry	Westerman
Hurd (TX)	Pittenger	Westmoreland
Hurt (VA)	Pitts	Whitfield
Issa	Poe (TX)	Williams
Jenkins (KS)	Poliquin	Wilson (SC)
Jenkins (WV)	Pompeo	Wittman
Johnson (OH)	Posey	Womack
Johnson, Sam	Price, Tom	Woodall
Jolly	Ratcliffe	Yoder
Jones	Reed	Yoho
Jordan	Reichert	Young (AK)
Joyce	Renacci	Young (IA)
Katko	Ribble	Young (IN)
Kelly (MS)	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
Kelly (PA)	Rigell	Zinke
King (IA)	Roby	

NOT VOTING—8

Adams	Cleaver	Fincher
Becerra	DeFazio	Maloney,
Cárdenas	Farr	Carolyn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2329

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 210, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

YEAS—216

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman

Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger

Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—210

Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bustos

Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Comstock

Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell

Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)

Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Posey

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Becerra
Cárdenas

Cleaver
DeFazio
Fincher

Maloney,
Carolyn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2335

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2577, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 2577, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, including the changes now at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the changes.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the amendment offered by Mr. Meehan of Pennsylvania, insert "first" before "dollar" in the instruction regarding page 2, line 13.

In the amendment offered by Mr. Burgess of Texas, insert "reduced by" before "\$4,000,000" in the instruction regarding page 2, line 13.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2289, COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2289, to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to accurately reflect the actions of the House including changing "14" to "13" in the ninth instruction on the third page of the amendment by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2383

Mr. PITTENGER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2383.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

KEEP THE DREAM ALIVE IN MEDORA, NORTH DAKOTA

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, big things are happening in the small cow town of Medora, North Dakota.

The famed Medora Musical, also known as the Greatest Show in the West, is celebrating 50 years of entertaining and inspiring visitors while paying tribute to American values like family, patriotism, and faith in God, and, of course, the legacies of Theodore Roosevelt and Harold Schafer.

Medora serves as the gateway to Theodore Roosevelt National Park, named for the city slicker turned cowboy who ranched the Badlands of Dakota Territory before going back East, refreshed and restored, to accomplish big things.

Madam Speaker, tonight, I am thankful that God gave us the Badlands and Theodore Roosevelt and that he gave a dream to Harold Schafer and that, today, the Theodore Roosevelt Medora Foundation keeps that dream alive in beautiful Medora, North Dakota.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 10, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 114th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

TRENT KELLY, First District of Mississippi.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1739. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report to Congress entitled, "Section 503 of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act: Prospective Payment System for Federally-Qualified Health Centers and Rural Health Clinics Transition Grants", pursuant to Sec. 503 of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1740. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Michigan; Part 3 Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0824; FRL-9928-35-Region 5] received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1741. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0528; FRL-9928-59-Region 7] received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1742. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri, Construction Permits Required [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0123; FRL-9928-60-Region 7] received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1743. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Biomass Fuel-Burning Equipment Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0089; FRL-9928-65-Region 3] received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1744. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — n-Butyl benzoate; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0265; FRL-9927-65] received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1745. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Aluminum sulfate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0207; FRL-9927-66] received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1746. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District

[EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0228; FRL-9928-07-Region 9] received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1747. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2015-0220; FRL-9927-67] received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1748. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alkyl (C8-20) Polyglucoside Esters; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0678; FRL-9927-19] received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1749. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; 2011 Lead Base Year Emissions Inventory [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0311; FRL-9928-68-Region 3] received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1750. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-033; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1751. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-016; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1752. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a list of international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to Congress within sixty days, in accordance with the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1753. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati 2014 management report, pursuant to the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1754. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka 2014 management report, pursuant to the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1755. A letter from the Chairman and the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1756. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; Subrogation and Reimbursement Recovery (RIN: 3206-AN14) received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1757. A letter from the Branch Chief, Border Security Regulations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland

Security, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Changes to the Visa Waiver Program to Implement the Electronic System for Travel Authorization (ESTA) Program and the Fee for Use of the System [Docket Nos.: USCBP-2008-003 and USCBP-2010-0025] (RIN: 1651-AA72 and RIN 1651-AA83) received June 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1758. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0286; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-004-AD; Amendment 39-18145; AD 2015-08-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1759. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0936; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-058-AD; Amendment 39-18153; AD 2015-09-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1760. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate previously held by Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0038; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-023-AD; Amendment 39-18146; AD 2015-09-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1761. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1130; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-008-AD; Amendment 39-18150; AD 2015-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1762. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Baghdad (ORBB) Flight Information Region (FIR) [Docket No.: FAA-2003-14766; Amendment No.: 91-327A; SFAR No.: 77] (RIN: 2120-AK60) received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1763. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Prohibition of Fixed-Wing Special Visual Flights Rules Operations at Washington-Dulles International Airport; Withdrawal [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0190; Amdt. No.: 91-337] (RIN: 2120-AK69) received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1764. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Major final rule — Clean Water Rule: Definition of "Waters of the United States" [EPA-HQ-OW-2011-0880; FRL-9927-20-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF30) received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on

Transportation and Infrastructure.

1765. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Rotary Club of Fort Lauderdale New River Raft Race, New River; Fort Lauderdale, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0024] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1766. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Security Zone; Portland Rose Festival on Willamette River, Portland, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0484] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1767. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the determination of a waiver of authority under Secs. 402(d)(1) and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, with respect to Belarus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1768. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the determination of a waiver of authority under Sec. 402(d)(1) 409 of the Trade Act of 1974, Pub. L. 93-618, as amended, with respect to Turkmenistan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1769. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before an Administrative Law Judge [Docket No.: SSA-2014-0034] (RIN: 0960-AH67) received June 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1770. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Presidential Determination No. 2015-07, Suspension of Limitations under the Jerusalem Embassy Act, Pub. L. 104-45, Sec. 7(a); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

1771. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Documents and Regulations Management, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Shared Savings Program; Accountable Care Organizations [CMS-1461-F] (RIN: 0938-AS06) received June 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 906. A bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters; with an amendment (Rept. 114-142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1734. A bill to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish require-

ments for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment (Rept. 114-143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NUNES: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 2596. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-144, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 303. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-145). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2596 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2688. A bill to block any action from being taken to finalize or give effect to a certain proposed rule governing the Federal child support enforcement program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California (for herself and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 2689. A bill to clarify the scope of eligible water resources projects under the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 2690. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate regulations clarifying the circumstances under which, consistent with the standards governing the privacy and security of individually identifiable health information promulgated by the Secretary under sections 262(a) and 264 of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, health care providers and covered entities may disclose the protected health information of patients with a mental illness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2691. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adjudicate and pay survivor's benefits without requiring the filing of a formal claim, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr.

MEEEKS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2692. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the above-the-line deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers and to allow Head Start teachers the same above-the-line deduction for supplies as is allowed to elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAT (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2693. A bill to designate the arbo-retum at the Hunter Holmes McGuire VA Medical Center in Richmond, Virginia, as the "Phyllis E. Galanti Arboretum"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. HAHN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MENG, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MEEEKS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 2694. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each State to ensure that each individual who provides identifying information to the State motor vehicle authority is automatically registered to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State unless the individual does not meet the eligibility requirements for registering to vote in such elections or declines to be registered to vote in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 2695. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that return information from tax-exempt organizations be made available in a searchable format and to provide the disclosure of the identity of contributors to certain tax-exempt organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2696. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require certain health insurance premium increase information submitted to the Secretary of Health and Human Services be disclosed to Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FARR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. NOR-TON):

H.R. 2697. A bill to assist in the conservation of rare felids and rare canids by supporting and providing financial resources for the conservation programs of nations within the range of rare felid and rare canid populations and projects of persons with demonstrated expertise in the conservation of rare felid and rare canid populations; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LONG, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. NUNES, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WALBERG, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 2698. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on indoor tanning services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2699. A bill to modernize the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2700. A bill to require all recreational vessels to have and post passenger capacity limits, to amend title 46, United States Code, to authorize States to enter into contracts for the provision of boating safety education services under State recreational boating safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2701. A bill to direct the President to impose duties on merchandise from the People's Republic of China in an amount equivalent to the estimated annual loss of revenue to holders of United States intellectual property rights as a result of violations of such intellectual property rights in China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2702. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to passenger motor vehicle crash avoidance information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 2703. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for employers establishing workplace child care facilities, to increase the child care credit to encourage greater use of quality child care services, to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities, and to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 2704. A bill to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2705. A bill to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 2706. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide priority for the establishment of new national cemeteries by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 2707. A bill to ensure a legislative solution for those individuals who may be affected by ObamaCare's unlawful implementation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2708. A bill to direct the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a study on cyber attack standards of measurement; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

46. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 89, urging the Congress of the United States to pass legislation that establishes a national, uniform, and scientifically-based label program for genetically modified food; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

47. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 10, urging the Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation to create the Willamette Falls National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

48. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 4, urging Congress to enact the Marketplace Fairness Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 9, respectfully requesting that the Congress of the United States expedite appropriation of funds to enhance efforts to monitor and prevent the spread of aquatic invasive species and to implement the intent of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

50. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial 1008, urging the United States Department of Veterans Affairs to review the disability rating process; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

51. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 0414, urging the United States Congress to take prompt action to reauthorize the James Zadroga 9/11 family of programs and to fully fund these programs; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

52. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial 1006, urging the United States Congress to vote to approve the Keystone XL oil pipeline; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California:

H.R. 2689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 2690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 2693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 (related to the power of Congress to raise and support armies) and Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 (related to the power of Congress to exercise exclusive legislation over needful buildings).

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 2698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, [. . .]"

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, and Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress's Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 2702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which reads "The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 2703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 2707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution gives Congress the power to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof." This legislation puts forth measures relating to the treatment of existing commerce and the exchange of health care products, services, and transactions as regulated by the Affordable Care Act.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and requirements outlined in the National Security Act of 1947. Article I, section 8 gives Congress the power "to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." The Necessary and Proper Clause of that section also grants Congress the power "[t]o make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof." Title I, Sec. 101 of the National Security Act of 1947, requires the National Security Council to "assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security; for the purpose of making recommendations . . ."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. YODER, Mr. DENT, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. POLIS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 9: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 136: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 169: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 218: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 223: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 232: Mr. REED, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 235: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 276: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 303: Mr. JONES, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 359: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 395: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 413: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 420: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 430: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 470: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 478: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 511: Mr. NUNES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 532: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 540: Mr. CONNOLLY and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 546: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 556: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. FLEMING, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 563: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 581: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 584: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 592: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 602: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 614: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 625: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 632: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 653: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 662: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 664: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 692: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 699: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 702: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. HULTGREN.

- H.R. 716: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 721: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BERA, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 731: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 757: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 766: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 767: Mr. HURT of Virginia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 772: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 774: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 775: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 781: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 785: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 789: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 825: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 840: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 845: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 846: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 855: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 865: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 868: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NUNES, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 921: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 932: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 963: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 969: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 985: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 986: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 989: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 990: Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1013: Mr. BEYER and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1023: Ms. HAHN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1062: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 1101: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1120: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 1141: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1145: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1151: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1153: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1161: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1171: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1178: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1181: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1185: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1188: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 1197: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1202: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1211: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 1233: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 1247: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1266: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1267: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1289: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1300: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 1301: Mr. FLORES, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1355: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1356: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ZINKE, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1375: Mr. HIMES, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1388: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1391: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1399: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1401: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1424: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 1427: Mr. CHABOT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1439: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1475: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 1496: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1533: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1546: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1549: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1552: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1555: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1559: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BERA, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1567: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1572: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 1602: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 1610: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1616: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1624: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1635: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1666: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1671: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1684: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1705: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 1726: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1742: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1748: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1752: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1760: Mr. WELCH, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1768: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1769: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1775: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1786: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1814: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1832: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1853: Mr. MESSER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1854: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1902: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1925: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1932: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1933: Mr. SIREs and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1994: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 2014: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 2019: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. HURT of Virginia.
H.R. 2025: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2026: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2042: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LONG, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLORES, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KLINE, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2044: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2058: Mr. YODER, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. HURT of Virginia.
H.R. 2061: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2096: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2123: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2132: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2148: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2156: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 2167: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2255: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2259: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 2260: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2280: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2295: Mr. TURNER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2300: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2302: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 2309: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2323: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2328: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2342: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2360: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2382: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 2400: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. PITTINGER.
H.R. 2404: Ms. PINGREE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. Ellmers of North Carolina, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GIBSON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2441: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2450: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2493: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2494: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COOK, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2506: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2508: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2535: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2536: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2538: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2540: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2544: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2545: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2568: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2590: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 2606: Mr. PALMER, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2610: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2611: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2623: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2634: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2647: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2657: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2660: Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2669: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2670: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TAKAI, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 2680: Mr. TAKANO.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 12: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H. Res. 14: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H. Res. 107: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 130: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Res. 145: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. EDWARDS.

H. Res. 154: Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 203: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 209: Mr. DESANTIS.

H. Res. 233: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. Res. 248: Mrs. BLACK.

H. Res. 270: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 294: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 295: Ms. GABBARD.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2383: Mr. PITTENGER.

H. Res. 198: Mr. AMASH.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. DENHAM

AMENDMENT No. 32: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for high-speed rail in the State of California or for the California High-Speed Rail Authority, nor may any be used by the Federal Railroad Administration to administer a grant agreement with the California High-Speed Rail Authority that contains a tapered matching requirement.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. DENHAM

AMENDMENT No. 33: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for high-speed rail in the State of California or for the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. EMMER OF MINNESOTA

AMENDMENT No. 34: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any enrichment as defined in Appendix A to Part 611 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, for any New Start grant request.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GROTHMAN

AMENDMENT No. 35: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Housing Programs—Project-Based Rental Assistance" may be used for any family who is not an elderly family or a disabled family (as such terms are defined in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)) and who was not receiving project-based rental assistance under section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f) as of October 1, 2015, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is reduced by \$300,000,000.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GROTHMAN

AMENDMENT No. 36: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Public and Indian Housing Programs—Tenant-Based Rental Assistance" may be used for any family who is not an elderly family or a disabled family (as such terms are defined in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)) and who was not receiving tenant-based rental assistance under section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f) as of October 1, 2015, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is reduced, the amount specified under such heading for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts is reduced, and the amount specified under such heading for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program) is reduced, by \$300,000,000, \$210,000,000, and \$90,000,000, respectively.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 37: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 4 _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to establish any asset management position (including any account executive, senior account executive, and troubled asset specialist position, as such positions are described in the Field Resource Manual (Wave 1) entitled "Transformation: Multifamily for Tomorrow" of the Department of Housing and Urban Development) of the Office of Multifamily Housing of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or newly hire an employee for any asset management position, that is located at a Core office (as such term is used in such Field Resource Manual) before filling each such asset management position that is located at a Non-Core office (as such term is used in such Field Resource Manual) and has been vacated since October 1, 2015.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. LEWIS

AMENDMENT No. 38: Page 156, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SEC. 416. Notwithstanding Mortgagee Letter 2015-12 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (dated April 30, 2015) or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(1) implement the Mortgagee Optional Election (MOE) Assignment for home equity conversion mortgages (as set forth in Mortgagee Letter 2015-03, dated January 29, 2015), allowing additional flexibility for non-borrowing spouses to meet its requirements; and

(2) provide for a 5-year delay in foreclosure in the case of any other home equity conversion mortgage that—

(A) has an FHA Case Number assigned before August 4, 2014; and

(B) has a last surviving borrower who has died and who has a non-borrowing surviving spouse who does not qualify for the Mortgagee Optional Election and who, but for the death of such borrowing spouse, would be able to remain in the dwelling subject to the mortgage.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. ZELDIN

AMENDMENT No. 39: At the end of the bill, (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to institute an administrative or civil action (as defined in section 47107 of title 49, United States Code) against the sponsor of the East Hampton Airport in East Hampton, NY.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. PETERS

AMENDMENT No. 40: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order 11246 (relating to Equal Employment Opportunity).

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. HULTGREN

AMENDMENT No. 41: None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Aviation Administration for the biodata assessment in the hiring of Air Traffic Control Specialists.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. MEEHAN

AMENDMENT No. 42: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act for Amtrak capital grants may be used for projects off the Northeast Corridor until the level of capital spending by Amtrak for capital projects on the Northeast Corridor during fiscal year 2016 equals the amount of Amtrak's profits from Northeast Corridor operations during fiscal year 2015.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act shall be used by the Department of Defense to process pursuant to the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense entitled "Military Accessions Vital to National Interest (MAVNI) Program Eligibility" and dated November 2014 any application wherein an individual relies on a granted deferred action by the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) process established pursuant to the memorandum of the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled "Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children" and dated June 15, 2012.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10003. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Defense Logistics Agency to implement the Small

Business Administration interim final rule titled “Small Business Size Standards; Adoption of 2012 North American Industry Classification System” (published August 20, 2012, in the Federal Register) with respect to the procurement of footwear.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 3:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any of the following:

(1) Sections 2(b), 2(d), 2(g), 3(c), 3(e), 3(f), or 3(g) of Executive Order 13423.

(2) Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f)(iii-iv), 2(h), 7, 9, 12, 13, or 16 of Executive Order 13514.

(3) Subsection (e) and paragraphs (4), (9), (10), and (12) of subsection (c) of section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) Sections 400AA or 400 FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374, 6374e).

(5) Section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

(6) Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. HUFFMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Strike section 8053.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. MACARTHUR

AMENDMENT NO. 5: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest or retire, or to prepare to divest or retire, KC-10 aircraft.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH
ANNIVERSARY OF COTERIE

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. DeGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Coterie organization as they celebrate their 100th anniversary. I have the privilege of representing this outstanding organization and many of its members, who are truly a great asset to our community.

Established in 1915 by a small group of African American women in Denver who had a great thirst for knowledge, the group has persevered for a century. Since their founding at a time when the Ku Klux Klan predominated and then through two world wars, the Great Depression, economic recessions and segregation, their tradition has endured. Each year, Coterie has investigated a new research topic, choosing subjects as diverse as the ages and interests of their members. Through the years, topics have included Milton and English Drama, Contemporary Women Meeting Today's Challenge of the Space Age, The World's Great Opera, and Spotlighting Colorado Afro-American Achievers.

Since Coterie members understand the value that education brings to a community, they have shared it with countless others over their 100 year history. Members have been mentors to others and have inspired young people to continue their education. The findings from their research will be stored at the Blair Caldwell African American Research Library, an appropriate depository of their work given, its mission of "sharing resources and services about African-American History." The preservation of their work will enable future generations to benefit from their efforts for many decades to come.

Coterie has been an important part of African-American culture in Denver, and many of their members have also served as community leaders. Some of their notable living members include Marie Greenwood, who is now 102 years old, joined Coterie in 1937, and is the first African American woman to receive a contract to teach with Denver Public Schools. Erma Ford, now 89 years old and a member since 1958, served as past president of the Colorado Association of Early Childhood Education.

Life, present and past, has been their teacher. Please join me in celebrating 100 years of Coterie in their dedicated pursuit of knowledge.

HONORING ANITA GERSON FOR
RECEIVING THE 2015 DELORES
BARR WEAVER ELDER ADVOCATE
AWARD

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Macclenny, Florida resident Anita Gerson, recipient of the 2015 Delores Barr Weaver Elder Advocate Award from ElderSource, an organization devoted to helping seniors across North Florida live independent lives.

A dedicated volunteer, Mrs. Gerson, 87, has served the elderly since her youth with ElderSource as her latest focus. For the last 15 years, she has put the needs of Baker County, Florida elderly at the top of her list, serving on the ElderSource board of directors and ensuring organization services are efficient, effective, and meet client needs. Additionally, she brought her devotion to the Baker County Council on Aging, where she served on the board of directors for seven years and president for one year.

Mrs. Gerson has been described as a "woman of great passion, wisdom and humor"—qualities she embodies day-in and day-out as she cares for her community and those in need. She is a leader, a doer, does not shy away from hard work, and will stop at nothing to serve the elderly in her community.

"Bloom where you are planted," her mother once told her, and make a positive difference in the lives of those around you. She has met that goal and then some throughout her entire life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to please join me in a very special Congressional salute to volunteer leader Northeast Florida resident Anita Gerson—an example for us all.

HONORING CHRISTIE RAMPONE
AND CARLI LLOYD

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. MacARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two remarkably talented women, Christie Rampone and Carli Lloyd of New Jersey's Third Congressional District, for their participation on the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team.

I am proud to have Ms. Rampone and Ms. Lloyd represent not only the United States and New Jersey, but the people of Ocean County and Burlington County, on an international scale. As 2 of the 23 elite players offered membership onto the team, Ms. Rampone and

Ms. Lloyd are not only exceptional athletes, but extraordinary testaments to determination, commitment, and sportsmanship.

Ms. Rampone, of Point Pleasant, New Jersey, is a 1999 FIFA Women's World Cup champion and a three-time Olympic gold medalist, having won championship titles at the last 4 Summer Olympics. She has finished no lower than third place in each of the World Cup or Olympic tournaments in which she has competed while also being the mother of two young children.

Ms. Lloyd, of Delran, New Jersey, is a two-time Olympic gold medalist, scoring the gold medal-winning goals in the finals of both the 2008 and the 2012 Summer Olympics. She has also represented the United States at two FIFA Women's World Cup tournaments, winning bronze and silver respectively, and has scored over 50 goals in 190 games throughout her career on the U.S. Women's National Team.

Mr. Speaker, South Jersey applauds Christie Rampone and Carli Lloyd with tremendous pride and admiration for their achievements in soccer. It is my honor to recognize them before the United States House of Representatives.

CONGRATULATING THE AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY
WOMEN FLINT BRANCH ON ITS
95TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the American Association of University Women Flint Branch on the occasion of their 95th anniversary.

The AAUW Flint Branch was established in 1919 when 28 college-educated women formed a branch of the Western Association of Collegiate Alumnae. Throughout its history, the Flint Branch has actively supported regional, cultural, civic and educational programs and events.

The group gathers several times per year through membership meetings and book club gatherings. The meetings have consisted of guest speakers who educate members and initiate conversation around important issues affecting women and the greater community. Funds are raised through various initiatives allowing the branch to build awareness and advocate for worthy causes not just with its voice but also through financial support.

In 1922, an annual college scholarship of \$200 was established for worthy women students. This fund was continued for four years. In 1972, the Flint branch reinstated the annual

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

merit scholarship bestowed to a female student attending a college or university in Genesee County. The award is now \$1,000 and is renewable one additional year to each recipient along with a new yearly recipient. The branch also provides financial support to the Eleanor Roosevelt Fund, the Legal Advocacy Fund, and the National Women's Council facilitated through the AAUW National office.

Throughout the years, the Flint branch has been a strong supporter of Title IX and would keep area schools and athletic associations apprised of issues at the national level. The branch also actively supports non-profit organizations in Genesee County such as Carriage Town Mission, Whaley Children's Center and UM-Flint's MPowering My Success program. In the 1960s and 1970s the Flint branch of the AAUW organized large book sales at the Genesee Valley Mall to promote literacy and generate funds for its philanthropic endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the work done by the AAUW Flint Branch and thank them for the service they have provided to the City of Flint and the surrounding communities.

TRIBUTE TO TAIWAN PRESIDENT MA YING-JEOU ON PEACE AND DIPLOMACY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my unwavering support to the people of the Republic of China Taiwan. The United States and Taiwan are two like-minded countries. The Taiwanese people share our same cultural values of respect for individual liberties, freedom of speech, adherence to the rule of law, and support for human rights.

I would also like to take this opportunity to share a speech entitled "True Friendship Lasts Forever" delivered by Taiwan President Ma Ying-jeou on June 2, 2015, at a video conference at Stanford University. In his speech, President Ma delineated the importance of future cooperation opportunities between our two countries. Below is the summary of President Ma's speech. For the full transcript, please visit the website of the office of the President of the Republic of China: <http://www.president.gov.tw>.

"I am very happy to be here for today's videoconference. This year marks the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II, as well as the Republic of China's (ROC) victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan. In July 1937, two years before World War II broke out, ROC forces began fighting against Japanese aggression alone, and for four long years, they continued with virtually no outside help. It wasn't until the Pearl Harbor attack in December 1941 that the ROC joined forces with the Allies to declare war against Japan, Germany, and Italy.

Although the ROC and U.S. severed diplomatic ties in 1979, barely three months later, the U.S. Congress passed the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA). Under that Act, Taiwan is treated as a foreign government for purposes of U.S. law and in U.S. courts. The Act also

requires the U.S. to provide Taiwan with defensive weapons.

Since I came into office in 2008, mutual ROC-U.S. trust has been restored at the highest levels of government. And over the past two years, there have been frequent, reciprocal visits by high-level officials. In April 2014, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Gina McCarthy visited Taiwan, and Charles Rivkin, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs is visiting Taiwan now. At the same time, heads of various ROC government agencies have visited the U.S., so there is a solid foundation of mutual trust there.

In addition to strong security ties, Taiwan-U.S. trade relations have also made significant progress over the last few years. In March 2013, after a five-year hiatus, we reopened negotiations with the U.S. under the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement (TIFA), a platform set up in 1994 to facilitate talks in trade and investment matters. We have continued bilateral consultations in a series of 12 work conferences, and have made significant progress. At the end of March 2015, the ROC is America's 10th largest trading partner, surpassing Brazil and Saudi Arabia, and the U.S. is Taiwan's third largest, after mainland China and Japan.

Let me turn to cross-strait relations. Over the past seven years, Taiwan and mainland China have signed 21 agreements. During that same period, visitors from mainland China have made over 14 million trips to Taiwan, almost four million of them in the past year alone. So the cross-strait situation is more stable and peaceful than it has ever been in the past 66 years.

In addition to seeking stable development in cross-strait and ROC-U.S. relations, Taiwan has also taken concrete actions over the past few years to be a regional peacemaker in both the East China Sea, and the South China Sea. Back in August 2012, I proposed the East China Sea Peace Initiative. That Initiative asks stakeholders to forgo conflict in favor of peaceful negotiations, and emphasizes cooperation in sharing resources. Eight months later in April 2013, Taiwan and Japan signed a fisheries agreement that embodies the spirit of that Initiative, and solved a fisheries dispute between Taiwan and Japan that has troubled both countries for 40 years. That agreement elicited widespread praise and support from the global community. Secretary of State John Kerry has publicly stated that the ROC-Japan fisheries agreement is a model for promoting regional stability, and that the principles at the heart of the East China Sea Peace Initiative apply to all of the waters in Asia.

In the East China Sea, the East China Sea Peace Initiative encourages stakeholders to shelve their disputes, and cooperate to create win-win situations. Its success makes it a model for peaceful development in the South China Sea. On May 26, 2015, I formally announced the South China Sea Peace Initiative, hoping that the relevant parties will: "shelve sovereignty dispute, pursue peace and reciprocity, and promote joint exploration and development." By upholding those principles, we hope that all the parties involved will work together to maintain regional peace and promote regional development. A U.S. State De-

partment official stated that the U.S. appreciates the proposals in the South China Sea Peace Initiative. I sincerely hope that all of the outstanding scholars and experts gathered here will support the pursuit of peace."

Mr. Speaker, this tribute recognizes the importance of the relationship between the United States and the Republic of China Taiwan as strategic partners under the Taiwan Relations Act.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF SENIOR JUDGE WIL- LIAM STAFFORD

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Judge William Stafford for his 40 years as a federal judge on the bench of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida. Since receiving his appointment by President Gerald Ford on May 30, 1975, Judge Stafford has worked tirelessly to uphold our Constitution, and his service is a true testament to his patriotism and commitment to justice.

Judge Stafford's service to our Nation began many years prior to his appointment as a federal judge, when, as a recent law school graduate, he joined the United States Navy, serving with honor and distinction until 1960. After nearly a decade in private practice, Judge Stafford served as a United States Attorney for the Northern District of Florida from 1969 until he received his appointment to serve as a federal judge.

During his time on the bench, Judge Stafford has served in numerous important positions, including more than 10 years as Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida and nearly 20 years as Senior Judge. In addition, he also served for 7 years as a judge on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which helps ensure that our Nation remains safe from those who seek to do us harm.

As a result of his excellence on the bench, Judge Stafford has received numerous professional appointments and awards. He served nearly a decade on the Committees of Judicial Conference of the United States, a position appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, in addition to myriad committee assignments with the Florida Bar, and a term as President of the District Judges Association of the Eleventh Circuit. Judge Stafford has also received recognitions including the Temple Law Alumni Achievement Award and the American Bar Association's Law Day USA National Speech Award, and his commitment to the legal profession saw him help found the American Inns of Court's Tallahassee Inn, which was renamed the William H. Stafford American Inn of Court in his honor.

Judge Stafford's commitment to service and dedication to his community extend far beyond his judicial service, and he has served both St. John's Episcopal Church in Tallahassee and Christ Church in Pensacola, in addition to service in the Brotherhood of St. Andrew and

the Dioceses of Florida and of the Central Gulf Coast. As a leader in civic society, Judge Stafford is a longtime Rotary Club member, having served as President of the Tallahassee Rotary Club and received awards such as the Frederick Clifton Moor Award; served as President of the Tallahassee YMCA; and served on numerous Boards, including the Friends of Leon County Library Board, Sacred Heart Hospital of Pensacola's Board of Directors, as well as the Board of Directors of the Pensacola Symphony. He is also a longtime member of fraternal organizations and has received both the Grand Cross of Honour from the Scottish Rite and was named Grand Orator.

Our Constitutional system of government enshrined checks and balances and three co-equal but separate branches of government, and in order to uphold our Constitution, it is vital that we have honorable public servants like Judge Stafford willing to dedicate their professional careers to service in the judicial branch. On behalf of the House of Representatives, I am privileged to recognize Judge Stafford's 40 years on the federal bench, and my wife Vicki and I send our best wishes for many more years to Judge Stafford; his wife, Nancy; sons William III, Donald and David; six grandchildren; and the entire Stafford family.

HONORING THE UPCOMING WEDDING OF ALEX FERNANDEZ AND ROBERT WOLFARTH

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the upcoming nuptials of Alex Fernandez and Robert Wolfarth.

Robert Wolfarth and Alex Fernandez of south Florida will be getting married in the District of Columbia at the Florida House on Capitol Hill. Their wedding ceremony marks the first same-sex marriage at the Florida House following its lawful recognition in the state through judicial ruling.

Giving back to their community has been a centerpiece of Robert and Alex's professional lives and of their relationship. Robert, the grandson of former Miami Mayor William M. Wolfarth, and Alex, a public servant since the age of 15, met on September 25th, 2006 at Miami-Dade County Hall where Alex worked at the time as a Press Secretary. The two were immediately bonded by a shared passion for public service.

Alex proudly served as an aide to Miami Beach Mayor Matti Herrera Bower and was her liaison to the LGBT Affairs Committee playing an instrumental role in the inaugural Miami Beach Gay Pride. As a successful real estate entrepreneur, Robert's most cherished professional accomplishment has been hiring an undocumented immigrant, helping her become an American citizen, obtain a real estate salesperson license, and achieve the American Dream of homeownership. A member of the Miami Beach Hispanic Affairs Board, Alex has been an active advocate for workforce housing for residents being displaced from their homes and community by the rising cost of living and real estate values.

Among their many professional and civic endeavors, Robert and Alex are most proud of their mutual service to the communities they love, Miami-Dade County and Miami Beach. Whether it be through the rescue of their three dogs from the shelter, or the distribution of pumpkin pies to the less fortunate on Thanksgiving, or through their past service on the Planning, Affordable Housing, or Charter Review Boards, Robert and Alex find in each day of their relationship the opportunity to make a positive impact in the lives of others.

Through their marriage and the continued support of their friends and loved ones, Robert and Alex hope to demonstrate that as a nation, states, and communities we are strengthened through the contributions of countless loving and committed American same-sex couples seeking the fundamental right to the pursuit of happiness.

On this special occasion, I wish Robert and Alex many continued years of love, health, and happiness as they enter this blessed new stage of their lives together.

**REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
FRED MILLER**

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember the life of Fred Miller of Toledo, Ohio. Passing from this life at the age of 88, Fred lived life to the fullest.

Fred Miller was born on March 28, 1925 to Mattie and Roy Miller. A lifelong Toledoan, he graduated from DeVilbiss High School in 1943 and soon followed graduation with service in the U.S. Army Air Corps in Europe until after World War II. Upon his return home, he enrolled in the University of Toledo where he graduated in 1949 with a degree in electrical engineering. A few months later he married his wife Dorothy. Dorothy and Fred were married 64 years and together raised three sons.

Fred Miller built his career at the Toledo Edison Company, giving the company 38 years of service.

A man of faith and service to others, Fred was an active member of Aldersgate United Methodist Church where he served on the finance committee for many years. He also found time to serve as a Boy Scout leader.

Retirement saw Fred furthering his skills as an angler, fishing all over North America from Alaska to the Florida Keys. He and Dorothy were fortunate to travel the world. He was also able to indulge in his hobbies of photography and building model airplanes.

Fred Miller was a loving husband, father and grandfather. He was a man who gave fully to his family, his faith and his community. May those who loved him find peace in the memory of his spirit and the imprint he leaves on their lives.

TRIBUTE TO CLINT CALLICOTT

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee 7th Congressional District, home to Williamson County, was shaped in part by its long-time leader, and a dear friend of mine, Clint Callicott.

Mr. Callicott's time on Earth will be remembered by his service to others. During his time on the Williamson county commission, as county Mayor and in the Tennessee General Assembly, Clint served the people of his community with distinction and passion. He leaves behind a legacy of love; love for his family, community, and the land.

Mr. Callicott was considered the "father" of the Williamson County Agriculture Exposition Park, home to rodeos, trade shows, and the Williamson County Fair. In gratitude for his work in establishing the Park, the facility's arena is named in his honor.

It is fitting that Clint Callicott spent his last hours on his family farm before joining our Savior in Heaven. I ask my colleagues to join with me in celebrating one of Williamson County's greatest men. My thoughts and prayers are with his beautiful wife Carolyn, sons Claude and Clayton, and his extended family.

RIVERVIEW/VALLEYVIEW CHRISTIAN AND MISSIONARY ALLIANCE CHURCH

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to congratulate the Riverview/Valleyview Christian and Missionary Alliance Church on the 100 year anniversary of their founding.

The Church was chartered by the Christian and Mission Alliance Organization in the Spring of 1915, in the Village of Endicott, New York. A church was built on the north side of the Susquehanna River and named "Riverview Christian and Missionary Alliance." In the mid 1980's a new larger church was built on a hill across the river in Vestal, New York, and the name changed to Valleyview Christian and Missionary Alliance. On June 13, 2015, the congregation will celebrate the 100th year anniversary of the founding of their Church, under the current leadership of its pastor, Rev. David M. Murphy.

Valleyview Christian and Missionary Alliance has made a difference and is a valued institution for Christian stewardship.

HONORING MR. RICHARD K. UHLER

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mr. Richard K. Uhler for his service and sacrifice during the Second World War.

Mr. Uhler, of Springfield, Pennsylvania, served in the United States Army as a Private First Class with Company H, 2nd Battalion, 180th Infantry Regiment, 45th Infantry Division. He served bravely in the Anzio campaign, where he was wounded by shrapnel. Despite his service and injury, he never received the Purple Heart.

Mr. Uhler was among the millions of veterans whose records were tragically destroyed by a fire at the National Personnel Records Center during the 1970s. After diligent investigation, I'm pleased my office was able to find documentation for his service and the injuries he sustained in battle. Mr. Uhler will now finally receive the commendations he earned more than 70 years after he was wounded in Italy.

Mr. Speaker, this week I had the chance to host Mr. Uhler while he was presented with the Purple Heart and Bronze Star he earned for his service. On behalf of the 7th District of Pennsylvania, I want to thank Mr. Richard Uhler for his service to our great nation.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,809,942,589.13. We've added \$7,525,932,893,676.05 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALMA S. ADAMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 2015, I was absent for recorded votes #270 through #273 due to the passing of my mother.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here:

On Roll Call #270, I would have voted "yes."

On Roll Call #271, I would have voted "yes."

On Roll Call #272, I would have voted "yes."

On Roll Call #273, I would have voted "no."

RECOGNIZING THE CITY OF ZNIN, POLAND

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a milestone in the long life of the City of Znin, Poland, of which I am proud to be an honorary citizen. June 3, 2015 marks 25 years of local self-government for the nearly 15,000 people of Znin.

Znin, originating from the Polish word for harvest, is nestled on the river Gasawka in Poland. Though the region has been settled for far longer, the city itself is nearly 900 years old and was once a major town on the trade route known as the Amber Road. King Casimir the Great of Poland visited many times and it was also a favorite of bishops through the latter half of the 14th Century. Fires destroyed much of Znin in the later 15th Century, but the town was rebuilt and boasted the first windmill, orchards, breweries and businesses. The 17th and 18th centuries brought disease and more fires from which the town did not recover well. During the First Partition of Poland in the 1770's, Znin was annexed by Prussia. The town was liberated in 1794 through the Kosciuszko Uprising. It became part of the Duchy of Warsaw a few years later, but was returned to Prussia in 1815. The town's economy developed through the 19th Century, with modern infrastructure and its population growing to 4,500 citizens.

Znin's residents successfully participated in the 1919 Greater Poland Uprising. A new town council was elected and Polish was reestablished as the official language of the town's nearly 5,000 residents. Between the two World Wars, the economy perked up once again and Znin boasted two colleges and both daily and weekly newspapers.

On September 1, 1939, the Nazi Luftwaffe bombed Znin to start World War II. Nine days later, German troops overtook the town and once again Znin was wiped from the map of Europe. The Germans renamed the town and its streets, the children could not go to school and hundreds of people were deported or shot.

After the war, with Poland under the brutal thumb of the Soviet Union as a result of the Yalta Conference, the people of Znin again faced repression and fear. Soviet industrialization brought development to Znin, but its citizens were forced to live under the Soviet regime while Poland was under the sphere of Soviet Communism. The people of Poland never gave up, though, and the ensuing decades saw uprisings as the people tried to liberate themselves. Finally, a group of shipyard workers in Gdansk brought light to the people of Poland. Over the course of a decade between 1980 and 1989, Solidarity moved forward culminating in the election of its leader Lech Walesa in 1990 and a free Poland.

Thus, on its 25th anniversary of return to self-governance, the citizens of Znin look forward. The fires of the past drive them forth, but the light of the future carries them to new possibilities. I am so pleased to stand with my compatriots in Znin as together we celebrate 25 years of freedom. Naprzód!

RECOGNIZING LAWRENCE L. KITCHING, JR. AND TRUTECH HEATING AND COOLING

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Lawrence L. Kitching, Jr. and TruTech Heating and Cooling, the recipient of our 2015 District of Columbia Small Business of the Year award. The award is given to an outstanding D.C. small business every year at our annual Small Business Fair.

TruTech Heating and Cooling is a small business that was founded by Lawrence L. Kitching. Through hard work, determination, knowledge of his craft and excellence in performance, Mr. Kitching has grown his business significantly. Since opening in D.C. in 2012, TruTech Heating and Cooling has expanded its business into Maryland and Virginia. The business prides itself on quality craftsmanship, integrity and customer service. The technicians and professionals at TruTech Heating and Cooling are well-trained.

Mr. Kitching, a native Washingtonian and graduate of William McKinley Technical High School, learned heating, ventilation and air conditioning at Lincoln Technical Institute and received his diploma in 1997. After heading down the wrong path, Mr. Kitching decided to pursue a better life for himself and his son, and began working to improve his skills while in prison. After his release, he worked at a prominent air conditioning company in the D.C. area for seven years. Then, he boldly followed his passion to become an entrepreneur and left his job to start his own company. Mr. Kitching and his company are certified by the North American Technician Excellence, and are recognized as professionals in the industry.

We are particularly proud that TruTech Heating and Cooling has provided such an essential service to the members of our community. Lawrence Kitching has succeeded in a tough, competitive business environment. In the process, he has become an inspiration not only to our local small businesses but also to anyone who has had a poor start in life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Lawrence L. Kitching, Jr. for recommitting himself to the pursuit of excellence and integrity and to TruTech Heating and Cooling, the District of Columbia 2015 Small Business of the Year.

HONORING LAKE WORTH DRAINAGE DISTRICT AS IT CELEBRATES 100 YEARS OF OPERATION

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Lake Worth Drainage District, which is celebrating its 100th Anniversary of

providing water management services to the Palm Beach County community.

For the past 100 years, the District has managed the surface water resources of southeastern Palm Beach County. Overseeing a complex system of 500 miles of canals and 20 major water control structures, the Lake Worth Drainage District has continued to protect our lands from the dangers of both flood and drought. Their tireless efforts have not only met the demands of our evolving urban and agricultural communities, but also bolstered employment and business growth opportunities. The amount of time and effort the District and its employees have expended for the betterment of their community is truly admirable and exhibits a level of commitment worthy of recognition. With their support Palm Beach County has remained the Winter Vegetable Capital of the United States.

I happily congratulate the District and its employees on a century of hard work and dedication to the urban and agricultural community of South Florida. It is with great pleasure that I honor them.

HONORING THE CAREER OF CAROLYN SIMS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the career and celebrate the retirement of a dedicated and tireless public servant, Carolyn Sims, who most recently worked as Precinct Administrator for County Commissioner Gary Fickes of Tarrant County, Texas.

Carolyn was born in Dallas and built her career of local service on a strong educational foundation. At the University of North Texas she earned her Bachelors in Business Education and a Masters in Public School Administration, in addition to a vocational teaching certification and hours toward a counseling certification. After briefly beginning her professional life at a bank, she put her background to work in helping children. From 1973 to 1982 she served as an 8th grade teacher in the Irving and Grapevine-Colleyville Independent School Districts, teaching vocational subjects, including typing, and also serving as a counselor. Afterward, Carolyn worked for the latter as a volunteer coordinator.

She then ran her own secretarial business for several years and became a mother to Trey and Kate. With that business experience in hand, in 1989, Carolyn became the president of the Colleyville Area Chamber of Commerce, where she worked to advance the concerns and success of local business for six years. Afterwards, she became president of the Arts Council of Northeast Tarrant County from 1995 to 2002. Seeing her record of service, Texas Representative Vicki Truitt recruited Carolyn to serve as her chief of staff in Austin during the legislative session of 2003. Upon returning, she entered local government by becoming the director of marketing and public affairs for the Town of Westlake until 2006, and then worked into the next year as the executive director of the Northwest Independent School District Education Foundation.

Finally, Carolyn's record of leadership led her to becoming the Precinct Administrator, essentially a chief of staff role, for Tarrant County Commissioner Gary Fickes in 2007. In that position, she regularly worked with and served people from 17 cities.

Her admirable history of service to the community, however, does not end with her professional track. Carolyn is currently on the boards of the Tarrant County MHMR (providing practical help to people with mental health needs), the Northeast Tarrant County Chamber of Commerce, and the Northeast Leadership Forum. Over the years she has volunteered with and been an active participant in numerous civic organizations including: Community Enrichment Center, United Way, JPS, Southlake Toastmasters, Hugworks, Rotary Club, Hill Country Bible Church, Austin Aggie Moms, Alliance for Children, Women's Shelter, Metroport Cities Partnership, Southlake Business Women Organization, American Cancer Society, University of North Texas Alumni, and other Chamber of Commerce branches and school district education foundations. She has also had professional affiliations with Americans for the Arts, Texas Alliance for the Arts, Association of Fundraising Professionals, Texas Travel Industry Association, North Hills Hospital Board, and the Texas Chamber of Commerce Executives.

Suffice it to say, Carolyn loves to help others through her organizations and community service, listening to their concerns, sharing job opportunities, and providing means of assistance to those in need. She is the model of a citizen who dedicates her life to working hard for her neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking Carolyn Sims for her years of service to Tarrant County, and various aspects of the community within it, and in celebrating her well-earned retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on June 3, 2015, because of the death of a close friend. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Roll Call #288—Aye

Roll Call #289—Aye

Roll Call #290—Aye

Roll Call #291—Aye

Roll Call #292—Aye

Roll Call #293—Aye

Roll Call #294—Aye

Roll Call #295—Aye

Roll Call #296—Nay

Roll Call #297—Yea

RECOGNIZING MARGARET WUWERT'S LIFE OF SERVICE

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life's work of Margaret Wuwert of Toledo, Ohio. After building the once-fledgling Children's Rights Council into the well-respected organization it has become, Margaret recently was retired from the organization which bears her imprimatur.

Margaret Wuwert joined the Children's Rights Council in 1995 and was appointed as Chapter Leader in Toledo, Ohio. In just five years, by 2000 she had implemented one of the best Supervised Visitation/Access Centers in the United States. So many families have been able to visit their children at these visitation/access sites. Margaret recruited and mentored many others to start sites in other communities. Always, with the goal of helping children and families, Margaret's enthusiasm for her work has been boundless and infectious.

Margaret has also been an honored member of the National Office in Washington, DC where her knowledge and experience have been much-valued at board meetings and conferences. Her passion is clear, endless, and passed on to everyone who met her.

With money often a concern in keeping sites open, Margaret "worked day and night trying to get grant money and many times she gave up her own salary in order to not close the doors to Children's Rights Council" according to one of her colleagues. Working with the family court system, Margaret developed relationships with judges, CASA volunteers and community leaders to move forward the goals of the Children's Rights Council. In her quiet and earnest way, Margaret was able to make the system of court ordered supervised visits work in the best way possible for children and parents.

As a colleague she mentored noted, "The world is a better place because she cared about these children who had no way to see their other parent. There are not too many people like Margaret. If it were not for her. . . life would be so much more complicated."

Margaret Wuwert is a joyful soul who brought joy to families in tragic situations. Without her tireless efforts and dedication to her work, there would not be a Children's Rights Council able to offer the help to families it does today. For twenty years, Margaret Wuwert was the Children's Rights Council. She leaves shoes impossible to fill, but a strong organization which is integral to the needs of families who find themselves in the court system.

We thank Margaret Wuwert for her compassion, her spirit and her unending efforts as a leader with the Children's Rights Council. We wish for Margaret in retirement time to spend with those for whom she cares and doing that which she most enjoys.

HONORING THE AMERICAN
LEGION, PASO DEL NORTE POST 58

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to recognize the American Legion Post 58 located in Northeast El Paso on Vulcan Avenue, also known as the El Paso Del Norte Post. I am pleased to recognize them as a distinguished Veteran Services Organization in my district.

As one of the largest VSOs in Texas, the Paso Del Norte Post's engagement with our veteran community is exemplary. Several of the officers at this post serve or have served on national committees and commissions of the American Legion. In the fall of 2014, a team from the American Legion national organization visited El Paso and worked with the El Paso VA to provide medical care to veterans in need. The visiting group of the American Legion, led by Verna Jones, Director of the Veterans Affairs and Rehabilitation Division in Washington, D.C., also hosted a town hall at the El Paso Del Norte headquarters where over 400 veterans attended.

Post 58 further provided accommodations to their national counterparts for four additional days to assist veterans through their "Veteran Crisis Command Center" where a team known as a "triage team" was available to help veterans get access to the medical care they deserve. The American Legion Post 58's commitment to our community's veterans is remarkable and their team is comprised of dedicated veterans who volunteer their time to serve fellow veterans. The American Legion in my district is currently led by Richard Britton. I thank him for his leadership.

The American Legion Paso Del Norte Post 58 is an asset to our veteran community and El Paso. I thank Post 58 for their commitment to honoring our veterans and for helping strengthen the bonds in the El Paso community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALMA S. ADAMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 2015 I was absent for recorded votes #298 through #308 due to the passing of my mother.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here:

On Roll Call #298 I would have voted No
On Roll Call #299 I would have voted No
On Roll Call #301 I would have voted Yes
On Roll Call #302 I would have voted No
On Roll Call #303 I would have voted No
On Roll Call #304 I would have voted No
On Roll Call #305 I would have voted Yes
On Roll Call #306 I would have voted Yes
On Roll Call #307 I would have voted No
On Roll Call #308 I would have voted Yes

HONORING THE MICCOSUKEE INDIAN SCHOOL FOR RECEIVING FLEXIBILITY TO USE CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE STANDARDS

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a historic chapter in Indian education. The Miccosukee tribe is the first tribe to receive flexibility from the Department of Education to use academic standards under the No Child Left Behind Act that reflect the unique culture of its people and needs of its children.

The standards developed for the Miccosukee Indian School integrate the tribe's culture and language while establishing tough academic standards that will promote college and career readiness.

Last Monday, Secretary of Education Arnie Duncan and Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell hosted a ceremony to honor Chairman Colley Billie and Miccosukee Indian School Principal Manuel Varela for this unprecedented achievement.

These new standards will not only help the children of the Miccosukee tribe, but will pave the way for future work with other tribes.

Chairman Billie and I have been in conversations about establishing a 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project at the Miccosukee Indian School. It is our hope to make it a part of the My Brother's Keeper initiative.

Congratulations Chairman Colley Billie and the Miccosukee Indian School. Congratulations to all of the generations of Miccosukee children yet to be born. This school will make a huge impact on your lives.

HONORING MR. TONY FRANSETTA

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Tony Fransetta who is retiring as the founding President of the Florida Alliance for Retired Americans. Mr. Fransetta's thoughtfulness and devotion to addressing the needs of senior citizens has made him a trusted voice for seniors in my community and throughout Florida, and I laud his continued work on behalf of our nation's retired and aging communities.

Mr. Fransetta's efforts to support labor rights began during his work with the Ford Motor Company following his service in the U.S. Navy during the Korean War. At Ford, Mr. Fransetta served as a leader for the United Auto Workers and represented 15,000 employees negotiating contracts and chairing programs such as quality control, insurance benefits, drug treatment, and employee education.

Following his retirement from Ford in 1990, Mr. Fransetta joined the National Council of Senior Citizens and was pivotal in trans-

forming the council into the Florida Alliance for Retired Americans in 2002. For over 13 years, Mr. Fransetta has dedicated himself to advocating on behalf of aging Americans and has received many accolades for his tireless work, including a lifetime achievement award from the national Alliance for Retired Americans and the honor of being appointed as a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging in 2005.

Mr. Fransetta's passion to civic service is reflected as well in his work as the chairman for the local area Auto Retiree Council, the chairman of the U.A.W. Florida Retiree C.A.P., which represents 26,000 retirees in Florida, the Vice President of the Executive Board, A.F.L.-C.I.O. State of Florida, and a General Policy Board Member for the national Alliance for Retired Americans.

The amount of time and effort Mr. Fransetta has expended for the betterment of his community is truly admirable and exhibits a level of passion worthy of recognition. It is with great pleasure that I honor my dear friend, Tony Fransetta and I know that his passionate advocacy will continue to inspire Floridians to live by his example.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Monday, June 1, 2015. Weather across the Midwest and eastern seaboard delayed my flight to Washington, DC until after votes had been called. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the Dingell Amendment (Roll no. 264) and the Lowenthal Amendment (Roll no. 265). I would have voted against H.R. 1335 (Roll no. 267).

RECOGNIZING JAYNE BACON
GARRISON

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a lifelong servant of Pennsylvania.

Jayne Bacon Garrison began serving her community in 1955, helping prepare Delaware County students to enter the workforce at the Pennsylvania Institute of Technology, an accredited junior college founded by her husband, Walter. Together, Jayne and Walter have built P.I.T. into the school it is today, with 800 students and more than 150 faculty members. Jayne continues to serve as the school's Chief Operating Officer and a member of its Board of Trustees.

But Jayne's contributions to her community expand far beyond P.I.T. She's long been active in a wide variety of philanthropic endeavors, including the Boy and Girl Scouts of America, the American Red Cross, the Delaware County Historical Society and the Elwyn

Foundation. Jayne has focused particularly on serving our veterans, aiding efforts to ease their transition to civilian life.

Over the years, Jayne has been recognized by many organizations for her persistence and dedication. Last week, she added to that list as she received the 30th Anniversary Pearl Award from the Delaware County Women's Commission. It's a fine honor, and one she well deserves.

THE OCCASION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HOLY TRINITY GREEK ORTHODOX CATHEDRAL

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very important milestone in the life of a church community in my District. Exactly 100 years ago today, Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church was incorporated. On June 27, 2015, His Eminence Archbishop Demetrios, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church of America, will lead the congregation and our community in Holy liturgy to celebrate the occasion.

Toledo, Ohio rose up as a city of immigrants. The city's Greek Americans arrived in Toledo in ever increasing numbers as the 20th Century dawned. These early settlers recognized the need to establish a church community. Bonded through faith and tradition, the community had been holding services in different locations in North Toledo. Upon incorporation, the move to build a church of their own began in earnest. In October of 1915 a house was purchased on the same lot on which the current church still stands. The remodeled house served as the church until a new church building was constructed. A splendid building in a Byzantine style, the church is truly magnificent. On Christmas Day 1920, the Divine Liturgy was celebrated for the first time in Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church.

The Cathedral itself serves to anchor the heart of Toledo in its near north end. Along the Cathedral's perimeter, visitors from near and far are welcomed to Toledo in sculpted letters carved into the landscape and a light shines forth from its entry foyer both day and night. Holy Trinity's congregants have built an institution worthy of its founders and vital to our community's character.

Through the coming decades the church community grew. Even in the hardship years of Depression and Wars, the members of the church soldiered on. They sacrificed and prayed and the church thrived. As the years continued and the church grew, the Greek American Progressive Association organized a chapter named Parmenides Lodge No. 136, auxiliaries were formed, and federations including Pan-Arcadian, Tenedian, Cretan, Samian, Corinthian, and Sterea-Elias came together to preserve the culture. The ladies of the church organized under the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Ladies Philoptochos Society. The Daughters of Penelope reactivated Dodona Chapter No. 24. World War II brought the formation of chapters of the Greek War

Relief Association to help those suffering in Greece.

The post-war years saw progressive leadership and a renewed spiritual activity. Choir and Sunday School were re-energized, The Hellenic Youth Organization was formed followed by the Greek Orthodox Youth of America. This time also brought a realization of the need for new church structures. Ground was broken in October 1951 for a new Education Building which was dedicated on September 13, 1953. In 1958, adjacent land was purchased. Improvements continued in the church culminating in a major renovation in 1966. The newly refurbished church was consecrated on May 22, 1966. With this consecration, a dream conceived so many years before became a reality.

Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church continued to grow and has been woven into the fabric of our community. It remains in Toledo's older North End near downtown and draws our entire community to its renowned festival each September. In 1987, the parish was elevated to a Cathedral. As the 20th century came to a close and a new century dawned, Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Cathedral and its members remained integral to Toledo. Today, Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Cathedral serves 450 families. The cathedral is part of the Metropolis of Detroit, of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It serves as a beacon of light to the faithful and fulfills the promise in Ephesians 2:20–22, "Built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone, in whom the whole structure, being joined together, grows into a holy temple in the Lord. In him you also are being built together into a dwelling place for God by the Spirit." I join with the members of Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Cathedral as well as our larger community in celebrating a century of faith.

HONORING THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SANTA BARBARA AND VENTURA COLLEGES OF LAW

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and congratulate the Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law for their many years of outstanding leadership in education and remarkable services to the Central Coast community.

The Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law have educated over 1,800 graduates who today serve in leadership positions in legal practice, government, business and non-profit organizations.

For over 45 years, the Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law have provided numerous opportunities and access to legal training in the practice of law through its Juris Doctor and Master of Legal Training degree programs. Through legal clinics, public service programs, and the work of its students as interns for governmental entities and non-profit

organizations, the Colleges of Law have further reinforced the rule of law and access to legal services. Furthermore, these colleges have been active stewards of the community by providing space, sponsorship and support for local law-related activities, including those of judiciary, bar associations, bar foundations, schools and other groups throughout the region.

On the occasion of its 45th anniversary, it is my sincere pleasure to honor the Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law for its contributions to academic excellence in the teaching of law and to the service and community leadership provided by its graduates.

A TRIBUTE TO ERIN HAMMOND

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate an accomplished Iowa high school graduate, Erin Hammond of Polk City, Iowa, as she prepares to embark on a journey overseas to fight hunger and help those who are most in need.

The World Food Prize Borlaug-Ruan International Internship Program offers a number of Iowa high school graduates the opportunity to travel overseas and participate in efforts to fight hunger in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East. This program was created by Dr. Norman Borlaug and John Ruan, Sr., to create interest in the agricultural sciences and give young people valuable experience in global food security jobs and research.

Erin will be spending her time at the SM Sehgal Foundation in Gurgaon, India. She will be conducting research on nonprofit organizations and how to optimize the benefits they provide to those who are less fortunate. Erin's passion for helping others is what inspired her to apply for this program.

It is with great pride that I recognize and congratulate Erin as she celebrates this great accomplishment. I commend her for her hard work and dedication to ending world hunger and her commitment to improving the lives of others. I wish her nothing but the best moving forward.

HONORING BOB DICKERSON

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of an amazing Washingtonian—Bob Dickerson. Bob died of cancer last week, something he had been dealing with for years, but, during all the ups and downs, that was never what defined him. Instead, he was a champion for those in need. Bob volunteered with the RESULTS organization, which works to reduce poverty and child mortality. Bob's advocacy was unparalleled; I met with him many times, both in my district office and in DC. Each time, I was impressed and humbled

by his passion for helping others, by his commitment to service. He had a heart for the world, doing everything within his power to improve the lives of each and every person in this world. My prayers are with Bob's family and the RESULTS team as they learn to live with Bob's memory rather than his person, and I suggest to all of us, that we take Bob's passion and service to heart, and put it before us as an example.

A TRIBUTE TO SAMANTHA
MAGNUSON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding commitment Samantha Magnuson demonstrates to her community of McClelland, Iowa. Samantha and her family have deep roots in McClelland. She has a strong record of volunteer service to her community by helping with the annual City-Wide Cleanup Day, the Children's Easter Egg Hunt and Halloween Party, and assisting with the Christmas program, along with many other activities throughout the year.

Samantha will be graduating this year from Underwood High School in Underwood, Iowa. She has been awarded the \$16,000 First Generation Scholarship from the Iowa West Foundation. She is planning to attend Iowa Western Community College and focus on a general education. Her future plan is to pursue a degree in engineering.

Samantha Magnuson is an active member of her community and is making a difference by helping others. It is with great honor that I recognize her today. I know that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring her accomplishments. I thank her for her service to the McClelland, Iowa community and wish her and her family all the best moving forward.

TRIBUTE TO ED BORCHERDT

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Ed Borchardt. He was a leader and entrepreneur. Mr. Borchardt attended Stanford University and received his BA and MBA there. He was the president of his own company, Borchardt & Co.

Mr. Borchardt served his country as a USMC Infantry Officer during the Korean War and later became a founding and vital member of the Korean War Veterans Memorial Foundation. He also served on the board of the Devil Pups Youth Program for America. Mr. Borchardt was twice appointed by President Reagan to serve on the Board of Visitors of the Naval Academy.

As Chairman of the Great Falls Memorial Committee, Mr. Borchardt tremendously helped his community. Previously, he was the President of the McLean Rotary Club and

founded and served as the President of the Northern Virginia Brittany Club.

Mr. Borchardt, known for his optimism, emphasized his motto: "onward and upward". He will also truly be remembered for his countless and endless service to his county and his community. I am confident that his passion and love for his country will serve as an inspiration for millions of people.

A TRIBUTE TO RICHARD AND
JOAN MADISON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Richard and Joan Madison on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary.

Richard and Joan's lifelong commitment to each other and to their many children and grandchildren truly embodies our Iowan values. I salute this devoted couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF
ARCELLE DANESE
THOMAS

HON. NORMA J. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Arcelle Danese Thomas, who passed away peacefully on April 7, 2015, at the age of 99.

Arcelle moved to Los Angeles in 1937, and remained a resident of the county for the rest of her life. After graduating from California State University Los Angeles, she worked as a teacher for the Los Angeles Unified School District and spent 30 years teaching children general education at South Park Elementary School. Outside of the classroom, Arcelle worked to improve childhood education by serving as the President of the American Childhood Education Institute.

An active member of the community, Arcelle became a lifetime member of the Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority. Even in her later years, she led her senior citizen's center community group, which further demonstrates her initiative and commendable leadership qualities.

Arcelle was one of ten brothers and sisters. While she was born in Albuquerque, New Mexico, she spent the majority of her life in Southern California where she raised a family with her husband of 63 years. She is survived by her sister, daughter, and loving grandchildren.

For her contributions to the community and for her many other achievements, I would like to honor Arcelle Danese Thomas and her family.

A TRIBUTE TO DON AND JOANNE
JORGENSEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Don and Joanne Jorgensen on the very special occasion of their 65th wedding anniversary.

Don and Joanne were married on April 9, 1950. Their lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowan values. I salute this devoted couple on their 65th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

A TRIBUTE TO THE ENDURING
U.S./TAIWAN FRIENDSHIP

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for greater support for closer U.S./Taiwan relationship. Taiwan is an important economic and security partner, and as an advanced industrial economy, has much to contribute to the world. I would also like to take this opportunity to share a speech entitled "True Friendship Lasts Forever" addressed by Taiwan President Ma Ying-jeou on June 2, 2015, at a video conference at Stanford University. In his speech, President Ma delineated the importance of future cooperation opportunities between our two countries. Below is the summary of President Ma's speech. For the full transcript, please visit the website of the office of the President of the Republic of China: <http://www.president.gov.tw>.

Summary of President Ma's remarks:

"This year marks the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II. In July 1937, two years before WWII broke out, ROC forces began fighting against Japanese aggression alone, and for four long years, they continued with virtually no outside help. It wasn't until the Pearl Harbor attack in December 1941 that the ROC joined forces with the Allies to declare war against Japan, Germany, and Italy.

The United States proved to be a staunch friend. The most notable example of that friendship was the American Volunteer Group (AVG), organized in 1941 even before the Pearl Harbor attack, a group that became legendary by their nickname: The Flying Tigers.

During the Cold War period following World War II, the friendship between the ROC and the U.S. flourished, as the U.S. continued to help us militarily while providing economic assistance. Between 1950 and 1965, that assistance included U.S. \$1.5 billion in economic aid, which is probably worth at least 12 billion now.

Although the ROC and U.S. severed diplomatic ties in 1979, barely three months later, the U.S. Congress passed the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA). Under that Act, Taiwan is

treated as a foreign government for purposes of U.S. law and in U.S. courts. The Act also requires the U.S. to provide Taiwan with defensive weapons.

Since I came into office in 2008, mutual ROC-U.S. trust has been restored at the highest levels of government. And over the past two years, there have been frequent, reciprocal visits by high-level officials.

In April of last year, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Gina McCarthy visited Taiwan, and Charles Rivkin, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs is visiting Taiwan now. At the same time, heads of various ROC government agencies have visited the U.S., so there is a solid foundation of mutual trust there.

The ROC is also gaining more support in Congress. Just last month during deliberations on the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2016, the House and Senate Armed Services Committees both passed initiatives that call for increased U.S.-ROC military exchanges.

In addition to strong security ties, Taiwan-U.S. trade relations have also made significant progress over the last few years. In March of 2013, after a five-year hiatus, we reopened negotiations with the U.S. under the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement (TIFA), a platform set up in 1994 to facilitate talks in trade and investment matters. We have continued bilateral consultations in a series of 12 work conferences, and have made significant progress. As of the end of this March, the ROC is America's 10th largest trading partner, surpassing Brazil and Saudi Arabia, and the U.S. is Taiwan's third largest, after mainland China and Japan.

Let me turn to cross-strait relations. Over the past seven years, Taiwan and mainland China have signed 21 agreements. In April last year, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs Daniel Russel said in Congress that "As a general matter, we very much welcome and applaud the extraordinary progress that has occurred in cross-strait relations under the Ma administration."

In addition to seeking stable development in cross-strait and ROC-U.S. relations, Taiwan has also taken concrete actions over the past few years to be a regional peacemaker in both the East China Sea, and the South China Sea. Back in August of 2012, I proposed the East China Sea Peace Initiative. That Initiative asks stakeholders to forgo conflict in favor of peaceful negotiations, and emphasizes cooperation in sharing resources. Eight months later in April of 2013, Taiwan and Japan signed a fisheries agreement that embodies the spirit of that Initiative, and solved a fisheries dispute between Taiwan and Japan that has troubled both countries for 40 years. Secretary of State John Kerry has publicly stated that the ROC-Japan fisheries agreement is a model for promoting regional stability, and that the principles at the heart of the East China Sea Peace Initiative apply to all of the waters in Asia.

On the 26th of last month, I formally announced the South China Sea Peace Initiative, hoping that the relevant parties will: "shelve sovereignty dispute, pursue peace and reciprocity, and promote joint exploration and de-

velopment." By upholding those principles, we hope that all the parties involved will work together to maintain regional peace and promote regional development. Immediately, a U.S. State Department official stated that the U.S. appreciates the proposals in the South China Sea Peace Initiative. I sincerely hope that all of the outstanding scholars and experts gathered here will support the pursuit of peace that I've presented today."

Mr. Speaker, I highly recommend that all of my colleagues review President Ma's important remarks and that we continue to work to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the people of the United States and of the ROC.

A TRIBUTE TO ERICKA ABELL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ericka Abell for being awarded the Hawkeye 10 All-Conference Character Award.

Ericka was selected for this honor because of the exceptional character she displayed throughout her years at Creston High School. This award is only given to students who demonstrate good character in Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring, Citizenship, Overcoming Obstacles, Making Difficult Choices, Generosity, Self-Sacrifice, and Community Service. She is the daughter of Scott and Mendy Abell of Cromwell, Iowa.

It is with great pride that I represent outstanding Iowans like Ericka in the U.S. House of Representatives. I know that all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating her on being recognized with this award. I wish her and her family nothing but the best moving forward.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Channel Islands Harbor on the occasion of the harbor's 50th anniversary as a premier harbor along the Central Coast.

In the 1940's, the United States Congress directed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to address the issue of beach erosion affecting the Naval Bases on the Ventura County coast, as well as communities and wetlands south of Port Hueneme. A location was recommended by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for a sand trap and breakwater in Hollywood by the Sea, and authorized by Congress in 1954.

Construction of the sand trap and entrance to Channel Islands Harbor began in 1959 for the purpose of preventing coastal erosion and providing boating and other recreational op-

portunities to residents of Ventura County. The development of Channel Islands Harbor was an example of cooperation among the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Navy, the County of Ventura, and businesses investing in the harbor. That cooperation continues to this day.

Since the County of Ventura held the grand opening of the harbor in May of 1965, Channel Islands Harbor has been serving the citizens of Ventura County and visitors alike as the first recreational harbor in the region. Visitors can enjoy numerous outdoor venues including several beach-lined parks and coastline for picnics and surfing, as well as nearby biking and walking paths. The harbor offers a number of restaurants and a diverse collection of shops to stroll.

For fishing enthusiasts, there are sport fishing excursions throughout the year. And from December through April, daily tours can offer a glimpse at the majestic whales that traverse the waters off our coastline. The harbor is also a departure point for voyages of exploration to the remarkable Channel Islands.

Though initial development included only a small portion of the current harbor area, Channel Islands Harbor now includes over 300 acres of land and water, including 2,200 boat slips, two hotels, two yacht club buildings, two boat yards, three shopping areas, two free-standing restaurants, a Maritime Museum, and over 100 condominiums and 400 apartments, providing both a thriving community and a recreational destination along the Central Coast of California.

For these reasons, it is my sincere pleasure to offer my congratulations to the Channel Islands Harbor on its 50th anniversary and its countless contributions to the region.

A TRIBUTE TO GARY BUCKLIN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Gary Bucklin for a wonderful career as KSIB radio's sports director in Creston, Iowa.

For the past 30 years, Gary has been the man on the microphone for all local sports coverage on KSIB radio. He received his first job in broadcasting announcing the fourth grade talent show in his hometown of Bayard, Iowa, and by driving the streets of Bayard in a speaker car announcing the grand opening for a local gas station. Since that time, Bucklin served in the Air Force during the Vietnam War, worked in retail, but always retained the radio "bug". He came to work for KSIB in 1985, becoming a part of not only the Creston community, but of every community in the area where he would broadcast their ballgames. He will be remembered for his deep commitment to the communities, the coaches and the students he so passionately spoke about.

I know that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Mr. Gary Bucklin on his well-deserved retirement and wish him the best in his future

endeavors. I consider it an honor to represent him in Congress.

JOSEPH C. BELL TRIBUTE

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY III

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute today to Joseph C. Bell, a visionary attorney who recently received one of Poland's highest awards in recognition of his efforts to build a new economy from the rubble of communism.

Mr. Bell received the Polish Commanders Cross in Warsaw on May 13, 2015, to honor his dedicated service, over a quarter century ago, "in furthering Poland's systemic and economic transformation." Working with the Polish Ministry of Finance under Leszek Balcerowicz, Mr. Bell stepped forward to help build a new and robust free-market system in the wake of the 1989 elections that saw Solidarity leader Tadeusz Mazowiecki named prime minister.

The goal under the first non-communist government in the post-World War II period was to accomplish what had never been done before—to build new capitalist institutions in record time to stir the Polish economy from decades of mismanagement and integrate the nation into the economies of Western Europe.

As a partner at the Washington firm of Hogan & Hartson with over 20 years of regulatory and commercial experience, Mr. Bell ably served as pro-bono counsel to the Polish Ministry of Finance in the critical years of 1989 to 1990, when the government launched reforms through "shock therapy" changes to Poland's economic system.

His experience in project finance and as a leading advocate of introducing competition into closed energy markets in the U.S. was invaluable in taking on the challenges of creating capital markets, a stock exchange, a convertible currency, orderly privatization and other features of a free-market system. The rapidity and scope of the changes were nothing less than a leap of faith into uncharted legal and economic waters.

The challenges were immense: Poland was suffering acute hyperinflation, falling productivity, huge foreign debt and shortages of consumer goods. As part of an intrepid team of advisers that included economist Jeffrey Sachs, Mr. Bell's tireless work helped usher in breathtaking reforms that stemmed inflation, attracted foreign investment, relieved Poland of its debt burden, and increased productivity.

The miracle turnaround of Poland's economy, coupled with the rise of democracy, paved the way for the nation to secure NATO membership and join the European Union.

Mr. Bell returned full-time to his law practice in Washington, D.C., in 1990 but that didn't end his commitment to helping emerging nations. His expertise has taken him to Mongolia, Liberia, Sao Tome & Principe, among others, to help structure extraction systems that work for the benefit of the many rather than enriching the few.

Currently serving Of Counsel to Hogan Lovells, Mr. Bell's work to shape mining and

energy policy in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East—including the management of extraction revenues and general issues of transparency and governance—will have a lasting impact.

Mr. Bell's career milestones also include serving as general counsel to Citizens Energy Corporation, which my father founded to use successful energy ventures to generate revenues to help the poor, from its inception up to 1989; working as Assistant General Counsel in the Federal Energy Administration; serving on the Duke Law School faculty and as an attorney in the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Justice Department.

Since 2001, the 1968 Yale Law School graduate has also been associated with the International Senior Lawyers Project, which provides volunteer legal services to promote the rule of law, economic development and human rights in developing countries.

Between his legal expertise, dedication to public service, advocacy for human rights and social justice, and broad range of volunteer experience, Mr. Bell embodies the tradition of the "Wise Men of Washington"—in the best sense of the term.

Mr. Speaker, I once again want to congratulate Mr. Bell for the honors accorded to him by the Polish government and to thank him for a long career of service to our nation and the international community.

A TRIBUTE TO ASHLEY HARRIS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ashley Harris for being awarded the Hawkeye 10 Conference Academic All-Conference Award.

Ashley was selected for this honor because of her commitment to academic excellence, maintaining a high grade point average throughout all four years of her education at Creston High School. She also received a 29 or higher on her ACT. Ashley is the daughter of Rod and Becky Harris of Creston, Iowa.

It is with great pride that I represent Iowans like Ashley in the U.S. House of Representatives. I know that all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating her for being recognized with this award. I wish her and her family nothing but continued success in the future.

AZERBAIJAN

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues the 97th Anniversary of the Republic Day of Azerbaijan.

Republic Day celebrates Azerbaijan's declaration of its independence from the Russian Empire on May 28, 1918, becoming the region's first Muslim democratic secular republic in Central Asia.

While that independence was short lived, from 1918–1920, the young Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan made tremendous strides, granting women the right to vote long before most Western democracies and laying the foundation for architecture and formal educational for future Azeris.

Two years after independence, Azerbaijan was occupied by the Soviet Union, losing the hard-won independence, and was forced to become a republic in the U.S.S.R. In 1990, as the U.S.S.R. crumbled, Azerbaijan regained its independence from the Soviets after seventy years. On August 30, 1991, Azerbaijan's Parliament restored their nation's independence for the second time in a century, and weeks later, adopted their Constitution.

A valuable international ally, Azerbaijan was among the first nations offering unconditional support to the United States in the war against al Qaeda, having provided a safe transit route to resupply our troops in Afghanistan. Azerbaijan leads the Central Asian area in regional economic cooperation, and is a crucial in European energy security matters.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in thanking the people of Azerbaijan for their friendship, and in congratulating Azerbaijanis around the world on the anniversary of Republic Day.

A TRIBUTE TO THE BETH EL JACOB SYNAGOGUE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a great Iowa Synagogue, Beth El Jacob Synagogue in Des Moines, Iowa, as they celebrate the incoming of their New Torah.

Originally formed in 1881, Beth El Jacob Synagogue was created by a group of Lithuanian Jews. The first permanent congregation started in 1885 at the corner of East Second and Walnut Street in Des Moines. Throughout the early 1900s Beth El Jacob called a number of locations in Des Moines home. It wasn't until the mid-1900s that the congregation built their permanent location, the Beth El Jacob Synagogue.

It is with great pride that I recognize Beth El Jacob Synagogue today as they celebrate this momentous occasion. I commend them for their support to the Des Moines community and their commitment to improving the lives of others. I wish the entire staff and congregation nothing but the best moving forward.

RECOGNIZING DR. TRUDY TUTTLE ARRIAGA

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Dr. Trudy Tuttle Arriaga, a supportive, encouraging, and inspirational educational leader and advocate in Ventura, California.

After earning a Bachelor's and Master's degree, teaching credentials, and a Doctorate from the University of Southern California, Dr. Arriaga worked as a paraeducator at Ventura Unified School District for two years beginning in 1974. She returned to Ventura Unified in 1981 to begin her teaching career. She taught special education at Mound Elementary School and from there transferred to Balboa Middle School where she taught general education and the deaf/hard of hearing program. She then became an itinerant teacher specialist at Elmhurst and Loma Vista Elementary Schools. Dr. Arriaga continued her career as a teacher and assistant principal at De Anza Middle School and later became principal at Sheridan Way Elementary School. She also served as principal at El Camino High School and Pacific High School. In July of 2001, Dr. Arriaga became the superintendent of the Ventura Unified School District, becoming the first woman to serve in the position.

During her tenure as superintendent, Dr. Arriaga was able to enhance the quality of education at the district. Seventeen of Ventura Unified School District's 27 schools have achieved an API score of 800 or above, drop-out rates throughout the district have decreased as attendance rates have increased. She also brought a focus on schools of choice and helped new elementary and middle schools focus on Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), leadership and the arts. Dr. Arriaga also brought a dual language program to the district and greatly encouraged the program. Now, many students are learning new languages and graduating with a multilingual seal.

For over three decades, Dr. Arriaga has dedicated her career to the education and academic success of countless students. She is a passionate advocate for children and continually demonstrates her support and encouragement of students. When making important decisions, Dr. Arriaga considers every angle, striving for the most beneficial solutions.

Following her retirement from Ventura Unified School District, Dr. Arriaga will continue her service and work for students and education at California Lutheran University, where she will soon serve as a full time instructor and as the administrator of the Education Leadership Doctoral and Master's Program. She has also accepted a contract from Corwin Press Publications and will be co-authoring a book on cultural proficiency.

Dr. Arriaga's passion for education for all students is unquestionable, and it is my sincere pleasure to join the Ventura Unified School District in honoring Dr. Trudy Tuttle Arriaga for her 35 years of dedication, passion, leadership and service for the students and community of Ventura. I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO JEFF HARMSSEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding heroism

displayed by Jeff Harmsen, of Des Moines, Iowa.

In the early morning hours of May 8, 2015, Mr. Harmsen was taking his normal morning commute when out of the corner of his eye he noticed his longtime neighbors home up in flames. Without hesitation, he parked his vehicle and ran to the backside of the home. It was then that he dialed 911 and made his first attempt at alerting the homeowners. He proceeded to pound on the home's door, successfully alerting the owners inside. Because of his heroics he was able to safely rescue his neighbors and their pets without any serious injuries.

I would like to thank Mr. Harmsen for this selfless act and I ask my colleagues to join me recognizing his heroics and bravery. I'm proud to represent Iowans like Mr. Harmsen in the U.S. House of Representatives and I wish him nothing but continued success in the future.

A TRIBUTE TO NEIL MCCOY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mr. Neil McCoy of Villisca, Iowa, for being selected as the recipient of the 2015 Iowa 4-H Hall of Fame Award. Iowa State 4-H and the Iowa 4-H Foundation sponsor the 4-H Hall of Fame recognition award for volunteers and staff who have selflessly given their time and talents in promoting the Iowa 4-H program.

Mr. McCoy has been an active member within 4-H throughout his distinguished career. He served as Page County Boys 4-H President in 1967. After graduating from high school, Mr. McCoy attended Iowa State University and returned to Page County to farm with his father. That is when he began volunteering with the 4-H program. He is a Page County Honorary 4-H member and a supporter of the Iowa 4-H Foundation 400 Club.

4-H has been a long tradition in the McCoy family. Mr. McCoy's passion for 4-H is derived from his grandfather Ralph and his father Malcolm who played major roles in his devotion to 4-H. Mr. McCoy has enjoyed the many pleasures of helping his children Jeromy, Katina, and Dustin participate in 4-H activities. He says his success in 4-H comes from the support he has had from his wife, Becky, and attributes his accomplishments to her unwavering support. Their family has shared many special memories through their years of involvement in 4-H.

Mr. McCoy is an Iowan who has made a difference and makes our state proud. He has dedicated his life to helping young people in 4-H and serving his community. It is with great honor that I recognize and congratulate him today. I know my colleagues in the House join me in honoring his accomplishments. I thank him for his service and wish him and his family all the best moving forward.

LAQUITTA DEMERCHANT COMMUNITY IMPACT AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Laquitta DeMerchant for receiving one of the World Youth Foundation's 2015 Community Impact Award thanks to her work as CEO of Fuzion Apps and dedication to her community.

Ms. DeMerchant has numerous accomplishments and shows tremendous enthusiasm for her community. She won the Women Innovation Mobile Award and the grand prize in the Department of Labor's Equal Pay App Challenge. Laquitta speaks at universities and high schools around the Houston area to increase awareness of wage gap issues and supports initiatives for working families. Laquitta also mentors young programmers and software developers in competitions throughout the nation. A member of her team at the Essence Festival YESWECODE hackathon went on to win the biggest international impact award for developing an anti-human trafficking app. We are proud of her accomplishments on behalf of our community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Laquitta DeMerchant for receiving the Community Impact Award. We appreciate your dedication to strengthening our community.

ALLIANCE WORLD CHAMPS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Clear Creek Independent School District's (CCISD) robotics team and their robot, Empire, for being named Alliance World Champs at the For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology (FIRST) Robotics Competition Championship.

The Robonauts is made up of students of all ages from around CCISD. Together these students worked hand in hand with mentors from NASA's Johnson Space Center to build their robot, Empire. The team travelled to St. Louis where they competed against 600 other engineering teams from around the globe. The Robonauts really had to put their engineering skills to the test. In St. Louis, Empire succeeded in each competition, allowing the Robonauts to take home first place. Congratulations to all of Robonauts' team members and mentors for their victory. We are excited to see all that you accomplish in the future.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the CCISD Robonauts for being crowned the Alliance World Champs.

COMMEMORATING THE 95TH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE JONES ACT

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important milestone in maritime history.

On June 5, 1920, the landmark Merchant Marine Act became law, establishing the importance of maintaining a strong domestic maritime fleet.

That law, known as the Jones Act, was the anchor that allowed the United States to launch a highly trained and skilled group of mariners who can serve to protect our nation in times of national emergency. It supports our shipyard industrial base and preserves our capacity to defend our homeland, patrol the seas, and promote American jobs.

Ninety-five years later, it's clear that the Jones Act has stood the test of time.

General Paul J. Selva, the Commander of U.S. Transportation Command, recently said, "I can stand before any group as a military leader and say without the contribution that the Jones Act brings to the support of our industry there is a direct threat to national defense, and I will not be bashful about saying it and I will not be silent."

I couldn't agree more.

General Selva doesn't stand alone in defending the Jones Act from its critics.

In fact, Congress passed one of the strongest statements of support for the Jones Act last year as part of the National Defense Au-

thorization Act, recognizing that it promotes "a strong domestic trade maritime industry, which supports the national security and economic vitality of the United States and the efficient operation of the United States transportation system."

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues to maintain the Jones Act for a new century, fight for our domestic maritime industry, and make sure that high quality, American-made vessels are being piloted by American mariners.

KATY HIGH SCHOOL SOFTBALL
STATE CHAMPIONS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Katy High School Lady Tiger softball team for winning the Texas 6A State Championship. This incredible team is now the best in Texas!

With a young team, the Lady Tigers had a lot to prove. The team reached the second round of the playoffs last season and was determined to perform better this season. This resilient team certainly rose to the challenge this season. In the state tournament, the Lady Tigers ousted the powerhouses of Alvin, Brazoswood, and The Woodlands before defeating Lewisville in the championship game. We are proud of the entire team and coaching staff for their immense dedication to each other and to the sport.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Head Coach Kalum Haack and the Katy High School Lady Tigers softball team on their State Championship. Thank you for bringing the gold back home to Katy.

NEEDVILLE HIGH SCHOOL STATE
SOFTBALL

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Needville High School softball team for completing their season as Class 4A Texas State Runners Up.

After a history-making season, the Lady Blue Jays finished strong with a 33-8 record. They were led on and off the field by two outstanding young pitchers, Victoria Moreno and Micayla Orsak, who received great encouragement from Coach Amber Schmidt. The Lady Blue Jays demonstrated immense dedication to the sport and remained motivated throughout the championship game. They fought hard until the very end! We are extremely proud of the entire Needville High School softball team and coaching staff.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the entire Lady Blue Jays softball team on an incredible season. We look forward to seeing everything this team accomplishes.

SENATE—Wednesday, June 10, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, who rules over humanity and nations, we ask You to support the Congress in its manifold tasks. Uphold our Senators, that their daily work may be performed with diligence and fidelity to our heritage under You.

Lord, raise up those who will unite in serving You with their whole heart and mind and strength. May our lawmakers fear only to be disloyal to the best they know, as You make them forgiving and forbearing. Teach them to value a conscience void of offense and the royalty of self-respect above all the pedestals, prizes, and preferments Earth can give.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the President put forth a mighty ObamaCare spin effort yesterday. We have to give him credit for trying to salvage a law that only one—one—out of every nine Americans thinks is actually working. But I don't think condescending to ObamaCare's victims was the best approach for him to take.

Consider this cringe-inducing assertion: Americans who already had health insurance "may not know that they've got a better deal now [under ObamaCare] . . . than they did, but they do."

In other words, he knows what is best for you, so quit complaining.

It is the very mindset that led this partisan law being forced through over the objections of the American people in the first place. It is the very mindset that said it was OK to cut a few corners and tell a few white lies to sell the country a law it didn't want.

So what, the Obama crowd seems to think, if Americans couldn't keep the plan they had and liked—so what. So what, ObamaCare's defenders must reason, if Americans see costs rise after being told they would fall.

To our friends on the left, it is just the cost of doing business. These days they have all but given up the ghost of empathy. They just talk past the middle class instead.

Consider some of the statements we have heard from top Democrats. "ObamaCare has been wonderful for America." "None of the predictions about how [ObamaCare] wouldn't work have come to pass." The implementation of this is "fabulous."

We have heard all of that from Democratic leaders.

These are the kinds of statements that raise our blood pressure all across America. But quotes such as these betray more than just a certain incongruence from reality. This is also a signal of a party that has lost confidence in the force of its own arguments—one that seems more intent on reassuring itself than convincing others.

Why else would they be saying things they know aren't true?

Now, I have spoken broadly over the past week about how ObamaCare has failed Americans in terms of higher costs especially, but allow me just to touch on the assertion that ObamaCare's implementation has been "fabulous" too.

Fabulous? That is certainly one way to describe how ObamaCare has been plagued by failure since day one. Consider the disastrous rollout. Many Americans won't forget the crashing Web sites, the hours on hold, the instructions to "fax in" their applications while at the same time seeing reports of ObamaCare contractors sitting idle, waiting for work to come through the door.

The White House tried to spin it all away as nothing more than a glitch—just a glitch—on the Web site. But the American people knew it pointed to broader systemic challenges in an unworkable law.

Consider the many pro-ObamaCare States that launched exchanges with great enthusiasm. These true-blue administrations did everything they could to make ObamaCare work, but they often ended up exposing ObamaCare's tragic realities instead.

Take deep blue Vermont. Many on the left looked to Vermont's extra-ambitious ObamaCare experiment as the crown jewel in their ideological crown, but it turned out to be little more than "an unending money pit," as one Vermonter put it.

In Oregon, officials spent over \$300 million taxpayer dollars to launch an ObamaCare exchange and marketing campaign. That is a big investment. But ObamaCare has been an even bigger flop. Millions of dollars down the tubes and Oregon has little to show for it beyond a couple of bizarre marketing videos and a criminal investigation.

Hawaii just announced it will be the latest State to shutter—close, shutter up—its faltering exchange.

In Kentucky, a Democratic administration poured one-quarter of a billion dollars into an exchange that placed nearly 80 percent of the enrollees into an already broken Medicaid system. Many of the remaining 20 percent or so now find themselves stuck with unaffordable ObamaCare coverage, such as a constituent from Ashland, who wrote to let me know that his monthly premium increased by more than 30 percent.

So it is hard to disagree with the top Vermont health official who said: "Good God, this just wasn't set up for success." That is from the top health official in Vermont. Given the spectacular flop in his State, he would certainly know, and he certainly seems to have a point. Of the 17 original ObamaCare exchanges, some have failed outright, and half of those that remain are struggling financially.

So the truth is this: ObamaCare never had a Web site problem; it had an ObamaCare problem.

No amount of wishful thinking or fast talk is going to change that reality. It is not going to change the failures I just mentioned, and it is not going to change the failures I haven't, such as the failed CLASS Act, the troubled co-ops, the debacle of giving people the wrong amount of subsidy or what we just learned yesterday—that the IRS may not even be able to verify that many of the people who received the tax credit for health insurance actually bought the health insurance.

I am asking ObamaCare's defenders in the White House and in Congress to redirect their efforts away from the spin and toward the reality instead. We all know that ObamaCare is a law filled with broken promises, higher costs, and failure. So let's work together to start over with real health care reform instead.

That is the kind of health care outcome that actually would be "fabulous" for our constituents. It is something that really would be "wonderful for America." And it is what we can work together to achieve once Washington politicians move past the failure of ObamaCare.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the massive cyber attack Americans just read about reminds us all of the need for action on this issue. Building America's public and private cyber defenses won't be easy. But the bipartisan cyber security measure that passed out of the Intelligence Committee with the support of every single Republican and every single Democrat but one, 14 to 1, will increase the ability of the public and private sector to share information and to make us safer. That is why we are going to take it up as part of the Defense authorization bill now before us.

I hope Senators of both parties will come together to support that bipartisan amendment when it comes to a vote, just as we saw the Senate come together to keep the Defense authorization bill intact and consistent with the budget resolution by standing against the Reed amendment yesterday. It keeps us on track to pass bipartisan legislation that will support the men and women who keep us safe every day.

There is something else worth noting about the vote, too. It means we have now taken twice as many amendment rollcall votes on this year's Defense authorization bill as we were allowed on the last two bills combined. Again, it means we have now taken twice as many amendment rollcall votes on this year's Defense authorization bill as were allowed in the last two bills combined. It is just the latest reminder of a new majority that is getting the Senate back on track and back to work.

Unfortunately, some leaders of the previous majority seem bound and determined to get us back into their gridlock comfort season. At a time of grave threats to our Nation, these Democratic leaders think it is a good idea to hold brave servicemen and brave servicewomen hostage to partisan demands for more waste at the IRS and bigger congressional office budgets for themselves. Let me repeat. At a moment of dangerous and gathering threats, here is the position of these Democratic leaders: They want to hold hostage the funding needed to make our troops combat ready so they can spend more on bureaucracies such as the IRS.

These Democratic leaders just can't seem to kick the gridlock habit, even on legislation with the exact same level of funding President Obama asked for in his own budget. They just can't shake their passion for partisanship, even on a bill that sailed out of committee on a hugely bipartisan vote of 22 to 4. That is how the Defense authorization bill came out of the committee: 22 to 4.

That doesn't mean the rest of their party has to go along with it. I am appealing to every commonsense Democrat—every Democrat uncomfortable

with the thought of holding our troops and our families to ransom for unrelated partisan demands—to keep working across the aisle in good faith, instead, because many of our colleagues understand the true sacrifice and unparalleled value of the nearly 1.5 million Active-Duty men and women who proudly wear our country's uniform, the 1.1 million members of the Reserve and National Guard, and the more than 700,000 civilian officials who stand in support, not to mention the many veterans and families who enrich our country and our communities.

We certainly understand their value in Kentucky. We are proud to host several important military bases across the Commonwealth. I wish to tell my colleagues about just one of them today.

Fort Campbell is home to approximately 30,000 Army personnel, including vital Special Operations units and the famed 101st Airborne Division. Units from Fort Campbell have bravely served as the tip of the spear in executing the U.S. global war on terror, with the 101st Airborne deploying as the first conventional unit in its support.

It was soldiers from Fort Campbell who proudly answered the call to assist with the delicate Ebola mission in West Africa, and it is Fort Campbell's unrivaled aviation infrastructure that provides the Army with the critical ability to rapidly deploy servicemembers to volatile regions.

It is obvious that Fort Campbell means a lot to our country, and I can't tell my colleagues how much it means to Kentucky. It means a lot to its local community, too, especially considering the fact that it has an annual economic impact of \$5 billion to the surrounding area.

This, of course, is hardly a unique story in America. From coast to coast, there is no end of examples of how our troops and our military enrich the fabric of our communities while at the same time keeping us safe. They are our neighbors. They are our friends. They are our daughters. They are our sons. They are not chess pieces for Democratic leaders to wield in some partisan game.

If Democratic leaders are really that worried about fattening up the IRS or adding a new coat of paint to their congressional offices, we can have that discussion, but let's leave our troops out of it and leave their families out of it.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is very difficult to respond to fiction, and that

is what we just heard. We heard a speech based on fiction, a speech based on no facts, a speech based on made-up facts.

It is so hard to comprehend the different areas the majority leader spoke of with no basis in reality. On the subject of health care, it is as if he doesn't realize that 16.5 million people have health insurance.

He denigrates people who aren't insured. Because of Obamacare, they now have the ability to go to a doctor or a hospital when they are sick because of Medicaid. Is there anything wrong with that? In America everyone is not rich. In America not everyone is middle class. Some people are falling through the cracks, and the fact that in the State of Kentucky a lot of people there now have the ability to go to doctors when they are sick or hurt shouldn't be anything that people make fun of.

Health care has changed dramatically. I walked into a drugstore near my home here in Washington—CVS. As a result of Obamacare and other reasons, you can go into that drugstore now and have a test for strep. If you need medicine, they can give it to you. That is progress in medicine in America.

My friend the Republican leader talks as if he would like to return to the time prior to Obamacare, when insurance companies defined the people who have preexisting disabilities. Let's go back to that system. Let's go back to the system where if you have a child who has diabetes, you can't get that kid insured. If you have been in an automobile accident and you broke your neck—even if you are doing fine now, but from the doctor's reports it shows that you broke your neck—you can't get insurance. People with debilitating diseases now can get help.

The overwhelming majority of Americans, statistically, who enrolled in health care plans under the new law are satisfied with the coverage. The majority leader continues to misstate the facts on the Affordable Care Act. The latest poll shows that the majority of Americans support the law, as they should. So I don't know why my friend has to come here and make up things.

Obamacare has been an important program for American families in Nevada and all over America. So I am very disappointed with the state of nonreality of my friend from Kentucky, who has come here each day this week to talk about Obamacare and what is wrong with it. Before this law came into being, patients and the American people were subject to premium increases without any notice, cancellations without notice, denials for preexisting conditions, which I have already mentioned, and arbitrary limits on how much care insurance companies would cover.

NATIONAL DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. REID. The majority leader also came here and talked about how Democrats don't care about people in the armed services in America—that we don't care. In Nevada, I would compare our military installations and their contributions to a stellar military. Nobody surpasses what we do in Nevada. We have the finest Air Force training center in the world for people who fly fighter aircraft. They are all there. We have 10,000 civilian employees, and about 10,000 troops are stationed there. It has been in existence since it was called the Gunnery School in World War II. We are very proud of that. It is an important part of our community, and we protect it.

If you go north 350 miles, there is the Fallon Naval Air Training Center, which is a great installation, where if you want to fly on an aircraft carrier in America, that is where you train, at Fallon. TOPGUN is there. It is a wonderful facility, and we are proud of that facility. It doesn't have as many civilian personnel as Nellis. It is not as big and does not have as many active military, but it is an outstanding operation. People come from all over the world to train at Nellis—from all over the world. We have such a vastness in Nevada, and people train there. They can't do it anywhere else in the world.

So I would put my support of the military—I would certainly compare it to my friend the Republican leader. I am sure he cares. I care also, and all 45 Members of the Democratic caucus care about the military. We care about it in a way that is not denigrating to the Internal Revenue Service that he keeps bashing.

One reason that the Internal Revenue Service has a tough time doing its job is because the Republicans keep cutting their budget. The head of the IRS came to see me a couple months ago, and said: We made it through the tax season. There were very few problems, but he said that if anyone wanted to call the IRS 2 months prior to the tax season ending, they couldn't answer the phones. They didn't have enough staff to do it.

The bill came out of the Armed Services Committee, and at that time, our leading member of that committee, JACK REED, a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy said that the bill was flawed. It was flawed because he hoped we could fix the funding mechanism that the Republicans put in this—another unbelievably fictitious way of taking care of our government.

The chairman of that committee is somebody with whom I came from the House of Representatives 33 years ago. We came to the Senate together. He has been someone who has stood on this floor and berated phony spending. Where is he now? How could this man be in favor of deficit spending? How can

he be in favor of OCO? He has spoken out openly against it in the past, but suddenly he is in favor of it.

The President said the minute that bill was taken up in the committee: If you don't change that, I am going to veto the bill—as he should. What we have said is we are going to support that. We believe what is in this bill is as fictitious as his account of what ObamaCare is all about. But my friend the Republican leader keeps talking about the leftwing: The leftwing is trying to kill this bill. We are not trying to kill the bill. We are trying to make sure we have programs in America that support the middle class, that support medical research, that support funding the FBI, and our court system. My friend the Republican leader seems only to care about the military. We care about the military, but we care about other things that lead to the security of this Nation.

We are not a secure Nation when we don't fund the National Institutes of Health. We are not a secure Nation when we don't fund the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Department of Homeland Security. We are not a secure Nation when we don't fund the Immigration and Naturalization Service. But my friend the Republican leader is saying: Don't worry about them. Just take care of the military. All this other stuff will work out.

The military is not secure, our government is not secure, and our homeland is not secure, when we have all these other agencies that are being, in effect, cut back in funding.

Now, on cyber security, we know the Presiding Officer of this body led the Senate through some very important debates in recent days, and one of the things that was underlying everything done by the Presiding Officer was cyber security—maybe sometimes not directly, but that is in the background, always.

What does the Republican leader now come and say?

Look how much I am on cyber security. Look at me. I lifted weights this morning.

But what he has done is that now he is going to put cyber security on the bill the President said he is going to veto. We are stuck. We have 400 amendments filed, and we are not going through these amendments. He wants to be able to check off the box, saying: Well, we did cyber security.

He hasn't done cyber security. I have a quote here from him on cyber security, just a short time ago: "Any issue of this importance deserves serious consideration and open debate." This is what the Republican leader said. He says: Oh, we have done double the amendments that were done in the last couple of bills.

It takes two sides of the Senate to have amendments heard. The Republicans would not let us have open de-

bate on the armed services bill the last two Congresses. We never even had a debate here. What happened is the two chairs of the committee met in secret and came up with a bill that came up to the Senate floor, and we were able to get that done. But for people to come here and say this is the 53rd year we have done the bill is a little fictitious itself.

I hope that my friend, the senior Senator from Kentucky, will get in touch with reality on ObamaCare, on the Defense authorization bill before this body, and on cyber security and stop making things up, because that is it. It is fiction, and it is not appropriate.

I was so disappointed yesterday to see my Republican colleagues vote against the amendment proposed by the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the senior Senator from Rhode Island. His amendment would have done what no Republicans have even tried to do, which is to adequately address sequestration.

Sequestration was supposed to be so absurd and so foolish that it would force Congress to reduce the deficit in a sensible, balanced manner. On the floor now—I have said this before and I will say it again—I asked the senior Senator from Illinois who came to this House with me and with JOHN MCCAIN 33 years ago: Would you do me a favor? We have this committee that the President has set up, and I need somebody that represents maybe a little bit left of center on this committee. Would you do it? He had many other obligations, but he agreed to be on the Bowles-Simpson Commission, and he did a stunningly important good job. He supported the financing of that. Quite frankly, that surprised me because of all the people yelling for all these budget cuts, and many of those voted against it in the committee. Now, no one in this body understands sequestration any better than my friend from Illinois.

Sequestration was supposed to be so absurd—I repeat—so foolish, that it would force Congress to balance in a sensible manner. Yet what the Republicans considered lunacy a few years ago is now the preferred form of legislating, the preferred form of budgeting. That tells you everything you need to know about today's Republican Party. They are beating their chests about how great sequestration is. Isn't it great that all of these Federal agencies are being cut.

The Reed amendment would have allowed the Democrats and Republicans to negotiate a balanced budget and would have rescinded sequestration, while ensuring adequate funding to the Department of Defense and nondefense programs. Instead, by rejecting Senator REED's legislation, the Republicans have effectively said spend first, budget later. Here is what they have come up with. They are saying: Ready,

fire, aim. Or they are saying: Fire, ready, aim. We know they are not saying: Ready, aim, fire. They have it all backwards, like everything they have done here legislatively—like ostriches with their heads buried deep in the sand.

The majority leader and Republicans continue to deny the need for a bipartisan budget. They deny the need to fix sequestration, just as they deny the urgent need to authorize the Export-Import Bank, which employs 165,000 people in America, as we speak. It expires at the end of this month.

They deny the urgent need to fix our roads, rails, and bridges. That program is going to expire in 6 weeks, which creates millions of jobs—millions of jobs.

Regardless of what Republicans tell themselves, they cannot wish these important issues to just disappear. It is our job to address these matters that affect working Americans.

Here we are in June, months before funding for the government runs out. We have plenty of time to sit down and work out an agreement that both sides can work out. It appears to me what the Republicans are doing is that we are heading for another shutdown. They did it once; they are going to do it again. They want to do nothing now. They want to wait until the fiscal year ends and then lock it up—close up government. There is no reason for this to become yet another manufactured crisis, and that is what we have here.

We can, I repeat, months before the funding for government runs out, do something about it. Do they desire another closed government? I hope not. But it appears that is where we are headed. The Republicans are unwilling to do things that are real. So I urge my Republican colleagues to change course, instead of barreling ahead with bills they know are going to fail.

The Defense authorization bill, the President is going to veto. The veto will be upheld. We will do it over here. But the House already has enough votes to sustain the President's veto. It is just moving forward for reasons that I do not fully understand. I urge them to change course, work with us to forge an agreement that can get signed into law.

The majority leader's party can continue to ignore and procrastinate all they want, but eventually we will need to negotiate a budget free of sequestration, a budget that protects our military and also nondefense, our middle class. Eventually, we will need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, I repeat, which sustains hundreds of thousands of jobs and is responsible for billions of dollars in U.S. exports.

Now, eventually we need to find a lasting way to fund on a long-term basis our American highways. Fifty percent of our highways are deficient, 64,000 bridges—50 percent of those are

structurally deficient. Not far from here, over the great Memorial Bridge, they are closing two lanes. Why? Because it has rotted away. Hundreds of thousands of people go over that every day—or they used to. So why wait? Instead of waiting for the President to veto their sham funding mechanism and then scramble to craft some last-minute, hastily wrought continuing resolution, the Republicans should work with us on a bipartisan solution now. We are ready to cooperate with Republicans to pass legislation that keeps America safe and protects the middle class. But to do that, my Republican colleagues will first have to pull their heads out of the sand.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the second half.

The assistant Democratic leader.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are considering this bill, and you can see by the size of it, it is a major undertaking. It comes up every year. It is the Department of Defense Authorization Act. It is an extraordinarily important bill. It literally authorizes programs for the defense of America.

We have two able leaders who brought the bill to the floor. One is the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, JOHN MCCAIN, a man with whom I entered the House many years ago and a man whose reputation and service to America is well known. He is someone who has served in the U.S. Navy, was a prisoner of war during the Vietnam war, and has been a leader in speaking out on behalf of the military throughout his life. It is built into his family. It is built into his soul.

On our side, we have Senator JACK REED from Rhode Island. Senator REED is a graduate of the West Point Military Academy. He served as well in the Active Army. He brings that service, that part of his life to his work on the Democratic side of the aisle. When it came to putting this bill together, I do not think we could have picked two more able leaders from the Senate, a Republican and a Democrat, to bring this bill to the floor.

They have their differences. But for the most part they agree on this bill. It was troubling this morning to hear the Republican majority leader suggest that the differences we have over this bill suggest a lack of commitment by Democrats to the military of the United States. That is not true. It is not fair. We are as committed on our side of the aisle as those on the other side of the aisle when it comes to the men and women in uniform—committed to making certain that they have what they need to be trained, to fight effectively, and to come home safely.

We are also committed to bringing them home to a welcoming America, preparing veterans programs for the rest of their lives, so they can have productive lives, happy lives after having risked their lives for America.

So to suggest that the Republicans are for the military and Democrats are against it, I regret that the majority leader made that suggestion. Both sides are committed—both the chairman and the ranking member are committed. But what is the issue that divides us when it comes to this bill? It is basically an issue of funding. Here is what it comes down to: We have a Budget Control Act, and if we do not hit the numbers in spending, in comes sequestration. What is sequestration? It is an across-the-board cut.

We do not want to see that happen. We have seen it. We know what it does. It was devastating to the Department of Defense when we went into sequestration. I know because I chaired the Appropriations Committee and I listened to the Secretary of Defense and the leaders from our branches and services tell us: It is impossible for us to budget an effective national security if we have to wonder whether we are going to face an across-the-board cut. I can understand that, not only in readiness, which is essential to the survival of our troops, but also in the procurement of substantial, expensive, important, and necessary technology.

So Senator MCCAIN on the Republican side brings to the floor this authorization bill and says: We will solve the problem of sequestration by inserting about \$38 to \$40 billion in wartime emergency funding into the Department of Defense. Well, we don't believe that is the right way to go, neither does the Secretary of Defense, neither does the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff because it is a 1-year fix.

We need a fix that has some continuity and predictability to it. Therein lies the difference in approach between Democrats and Republicans. Is one side patriotic and the other side not patriotic because we disagree on a budget reform? Of course not. We happen to believe there is a better way to do this and so does the President.

But there is another element I want to make a reference to. The Republican

majority leader came here and said: Well, the Democrats are fighting to put more money into the rest of government—nondefense. It is true, we are. He used his two examples: Well, they want to hire more people at the Internal Revenue Service and maybe they want to put another coat of paint on their offices. That is what the majority leader said.

Well, it could not be further from the truth. I will argue for adequate funding for the Internal Revenue Service. The overwhelming majority of Americans who pay their fair share of taxes and are honest people and try to follow the law should be respected. Those who don't, those who try to cheat our tax system should be held accountable. I do not think that is a radical idea. It takes employees at the Internal Revenue Service to make sure that is true. Right now we have cut back on their spending.

But let me go to another issue which I think really tells the story about why we think we not only need to make sure the Department of Defense is adequately funded, but we want to make sure other areas of government are adequately funded. Once every 67 seconds in America someone is diagnosed with Alzheimer's—once every 67 seconds. It is a disease which is now growing at a rapid pace because of the aging of our population. It is extraordinarily expensive. Under Medicare and Medicaid, \$200 billion were spent last year in the care of those with Alzheimer's.

That number is projected to grow dramatically in the years to come. Well, it is a heartbreaking disease, as you see someone whom you dearly love, someone in your family, and their mind is not as responsive as it once was. It is extraordinarily devastating to these families, and it is extraordinarily expensive to taxpayers.

So what will we do about it? I hope we will be committed, on a bipartisan basis, to medical research. Medical research, through the National Institutes of Health, is part of the nondefense budget that we are trying to help by resolving this whole question of sequestration. It is not about putting a coat of paint on my office. That is not why I am fighting to make sure the non-defense part of the budget is not victimized by sequestration. I am fighting for the National Institutes of Health.

How important is it that they not face sequestration? They have done it. They faced it. Let me tell you just one example of what it meant. Dr. Frank LaFerla is at the University of California in Irvine. He is a medical researcher. He and his team have created mice that develop Alzheimer's disease in the same way humans do. Now, his research team can study that disease in these mice, but the mice need to age 18 months before research on potential Alzheimer's disease treatments can be done.

In 2013, when we faced sequestration, across-the-board cuts in the budget, Dr. LaFerla was faced with the prospect of having to sacrifice these laboratory animals and close his lab. If that had happened, months of research would have been wasted. That is what happens when you do something as mindless as sequestration in the Department of Defense and in the National Institutes of Health.

We even have an amendment, which I hope will not be offered but is pending—has now been filed, I should say, in the Senate, which would cut medical research in the Department of Defense. I wonder what my colleagues are thinking; that we in America should cut back on medical research as a way of balancing our budget. I am praying for the day that Dr. LaFerla or someone like him will find a way to delay the onset of Alzheimer's and, God willing, find a cure. If they do, the investment in the National Institutes of Health will be paid off over and over and over again, and human suffering will be avoided.

So when I hear the Republican majority leader dismiss the idea of funding outside the Department of Defense, when I hear him suggest that the Democrats are trying to work toward a budget solution that is fair to the Department of Defense and all other agencies so that we "have enough money to paint our offices"—that is what he said—I am troubled by that. There is much more at stake.

When it comes to medical research, I would hope the Senator from Kentucky feels, as all of us do, this is not partisan at all. The victims of Alzheimer's are of both political parties and people who never vote. They are just across the board. We ought to be committed to making certain that medical research makes a difference and that we believe in it. I hope this amendment that is being offered to cut Department of Defense medical research is not offered, because if it is, I plan to come to the floor and tell the story about what that medical research has meant over the last 20 years.

For example, the second largest investment in breast cancer research is in the U.S. Department of Defense. There are dramatic stories to be told about what they have discovered and what they have been able to do in the Department of Defense. The suggestion that we should eliminate this research to me is a very bad one. It does not reflect the reality of the fright and concern that come with a diagnosis of breast cancer.

I am prepared for that battle, not just on breast cancer but on all of the other areas of medical research in the Department of Defense, as well as medical research in the National Institutes of Health. If there is one issue that should unite us, Democrats and Republicans, it is medical research. I will tell

you, the people I represent in Illinois, regardless of party affiliation, believe that we in both political parties should be making this commitment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I know we are in morning business time, and if I could speak on the Republican time, reserving the time remaining for the Democrats, I would be pleased to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I rise today, the 13th time, for the "Waste of the Week." So far, we have identified waste in many areas, ranging from the familiar, such as the duplication of government programs and outrageous spending and lack of control, to the bizarre, such as the government-funded massages for New Zealand rabbits. I have received more responses on that than I have for some of the major items I have listed. Every once in a while, I throw in a "Can you believe they do that?"

To date, we have estimated nearly \$67 billion of fraud, abuse, and waste. This is taxpayer money. These are taxpayer dollars that are coming in for programs that the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, and other special investigators have looked at and said: Why are we spending this money in the first place? It is a total waste, it is fraud, and it has been abused.

So we are at the level of nearly two-thirds of our goal of \$100 billion and moving forward.

And so today, I wish to talk about yet another fiscal situation we have come across that is costing the taxpayers the hard-earned dollars. They're sending them to Washington and they want accountability. Since we are doing debate on the Defense bill this week, I thought I would look at the defense issue. I will use contracting accountability as an example of the need for another effort to save the taxpayers' dollars because they are being wasted.

Now, it is not uncommon for every agency of the Federal Government to use contractors. The Department of Defense uses contractors. They do necessary work. They provide services for our troops overseas. We owe our troops, we owe them, given the sacrifices they are making to provide those needed services in an effective and efficient

way, but we also owe the taxpayer clear oversight in terms of how their money is spent to make sure that these services that are provided, these tasks that are undertaken by defense contractors as well as all Federal contractors are done so in an accountable way.

The issue today arises out of a report by the Special Investigator General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. That report identified a total of \$135 million of questionable costs spent by one specific contractor between October 2011 and March 2014. He said that in most cases the funds that were spent were not supported with adequate documentation or did not have prior approval. In another instance, this same contractor also overcharged the government by over \$1 million. The government lost about \$37,000 in interest payments. That is a little bit of change in a total of billions of dollars being spent, but nevertheless it is not all that small of an amount to a number of Americans who work awfully hard to pay their taxes, and they want those taxes to be used wisely.

Again, this same contractor in three other cases violated Federal procurement law in securing contracts totaling almost \$5 million.

So here we have one contractor that has been singled out among many but put in place \$135 million of questionable costs, and the American taxpayers have every right to know how and where their tax dollars are spent and particularly those tax dollars which are spent on providing our Armed Forces, men and women in uniform, with the necessary services they need.

This was compounded when in 2012 headlines showed that two former employees of this particular contractor, in a video, were drunk or under the influence of narcotics during parties that were allegedly thrown “every other day” at the contractor’s operations center in Kabul. So to compound the problem, not only were the costs questioned, but also the character and behavior of the employees were something we certainly are not proud of.

All of this happened, as the video shows, while weapons were present. Bonfires were also lit, and employees would often throw live ammunition rounds and fire extinguishers into the flames.

Some might say: Well, OK, that is a one-off. That is an aberration. That surely doesn’t happen all the time. There is a bad apple here, and there are a bunch of good apples in the barrel.

Yes, there are contractors that are providing services to our men and women who are doing it in a responsible and legal way, but the special inspector for Afghanistan has also found multiple examples of similar types of waste. In fact, since its creation, the special inspector for Afghanistan has undertaken 324 investigations—he is a busy man—and has accounted for over \$571 million of misspent taxpayer dol-

lars, and this is just in Afghanistan. As you know, we have operations around the world, and when we total everything, who knows what that final number will be.

I am pleased to report that while these numbers are disturbing, there is also progress being made. The special investigator for Afghanistan whom I have referred to has made over 200 recommendations for reforms and over 160 of those recommendations have been adopted by the Department of Defense in trying to help safeguard Federal dollars. So I don’t want to leave the impression that something isn’t being done about this. Nevertheless, it is important that we bring these things to light so that we can put procedures in place that will prevent them from happening again.

Also, I am pleased that title VIII of this bill we are now debating on this floor, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, directly addresses defense acquisition policy and management and would make several reforms to the contracting process. So action is being taken. For instance, the bill that calls for the Department of Defense to establish a preference for fixed-price contracts when developing new programs is a needed reform that is part of this legislation we are debating now. Entering into fixed-price contracts helps eliminate the kinds of questionable costs and cost overruns seen in many previous contracts.

We need to make sure, Congress needs to make sure, all of us need to make sure that our service men and women have the support they need to defend our Nation. That is why it is so frustrating when we hear about these instances of contractors that are supposed to be supporting our troops but instead are wasting money, whether intentionally or through error or through simply misbehavior.

So what we have done today is add another \$571 million to our taxpayer savings gauge. As you can see, we are pushing toward the goal of \$100 billion. We hope to go past that. There is no end of issues that need to be addressed so that we can tell the American people that we are running an efficient and effective shop in Congress and that we are being careful with their taxpayer dollars.

I look forward to returning to the floor next week for my next installment of the “Waste of the Week.”

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, given the fact that no one has come to the floor, I wish to speak on another matter. I will do so, and when other Members come to the floor to speak, I will try to wrap up and save that time for them.

OBAMACARE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, last week I chaired a hearing of the Joint Economic Committee entitled “Examining the Employment Effects of the Affordable Care Act.” The purpose of the hearing was to discuss how the Affordable Care Act has affected the ability of Americans to earn and do business, particularly for small businessmen.

The impact of the Affordable Care Act—better known as ObamaCare—is particularly important to discuss at this point this year now that the delayed employer provisions are in effect and employers are feeling the pinch. Frankly, “pinch” is the wrong word; they are feeling the hammer blow of the burdens imposed on them, both from regulatory and a tax standpoint that are directly affecting their ability to grow, to provide jobs, and to expand their business.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the law, ObamaCare, will reduce the total number of hours worked by as much as 2 percent from the years 2017 to 2024.

People said: Two percent—is that a big deal?

Yes, it is a big deal. It is equal to 2.5 million full-time-equivalent jobs—for workers who are looking for those jobs.

The CBO reasoned that this would result from new taxes embedded throughout the ObamaCare program—not talked about when this was passed. In fact, nothing was talked about that was passed in terms of the way people could understand it, as acknowledged by the former head of the House of Representatives.

With new taxes and measures that employers will face and the financial benefits that some will be imposed, the CBO estimates a 1-percent reduction in total pay over the same timeframe as a result of ObamaCare.

This was something that was sold to the American people without credibility. All the promises that were made, some so defiantly made by the President. He said: Take my word for it, period, not one penny of increase in your premium cost. Keep your doctor. If you like your doctor, keep your doctor. If you like your health care plan, keep your health care plan. What a misrepresentation of the bill this has been.

I have received many stories in my office, by email, by regular mail, by phone calls with descriptions of the impact this law has had and the broken promises that have imposed higher premiums, higher copays, higher deductibles, and higher costs for the

American people. So we anxiously await the decision of the Supreme Court, which will be coming in several weeks or less, to see where we go.

I want to take this opportunity to share just one story of one company and the head of that company and what that one small company—providing needed and good jobs for Hoosiers in my State—has had to endure under this particular law. I think this was expressed so well by the head of that company. His name is Dr. Joseph Sergio, president of the Sergio corporation.

He came before our committee, and we heard some of the most clear and defined discussion of the impact, the personal impact on families and workers of the ObamaCare act and what it has done to his small business, which I think is representative of millions of small businesses across the country.

Dr. Sergio is a first-generation American citizen whose family business was founded 36 years ago. His father was an Italian immigrant who came to America to realize the American dream, and he did. Dr. Sergio expanded his father's business, which includes First Response—a national award-winning disaster restoration company, involved in every major hurricane and storm disaster in recent history, with awards for their performance and how effectively and efficiently they brought response to people who needed it following these disasters—and Polar Clean—another company he has which is an environmentally friendly dry ice blast cleaning industrial service. We talk about going green. We talk about caring about our environment. This is a revolutionary way of cleaning any number of factories, businesses, energy companies, and so forth with a new environmentally friendly process.

Here is what Dr. Sergio said to me: "As a small business, we have felt the profound imposition of the Affordable Care Act, or as it is known among many small business entrepreneurs, the Unaffordable Care Act."

As a small business owner, Dr. Sergio said to be successful he needed to be able to accurately identify, forecast, and control expenses in order to create profits which would then be reinvested in his growing business. That means new jobs and new opportunity. That, he said, is where the frustration with ObamaCare begins.

Now, look, what Dr. Sergio outlined is economics 101. It is the first thing you learn in an economics class or the first thing your parents tell you: To be successful—and I wish this applied to the Federal Government—you have to control your costs, you have to identify and forecast what your expenses are going to be in the future and make sure you can cover those. And only when you make a profit—not just seeking neutrality here in the Federal Government—but only when you make a

profit in the business can you grow that business and put more people back to work.

ObamaCare, Dr. Sergio said, has imposed a whole set of complications and regulations on small business owners that obscures their ability to do just that—to identify, forecast, and control expenses. This makes it difficult to determine profits that are needed to increase employee wages, expand research and development, and invest in new equipment. For a company working in disaster response, all of this is important. Of course, all of this is important for any company.

Dr. Sergio said his business has been forced to make major changes to meet the requirements imposed by ObamaCare. They had to drop their health care plan because it didn't meet the requirements of ObamaCare, even though it had been worked out between the employer and the employees and they were happy with their plan.

As a result, his employees and the company are paying more for an inferior policy. He said:

Employees are now paying larger co-pays and larger deductibles. Some are opting to pay the penalty rather than absorb the high cost of ObamaCare.

This not only illustrates how ObamaCare affects businesses but how it directly affects families all across our Nation.

Small business owners are angry because ObamaCare promised to lower costs for the average family by \$2,500. That was another broken promise from the White House. They said it would lower costs by an average of \$2,500. Rather, ObamaCare now has increased the price of insurance and decreased the quality of affordable insurance.

In addition to the quality of insurance, the mandate has affected his company's growth, said Dr. Sergio. Small business owners have a limited amount of capital to spend on their labor pool—employees. The mandates of ObamaCare have pushed spending over to the benefits side. This limits the amount of day-to-day compensation increases a company can provide.

This is not only demoralizing to the employee but frustrating to the employer that is seeing capital going into an ObamaCare-compliant benefits plan that is not benefiting their employees as well as it used to. So all the touting of the magnificence of this ObamaCare helping people to have better insurance coverage without increasing their cost is a fraud. It has simply not turned out to be what it was promised to be, and it doesn't benefit his employees—small business employees—as well as the plans they had before, he said.

So this is Dr. Sergio's current dilemma. He has a history of providing a strong benefits package, paying up to 50 percent of insurance for employees and their dependents and now is unsure how he can keep it under the new law.

He testified that surpassing 50 employees would now bring on more administrative costs and reporting requirements, causing him to purposely stay under the 50-employee threshold and utilize more part-time employees that work less than 30 hours per week.

We have heard story after story after story on this floor. I have an abundance of messages coming into my office simply saying I have no choice other than to put my full-time employees on a part-time basis. And I have no choice of adding new employees who take me over the 50-employee threshold because it puts me into all these regulations and impositions by ObamaCare. So it is having a dramatic negative effect on employment—on business growth—and that is where the jobs are. It is not the big companies as much as it is small companies in America, and they are being strangled over these regulations and taxes imposed and the regulations telling them what they have put together that their employees are happy with, that allow the employer to be profitable so they can continue to maintain these benefits and increase wages is simply out the window under ObamaCare.

Can we repair the damage of ObamaCare? Dr. Sergio closed his remarks with this request:

Please work to undo the vast harms that ObamaCare has and is causing to the middle class and start addressing the essential issue of unleashing small businesses to create millions of new jobs which could raise most people from being at risk and into truly affordable plans.

As a small business entrepreneur and job creator, I urge you to repeal ObamaCare, and allow for market innovation within the health industry, and allow for pooling across State lines, and allow small businesses freedom from oppressive requirements, new taxes and fees, and increased uncertainty.

I was moved by his testimony, and that is why I am standing here today, so I can put it in the RECORD. I was moved by his experience of how ObamaCare has impacted his business decisions in a negative way, how it has hurt his employees, the families of his employees, how it has restricted him from expanding his business, how it has caused him from going to a profitable business, where he could do more research, do more innovation, pay more, provide more benefits to his employees to a situation where he now has to reduce those benefits, where he has to sit down with his employees and say, I am sorry, under the requirements of this new act, this is where we are as a company. We can't continue to give you the benefits you once had. We can't raise your wages because we are not making the profits, and it is either go out of business or it is to try to struggle along under this new law, which is why he believes we need to change it.

I certainly agree with that, and I think this is backed by tens of millions of businesses all across America. We

can all agree with the goal of ensuring access to quality care when it is needed. I don't think anyone on this floor has disputed that fact. Unfortunately, a one-size-fits-all government-run health care system is not the answer. We are looking for the best workable, real-world solution for Americans and their health care, and we have not hit that mark. This Congress has failed and this administration has failed to hit that mark.

We should pursue initiatives that truly make health care an option for all. Such initiatives should drive down costs by increasing competition and transparency, reforming medical malpractice, making health insurance portable, promoting pooling options for small businesses, and giving States greater flexibility in how they deliver their services.

Dr. Sergio should have better certainty for his business, and all small business people should have better certainty for their future. His employees should have a better health care system, as should all Americans. These are the goals we need to reach.

We should strive for a system that puts individuals squarely in charge of their health care and doesn't discourage Americans from working and improving their earnings. That is the American dream Dr. Sergio's father sought to achieve when he started his business 36 years ago. That is the dream we should pursue. Yet we are hampered in doing that by the onerous regulations, taxes, and stipulations imposed by the health care law passed by one party without any input from the opposing party, and famously labeled as something we would need to learn about after it was passed. That was probably the most telling statement by a Member of Congress—in this case the former majority leader and then-Speaker of the House of Representatives—about something that was shoved down America's throat without any bipartisan support whatsoever.

Now, yes, if it had been read before it was passed, we could have avoided all of this. It could have been debated and people could have looked for a bipartisan way of moving forward to provide health care for the uninsured and to ensure the health care plan they imposed would not have these negative effects. That is what should have happened. It didn't. We now have a chance to rectify that. We have a chance to remedy that. We are waiting for a Supreme Court decision before we go forward with an alternative to what has cost us in terms of jobs and all the costs to small businesses in terms of their ability to grow.

That is a part of the American dream. We have denied that under this health care program, and I am hoping my colleagues will join us as we look to address this very important issue—important not only for the health of

the American public but important for the growth of our economy.

Mr. President, with that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. COATS. The Senator will be happy to do just that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

PROMOTING UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to talk about an amendment I have filed to the National Defense Authorization Act, amendment No. 1708.

This amendment would require the President to submit a comprehensive strategy within 120 days to promote U.S. interests in the Asia-Pacific region. This language or similar language was already placed in the House version of the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act.

The amendment would assure that the U.S. Government is effectively marshaling resources and employing a whole-of-government approach to implement an effective, multifaceted engagement policy in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

This region will be vital to U.S. national interests for generations to come, and the administration's Asia pivot or rebalance policy was intended to reflect that. This is something the administration has talked about for years, this Asia rebalance or Asia pivot. But currently, the administration does not seem to have such a comprehensive strategy or approach that seamlessly incorporates U.S. military, diplomatic, and commercial activities to make the rebalance an effective policy.

In April of 2014, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee released a report stating that U.S. Government agencies "have not substantially prioritized their resources to increase engagement in the Asia-Pacific region." In fact, if we look at U.S. foreign military assistance, I believe it ranks somewhere around 4 percent of spending. If we look at the Bureaus, this region we are addressing, hopefully through the Asia pivot and rebalance, receives about 1 percent or so of funding, depending on how we measure it. In fact, it is last among the Bureau funding.

Last month, at the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter announced a new initiative that envisions a boost in U.S. military assistance over the next 5 years to enhance maritime security efforts with Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Vietnam, and Thailand. This effort is a welcomed step forward but alone is not enough.

These initiatives cannot take place in a vacuum. Department of Defense ef-

forts need to be more effectively wedded with other efforts of U.S. Government agencies into a coherent and comprehensive strategy of assistance and engagement in the region. In light of the shared threats in the region, this lack of a comprehensive policy sends the wrong message to our allies throughout the region.

The amendment will ensure that Congress is a genuine partner to the administration's effort to implement this important effort. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

One of the challenges we have seen going forward, of course, in the Asia-Pacific region is—as we talk about Asia balance, as we talk about a pivot—our day-to-day attention seems to be more and more drawn to the Middle East, rightly so. But our long-term interests lie in Asia and these regions that we are trying to negotiate a Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement with. Hopefully, the House will pass trade promotion authority later this week, and we can begin to work in earnest on ideas that represent our commitment through the Asia pivot or Asia rebalance.

I am concerned that we have talked a lot of good talk and we have put together some fancy rhetoric and put a pretty good label on our foreign policy efforts as it relates to the Asia Pacific, but what we haven't done is actually followed through. While I commend Secretary Carter for his efforts and commitment, we can't just stop there. We must make sure we are doing everything we can to grow our opportunities in this region through an Asia pivot or Asia rebalance that truly does need reenergizing.

One of the best ways to help a rising China truly become a great nation is to make sure it is abiding by the norms and standards of acceptable international behavior. We have talked before about the challenges we have—from violations of intellectual property rights and cyber theft. In fact, five PLA officers have been indicted. President Obama has put forward an Executive order listing possible sanctions on cyber threats. We know that if we can start avoiding these kinds of bad behaviors when we start engaging Asia and our neighbors and friends throughout the region, the region we will be dealing with through the Trans-Pacific Partnership—it is my hope we can truly bring this amendment through the National Defense Authorization Act to bring coherence and clarity to the rebalance strategy we have talked about but so far have not been the best in our execution.

COLORADO'S WESTERN SLOPE

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I wish to talk a little bit about what is happening on Colorado's Western Slope this morning.

Several weeks ago, a judge in Denver, CO, ruled that a permit was improperly given to a mine known as the Colowyo mine on the Western Slope in North-western Colorado. This lawsuit was brought, I think, some 8 years after this permit was granted. Mine employees number around 220 people on Colorado's Western Slope. It is critical to the region's economy, and it is critical to the economy of Craig, CO. Without these employees and without this mine, it will truly be an economically devastating moment in Western Slope history.

So I hope the Department of the Interior will pay attention to the multiple letters they have received from our colleague Senator BENNET, from Governor Hickenlooper of Colorado, who have urged this to be taken seriously, to be reconsidered and appealed. It would be economically devastating for these communities to lose 220 jobs. I certainly hope the administration is paying the serious attention to this matter that it deserves.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, we will begin today, and hopefully, with the agreement of my friend from Rhode Island, we will have some amendments, voice votes, and recorded votes today. My colleagues can look forward to it. Also, those who wish to come to the floor to propose amendments, we are still looking at, hopefully, an agreement that the amendments will be closed out by this evening.

Mr. REED. We are fine with that.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words here about the fact that apparently President Obama is now going to send hundreds more troops to Iraq. "The President plans to deploy hundreds," according to the media reports, "more American troops to western Anbar Province, POLITICO has learned, to step up training for Iraqi troops who'll be charged with retaking the city of Ramadi and other ground lost to ISIL."

However, American troops still will not go into combat with Iraqi units, to help fight ISIL directly or to call for airstrikes. And defense officials continue to worry about

Iraqis' end of the bargain—whether Baghdad can send enough recruits to take advantage of a widened American training pipeline. One U.S. training center, at Al Assad Air Base in western Anbar, hasn't had any Iraqi recruits to train for months.

We are going to send 400 more people, maybe, to staff up their headquarters. I don't know, but when we have a situation where 75 percent of the air combat missions over Iraq and Syria return—75 percent of them—without dropping a weapon, it is so reminiscent of another war at another time many years ago where, under then-Secretary of Defense McNamara, this same kind of strategy prevailed.

I would remind my colleagues of the various statements that have been made by President Obama and others.

January 27, 2014: "Obama Likens ISIS to 'J.V. Team.'"

On August 7, 2014, Mr. Obama said that "the United States had no intention of 'being the Iraqi air force.'"

September 10, 2014:

President Obama authorized a major expansion of the campaign against the Islamic State, saying the United States was recruiting a global coalition to "degrade and ultimately destroy" the militants.

Unfortunately, there is still—the President said I believe the day before yesterday that "we do not yet have a complete strategy" for fighting the Islamic State and that thousands of new fighters were replenishing the ranks of the militant group faster than the coalition could remove them from the fight.

In other words, we are losing.

I would remind my colleagues of the news items today. The Wall Street Journal: "U.S. Strategy in Lebanon Stirs Fears."

Critics say Washington's funding cut for a program in Lebanon to develop alternative Shiite political voices to Hezbollah is an effort to appease Iran.

"China military says conducted drills near Taiwan, Philippines."

Chinese warships and aircraft on Wednesday passed through Bashi Channel between Taiwan and the Philippines to hold routine planned exercises in the Western Pacific.

The Hill: "U.S. training base in Iraq hasn't seen a new recruit in weeks."

The U.S. mission in Iraq has stalled at one of the five coalition training sites because the central government has not been sending new recruits, according to defense officials.

There is an interesting one in the Wall Street Journal: "Iraqi City of Mosul Transformed a Year After Islamic State Capture."

I remind my colleagues of the many statements made by American officials as well as Iraqis that they were going to retake the city of Mosul very quickly.

In Islamic State's stronghold of Mosul, the extremist group is working day and night to repair roads, manicure gardens and refurbish hotels. Iraq's second-largest city has never looked so good thanks to strict laws enforced by the Sunni militants. But beneath that ve-

neer, the group metes out deadly punishments to those who don't comply with a long list of prohibitions imposed over the year since it took control of Mosul on June 10, 2014, according to interviews with more than a dozen current and former city . . . officials.

Mosul is still almost fully inhabited—a contrast to cities where Iraqi and coalition forces have pushed the Islamic State out.

Doctors, judges, and professors who defied or questioned Islamic State laws have been executed, sometimes by public stoning or crucifixion. Prisons are filled with people awaiting their sentences from the Islamic court.

"Nearly no one gets out alive," one of the residents said.

Then came the attacks on minorities.

"There are many things we do not consider Islamic at all, like the way Christians were treated," said a female doctor from Mosul who is pious and veiled.

"All of Mosul does not accept what has happened to the Christians," said the woman, who lives in the northern city of Kirkuk. The group's attack on minorities "was a major mistake that cost them our support."

"Suicide bomber attacks tourist site in Luxor, four Egyptians wounded."

"China military conducts drills near Taiwan, Philippines."

"Al-Qaida militants in Libya attack IS after leader killed."

"China exports repression beyond its borders."

"Foreign Policy: Airstrikes Killing Thousands of Islamic State Fighters, but It Just Recruits More."

"The strength of ISIS continues to grow, so they're getting more in from recruits than they are losing through casualties," said Rick Brennan, a former U.S. Army infantry officer who was a civilian adviser to the U.S. military in Iraq. . . Brennan, now a senior political scientist at the Rand Corp., said he was basing his opinion on intelligence estimates that have been made public.

So the bragging about killing 10,000 ISIS—they forgot to mention that there are more coming in than they are killing—also reminiscent of the days of the Vietnam war where body counts seemed to be the criteria.

"Islamic State keeps firm grip one year after Mosul's fall."

Weak Iraqi forces no closer to reclaiming strategic city.

The New York Times: "ISIS Stages Attacks in Iraq and Libya, Despite U.S. Airstrikes."

Islamic State militants staged attacks near Baghdad and the Libyan city of Surt on Tuesday, underscoring the group's persistent strength on both fronts despite a monthlong American-led air campaign against it in Syria and Iraq.

The Wall Street Journal: "U.S. Prepares Plan to Send Hundreds More Trainers to Iraq," as I talked about.

The Associated Press: "State Dep't spokesman: Saving Iraq could take 3-5 years."

Naturally, there is no mention of Syria.

By the way, they said that they were developing if not a complete strategy—I would like to know the incomplete

part of it. I would like to know what strategy there is of any kind.

The Wall Street Journal: "Iraqi City of Mosul Transformed a Year After Islamic State Capture."

I mentioned before that ISIS stage attacks in Iraq and Libya despite U.S. airstrikes.

It goes on and on. Meanwhile, the President of the United States will, according to the media reports, announce today that we will send 400 or so more to Iraq, none of which is accompanied by a strategy, none of which is accompanied by forward air controllers, so we will continue to see 75 percent of the combat missions flown return to base without having discharged their weapons since we have no one on the ground to identify targets. This is incrementalism at its best or worst, depending on how you would describe it.

Today, I hope we will be able to take some additional amendments. We have a managers' package getting prepared, and I believe Senator REED and I are moving forward with some amendments we can have debated and also voted on today.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute.

McCain amendment No. 1456 (to amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.

Cornyn amendment No. 1486 (to amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Vitter amendment No. 1473 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units.

Markey amendment No. 1645 (to amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Reed (for Blumenthal) amendment No. 1564 (to amendment No. 1463), to increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

McCain (for Paul) modified amendment No. 1543 (to amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

Reed (for Durbin) modified amendment No. 1559 (to amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.

McCain (for Burr) amendment No. 1569 (to amendment No. 1463), to ensure criminal background checks of employees of the military child care system and providers of child care services and youth program services for military dependents.

Feinstein (for McCain) amendment No. 1889 (to amendment No. 1463), to reaffirm the prohibition on torture.

Fischer/Booker amendment No. 1825 (to amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

Burr/McCain amendment No. 1921 (to amendment No. 1569), to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I was first going to offer an amendment, but both the chairman and ranking member of the committee suggested that I wait until after they have had a chance to review some of the technical details. So I will speak on an amendment that I will in all probability offer at a later time.

My amendment really goes to how we make sure we help our troops with the many stresses that are in their lives. My goal is to add money to funding our commissaries. This amendment, which I will offer at a later time, restores \$322 million in cuts to commissaries proposed by the Department of Defense. It would authorize \$1.4 billion in funding—the same level that is in the House National Defense Authorization Act and in the House Defense appropriations bill. It offsets the \$322 million for commissaries by reducing the Pentagon's budget in failed policies to buy spare parts. They have a lot of waste there, and we think we can find the \$322 million we need there, and that is the technical issue we need to work, also known as the offset. But what is not technical is the fact that we have to make sure our commissaries function at their current level.

Commissaries represent one of the most significant and lasting benefits for military members and their families. Commissaries have been around

since 1826, giving military families the ability to shop at a network of stores. The commissary system is simple. If you are Active Duty, Reserve, National Guard, or a retired member of the family, you have access to 246 commissaries worldwide. They are particularly important to many of our troops overseas, and they give military families affordable access to healthy foods.

The benefits of commissaries are significant. They feed those people who are actually members of our military. They help military families stretch their budgets, and they also help provide jobs to family members in the military who work in those commissaries.

Our distinguished colleagues on the authorizing committee, Senator MCCAIN and Senator JACK REED, are themselves military men. Senator MCCAIN is a graduate of the Naval Academy and Senator JACK REED graduated from West Point. They know that one of the big expenditures right now for our military is rising health costs. The military itself is looking at how to make sure they keep our troops healthy not only while they are doing their job but also how to keep them healthy so that when they move on, they will be in excellent shape. The commissaries do those kinds of things. They provide what grocery stores provide—fresh fruits and vegetables. They provide healthy foods.

Also, for example, my own commissary at Fort Meade, which is part of the Healthy Base Initiative, has shown people how to stretch their dollar more so they can get more for their family budget and also has actual recommendations on how to add nutrition—save money and add nutrition. If we want to bend the health care cost curve, while we are looking at important medical research, research shows that good food leads to good health.

The other thing is this: Military members get a significant savings from commissaries. The average savings is about 30 percent on a grocery bill. For a family of four, that comes to over \$4,000 a year. Everyone knows how much military families are stretched, and for our men and women who are enlisted, this is a really big deal. We need to make this available for them.

What many people don't realize is that the commissaries not only create jobs, but 60 percent of commissary workers are spouses of men who serve in the military. About 100,000 jobs are supported through commissaries. The other thing the DOD wants to do is cut their hours. Well, if they cut their hours, that does cut jobs, but it also cuts opportunity.

When you are in the military, you work around the clock. You are not on the clock; you work around the clock. So if you are a military police officer, you could be getting off of duty late at night. If you are someone who repairs

our helicopters or airplanes, you could be getting off at night.

The commissary at Fort Meade serves agencies such as the National Security Agency. They essentially work a 36-hour day. They work around the clock, 24 hours a day. Our commissary isn't open 24 hours a day, but I can tell you it can't be open from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. and still meet the needs of our military workforce.

The Department of Defense wants to make the commissaries more self-sustaining, and we don't argue with that. We can always find efficiencies and look at new ways to do things. But don't cut \$322 million and further cut it close to \$1 billion over the next 4 years.

What we want to do is make sure our military families have what they need. First of all, we want them to have good food. We want them to be able to go to these commissaries at hours that work for military families. We also want to look at the long-range effects of bending the health care curve.

I am going to come back to the commissary at Fort Meade. I am very proud of the fact that Fort Meade is what we call a compassionate post. That means if you are in the U.S. Army and you have a special needs child, one of the highly desirable places to be based is at Fort Meade. Why? Because Anne Arundel County has one of the best programs for special education in the State and in the country. You also have access to Kennedy Krieger, which is one of the internationally iconic agencies that address the needs of children with not only special needs but multiple special needs.

We are very happy that Fort Meade is in Maryland and that it is known as a compassionate post. But think of those families who have a child with cerebral palsy or multiple complications that might even require the child to constantly need a respirator. All of these things go on along with the stress of being a military family. We can certainly keep the commissaries open so that they can get the food they need for their families and have the commissaries open during the hours that work for them. This is what real life in the military is.

After Desert Storm, I remember when the Appropriations Committee met under the leadership of Senator Byrd and Senator Ted Steven. They asked General Schwarzkopf what he needed in an after-action report. He said: We need better intelligence. And we worked really hard to upgrade to where we are. He also said: We need better food. We need better food for our troops, and people need to believe their families are being taken care of while they are in harm's way.

We ask a lot from our military, and our military families are now asking us: Don't cut the commissaries. Keep them open. Keep them affordable. Keep them available. Once we clarify the

technicalities of the offset, which is required, I will come back and offer my amendment, which I hope will pass the Senate with a 100-to-0 vote.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1569, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I modify my amendment No. 1569 by accepting the second-degree amendment No. 1921, offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

TITLE XVII—CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING

SECTION 1701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015".

SEC. 1702. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) ANTITRUST LAWS.—The term "antitrust laws"—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 1 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12);

(B) includes section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that section 5 of that Act applies to unfair methods of competition; and

(C) includes any State law that has the same intent and effect as the laws under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(3) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The term "appropriate Federal entities" means the following:

(A) The Department of Commerce.

(B) The Department of Defense.

(C) The Department of Energy.

(D) The Department of Homeland Security.

(E) The Department of Justice.

(F) The Department of the Treasury.

(G) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(4) CYBERSECURITY PURPOSE.—The term "cybersecurity purpose" means the purpose of protecting an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system from a cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability.

(5) CYBERSECURITY THREAT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term "cybersecurity threat" means an action, not protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, on or through an information system that may result in an unauthorized effort to adversely impact the security, availability, confidentiality, or integrity of an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term "cybersecurity threat" does not include any action that solely involves a violation of a consumer

term of service or a consumer licensing agreement.

(6) CYBER THREAT INDICATOR.—The term "cyber threat indicator" means information that is necessary to describe or identify—

(A) malicious reconnaissance, including anomalous patterns of communications that appear to be transmitted for the purpose of gathering technical information related to a cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability;

(B) a method of defeating a security control or exploitation of a security vulnerability;

(C) a security vulnerability, including anomalous activity that appears to indicate the existence of a security vulnerability;

(D) a method of causing a user with legitimate access to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system to unwittingly enable the defeat of a security control or exploitation of a security vulnerability;

(E) malicious cyber command and control;

(F) the actual or potential harm caused by an incident, including a description of the information exfiltrated as a result of a particular cybersecurity threat;

(G) any other attribute of a cybersecurity threat, if disclosure of such attribute is not otherwise prohibited by law; or

(H) any combination thereof.

(7) DEFENSIVE MEASURE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term "defensive measure" means an action, device, procedure, signature, technique, or other measure applied to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system that detects, prevents, or mitigates a known or suspected cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term "defensive measure" does not include a measure that destroys, renders unusable, or substantially harms an information system or data on an information system not belonging to—

(i) the private entity operating the measure; or

(ii) another entity or Federal entity that is authorized to provide consent and has provided consent to that private entity for operation of such measure.

(8) ENTITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term "entity" means any private entity, non-Federal government agency or department, or State, tribal, or local government (including a political subdivision, department, or component thereof).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term "entity" includes a government agency or department of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(C) EXCLUSION.—The term "entity" does not include a foreign power as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(9) FEDERAL ENTITY.—The term "Federal entity" means a department or agency of the United States or any component of such department or agency.

(10) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term "information system"—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) includes industrial control systems, such as supervisory control and data acquisition systems, distributed control systems, and programmable logic controllers.

(11) **LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “local government” means any borough, city, county, parish, town, township, village, or other political subdivision of a State.

(12) **MALICIOUS CYBER COMMAND AND CONTROL.**—The term “malicious cyber command and control” means a method for unauthorized remote identification of, access to, or use of, an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(13) **MALICIOUS RECONNAISSANCE.**—The term “malicious reconnaissance” means a method for actively probing or passively monitoring an information system for the purpose of discerning security vulnerabilities of the information system, if such method is associated with a known or suspected cybersecurity threat.

(14) **MONITOR.**—The term “monitor” means to acquire, identify, or scan, or to possess, information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(15) **PRIVATE ENTITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

(B) **INCLUSION.**—The term “private entity” includes a State, tribal, or local government performing electric utility services.

(C) **EXCLUSION.**—The term “private entity” does not include a foreign power as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(16) **SECURITY CONTROL.**—The term “security control” means the management, operational, and technical controls used to protect against an unauthorized effort to adversely affect the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of an information system or its information.

(17) **SECURITY VULNERABILITY.**—The term “security vulnerability” means any attribute of hardware, software, process, or procedure that could enable or facilitate the defeat of a security control.

(18) **TRIBAL.**—The term “tribal” has the meaning given the term “Indian tribe” in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

SEC. 1703. SHARING OF INFORMATION BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Consistent with the protection of classified information, intelligence sources and methods, and privacy and civil liberties, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and promulgate procedures to facilitate and promote—

(1) the timely sharing of classified cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government with cleared representatives of relevant entities;

(2) the timely sharing with relevant entities of cyber threat indicators or information in the possession of the Federal Government that may be declassified and shared at an unclassified level;

(3) the sharing with relevant entities, or the public if appropriate, of unclassified, including controlled unclassified, cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government; and

(4) the sharing with entities, if appropriate, of information in the possession of the Federal Government about cybersecurity

threats to such entities to prevent or mitigate adverse effects from such cybersecurity threats.

(b) **DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The procedures developed and promulgated under subsection (a) shall—

(A) ensure the Federal Government has and maintains the capability to share cyber threat indicators in real time consistent with the protection of classified information;

(B) incorporate, to the greatest extent practicable, existing processes and existing roles and responsibilities of Federal and non-Federal entities for information sharing by the Federal Government, including sector specific information sharing and analysis centers;

(C) include procedures for notifying entities that have received a cyber threat indicator from a Federal entity under this title that is known or determined to be in error or in contravention of the requirements of this title or another provision of Federal law or policy of such error or contravention;

(D) include requirements for Federal entities receiving cyber threat indicators or defensive measures to implement and utilize security controls to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures; and

(E) include procedures that require a Federal entity, prior to the sharing of a cyber threat indicator—

(i) to review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator contains any information that such Federal entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(ii) to implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—In developing the procedures required under this section, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General shall coordinate with appropriate Federal entities, including the National Laboratories (as defined in section 1702 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801)), to ensure that effective protocols are implemented that will facilitate and promote the sharing of cyber threat indicators by the Federal Government in a timely manner.

(c) **SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall submit to Congress the procedures required by subsection (a).

SEC. 1704. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PREVENTING, DETECTING, ANALYZING, AND MITIGATING CYBERSECURITY THREATS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION FOR MONITORING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a private entity may, for cybersecurity purposes, monitor—

(A) an information system of such private entity;

(B) an information system of another entity, upon the authorization and written consent of such other entity;

(C) an information system of a Federal entity, upon the authorization and written consent of an authorized representative of the Federal entity; and

(D) information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information sys-

tem monitored by the private entity under this paragraph.

(2) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the monitoring of an information system, or the use of any information obtained through such monitoring, other than as provided in this title; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION FOR OPERATION OF DEFENSIVE MEASURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a private entity may, for cybersecurity purposes, operate a defensive measure that is applied to—

(A) an information system of such private entity in order to protect the rights or property of the private entity;

(B) an information system of another entity upon written consent of such entity for operation of such defensive measure to protect the rights or property of such entity; and

(C) an information system of a Federal entity upon written consent of an authorized representative of such Federal entity for operation of such defensive measure to protect the rights or property of the Federal Government.

(2) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the use of a defensive measure other than as provided in this subsection; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION FOR SHARING OR RECEIVING CYBER THREAT INDICATORS OR DEFENSIVE MEASURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, an entity may, for the purposes permitted under this title and consistent with the protection of classified information, share with, or receive from, any other entity or the Federal Government a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

(2) **LAWFUL RESTRICTION.**—An entity receiving a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure from another entity or Federal entity shall comply with otherwise lawful restrictions placed on the sharing or use of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure by the sharing entity or Federal entity.

(3) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the sharing or receiving of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure other than as provided in this subsection; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(d) **PROTECTION AND USE OF INFORMATION.**—

(1) **SECURITY OF INFORMATION.**—An entity monitoring an information system, operating a defensive measure, or providing or receiving a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure under this section shall implement and utilize a security control to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

(2) **REMOVAL OF CERTAIN PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—An entity sharing a cyber threat indicator pursuant to this title shall, prior to such sharing—

(A) review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator contains any information that the entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(B) implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any information

contained within such indicator that the entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(3) USE OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND DEFENSIVE MEASURES BY ENTITIES.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Consistent with this title, a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure shared or received under this section may, for cybersecurity purposes—

(i) be used by an entity to monitor or operate a defensive measure on—

(I) an information system of the entity; or

(II) an information system of another entity or a Federal entity upon the written consent of that other entity or that Federal entity; and

(ii) be otherwise used, retained, and further shared by an entity subject to—

(I) an otherwise lawful restriction placed by the sharing entity or Federal entity on such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure; or

(II) an otherwise applicable provision of law.

(B) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the use of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure other than as provided in this section.

(4) USE OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS BY STATE, TRIBAL, OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—

(A) **LAW ENFORCEMENT USE.**—

(i) **PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), a cyber threat indicator shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this section may, with the prior written consent of the entity sharing such indicator, be used by a State, tribal, or local government for the purpose of preventing, investigating, or prosecuting any of the offenses described in section 1705(d)(5)(A)(vi).

(ii) **ORAL CONSENT.**—If exigent circumstances prevent obtaining written consent under clause (i), such consent may be provided orally with subsequent documentation of the consent.

(B) **EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.**—A cyber threat indicator shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this section shall be—

(i) deemed voluntarily shared information; and

(ii) exempt from disclosure under any State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure of information or records.

(C) STATE, TRIBAL, AND LOCAL REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this title shall not be directly used by any State, tribal, or local government to regulate, including an enforcement action, the lawful activity of any entity, including an activity relating to monitoring, operating a defensive measure, or sharing of a cyber threat indicator.

(ii) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO PREVENTION OR MITIGATION OF CYBERSECURITY THREATS.**—A cyber threat indicator or defensive measures shared as described in clause (i) may, consistent with a State, tribal, or local government regulatory authority specifically relating to the prevention or mitigation of cybersecurity threats to information systems, inform the development or implementation of a regulation relating to such information systems.

(e) ANTITRUST EXEMPTION.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in section 1708(e), it shall not be considered a violation of any provision of antitrust laws for

2 or more private entities to exchange or provide a cyber threat indicator, or assistance relating to the prevention, investigation, or mitigation of a cybersecurity threat, for cybersecurity purposes under this title.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—Paragraph (1) shall apply only to information that is exchanged or assistance provided in order to assist with—

(A) facilitating the prevention, investigation, or mitigation of a cybersecurity threat to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system; or

(B) communicating or disclosing a cyber threat indicator to help prevent, investigate, or mitigate the effect of a cybersecurity threat to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(f) **NO RIGHT OR BENEFIT.**—The sharing of a cyber threat indicator with an entity under this title shall not create a right or benefit to similar information by such entity or any other entity.

SEC. 1705. SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND DEFENSIVE MEASURES WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

(1) **INTERIM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and submit to Congress interim policies and procedures relating to the receipt of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures by the Federal Government.

(2) **FINAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, promulgate final policies and procedures relating to the receipt of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures by the Federal Government.

(3) **REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—Consistent with the guidelines required by subsection (b), the policies and procedures developed and promulgated under this subsection shall—

(A) ensure that cyber threat indicators are shared with the Federal Government by any entity pursuant to section 1704(c) through the real-time process described in subsection (c) of this section—

(i) are shared in an automated manner with all of the appropriate Federal entities;

(ii) are not subject to any delay, modification, or any other action that could impede real-time receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

(iii) may be provided to other Federal entities;

(B) ensure that cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government by any entity pursuant to section 1704 in a manner other than the real-time process described in subsection (c) of this section—

(i) are shared as quickly as operationally practicable with all of the appropriate Federal entities;

(ii) are not subject to any unnecessary delay, interference, or any other action that could impede receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

(iii) may be provided to other Federal entities;

(C) consistent with this title, any other applicable provisions of law, and the fair information practice principles set forth in appendix A of the document entitled “National Strategy for Trusted Identities in Cyber-

space” and published by the President in April 2011, govern the retention, use, and dissemination by the Federal Government of cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this title, including the extent, if any, to which such cyber threat indicators may be used by the Federal Government; and

(D) ensure there is—

(i) an audit capability; and

(ii) appropriate sanctions in place for officers, employees, or agents of a Federal entity who knowingly and willfully conduct activities under this title in an unauthorized manner.

(4) GUIDELINES FOR ENTITIES SHARING CYBER THREAT INDICATORS WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall develop and make publicly available guidance to assist entities and promote sharing of cyber threat indicators with Federal entities under this title.

(B) **CONTENTS.**—The guidelines developed and made publicly available under subparagraph (A) shall include guidance on the following:

(i) Identification of types of information that would qualify as a cyber threat indicator under this title that would be unlikely to include personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cyber security threat.

(ii) Identification of types of information protected under otherwise applicable privacy laws that are unlikely to be directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(iii) Such other matters as the Attorney General considers appropriate for entities sharing cyber threat indicators with Federal entities under this title.

(b) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—

(1) **GUIDELINES OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1), develop, submit to Congress, and make available to the public interim guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this title.

(2) FINAL GUIDELINES.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1) and such private entities with industry expertise as the Attorney General considers relevant, promulgate final guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this title.

(B) **PERIODIC REVIEW.**—The Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers and private entities described in subparagraph (A), periodically review the guidelines promulgated under subparagraph (A).

(3) **CONTENT.**—The guidelines required by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, consistent with

the need to protect information systems from cybersecurity threats and mitigate cybersecurity threats—

(A) limit the impact on privacy and civil liberties of activities by the Federal Government under this title;

(B) limit the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons, including by establishing—

(i) a process for the timely destruction of such information that is known not to be directly related to uses authorized under this title; and

(ii) specific limitations on the length of any period in which a cyber threat indicator may be retained;

(C) include requirements to safeguard cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons from unauthorized access or acquisition, including appropriate sanctions for activities by officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Government in contravention of such guidelines;

(D) include procedures for notifying entities and Federal entities if information received pursuant to this section is known or determined by a Federal entity receiving such information not to constitute a cyber threat indicator;

(E) protect the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons to the greatest extent practicable and require recipients to be informed that such indicators may only be used for purposes authorized under this title; and

(F) include steps that may be needed so that dissemination of cyber threat indicators is consistent with the protection of classified and other sensitive national security information.

(C) CAPABILITY AND PROCESS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and implement a capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security that—

(A) shall accept from any entity in real time cyber threat indicators and defensive measures, pursuant to this section;

(B) shall, upon submittal of the certification under paragraph (2) that such capability and process fully and effectively operates as described in such paragraph, be the process by which the Federal Government receives cyber threat indicators and defensive measures under this title that are shared by a private entity with the Federal Government through electronic mail or media, an interactive form on an Internet website, or a real time, automated process between information systems except—

(i) communications between a Federal entity and a private entity regarding a previously shared cyber threat indicator; and

(ii) communications by a regulated entity with such entity's Federal regulatory authority regarding a cybersecurity threat;

(C) ensures that all of the appropriate Federal entities receive in an automated manner such cyber threat indicators shared through the real-time process within the Department of Homeland Security;

(D) is in compliance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by this section; and

(E) does not limit or prohibit otherwise lawful disclosures of communications, records, or other information, including—

(i) reporting of known or suspected criminal activity, by an entity to any other entity or a Federal entity;

(ii) voluntary or legally compelled participation in a Federal investigation; and

(iii) providing cyber threat indicators or defensive measures as part of a statutory or authorized contractual requirement.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 10 days prior to the implementation of the capability and process required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, certify to Congress whether such capability and process fully and effectively operates—

(A) as the process by which the Federal Government receives from any entity a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure under this title; and

(B) in accordance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines developed under this section.

(3) PUBLIC NOTICE AND ACCESS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure there is public notice of, and access to, the capability and process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) so that—

(A) any entity may share cyber threat indicators and defensive measures through such process with the Federal Government; and

(B) all of the appropriate Federal entities receive such cyber threat indicators and defensive measures in real time with receipt through the process within the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) shall ensure that other Federal entities receive in a timely manner any cyber threat indicators and defensive measures shared with the Federal Government through such process.

(5) REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report on the development and implementation of the capability and process required by paragraph (1), including a description of such capability and process and the public notice of, and access to, such process.

(B) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) INFORMATION SHARED WITH OR PROVIDED TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(1) NO WAIVER OF PRIVILEGE OR PROTECTION.—The provision of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures to the Federal Government under this title shall not constitute a waiver of any applicable privilege or protection provided by law, including trade secret protection.

(2) PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Consistent with section 1704(c)(2), a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure provided by an entity to the Federal Government under this title shall be considered the commercial, financial, and proprietary information of such entity when so designated by the originating entity or a third party acting in accordance with the written authorization of the originating entity.

(3) EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall be—

(A) deemed voluntarily shared information and exempt from disclosure under section 552

of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure of information or records; and

(B) withheld, without discretion, from the public under section 552(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local provision of law requiring disclosure of information or records.

(4) EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.—The provision of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure to the Federal Government under this title shall not be subject to a rule of any Federal agency or department or any judicial doctrine regarding ex parte communications with a decisionmaking official.

(5) DISCLOSURE, RETENTION, AND USE.—

(A) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title may be disclosed to, retained by, and used by, consistent with otherwise applicable provisions of Federal law, any Federal agency or department, component, officer, employee, or agent of the Federal Government solely for—

(i) a cybersecurity purpose;

(ii) the purpose of identifying a cybersecurity threat, including the source of such cybersecurity threat, or a security vulnerability;

(iii) the purpose of identifying a cybersecurity threat involving the use of an information system by a foreign adversary or terrorist;

(iv) the purpose of responding to, or otherwise preventing or mitigating, an imminent threat of death, serious bodily harm, or serious economic harm, including a terrorist act or a use of a weapon of mass destruction;

(v) the purpose of responding to, or otherwise preventing or mitigating, a serious threat to a minor, including sexual exploitation and threats to physical safety; or

(vi) the purpose of preventing, investigating, disrupting, or prosecuting an offense arising out of a threat described in clause (iv) or any of the offenses listed in—

(I) section 3559(c)(2)(F) of title 18, United States Code (relating to serious violent felonies);

(II) sections 1028 through 1030 of such title (relating to fraud and identity theft);

(III) chapter 37 of such title (relating to espionage and censorship); and

(IV) chapter 90 of such title (relating to protection of trade secrets).

(B) PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall not be disclosed to, retained by, or used by any Federal agency or department for any use not permitted under subparagraph (A).

(C) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall be retained, used, and disseminated by the Federal Government—

(i) in accordance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by subsections (a) and (b);

(ii) in a manner that protects from unauthorized use or disclosure any cyber threat indicators that may contain personal information of or identifying specific persons; and

(iii) in a manner that protects the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying a specific person.

(D) FEDERAL REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall not be directly used by any Federal, State, tribal, or local

government to regulate, including an enforcement action, the lawful activities of any entity, including activities relating to monitoring, operating defensive measures, or sharing cyber threat indicators.

(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—

(I) REGULATORY AUTHORITY SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO PREVENTION OR MITIGATION OF CYBERSECURITY THREATS.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title may, consistent with Federal or State regulatory authority specifically relating to the prevention or mitigation of cybersecurity threats to information systems, inform the development or implementation of regulations relating to such information systems.

(II) PROCEDURES DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED UNDER THIS TITLE.—Clause (i) shall not apply to procedures developed and implemented under this title.

SEC. 1706. PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY.

(a) MONITORING OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS.—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any private entity, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for the monitoring of information systems and information under section 1704(a) that is conducted in accordance with this title.

(b) SHARING OR RECEIPT OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS.—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any entity, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for the sharing or receipt of cyber threat indicators or defensive measures under section 1704(c) if—

(1) such sharing or receipt is conducted in accordance with this title; and

(2) in a case in which a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure is shared with the Federal Government, the cyber threat indicator or defensive measure is shared in a manner that is consistent with section 1705(c)(1)(B) and the sharing or receipt, as the case may be, occurs after the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the interim policies and procedures are submitted to Congress under section 1705(a)(1); or

(B) the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to require dismissal of a cause of action against an entity that has engaged in gross negligence or willful misconduct in the course of conducting activities authorized by this title; or

(2) to undermine or limit the availability of otherwise applicable common law or statutory defenses.

SEC. 1707. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) BIENNIAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this title, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the heads of the appropriate Federal entities shall jointly submit and the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Inspector General of the Department of Energy, in consultation with the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, shall jointly submit to Congress a detailed report concerning the implementation of this title.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the sufficiency of the policies, procedures, and guidelines required

by section 1705 in ensuring that cyber threat indicators are shared effectively and responsibly within the Federal Government.

(B) An evaluation of the effectiveness of real-time information sharing through the capability and process developed under section 1705(c), including any impediments to such real-time sharing.

(C) An assessment of the sufficiency of the procedures developed under section 1703 in ensuring that cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government are shared in a timely and adequate manner with appropriate entities, or, if appropriate, are made publicly available.

(D) An assessment of whether cyber threat indicators have been properly classified and an accounting of the number of security clearances authorized by the Federal Government for the purposes of this title.

(E) A review of the type of cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this title, including the following:

(i) The degree to which such information may impact the privacy and civil liberties of specific persons.

(ii) A quantitative and qualitative assessment of the impact of the sharing of such cyber threat indicators with the Federal Government on privacy and civil liberties of specific persons.

(iii) The adequacy of any steps taken by the Federal Government to reduce such impact.

(F) A review of actions taken by the Federal Government based on cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this title, including the appropriateness of any subsequent use or dissemination of such cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity under section 1705.

(G) A description of any significant violations of the requirements of this title by the Federal Government.

(H) A summary of the number and type of entities that received classified cyber threat indicators from the Federal Government under this title and an evaluation of the risks and benefits of sharing such cyber threat indicators.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) may include recommendations for improvements or modifications to the authorities and processes under this title.

(4) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) REPORTS ON PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—

(1) BIENNIAL REPORT FROM PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this title and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board shall submit to Congress and the President a report providing—

(A) an assessment of the effect on privacy and civil liberties by the type of activities carried out under this title; and

(B) an assessment of the sufficiency of the policies, procedures, and guidelines established pursuant to section 1705 in addressing concerns relating to privacy and civil liberties.

(2) BIENNIAL REPORT OF INSPECTORS GENERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this title and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the Inspector General of

the Department of Homeland Security, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Inspector General of the Department of Energy shall, in consultation with the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, jointly submit to Congress a report on the receipt, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures that have been shared with Federal entities under this title.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) A review of the types of cyber threat indicators shared with Federal entities.

(ii) A review of the actions taken by Federal entities as a result of the receipt of such cyber threat indicators.

(iii) A list of Federal entities receiving such cyber threat indicators.

(iv) A review of the sharing of such cyber threat indicators among Federal entities to identify inappropriate barriers to sharing information.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Each report submitted under this subsection may include such recommendations as the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (1), or the Inspectors General referred to in paragraph (2)(A), with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (2), may have for improvements or modifications to the authorities under this title.

(4) FORM.—Each report required under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1708. CONSTRUCTION AND PREEMPTION.

(a) OTHERWISE LAWFUL DISCLOSURES.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to limit or prohibit otherwise lawful disclosures of communications, records, or other information, including reporting of known or suspected criminal activity, by an entity to any other entity or the Federal Government under this title; or

(2) to limit or prohibit otherwise lawful use of such disclosures by any Federal entity, even when such otherwise lawful disclosures duplicate or replicate disclosures made under this title.

(b) WHISTLE BLOWER PROTECTIONS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit or limit the disclosure of information protected under section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse, or public health or safety threats), section 7211 of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures to Congress), section 1034 of title 10, United States Code (governing disclosure to Congress by members of the military), section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3234) (governing disclosure by employees of elements of the intelligence community), or any similar provision of Federal or State law.

(c) PROTECTION OF SOURCES AND METHODS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) as creating any immunity against, or otherwise affecting, any action brought by the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to enforce any law, executive order, or procedure governing the appropriate handling, disclosure, or use of classified information;

(2) to affect the conduct of authorized law enforcement or intelligence activities; or

(3) to modify the authority of a department or agency of the Federal Government

to protect classified information and sources and methods and the national security of the United States.

(d) **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect any requirement under any other provision of law for an entity to provide information to the Federal Government.

(e) **PROHIBITED CONDUCT.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to permit price-fixing, allocating a market between competitors, monopolizing or attempting to monopolize a market, boycotting, or exchanges of price or cost information, customer lists, or information regarding future competitive planning.

(f) **INFORMATION SHARING RELATIONSHIPS.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to limit or modify an existing information sharing relationship;

(2) to prohibit a new information sharing relationship;

(3) to require a new information sharing relationship between any entity and the Federal Government; or

(4) to require the use of the capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security developed under section 1705(c).

(g) **PRESERVATION OF CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to amend, repeal, or supersede any current or future contractual agreement, terms of service agreement, or other contractual relationship between any entities, or between any entity and a Federal entity; or

(2) to abrogate trade secret or intellectual property rights of any entity or Federal entity.

(h) **ANTI-TASKING RESTRICTION.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to permit the Federal Government—

(1) to require an entity to provide information to the Federal Government;

(2) to condition the sharing of cyber threat indicators with an entity on such entity's provision of cyber threat indicators to the Federal Government; or

(3) to condition the award of any Federal grant, contract, or purchase on the provision of a cyber threat indicator to a Federal entity.

(i) **NO LIABILITY FOR NON-PARTICIPATION.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to subject any entity to liability for choosing not to engage in the voluntary activities authorized in this title.

(j) **USE AND RETENTION OF INFORMATION.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize, or to modify any existing authority of, a department or agency of the Federal Government to retain or use any information shared under this title for any use other than permitted in this title.

(k) **FEDERAL PREEMPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—This title supersedes any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State that restricts or otherwise expressly regulates an activity authorized under this title.

(2) **STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to supersede any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State concerning the use of authorized law enforcement practices and procedures.

(l) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to authorize the promulgation of any regulations not specifically authorized by this title;

(2) to establish or limit any regulatory authority not specifically established or limited under this title; or

(3) to authorize regulatory actions that would duplicate or conflict with regulatory requirements, mandatory standards, or related processes under another provision of Federal law.

(m) **AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO RESPOND TO CYBER ATTACKS.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense to develop, prepare, coordinate, or, when authorized by the President to do so, conduct a military cyber operation in response to a malicious cyber activity carried out against the United States or a United States person by a foreign government or an organization sponsored by a foreign government or a terrorist organization.

SEC. 1709. REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY THREATS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of other appropriate elements of the intelligence community, shall submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report on cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the current intelligence sharing and cooperation relationships of the United States with other countries regarding cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches, directed against the United States and which threaten the United States national security interests and economy and intellectual property, specifically identifying the relative utility of such relationships, which elements of the intelligence community participate in such relationships, and whether and how such relationships could be improved.

(2) A list and an assessment of the countries and nonstate actors that are the primary threats of carrying out a cybersecurity threat, including a cyber attack, theft, or data breach, against the United States and which threaten the United States national security, economy, and intellectual property.

(3) A description of the extent to which the capabilities of the United States Government to respond to or prevent cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, or data breaches, directed against the United States private sector are degraded by a delay in the prompt notification by private entities of such threats or cyber attacks, theft, and breaches.

(4) An assessment of additional technologies or capabilities that would enhance the ability of the United States to prevent and to respond to cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches.

(5) An assessment of any technologies or practices utilized by the private sector that could be rapidly fielded to assist the intelligence community in preventing and responding to cybersecurity threats.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be made available in classified and unclassified forms.

(d) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

SEC. 1710. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) **PUBLIC INFORMATION.**—Section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking “wells.” and inserting “wells; or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) information shared with or provided to the Federal Government pursuant to the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.”.

(b) **MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION CONCERNING PENETRATIONS OF DEFENSE CONTRACTOR NETWORKS.**—Section 941(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) is amended by inserting at the end the following: “The Secretary may share such information with other Federal entities if such information consists of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures and such information is shared consistent with the policies and procedures promulgated by the Attorney General under section 1705 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.”.

SEC. 1711. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE MILITARY CHILD CARE SYSTEM AND PROVIDERS OF CHILD CARE SERVICES AND YOUTH PROGRAM SERVICES FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS.

(a) **EMPLOYEES OF MILITARY CHILD CARE SYSTEM.**—Section 1792 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) **CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.**—The criminal background check of child care employees under this section that is required pursuant to section 231 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13041) shall be conducted pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in accordance with the provisions of section 658H of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858f).”.

(b) **PROVIDERS OF CHILD CARE SERVICES AND YOUTH PROGRAM SERVICES.**—Section 1798 of such title is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) **CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.**—A provider of child care services or youth program services may not provide such services under this section unless such provider complies with the requirements for criminal background checks under section 658H of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858f) for the State in which such services are provided.”.

(c) **FUNDING.**—Amounts for activities required by reason of the amendments made by this section during fiscal year 2016 shall be derived from amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program as specified in the funding tables in section 4301.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 1921 is rendered moot.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, turning to the underlying legislation that we are debating, the Defense authorization bill, I can't think of anything more basic or fundamental to the Federal Government's responsibility than national security and defense and to make sure we provide our men and women in uniform with the resources they need in order to do the job they volunteered to do on our behalf. Of course, many of us have commented time and again on this floor and elsewhere about the increasing complexity of the threats facing our national security and the security and peace of the world.

This legislation enables our troops to get the funding and the resources and the authorities they need in order to have success on the battlefield. As we consider the current state of the world, it is clear why this bill is vital. We live in a world marked by constant dynamic threats to our way of life. For example, parts of the Middle East and North Africa have been overrun by the Islamic State, and the region continues to be a hotbed of failed states and ungoverned places. If we have learned anything from 9/11, it is that ungoverned spaces are a threat to our national security, because that is where our adversaries will organize and train and then export those threats to our homeland.

Despite ongoing negotiations, Iran remains an enemy of the United States and continues its campaign to achieve regional domination and become a threshold nuclear State, threatening our most trusted allies and partners in the region. In Europe and in Asia, Russia and China continue to threaten our allies in their respective neighborhoods, using a growing array of soft-power and hard-power tactics to twist arms and to coerce our friends and allies. These new dynamic threats include cyber attacks, which have been much in the news today, including espionage and just outright theft of our intellectual property in seed corn created from the brains and ingenuity of American entrepreneurs and creators. Today, our courageous men and women in uniform are tasked with the challenge of facing these many threats and many others in regions all around the world.

So it is astounding to me that the Democratic leader, in the face of these threats and in the face of our grave responsibilities to meet these challenges, would come to the floor and suggest that debating this bill would be what he called a "waste of time" and go further to say that the Democratic minority would consider filibustering this legislation. It is just unbelievable.

This blatant disregard for our responsibilities and for our troops is very troubling, particularly because this bill has historically been one that has enjoyed broad bipartisan support. In

fact, as our colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona, pointed out in an op-ed he wrote yesterday, Congress has passed a Defense authorization bill for 53 consecutive years—53 consecutive years—because it is a national priority. It should be, and it is. Up to now, this bill has been marked by strong bipartisan backing in the committee. The bill sailed through the Senate Armed Services Committee with a bipartisan vote of 22 to 4. We don't get much more bipartisan in today's Senate than that. Yet, with all of the support from both sides of the aisle and even with such a clearly demonstrated need as the funding and well-being of our troops and their families, the President himself—the Commander in Chief—has threatened to veto this bill—a bill that actually provides the full funding levels he himself requested.

It is important to note—because some of our colleagues on the other side have said that the problem with this bill is that it doesn't spend enough money or that we ought to reallocate our nondefense discretionary spending to increase that, as well—that this bill includes the exact same level of funding that President Obama himself requested in his budget. So why in the world would the President threaten to veto a bill that meets the funding levels that he himself identified in his budget?

For some reason, instead of focusing on our most fundamental responsibilities of funding the brave men and women in our Armed Forces and making sure they have the resources they need to keep our country safe, our Commander in Chief and the minority leader are threatening to hold this bill hostage to extract more government spending for nondefense discretionary spending for organizations and agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service. So why in the world would we hold national security spending hostage so we can spend more money on the IRS? It is just a complete upside-down view of our priorities.

So the President's lack of strategic depth or his understanding of our Nation's most fundamental duties is really astounding. I am troubled to say this, but I think it is actually true: I think the President understands our Nation's fundamental duties very clearly. The problem is that this threat to hold this bill hostage is just cynical. It just uses a political tool to try to gain advantage when it comes to raising the caps on nondefense discretionary spending. For a President who admits that he doesn't have a complete strategy to defeat the Islamic State, I find his comments to be irresponsible. He is threatening to veto this bill to satisfy the far leftwing of his party, which doesn't believe government could ever spend too much money and that government is ever big enough. The government is never big enough or

spends enough for some of our colleagues across the aisle and some of the political base in the President's party.

Just this morning, the Washington Post reported that Senate Democrats have now come up with a brand-new political strategy, and this time they are going further—to threaten to block all funding bills for the rest of the summer, including the Defense appropriations bill, which I know the majority leader is scheduling to be debated and voted on right after we complete our work on this legislation. As a matter of fact, the Democratic leader said this morning: "We're headed for another shutdown." Senator REID said: "They did it once, they're going to do it again. . . . They want to wait until the fiscal year ends and then close up government."

It is bad enough that Democrats are threatening to filibuster the defense spending bill, but now they are claiming that it is really the Republicans' fault. In other words, they are saying: We are not for stopping the Defense authorization bill.

We are for funding our national responsibilities when it comes to national security. But because our Democratic friends wish to hold the Defense authorization bill and the Defense appropriations bill hostage, they somehow now are claiming that we are the ones responsible. Because we won't accede to their insatiable demand for bigger government and more government spending, and we won't allow them to hold our troops and their families and our national security hostage, we are the ones at fault.

But, today, as we know, thanks to the Washington Post, the filibustering of this and other bills is just part of a political strategy.

One point I have to acknowledge is the candor of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. If we want to know what they are planning to do, all we have to do is read the newspaper, because they are more than happy to tell us exactly what they are going to do and what their plans are.

This is all part of a cynical political strategy to keep the Senate from working and to deny funding to our Armed Forces while bulking up Federal agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the IRS. This is shameless, and it is hypothetical, and the American people will not be fooled by it.

I wish to remind our colleagues across the aisle that stifling debate and blocking votes is a pretty lousy political strategy, as well. It is what lost them control of this Chamber last November. It is a losing strategy, it is bad policy, it is cynical politics, and the American people understand that. It is simply shameful that they are trying to use our troops, who protect this great Nation, as some sort of leverage in some sort of political game.

I don't have to remind the Presiding Officer, who continues to serve honorably in our military services, that we live in a very dangerous world. Somehow, we don't pay enough attention to that until something reaches out and bites us or injures someone we love. Our Armed Forces face new and growing threats on a daily basis. Our troops deserve our full attention and every resource they need as they serve and defend our country around the world.

So that is why I have come to the floor, to say: Why in the world, after 53 consecutive Defense authorization bills, would the Democratic leader—and indeed with the complicity of the President of the United States himself—say they are going to hold this Defense bill hostage until they get what they want when it comes to spending more money?

This bipartisan bill, which focuses squarely on the needs of our warfighters and authorizes funding at the same level the President himself suggested, should not be held hostage to political gamesmanship. So I would encourage the more sensible Members across the aisle to focus on the troops and their families, not on the partisan agenda of their leadership, and pass this legislation to provide the funding our troops need to continue to do their courageous work of keeping our country safe.

One way my colleagues could play a constructive role and move this legislation forward, instead of threatening to filibuster, is to work with us on commonsense amendments, such as the one I have filed that is pending on the underlying bill.

Under current law, the President has discretion to allow energy exports to vulnerable allies, our partners in Europe, and around the world when it is deemed to be in our national interest. The amendment I have offered in the underlying bill simply reaffirms the existing authority of the President of the United States but encourages the President not to allow our adversaries, such as Vladimir Putin, to use energy supplies for vulnerable countries in Europe as a weapon. It would also commission a report that would allow us to get an accurate assessment of just how dependent our allies in the region are on those who would wield their energy supply as a weapon.

This amendment is a commonsense measure that serves as a first step to addressing the requests—the pleas in some cases—of our allies and partners in an increasingly unpredictable world, and it doesn't change the existing authority the President already has.

I would urge our colleagues to put down the political playbook and work with us in a constructive way on the underlying legislation. This has been the great tradition of the Defense authorization bill and one that is being threatened by the political gamesman-

ship that we see threatened by the Democratic leader and, indeed, even with the complicity and the fingerprints of the President of the United States.

We owe it and so much more to our troops, who are relying on us to act today. Even more than that, we have a duty to the country to make sure we maintain the security of the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, last week we learned of the latest in the string of massive breaches of private information from cyber penetrations, this time of government personnel records held by the Office of Personnel Management.

In its annual worldwide threat assessment, the intelligence community this year ranked cyber intrusions and attacks as the No. 1 threat to our Nation's security. Cyber attacks and threats are also a major drag on our economy, with the theft of billions and billions of dollars of intellectual property and actual money from our Nation's businesses. Quite simply, cyber attacks are a major and growing threat to every aspect of our life.

It is with that background that Senator BURR and I began working early this year on a new cyber security information-sharing bill. It is a first-step bill, in that for sharing company to company or sharing cyber threat information directly with the government, a company would receive liability protection and therefore feel free to have this kind of constructive interchange.

The Senate Select Intelligence Committee produced the bill in the last Congress, but it didn't receive a vote. Chairman BURR and I have been determined not only to get a vote but to get a bill signed into law. It should be evident to everybody that the only way we will get this done is if it is bipartisan.

With significant compromises on both sides, we put together the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act, a bill approved in March by our Intelligence Committee by an overwhelming 14-to-1 vote. That bill has been ready for Senate consideration for nearly 3 months but has not yet been brought to the floor.

Last week's attack underscores why such legislation is necessary.

The Democratic leader told me many weeks ago that this issue is too impor-

tant for political wrangling, that he would not seek to block or slow down consideration of the bill and would work to move the bill quickly. So the bill is ready for floor consideration.

Now, a number of my colleagues would like to propose amendments—as is their right—and I expect I would support some of them and would oppose some of them. The Senate should have an opportunity to fully consider the bill and to receive the input of other committees with jurisdiction in this area. Unless we do this, we won't have a bipartisan vote, I believe, because, like it or not, no matter how simple—and I have been through two bills now—this was not an easy bill to draft because there are conflicts on both sides.

Filing the cyber security bill as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill prompted a lot of legitimate and understandable concern from both sides of the aisle. People want debate on the legislation, and they want an opportunity to offer relevant amendments. To do this as an amendment—when Senator BURR discussed it with me, I indicated I did not want to go on and make that proposal—I think is a mistake.

I very much hope that the majority leader will reconsider this path, and that once we have finished with the Defense authorization bill, the Senate can take up, consider, and hopefully approve the cyber security legislation. I think if we do it any other way, we are in for real trouble, and this is the product of experience. So I very much hope that there can be a change in procedure and that this bill—I know our leader will agree—could come up directly following the Defense authorization bill.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I speak today about Cotton amendment No. 1605, addressing funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration, the administration that safeguards our nuclear stockpile for the

country. The Obama administration, in its budget earlier this year, requested approximately \$50 million per year for the next 5 years for the administration to be able to dismantle old or obsolete warheads. My amendment would simply codify President Obama's own budget request, limiting the administration to spend \$50 million per year for the next 5 years on nuclear dismantlement.

My amendment also includes a waiver that would allow the President to increase the amount of spending under certain limited conditions. This amendment has been approved not only by the majority but also the minority of the Armed Services Committee.

I offer this amendment because of troubling statements from the Obama administration about their intent to accelerate nuclear disarmament, however. Last month, Secretary of State Kerry announced at the Nuclear Non-proliferation Review Conference that the United States would accelerate its dismantlement of nuclear warheads by 20 percent. Beyond obsolete or outdated warheads, I do not believe that is a priority. Nuclear modernization is a priority.

We should not be accelerating our nuclear disarmament by up to 20 percent because it would send the exact wrong message to Russia, other adversaries, and our allies. Russia is making overt nuclear threats to the United States and our allies, and we are going to accelerate our unilateral nuclear disarmament? That defies logic.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up Cotton amendment No. 1605.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Is there objection?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object. I am very concerned about this. It unnecessarily limits the National Nuclear Security Administration's ability to dismantle the retired nuclear weapons that no longer have any role in our national defense.

The President's budget proposed \$48 million for dismantlement, and this amendment would freeze funding at that level and at specific funding levels for the next 5 years. However, the Appropriations Committee, just last month, provided an additional \$4 million for dismantlement in the Energy and Water bill.

I am ranking member on that committee. It was approved on a bipartisan basis, 26 to 4. This funding is appropriate and it is justified. The fact is, there are currently approximately 2,400 retired warheads awaiting dismantlement. The rate at which we dismantle these warheads does not have anything to do with the 4,800 warheads that remain in the stockpile, consistent with the New START treaty.

This is a treaty, not an agreement. The administration has committed ac-

celerating dismantlement and we should support its goals of eliminating redundant nuclear weapons. I see no reason to imply congressional disapproval for this effort and to micromanage NNSA's weapons activity. Modernization and dismantlement go hand in hand. NNSA routinely shifts employees from weapons stockpile stewardship and modernization work to dismantlement to keep the workforce fully and usefully engaged. It is completely unnecessary to complicate this process. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I understand that the Senator from California objects to my amendment. But this is the Senate. This is an important issue. We should be debating the matter. If the Senator from California wishes to defeat my amendment, we should call it up and make it pending and have a vote on it, not object to an amendment simply being brought to the floor to be debated.

Is there a reason to manage our nuclear policy? Yes, I would say there is a strong reason. On many issues, the administration has shown itself less than forthcoming in dealing with Congress, in particular on nuclear policy. As we now know, the administration minimized reports of Russia's activities under the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty at a time they were trying to pass the New START treaty in 2010.

I would further say this amendment simply codifies the President's budget request. The Senator from California said \$48 million for this year. For the next 4 years after that, it is \$48.3 million, \$50 million, \$52.4 million, \$51.8 million. I will concede that, in sum, that is \$50.1 million per year, on average. So I am giving the administration a haircut of \$100,000 per year. If that is objectionable, I would be happy to modify my amendment to put it at \$50.1 million per year.

But this Congress should not give the President a blank check to engage in further unilateral nuclear disarmament at a time when Vladimir Putin is making nuclear threats against the United States, invading sovereign countries, and his missiles are shooting civilian aircraft out of the sky in the heart of Europe.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I rise to speak on my amendment No. 1706. This amendment addresses the contributions of the member states to

the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in relation to their commitment towards their defense budgets within their economy.

At the 2006 NATO summit in Riga, Latvia, which I was honored to be able to attend, NATO member countries committed to spend a minimum of 2 percent of their national income, GDP, on defense. Furthermore, at the 2014 NATO summit in Wales, NATO member countries agreed again that "allies currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense will aim to continue to do so".

They went on to state that "allies whose current proportion of GDP spent on defense is below this level will: halt any decline in defense expenditure; aim to increase defense expenditure in real terms as GDP grows; aim to move towards the 2 percent guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO Capability Targets and filling NATO's capability shortfall."

Well, I suggest that is a pretty weak commitment, but it remains a commitment. It certainly can be stretched out, and they are already failing too often to meet those commitments.

So, in 2015, only 4 this year—only 4 out of the 28 NATO-member countries, including the United States, meet the 2-percent target. That is 4 out of the 28.

Regrettably, European NATO allies averaged just 1.33 percent of their GDP on defense, even though NATO countries have made numerous, unbinding, unfulfilled agreements to spend 2 percent. The United States currently spends 3.8 percent of its GDP on defense—a large portion of it defending Europe.

So, in contrast, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development data shows that European-NATO allies averaged 24 percent of their GDP on social welfare programs, contrasting to 19 percent in the United States. So they spend more in-country on their programs while we are spending more to defend them.

Unfortunately, reductions in military spending are a common theme across Europe. Just 5 years ago, according to the NATO figures, France's military budget amounted to 2.4 percent of GDP. This past year, it stood at 1.9 percent, and France's budget law orders no increases before 2019. As for Germany, Europe's economic powerhouse, it spends only 1.3 percent of its GDP on defense. By the way, the European economy, as a whole, is as large or slightly larger than the U.S. economy as a whole.

So in 1990, NATO's European member states spent, on average, about 2.3 percent GDP on defense—well above today's average of 1.3. America's share of NATO military expenditures—get this, colleagues—is 75 percent. The U.S. share of the NATO military expenditures is 75 percent and has grown an

additional 5 percent since 2007. This is a rather dramatic figure.

I had the privilege to be able to travel to Eastern Europe recently, and it was raised to us, by individuals in those countries, that they were somewhat embarrassed about this. But the reality is, they are taking no substantial steps to deal with it.

Former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates—who is one of the most wise people in the world, I believe, in terms of U.S. policy and international policy, served in multiple administrations over the years in the White House and as Secretary of Defense under President Obama and President Bush—in his last speech as Secretary of Defense had the following to say on this matter:

Indeed, if current trends in the decline of European defense capabilities are not halted and reversed, future U.S. political leaders—those for whom the Cold War was not the formative experience that it was for me—may not consider the return on America's investment in NATO worth the cost.

What I've sketched out is the real possibility for a dim, if not dismal future for the transatlantic alliance. Such a future is possible, but it is not inevitable. The good news is that the members of NATO—individually and collectively—have it well within their means to halt and reverse these trends, and instead produce a very different future.

This was his last speech. He made a speech on a subject he considered to be extraordinarily important. It is a statement he has made previously at other times, but it reflected, I think, something akin to Washington's Farewell Address as he raised and discussed one of the most important problems facing the world today; that is, the developed world, other than the United States, is not conducting itself financially in an effective way to defend themselves.

Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, for decades one of the world's wisest world leaders and commentators, has repeatedly questioned Europe's will. It gets down to that level: To what extent is Europe willing to pay a modest price to maintain their security?

There was a book out a number of years ago, referred to as "Of Paradise and Power," and Robert Kagan's book notes that the Europeans are living in the paradise provided by American power.

So when the Russians took this aggressive step to invade the Ukraine, a nation we have considered for admission into NATO, took Crimea and otherwise acted in violation of international law, we announced a European reassurance initiative, \$1 billion. This \$1 billion was to be utilized in a way that would reassure our allies and reaffirm our commitment to Europe, even in the face of this dangerous and provocative action by Russia.

Well, colleagues, after having been to Europe and Eastern Europe on a number of occasions, I would say I am get-

ting to the point where I want to be reassured. I want to have confidence in Europe's commitments.

At this volatile time in world history, this lack of commitment on the part of our European allies must end. We need to ensure that NATO members are spending at least what is needed and certainly the minimum 2 percent of GDP they repeatedly committed to spend.

The dangers in this world are much closer to Europe than they are to the United States, and our European allies are right to be concerned. They are anxious to have our presence. The requests for more and numerous military support, action from the United States, are even urgent in some of those countries. They want us there.

But, great danger arises from Europe living in an unreal comfort zone, living in the paradise of American power. Unless the history of the world has been dramatically altered, and it has not, threats to Europe will remain. Who will resist the dangerous pressures on Europe? Will our European partners just rest on American power? That is what the reality suggests is, in fact, occurring now.

Europeans now insist Greece must take painful financial steps for the good of the European Union to be a good team player, they say.

I think it is right and appropriate for the United States to call on our NATO allies to do their part for this great alliance that has done so much for stability, prosperity, and peace for Europe and for the entire world.

This amendment before the Senate has overwhelming support, I believe. I think it will be accepted as part of the managers' package. The call it makes on NATO members is the absolute minimum, I think, that can be expected of them.

Let's consider the plain facts. The deployment of U.S. military forces to any nation in the world, for the purpose of defending that nation and a region, is an august thing. Obviously, the military might of the United States is unsurpassed. The United States cannot and must not take these commitments lightly. The ramifications of our commitment to the defense of a foreign nation are significant—grave indeed.

This Nation has every right and a duty to our citizens to ensure that those with whom we partner do their share. The idea that a small nation can simply send an email to the United States calling for more forces whenever they become nervous—while taking only limited steps to fund and defend their own country—suggests a disconnect with reality.

This Senate, by this amendment, is sending a clear call for NATO to do more. It is not too late to maintain this alliance as the force for good it has always been. But everyone on both sides of the Atlantic who understands

these issues realizes we are in a precarious situation if a miscalculation occurs, and miscalculations can lead to violence and war.

So it is time to make clear the strength of our commitment to each other and to ensure there is no miscalculation. To do that, more is required of our NATO allies.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise to speak about amendment No. 1473 that is pending. I will be modifying it, not now but later today, in a technical way. The majority and the minority have been notified of this modification, so I will be making that later, and I am going to talk about the substance of the amendment.

This amendment is very significant in terms of our Army force structure. It would limit any additional reductions the Army can make to Army BCTs, which have already been drastically reduced from 48 brigade combat teams in 2008 to 45 in 2013, to now 33 in 2015—so in just 7 years, from 48 to 33. Obviously, it was a dramatic reduction.

This is important because brigade combat teams are a very significant element of Army force structure, and many experts all across the spectrum would acknowledge that and would acknowledge that further significant reductions would be very dangerous.

To clarify, my amendment would require the Army to trim its force structure. It doesn't stop that trend, but it also offers protections for that primary core unit of the brigade combat team without mandating additional money, additional requirements, et cetera. There is a serious and urgent need for Congress to act quickly so the Defense Department has the authority and support it needs to defend our Nation.

This specific amendment protecting those core, required brigade combat teams is supported by the National Guard Association of the United States and the Association of the United States Army, the two key national groups that support the direct Army and the National Guard.

Some Members may argue that we don't want to micromanage the Army and how it deals with force structure. I certainly agree with that generally, but this is certainly not getting into the fine weeds. This is a major issue, and brigade combat teams are a major tool of their force structure. Furthermore, exactly this sort of limitation has been done in this bill, in the underlying bill, both with regard to the Air Force and with regard to the Navy.

The bill, as it stands on the floor coming out of committee, includes numerous provisions to block the elimination of certain weapons systems, such as the Air Force fighter inventory, the A-10, EC-130 Compass Call aircraft. So it is very similar on the Air Force side to justify blocking these eliminations. The chairman's report states:

The committee believes further reductions in fighter force capacity, in light of ongoing and anticipated operations in Iraq and Syria against the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant, coupled with a potential delay of force withdrawals from Afghanistan, poses excessive risk to the Air Force's ability to execute the National Defense Strategy, causes remaining fighter squadrons to deploy more frequently, and drives even lower readiness rates across the combat air forces.

Exactly that same sort of rationale which is in the bill with regard to limitations of what the Air Force can do also applies to the Army and brigade combat teams.

In addition, the same sort of thing is already in this underlying bill with regard to the Navy. There is specific language blocking certain further reductions of aircraft carriers—again, a major element of force structure; again, Congress saying: No, don't go below this number. That is not justified. That will weaken our overall capability, and that will weaken force structure.

So again on the Navy side on this bill the chairman and the committee have done exactly the same thing. My amendment would simply do something very similar and equally as important and justified on the Army side with regard to brigade combat teams.

Because of the significance of brigade combat teams to Army readiness and operations, because of the enormous cuts that have already been made in those numbers in the last 7 years—from 48 to 33—I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to support this commonsense amendment.

Again, Madam President, to underscore, I will be returning to the floor sometime today to modify my amendment in a technical way. Everyone—certainly including the majority and minority leaders on this bill—has been given those modifications. They are not controversial. I will simply wait for them to be on the floor to make that modification, which is within my right and purview and does not require unanimous consent, and then I am very hopeful this amendment will be tied up in the next group of votes, perhaps around 3:30.

Madam President, with that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1921

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I want to say a few words about the Burr amendment, No. 1921, which has now been made pending. I am thankful for the leadership of Chairman BURR and Vice Chairman FEINSTEIN.

The language of this amendment, of which I am an original cosponsor, was overwhelmingly approved by a 14-to-1 vote in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in March.

Implementing legislation to address a long list of cyber threats that have become all too common is among my highest priorities. Earlier this month, it was the Office of Personnel Management and the Army. A few weeks before that, it was the Pentagon network, the White House, and the State Department. Before that, it was Anthem and Sony. That is just to name a few.

I am pleased we are able to consider this amendment on the National Defense Authorization Act. This voluntary information sharing is critical to addressing these threats and ensuring that mechanisms are in place to identify those responsible for costly and crippling cyber attacks and ultimately deterring future attacks.

Our current defenses are inadequate, and our overall cyber strategy has failed to deter cyber adversaries from continued attacks of intellectual property theft and cyber espionage against the U.S. Government and American companies. This failure to develop a meaningful cyber deterrent strategy has increased the resolve of our adversaries and will continue to do so at a growing risk to our national security until we demonstrate that the consequences of exploiting the United States through cyber greatly outweigh any perceived benefit.

This amendment is a crucial piece of that overall deterrent strategy, and it is long past time that Congress move forward on information-sharing legislation. This legislation—again, 14 to 1 from the Select Committee on Intelligence—complements a number of critical cyber provisions which are already in the bill which will ensure that the Department of Defense has the capabilities it needs to deter aggression, defend our national security interests, and, when called upon, defeat our adversaries in cyber space.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Defense to develop, prepare, coordinate, and, when authorized by the President, conduct a military cyber operation in response to malicious cyber activity carried out against the United States or a U.S. person by a foreign power.

The bill includes a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to conduct biennial exercises on responding to cyber attacks against critical infra-

structure. It limits \$10 million in funds available to the Department of Defense to provide support services to the Executive Office of the President until the President submits the integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyber space, which was required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

It authorizes \$200 million for a directed evaluation by the Secretary of Defense of the cyber vulnerabilities of every major DOD weapons system by not later than December 31, 2019.

It requires an independent panel on DOD war games to assess the ability of the national mission forces of the U.S. Cyber Command to reliably prevent or block large-scale attacks on the United States by foreign powers with capabilities comparable to those expected of China, Iran, North Korea, and Russia in years 2020 and 2025.

It establishes a \$75 million cyber operations procurement fund for the commander of U.S. Cyber Command to exercise limited acquisition authorities.

It directs the Secretary of Defense to designate Department of Defense entities to be responsible for the acquisition of critical cyber capabilities.

The cyber security bill was passed through the Select Committee on Intelligence because that is clearly, in many respects, among the responsibilities of the Select Committee on Intelligence. But I think it is obvious to anyone that the Department of Defense is a major player. I just outlined a number of the provisions of the bill which are directly overseen and related to the Department of Defense.

So my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be all torqued-up about the fact that this cyber bill should be divorced from the Department of Defense. I know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are very aware that just in the last few days, 4 million Americans—4 million Americans—had their privacy compromised by a cyber attack. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has stated that we are ahead in every aspect of a potential adversary except for one, and that is cyber. There are great threats that are now literally to America's supremacy in space and to many other aspects of technology that have been developed throughout the world and are now part of our daily lives.

So I am not quite sure why my friends on the other side of the aisle should take such exception to legislation that addresses our national security and the threats to it, which literally every expert in America has agreed is a major threat to our ability to defend the Nation.

So I think there are colleagues who are not on the Intelligence Committee and are not familiar with the provisions of this bill. It clearly is not only Department of Defense-related, but it is Department of Defense-centric, with

funds available to DOD to provide services to the Executive Office of the President, \$200 million, cyber vulnerabilities of major DOD weapons system, an independent panel on DOD war games, and on and on. It is Department of Defense-related, and it is the whole purpose of the Defense authorization bill, which is to defend the Nation. To leave cyber security out of that—yes, there are some provisions in the underlying bill, but this hones and refines the requirements that we are badly in need of and gives the President of the United States and Secretary of Defense tools to try to limit the damage that is occurring as we speak.

I want to repeat—and to my colleague from Indiana who is a member of that committee, I would ask him—4 million Americans recently were compromised by cyber attack.

Mr. COATS. In response to my friend from Arizona—

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, this is a serious breach, and there is more to the story to be told. It shows the extreme position that we are in here as Americans, as there are those who want to take this country down, those who want to invade privacy of Americans and have the capabilities of breaching this. The legislation before us, and the reason why it is brought here now and, hopefully, will be attached to the Defense bill is that this needs to be done now and not later. How many breaches do we have to hear about—whether it is the private sector or whether it is the government sector—before this Congress and this Senate will stand up and say we have the capability of preventing some of these things from happening, but we need the legislative authority to do it. To delay and not even allow us to go forward with this puts more and more millions of Americans at risk, whether they work for the government or are in private industry.

Mr. MCCAIN. And isn't it true, I would ask my colleague from Indiana, that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recently stated that in the potential of our adversaries to threaten our security, we have a definite superiority in all areas except for one, which is in the issue of cyber security; is that correct?

Mr. COATS. I think that is obvious, because, clearly, while we have the capability to address some of these issues, we are not allowed to use the capability. This legislation gives us the opportunity to have a cooperative effort. Some of those who resist the use of this because they think it is potentially a breach of privacy now understand that breaches are occurring from

outside and into the United States, by those who are enemies of the state, those who are criminal groups, those who are terrorist groups. While we may have the capacity to deal with this, without this legislative authority we are not allowed to use it.

So what an irony—what an irony that some are saying: We can't trust the government on this to help us. This is defense. This is like saying we can't trust the Department of Defense, we can't trust the Army or the Navy to protect us from attack because it is government-run. Now, they are saying there are some operations in government here that are part of our defenses that can't be used until we have authority. The irony is that people's privacies are being breached by all of these attempts, and we are denying the opportunity to put the tools in place to stop that from happening.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I ask my colleague again: The 4 million people whose privacy was just breached—4 million Americans—what potential damage is that to those individual Americans?

Mr. COATS. Well, we are just learning what damage this is and how it can be misused in any number of ways. Some of this information is classified. But I can say to my colleague from Arizona, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that this puts some of our people and some of our systems in great peril. It is something that needs to be addressed now and not pushed down the line.

Mr. MCCAIN. So it seems to me that to those 4 million Americans, we owe them and it is our responsibility—in fact, our urgent responsibility—to try to prevent that same kind of breach from being perpetrated on 4 million or 8 million or 10 million more Americans. If they are capable of doing it once to 4 million Americans, what is to keep them from doing the same thing to millions of Americans more, if we sit here idly by and do nothing on the grounds that the objection is that it is not part of the Department of Defense bill, which seems to me almost ludicrous?

Mr. COATS. Well, since the Department of Defense is one of those agencies being attacked, I would certainly think this is the appropriate attachment to a bill for which, hopefully, we will be given the opportunity by our friends across the aisle. Hopefully, we will be able to pass it in the Senate, move it on to the House, and get it to the President so that these authorities can be in place.

The Senator mentioned 4 million. A company whose headquarters is in the State of Indiana, Anthem insurance company, was breached—and this is public information—of 80 million people on their roles. That is almost one-third of all Americans who have had their private information breached by

a cyber attack—not to mention the threat that comes from cyber attack on our critical infrastructure.

What if they take down the financial system of one of our major banks or several banks? What if they take down the financial transactions that they place on Wall Street every day? What if they shut down an electric power grid in the middle of February when the temperatures in the Northeast are in minus-Fahrenheit temperatures or when it is 110 degrees in Phoenix and you lose your power and can't turn on air conditioning? People will die. People will be severely impacted by this. To not go forward and give authorization to use the tools to try to better protect American safety is not only unreasonable but is a very serious thing.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleague from Indiana for his outstanding work on a very difficult issue that poses a threat to every American and citizens throughout the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator VITTER's amendment No. 1473, which requires the Army to maintain no fewer than 32 brigade combat teams, which are also referred to as BCTs.

I support this amendment because cutting the brigade combat teams is cutting the core of the Army's structure and their ability to perform their mission. This amendment requires the Army to maintain a brigade combat team level of 32. Currently, the Army is planning on cutting these to 30 and to continue cutting to a point where we will have a hollow force. This is a short-sighted approach to a bigger problem.

First, what the amendment says is that the Secretary shall give priority under this paragraph to be carried out as funding or appropriations become available.

Secondly, nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede the Army's manning of brigade combat teams at designated levels, and it requires congressional defense committees to have a report on the current manning of each brigade combat team of the Army. It also ensures that the Army National Guard brigade combat teams are maintained at 26, and this accounts for the deactivation of two Air National Guard brigade combat teams previously agreed to.

You may ask, Why do we need 32 brigade combat teams? At the height of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, we had 48 brigade combat teams. If we have noticed, in the Middle East, it is getting worse, not better. This is not to say that we will commit these troops, but it will be to say that we shall maintain our readiness.

Next, the Army's key weapon system is the brigade combat team. This

amendment protects that key weapon from those cuts.

Lastly, reducing brigade combat teams does not—I emphasize, does not—make existing brigade combat teams more ready. It wears them out. If you have fewer teams, they are deployed more often in whatever activity they are deployed to, and that stretches that manpower and womanpower potentially to the break.

Under this, with the higher level of force, there is less stress upon those who are there maintaining their readiness. In total, this amendment requires the Army to take a closer look at their strategy and risk, forcing the Army to think long term instead of just cutting the most crucial part of our force, which is the people, the human capital, our fellow citizens.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to support the underlying bill we are talking about on the floor, which is the Defense authorization bill.

At a time of a rapidly deteriorating security environment around the world, we need to modify our policies. From the violence in Iraq and Syria to China's aggressive land reclamation in the South China Sea to Russia's activities on the eastern border of Ukraine as we speak here today—all of this is going on. We live in a world that is a lot less safe and less friendly to U.S. interests. Every day we see more of this. Frankly, it is time for us here in the Senate to help by changing some of our policy approaches to address this changing and more dangerous situation we see around the world.

I would hope we can do this on a bipartisan basis. Our differences with regard to other issues tend to be more pronounced, but with regard to national security, normally we come together. I am concerned with what I am hearing, at least from some of the debate I have heard on the floor, where it sounds as though some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to actually shut down this debate and not have a debate on some of these amendments and not have some votes on some of these amendments and not have a vote on this bill to try to adjust our national security posture so that we can address these new challenges around the world. It doesn't mean that everything that this side of the aisle wants to do would be accepted. Democrats would have the chance to offer their ideas, and we would have a good debate on it, and

they would have a say in it. We need Democrat support to get the legislation done. But let's have that debate and that discussion.

So I hope that what I am hearing is not accurate. I hope we will be able to come together and continue this discussion and be able to have votes on amendments and on the final bill and then be able to help, to the extent we can in the Senate, to adjust our foreign policy and our national security policy to address these very real threats we see emerging all over the world.

I will give an example of one that I will offer today. This is an amendment that has to do with Ukraine. As some of my colleagues know, the situation in Ukraine has deteriorated significantly in the last year or so, and it has done so because Russia not only invaded Crimea and took that part of Ukraine but they are also now continuing their aggression on the border of Ukraine. This is a situation that affects us as Americans because Ukraine is our ally. Ukraine is a country that has decided to stand with us. It is time for us and the other NATO countries to stand with them.

Our policy toward Ukraine, in my view, has been not just insufficient but it has been kind of piecemeal. We haven't had a strategy to deal with this issue. So what this amendment attempts to do is to take the language that is in the underlying legislation—already in the bill the committee put together—and improve it so that, indeed, we do have a more comprehensive strategy toward Ukraine. This is incredibly important not just for Ukraine but for the international order, for our national security, and for our ability to help stop this aggression in Europe—the first, really, since World War II, where we have seen that a country is going across another country's boundaries and actually violating territorial integrity.

I visited Ukraine a couple of months ago in April. I got to see some of the conflict consequences firsthand. For those who have been to Ukraine—a number of my colleagues have, including Senator DURBIN, who just got back from Ukraine—I think they would all agree with me that Ukraine is in a state of war and it is under siege. That makes it much more difficult for Ukraine to do what they know they need to do, which is to improve their economy, to deal with corruption, to have more transparency, to become more like those countries they want to emulate—the European countries and the United States of America. They are attempting to do that, but it is difficult when they have this conflict on their border where troops are being killed and civilians are being killed and where they have to devote enormous amounts of time and resources.

Just this week I had the opportunity to meet with the Prime Minister of

Ukraine and the Finance Minister, both of whom are in town. In fact, we met with them yesterday as part of the Ukrainian Caucus, which I cofounded with Senator DURBIN. I will tell my colleagues that talking to them, it is very troubling to hear what is happening in their country right now.

As some of my colleagues know, there is supposed to be a cease-fire in place. It came from the second of what is called the Minsk agreement. Whatever semblance of credibility this Minsk cease-fire had left—I don't think it had much—it has now totally crumbled. Just last week, combined Russian-separatist forces launched a major assault to the north and southwest of the Province of Donetsk. Donetsk is one of those areas also known as an oblast or a province, where there is a lot of Russian and Russian-separatist activity. They were focused on this strategic town of Maryinka. We probably saw some of this on TV. It is very troubling that once again it looks as of these separatist forces, backed by Russia and Russian equipment, which are directly involved in this, are beginning to push back into Ukraine again.

The casualty reports are still coming in, but it appears that dozens have been killed or wounded in this assault, according to BBC. These independent news organizations are following this, and I hope all of us are focused on this. The U.S. intelligence in the area is not what it ought to be, frankly, in my view, so we do need to rely on some of these media sources.

It is very clear that in terms of this assault, they were using tanks and heavy multiple-launch rocket systems and over 1,000 men were involved. So clearly, this is something that is not only a serious military exercise, but it is one that is backed by Russia, using Russian equipment. We have seen just how committed the Russian Government is to this—to promoting instability in that region of the world. They are committed.

The question is whether we are committed to step up and support the people of Ukraine. This is something that, in my view, the NATO forces and the United States should have done a long time ago—not by us getting involved directly, which, frankly, that is not what they are asking for. They are asking for assistance and aid to be able to defend themselves. They are asking for us to help them to be able to stop this assault by giving them just the basic weaponry they need to stop tanks, potentially to stop aircraft if aircraft get involved, and to be able to stop the invasion and to protect the territorial integrity of the country of Ukraine.

The President and some of his top advisers continue to stand in the way of meaningful U.S. and NATO action. They have told me they fear that it would provoke Russia, as if deadly clashes such as the one we saw last

week and, in fact, yesterday—and we will continue to see today, probably, this steady stream of Russian tanks, artillery pieces, and soldiers into Ukraine—aren't evidence enough that NATO and American restraint has not deescalated this conflict. In fact, I think, in a way, it has emboldened the Russians, and it has inflamed them. Again, we are not talking about U.S. troops. What we are talking about is helping this country that is our ally that has turned to us through NATO, and we want them to be able to defend themselves.

The President continues to enforce this *de facto* embargo on any kind of significant weapon that Ukraine has said it needs to defend itself. He does that despite an overwhelming bipartisan consensus here in this body and in the House that it is time to increase this help. That would include lethal and nonlethal assistance to Ukraine. Congress has voted repeatedly to do just that, most notably in the Ukrainian Freedom Support Act, which was signed into law by President Obama in December. It also provided the President a national security waiver so he didn't have to do what we think he should do, which is to help them to defend themselves. The administration continues to withhold these arms, and it is time for that to end.

There is really very little disagreement on the capabilities that Ukraine needs. My amendment, which is amendment No. 1850, modifies and builds on the great work that Senator MCCAIN and Senator REED and others have already done in the bill. If we look at section 1251 of the bill, we will see that there is already assistance being provided to Ukraine, about \$300 million. Our amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to spend this money in a way that all of us know is the appropriate way to ensure that we get the most bang for the buck and that we are giving them the assistance they really need.

It requires the Secretary of Defense to spend this money on a number of critical capabilities they need to defend themselves, including real-time intelligence, medium-range and long-range counter-artillery radars, defensive lethal assistance such as antitank weapons, UAVs, secure communications, and training to develop key combat, planning, and support capabilities at both the small unit level and at the brigade level. So it provides, frankly, less wiggle room for the administration by laying out exactly what is needed, what is being asked for by the Ukrainian military, and what, in this Chamber and having done a lot of work in this area through our Ukrainian Caucus and through other sources, we know is necessary.

Half of this \$300 million under our amendment would be fenced off until at least \$60 million of it is spent on the

important capabilities the Ukrainians really need and have requested. That is the real-time intelligence, defensive lethal assistance, and counter-artillery batteries. If the administration fails to use this money for the purposes specified, then they have to use it to support other nations facing an increased risk of Russian aggression—countries such as Georgia and Moldova.

The amendment also requires DOD to report on the quantity and the type of security assistance being provided to Ukraine and how it complies with the purposes that are established in the legislation.

So the amendment helps to ensure that U.S. military assistance provides the assistance that will truly have a meaningful impact on the ground, and it gives Ukraine the tools it needs to defend itself.

It will also finally increase the cost of Russia's aggression. At no point has President Putin's decision to escalate this war been costly enough to force President Putin and the Russians to fundamentally reconsider their strategy. The annexation of Crimea, the campaign to destabilize and then invade eastern Ukraine last summer and fall, and the recent offensive have all happened despite a flurry of Western attempts to force a negotiated settlement. In fact, each temporary cease-fire in some senses has merely legitimized what the Russians have done. When there is this flurry of diplomatic activity, it tends to happen after the Russians have made gains on the ground and then it accepts those gains on the ground as the basis for negotiations, granting the separatists and their Russian supporters moral and, I would say, some legal equivalency that they simply don't deserve.

There is a pattern here. They seize the land, they preserve their gains through an internationally mediated cease-fire, and then they break that cease-fire, as they are doing right now, to seize more land and then use a new cease-fire to secure acceptance of their new gains. This has to stop.

The Obama administration and some EU members have been so fixated on ensuring that the successful implementation of the February cease-fire is a goal in and of itself that they have lost sight of this broader policy objective that a cease-fire should be working to achieve, which should be the defense of Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity and support for the economic and political reforms that Ukraine needs. Let me underscore that. It is very difficult for them to undertake the economic and political reforms they need with this siege going on, and that is what we need. We need them to make those reforms so they cannot just keep their territorial integrity but also so they become a stable, democratic, and prosperous country.

The Russian aggression in Ukraine is not going to go away or resolve itself

simply because we wish it to. It will take a comprehensive strategy, which is laid out in this amendment, and coordinated political, military, and economic actions to change the current dynamic. Sanctions and economic assistance for Ukraine are important, but they are tools, not a strategy. Russian military action has been successful in threatening Ukraine's stability where other attempts to use economic or political means have failed. So what the Russians and separatists have found is that they have tried to disrupt through economic means and political means, and they haven't been successful there. In fact, the Ukrainians have rejected that, including by a recent election. It is no accident that their most successful tactic, the military tactic, is the one the United States and the West has done the least to address.

I have argued for months that this piecemeal, reactionary response to intimidation from Moscow is a recipe for failure. Instead, we have to have a comprehensive, proactive strategy that strengthens NATO, deters Russian aggression, and gives Ukraine the political, economic, and military support it needs to maintain its independence. We need a strategy that seeks to shape the outcomes, rather than one that is shaped by them. Much of that leadership must come from us and the administration here in the United States. Of course, this body has an important role to play, and that is what this amendment is all about.

Let's include funding for Ukrainian military assistance, not just in this authorization bill where we are setting the policy for it, but let's be sure in the spending bills that follow that we provide the Ukrainians what they need.

We should pass this legislation—the underlying bill—which Chairman MCCAIN has correctly noted is critical to helping us deal with so many challenges in the dangerous world we face. We should pass, again, the defense spending bill that doesn't leave the men and women in uniform without the means to carry out their incredibly important mission.

Importantly, for today's purposes, we have to be clear about what the stakes are in Ukraine. Events in Ukraine are a direct and deliberate challenge to the credibility of NATO itself, to the U.S.-led international order. President Putin's actions upend decades of established international norms and threaten the very foundation of this system order. Confidence in America and our European allies' unity and commitment to upholding this system deters bad actors. It incentivizes other countries to play by the rules. That is what we want. We want to help ensure peace, stability, and prosperity. If the credibility of our commitment is in doubt, the risk of economic collapse, more violence, and more instability increases. Into a void, chaos ensues. The Ukrainians understand this. They understand

the importance of this conflict well beyond their borders. I hope in the United States of America we understand it. I hope we act in a way to help the Ukrainians be able to defend themselves and counter these activities on the eastern border of Ukraine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of debate only until 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you so much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business until I conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

HIGHWAY BILL

I come to talk about something different than the pending legislation—I have a number of things to say about that, a number of amendments I am supporting, many of them bipartisan.

At this point, I want to talk about the crisis we are facing in terms of our highway bill. We now have 51 days until the highway trust fund is empty. For all of us, this is a terrible prospect because a lot of our States rely on the Federal Government for up to 85 to 90 percent of their funding. Some States rely on less. My State relies on about 50 percent, but it is still huge. When this trust fund goes under, we are going to be in a lot of trouble.

What we have seen in this particular Senate since our Republican friends took over—and they are my friends—are a number of self-inflicted crises. Lord knows we have enough of them coming our way, we don't have to invent them—but we have seen several. In the first crisis we had, we were headed toward a partial shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security over an unrelated immigration issue. That was ridiculous. There was a lot of angst and finally it was resolved.

The second self-inflicted crisis ended last week, and it was brought about because the Republican leader didn't like the USA FREEDOM Act the House had passed overwhelmingly. As a result of his opposition, he, for several days, turned away from 57, 58, and more Senators who actually supported that bill, and he brought the surveillance of terrorists to a screeching halt. That wasn't what he wanted to do, but as a result of that self-inflicted crisis, we

had a couple of moments there where we were dark. That problem luckily ended after a couple of days.

And now we are headed for another self-inflicted crisis, although I must say, from conversations I have had, I have some hope we can avert this crisis.

We have known about this since last December, when Democrats said: Let's stay in until we solve the highway trust fund. And Republicans said: Oh, no, let's just take care of it in May. Then, in May, the Republicans said: Let's just take care of it in July. That is no way to run a country. It is no way to run a transportation system. It is ridiculous, and our States, as I will point out later, are starting to cut way back on transportation projects—highways, bridges, and transit systems—because they are scared we are not going to reach agreement. So, 51 days, and I am here today to talk about it.

I want to show you a photograph of a bridge collapse in Minneapolis, MN, that happened in August of 2007. This bridge collapsed because there was a design flaw. It went undetected because there were not enough inspections made of the bridge because there wasn't enough being spent on ensuring that our bridges are safe.

To me, as I look at this, it is a metaphor for the current status of the highway trust fund, which supports thousands of businesses and millions of jobs and is on the verge of bankruptcy. You can see on this photograph the chaos, the danger, the disaster. Even though there are no people you can see, you can imagine the shock that occurred from this collapse.

Now, you might think this is an isolated incident, but I want to tell you we have 61,300 bridges in the United States which have been cited as being structurally deficient by engineers. The fact that we don't have a multiyear plan in place to fix these bridges is a shame upon our Nation. It is a shame upon our Nation. If you had your loved one in one of these cars, you would know this is unacceptable.

My message today to both sides of the aisle and to the House and the Senate is simple: We cannot afford to pass yet another short-term extension because that doesn't give us the certainty or the funds to fix bridges such as these—the 61,300 bridges that need repair. The continued inaction by Congress to enact a long-term bill is a disgrace and we need to meet this challenge head-on.

Now, I have heard rumors that we are making progress, and I know we are in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I serve on that committee with my friend Senator INHOFE. He and I have agreed we will go forward with a multiyear bill. This is wonderful. It is a little late in the day—we should have done it a long time ago—but I am proud he and I have agreed this is a pri-

ority. We have a date set of June 24 to mark up the bill. That is only about 35 days before the collapse of the trust fund, but if all the other committees did their job as our committee did, we would be OK. So, yes, I am encouraged, but there are three other committees that haven't set up dates to mark up anything, as far as I know. Unless a miracle occurs, I believe my Republican friends are going to ask us for yet another short-term extension.

Now, if you went out on the street and stopped anybody—Republican, Democrat, whatever age—if you asked: Is it controversial for the Federal Government to fund transportation projects? They would say no.

Maintaining and improving our roads, bridges, and transit systems is a necessity. It is a necessary investment in our future that was recognized at our country's founding in the Constitution. That is why Senator INHOFE, who is one of the leading conservatives in the Senate, and myself, a very strong progressive Member, agree. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution gave Congress the authority “to establish Post Offices and post Roads,” and that has continued throughout our Nation's history.

Legislation authorizing Federal investment in our highways dates back 100 years to the passage of the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916 and the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1921.

I quote one of my favorite Presidents, Dwight Eisenhower. In 1956, he established the highway trust fund to serve as the major source of funding for our Nation's highway systems. This was significant because it was a large increase of Federal infrastructure investment. President Eisenhower knew we needed modern, efficient transportation systems to ensure our security. I say “security” because this is what President-elect Eisenhower said, a general and a hero from World War II: “A network of modern roads is as necessary to defense as it is to our national economy and personal safety.”

He viewed a network of modern roads as a necessity to our defense. And I would add the word “bridges,” because you can have a convoy going over our bridges, too. So General Eisenhower and then President Eisenhower knew how important an efficient system of roads is to our military and national defense.

While serving in the Army way back in 1919, he joined a convoy of approximately 80 trucks and other military vehicles to cross from Washington, DC, to San Francisco to test the military's motor vehicles. This trip took 2 months, averaging 6 miles an hour. From this experience, plus his countless other experiences with the military, both home and abroad, he understood how important a reliable transportation system is to a First World nation.

Again, he said, "A network of modern roads is as necessary to defense as it is to our national economy and our personal safety."

Today, our economy still relies on interconnected transportation systems to move goods out of major ports of entry. I want to talk about my own State because at the Port of Los Angeles, we take in about 40 percent of the Nation's imports. We know they go straight out onto those roads and they deliver goods all over our great Nation.

We know there is a universal understanding that we have to maintain that road system so we can move people and goods efficiently. These surface transportation systems, which used to be the envy of the world, remain the foundation of a strong U.S. economy and enable us to compete in the global marketplace.

I hope you heard that I said our transportation system used to be the envy of the world because it is no longer the envy of the world. It is our fault. This has to be a priority. The United States lags behind its overseas competitors in infrastructure investment. According to the most recent World Economic Forum ranking within the past decade, the United States has fallen from 7th to 16th in the quality of our roads. We are behind countries such as China, Portugal, and Oman. This is ridiculous. The greatest Nation in the world—that is what we are—but we are falling behind on our infrastructure because we do not have the guts to face the fact that we have to fund the highway system.

Why are we behind? We only spend 2 percent of our gross domestic product on infrastructure, and that is a 50-percent decline from 1960. So we spend 2 percent of our gross domestic product while Europe spends 5 percent and China spends 9 percent.

The Federal Government does provide, as I said, over 50 percent of the capital expenditures for State highway projects nationwide, which means that all of our States and all of our local governments rely heavily on Federal funding to maintain and to improve their transportation. However, this is just a national average.

(Mr. SCOTT assumed the Chair.)

I see my colleagues have changed places here. For South Carolina, South Carolina depends on the Federal Government for 80 percent of their highway funds and their bridge repair—80 percent. California is 50 percent. North Dakota is 80 percent. Montana is 87 percent.

So what I am saying to my colleagues who I hope are somewhere listening is that if we do not act to fill the highway trust fund and to meet this looming made-up crisis—check out your State and how much you rely on Federal funds.

I already showed the picture of the Minnesota bridge collapse. I would like

to put that up again because I think the Minnesota bridge collapse is a metaphor for where we are. Our whole thing is discombobulated. Our whole thing is disrupted because we do not have the courage to fund the highway trust fund, which, as President Eisenhower said all of those areas ago, is critical to our national security.

I am going keep this picture up here for a minute. I want to talk about our States and the bridges that are in disrepair. I hope people who may be listening across the country—if you live in one of these States, give a call to your Senator and ask him or her: What are you doing to fill the highway trust fund?

For example, in Kentucky there are over 1,100 structurally deficient bridges—bridges that could look like this. Pennsylvania has more than 5,000 structurally deficient bridges, which accounts for over 20 percent of all the bridges in their State.

In addition to the dangerously poor conditions of our bridges, 50 percent of our Nation's roads are in less than good condition. These roads and bridges that are no longer in good working condition span across the country.

So I am going to show a chart that I don't think we have ever talked about here. These are examples of deficient highway bridges in need of repair: Alabama, I-65 bridge over U.S. 11 in Jefferson County; Arizona, I-17 bridge over 19th Avenue in Maricopa County; Arkansas, I-30 bridge over the UP Railroad in Pulaski County; California, the Golden Gate Bridge, for goodness' sake; Colorado, the I-70 bridge in Denver; Connecticut, the West River Bridge in New Haven; District of Columbia, the Memorial Bridge. There was a press conference right near the Memorial Bridge by one of my colleagues a couple of weeks ago.

People are getting really scared about this. The point of this is not to scare anybody; the point of this is to say to my colleagues that we are responsible.

You know, maybe it is me. When I was growing up, my mother and father said: If you know there is a problem, do something about it. You don't have a right to turn your back and walk away.

I remember once when I was a county supervisor I found out that the county building we were in was earthquake-prone. Nobody talked about it. As soon as I found out it could collapse in an earthquake, I brought it to my colleagues. I said: Colleagues, we need to do something.

Do you know what they said, one or two of them? Don't bring it up. We don't have the money.

Excuse me. You have to have the money if you know the building you are in could collapse in an earthquake. You have to have some money if you know all of these bridges are in disrepair.

So let's continue. Florida, the Pensacola Bay Bridge; Georgia, a bridge in Fulton County; Hawaii, Halona Street Bridge in Honolulu; Illinois, Poplar Street Bridge; Indiana, the bridge over the CSX Railroad; Iowa, the Centennial Bridge; Kentucky—another one—the Brent Spence Bridge; Louisiana, another bridge there; Maine, the Piscataqua River Bridge; Maryland, the Chesapeake Bay Bridge; Massachusetts, the I-95 bridge in Middlesex; Michigan, the I-75 Rogue River Bridge.

Remember, if you are hearing my voice and you are hearing your State mentioned, give a call to your Senator and ask him or her, whether they are a Democrat or Republican, what they are doing about the highway trust fund because in 51 days it will go bust.

In Minnesota—did I mention that—the I-35 East Bridge over Pennsylvania Avenue; Mississippi, the Vicksburg Bridge; Missouri, the East Bridge over Conway Road; Nevada, the Virginia Street Bridge in Reno; New Hampshire, the I-293 bridge in Hillsborough; New Jersey, the Garden State Parkway in Union County; New Mexico, the Main Street Bridge; New York, the Brooklyn Bridge.

If you did not read the book "The Great Bridge," you should read that book by David McCullough. It is an incredible book. That bridge was built so long ago. We don't want to lose the Brooklyn Bridge.

In North Carolina, the Greensboro Bridge; Ohio, the John Roebling Suspension Bridge; Oklahoma, the I-40 bridge over Crooked Oak Creek; Oregon, the Columbia River Crossing; Pennsylvania, the Benjamin Franklin Bridge; Rhode Island, the viaduct in Providence; South Carolina, the I-85 bridge in Greenville; Texas, the I-45 bridge over White Oak Bayou; Utah, the I-15 bridge over SR-93 in Davis County; Washington, the Evergreen Point Floating Bridge; Wisconsin, the U.S. 41 bridge over a river.

I just have to ask my friends on both sides of the aisle, if the roof on your house is about to cave in with your children inside and you know about it, would you find a way to pay for that repair or would you let it collapse on your kids? The answer is obvious. Of course you are going to fix the roof on your house. You have to keep infrastructure in good repair. The roof is caving in on our roads and our bridges. Lord help us if we do not act and someone else goes down in a crisis.

We can look at the details surrounding the I-35 bridge collapse in Minneapolis, MN, shown in that picture. On August 1, 2007, this eight-lane bridge, which is Minnesota's second busiest bridge, carrying 140,000 vehicles every day, suddenly collapsed during rush hour, killing 13 people and injuring 145 people.

It is critical that our Nation continue investing in our aging infrastructure. Everybody knows it. Everybody

knows it—Congress, States, businesses, American workers. Republicans say they are for infrastructure investment, but they have not acted. Happily, we are having a markup—I am excited about it—in our EPW Committee. Not one other committee has marked up a long-term bill.

The highway trust fund is an integral part of how the Federal Government provides predictable, multiyear funding to States so that States can plan and construct long-term highway, bridge, and transit projects; therefore, the highway trust fund should be our No. 1 priority. In 51 days, the fund will go bust. It will be gone. We will not be able to pay all of our bills. So we have to move quickly because otherwise we will face a transportation shutdown.

The law that currently authorizes our transportation program is set to expire on July 31, and the highway trust fund will go bankrupt shortly thereafter. The clock is ticking, and failure is not an option. So let's put up that 51-day ticking time bomb, if you will. The highway trust fund is in serious trouble, and much needed transportation projects are in peril.

The short fund creates uncertainty, and uncertainty is terrible for business, it is terrible for workers, and it is terrible for the economy. Billions of dollars will be delayed to our States. Many States, including Utah, Arkansas, Georgia, Tennessee, and Wyoming, have already delayed or cancelled construction projects due to the uncertainty in the funding.

We are facing a crisis, and everybody knows it. If we do not act and act quickly, we will see a domino effect that will be felt throughout our economy.

I don't think I have to remind people that we came out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. I was here when we saw that happen at the end of George W. Bush's term. We were losing 700,000 jobs a month. I remember standing here on the floor of the Senate feeling that the whole world was collapsing around us.

The recovery is taking a long time, and thank God it is moving forward now. Our economy, though, is still recovering, and we must have a strong, modern, efficient transportation system to move goods and people. There are some people who absolutely need transportation to get to work. This is not a game. Either they need their cars or they need to hop on a bus or a subway. And we have 51 days until the highway trust fund will be empty.

The amount of money we need just to keep up with the demand right now to fix our roads and our bridges—that amount is \$123 billion just to catch up on the nightmare we are facing. So we not only need a 6-year bill, but we need one that is robust so we can start spending some money on these repairs. Millions of jobs and thousands of businesses are at stake here.

You know, it is 51 days. And I have stood in several press conferences with business leaders, the chamber of commerce, the AFL-CIO, construction workers, the concrete people, the tar people, the granite people—you name it. They are united as one America in favor of a 6-year solution. I will show you just some of the people whom I have stood with over time in recent days: The AFL-CIO; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—it is hard to get them on the same page, but they are on the same page and they want this fix; the U.S. Conference of Mayors; the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials; the American Council of Engineering Companies; the American Highway Users Alliance; the American Public Transportation Association; the American Road and Transportation Builders Association; the American Society of Civil Engineers; and the American Trucking Association.

The truckers have said to me: Senator, we are willing to pay more in our gas tax because we cannot continue to ride on these roads that are falling apart.

When was the last time someone came up to you and said "Raise my gas tax"? It is rare. But the truckers have asked us to do it as long as we use the money to fix the road. The chamber of commerce has asked us to raise the gas tax 6 cents to 8 cents. I mean, this is unusual, and I know there is very little support for that.

I have proposed numerous ways to pay for the trust fund, including a refundable gas tax increase. So if you earn \$100,000 or less in your family, you get back the tax increase, which is about \$40 a year. So I think it is worth \$40 a year to know that the bridge you drive on is safe, but we would make it refundable so that you would get that back if you are in the middle class or below.

I will tell you, facing a shutdown—and we are already seeing a shutdown in five, six, or seven States—is painful for businesses. I have had business people come before me with their heads in their hands because they do this work. They build the highways. They fix the bridges. They build the transit systems. And they know we have not come together yet. It is a recipe for disaster.

What planet are we living on? All of America wants this.

I will continue with some more of these names. I just read some of them; I will read some more: the Associated General Contractors; the Association of Equipment Manufacturers; the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations; the International Union of Operating Engineers; the Laborers' International Union of North America; the National Asphalt Pavement Association; the National Association of Counties; the National Association of Manufacturers.

The National Association of Manufacturers, the Associated General Contractors, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the Laborers' International Union of North America—this is all of America. This isn't red. This isn't blue. This is everybody. Everybody wants us to fix the roads. Everybody wants us to fix the bridges.

We have the National Association of Truck Stop Operators; the National Governors Association—the Governors are Republicans and Democrats, and they are begging us to get our act in gear and get this done; the National League of Cities, and finally, the National Ready Mixed Concrete Association; the National Stone, Sand, and Gravel Association; the Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association; the Portland Cement Association; and the Retail Industry Leaders Association.

The list I read is a partial list. The list that I read, frankly, is mostly Republican-leaning organizations.

Why have we not done our job? Why don't we already have a long-term transportation bill before us before the fund goes bust in 51 days? Why?

It is Congress's responsibility to act quickly to address our Nation's infrastructure needs. Every day that the Republicans fail to move forward with a bill, they are putting people at risk. This isn't about philosophy. This is about bread and butter. This is about getting to work safely. This is about driving with your family and not being fearful that the bridge you are on is going to fail.

I am always asked: Well, Senator, that is all well and good, but how are you going to pay for this?

Well, I have a lot of ideas, and I will lay them out. There are many ways to pay, and I will give just a sampling of ideas, and I will embrace these ideas. I will work with any Democrat or Republican on any one of these ideas.

Replace existing gas and diesel fuel fees with a user fee charged at the refinery based on the fuel price. In other words, do away with the gas tax and replace it with a refinery-based fuel fee. They did that in Virginia, and I think it is working well.

Increase existing gas and diesel fuel fees by indexing those fees to inflation, along with a refundable tax credit for low- and middle-income families to offset those costs. So we can have a modest increase of 6 cents, 7 cents, 8 cents on the gas tax and make it refundable to families earning \$100,000 or less.

Assess a user fee on the sale of new and used vehicles. That is another idea.

Use revenue generated from repatriation of corporate earnings currently held overseas. That is international tax reform. We have a lot of money sitting abroad from corporations that have parked it there. They don't like the rate of their taxes. If you lower their tax, that money can come home, and

we can use the taxes we collect to fund the highway trust fund. I have a bill on that with Senator PAUL. It is bipartisan. Join us. Join us and let's fix the problem.

How about this: Borrow money from the general fund, to be paid back from the stimulative effect of transportation infrastructure investments on the economy. When we make these investments, they generate so much employment and so much business that people will pay income taxes because they are working. These are millions of jobs, thousands of businesses.

Another way to pay for it: Apply a new, honor-based user fee on the number of miles each individual drives each year. So when you fill out a form to get your car registered, just tell me how many miles you traveled last year, there will be a modest fee, and we can help the trust fund.

By the way, I notice my friends want to use savings from reducing the overseas contingency operations account. They want to use that money. They used it for the military; why not use it for saving the trust fund? And how about the savings of uncollected revenues owed to the Federal Government? If we just collected one-third of those, we would meet the shortfall.

So, as I count these ideas, there are eight ideas that I have, and I am sure everybody has their own ideas. There is not a shortage of ideas. There is a bit of shortage of courage to come out and say the obvious. If your roof is about to collapse on your home, it will cost you something to fix it. Admit it upfront. No one is going to do it for free. No one is going to fix these 60,000-plus bridges for free. No one is going to build new highways for free. No one is going to build new transit systems for free. Grow up and pay for it. This is ridiculous.

I am speaking for myself. I will support any of these eight ideas or any combination of them. We know our country is in danger. Our people are in danger every day because of these structurally deficient bridges. If we don't do anything about it, we will be liable—maybe not in a court of law, but in my mind it is a moral responsibility. So I can support any of these ideas. Some of them are conservative ideas, and some of them are liberal ideas. I don't care. I want to pay for the highway trust fund.

The bottom line is that the only solution is a consensus-based, bipartisan 6-year transportation bill that will provide States and local communities with the funding and the certainty they need to build these multiyear projects and modernize our infrastructure.

This isn't rocket science. Choose one of the options. Add one of your own. Do a combination of these options. Let's have the courage and the moral fortitude to do what is our responsibility.

We know our Nation's infrastructure is deteriorating. We are responsible for it. This is one Nation under God, and we have to act to protect our people. It is our job.

I think the clearest message was from President Eisenhower on this front, and President Reagan, who stepped up to the plate. President Reagan signed into law an increase in the gas tax. He was so proud. He said: I am proud to do this. We have to do this. Let me read his quote. He signed the surface transportation bill, which did increase the gas tax, and he said:

Because of the prompt and bipartisan action of Congress, we can now ensure for our children a special part of their heritage—a network of highways and mass transit that has enabled our commerce to thrive, our country to grow, and our people to roam freely and easily to every corner of our land.

President Ronald Reagan. I was elected the same year he said this. I mean, I am giving away my age, but I was proud that my President understood this. I didn't agree with Ronald Reagan on a bunch of things. He said once: "If you have seen one tree, you have seen them all." I never agreed with that.

But setting all of that aside, I agree with what he said. This is magnificent. Listen to this:

Because of the prompt and bipartisan action of Congress, we can now ensure for our children a special part of their heritage—a network of highways and mass transit that has enabled our commerce to thrive, our country to grow, and our people to roam freely and easily to every corner of our land.

Another person whom I really admire on this subject is Senator INHOFE, my friend from Oklahoma, my chairman. I was his chairman for a few years—I think 8—and unfortunately for me I am no longer chairman, I am the ranking member. But I will tell you why we will do hand-to-hand combat on the environment—and we did that today. When it comes to infrastructure, we are very close. Do you know what he said? "The conservative thing is to pass a bill instead of having the extensions."

Anthony Foxx, our Transportation Secretary, and 11 of his predecessors offered an open letter to Congress expressing their support for passage of a long-term bill. Remember, this was signed by people who worked for—follow me—President Johnson, President Ford, President Reagan, President George Herbert Walker Bush, President Clinton, President George W. Bush, and President Obama. They offered an open letter and said this about the current situation:

Never in our nation's history has America's transportation system been on a more unsustainable course. . . . So, what America needs is to break this cycle of governing crisis-to-crisis, only to enact a stopgap measure at the last moment. We need to make a commitment to the American people and the American economy.

That is four Republican Presidents and three Democratic Presidents—people from those administrations. My goodness, there is bipartisanship everywhere but here in this room.

I read the list of everybody who wants this bill, and it is very impressive: labor, business—small business, large business. It is extraordinary.

A survey by the National Association of Manufacturers of its members—one of our more conservative organizations—found that 65 percent don't believe our infrastructure is sufficient. We know from the Texas Institute study that traffic congestion in 2011 was \$121 billion. We are wasting so much time in traffic. The cost to truck goods moving on our highway system—\$27 billion in wasted time and diesel fuel.

So I hear a lot of talk about passing a long-term bill. I am pleased I am hearing that talk. I say to my colleagues, I hadn't heard of that, and now I am starting to hear my Republican friends say maybe we can do it. I think we need to do it. We still have 1.4 million fewer construction jobs than we had before the recession.

The clock is ticking. Failure is not an option. Let's get going. Let's come together and do the right thing. Pass the highway bill.

Thank you.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, are we in a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not in a quorum call.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today following on the speech just delivered by Senator BOXER, who highlighted her concern about a manufactured crisis—the impending expiration of the highway bill, which must be reauthorized by July 31. I come to speak to another manufactured crisis. We have to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank by June 30 or face the loss of its support for vital jobs in our economy that will happen with its expiration.

I am a big advocate for manufacturing here in the Senate and in my home State of Delaware, but I am not a big fan of manufactured crises. Both of these are unneeded, self-inflicted wounds that will create further drag on our economic recovery. I think we can and should find ways to work together across the aisle to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

For more than 80 years, the Export-Import Bank, commonly known as Ex-Im, has served as a vital tool to help American companies sell their goods around the world. By making loan guarantees and providing risk insurance and other financial products to American firms at market prices, the Bank has helped to ensure that American companies and their workers can compete anywhere in the world and at no cost to the American taxpayer. I

will say that again: at no cost to the American taxpayer.

The Bank not only pays for itself, but it actually often runs a surplus. Last year alone, it returned \$700 million to the U.S. Treasury. Today, the Ex-Im Bank helps American businesses sell nearly \$30 billion in goods every single year and supports more than 150,000 American jobs.

The Bank is a government agency, however, and even though it costs taxpayers nothing and has an undeniably positive impact on our economy and on job creation, it remains unclear if this Congress will be able to come together to reauthorize it by June 30 and keep it running.

Unfortunately, some of my colleagues would like to close the Bank, and they are using arguments I think are unfounded and misguided to do so.

First, I have heard the Ex-Im Bank is somehow a government giveaway to large politically connected corporations. But the truth is the Bank helps companies of many different sizes, large and small.

In my home State of Delaware, for instance, the Ex-Im Bank has helped a company I know well—Voigt and Schweitzer, a hot-dip zinc galvanizing company. It has helped them to sell their products abroad. Voigt & Schweitzer has a few facilities around the United States, in addition to the one in New Castle, DE. At its Delaware location it provides galvanizing services for a range of steel products for export. V&S isn't a huge corporation. It has just a few dozen employees in Delaware. It is because of Ex-Im's support that it has been able to compete with other companies around the globe.

In fact, Ex-Im's support helped the firm's Delaware location earn the business to galvanize literally hundreds of bridges that were manufactured in Pennsylvania and being exported and sold to Africa—business that would have likely gone to competitors overseas without Ex-Im's help.

Now, Ex-Im does also help large corporations export their goods to countries around the world, but that support also benefits small and medium-sized businesses. For example, Boeing often receives significant support from the Ex-Im Bank, which helps it compete with international airplane manufacturers such as Airbus. I have heard Senators criticize this support, but the reality is it isn't just Boeing that benefits. This is an important point about how modern manufacturing and the integration of the supply chain work.

When Boeing manufactures a finished airplane, it doesn't make all of the plane's parts with its own factories and its own workforce. It, in fact, buys the vast majority of the component parts from much smaller manufacturers spread throughout the United States. From the brakes on the landing gear to the in-flight entertainment system,

other companies make those parts and sell them to Boeing for the finished product. So when Ex-Im helps Boeing export a 747, it helps sustain tens of thousands of jobs for American workers at other smaller companies.

I have seen this myself in Delaware. Although Boeing directly employs in Delaware just 16 people, the company supports 1,300 jobs with 52 different Delaware companies. Let me give one example. A smallish company, Polymer Technologies, manufactures and sells thermal and acoustic insulation to Boeing for inclusion in their planes, which are then exported through the help of Ex-Im.

So when Ex-Im's opponents in this Chamber argue that this is all about a few big companies, that just isn't true. It also is vital to sustaining and supporting smaller manufacturers that are vital to our communities.

The next misplaced argument I have heard is that government shouldn't be supporting private companies, period. They should not be, as it were, picking winners and losers. But even to a supporter of the free market, the point of government is to step in where the private market fails to do so, and that is exactly what Ex-Im does.

When the Bank makes a loan to a business, it isn't replacing capital that would otherwise have come from a private bank. It supplements private capital or makes a private bank more inclined to put at risk its own capital through provision of political risk insurance. Much of the time Ex-Im serves as a lender of last resort and provides a loan where a private bank can't or won't.

So the Export-Import Bank isn't doing something the private sector should be doing. It is picking up where the market leaves off, and in doing so it helps to level the global playing field on which American companies compete.

The reality is that every single one of our trading partners provides the same type of support for their exports as the Ex-Im Bank does for ours. So they are picking winners. They are picking American winners on the global playing field.

For example, as Ex-Im's chairman, Fred Hochberg, has written, "Ex-Im has given \$590 billion in loans, guarantees, and insurance over its entire history but Chinese institutions"—Chinese export-financing institutions—"have provided an estimated \$670 billion in just the past 2 years."

In other words, China has done more in just 2 years to support the financing of their exporters than our Export-Import Bank has done in its entire 80-year history and at no cost to the taxpayer.

The bottom line is that American jobs are at stake in this debate, and if we fail to keep the doors open to the Export-Import Bank, we will fail a lot of American workers. Every year, Ex-

Im supports hundreds of thousands of jobs, and shuttering it will put them at risk.

In fact, as the Wall Street Journal reported just this morning, American companies worry that global competition is "so cutthroat," that they would "be forced to move manufacturing overseas" and to ship American manufacturing jobs out of the United States "if the Ex-Im Bank isn't open."

At a time when our economy is continuing to gain steam and Americans are going back to work—at a clip of 280,000 new jobs announced just last month—we need to continue to help American companies compete in markets around the world. The Ex-Im Bank is central to our competitiveness and our continued strength at home and abroad. It is critical that we act together to reauthorize it before the end of June. So I urge my colleagues to join this effort to help support American jobs, American manufacturing, and the American middle class.

Mr. President, for more than 20 years, the State Partnership Program—or SPP—has helped the United States to build closer sustained relationships with militaries and nations around the world. Although I will not call it up and make it pending at this moment, I want to take a few minutes to speak on the floor today about my amendment No. 1474 to the NDAA, an amendment that would significantly strengthen the State Partnership Program.

First established after the fall of the Soviet Union, the State Partnership Program was created to help countries transition their militaries from the Soviet model and enshrine the idea of civilian control of the military through professional and personal exchanges with our State National Guard units.

The SPP facilitates cooperation across all aspects of civil military affairs and, besides military relationships, encourages people-to-people ties at the State level. I have personally seen the benefits of this program through the participation of my home State National Guard in their State partnership with Trinidad and Tobago and the civilian control that it reinforces.

I have also seen it in farflung parts of the globe, from Liberia to Senegal to Tunisia on the African continent, where three different State Partnership Programs are actively at work providing training and support and resources for the military of those three nations.

The California National Guard, for example, currently has units that are helping Ukraine to push back against Russian aggression in eastern Ukraine, leveraging a deep and trusting relationship first established back in 1993.

Since its creation, the SPP has grown substantially. Today, it consists

of 68 partnerships between U.S. National Guard units and foreign countries, with the 69th, between Kentucky's National Guard and the African nation of Djibouti, having just been signed. Djibouti is a nation that is actually the site of our only substantial military presence on the continent of Africa, and that State Partnership Program will help to strengthen, sustain, and reinforce our ongoing and vital security partnership with Djibouti, a nation that is sandwiched between Somalia and Yemen, countries currently in chaos and facing significant threats from Islamic terrorism.

That is just one example of how the State Partnership Program helps leverage the resources of our National Guard.

Traditionally, the program has needed to be reauthorized every 2 years, so I am happy this year that both the House and Senate have recognized its value and have decided to work together to permanently reauthorize it in their respective National Defense Authorization Act. However, there are a few changes we can make that would add to making the SPP more transparent, more efficient, and more effective, and that is what my amendment would do.

First, it would allow the Secretary of Defense to consolidate the various funding streams for the SPP, which right now come from over a half dozen different accounts scattered across DOD, which makes it more difficult to provide meaningful congressional sight. This amendment would allow the Defense Secretary to combine these funding sources into one National Guard fund to pay for personnel, training, operations, and equipment.

Second, my amendment would allow the National Guard to determine its core competencies and to help combatant commanders determine how best to leverage the National Guard to serve the needs of a partner country.

Last, my amendment would establish clear and enhanced reporting requirements so we can better track the annual performance of our units and make modifications where needed to enhance the program's effectiveness.

Critically, this amendment would not increase the program's costs at all. This amendment, which is based on the State Partnership Program Enhancement Act and currently has 9 Republican and 12 Democratic Senators, including myself, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina, Senator PAT LEAHY of Vermont, and Senator JONI ERNST of Iowa, enjoys broad bipartisan support from a wide range of States whose National Guards have participated and benefited from the State Partnership Program.

The amendment is enthusiastically supported by the National Guard Association of the United States, the National Guard Bureau, and the Adj-

utant General. It would take important steps to strengthening a program that is essential to many of our international partnerships, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

With that, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I join my Virginia colleague Senator TIM Kaine in expressing concern over the chairman's measure to cut \$1.7 billion in funding from specific operations and maintenance accounts in an effort to streamline defense headquarters functions.

The Department of Defense is in the midst of implementing a 20 percent headquarters reduction that defense officials have planned over time to ensure that consequences of the reductions are known and managed. Like my colleague, I am concerned that the chairman's proposed legislation would require additional headquarters reductions, the results of which have not been properly considered.

While I support continued efficiency gains within the Department of Defense, including—where merited—reducing headquarters functions, I believe that before such cuts are taken, the Department must conduct a thorough analysis of the best methods to streamline their organizations for the most efficient staffing solutions while remaining viable and effective.

At a time when department officials are managing through enormous budget pressure in an increasingly complex national security environment, I fear the Department will be forced to reduce funding to critical programs.

Finally, the men and women who will likely bear the brunt of these cuts are performing the very work that Congress charged the Department of Defense to conduct. Even this authorization includes additional reports, studies, and demands for improvement in areas like program management, personnel planning, acquisition, and sexual assault. These programs require a professional cadre to conduct the required analysis and propose recommendations for improvement.

I look forward to passing a defense authorization that adequately supports the Department that has been at war for nearly 15 years.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I am pleased the Senate is debating the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016. Senators McCain and Reed, with help from my colleagues and me on the Senate Armed Services Committee, have worked tirelessly throughout the spring on these important military issues. Our committee prides itself on taking a bipartisan and measured approach to reforming and providing oversight to the Department of Defense. I believe we largely succeeded in this endeavor, but I remain gravely concerned about the chairman's proposals to streamline Depart-

ment of Defense Headquarters by cutting funding to specific operations and maintenance, O&M, accounts.

The Department of Defense already implemented a 20 percent reduction of headquarters, which began this year and continues through 2019. Planning for the reduction began several years ago, affording the Department adequate time to ensure compliance with various directives, including requirements of the Goldwater-Nichols Act that established the division in roles among the service chiefs and combatant commanders. I am concerned the chairman's proposed legislation this year, requiring additional headquarters reductions, will force the Department of Defense to find efficiencies that will blur the lines between service and warfighting functions, undermining the bedrock reforms established by Goldwater-Nichols.

I support reducing the magnitude of these cuts, while allowing the Department to conduct a thorough analysis of the best methods to streamline organizations for the most efficient staffing solutions while remaining viable and effective.

The chairman's specific proposed reductions are not supported by any report or study. Instead, they are based on a perception of unnecessary growth based on anecdotal evidence and nebulous data-sets fueled a \$1.7 billion cut to several operations and maintenance accounts.

To the chairman's point, there has undoubtedly been a growth in headquarters over the past decade. Areas that saw significant increases include cyber warfare and special operations. USCYBERCOM did not exist a decade ago, but now has almost 6,000 employees. Special Operations Command is forecasted to swell to over 70,000 by 2017, but both headquarters are excluded from consideration for reduction, against the requests of the DOD to leave everything on the table if forced to act on this provision.

The timing and magnitude of these cuts are so severe that I fear the Department will be forced to reduce funding to critical programs associated with the targeted accounts. Some key programs associated with these accounts include military burial honors, suicide prevention, radioactive waste disposal, nuclear command and control networks, acquisition support, veteran hiring programs, and installation fire departments. Many of these programs are tied to our Nation's commitment to our servicemembers and veterans and should not be subjected to such drastic cuts without due consideration of the downstream effects.

Finally, the men and women who will likely bear the brunt of these cuts are performing the very work that Congress charged the Department of Defense to conduct. Even this authorization includes additional reports, studies, and demands for improvement in

areas like program management, acquisition, and sexual assault. These programs require a professional cadre to conduct the required analysis and propose recommendations for improvement. Asking our workforce to bear additional oversight and program management functions while cutting their funding is illogical and wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak this afternoon about a controversial proposal, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act, otherwise known as CISA, which was filed yesterday as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill.

I want to begin by saying to the Senate that I believe tacking this legislation onto the Defense bill would, in my view, be a significant mistake. I expect our colleagues are going to have a wide range of views about this legislation, and I hope the Senate can agree that bills as controversial as this one ought to be subject to public debate and an open-ended process, not stapled onto unrelated legislation with only a modest amount of discussion.

This is particularly true given the issue of cyber security, which is going to have a significant impact on the security and the well-being of the American people and obviously the consumer rights and the privacy of law-abiding Americans. Because it is designed to increase government collection of information from private companies, I am of the view that for the Senate to have this expansion of collecting so much information about the people of the United States, for it to have real legitimacy in the eyes of the public, it is important to have open debate, with votes on amendments from Senators who have a wide variety of opinions on the issue of cyber security. Trying to rush this bill through the Senate, in my view, is not going to increase public confidence.

So let me be clear about the process and talk a bit about the substance of the legislation as well. I believe tacking it onto the Defense bill is a flawed process. But I think there are also significant flaws with the substance of the legislation as well. Dozens of independent experts agree this legislation will have serious consequences and do little to make our Nation more secure at a time when cyber threats are very real. The issue of cyber threats requires more than a placebo, and this legislation is a bandaid on a gaping wound. I believe the Senate, having the time for adequate reflection and amendment, can do better.

In beginning, I would like the Senate to know just how much controversy and concern this legislation has generated among those who are considered independent experts on cyber security. Shortly before the Intelligence Com-

mittee, which I have been honored to serve on for more than 14 years—shortly before the committee marked up this legislation, a coalition of nearly 50 organizations and security experts wrote to the members of the Intelligence Committee expressing serious concerns about the legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Re Cyber Threat Information Sharing Bills

APRIL 16, 2015.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Congressman ADAM SCHIFF,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Congressman MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Senator RICHARD BURR,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Congressman DEVIN NUNES,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BURR, SENATOR FEINSTEIN, AND REPRESENTATIVES NUNES, SCHIFF, AND MCCAUL: We are writing you today as technologists, academics, and computer and network security professionals who research, report on, and defend against Internet security threats. Among us are antivirus and threat signature developers, security researchers and analysts, and system administrators charged with securing networks. We have devoted our careers to building security technologies, and to protecting networks, computers, and critical infrastructure against a wide variety of even highly sophisticated attacks.

We do not need new legal authorities to share information that helps us protect our systems from future attacks. When a system is attacked, the compromise will leave a trail, and investigators can collect these bread crumbs. Some of that data empowers other system operators to check and see if they, too, have been attacked, and also to guard against being similarly attacked in the future. Generally speaking, security practitioners can and do share this information with each other and with the federal government while still complying with our obligations under federal privacy law.

Significantly, threat data that security professionals use to protect networks from future attacks is a far more narrow category of information than those included in the bills being considered by Congress, and will only rarely contain private information. In those rare cases, we generally scrub the data without losing the effectiveness of the threat signature.

These are some common categories of data that we share to figure out if systems have been compromised (indicators of compromise, or IoCs) and to mitigate future threats:

- Malware file names, code, and hashes
- Objects (code) that communicate with malware
- Compile times: data about the conversion of source code to binary code
- File size
- File path location: where on the computer system malware files are stored

Registry keys: configuration settings for low-level operating system and applications

Memory process or running service information

Attached to this letter is an actual example of a threat signature containing data that helps system administrators secure their networks. You'll see that the information does not contain users' private information.

Waiving privacy rights will not make security sharing better. The more narrowly security practitioners can define these IoCs and the less personal information that is in them, the better. Private information about individual users is often a detriment in developing threat signatures because we need to be able to identify an attack no matter where it comes from and no matter who the target is. Any bill that allows for and results in significant sharing of personal information could decrease the signal-to-noise ratio and make IoCs less actionable.

Further, sharing users' private information creates new security risks. Here are just three examples: First, any IoC that contains personal information exacerbates the danger of false-positives, that innocent behavior will erroneously be classified as a threat. Second, distribution of private data like passwords could expose our users to unauthorized access, since, unfortunately, many people use the same password across multiple sites. Third, private data contained in personal emails or other messages can be abused by criminals developing targeted phishing attacks in which they masquerade as known and trusted correspondents.

For these reasons, we do not support any of the three information sharing bills currently under consideration—the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act (CISA), the Protecting Cyber Networks Act (PCNA), or the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015. These bills permit overbroad sharing far beyond the IoCs described above that are necessary to respond to an attack, including all “harms” of an attack. This excess sharing will not aid cybersecurity, but would significantly harm privacy and could actually undermine our ability to effectively respond to threats.

As a general rule, when we do need to share addressing information, we are sharing the addresses of servers which are used to host malware, or to which a compromised computer will connect for the exfiltration of data. In these cases, this addressing information helps potential victims block malicious incoming connections. These addresses do not belong to subscribers or customers of the victims of a security breach or of our clients whose systems we are helping to secure. Sharing this kind of addressing is a common current practice. We do not see the need for new authorities to enable this sharing.

Before any information sharing bill moves further, it should be improved to contain at least the following three features:

1. Narrowly define the categories of information to be shared as only those needed for securing systems against future attacks;
2. Require firms to effectively scrub all personally identifying information and other private data not necessary to identify or respond to a threat; and
3. Not allow the shared information to be used for anything other than securing systems.

We appreciate your interest in making our networks more secure, but the legislation proposed does not materially further that goal, and at the same time it puts our users' privacy at risk. These bills weaken privacy

law without promoting security. We urge you to reject them.

Sincerely,

Ben Adida; Jacob Appelbaum, Security and privacy researcher, The Tor Project; Sergey Bratus, Research Associate Professor, Computer Science Department, Dartmouth College; Eric Brunner-Williams, CTO, Wampumpeag; Dominique Brezinski, Principal Security Engineer, Amazon.com; Jon Callas; Katherine Carpenter, Independent Consultant; Antonios A. Chariton, Security Researcher, Institute of Computer Science, Foundation of Research and Technology—Hellas; Stephen Checkoway, Assistant Research Professor, Johns Hopkins University; Gordon Cook, Technologist, writer, editor and publisher of “COOK report on Internet Protocol” since 1992; Shaun Cooley, Distinguished Engineer, Cisco; John Covici, Systems Administrator, Covici Computer Systems; Tom Cross, CTO, Drawbridge Networks; David L. Dill, Professor of Computer Science, Stanford University; A. Riley Eller, Chief Technology Officer, CoCo Communications Corp; Rik Farrow, USENIX.

Robert G. Ferrell, Special Agent (retired), U.S. Dept of Defense; Kevin Finisterre, Owner, DigitalMunition; Bryan Ford, Associate Professor of Computer Science, Yale University; Dr. Richard Forno, Affiliate, Stanford Center for Internet and Society; Paul Ferguson, Vice President, Threat Intelligence; Jim Fruchterman, Benetech; Kevin Gennuso, Information Security Professional; Dan Gillmor, Teacher and technology writer; Sharon Goldberg, assistant professor, Computer Science Department, Boston University; Joe Grand, Principal Engineer, Grand Idea Studio, Inc.; Thaddeus T. Grugq, independent security researcher; J. Alex Halderman, Morris Wellman Faculty Development Assistant Professor of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Michigan, Director, University of Michigan Center for Computer Security and Society; Professor Carl Hewitt, Emeritus EECS MIT; Gary Knott, PhD (Stanford CS, 1975), CEO, Civilized Software; Rich Kulawiec, Senior Internet Security Architect, Fire on the Mountain, LLC; Ryan Lackey; Product, CloudFlare, Inc.

Ronald L. Larsen, Dean and Professor, School of Information Sciences, University of Pittsburgh; Christopher Liljenstolpe, Chief architect for AS3561 (at the time about 30% of the Internet backbone by traffic) and AS1221 (Australia's main Internet infrastructure); Ralph Logan, Partner, Logan Haile, LP; Robert J. Lupo, Senior Security Engineer “sales team”, IBM inc.; Marc Maiffret, Former CTO BeyondTrust; Steve Manzulk, Director of Security Research, Duo Security; Ryan Maple, Information security professional; Brian Martin, President Open Security Foundation (OSF); Morgan Marquis-Boire; Aaron Massey, Postdoctoral Fellow, School of Interactive Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology; Andrew McConachie, Network engineer with experience working on Internet infrastructure; Daniel L. McDonald, RTI Advocate and Security Point-of-Contact, illumos Project; Alexander McMillen, Mission critical datacenter and cloud services expert; Charlie Miller, Security Engineer at Twitter; HD Moore, Chief Research Officer, Rapid7.

Joseph “Jay” Moran, Vice President of Cimpres Technology Operations; Peter G. Neumann, Senior Principal Scientist, SRI International Moderator of the ACM Risks Forum (risks.org); Jesus Oquendo, Information Security Researcher, E-Pensive Security Strategies; Ken Pfeil, CISO, Pioneer in-

vestments; Benjamin C. Pierce, Professor of Computer and Information Science, University of Pennsylvania; Ryan Rawdon, Network and Security Engineer; Bruce Schneier, security researcher and cryptographer, published seminal works on applied cryptography; Sid Stamm, Ph.D., Principal Engineer, Security and Privacy, Mozilla; Visiting Assistant Professor of Computer Science, Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology; Armando Stettner, Technology Consultant; Matt Suiche, Staff Engineer, VMware.

C. Thomas (Space Rogue), Security Strategist Tenable Network Security; Arrigo Triulzi, independent security consultant; Doug Turner, Sr. Director—Privacy, Security, Networking, Mozilla Corporation; Daniel Paul Veditz, Principal Security Engineer, Mozilla, Co-chair Web Application Security Working Group, W3C; David Wagner, Professor of Computer Science, University of California, Berkeley; Dan S. Wallach, Professor, Department of Computer Science and Rice Scholar, Baker Institute for Public Policy, Rice University; Jonathan Weinberg, Professor of Law, Wayne State University; Stephen Wilson, Managing Director and Founder, Lockstep Technologies; Chris Wysopal, CTO and co-founder Veracode, Inc.; Stefano Zanero, Board of Governors member, IEEE Computer Society.

Mr. WYDEN. The signers of the letter expressed very serious concerns about the legislation and were particularly concerned it would “significantly undermine privacy and civil liberties.” Unfortunately, as the signers of the legislation will report, these concerns were not adequately addressed in the committee markup.

Shortly after the committee markup, a group of 65 technologists and cyber security professionals wrote to Chairman BARR and Vice Chairman FEINSTEIN expressing their opposition to this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD as well.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 2, 2015.

Chairman RICHARD BARR,
Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, U.S. Senate.

Vice Chairman, DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, U.S. Senate.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BARR, VICE CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN, AND MEMBERS OF THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: We the undersigned civil society organizations, security experts, and academics write to explain how the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (CISA), would significantly undermine privacy and civil liberties. We now know that the National Security Agency (NSA) has secretly collected the personal information of millions of users, and the revelation of these programs has created a strong need to rein in, rather than expand, government surveillance. CISA disregards the fact that information sharing can—and to be truly effective, must—offer both security and robust privacy protections. The legislation fails to achieve these critical objectives by including:

Automatic NSA access to personal information shared with a governmental entity;

Inadequate protections prior to sharing;

Dangerous authorization for countermeasures; and

Overbroad authorization for law enforcement use.

For the following reasons, we urge rejection of CISA in its current form:

Automatic NSA Access to Personal Information and Communications: Since the summer of 2013, NSA surveillance activities, such as the telephony metadata bulk collection program and the PRISM program, have raised nationwide alarm. CISA ignores these objections, and requires real time dissemination to military and intelligence agencies, including the NSA. Congress should be working to limit the NSA's overbroad authorities to conduct surveillance, rather than passing a bill that would increase the NSA's access to personal information and private communications.

Automatic sharing with NSA risks not only privacy, but also effectiveness. During a recent House Intelligence Committee hearing, NSA Director Admiral Mike Rogers stated that sharing threat indicators without filtering out personal data would slow operations and negatively impact NSA's cyber defense activities. Further, in the wake of revelations regarding the PRISM program, major tech companies stated that they would not voluntarily share users' information with the NSA. Automated NSA access could thus disincentivize sharing, undercutting the key goal of the legislation.

Inadequate Protections Prior to Sharing: CISA does not effectively require private entities to strip out information that identifies a specific person prior to sharing cyber threat indicators with the government, a fundamental and important privacy protection. While the bill requires that companies “review” cyber threat indicators for information that identifies a specific person and sometimes remove it, the bill contains no standard to ensure that this review effort is—at a minimum—reasonable.

Further, the bill requires companies to remove that information only for individuals that it knows are “not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.” This could encourage companies to retain data by default, unnecessarily exposing the information of innocent bystanders and victims to the government, and making it available to law enforcement for a myriad of investigative uses. Legislation should instead require that prior to sharing, companies make at least a reasonable effort to identify all personally identifiable information and, unless it is necessary to counter the cyber threat before sharing any indicators with the government, remove it. The default should be to preserve privacy, rather than to sacrifice it.

Dangerous Authorization for Countermeasures: CISA authorizes countermeasures “notwithstanding any law,” including the federal Computer Fraud and Abuse Act. As amended by CISA, federal law would permit companies to retaliate against a perceived threat in a manner that may cause significant harm, and undermine cybersecurity. CISA provides that countermeasures must be “operated on” one's own information systems, but may have off-networks effects—including harmful effects to external systems—so long as the countermeasures do not “intentionally” destroy other entities' systems. Given the risks of misattribution and escalation posed by offensive cyber activities—as well as the potential for misappropriation—this is highly inadvisable. CISA permits companies to recklessly deploy countermeasures that damage networks belonging to innocent bystanders, such as a hospital or emergency responders that attackers use as proxies to hide behind, so

long as the deploying company does not intend that the countermeasure result in harm. CISA's authorization would not only inadvisably wipe away the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act's current prohibition against these activities, it would be dangerous to internet security.

Overbroad Law Enforcement Use: Law enforcement use of information shared for cybersecurity purposes should be limited to prosecuting specific cyber crimes identified in the bill and preventing imminent loss of life or serious bodily harm. CISA goes far beyond this, and permits law enforcement to use information it receives for investigations and prosecutions of a wide range of crimes involving any level of physical force, including those that involve no threat of death or significant bodily harm, as well as for terrorism investigations, which have served as the basis for overbroad collection programs, and any alleged violations of various provisions of the Espionage Act. The lack of use limitations creates yet another loophole for law enforcement to conduct backdoor searches on Americans—including searches of digital communications that would otherwise require law enforcement to obtain a warrant based on probable cause. This undermines Fourth Amendment protections and constitutional principles.

Cybersecurity legislation should be designed to increase digital hygiene and identify and remediate advanced threats, not create surveillance authorities that would compromise essential privacy rights, and undermine security. Accordingly, we urge that the Committee not approve this bill without addressing these concerns.

Thank you for your consideration.

Civil Society Organizations—Access: American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; American Library Association; Advocacy for Principled Action in Government; American Civil Liberties Union; Association of Research Libraries; Bill of Rights Defense Committee; Brennan Center for Justice; Center for Democracy & Technology; Center for National Security Studies; Competitive Enterprise Institute; Constitutional Alliance; The Constitution Project; Council on American Islamic Relations; Cyber Policy Project; Defending Dissent Foundation; Demand Progress; Electronic Frontier Foundation; Free Press Action Fund; FreedomWorks; Liberty Coalition; National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers; New America's Open Technology Institute; Project on Government Oversight; R Street Institute; Sunlight Foundation.

Security Experts and Academics—Ben Adida, Cryptographer; Jacob Appelbaum, The Tor Project; Alvaro Bedoya, Center on Privacy and Technology at Georgetown Law; Brian Behlendorf; David J Farber, University of Pennsylvania; J. Alex Halderman, University of Michigan; Joan Feigenbaum, Yale University; Bryan Ford, Yale University; Matthew D. Green, Johns Hopkins University; Daniel Kahn Gillmor, Technologist; Susan Landau, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; Sascha Meinrath, X-Lab; Peter G. Neumann, SRI International; Ronald L. Rivest, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Philip Rogaway, University of California, Davis; Bruce Schneier, Cryptographer and Security Specialist; Christopher Soghoian, Technologist; Gene Spafford, Purdue University; Micah Sherr, Georgetown University; Adam Shostack; Dan S. Wallach, Rice University; Nicholas Weaver, University of California at Berkeley.

Mr. WYDEN. This is a particularly important letter. We have some of the

most distinguished independent experts from across the country—whether Amazon or Sysco, Stanford University, Dartmouth, some of the leading experts in the private sector and academia—expressing real concerns about this legislation and its House companion.

From their letter:

We appreciate your interest in making our networks more secure, but the legislation proposed does not materially further that goal, and at the same time it puts our users' privacy at risk. These bills weaken privacy law without promoting security. We urge you to reject them.

The reason I want our colleagues to be aware that these distinguished scientists in Silicon Valley, and literally every corner of the country, are so concerned is that the American people want both security and liberty—and they understand the two are not mutually exclusive. What this distinguished group of experts has just said is this “weaken[s] privacy law without promoting security.” I hope the Senate will review what these experts are saying.

Along the same lines, I note that the Christian Science Monitor recently polled a group of more than 78 high-profile security and privacy experts from across government, think tanks, and the private sector. With these experts, they asked if legislation along the lines of this bill—this bill which has been attached to the Defense authorization. These experts were asked if this legislation would significantly reduce security breaches, and 87 percent said it would not. Many of them noted—a concern I have noted in opposing the legislation—that incentivizing private companies to share information about security threats is a very worthwhile proposition, a worthwhile thing to do. But they go on to say that bills like this are going to have limited value in that area and would have significant negative consequences.

Now, many of my colleagues may have some disagreement with some of the dozens and dozens of independent experts I have just mentioned. Some of them may agree with the 13 percent of those experts who said this bill will do a lot to reduce security breaches. That is their right, and that is what a good Senate debate would be all about. But what the Senate should not do is pretend that this legislation is uncontroversial and try to rush it through without substantial revisions and the chance for Senators on both sides of the aisle to be heard.

Now, I think we all understand why some in the Senate would feel we have to move immediately on this issue and in effect be tempted to rush to action here. We have all understood there have been a number of recent high-profile hacks that have drawn attention to the need to improve our Nation's cyber security—and I don't disagree with the importance of that at all.

For example, a major company in Oregon was hacked by the Chinese simply because they were trying to enforce their rights under trade law.

So this is not some abstract issue for the people I represent. We have seen it in my home State.

So these high-profile hacks, like the one we saw here recently, is obviously drawing attention to the need to improve cyber security. The recent compromise of a very large amount of Office of Personnel Management data is obviously the latest of these, but it is certainly not going to be the last.

Every single time I read about these kind of hacks, what I do is—and I have a very talented staff from the Intelligence Committee and my own office to assist me—I try to reach out and talk to experts in the field about ways to improve cyber security. But that doesn't mean every single piece of legislation with the word “cyber security” in it is automatically a good idea that ought to be blessed without revision in the Senate.

The fact is, this particular cyber security bill is largely focused on trying to make it more difficult for individuals to be able to take on corporations. I understand why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce likes it so much. They have always been concerned about the rights of the large corporations. Sometimes the inevitable is, well, we are concerned about the large corporations, let's make it harder for individuals to be able to get a fair shake in the marketplace. But in my judgment, the actual cyber security value of this bill would be very limited, and the consequences for those individuals who are trying to get a fair shake would be quite serious.

I am going to turn in a moment to the substance of the CISA bill to explain why I consider it so problematic and why it needs a major revision. But first I am going to take just a few minutes to discuss proposals that I believe would actually make a difference in terms of improving American cyber security.

First, the most effective way to improve cyber security is to ensure that network owners take responsibility for the security of their networks and effectively implement good security practices. This proposal was the centerpiece of a 2012 bill called the Lieberman-Collins cyber security bill, and in my view that legislation was just a few changes away from being good cyber security law. Unfortunately, the notion of having the government create even voluntary standards for private companies was strongly opposed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Congress has not revisited it since.

Beyond ensuring that network owners take responsibility and implement good security practices, it is also important to ensure that government agencies do not deliberately weaken security standards.

I know the Presiding Officer in the Senate has a great interest, as I do, in innovation and American competitiveness. It is pretty hard—when we say the words: The American Government is actually thinking, as the FBI Director has talked about, about requiring companies to build weaknesses into their products—it is pretty hard to get your arms around this theory, not the least of which is the reason that once the good guys have the keys, the bad guys will also have the keys, which will facilitate cyber hacking.

I have been skeptical of these statements from senior FBI officials suggesting that U.S. hardware and software companies should be required, as I would characterize it, to weaken the security of their products because encryption and other advanced security measures are a key part, a key compound of actually improving cyber security.

I was pleased to see that in the other body, just last week, a new amendment from Representatives MASSIE and LOFGREN to prevent the government from deliberately weakening encryption standards was voted on, and I am very hopeful the Senate will eventually follow suit. In fact, I offered that concept in the Intelligence Committee, and regrettably it did not pass.

With regard to government-held data, it is absolutely imperative that Federal agencies receive the funding and expertise they need to develop and implement strong network security programs and to ensure that they have the technical and administrative controls in place to combat a wide range of cyber security threats.

I also believe our government needs to be in a stronger position to recruit and retain a capable Federal cyber security workforce by ensuring that cyber security professionals can find opportunities in government that are as rewarding as those in the private sector. In order to ensure that there are enough professionals to fill positions in both the private sector and the government, it is obvious that there is going to need to be an investment in the education of the next generation of cyber security leaders.

As we talk about responsible approaches to deal with these cyber issues, I would like to note that I consider the Consumer Privacy Protection Act—a piece of legislation initiated by Senator LEAHY—to be another step in the right direction. This legislation creates a comprehensive approach to data security by requiring companies to build a cyber security program that can defend against cyber attacks and prevent data breaches. It also protects a wide range of personal information, not just name or financial account information but also online user names and passwords, information about a person's geolocation, and access to private digital photographs and videos.

Unlike CISA, this legislation would, in my view, provide real tools to address the kinds of recent cyber attacks we have seen in the news, such as the celebrity photo hack. Unlike CISA, it would also empower individuals by requiring companies to notify consumers if their information has been lost and would protect the rights offered under some State laws for consumers to sue in the event of a privacy incident. The Consumer Privacy Protection Act is the right kind of responsible, thoughtful approach to cyber security, which is legislation that will help us get an added measure of security and public protection, while at the same time protecting the individual liberties and the privacy of our people.

Finally, in my judgment, our country needs to be willing to impose consequences on foreign entities that attempt to hack into American networks and steal large quantities of valuable data. These hacks are undermining our national security, our economic competitiveness, and the personal privacy of huge numbers of Americans. These consequences should draw on the full range of American power, depending on the nature of the hack and the entity responsible.

It would be a failure of American imagination to say that the only way to respond to foreign hacking is to have our military and intelligence agencies “hack back,” as the concept has been known, at the parties responsible. We are the most powerful country in the world, and our government has a wide variety of tools at its disposal, including economic sanctions, law enforcement, and multilateral diplomacy. And building a multifaceted strategy to deter foreign hacking is going to require all of those kinds of tools I have mentioned by way of articulating responsible steps to deal with cyber security, steps that protect both our security and liberty. All of those tools are ones we will have to draw on.

Having laid out ways that the Senate on a bipartisan basis can improve cyber security, I want to turn to the proposal in detail that is now in front of the Senate. As I have said, I believe it makes sense to encourage private companies to share information about cyber security threats. Cyber is a problem. Sharing information can be useful, but it is also vital that information sharing not be bereft of privacy protections for law-abiding Americans.

Cyber security is a problem. Information sharing is a plus. But let's make no mistake about it—an information-sharing bill that lacks privacy protections really is not a cyber security bill; it is a surveillance bill. That is what has been one of my major concerns about this legislation, that the legislation in front of the Senate—we talked about the flaws in the process, but substantively, if you have an information-

sharing bill that lacks adequate privacy protections, it is a surveillance bill by another name.

When the Senate Intelligence Committee voted on the CISA bill, I opposed it. I opposed it because I believe its insufficient privacy protections will lead to large volumes of Americans' personal information, personal information from law-abiding Americans who have done nothing wrong—that they will be faced with the prospect that their information is shared with the government even when that information is not needed for cyber security. When I say “personal information,” I am talking about the contents of emails, financial information, and what amounts to any data at all that is stored electronically.

Some of my colleagues have stressed that companies will have a choice about whether to participate in this information-sharing part of the legislation. That is true, but while corporations will have a choice about whether to participate, they will be able to do so without the knowledge or consent of their customers, and they will receive broad liability protections when they do so. The CISA bill as written trumps all Federal privacy laws.

Furthermore, once this information is shared with the government, government agencies will be permitted to use it for a wide variety of purposes unrelated to cyber security. The bill creates what I consider to be a double standard—really a bizarre double standard in that private information that is shared about individuals can be used for a variety of non-cyber security purposes, including law enforcement action against these individuals, but information about the companies supplying that information generally may not be used to police those companies.

I will tell you, I think that will be pretty hard to explain at a townhall meeting in virtually any corner of America because I believe it is wrong to say that the privacy rights of corporations matter more than the privacy rights of individual Americans.

I expect that some colleagues will say that it is not their intent to authorize this excessively broad collection. The argument will be that this is legislation to encourage companies to share information about actual cyber security threats, such as lines of malicious code and signatures of hostile cyber actors. Again, I would say to colleagues that I am all for encouraging companies to share information about genuine security threats, but if you read the language that is now before the Senate in the cyber security bill, the language of that bill is much broader than just sharing information about genuine security threats.

If Senators want to pass a bill that is focused on real cyber security threats and includes real protection for Americans' privacy, then the Senate should

add language specifying that companies should only provide the government with individuals' personal information if it is necessary to describe a cyber security threat. That does not seem to me to be an unreasonable protection for the privacy of Americans, that the Senate would adopt language specifying that the companies provide the government with individuals' personal information if it is necessary to describe a cyber threat. That is pretty obvious.

We can explain that, I would say to the distinguished President of the Senate, at a townhall meeting, that if it is related to a cyber security threat, then the companies would provide individuals' personal information. But this would discourage companies from unnecessarily sharing large amounts of their customers' private information with the government.

Unfortunately, the cyber security bill in front of the Senate now takes the opposite approach. It only requires companies to withhold information that is known at the time of sharing to be personal information unrelated to cyber security. This approach will clearly discourage companies from closely reviewing the information that they share and will lead to a much greater amount of Americans' personal information being transferred needlessly to government agencies.

I hope that here in the Senate there will be an opportunity to carefully consider the potential consequences of this legislation before voting to rush it through by an expedited process.

I have said here several times that cyber security is a real problem, and policymakers are going to have to deal with it. In fact, I will go so far as to say that the issue of cyber security is going to be an ongoing and enduring challenge of the digital age. It is my view that every Senator who serves in this body today can expect to deal with cyber security questions for the rest of their career in public service. Voting to rush a bill through, however, is not going to make these problems somehow go away, and it will have real consequences for our constituents for years to come, and in particular, it will not make us safer and will jeopardize the rights of individual Americans.

Before I wrap up, I believe it is important and I have an obligation to draw my colleagues' attention to one final issue. As of this afternoon, there is a secret Justice Department legal opinion that is of clear relevance to this debate that continues to be withheld from the public. This opinion remains classified. The Senate rules prohibit me from describing it in detail. But I can say that it interprets common commercial service agreements and that in my judgment is inconsistent with the public's understanding of the law.

So this gets back to a question I have talked about on the floor often, which

is secret law, when the public reads one thing and there is a secret interpretation that goes in another direction and it contributes to the public's cynicism about Washington.

As always, I certainly see it as my job to say that colleagues can decide whether to take my counsel, but I believe any Senator who votes for this legislation, without reading this secret Justice Department legal opinion I have referred to, is voting without a full understanding of the relevant legal landscape. If Senators do not understand how these common commercial service agreements have been interpreted by the executive branch, then it will be harder for the Senate to have a fully informed debate on the cyber security legislation, whether it is considered now or later.

I would also like to note for the record that I have repeatedly asked the Justice Department to withdraw this opinion and to make it public so anyone who is party to one of these commercial service agreements can decide whether their agreement ought to be revised. The Justice Department has chosen not to take my advice on either of my suggestions.

In public testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee, the deputy head of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel told me she personally would not rely on this opinion today, and I appreciate her view on that matter. Yet, until the opinion is withdrawn, I believe Senators should be concerned about other government officials choosing to rely on it at any time. In my judgment, that is a very clear instance of the government developing what is essentially secret law—law that is at variance with what you read if you are in a coffee shop in Arkansas or Utah or anywhere else.

The reality is, as I have said often on the floor, operations always have to be secret, as do the sources and methods. Chairman HATCH remembers this from his service on the Intelligence Committee. Operations always have to be secret, but the law ought to be public because that is how the American people have confidence in how we make decisions in our Republic.

I will close by saying it is quite obvious at this point that I have significant reservations about the cyber security bill. I believe a number of Senators are going to share these concerns. I will let them speak for themselves, although I believe Senator LEAHY's strong statement yesterday was certainly on point. Yet I will also say, even to my colleagues who are inclined to vote for this bill, that I hope all Senators will think about whether this is an appropriate process for this sort of legislation.

I have already said I believe Senators are going to be dealing with cyber security questions for the rest of their time in public service, because in the

digital age, I think we are going to see a constant evolution in this field with respect to these threats and both the technical and political concerns that are raised by them.

Should the Senate be rushing a bill like this through by tacking it onto an unrelated defense measure? Is this the best way to show the American people, once again, that security and liberty are not mutually exclusive and that it is possible to do both?

If Senators share the concerns I have raised, I hope they will oppose the cyber security amendment if it is brought up for a vote on the Defense bill. I hope Senators will support this issue, which has been brought to the floor under a different process—a process that involves regular order, so every Senator on both sides of the aisle will have an opportunity to make the revisions I believe it needs and to offer their own ideas.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Utah.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as the House of Representatives moves closer to a vote on the Senate-passed legislation to renew trade promotion authority, I wish to take a few minutes to talk about the links between our Nation's trade policy, foreign policy, and national security. Whether it is Russia's aggression toward the Ukraine, civil wars in the Middle East or ongoing efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation, the world faces a number of challenges that are impacting the future geopolitical landscape.

In all of this, the question we have to consider is: Going forward, what role will the United States play? Are we going to lead or are we going to follow?

Make no mistake, the path we take on international trade will say a lot about how we plan to answer those questions.

Consider a few facts. In the next few years, China will likely pass the United States as the world's largest economy. It is already the world's largest exporting country. China is continually seeking to expand its influence in order to dictate the terms of international trade, particularly in places like Sub-Saharan Africa, Central Asia, and Latin America.

In other words, when we are talking about trade and the possibility of the United States retreating from the international marketplace, China is the proverbial 800-pound gorilla in the room. Indeed, any ground we cede in leading the world on trade is, more likely than not, ground ceded to China.

I have heard many people—including Members of Congress—express their concerns about China, both strategically and economically, and rightfully so. After all, when it comes to trade, China has constantly shown a disregard for international norms and

standards. However, oddly enough, many of those same people who talk the most about the threat posed by China have expressed opposition to TPA, the trade promotion authority bill, and to the Trans-Pacific Partnership or TPP. This is puzzling and reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the Senate TPA bill and free trade in general.

If we are serious about keeping China and its growing economic and political influence in check, getting a strong TPP agreement that advances U.S. interests should be a top priority. In addition, if we want to eventually convince China to change their harmful practices, a high-standard TPP agreement would naturally be a big step in the right direction.

Free-trade agreements like TPP, if done correctly, should provide new rules for trade in the 21st century. They should set modern standards for economic liberalization and integration, including the protection of foreign investments and intellectual property rights and the marginalization of state-owned enterprises.

We need to be setting the standards and writing the rules on trade so our workers, innovators, researchers, and job creators can fairly compete in the global market. If we don't lead, if we sit on the sidelines, Americans will be competing on an imbalanced playing field, with rules designed specifically to disadvantage us. Given that TPP countries comprise 40 percent of the world economy, it is vital we improve our ability to compete in that region.

Moreover, if TPP fails, we will lose influence in one of the most economically dynamic and strategic regions of the world, and any leadership vacuum left by the United States will almost certainly be filled by someone else and, in this case, most likely China.

But don't just take my word for it. Congress recently received a letter from 17 former Secretaries of Defense and retired military leaders, including Colin Powell, Leon Panetta, William Perry, and Donald Rumsfeld.

In that letter, these leaders said:

We write to express our strongest possible support for enactment of Trade Promotion Authority legislation, which is critical to the successful conclusion of two vital agreements: the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). Indeed, TPP in particular will shape an economic dynamic over the next several decades that will link the United States with one of the world's most vibrant and dynamic regions. If, however, we fail to move forward with TPP, Asian economies will almost certainly develop along a China-centric model. In fact, China is already pursuing an alternative regional free trade initiative. TPP, combined with TTIP, would allow the United States and our closest allies to help shape the rules and standards for global trade.

The concerns outlined in this letter went beyond China.

The letter continues:

The stakes are clear. There are tremendous strategic benefits to TPP and TTIP, and there would be harmful strategic consequences if we fail to secure these agreements. In both the Asia-Pacific and the Atlantic, our allies and partners would question our commitments, doubt our resolve, and inevitably look to other partners. America's prestige, influence, and leadership are on the line. With TPP originating in the Bush administration, these agreements are fundamentally bipartisan in nature and squarely in our national security interest. It is vitally important that we seize the new strategic opportunities these agreements offer our nation.

When 17 former Secretaries of Defense, admirals, and generals who served under both Republican and Democratic administrations have joined together with such a strong message, they probably have a point, and Congress had better listen closely.

Many people, including a number of our colleagues in Congress, continually argue that one of the best uses of American power would be to better promote human rights and democracy in developing countries and increase our efforts at alleviating poverty. I don't necessarily disagree with that sentiment.

Indeed, while there are different opinions about how we can best accomplish these goals, I think most of us in Congress, in both the Senate and the House, agree with the basic premise that we should continually be working to expand our influence and advance our values, particularly in the developing world.

History has demonstrated that the best way to accomplish these objectives is to increase U.S. trade with these countries. Indeed, if we want to export the benefits of American exceptionalism, capitalism, work ethic, and democracy, a freer, expanded exchange of goods is absolutely the best way to do it.

Trade is an effective exercise of America's economic power and influence, trade is how you spread capitalism and encourage other countries to open their economies, trade is how you export American values in the developing world, and, most importantly, trade is how you counter the growing influence of countries like China in the world economy.

The stakes are high. The importance of TPP and other trade agreements to our strategic and security interests is obvious, and given that reality, the importance of TPA should be just as obvious.

Put simply, without TPA, there is no TPP. That is just a fact. Sure, technically speaking, TPA is not required for the administration to complete negotiations and send the agreement to Congress, but technicalities aside, that route is unlikely to yield a desirable result, both in terms of the substance and process.

Japan and Canada, two of our largest trading partners in the TPP negotia-

tions, have each stated they are reluctant to bring their final offers to the table until Congress provides the administration with TPA. Trade promotion authority assures our trading partners that if they reach an agreement, it will not be unraveled when it is sent to Congress for approval. This allows our negotiators to get the best deal possible.

TPA also ensures that Congress has a meaningful role in crafting the specifics of the agreement by setting objectives, mandating transparency, and requiring periodic updates. Under the Senate-passed bill, Congress will have more authority than ever to review and respond to the administration on individual trade agreements.

Long story short, TPA is absolutely necessary for advancing U.S. interests abroad and protecting the opportunities for millions of Americans to earn and compete for a livelihood in an increasingly global trade environment.

With the House TPA vote set to take place in a matter of days, I hope our colleagues in the other Chamber will recognize the strategic and economic realities we face as a country and be willing to advance our Nation's interests and security. I am confident that most of them will make the right choice, and it will be good for America as well as them.

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to speak about another matter of great importance not just to me but to everybody.

Last year, after the midterm elections, the Obama administration quietly and without much fanfare proposed a massive, far-reaching rule that would overturn a number of bedrock principles of child support enforcement and welfare reform, chief among them being the principle that parents should be financially responsible for their children.

This was just the latest attempt on the part of the Obama administration to bypass Congress and work to enact policies through executive fiat. Sadly, it wasn't even the first time this administration tried to gut welfare reform. Indeed, we all remember a few years back when the administration granted itself the unprecedented authority to waive critical welfare work requirements.

Put simply, this latest rule would make it easier for noncustodial parents to evade paying child support. It would undermine a key feature of welfare reform, which is that single mothers can avoid welfare if fathers comply with child support orders.

I am fundamentally opposed to policies that allow parents to abdicate their responsibilities, which, in return, results in more families having to go on welfare. I think most Americans would agree with me. That is why I, joined by Senator CORNYN and House

Ways and Means Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN, have introduced legislation that would prevent the Obama administration from bypassing Congress in yet another attempt to subvert key features of welfare reform. I regret that we must take this action.

In the past, Members of Congress have generally been able to find common ground and work on a bipartisan basis to address issues relating to child support. In fact, Congress recently passed, and the President recently signed legislation, that made improvements to child support enforcement policies.

In 2013, the Senate Finance Committee reported a series of ambitious proposals related to child support enforcement. At that time, we requested input on these proposals from the Obama administration. At no time did administration officials indicate that the Department of Health and Human Services was quietly working to advance a massive overhaul of child support enforcement, much less that it was planning on doing so without the help or input of Congress.

It is important to note that this secretive preparation only came to light after the recent elections. That suggests to me that the administration does not have faith that its proposal can withstand public scrutiny and that they have no interest in making a full and transparent justification for the policies they are trying to ram through.

Truth be told, Chairman RYAN and I have introduced our legislation more out of sorrow than anger. For many months, our offices attempted to work out an equitable arrangement with the Obama administration. We tried to convince HHS to withdraw the problematic features of the rule, and in exchange we would agree to engage in a substantive, productive discussion on how to move forward with improvements to child support enforcement.

I firmly believe there is room for common ground. In fact, there are a number of features of the administration's proposed rule that could generate bipartisan support. But any workable solution would have to include the full participation and ultimate consent of the legislative branch. Any changes to the law would have to go through Congress and not simply be dictated by the administration.

So Chairman RYAN and I will do all we can to get our bill through Congress and present it to the President. If we are successful, I hope he will sign it and commit to working with us in the future to advance reforms to child support enforcement. I stand ready to work with the administration and any of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol to achieve this goal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986

(Purpose: To reauthorize and reform the Export-Import Bank of the United States)

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator KIRK, I send an amendment to the desk to the text proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1463.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Ms. AYOTTE], for Mr. KIRK, proposes an amendment numbered 1986 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1463.

Ms. AYOTTE. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Ms. AYOTTE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise today to talk about an important amendment that was offered by Senator KIRK, which I cosponsor, and that is the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

I can tell you that in my home State of New Hampshire, on Monday, I was at a roundtable at GE Aviation. GE Aviation has over 700 jobs in the State of New Hampshire. They are building a new facility there. The Export-Import Bank provides a company like GE Aviation the opportunity to obtain financing to export its products that are manufactured in the United States of America, in New Hampshire, to other countries overseas, increasing the opportunity for American manufacturing jobs.

At that company, on Monday, they invited a lot of their suppliers and small businesses who also have either used Ex-Im financing or are suppliers for the larger companies that use Ex-Im financing.

One of those companies that were around the table that had used Ex-Im financing in New Hampshire was Boyle Energy in Concord. In fact, Mike Boyle, who is the CEO of Boyle Energy, has been able to use Ex-Im financing to grow New Hampshire jobs. He has a vision for a new plant in Merrimack, NH, that he is ready to expand. If he can get this financing, he is going to be selling more of his great products overseas, creating more jobs in New Hampshire.

Yet, this Bank expires at the end of June. This is a very important tool for American businesses. This program—and I wish I had this problem with every program in Washington—actu-

ally returns money to the Treasury, and it creates American jobs.

The reason this type of financing is available is because of the risk that is often taken in exporting products and there aren't commercial loans always available. The Ex-Im Bank has the ability to allow financing for our businesses in America. In fact, other countries around the world have programs such as this, and that are much more extensive. So without the Ex-Im Bank, it is not a level playing field for our American companies that want to manufacture in the United States of America. The Ex-Im Bank will allow access to financing that will enable businesses to create American jobs.

Also around that table on Monday at GE Aviation was Goss International. They manufacture great printing presses in New Hampshire. We are very proud of them. They have also been able to use Ex-Im financing. If that financing doesn't go through, we heard from a representative of Goss that, in fact, they could lose up to 40 jobs in my home State of New Hampshire. So it is important that we reauthorize this Bank.

I want to thank the Senator from Illinois for offering this amendment to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank so that our companies here in the United States of America can manufacture here, sell to consumers around the world, and have access to this financing. In fact, in New Hampshire there have been about 36 companies—many of them small companies—that were able over the last several years to use Ex-Im financing to create New Hampshire jobs.

This is about jobs in the United States of America. This is about competing. We recently had the TPA—trade promotion authority—on the floor to expand opportunities for trade. This goes hand in hand with that legislation so that companies have opportunities to get financing to create jobs here and return money to the Treasury. I wish I could say that about every program—that it returns money to the Treasury. The default rate at Ex-Im Bank is lower than with commercial loans.

I hope that Senator KIRK's amendment will get a vote on the Senate floor, that we can get this reauthorized before the expiration date at the end of this month, and that we can continue to allow this financing for American businesses to continue to build and create products to sell overseas and to create American jobs. This is what this financing allows these businesses to do. This is very important in making sure that we remain competitive and that we have more jobs here and that we continue to sell our great products built here in the United States of America around the world.

So I am very honored to support this amendment. I hope we will get a vote

on this amendment on the Defense authorization bill or get a vote and make sure that we have this passed before the end of this month when this Bank expires so that we could have continuity in this important financing mechanism for our businesses here in this country.

In addition to the businesses I previously mentioned that were around the table on Monday, I also want to mention GKN Aerospace from Charleston, which is a larger business with a smaller footprint in New Hampshire that has been able to export and create jobs in New Hampshire and across the country. In addition to that, we were so glad to hear from other businesses in New Hampshire that were able to rely on this important financing mechanism.

I am very glad to support Senator KIRK's amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

SPACE PROGRAM CUT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I just learned that the CJS subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee reported a bill out that made a substantial cut in the request for commercial crew in order for us to be able to have Americans flying on American rockets to and from the International Space Station, instead of having to rely on the Russian Soyuz, which we buy and have been buying those ever since we shut down the space shuttle at something like \$60 million to \$70 million per passenger going up to the space station.

Now, the whole idea was that since we cooperated with the Russians in building this space station, we would both have the means of transportation to get up there. We do have the means of transportation of getting cargo to and from the space station, since we shut down the space shuttle, but we are in the process of a competition between several companies—especially those that have been selected in the competition by NASA, Boeing and SpaceX. Each of them has been granted money to develop all of the redundancies and safety and escape systems in their spacecraft capsule in order to make it safe for Americans to go to and from the International Space Station.

Now, I can tell you that for the average American on the street, their image of our space program is one that since the space shuttle shut down in 2011, they think the space program is over, when, in fact, it is really just beginning, and we are going to Mars in the decade of the 2030s. Well, that is the whole point of our being able to rely on our own spacecraft and on our own rockets, instead of relying on the Russians.

If this cut is sustained—and this is a cut from a request of \$1.24 billion for this competition for making American

rockets safe and creating the spacecraft to take Americans to the space station—it will have been cut to \$900 million. If that cut in the subcommittee is sustained in the full committee and ultimately in the final appropriations bill, it is going to delay us from being able to launch Americans on American rockets.

Instead of 2017—just 2 years from now—it will delay us another 4 years. That is 4 more years of relying on the Russians. Now, I know there are a bunch of Senators around here that do not like the fact of the aggressiveness of Vladimir Putin. Well, this is one way to wean ourselves from having to depend on them.

The final comment on this subject is that the money that supposedly is being cut, which is just a little over \$300 million, we would lose in still paying that money to the Russians to fly an additional 2 years. We need to wake up to what is happening. Senator MIKULSKI will be offering an amendment to the full Appropriations Committee to restore that cut. I hope Senators will understand all the nuances and support Senator MIKULSKI.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I seek to speak on my amendment on behalf of the Export-Import Bank. I would like to say the Export-Import Bank is set to expire this year on June 30. It allows thousands of American companies to advance their technology overseas. Without these loans, many American jobs would be ceded to China or Europe.

Now, 200,000 American workers depend on Ex-Im, plus 46,000 in my home State of Illinois. They work for these companies that depend on Ex-Im's backing to make exports happen. Some people are interested in killing this agency because it may be a government handout agency. It is not. It actually makes the taxpayer \$1 billion a year. In the last 3 years, it has earned the U.S. Treasury over \$3 billion.

I will be offering the Kirk-Heitkamp amendment to keep this Bank alive. I want to thank Senators BLUNT, CANTWELL, and MANCHIN for defending these American jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the National Defense Authorization Act. This is legislation we are currently considering that we need to pass. It is important for our military, and it is important for the American people. I have offered a number of amendments, and I rise to speak about three of those amendments at this point.

The first is amendment No. 1483, which involves RPA flight training. Es-

entially, amendment No. 1483 would instruct the Air Force to consider allowing private contractors to provide the Air Force with training for remotely piloted aircraft or RPAs. These are the vehicles used in unmanned aerial systems, commonly called UAS.

Currently, the Air Force is training pilots for RPAs, remotely piloted aircraft, within the service itself. But there are some very skilled private contractors. In fact, the people who make unmanned aircraft could be doing high-quality training for them as well, particularly in concert with our universities that provide aviation training.

Right now the Air Force faces a real challenge in training a sufficient number of unmanned aircraft pilots to meet operational demands. Specifically, this amendment directs the Air Force to evaluate the use of private contractor facilities, equipment, and trainers to increase the number of qualified pilots for our RPA missions. It requires the Air Force to detail various aspects of their shortfall in manning RPAs, the authorized number of personnel assigned to the missions, and the identification and assessment of actions to address that shortfall.

In this rapidly growing era of unmanned aerial systems technology, it just makes sense for the military to partner with companies and universities that have the expertise to provide the critical training the military needs. It is cost effective. It is efficient. It is good for the military and our country. Right now the demand for unmanned aerial systems is so strong worldwide that the Air Force has all of its pilots flying the missions. That does not give them the resources, the pilots to train more pilots to fly unmanned aerial systems.

So this is a way that we can help the Air Force train these new pilots with the very contractors that make things such as Global Hawk, Predator and with our universities that provide aviation training. I think it would be of great benefit and assistance to the Air Force.

The second amendment that I want to talk about is amendment No. 1484. This one seeks to give the Air National Guard units a larger role in the Global Hawk unmanned aerial systems mission. Specifically, this measure directs the Air Force to determine the feasibility of partnering the Air National Guard with Active-Duty Air Force to operate and maintain the Global Hawk. The RQ-4 Global Hawks, including the Block 20, Block 30, and Block 40 variants, are the Air Force's high-altitude, long-endurance aircraft for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

They are currently operated and maintained only by Active-Duty forces. But the Air National Guard could be providing a valuable adjunct to the Air

Force's regular personnel if we allow them to do that. The North Dakota Air National Guard, for example, already operates and maintains the armed MQ-1 Predator, and does it exceptionally well. They and units like them are clearly capable of taking on part of the Global Hawk mission, in association with their Active-Duty counterparts.

This amendment would further the joint operations which have been a major initiative of all of the armed services, the Guard, and the Reserves in recent years, and they have done a tremendous job on jointness. It has made our military stronger, more effective, and more responsive. We need to continue to build on that joint operation. That is exactly what this amendment does.

The third amendment that I would like to discuss is amendment No. 1485. It regards the Nuclear Force Improvement Program. This amendment seeks to fortify the Nuclear Force Improvement Program, or NFIP, which I believe is crucial to our national security both now and well into the future. The reality is that we are facing an increasingly nuclearized future. Nations such as Iran, North Korea, and others have or are developing nuclear weapons.

That means we must maintain a credible, decisive nuclear deterrent. That is what the Nuclear Force Improvement Program is all about. In 2014, the Air Force initiated the program to bolster and enhance its nuclear missions, including the intercontinental ballistic missile, ICBM, and nuclear-capable bomber missions. The program involves a wide range of efforts to improve morale, update facilities and equipment, and reinvigorate the nuclear-related career fields in the Air Force.

We need to continue to invest in and build this program. Specifically, my amendment provides that the nuclear mission should be a top priority for the Department of Defense and the Air Force; that Congress should support investments which sustain progress made under the Nuclear Force Improvement Program; that the Air Force should regularly inform Congress on the program's progress and any additional requirements it may identify; and that future Air Force budgets should reflect the importance of the nuclear mission and the need to support personnel performing the nuclear mission.

The bottom line is that the men and women assigned to the nuclear mission in the U.S. Air Force are doing incredibly important work every day for the security of our country. We need to do all we can to support them. We need to provide them with the support they deserve so they can continue to do the job we ask them to do and do it at the level that our security requires.

The Nuclear Force Improvement Program is a success, and the Air Force needs to extend it into the future and

continue to shore up the foundations of our nuclear deterrent, which is, itself, at the foundation of national security.

In conclusion, let me say that working on legislation as essential as the defense of our Nation is and should be a bipartisan effort. The Senate Armed Services Committee passed this bill out of committee with a bipartisan vote of 22 to 4. Let's come together and do this for the American people and the men, women, and families who have undertaken the great and noble effort to protect our country.

I want to thank both the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the ranking member for their hard work, for their bipartisanship, and, again, offer my support as we work to pass this vitally important legislation for our military and for this great country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I wish to tell you a little bit about Gregg Keesling, a dad and small business owner from Indianapolis. I have gotten to know Gregg over the past few years because Gregg and his wife Jannett lost their son Chancellor to suicide while Chancellor was serving in Iraq in 2009, joining a club he often says he doesn't want anyone else to join.

On the poster, this is Gregg and this is Chancellor. This is Chancellor again, on duty. This is the memorial they had for Chancellor.

Gregg recently said that he sees the invisible wounds borne by our men and women in uniform as "one of the greatest challenges that our country faces." And he noted that "we're going to face this challenge for many years to come." Gregg is right. We have lost more troops to suicide than in combat each of the past 3 years. We lost more than 400 Active-Duty, Guard, and Reserve servicemembers last year alone. It is also estimated that we lose 22 veterans to suicide every single day. These are preventable deaths.

We must do more to get these men and women the mental health care they have earned. We need to remind our troops and veterans, along with our friends and family, that it is OK to share the burden of their personal struggles. It is a sign of strength to seek help. Our servicemembers, veterans, and their families sacrifice for us, so we must do everything possible to support them.

Last year we passed and the President signed into law the Jacob Sexton Military Suicide Prevention Act, which

for the first time requires an annual, in-person mental health assessment for all servicemembers, whether they are Active, Guard, or Reserve. Just like physical health, mental health is an essential piece of military readiness. We need to have an attitude of all-in toward providing support for mental health challenges and also for the day-to-day struggles we know contribute to suicide risk, such as financial problems, relationship issues—things that are never made easier by military life.

The Sexton act was named for a member of the Indiana National Guard who took his own life while home on leave from Afghanistan in 2009. Jeff and Barb Sexton, Jacob's parents, have been incredible partners in this work. Jeff recently spoke about the decision he and his wife made to speak out about military suicide.

This is SPC Jake Sexton. Here he is in his Humvee, and here he is serving as well. His parents, Jeff and Barb—actually, it was Jeff in particular, his dad, who said:

I had three choices: I could crawl in a corner, I could crawl in a bottle or I could stand up and fight. It's not been an easy job, but it's something I feel me and my wife have to do.

The Keeslings and the Sextons are courageously telling their stories to help prevent any more families from going through this nightmare. Congress needs to continue to answer their call. This is an issue we cannot let up on because there is so much more important work to do.

This year, we are taking the next step in the continuum of care and focusing on improving the quality of and access to mental health care through Department of Defense providers, VA providers, and private community providers.

This year, we introduced the servicemember and veteran mental health care package—three bills. Each improves access to quality mental health care for servicemembers and veterans. The care package aims to improve mental health care by focusing on direct care providers at DOD and VA, community providers in their own towns, and the training of physician assistants as mental health providers.

I thank Chairman MCCAIN and Senator REED for working with me to include elements of the care package in the national defense bill, specifically those elements which deal with DOD and care for servicemembers.

I wish to go through the care package provisions in the NDAA briefly and offer two amendments to ensure that these provisions support not only servicemembers but also veterans.

First, section 716 is based on the first of our care package bills, the Community Provider Readiness Recognition Act. It is cosponsored by my friend, Senator JONI ERNST, and it creates a special military-friendly designation

for providers who choose to receive training in military culture and the unique needs of servicemembers and military families. Providers who receive this designation would be listed in a regularly updated online registry, allowing servicemembers to search for designated providers in their area.

This bill is inspired by the Star Behavioral Health Provider Network, which is a program that the Military Family Research Institute at Purdue University built in Indiana to train providers to better understand military culture and medical treatments. Designating a provider as part of the Star Behavioral Health Provider Network helps servicemembers and their families make informed choices about where to seek care. This can easily be translated on a national scale so that servicemembers, veterans, and their families know which private mental health care providers are well-suited and trained to treat them.

Mr. President, second, section 713 of the NDAA is drawn from another care package bill, the Military and Veterans Mental Health Provider Assessment Act, cosponsored by my friend Senator ROGER WICKER of Mississippi.

This legislation requires that all of DOD primary care and mental health providers have received evidence-based training on suicide risk recognition and management and that their training be updated to keep pace with changes in mental health care best practices.

It also requires DOD to report to Congress on the military's current mental health workforce, the long-term mental health needs of servicemembers and military families, and how we ensure DOD meets those needs.

Finally, it requires the Department of Defense to bring us a plan to assess mental health outcomes in DOD care, variations in outcomes across different DOD health care facilities, and barriers to DOD mental health providers implementing the best clinical practice guidelines and other evidence-based treatments.

Finally, by including elements from the Frontline Mental Health Provider Training Act, cosponsored by my friend Senator JOHN BOOZMAN from Arkansas, the NDAA calls on the Department of Defense to train physician assistants to specialize in psychiatric care in order to help meet the increasing demand for mental health services among servicemembers and their families. We are also working to extend the same spectrum of care to our veterans, and we are working toward a hearing on the corresponding veterans bills for this mental health care package in the months ahead. These are smart, bipartisan provisions that address one of the most serious challenges facing our military, our veterans and our country.

We must improve the mental health care at the Department of Defense and

the Veterans' Administration and at private community providers from Ellsworth, ME, to Evansville, IN, to the shores of California so they are better able to serve our servicemembers, veterans, and their families. It is absolutely essential that we have coordination and continuity for servicemembers and their families as they transition to veteran status.

I will leave you with a couple of brief thoughts from two brave Hoosiers I have the privilege to know and have gotten to know well. Jeff Sexton, Jacob's dad, put it this way: "It is one thing to lose someone you love in the war. It is a whole other thing to lose them to the war." And Gregg Keesling, Chancellor's dad, concluded this: "The bottom line is I don't want anybody to go through what we've gone through."

We must act and we must act now before any more families have to experience this loss from suicide. I urge all of my colleagues to support the care package provisions for servicemembers and to later extend them to our veterans who need our help and who need us to stand up for them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am coming to the floor to speak on behalf of an amendment I am offering, along with Senators SCHATZ, UDALL, BLUMENTHAL, HEINRICH, TESTER, MERKLEY, and BALDWIN.

Today, it was announced that President Obama is going to be sending another 450 troops to Iraq to help assist in the fight against ISIL. That will mean we now have 3,500 troops in position throughout Iraq assisting in the battle against ISIL within those borders. This marks also nearly a year since we have reengaged in military activities in Iraq and in Syria, both with support forces for the Iraqis, with training for those who are fighting in Syria, and major air operations targeting ISIL.

I think there is broad bipartisan consensus here that the United States needs to take the fight to this enemy—an enemy that is seeking to occupy an enormous amount of territory in a very dangerous region from which it can plot attacks against the United States. But I also think there is bipartisan agreement that we should do our constitutional duty; that we should authorize this war against ISIL. My hope is the Foreign Relations Committee—of which I am a member, of which the Presiding Officer is a member—will have that debate in the upcoming months.

But given that we are authorizing hundreds of millions of dollars in this bill in order to take the fight to ISIL, I think it makes sense to have some commonsense limitations on the use of that money that are in keeping with the very public promises the President has made.

President Obama has stated very clearly that he does not think it is a wise strategy to reinsert major combat troop operations into the Middle East. I agree with him. I think many of us agree with him. There is nothing about the last 10 years of American occupation in Iraq that tells us that U.S. troops inside Iraq can have the effect of killing more terrorists than are created, in part, through the recruitment benefit of major U.S. combat operations.

So the amendment we are offering today is a fairly simple one. It would prohibit the use of major combat—of large numbers of combat troops in the fight against ISIL, with certain commonsense exceptions: an exception for rescue operations, an exception for intelligence-gathering exercises, and an exception for special operations in and throughout the region; special operations like the one we used to kill a high-ranking ISIS commander just within the last several weeks.

We think it is important that Congress weigh in and state what we believe to be the desire and imperative of our constituents; that we learn from the mistakes of the Iraq war; that we don't repeat them by inserting thousands of American ground troops back into Iraq or perhaps Syria.

ISIS was created, first and foremost, primarily by a political vacuum inside Iraq, not a military vacuum. We need to acknowledge that any strategy to ultimately defeat ISIL, as we are all committed to, has to first and foremost have a realistic political strategy on the ground to divorce Sunni populations from this death cult that is ISIL.

Sunni grievances grew throughout Nouri al-Maliki's reign. They were denied an equitable share of oil revenues. They were excluded from government jobs. There were real atrocities committed against Sunni communities—mass incarcerations, torture, extrajudicial killings. If we don't have an Iraq Government that is committed to being inclusive of Sunni populations, there is no amount of American troops on the ground that can heal those divisions. In fact, what we know about the Iraq war is that major American combat operations on the ground in Iraq have an effect of exacerbating those divisions rather than healing them. They give space for people like Maliki to try to marginalize these populations. They increase suffering on the ground, especially for these populations that aren't represented effectively within the reigning Shiite government in Baghdad.

So if we really want to learn lessons from the past, then let's take President Obama at his word. Let's include in the NDAA a commonsense limitation, with exceptions, with respect to the deployment of major ground operations inside Iraq.

Now, there are some people who will say this isn't the role of Congress. I would just state for the record that there are a litany of examples in the past in which Congress has placed commonsense limitations on our authorizations for military force. In fact, the President, in submitting a proposed AUMF to the Foreign Relations Committee several months ago, in fact, included in that authorization of military force a limitation on ground forces. So this would be entirely consistent with the history of this body but also with the proposal the President has made.

I know, from having visited our troops in Iraq and in Afghanistan, that it is easy for us to believe there is no mission that U.S. soldiers can't take on; that their capability, that their bravery, that their courage, that their adaptability knows no bounds. They have done admirable work inside Iraq over the course of the last 10 years, but what we know is that those troops inside Iraq also made Iraq what our own intelligence community called the cause celebre for the international terrorist movement, drawing in thousands of would-be terrorists to fight the Americans.

What we know is that the ISIS we are fighting today is a follow-on organization from Al Qaeda in Iraq, which was created because of the American invasion and occupation—maybe not in whole but certainly as the primary influence.

So we hope to be able to have a full debate on an authorization of military force. But with the inability to move that piece of legislation through the Foreign Relations Committee, we think it is proper on the NDAA to hold the President at his word, place a commonsense limitation on the use of ground troops and learn from the mistakes of the last 10 years inside Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I urge this Chamber to reject the motion to table my amendment, which put forward reforms to the Export-Import Bank. I would say to Members that this is going to be a key scored vote by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers; that, without my amendment, we would not have the reforms to make sure Ex-Im works at least 25 percent of its portfolio with small businesses.

I urge Members to vote no on the motion to table my amendment by Mr. SHELBY that I understand is coming up.

This is a key test vote, Export-Import Bank. With a good bipartisan vote, I would think we would have people supporting the Kirk-Heitkamp-Blunt-Graham reform legislation for Ex-Im.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SHELBY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, very briefly. Senators AYOTTE and KIRK's amendment is coming up. There will be a motion to table. What we are trying to do is basically show support for the Ex-Im Bank, which is due to expire in June. We are trying to find a vehicle, a must-pass piece of legislation, to keep the Bank afloat. I think it is very important to the American economy that American manufacturers not be disadvantaged. The Ex-Im Bank makes money for the American taxpayer. China's Ex-Im Bank is larger than France, Germany, the United States, and England's combined.

What does this mean to the average person? When a product is made in the United States and sold into the developing world without the Ex-Im financing mechanism available to American manufacturers, we are going to lose market share to other countries like China, France, Germany that produce wide-body jets and other products. Eighty-nine percent of the people who get help from the Ex-Im Bank are small businesses.

This is an attempt to show the investor community and those who are watching this issue that the Senate is in support of the Bank. So I am urging a "no" vote on tabling. We had to do this procedurally. So this will be a signal to the markets that the Senate is in support of the Bank. I urge everyone who believes the Bank is vital to American exports and not against unilateral surrendering of market share to the Chinese and other competitors to vote no. There will be another vote of our choosing on a vehicle that will have to get to the President's desk. This is not the last vote we will take on Ex-Im Bank.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I understand we have a vote scheduled at 5 o'clock, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak for about 60 seconds.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473

I came to the floor today to speak in favor of an amendment described earlier in the afternoon by Senator VITTER. This is an amendment, of course, to the National Defense Authorization

Act that makes certain our U.S. Army is able to maintain the current number of brigade combat teams.

Sequestration is creating significant problems in many arenas but no more important than in the area of our Army and defense. The concern is that in the process of downsizing the Army as a result of sequestration and other reductions in available funding, brigade combat teams would be eliminated. Senator VITTER's amendment, which I support and am a cosponsor of, would eliminate that as an option.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986

Mr. SHELBY. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Ayotte-Kirk amendment.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the amendment, which is a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. In my opinion, after evaluating this issue during a series of hearings in the Senate banking committee, there is no compelling case to reauthorize the bank.

After years of efforts to reform the Export-Import Bank, it has become clear to me that its problems are beyond repair and that the Bank's expiration is in the best interest of American taxpayers. Nearly 99 percent of all American exports—over \$2 trillion—are financed without the Export-Import Bank's help, which demonstrates that the subsidies are more about corporate welfare than advancing our economy.

I believe the Export-Import Bank has outlived its usefulness and should be allowed to expire.

At this point, I move to table the Kirk amendment No. 1986 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 65, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Barrasso	Cornyn	Enzi
Boozman	Cotton	Fischer
Capito	Crapo	Flake
Cassidy	Cruz	Gardner
Corker	Daines	Grassley

Inhofe
Isakson
Lankford
Lee
McConnell
Paul

Perdue
Risch
Sanders
Sasse
Sessions
Shelby

Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Vitter

NAYS—65

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt
Booker
Boxer
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Coons
Donnelly
Durbín
Ernst
Feinstein

Franken
Gillibrand
Graham
Hatch
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Heller
Hirono
Hoeven
Johnson
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
McCain
McCaskill
Menendez
Mikulski
Moran

Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Peters
Portman
Reed
Roberts
Rounds
Schatz
Schumer
Scott
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Merkley
Reid

Rubio
Toomey

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986 WITHDRAWN

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator KIRK, I withdraw amendment No. 1986.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is withdrawn.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 1569, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 1569, as modified, to the McCain amendment No. 1463 to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, David Perdue, Bob Corker, Michael B. Enzi, Susan M. Collins, Jeff Flake, Mike Rounds, Richard Burr, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Daniel Coats, John McCain, Deb Fischer, Tom Cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. COATS. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Sure.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I am very excited about the Kirk-Heitkamp amendment getting an overwhelming show of support. The reality is that if we do not vote on the Kirk-Heitkamp bill itself and pass it out of this Chamber, at the end of this month, the charter for the Ex-Im Bank will expire.

This vote has nothing to do with the charter for the Ex-Im Bank. It does nothing to prevent the charter for the Ex-Im Bank from expiring. This is at a time when China and India are pumping billions of dollars into their export credit agency. This is at a time when we have \$15 billion worth of credit waiting to move through the Ex-Im Bank so we create jobs here in our country—jobs for American workers—and we are stalling the Bank.

When we had this discussion during the TPA debate, we wanted to have a vote that would guarantee we would have an opportunity to prevent the charter for the Ex-Im Bank from expiring. That is not this vote today.

I am extraordinarily gratified by the show of support because what it really does tell us is if we bring up an Ex-Im Bank bill on its own—an extension bill on its own—we will be able to prevent something from happening that could have catastrophic economic results in this country. So I urge this body to find a path forward to prevent the Ex-Im Bank charter from expiring, to have a path forward to honor our commitments that were made during an earlier vote so we can have a vote and actually move this bill forward and not simply have a vote to show support but actually pass a bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator for her comments and I ask her this question: So that we understand the procedure that just took place, there was an amendment offered that would have extended the Ex-Im Bank and then a motion to table it, and I believe 60 Members or more voted against the motion to table, which shows a positive sentiment about extending the Ex-Im Bank charter. After that vote, the sponsors of the amendment withdrew the amendment from this bill.

So at this moment in time, I wish to ask the Senator, for absolute clarity: We have nothing before us that would extend the Ex-Im Bank either in this

bill or in any other manner before the end of June when it expires; is that correct?

Ms. HEITKAMP. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. DURBIN. And that creates a disadvantage for businesses in Illinois, and I am sure in North Dakota, in terms of exports and jobs, and unless we do take this seriously and quickly, they will be jeopardized.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I think the other thing it does also is it is a signal to all of those companies we are competing with, whether it is China or India, that we are out of the business, and that opens a wide path for them to be in the business of exports. So this takes us out of the business of financing exports, which is going to have and will have catastrophic results. We don't have a path forward, and the charter of the Bank expires at the end of this month. Without a path forward, we are opening an opportunity for our competitors to take those exports and to take away our opportunity to have those jobs.

So I am very gratified by the result of this vote because I think it signals support for Ex-Im Bank. When we get this kind of support from the U.S. Senate—almost veto-proof support—maybe we ought to move the bill. People will say there isn't an opportunity to do that; there is no path forward. Let me tell my colleagues that there is no one in the country who believes that is true. If there is a will, there is a way.

We have to have a vote on the Export-Import Bank by the end of the month and get it over to the House so the House can support it and move this forward or we will be playing chicken with the exports of the United States of America.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Yes.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Senator AYOTTE, in offering this amendment, talked about a forum in New Hampshire at General Electric where a number of small businesses participated. Senator CANTWELL and I were at that forum. We heard testimony from an employee of a company called Goss International, which makes large printing presses and competes mostly with Germany but with countries around the world. One of the issues she spoke about is that they have \$10 million in deals that are sitting on the table at Ex-Im that they need to have approved before the end of June when the authorization expires. If those don't get approved, they are not going to be able to create 45 new jobs they are talking about being able to create as part of that deal.

So if the authorization for Ex-Im expires, not only is Goss going to have trouble with those jobs, but companies across this country are going to lose jobs that would be created if those financing deals could go through; isn't that the case?

Ms. HEITKAMP. In fact, the case is nearly \$16 billion worth of American business and American exports that create American jobs will languish in the pipeline at the Ex-Im Bank because we foolishly let a charter expire at a time when we are in competition for exports, a competition for commerce throughout the world.

When we debated trade promotion—and a lot of us took some tough votes on TPA—we were promised a vote that would be mutually agreed upon here so we could advance the Ex-Im Bank by the end of June. We haven't gotten that vote because today all we did was show—I think rightfully so—that we have tremendous support in this body for the Ex-Im Bank and we shouldn't be held hostage to the narrow ideology of a few.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Yes.

Ms. CANTWELL. The Senator from North Dakota has obviously been working so hard on this in the Banking Committee, and she understands, I believe, that when the Bank expires on June 30, there is about \$12 billion of approved deals that are in the process, and they will not be approved while the Bank is not operating; is that correct?

Ms. HEITKAMP. That is correct. The last number I was given, I say to my friend, the Senator from Washington, was almost \$5.5 billion.

Ms. CANTWELL. So today's vote is a symbolic vote but does nothing to help us resolve the issue for getting this approved before June 30.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Unfortunately, too often we have symbolic votes that don't have real consequences in the real world. Our wonderful businesses that are outcompeting and outmaneuvering and outresearching the rest of the world are now with their hands tied behind their backs and losing credits as we stand.

Ms. CANTWELL. Are there a lot of small businesses in South Dakota that are a part of this export economy?

I say that because I think a lot of people get the impression that this is about big manufacturers. I have always said those guys will take care of themselves; they have lots of people here to take care of them. But the small people who will actually lose business on June 30 don't have people here and that is why we are fighting so hard to get a vote before June 30 that actually will go over to the House on a vehicle.

Ms. HEITKAMP. We have companies in Wahpeton, ND, where bankruptcy has been prevented because they have been able to find their way to the Ex-Im Bank and actually find their way to a credit relationship with their importers.

We have a company in West Fargo that builds portable wheelchair ramps and they have saturated the market

here and they are marketing these all over the country. They will tell us today and tell anyone who will listen that the only reason they are as successful as they are is because of the credit agency, the Export-Import Bank.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank the Senator for her leadership in committee. As she said, with 65 votes, we can do a lot of things to get this legislation out of here, so we will certainly be looking for those opportunities.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. I will.

Mrs. BOXER. First, before I ask my question, I wish to thank Senator HEITKAMP and Senator CANTWELL and Senator SHAHEEN. These three women have been just stalwart on this. We were on different sides on the trade vote, and I remember how hard they pushed for a real commitment, which I think in good faith they believed they got.

I am afraid what we saw here tonight is quite cynical. It doesn't do anything. I don't get what the point was.

Wouldn't it be far better if we got a commitment from the majority leader to set aside some time right after this bill—certainly before the end of this month, because as Senator CANTWELL always tells us, the end of the month is the end of the Bank.

So if we could get a commitment, I am asking my friend, would she be willing to agree to a time agreement so we wouldn't have to take up days and days and days to get this reauthorization done?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Absolutely. I think we have a vehicle, as we can say, for the Kirk-Heitkamp bill, which was, in fact, this amendment we just voted on. We have overwhelming support in the Senate. We will do anything we can to move this authorization forward because without it we are costing American jobs.

Mrs. BOXER. Another point I wish to make to my friend is I don't know if she is aware, but California has well over \$1 billion of projects on the line. Even in our State, that is significant.

I just wanted to thank her and Senators CANTWELL and SHAHEEN and others who have worked so hard. I have been here a long time, and I know a cynical ploy when I see it. I just saw it.

I know how easy it is to resolve this problem. You have an overwhelming, filibuster-proof number of people who want this Bank reauthorized. All you probably need is an hour or so. Anytime night or day, we will come in. I would hope and I would ask my friend if she and her colleagues will pursue a meeting or ask directly at some point in time for a commitment to take this up and, within a reasonable time limit, get it done.

In my State, many jobs are dependent on this, and all across the Nation,

as you have eloquently pointed out, as well as Senators CANTWELL and SHAHEEN. I thank you for your leadership.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I thank my friend from California.

I would say that as much as relationships here matter, what matters more to me is Americans working. What matters more to me are the jobs that will be lost and the opportunities that will be lost, as these manufacturing facilities and as these great innovative manufacturers have worked so hard. Think about all the work that is behind almost \$16 billion worth of credit, all the relationships. All of a sudden, they have to say to their customer: Guess what, I am not there.

I would suggest that one of the most heart-wrenching stories I have heard about the loss already of a big deal came out of California—a 100-percent disabled vet who told us he has already lost \$57 million and he is on a path to lose a \$200 million deal out of the Philippines, and that means jobs, jobs, jobs.

In California, jobs matter. In North Dakota, jobs matter. All across this country, jobs matter. If we can start putting the focus on jobs and the American worker first instead of ideology and politics, if we stop playing games, we can get things done here.

What was interesting to me is people say: Well, there is no path forward.

Really? I think that if we needed a bill passed, if, in fact, we were in a spot where in 2 weeks or 2-plus weeks we were going to lose the charter of the Ex-Im Bank—and we are in that spot. If you really care about the Ex-Im Bank, if you really care about American jobs, you would figure out a way to pass this bill out of the Senate for which we have 65 votes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

(The remarks of Mr. WHITEHOUSE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1548 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JANET BURRELL

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I wish to honor and thank Janet Burrell for her 37 years of talented and dedicated public service upon her retirement from the Senate. Her career in the Senate spans an impressive array of issues and responsibilities—all of which she

met with grace, skill, and good cheer. For the last 16 years, Janet has served as the office administrator for the Democratic staff of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Janet started her career in the Senate on the Committee on Finance in 1985 as a staff assistant. She and her colleagues worked around the clock—taking shifts, day and night—to help enact the mammoth and historic Tax Reform Act of 1986. From the Committee on Finance, she moved to the Committee on Environment and Public Works and, finally, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, which is now the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Over her 30 years of service in the Senate, Janet worked on teams tackling a wide range of legislation, moving from the Tax Reform Act of 1986 to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2003. She has worked for six Senators over the years, including both Republicans and Democrats, in both the majority and the minority, and even in a Senate evenly split between Democrats and Republicans.

Along the way in her Senate career, Janet learned and mastered a broad array of new skills from managing human resources to operating computers to learning the intricacies of how to make a committee run smoothly. She was the office administrator of the now-Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs during the 9/11 terrorist attacks, when anthrax was discovered in the Senate, and even during an earthquake. The challenges were difficult and diverse but Janet rose to every task. Among other things, at the time of the anthrax incident, Janet supervised the young staff who opened the mail. In that capacity, it was among her responsibilities to calm the fears of the staff and their worried parents. She was also responsible for figuring out evacuation drills for scenarios like a biological attack, terrorist attack, or active shooter—risks that few could have envisioned when she started with the committee 16 years ago. Janet also helped shape Senate history. Beginning in 2004, she played an instrumental role in orchestrating the committee's transition from the Governmental Affairs Committee to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Prior to serving in the Senate, Janet worked in the House of Representatives for my former colleague, Ralph H. Regula of Ohio, and she served 7 years in the executive branch at the U.S. Office of Government Ethics and at the U.S. General Services Administration.

In every office that she was a part of, Janet acted as a force of calm and generosity at the center of chaotic day-to-day, week-to-week schedules. Her col-

leagues are quick to share stories of times when Janet went above and beyond the call of duty to make someone's day smoother. In fact, they tell me that her selflessness and kindness was reflected in every task she took on. One of Janet's former staff directors said that Janet, "always did whatever had to be done to make sure that others felt and understood how much they were appreciated." I couldn't agree more. She truly embodies the Golden Rule by always treating others as she would want to be treated. As she gracefully exits her lifelong career in public service, Janet leaves behind a family of colleagues that will miss her and long remember her.

As we speak of Janet's most significant accomplishments, I would be remiss if I did not mention Janet's daughter Ashley, the apple of her eye. Ashley got an early start in the Senate—as an infant in the Senate day care center. She went on to be one of the few students at her high school to earn a full international baccalaureate diploma. From there, Ashley earned an advanced degree in counseling and is now fully licensed, helping numerous young adults and families as they cope with life's challenges. Clearly, the apple did not fall far from the tree.

Upon her retirement, I thank Janet for the many invaluable contributions she has made to our committee, the Senate, the Federal Government, and our Nation. I congratulate her on a truly remarkable career. On behalf of all of us in the Senate, I want to wish her and her family the very best in all that lies ahead for each of them. Godspeed.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING B. GREEN & COMPANY ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to recognize a special Baltimore company—B. Green & Company—on its 100th anniversary, which will be celebrated this Saturday, June 13. Benjamin Green founded this great Baltimore company one century ago. He was an immigrant from Lithuania who worked as a street peddler before starting a wholesale grocery business in 1915 in a rowhouse located at 828 West Baltimore Street. He made deliveries to Baltimore-area grocery stores by horse-drawn carts and later by "tin lizzy" type trucks.

One hundred years ago, warehouses were multistoried buildings, record-keeping, inventories, and billing were done by hand, and most items—even commodities like butter—were sold in bulk. Today, we have sprawling one-story warehouses accessible by tractor-trailer trucks. "Just in time" inventories are tracked by barcode. Com-

puter software has automated much of the book-keeping and billing. And products of all types are sold in more convenient packages.

B. Green & Company was—and remains—a family business. All of Benjamin Green's children—his sons Sam and Bernie and his daughters Rose, Anna, Sarah, and Dora "Duckye" and their spouses joined in supporting the business, learning it from the ground up. As they developed their own areas of expertise, the size and nature and status of the company grew. The third generation of the family joined their parents in the business in the 1960s and 1970s. Today, the remaining family members in the business are chief executive officer Benjamin "Benjy" Green and his cousins Ben Sigman, chairman emeritus; and Bernice Sigman, a retired physician and board member.

For a company to survive and prosper for 100 years, it needs to evolve and change with the times. During World War II, the company started supplying food to military bases and grew into the largest military commissary supplier on the east coast. In 1948, B. Green & Company was one of the first food wholesalers to use data processing equipment. Also, that year, the company relocated to the first single-story warehouse in the area at 2200 Winchester Street. A catastrophic fire destroyed the entire warehouse and most of the corporate offices in 1959, but the company had such strong relations with its suppliers and customers that it was able to resume delivering groceries from a rented warehouse within a few days.

In 1966, B. Green & Company purchased Capital Wholesale Grocery Company, which allowed it to add the Cash & Carry business. The corporate offices were moved to 400 West Conway Street where the Cash & Carry was located. In 1968, the company acquired Colonial Foods Distributing Company to add gourmet and specialty foods and snack items to the main grocery products, and to add some national chains as customers. In 1972, the company acquired property at 3601 Washington Boulevard from Westinghouse to expand warehousing capacity, and the corporate offices relocated there in 1975. Three years later, the company acquired Southern Beef Company to expand its line of meat products.

B. Green & Company eventually became the largest grocery wholesaler on the east coast. In 1979, it helped pioneer warehouse-style, low-price, no-frills supermarkets by opening the York Warehouse Food Market. In 1983, using state-of-the-art technology, it became one of the first wholesalers to use a mechanized warehouse system. In 1989, the Maryland Stadium Authority, by the "right of eminent domain", condemned the 400 West Conway location to build Oriole Park at Camden Yards. Cash & Carry moved to its current location at 1300 South Monroe Street.

By 1991, with annual sales of \$675 million, B. Green & Company ranked 263d on Forbes magazine's list of the Nation's largest private companies. But the company continued to evolve, shifting its focus from wholesaling to retailing. In 1992, it sold its military distribution business to Nash Finch, a Minnesota-based wholesale grocery distributor. In 1993, it sold its civilian distribution business to Richfood of Richmond, VA.

Today, B. Green & Company runs several different food operations. It still distributes groceries to food retailers who are too small for the big wholesalers. It continues to run Cash & Carry from the warehouse at 1300 South Monroe Street and another one located at 2401 Belair Road. Cash & Carry is a members-only warehouse where many corner grocers in the area can shop for goods. And it operates two "everyday-low-price" Food Depot stores in Baltimore at the Belair Road site, which opened in 1996, and at 2495 Frederick Avenue, which opened in 2008. These stores ushered in a new generation of urban full-service supermarkets, featuring a fresh seafood and fish department, one of the largest and most diversified produce departments in Baltimore City, a full-service deli and bakery, and a meat department with a great variety of products and cuts of meat. The stores succeed as independent grocers by customizing their products and services to the neighborhoods they serve. Store managers and associates are encouraged to suggest products and merchandising strategies. In 2011, the company expanded into Howard County with a new format, the Green Valley Marketplace at 7280 Montgomery Road in ElkrIDGE, MD. Green Valley Marketplace is a new suburban supermarket.

I am proud that B. Green & Company launched a campaign to expand healthy food choices in the city's poorest neighborhoods in a partnership with the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health that encourages shoppers to buy healthier items and fewer highly processed foods. Many Food Depot customers rely on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. The stores have licensed dieticians on-site who teach customers how to shop for and prepare healthy meals on a budget.

Today, B. Green & Company employs nearly 500 associates, who are considered extended family. Benjy Green knows most of them by name and can recount their backgrounds. The company thrives 100 years after its creation because, as Benjy put it, "we know the neighborhood we serve better than the other guy". It thrives because it treats its employees and its customers with respect. It thrives because it fulfills a vital function in communities across Baltimore and the surrounding area. I would ask my col-

leagues to join me in congratulating B. Green & Company on its 100th anniversary and sending best wishes for the next 100 years.●

CONGRATULATING JAYDYN CHILD

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Jaydyn Child who was recently awarded the Girl Scouts' Gold Award, the highest possible award granted to Girl Scouts. Jaydyn is a dedicated Girl Scout and high school junior from Dillon, MT. She earned this prestigious honor for her service project entitled, "Teen Suicide—Your Life is Worth Living." Through this project she spent 150 hours of her time working, fundraising, making bracelets and creating pamphlets to raise awareness. Additionally, she organized events in local schools for an anti-bullying speaker to educate students about suicide prevention.

Montana currently has the highest suicide rate in the Nation, and a rate twice the national average for suicide amongst teenagers and young adults. Jaydyn is doing a tremendous job informing her peers and the community and she is right to be commended. Jaydyn is exemplifying the best of Montana through her selflessness and dedication to others.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. LEODREY WILLIAMS

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I honor Dr. Leodrey Williams, chancellor of the Southern University Agricultural Research and Extension Center, on his retirement after 50 years of public service.

Dr. Williams is a 1961 graduate of Southern University of Louisiana in vocational agriculture education. Immediately upon graduation, he began his distinguished career by joining the U.S. Army and training as an oral x-ray technician and hygienist. He then began working for cooperative extension, where he helped to build the new curriculum by assisting and launching the program throughout the State of Louisiana. He earned a master of science degree in 1970 and doctor of education degree in 1975 from Louisiana State University. After 5 years as an agriculture specialist, Dr. Williams returned to Louisiana State University as an associate professor and director of equal employment opportunity and civil rights. In 1991, Dr. Williams co-chaired a national task force that studied America's cooperative extension system. He was subsequently appointed Special Assistant to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Extension Administrator, and he was later named the National Director of Extension.

Besides his active involvement in agriculture, Dr. Williams has served as a consultant to the governments of Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, and Republic of

South Africa in the areas of extension administration and adult and continuing education. During his visits to China, Honduras, and Liberia, he assisted in developing strategies for university collaboration and exchange, along with addressing concerns and issues facing urban populations.

For the past 14 years, Dr. Williams has been the first chancellor for the Southern University Agricultural Research and Extension Center. He has served the citizens of Louisiana, Louisiana State University, and the Southern University System with his knowledge, skill, enthusiasm, and leadership.

I am pleased to honor the esteemed career of Dr. Leodrey Williams. I thank him for his years of service to our state and country and wish him the best in his future endeavors.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13405 OF JUNE 16, 2006, WITH RESPECT TO BELARUS—PM 19

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and

other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2015.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 10, 2015.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:05 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 235. An act to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

H.R. 889. An act to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title.

H.R. 2051. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2088. An act to amend the United States Grain Standards Act to improve inspection services performed at export elevators at export port locations, to reauthorize certain authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under such Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2289. An act to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2394. An act to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2577. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 235. An act to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2051. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2088. An act to amend the United States Grain Standards Act to improve inspection services performed at export elevators at export port locations, to reauthorize certain authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2289. An act to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2394. An act to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2577. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016" (Rept. No. 114-61).

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment:

S. 552. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to provide for increased limitations on leverage for multiple licenses under common control.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 957. A bill to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs to help create jobs.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 958. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for team and joint venture offers for certain contracts.

S. 966. A bill to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration.

S. 967. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, and for other purposes.

S. 999. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to small business development centers.

S. 1000. A bill to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 1001. A bill to establish authorization levels for general business loans for fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

S. 1292. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to treat certain qualified disaster areas as HUBZones and to extend the period for HUBZone treatment for certain base closure areas, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1470. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional assistance to small business concerns for disaster recovery, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

*Anne Elizabeth Wall, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Azita Raji, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Sweden.

*Nancy Bikoff Pettit, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Latvia.

*Gregory T. Delawie, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kosovo.

*Ian C. Kelly, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Georgia.

*Julieta Valls Noyes, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Croatia.

*Sunil Sabharwal, of California, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of two years.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Daniel L. Angermiller and ending with Laura Merritt Stone, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2015. (minus 1 nominee: Stuart MacKenzie Hatch-er)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Bruce Matthews and ending with Brian Stephen Zelakiewicz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2015.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1535. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to passenger motor vehicle crash avoidance information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ENZI, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1536. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1537. A bill to establish grant programs to improve the health of border area residents and for all hazards preparedness in the border area including bioterrorism, infectious disease, and noncommunicable emerging threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1538. A bill to reform the financing of Senate elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1539. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1540. A bill to improve the enforcement of prohibitions on robocalls, including fraudulent robocalls; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1541. A bill to empower States with authority for most taxing and spending for highway programs and mass transit programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1542. A bill to establish a program that promotes reforms in workforce education and skill training for manufacturing in States and metropolitan areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 1543. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1544. A bill to rescind unused earmarks provided for the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1545. A bill to require a quarterly report by the Federal Communications Commission on the Lifeline program funded by the Universal Service Fund; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1546. A bill to establish an export credit insurance program in the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1547. A bill to provide high-skilled visas for nationals of the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1548. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emission fees, reduce the rate of the corporate income tax, provide tax credits to workers, deliver additional benefits to retired and disabled Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1549. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care coordination services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1550. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in certain Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 198. A resolution commemorating the 150th anniversaries of the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, often referred to as the "Second Founding" of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to safeguard data stored abroad from improper government access, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 713

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 713, a bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level

ozone standards, and for other purposes.

S. 786

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 786, a bill to provide paid and family medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 1054

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1054, a bill to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small- and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1193

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1193, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent and expand the temporary minimum credit rate for the low-income housing tax credit program.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1256

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1256, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy storage research program, loan program, and technical assistance and grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1312

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to modernize Federal policies regarding the supply and distribution of energy in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1385, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring race or ethnicity to be disclosed in connection with the transfer of a firearm.

S. 1398

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from West Vir-

ginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1398, a bill to extend, improve, and consolidate energy research and development programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1407

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1407, a bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public land, and for other purposes.

S. 1428

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1428, a bill to amend the USEC Privatization Act to require the Secretary of Energy to issue a long-term Federal excess uranium inventory management plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1458

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1458, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to ensure scientific transparency in the development of environmental regulations and for other purposes.

S. 1466

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1466, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify payment under the Medicare program for outpatient department procedures that utilize drugs as supplies, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to provide for enhanced Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 194

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 194, a resolution welcoming the President of the Republic of Korea on her official visit to the United States and celebrating the United States-Republic of Korea relationship, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1474

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1474 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1500

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1500 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1569

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1569 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1578

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1578 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1615

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1615 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1622

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1622 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1628

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1628 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1647

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1647 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1650

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1650 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1684

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1684 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fis-

cal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1704

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1704 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1710

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1710 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1748

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1748 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1760

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1760 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1783

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1783 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1798

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1798 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1853

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1853 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1874

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1874 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1889

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1889 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1898

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1898 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1916

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1916 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year

2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1941

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1941 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1944

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1944 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1945

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1945 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1948

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1948 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1958

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1958 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1961

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from South Caro-

lina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1961 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1962

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1962 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1966

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1966 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1538. A bill to reform the financing of Senate elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1538

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Fair Elections Now Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING OF SENATE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Subtitle A—Fair Elections Financing Program

Sec. 101. Findings and declarations.

Sec. 102. Eligibility requirements and benefits of Fair Elections financing of Senate election campaigns.

Sec. 103. Prohibition on joint fundraising committees.

Sec. 104. Exception to limitation on coordinated expenditures by political party committees with participating candidates.

TITLE II—IMPROVING VOTER INFORMATION

Sec. 201. Broadcasts relating to all Senate candidates.

Sec. 202. Broadcast rates for participating candidates.

Sec. 203. FCC to prescribe standardized form for reporting candidate campaign ads.

TITLE III—RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Sec. 301. Petition for certiorari.

Sec. 302. Filing by Senate candidates with Commission.

Sec. 303. Electronic filing of FEC reports.

TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION IN FUNDING OF ELECTIONS

Sec. 401. Refundable tax credit for Senate campaign contributions.

TITLE V—REVENUE PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Fair Elections Fund revenue.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 601. Severability.

Sec. 602. Effective date.

TITLE I—FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING OF SENATE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Subtitle A—Fair Elections Financing Program

SEC. 101. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.

(a) UNDERMINING OF DEMOCRACY BY CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS FROM PRIVATE SOURCES.—The Senate finds and declares that the current system of privately financed campaigns for election to the United States Senate has the capacity, and is often perceived by the public, to undermine democracy in the United States by—

(1) creating a culture that fosters actual or perceived conflicts of interest by encouraging Senators to accept large campaign contributions from private interests that are directly affected by Federal legislation;

(2) diminishing or appearing to diminish Senators' accountability to constituents by compelling legislators to be accountable to the major contributors who finance their election campaigns;

(3) undermining the meaning of the right to vote by allowing monied interests to have a disproportionate and unfair influence within the political process;

(4) imposing large, unwarranted costs on taxpayers through legislative and regulatory distortions caused by unequal access to lawmakers for campaign contributors;

(5) making it difficult for some qualified candidates to mount competitive Senate election campaigns;

(6) disadvantaging challengers and discouraging competitive elections; and

(7) burdening incumbents with a preoccupation with fundraising and thus decreasing the time available to carry out their public responsibilities.

(b) ENHANCEMENT OF DEMOCRACY BY PROVIDING ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FAIR ELECTIONS FUND.—The Senate finds and declares that providing the option of the replacement of large private campaign contributions with allocations from the Fair Elections Fund for all primary, runoff, and general elections to the Senate would enhance American democracy by—

(1) reducing the actual or perceived conflicts of interest created by fully private financing of the election campaigns of public officials and restoring public confidence in the integrity and fairness of the electoral and legislative processes through a program which allows participating candidates to adhere to substantially lower contribution limits for contributors with an assurance that there will be sufficient funds for such candidates to run viable electoral campaigns;

(2) increasing the public's confidence in the accountability of Senators to the constituents who elect them, which derives from the program's qualifying criteria to participate in the voluntary program and the conclusions that constituents may draw regarding candidates who qualify and participate in the program;

(3) helping to reduce the ability to make large campaign contributions as a determinant of a citizen's influence within the political process by facilitating the expression of support by voters at every level of wealth, encouraging political participation, and incentivizing participation on the part of Senators through the matching of small dollar contributions;

(4) potentially saving taxpayers billions of dollars that may be (or that are perceived to be) currently allocated based upon legislative and regulatory agendas skewed by the influence of campaign contributions;

(5) creating genuine opportunities for all Americans to run for the Senate and encouraging more competitive elections;

(6) encouraging participation in the electoral process by citizens of every level of wealth; and

(7) freeing Senators from the incessant preoccupation with raising money, and allowing them more time to carry out their public responsibilities.

SEC. 102. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS AND BENEFITS OF FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING OF SENATE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE V—FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING OF SENATE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

“Subtitle A—General Provisions

“SEC. 501. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) ALLOCATION FROM THE FUND.—The term ‘allocation from the Fund’ means an allocation of money from the Fair Elections Fund to a participating candidate pursuant to section 522.

“(2) BOARD.—The term ‘Board’ means the Fair Elections Oversight Board established under section 531.

“(3) FAIR ELECTIONS QUALIFYING PERIOD.—The term ‘Fair Elections qualifying period’ means, with respect to any candidate for Senator, the period—

“(A) beginning on the date on which the candidate files a statement of intent under section 511(a)(1); and

“(B) ending on the date that is 30 days before—

“(i) the date of the primary election; or

“(ii) in the case of a State that does not hold a primary election, the date prescribed

by State law as the last day to qualify for a position on the general election ballot.

“(4) FAIR ELECTIONS START DATE.—The term ‘Fair Elections start date’ means, with respect to any candidate, the date that is 180 days before—

“(A) the date of the primary election; or

“(B) in the case of a State that does not hold a primary election, the date prescribed by State law as the last day to qualify for a position on the general election ballot.

“(5) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the Fair Elections Fund established by section 502.

“(6) IMMEDIATE FAMILY.—The term ‘immediate family’ means, with respect to any candidate—

“(A) the candidate's spouse;

“(B) a child, stepchild, parent, grandparent, brother, half-brother, sister, or half-sister of the candidate or the candidate's spouse; and

“(C) the spouse of any person described in subparagraph (B).

“(7) MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.—The term ‘matching contribution’ means a matching payment provided to a participating candidate for qualified small dollar contributions, as provided under section 523.

“(8) NONPARTICIPATING CANDIDATE.—The term ‘nonparticipating candidate’ means a candidate for Senator who is not a participating candidate.

“(9) PARTICIPATING CANDIDATE.—The term ‘participating candidate’ means a candidate for Senator who is certified under section 515 as being eligible to receive an allocation from the Fund.

“(10) QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION.—The term ‘qualifying contribution’ means, with respect to a candidate, a contribution that—

“(A) is in an amount that is—

“(i) not less than the greater of \$5 or the amount determined by the Commission under section 531; and

“(ii) not more than the greater of \$150 or the amount determined by the Commission under section 531;

“(B) is made by an individual—

“(i) who is a resident of the State in which such candidate is seeking election; and

“(ii) who is not otherwise prohibited from making a contribution under this Act;

“(C) is made during the Fair Elections qualifying period; and

“(D) meets the requirements of section 512(b).

“(11) QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTION.—The term ‘qualified small dollar contribution’ means, with respect to a candidate, any contribution (or series of contributions)—

“(A) which is not a qualifying contribution (or does not include a qualifying contribution);

“(B) which is made by an individual who is not prohibited from making a contribution under this Act; and

“(C) the aggregate amount of which does not exceed the greater of—

“(i) \$150 per election; or

“(ii) the amount per election determined by the Commission under section 531.

“(12) QUALIFYING MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEE CONTRIBUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualifying multicandidate political committee contribution’ means any contribution to a candidate that is made from a qualified account of a multicandidate political committee (within the meaning of section 315(a)(2)).

“(B) QUALIFIED ACCOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘qualified account’ means, with respect to a multicandidate political committee, a separate,

segregated account of the committee that consists solely of contributions which meet the following requirements:

“(i) All contributions to such account are made by individuals who are not prohibited from making contributions under this Act.

“(ii) The aggregate amount of contributions from each individual to such account and all other accounts of the political committee do not exceed the amount described in paragraph (1)(C).

“SEC. 502. FAIR ELECTIONS FUND.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the ‘Fair Elections Fund’.

“(b) AMOUNTS HELD BY FUND.—The Fund shall consist of the following amounts:

“(1) APPROPRIATED AMOUNTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated to the Fund.

“(B) SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING APPROPRIATIONS.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

“(i) there should be imposed on any payment made to any person (other than a State or local government or a foreign nation) who has contracts with the Government of the United States in excess of \$10,000,000 a tax equal to 0.50 percent of amount paid pursuant to such contracts, except that the aggregate tax for any person for any taxable year shall not exceed \$500,000; and

“(ii) the revenue from such tax should be appropriated to the Fund.

“(2) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.—Voluntary contributions to the Fund.

“(3) OTHER DEPOSITS.—Amounts deposited into the Fund under—

“(A) section 513(c) (relating to exceptions to contribution requirements);

“(B) section 521(c) (relating to remittance of allocations from the Fund);

“(C) section 533 (relating to violations); and

“(D) any other section of this Act.

“(4) INVESTMENT RETURNS.—Interest on, and the proceeds from, the sale or redemption of, any obligations held by the Fund under subsection (c).

“(c) INVESTMENT.—The Commission shall invest portions of the Fund in obligations of the United States in the same manner as provided under section 9602(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(d) USE OF FUND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The sums in the Fund shall be used to provide benefits to participating candidates as provided in subtitle C.

“(2) INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS.—Under regulations established by the Commission, rules similar to the rules of section 9006(c) of the Internal Revenue Code shall apply.

“Subtitle B—Eligibility and Certification

“SEC. 511. ELIGIBILITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A candidate for Senator is eligible to receive an allocation from the Fund for any election if the candidate meets the following requirements:

“(1) The candidate files with the Commission a statement of intent to seek certification as a participating candidate under this title during the period beginning on the Fair Elections start date and ending on the last day of the Fair Elections qualifying period.

“(2) The candidate meets the qualifying contribution requirements of section 512.

“(3) Not later than the last day of the Fair Elections qualifying period, the candidate files with the Commission an affidavit signed by the candidate and the treasurer of the candidate's principal campaign committee declaring that the candidate—

“(A) has complied and, if certified, will comply with the contribution and expenditure requirements of section 513;

“(B) if certified, will comply with the debate requirements of section 514;

“(C) if certified, will not run as a non-participating candidate during such year in any election for the office that such candidate is seeking; and

“(D) has either qualified or will take steps to qualify under State law to be on the ballot.

“(b) GENERAL ELECTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a candidate shall not be eligible to receive an allocation from the Fund for a general election or a general runoff election unless the candidate's party nominated the candidate to be placed on the ballot for the general election or the candidate otherwise qualified to be on the ballot under State law.

“SEC. 512. QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A candidate for Senator meets the requirement of this section if, during the Fair Elections qualifying period, the candidate obtains—

“(1) a number of qualifying contributions equal to the greater of—

“(A) the sum of—

“(i) 2,000; plus

“(ii) 500 for each congressional district in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election; or

“(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531; and

“(2) a total dollar amount of qualifying contributions equal to the greater of—

“(A) 10 percent of the amount of the allocation such candidate would be entitled to receive for the primary election under section 522(c)(1) (determined without regard to paragraph (5) thereof) if such candidate were a participating candidate; or

“(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO RECEIPT OF QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION.—Each qualifying contribution—

“(1) may be made by means of a personal check, money order, debit card, credit card, or electronic payment account;

“(2) shall be accompanied by a signed statement containing—

“(A) the contributor's name and the contributor's address in the State in which the contributor is registered to vote; and

“(B) an oath declaring that the contributor—

“(i) understands that the purpose of the qualifying contribution is to show support for the candidate so that the candidate may qualify for Fair Elections financing;

“(ii) is making the contribution in his or her own name and from his or her own funds;

“(iii) has made the contribution willingly; and

“(iv) has not received anything of value in return for the contribution; and

“(3) shall be acknowledged by a receipt that is sent to the contributor with a copy kept by the candidate for the Commission and a copy kept by the candidate for the election authorities in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election.

“(c) VERIFICATION OF QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Commission shall establish procedures for the auditing and verification of qualifying contributions to ensure that such contributions meet the requirements of this section.

“SEC. 513. CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—A candidate for Senator meets the requirements of this section if, during the election cycle of the candidate, the candidate—

“(1) except as provided in subsection (b), accepts no contributions other than—

“(A) qualifying contributions;

“(B) qualified small dollar contributions;

“(C) qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions;

“(D) allocations from the Fund under section 522;

“(E) matching contributions under section 523; and

“(F) vouchers provided to the candidate under section 524;

“(2) makes no expenditures from any amounts other than from—

“(A) qualifying contributions;

“(B) qualified small dollar contributions;

“(C) qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions;

“(D) allocations from the Fund under section 522;

“(E) matching contributions under section 523; and

“(F) vouchers provided to the candidate under section 524; and

“(3) makes no expenditures from personal funds or the funds of any immediate family member (other than funds received through qualified small dollar contributions and qualifying contributions).

For purposes of this subsection, a payment made by a political party in coordination with a participating candidate shall not be treated as a contribution to or as an expenditure made by the participating candidate.

“(b) CONTRIBUTIONS FOR LEADERSHIP PACS, ETC.—A political committee of a participating candidate which is not an authorized committee of such candidate may accept contributions other than contributions described in subsection (a)(1) from any person if—

“(1) the aggregate contributions from such person for any calendar year do not exceed \$150; and

“(2) no portion of such contributions is disbursed in connection with the campaign of the participating candidate.

“(c) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a candidate shall not be treated as having failed to meet the requirements of this section if any contributions that are not qualified small dollar contributions, qualifying contributions, qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions, or contributions that meet the requirements of subsection (b) and that are accepted before the date the candidate files a statement of intent under section 511(a)(1) are—

“(1) returned to the contributor; or

“(2) submitted to the Commission for deposit in the Fund.

“SEC. 514. DEBATE REQUIREMENT.

“A candidate for Senator meets the requirements of this section if the candidate participates in at least—

“(1) 1 public debate before the primary election with other participating candidates and other willing candidates from the same party and seeking the same nomination as such candidate; and

“(2) 2 public debates before the general election with other participating candidates and other willing candidates seeking the same office as such candidate.

“SEC. 515. CERTIFICATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 days after a candidate for Senator files an affidavit under section 511(a)(3), the Commission shall—

“(1) certify whether or not the candidate is a participating candidate; and

“(2) notify the candidate of the Commission’s determination.

“(b) REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may revoke a certification under subsection (a) if—

“(A) a candidate fails to qualify to appear on the ballot at any time after the date of certification; or

“(B) a candidate otherwise fails to comply with the requirements of this title, including any regulatory requirements prescribed by the Commission.

“(2) REPAYMENT OF BENEFITS.—If certification is revoked under paragraph (1), the candidate shall repay to the Fund an amount equal to the value of benefits received under this title plus interest (at a rate determined by the Commission) on any such amount received.

“Subtitle C—Benefits

“SEC. 521. BENEFITS FOR PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For each election with respect to which a candidate is certified as a participating candidate, such candidate shall be entitled to—

“(1) an allocation from the Fund to make or obligate to make expenditures with respect to such election, as provided in section 522;

“(2) matching contributions, as provided in section 523; and

“(3) for the general election, vouchers for broadcasts of political advertisements, as provided in section 524.

“(b) RESTRICTION ON USES OF ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.—Allocations from the Fund received by a participating candidate under section 522 and matching contributions under section 523 may only be used for campaign-related costs.

“(c) REMITTING ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 45 days after an election in which the participating candidate appeared on the ballot, such participating candidate shall remit to the Commission for deposit in the Fund an amount equal to the lesser of—

“(A) the amount of money in the candidate’s campaign account; or

“(B) the sum of the allocations from the Fund received by the candidate under section 522 and the matching contributions received by the candidate under section 523.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a candidate who qualifies to be on the ballot for a primary runoff election, a general election, or a general runoff election, the amounts described in paragraph (1) may be retained by the candidate and used in such subsequent election.

“SEC. 522. ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall make allocations from the Fund under section 521(a)(1) to a participating candidate—

“(1) in the case of amounts provided under subsection (c)(1), not later than 48 hours after the date on which such candidate is certified as a participating candidate under section 515;

“(2) in the case of a general election, not later than 48 hours after—

“(A) the date of the certification of the results of the primary election or the primary runoff election; or

“(B) in any case in which there is no primary election, the date the candidate qualifies to be placed on the ballot; and

“(3) in the case of a primary runoff election or a general runoff election, not later than 48 hours after the certification of the

results of the primary election or the general election, as the case may be.

“(b) METHOD OF PAYMENT.—The Commission shall distribute funds available to participating candidates under this section through the use of an electronic funds exchange or a debit card.

“(c) AMOUNTS.—

“(1) PRIMARY ELECTION ALLOCATION; INITIAL ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a primary election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the base amount with respect to such participating candidate.

“(2) PRIMARY RUNOFF ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a primary runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the primary election.

“(3) GENERAL ELECTION ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to the base amount with respect to such candidate.

“(4) GENERAL RUNOFF ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 25 percent of the base amount with respect to such candidate.

“(5) UNCONTESTED ELECTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a primary or general election that is an uncontested election, the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund to a participating candidate for such election in an amount equal to 25 percent of the allocation which such candidate would be entitled to under this section for such election if this paragraph did not apply.

“(B) UNCONTESTED ELECTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph, an election is uncontested if not more than 1 candidate has campaign funds (including payments from the Fund) in an amount equal to or greater than 10 percent of the allocation a participating candidate would be entitled to receive under this section for such election if this paragraph did not apply.

“(d) BASE AMOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the base amount for any candidate is an amount equal to the greater of—

“(A) the sum of—

“(i) \$750,000; plus

“(ii) \$150,000 for each congressional district in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election; or

“(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

“(2) INDEXING.—In each even-numbered year after 2019—

“(A) each dollar amount under paragraph (1)(A) shall be increased by the percent difference between the price index (as defined in section 315(c)(2)(A)) for the 12 months preceding the beginning of such calendar year and the price index for calendar year 2018;

“(B) each dollar amount so increased shall remain in effect for the 2-year period beginning on the first day following the date of the last general election in the year preceding the year in which the amount is increased and ending on the date of the next general election; and

“(C) if any amount after adjustment under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of \$100,

such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100.

“SEC. 523. MATCHING PAYMENTS FOR QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall pay to each participating candidate an amount equal to 600 percent of the amount of qualified small dollar contributions received by the candidate from individuals who are residents of the State in which such participating candidate is seeking election after the date on which such candidate is certified under section 515.

“(b) LIMITATION.—The aggregate payments under subsection (a) with respect to any candidate shall not exceed the greater of—

“(1) 400 percent of the allocation such candidate is entitled to receive for such election under section 522 (determined without regard to subsection (c)(5) thereof); or

“(2) the percentage of such allocation determined by the Commission under section 531.

“(c) TIME OF PAYMENT.—The Commission shall make payments under this section not later than 2 business days after the receipt of a report made under subsection (d).

“(d) REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each participating candidate shall file reports of receipts of qualified small dollar contributions at such times and in such manner as the Commission may by regulations prescribe.

“(2) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—Each report under this subsection shall disclose—

“(A) the amount of each qualified small dollar contribution received by the candidate;

“(B) the amount of each qualified small dollar contribution received by the candidate from a resident of the State in which the candidate is seeking election; and

“(C) the name, address, and occupation of each individual who made a qualified small dollar contribution to the candidate.

“(3) FREQUENCY OF REPORTS.—Reports under this subsection shall be made no more frequently than—

“(A) once every month until the date that is 90 days before the date of the election;

“(B) once every week after the period described in subparagraph (A) and until the date that is 21 days before the election; and

“(C) once every day after the period described in subparagraph (B).

“(4) LIMITATION ON REGULATIONS.—The Commission may not prescribe any regulations with respect to reporting under this subsection with respect to any election after the date that is 180 days before the date of such election.

“(e) APPEALS.—The Commission shall provide a written explanation with respect to any denial of any payment under this section and shall provide the opportunity for review and reconsideration within 5 business days of such denial.

“SEC. 524. POLITICAL ADVERTISING VOUCHERS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish and administer a voucher program for the purchase of airtime on broadcasting stations for political advertisements in accordance with the provisions of this section.

“(b) CANDIDATES.—The Commission shall only disburse vouchers under the program established under subsection (a) to participants certified pursuant to section 515 who have agreed in writing to keep and furnish to the Commission such records, books, and other information as it may require.

“(c) AMOUNTS.—The Commission shall disburse vouchers to each candidate certified under subsection (b) in an aggregate amount equal to the greater of—

“(1) \$100,000 multiplied by the number of congressional districts in the State with respect to which such candidate is running for office; or

“(2) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

“(d) USE.—

“(1) EXCLUSIVE USE.—Vouchers disbursed by the Commission under this section may be used only for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertisements relating to a general election for the office of Senate by the participating candidate to which the vouchers were disbursed, except that—

“(A) a candidate may exchange vouchers with a political party under paragraph (2); and

“(B) a political party may use vouchers only to purchase broadcast airtime for political advertisements for generic party advertising (as defined by the Commission in regulations), to support candidates for State or local office in a general election, or to support participating candidates of the party in a general election for Federal office, but only if it discloses the value of the voucher used as an expenditure under section 315(d).

“(2) EXCHANGE WITH POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A participating candidate who receives a voucher under this section may transfer the right to use all or a portion of the value of the voucher to a committee of the political party of which the individual is a candidate (or, in the case of a participating candidate who is not a member of any political party, to a committee of the political party of that candidate's choice) in exchange for money in an amount equal to the cash value of the voucher or portion exchanged.

“(B) CONTINUATION OF CANDIDATE OBLIGATIONS.—The transfer of a voucher, in whole or in part, to a political party committee under this paragraph does not release the candidate from any obligation under the agreement made under subsection (b) or otherwise modify that agreement or its application to that candidate.

“(C) PARTY COMMITTEE OBLIGATIONS.—Any political party committee to which a voucher or portion thereof is transferred under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) shall account fully, in accordance with such requirements as the Commission may establish, for the receipt of the voucher; and

“(ii) may not use the transferred voucher or portion thereof for any purpose other than a purpose described in paragraph (1)(B).

“(D) VOUCHER AS A CONTRIBUTION UNDER FECA.—If a candidate transfers a voucher or any portion thereof to a political party committee under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the value of the voucher or portion thereof transferred shall be treated as a contribution from the candidate to the committee, and from the committee to the candidate, for purposes of sections 302 and 304;

“(ii) the committee may, in exchange, provide to the candidate only funds subject to the prohibitions, limitations, and reporting requirements of title III of this Act; and

“(iii) the amount, if identified as a ‘voucher exchange’, shall not be considered a contribution for the purposes of sections 315 and 513.

“(e) VALUE; ACCEPTANCE; REDEMPTION.—

“(1) VOUCHER.—Each voucher disbursed by the Commission under this section shall have a value in dollars, redeemable upon presentation to the Commission, together with such documentation and other information as the Commission may require, for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political

advertisements in accordance with this section.

“(2) ACCEPTANCE.—A broadcasting station shall accept vouchers in payment for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertisements in accordance with this section.

“(3) REDEMPTION.—The Commission shall redeem vouchers accepted by broadcasting stations under paragraph (2) upon presentation, subject to such documentation, verification, accounting, and application requirements as the Commission may impose to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the voucher redemption system.

“(4) EXPIRATION.—

“(A) CANDIDATES.—A voucher may only be used to pay for broadcast airtime for political advertisements to be broadcast before midnight on the day before the date of the Federal election in connection with which it was issued and shall be null and void for any other use or purpose.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES.—A voucher held by a political party committee may be used to pay for broadcast airtime for political advertisements to be broadcast before midnight on December 31st of the odd-numbered year following the year in which the voucher was issued by the Commission.

“(5) VOUCHER AS EXPENDITURE UNDER FECA.—The use of a voucher to purchase broadcast airtime constitutes an expenditure as defined in section 301(9)(A).

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BROADCASTING STATION.—The term ‘broadcasting station’ has the meaning given that term by section 315(f)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934.

“(2) POLITICAL PARTY.—The term ‘political party’ means a major party or a minor party as defined in section 9002 (3) or (4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9002 (3) or (4)).

“Subtitle D—Administrative Provisions

“SEC. 531. FAIR ELECTIONS OVERSIGHT BOARD.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Federal Election Commission an entity to be known as the ‘Fair Elections Oversight Board’.

“(b) STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be composed of 5 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of whom—

“(A) 2 shall be appointed after consultation with the majority leader of the Senate;

“(B) 2 shall be appointed after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate; and

“(C) 1 shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the members appointed under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

“(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The members shall be individuals who are nonpartisan and, by reason of their education, experience, and attainments, exceptionally qualified to perform the duties of members of the Board.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No member of the Board may be—

“(i) an employee of the Federal Government;

“(ii) a registered lobbyist; or

“(iii) an officer or employee of a political party or political campaign.

“(3) DATE.—Members of the Board shall be appointed not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

“(4) TERMS.—A member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 5 years.

“(5) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Board shall be filled not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which the Board is given

notice of the vacancy, in the same manner as the original appointment. The individual appointed to fill the vacancy shall serve only for the unexpired portion of the term for which the individual's predecessor was appointed.

“(6) CHAIRPERSON.—The Board shall designate a Chairperson from among the members of the Board.

“(c) DUTIES AND POWERS.—

“(1) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall have such duties and powers as the Commission may prescribe, including the power to administer the provisions of this title.

“(2) REVIEW OF FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After each general election for Federal office, the Board shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Fair Elections financing program under this title, including—

“(i) the maximum dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions under section 501(11);

“(ii) the maximum and minimum dollar amounts for qualifying contributions under section 501(10);

“(iii) the number and value of qualifying contributions a candidate is required to obtain under section 512 to qualify for allocations from the Fund;

“(iv) the amount of allocations from the Fund that candidates may receive under section 522;

“(v) the maximum amount of matching contributions a candidate may receive under section 523;

“(vi) the amount and usage of vouchers under section 524;

“(vii) the overall satisfaction of participating candidates and the American public with the program; and

“(viii) such other matters relating to financing of Senate campaigns as the Board determines are appropriate.

“(B) CRITERIA FOR REVIEW.—In conducting the review under subparagraph (A), the Board shall consider the following:

“(i) QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTIONS AND QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Board shall consider whether the number and dollar amount of qualifying contributions required and maximum dollar amount for such qualifying contributions and qualified small dollar contributions strikes a balance regarding the importance of voter involvement, the need to assure adequate incentives for participating, and fiscal responsibility, taking into consideration the number of primary and general election participating candidates, the electoral performance of those candidates, program cost, and any other information the Board determines is appropriate.

“(ii) REVIEW OF PROGRAM BENEFITS.—The Board shall consider whether the totality of the amount of funds allowed to be raised by participating candidates (including through qualifying contributions and small dollar contributions), allocations from the Fund under section 522, matching contributions under section 523, and vouchers under section 524 are sufficient for voters in each State to learn about the candidates to cast an informed vote, taking into account the historic amount of spending by winning candidates, media costs, primary election dates, and any other information the Board determines is appropriate.

“(C) ADJUSTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Based on the review conducted under subparagraph (A), the Board shall provide for the adjustments of the following amounts:

“(I) the maximum dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions under section 501(11)(C);

“(II) the maximum and minimum dollar amounts for qualifying contributions under section 501(10)(A);

“(III) the number and value of qualifying contributions a candidate is required to obtain under section 512(a)(1);

“(IV) the base amount for candidates under section 522(d);

“(V) the maximum amount of matching contributions a candidate may receive under section 523(b); and

“(VI) the dollar amount for vouchers under section 524(c).

“(ii) REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall promulgate regulations providing for the adjustments made by the Board under clause (i).

“(D) REPORT.—Not later than March 30 following any general election for Federal office, the Board shall submit a report to Congress on the review conducted under paragraph (1). Such report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Board based on such review.

“(d) MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.—

“(1) MEETINGS.—The Board may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Board considers advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

“(2) QUORUM.—Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for purposes of voting, but a quorum is not required for members to meet and hold hearings.

“(e) REPORTS.—Not later than March 30, 2018, and every 2 years thereafter, the Board shall submit to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration a report documenting, evaluating, and making recommendations relating to the administrative implementation and enforcement of the provisions of this title.

“(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(1) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each member, other than the Chairperson, shall be paid at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

“(B) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson shall be paid at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) PERSONNEL.—

“(A) DIRECTOR.—The Board shall have a staff headed by an Executive Director. The Executive Director shall be paid at a rate equivalent to a rate established for the Senior Executive Service under section 5382 of title 5, United States Code.

“(B) STAFF APPOINTMENT.—With the approval of the Chairperson, the Executive Director may appoint such personnel as the Executive Director and the Board determines to be appropriate.

“(C) ACTUARIAL EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—With the approval of the Chairperson, the Executive Director may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

“(D) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon the request of the Chairperson, the head of any Federal agency may detail, without reimbursement, any of the personnel of such agency to the Board to assist in carrying out the duties of the Board. Any such detail shall not interrupt or otherwise affect

the civil service status or privileges of the Federal employee.

“(E) OTHER RESOURCES.—The Board shall have reasonable access to materials, resources, statistical data, and other information from the Library of Congress and other agencies of the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. The Chairperson of the Board shall make requests for such access in writing when necessary.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subtitle.

“SEC. 532. ADMINISTRATION PROVISIONS.

“The Commission shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this title, including regulations—

“(1) to establish procedures for—

“(A) verifying the amount of valid qualifying contributions with respect to a candidate;

“(B) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on the raising of qualified small dollar contributions;

“(C) monitoring the raising of qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions through effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on individual contributions to qualified accounts of multicandidate political committees;

“(D) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on the use of personal funds by participating candidates;

“(E) monitoring the use of allocations from the Fund and matching contributions under this title through audits or other mechanisms; and

“(F) the administration of the voucher program under section 524; and

“(2) regarding the conduct of debates in a manner consistent with the best practices of States that provide public financing for elections.

“SEC. 533. VIOLATIONS AND PENALTIES.

“(a) CIVIL PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENTS.—If a candidate who has been certified as a participating candidate under section 515(a) accepts a contribution or makes an expenditure that is prohibited under section 513, the Commission shall assess a civil penalty against the candidate in an amount that is not more than 3 times the amount of the contribution or expenditure. Any amounts collected under this subsection shall be deposited into the Fund.

“(b) REPAYMENT FOR IMPROPER USE OF FAIR ELECTIONS FUND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission determines that any benefit made available to a participating candidate under this title was not used as provided for in this title or that a participating candidate has violated any of the dates for remission of funds contained in this title, the Commission shall so notify the candidate and the candidate shall pay to the Fund an amount equal to—

“(A) the amount of benefits so used or not remitted, as appropriate; and

“(B) interest on any such amounts (at a rate determined by the Commission).

“(2) OTHER ACTION NOT PRECLUDED.—Any action by the Commission in accordance with this subsection shall not preclude enforcement proceedings by the Commission in accordance with section 309(a), including a referral by the Commission to the Attorney General in the case of an apparent knowing and willful violation of this title.”

SEC. 103. PROHIBITION ON JOINT FUNDRAISING COMMITTEES.

Section 302(e) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30102(e)) is

amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) No authorized committee of a participating candidate (as defined in section 501) may establish a joint fundraising committee with a political committee other than an authorized committee of a candidate.”

SEC. 104. EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON COORDINATED EXPENDITURES BY POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES WITH PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

Section 315(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “in the case of” and inserting “except as provided in paragraph (5), in the case of”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6)(A) The limitation under paragraph (3)(A) shall not apply with respect to any expenditure from a qualified political party-participating candidate coordinated expenditure fund.

“(B) In this paragraph, the term ‘qualified political party-participating candidate coordinated expenditure fund’ means a fund established by the national committee of a political party, or a State committee of a political party, including any subordinate committee of a State committee, for purposes of making expenditures in connection with the general election campaign of a candidate for election to the office of Senator who is a participating candidate (as defined in section 501), that only accepts qualified coordinated expenditure contributions.

“(C) In this paragraph, the term ‘qualified coordinated expenditure contribution’ means, with respect to the general election campaign of a candidate for election to the office of Senator who is a participating candidate (as defined in section 501), any contribution (or series of contributions)—

“(i) which is made by an individual who is not prohibited from making a contribution under this Act; and

“(ii) the aggregate amount of which does not exceed \$500 per election.”

TITLE II—IMPROVING VOTER INFORMATION

SEC. 201. BROADCASTS RELATING TO ALL SENATE CANDIDATES.

(a) LOWEST UNIT CHARGE; NATIONAL COMMITTEES.—Section 315(b)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “to such office” and inserting the following: “to such office, or by a national committee of a political party on behalf of such candidate in connection with such campaign,”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “for preemptible use thereof” after “station”.

(b) PREEMPTION; AUDITS.—Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively and moving them to follow the existing subsection (e);

(2) by redesignating the existing subsection (e) as subsection (c); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(d) PREEMPTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), and notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (b)(1)(A), a licensee shall not preempt the use of a broadcasting station by a legally qualified candidate for Senate who has purchased and paid for such use.

“(2) CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND CONTROL OF LICENSEE.—If a program to be broadcast by a broadcasting station is preempted because of circumstances beyond the control of the station, any candidate or party advertising spot scheduled to be broadcast during that program shall be treated in the same fashion as a comparable commercial advertising spot.

“(e) AUDITS.—During the 30-day period preceding a primary election and the 60-day period preceding a general election, the Commission shall conduct such audits as it deems necessary to ensure that each broadcaster to which this section applies is allocating television broadcast advertising time in accordance with this section and section 312.”.

(C) REVOCATION OF LICENSE FOR FAILURE TO PERMIT ACCESS.—Section 312(a)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 312(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or repeated”;

(2) by inserting “or cable system” after “broadcasting station”; and

(3) by striking “his candidacy” and inserting “the candidacy of the candidate, under the same terms, conditions, and business practices as apply to the most favored advertiser of the licensee”.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f), as redesignated by subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “For purposes of this section—” and inserting the following: “DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “the term” and inserting “BROADCASTING STATION.—The term”; and

(ii) by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “the terms” and inserting “LICENSEE; STATION LICENSEE.—The terms”; and

(2) in subsection (g), as redesignated by subsection (b)(1), by striking “The Commission” and inserting “REGULATIONS.—The Commission”.

SEC. 202. BROADCAST RATES FOR PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

Section 315(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(b)), as amended by section 201, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.—In the case of a participating candidate (as defined in section 501(9) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971), the charges made for the use of any broadcasting station for a television broadcast shall not exceed 80 percent of the lowest charge described in paragraph (1)(A) during—

“(A) the 45 days preceding the date of a primary or primary runoff election in which the candidate is opposed; and

“(B) the 60 days preceding the date of a general or special election in which the candidate is opposed.

“(4) RATE CARDS.—A licensee shall provide to a candidate for Senate a rate card that discloses—

“(A) the rate charged under this subsection; and

“(B) the method that the licensee uses to determine the rate charged under this subsection.”.

SEC. 203. FCC TO PRESCRIBE STANDARDIZED FORM FOR REPORTING CANDIDATE CAMPAIGN ADS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding to establish a standardized form to be used by each broadcasting station, as defined in section 315(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(f)) (as redesignated by section 201(b)(1)), to record and report the purchase of advertising time by or on behalf of a candidate for nomination for election, or for election, to Federal elective office.

(b) CONTENTS.—The form prescribed by the Commission under subsection (a) shall require a broadcasting station to report to the Commission and to the Federal Election Commission, at a minimum—

(1) the station call letters and mailing address;

(2) the name and telephone number of the station's sales manager (or individual with responsibility for advertising sales);

(3) the name of the candidate who purchased the advertising time, or on whose behalf the advertising time was purchased, and the Federal elective office for which he or she is a candidate;

(4) the name, mailing address, and telephone number of the person responsible for purchasing broadcast political advertising for the candidate;

(5) notation as to whether the purchase agreement for which the information is being reported is a draft or final version; and

(6) with respect to the advertisement—

(A) the date and time of the broadcast;

(B) the program in which the advertisement was broadcast; and

(C) the length of the broadcast airtime.

(c) INTERNET ACCESS.—In its rulemaking under subsection (a), the Commission shall require any broadcasting station required to file a report under this section that maintains an Internet website to make available a link to each such report on that website.

TITLE III—RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SEC. 301. PETITION FOR CERTIORARI.

Section 307(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30107(a)(6)) is amended by inserting “(including a proceeding before the Supreme Court on certiorari)” after “appeal”.

SEC. 302. FILING BY SENATE CANDIDATES WITH COMMISSION.

Section 302(g) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30102(g)) is amended to read as follows:

“(g) FILING WITH THE COMMISSION.—All designations, statements, and reports required to be filed under this Act shall be filed with the Commission.”.

SEC. 303. ELECTRONIC FILING OF FEC REPORTS.

Section 304(a)(11) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “under this Act—” and all that follows and inserting “under this Act shall be required to maintain and file such designation, statement, or report in electronic form accessible by computers.”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “48 hours” and all that follows through “filed electronically” and inserting “24 hours”; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (D).

TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION IN FUNDING OF ELECTIONS

SEC. 401. REFUNDABLE TAX CREDIT FOR SENATE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to refundable credits) is amended by inserting after section 36B the following new section:

“SEC. 36C. CREDIT FOR SENATE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle an amount equal to 50 percent of the qualified My Voice Federal Senate campaign contributions paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

“(b) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—The amount of qualified My Voice Federal Senate campaign contributions taken into account under subsection (a) for the taxable year shall not exceed \$50 (twice such amount in the case of a joint return).

“(2) LIMITATION ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL SENATE CANDIDATES.—No credit shall be allowed under this section to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer made aggregate contributions in excess of \$300 during the taxable year to—

“(A) any single Federal Senate candidate, or

“(B) any political committee established and maintained by a national political party.

“(3) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—No credit shall be allowed under this section to any taxpayer unless the taxpayer provides the Secretary with such information as the Secretary may require to verify the taxpayer's eligibility for the credit and the amount of the credit for the taxpayer.

“(c) QUALIFIED MY VOICE FEDERAL SENATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘My Voice Federal Senate campaign contribution’ means any contribution of cash by an individual to a Federal Senate candidate or to a political committee established and maintained by a national political party if such contribution is not prohibited under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

“(d) FEDERAL SENATE CANDIDATE.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘Federal Senate candidate’ means any candidate for election to the office of Senator.

“(2) TREATMENT OF AUTHORIZED COMMITTEES.—Any contribution made to an authorized committee of a Federal Senate candidate shall be treated as made to such candidate.

“(e) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2018, the \$50 amount under subsection (b)(1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2017’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of \$5, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$5.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6211(b)(4)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting “36C,” after “36B.”.

(2) Section 1324(b)(2) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting “36C,” after “36B.”.

(3) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 36B the following new item:

“Sec. 36C. Credit for Senate campaign contributions.”.

(c) FORMS.—The Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, shall ensure that the credit for contributions to Federal Senate candidates allowed under section 36C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section, may be claimed on Forms 1040EZ and 1040A.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—At the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Election Commission shall provide the Secretary of the Treasury with such information and other assistance as the Secretary may reasonably require to administer the credit allowed under section 36C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

TITLE V—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. FAIR ELECTIONS FUND REVENUE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after chapter 36 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 37—TAX ON PAYMENTS PURSUANT TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

“Sec. 4501. Imposition of tax.

“SEC. 4501. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

“(a) TAX IMPOSED.—There is hereby imposed on any payment made to a qualified person pursuant to a contract with the Government of the United States a tax equal to 0.50 percent of the amount paid.

“(b) LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount of tax imposed under subsection (a) for any calendar year shall not exceed \$500,000.

“(c) QUALIFIED PERSON.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified person’ means any person which—

“(1) is not a State or local government, a foreign nation, or an organization described in section 501(c)(3) which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a), and

“(2) has contracts with the Government of the United States with a value in excess of \$10,000,000.

“(d) PAYMENT OF TAX.—The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the person receiving such payment.

“(e) USE OF REVENUE GENERATED BY TAX.—It is the sense of the Senate that amounts equivalent to the revenue generated by the tax imposed under this chapter should be appropriated for the financing of a Fair Elections Fund and used for the public financing of Senate elections.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 36 the following:

“CHAPTER 37—TAX ON PAYMENTS PURSUANT TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contracts entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the

provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

SEC. 602. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided for in this Act, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on January 1, 2018.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1548. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emission fees, reduce the rate of the corporate income tax, provide tax credits to workers, deliver additional benefits to retired and disabled Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise this evening to introduce, along with my lead cosponsor, Senator SCHATZ of Hawaii, the American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act of 2015.

We announced this legislation this afternoon at an event hosted by the American Enterprise Institute, and I want to thank the American Enterprise Institute for their hospitality. I think their interest in this idea clearly reflects the difference between core conservative economic principles and simply being pushed around by the hectoring of the fossil fuel industry. There is a difference between the two, and this bill meets legitimate conservative economic principles.

I will start by saying the obvious, which is that climate change is real. It is virtually universal in peer-reviewed science that climate change is real, that carbon pollution from burning fossil fuels is causing unprecedented climate and oceanic changes. Every major scientific society in our country has said so. Our brightest scientists at NOAA and at NASA are unequivocal. The fundamental science of climate change is, indeed, settled.

In the details of local application and the extent to which a particular storm is caused by or exacerbated by climate change, in the vagaries of prediction about how things are going to be 10 or 15 years out at those margins, yes—there is always room for conversation and debate at the margins, but the core science of climate change is beyond legitimate debate. It is known science, like debating gravity.

Americans get it. In poll after poll, Americans understand that climate change is real, know that humans are the cause, and want their government to do something about it.

Climate change is not our only national challenge. The Federal Tax Code, for example, is a mess, with one of the highest corporate tax rates in the developed world, while some take advantage of loopholes to pay far less than others and, indeed, some pay nothing at all. We have an economic recovery that has left far too many Americans behind, and we have a job market that has still not fully rebounded.

What if our answer to climate change helped address those other concerns as well? What if that approach was firmly grounded in core conservative economic principles, values such as property rights, market efficiency, and personal liberty?

Aparna Mathur of the free-market think tank the American Enterprise Institute conducted an analysis with a colleague from the Brookings Institution showing that a carbon fee could reduce emissions, shore up the country's fiscal outlook, and play an important part in broader tax reform. AEI's Kevin Hassett, Steven Hayward, and Kenneth Greene have pointed out that a carbon fee could obviate some environmental regulations. The idea behind it is extremely simple. You levy a price on the thing you don't want—carbon pollution—and you use the revenue to help with things you do want.

Whether they are called neighborhood effects or negative externalities, the effects of carbon pollution harm us all. Conservative economist Milton Friedman wrote that the government exists in part to reduce such harms. When the costs of such externalities don't get factored into the price of a product, conservative economic doctrine—indeed, all economic doctrine—classifies that as a subsidy—a market failure. Right now for fossil fuel producers, that subsidy is immense, giving them artificial advantage over cleaner energy sources. The International Monetary Fund just postulated that the annual subsidy just in America to the fossil fuel industry is \$700 billion. We tend to talk around here in budget cycles of 10 years. That means it is \$7 trillion in a budget cycle. That is a subsidy, all right.

A carbon fee can repair that market failure by incorporating unpriced damage into the costs of fossil fuels. Then the free market—not industry, not government—can drive the best energy mix for the country, with everyone competing on level ground.

That is how Nixon's Treasury Secretary and Reagan's Secretary of State George Shultz sees it. He and the late Nobel laureate Gary S. Becker made the case for a carbon fee in the Wall Street Journal. They wrote:

Americans like to compete on a level playing field. All players should have an equal opportunity to win based on their competitive merits, not on some artificial imbalance that gives someone or some group a special advantage.

Such as a \$700 billion-a-year special advantage.

Just last week, even the CEOs of Europe's major oil companies called on governments to institute national prices on carbon.

This could be a big economic win. George W. Bush's Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson said, “A tax on carbon emissions will unleash a wave of innovation to develop technologies, lower

the costs of clean energy, and create jobs, as we and other nations develop new energy products and infrastructure."

It is in that spirit that I am introducing the American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act—a framework I hope both Republicans and Democrats can embrace. The bill would establish an economy-wide carbon fee on carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions. The fee would be assessed way upstream where it is easiest to administer, minimizing the universe of taxpayers and the compliance burden—at the coal mine, at the natural gas processing station, and at the petroleum refinery.

Other sources of greenhouse gas emissions would be charged at existing reporting requirements that are rate tied to the carbon dioxide equivalency of each gas. Fluorocarbons are assessed at a special rate that accounts for their high greenhouse potency. Sequestering, utilizing, or encapsulating carbon dioxide earns you a credit.

My bill sets the fee per ton of carbon emitted at \$45 for 2016. That is the central range of the social cost of carbon as estimated by the Office of Management and Budget. That fee would increase each year at a real 2 percent. When emissions fall 80 percent below 2005 levels, the annual adjustment falls to inflation.

Border adjustments for the trade of energy-intensive goods include tariffs on such goods imported from countries with weaker or no carbon pricing—to make sure we protect our industries at home—and rebates for U.S. exporters of energy-intensive goods. We took care to design the border adjustments to achieve harmony with World Trade Organization rules.

According to the nonpartisan group Resources for the Future, this carbon fee proposal would reduce U.S. CO₂ emissions by more than 40 percent by 2025.

In addition to the environmental benefits, of course, a carbon fee also generates revenue. In this case, it would generate over \$2 trillion in revenue over 10 years. We intend to return every dime of that to the American people. Here is how.

First, the bill lowers the top marginal corporate income tax rate from 35 percent to 29 percent. This would cut American corporate taxes by almost \$600 billion over the first decade.

Second, it provides workers with a \$500 refundable tax credit—\$1,000 for a couple—to offset the first \$500 paid each year in Social Security payroll taxes. The credit would grow with inflation. The tax credits would return over \$750 billion to American households over the first 10 years.

Third, it would give benefits to Social Security recipients, veterans program beneficiaries, and certain other groups of retirees at the same level as

the tax credit. These benefits would total more than \$400 billion over 10 years.

Finally, the bill would establish a block grant for States, totalling \$20 billion in 2016 and growing with inflation, to help with low-income needs, rural households, and transitioning workers. Governors in these States will know best what to do with the funds. In West Virginia, for example, they could use the money to transition coal workers into the technology jobs of the future or to shore up the beleaguered pension plans of coal miners. Rhode Island, on the other hand, might choose to make homes more energy efficient. And we have a reporting mechanism for the public to transparently track where the money is going to assure that it is all going back to the American people.

The entire bill is 37 pages long—short, simple, straightforward. It would cut back on the pollution that threatens dramatic changes to our home planet. It would cut taxes. It would end a grievous market distortion. It would start a wave of investment and innovation.

With this bill, Senator SCHATZ and I extend an open hand, or as one Republican former Congressman who cares about the climate change problem said: It extends an olive limb to conservatives everywhere.

Whether you want to pursue tax reform or support the free market for energy, or as Senator GRAHAM suggested this week, honestly address the real effects of climate change, this can be a vehicle. I hope my colleagues will agree with me that this is a discussion that we can continue. I look forward to trying to find a way forward that is better than simply ignoring this problem, pretending that it does not exist, and sleepwalking through our moment in history.

It is time to wake up. I have an attachment here that summarizes some of the support from conservatives and business leaders for a carbon fee. I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATIVES AND BUSINESS LEADERS SUPPORT A CARBON FEE

FORMER REPUBLICAN APPOINTEES

"A tax on carbon emissions will unleash a wave of innovation to develop technologies, lower the costs of clean energy and create jobs as we and other nations develop new energy products and infrastructure."—Henry M. Paulson, Treasury Secretary under President George W. Bush

"How can you possibly create a level playing field? By taking a step that makes all forms of energy bear not only their immediate costs of energy, but also the costs of the pollution they emit . . . So my proposal is to have a revenue-neutral carbon tax."—George P. Schultz, Secretary of Labor under President Nixon, Treasury Secretary under

Presidents Nixon and Ford, and Secretary of State under President Reagan

"A market-based approach, like a carbon tax, would be the best path to reducing greenhouse-gas emissions . . . Rather than argue against [President Obama's] proposals, our leaders in Congress should endorse them and start the overdue debate about what bigger steps are needed and how to achieve them."—William D. Ruckelshaus, EPA Administrator under Presidents Nixon and Reagan; Lee M. Thomas, EPA Administrator under President Reagan; William K. Reilly, EPA Administrator under President George H. W. Bush; and Christine Todd Whitman, EPA Administrator under President George W. Bush

CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

"I am no scientist, but I've traveled throughout the world with Senator McCain and others, and seen the effects of a warming planet. . . . I've been told by a lot of business leaders in South Carolina, 'Senator Graham, once you price carbon in a reasonable way, this green economy that we're hoping for really will begin to flourish.'"—Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC)

"I wish we would just talk about a carbon tax, 100 percent of which would be returned to the American people."—Senator Bob Corker (R-TN)

"If there's one economic axiom, it's that if you want less of something, you tax it. Clearly, it's in our interest to move away from carbon."—Senator Jeff Flake (R-AZ)

"We should eliminate all the subsidies. No more Solyndras. No more production tax credits for wind. No more credits for electric vehicles. No more special tax provisions for oil and gas. Level the playing field. The big challenge is reaching fellow conservatives and convincing them that the biggest subsidy of all may be to belch and burn into the trash dump in the sky—for free. That lack of accountability may be the biggest subsidy of them all."—former Representative Bob Inglis (R-SC)

FORMER REPUBLICAN AIDES

"The scientists tell us that world temperatures are rising because humans are emitting carbon into the atmosphere. Basic economics tells us that when you tax something, you normally get less of it. So if we want to reduce global emissions of carbon, we need a global carbon tax."—N. Gregory Mankiw, economic advisor to Mitt Romney's presidential campaign and Harvard economist

Using a carbon tax to fund a payroll tax cut "would be very good for the economy and as an adjunct, it would reduce also carbon emissions into the environment."—Arthur B. Laffer, economic advisor to President Reagan

"Although a general carbon fuel tax is moot for the moment, the idea will not go away. If carbon dioxide emissions are to be reduced further in the U.S., such a tax will achieve the goal with less economic waste than new bureaucratic hurdles."—Martin Feldstein, former Chairman of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisors

CONSERVATIVE THOUGHT-LEADERS AND ECONOMISTS

[Why a carbon tax?] "First, it is a less expensive, more efficient and more effective policy than the status quo. . . . Second, greenhouse gas emissions impose risk. . . . Third, it is the principled conservative position. Government's role is to protect the rights to life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness."—Jerry Taylor, former vice president at the Cato Institute and co-founder of the Niskanen Center

"We have a unique opportunity to end the rancorous debate about climate change, a debate that is poisoning the air—the political air, that is—and inhibiting progress on two fronts: progress on addressing the possibility that we are on the road to a catastrophic warming of the globe, and progress on reforming our anti-growth tax structure, which is so inequitable that it is straining the public's belief in the fairness of capitalism and what we like to call 'the American Dream.' All we need do is stop pretending that the cost of carbon emissions is certainly zero, and that regulation provides a more efficient solution than the Market."—Irwin M. Stelzer, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute

CORPORATIONS

This month, the top executives for six major oil and gas companies penned a letter to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change calling for a worldwide price on carbon:

BP, Statoil, Shell, Eni SpA, Total, BG Group.

Many other major companies have integrated an "internal carbon fee" as part of their long-term financial planning. Companies that have reportedly adopted an internal carbon price include:

Wal-Mart Stores; Delphi Automotive; Devon Energy Corporation; Total; Delta Airlines; Jabil Circuit Inc.; American Electric Power Co.; Entergy Corporation; Xcel Energy Inc.; Microsoft; Chevron Corporation; Hess Corporation; Wells Fargo & Company; General Electric Company; E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; CMS Energy Corporation; Integrys Energy Group; Walt Disney World; ConocoPhillips; Royal Dutch Shell; Cummins Inc.; Google Inc.; Ameren Corporation; Duke Energy Corporation; PG&E Corporation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 198—COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARIES OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE 13TH, 14TH, AND 15TH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, OFTEN REFERRED TO AS THE "SECOND FOUNDING" OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 198

Whereas, in 1787, delegates from the original 13 States gathered in Philadelphia to propose and ratify a new guiding charter, the Constitution of the United States, for the young republic;

Whereas George Washington, James Madison, and the other delegates managed to craft the most durable form of government in world history, one that provided for its own revision and, therefore, allowed future generations to continue to build a "more perfect Union";

Whereas following the Civil War, President Lincoln and his generation did just that, ratifying a series of transformational amendments that gave the United States what Lincoln promised at Gettysburg, "a new birth of freedom";

Whereas the Second Founding of the United States began in earnest on January

31, 1865, when Congress passed the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and sent it to the States for ratification;

Whereas the next day, President Lincoln signed the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, calling it a "King's cure" for the evil of slavery;

Whereas the people of the United States ratified the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States on December 6, 1865, banning slavery and forced labor;

Whereas the people of the United States next ratified the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States on July 9, 1868, enshrining a host of new constitutional guarantees;

Whereas the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States granted United States citizenship to everyone born on the soil of, and subject to the jurisdiction of, the United States, protected fundamental rights like free speech from State abuses, ensured due process of law for the people of the United States, and guaranteed equality for all of the people of the United States;

Whereas the people of the United States ratified the 15th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States on February 3, 1870, guaranteeing the right to vote free from racial discrimination;

Whereas the ratification of this series of amendments truly constituted a "Second Founding" for the United States; and

Whereas the 150th anniversary of the Second Founding occurs over the course of the next 5 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 150th anniversaries of the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States—the Second Founding of the United States;

(2) designates the year of 2015 as the "Sesquicentennial of Our Nation's Second Founding, New Birth of Freedom: Commemorating the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments";

(3) encourages State and local governments to join in the Sesquicentennial celebration by organizing appropriate ceremonies, activities, and educational outreach; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to explore the history and significance of the Second Founding and to celebrate the continuing importance to our Constitution and to the United States of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1974. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1975. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1976. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1977. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1978. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1979. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1980. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1981. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1982. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1983. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1984. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1985. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1986. Ms. AYOTTE (for Mr. KIRK) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1987. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1988. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1989. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1983 submitted by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1990. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1983 submitted by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1991. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1992. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1993. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1994. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1995. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1996. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1974. Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE SECURITY AND PROTECTION OF IRANIAN DISSIDENTS LIVING IN CAMP LIBERTY, IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The residents of Camp Liberty, Iraq, renounced violence and unilaterally disarmed more than a decade ago.

(2) The United States recognized the residents of the former Camp Ashraf who now reside in Camp Liberty as “protected persons” under the Fourth Geneva Convention and committed itself to protect the residents.

(3) The deterioration in the overall security situation in Iraq has increased the vulnerability of Camp Liberty residents to attacks from proxies of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps and Sunni extremists associated with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(4) The increased vulnerability underscores the need for an expedited relocation process and that these Iranian dissidents will neither be safe nor secure in Camp Liberty.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) take prompt and appropriate steps in accordance with international agreements to promote the physical security and protection of Camp Liberty residents;

(2) urge the Government of Iraq to uphold its commitments to the United States to ensure the safety and well-being of those living in Camp Liberty;

(3) urge the Government of Iraq to ensure continued and reliable access to food, clean water, medical assistance, electricity and other energy needs, and any other equipment and supplies necessary to sustain the residents during periods of attack or siege by external forces;

(4) oppose the extradition of Camp Liberty residents to Iran;

(5) implement a strategy to provide for the safe, secure, and permanent relocation of Camp Liberty residents that includes the steps that would need to be taken by the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the Camp Liberty residents to potentially relocate some residents to the United States;

(6) encourage continued close cooperation between the residents of Camp Liberty and the authorities in the relocation process; and

(7) assist the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in expediting the ongoing resettlement of all residents of Camp Liberty to safe locations outside Iraq.

SA 1975. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XV, add the following:

SEC. 1523. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN UNOBLIGATED FUNDS AVAILABLE TO CONSTRUCT, RENOVATE, REPAIR, OR EXPAND ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOLS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS TO ADDRESS CAPACITY OR FACILITY CONDITION DEFICIENCIES.

(a) CESSATION OF AVAILABILITY.—Any amount of the \$464,017,143 of unobligated funds in the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, account and available for the Office of Economic Adjustment, or for transfer to the Secretary of Education, to construct, renovate, repair, or expand elementary and secondary public schools on military installations in order to address capacity or facility condition deficiencies at such schools as of the date of the enactment of this Act that remain unobligated as of September 30, 2016, shall no longer be available for obligation for that purpose as of October 1, 2016.

(b) AUTHORITY TO REPROGRAM FOR OCO PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may reprogram amounts no longer available for obligation for the purpose described in subsection (a) as of October 1, 2016, by reason of subsection (a) for such programs, projects, and activities in connection with overseas contingency operations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—The authority to reprogram funds under paragraph (1) is in addition to any other authority available to the Secretary to transfer or reprogram funds in this Act or otherwise provided by law.

SA 1976. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such

fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . APPREHENSION AND PROSECUTION OF INTERNATIONAL CYBER CRIMINALS.

(a) INTERNATIONAL CYBER CRIMINAL DEFINED.—In this section, the term “international cyber criminal” means an individual—

(1) who is physically present within a country with which the United States does not have a mutual legal assistance treaty or an extradition treaty;

(2) who is believed to have committed a cybercrime or intellectual property crime against the interests of the United States or its citizens; and

(3) for whom—

(A) an arrest warrant has been issued by a judge in the United States; or

(B) an international wanted notice (commonly referred to as a “Red Notice”) has been circulated by Interpol.

(b) BILATERAL CONSULTATIONS.—The Secretary of State, or designee, shall consult with the appropriate government official of each country in which one or more international cyber criminals are physically present to determine what actions the government of such country has taken—

(1) to apprehend and prosecute such criminals; and

(2) to prevent such criminals from carrying out cybercrimes or intellectual property crimes against the interests of the United States or its citizens.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report that identifies—

(A) the number of international cyber criminals who are located in countries that do not have an extradition treaty or mutual legal assistance treaty with the United States, broken down by country;

(B) the dates on which an official of the Department of State, as a result of this Act, discussed ways to thwart or prosecute international cyber criminals in a bilateral conversation with an official of another country, including the name of each such country; and

(C) for each international cyber criminal who was extradited into the United States during the most recently completed calendar year—

(i) his or her name;

(ii) the crimes for which he or she was charged;

(iii) his or her previous country of residence; and

(iv) the country from which he or she was extradited into the United States.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

SA 1977. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 1227, before the end quote and final period, insert the following:

“(17) REPORT INFORMING THE PROCESSING TIME FOR APPLICANTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, to shall submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that includes—

“(A) the number of applicants in the ‘administrative processing’ phase of the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa application process, broken down by month, during the most recent 12-month period;

“(B) the shortest and longest period that an application described in subparagraph (A) has been in such phase; and

“(C) a description of the steps that the Department of State and the Department of Homeland Security have taken to reduce the length of the administrative processing phase, while maintaining adequate security review and screening of such applications.

SA 1978. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 718, strike “has emerged” on line 15 and all that follows through “such competition” on line 17.

SA 1979. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the

Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.

(a) INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism. For purposes of carrying out the duties described in paragraph (2), such officer shall have the title of “Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator”.

(2) DUTIES.—The Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator shall have the following duties:

(A) Coordinate and direct all activities of the Federal Government relating to each hostage situation described in paragraph (1) to ensure efforts to secure the release of all hostages in a hostage situation are properly resourced and correct lines of authority are established and maintained.

(B) Establish and direct a fusion cell consisting of appropriate personnel of the Federal Government with purview over each hostage situation described in paragraph (1).

(C) Develop a strategy to keep family members of hostages described in paragraph (1) informed of the status of such hostages and inform such family members of updates, procedures, and policies that do not compromise the national security of the United States.

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator shall be limited to hostage cases outside the United States.

(c) QUARTERLY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On a quarterly basis, the Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the members of Congress described in paragraph (2) a report that includes a summary of each hostage situation described in subsection (a)(1) and efforts to secure the release of all hostages in such hostage situation.

(2) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DESCRIBED.—The members of Congress described in this paragraph are, with respect to a United States person hostage covered by a report under paragraph (1), the Senators representing the State, and the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives representing the district, where a hostage described in subsection (a)(1) resides.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report under this subsection may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Federal Government to negotiate with a state sponsor of terrorism or an organization that the Secretary of State has designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189) or any other hostage-takers.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HOSTILE GROUP.—The term “hostile group” means—

(A) a group that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of

the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a));

(B) a group that is engaged in armed conflict with the United States; or

(C) any other group that the President determines to be a hostile group for purposes of this paragraph.

(2) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—The term “state sponsor of terrorism”—

(A) means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or any other provision of law, to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; and

(B) includes North Korea.

SA 1980. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 608. REPORT ON SUFFICIENCY OF MILITARY BASIC PAY TO COMPENSATE MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Not later than January 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment of the extent to which rates of military basic pay are sufficient to compensate military personnel. The assessment shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of the extent to which rates of military basic pay are sufficient to compensate members of the Armed Forces when compared with pay available for their civilian counterparts.

(2) A description and assessment of modifications to the structure of military basic pay in order to adequately compensate members of the Armed Forces for their skill sets and educational competencies rather than the current system of rates of military basic pay based primarily on grade and time in grade.

(3) An assessment of replacing the current payment of basic allowance for housing (BAH) with payment of an increased amount of military basic pay adjusted to account for differences in costs among localities.

SA 1981. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO ENGAGE UNITED STATES MANUFACTURERS IN PROCUREMENT OPPORTUNITIES RELATED TO EQUIPPING THE AFGHAN NATIONAL SECURITY FORCES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Secretaries to engage United States manufacturers in procurement opportunities related to equipping the Afghan National Security Forces.

SA 1982. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. USE OF ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES.

(a) **ENERGY MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 543(f)(4) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by striking “Not later than” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **MEASURES NOT IMPLEMENTED IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES.**—Each energy manager of a Department of Defense facility, as part of the certification system under paragraph (7) and using guidelines developed by the Secretary, shall provide an explanation regarding any life-cycle cost-effective measures described in subparagraph (A)(i) that have not been implemented with respect to the Department of Defense facility.”.

(b) **REPORTS.**—Section 548(b) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8258(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) in the case of Department of Defense facilities—

“(A) the status of the energy savings performance contracts and utility energy service contracts of each agency;

“(B) the investment value of the contracts;

“(C) the guaranteed energy savings for the previous year as compared to the actual energy savings for the previous year;

“(D) the plan for entering into the contracts in the coming year; and

“(E) information explaining why any previously submitted plans for the contracts were not implemented.”.

(c) **DEFINITION OF ENERGY CONSERVATION MEASURES.**—Section 551(4) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8259(4)) is amended by striking “or retrofit activities” and inserting “retrofit activities, or, in the case of Department of Defense fa-

cilities, energy consuming devices and required support structures”.

(d) **AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS.**—Section 801(a)(2)(F) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287(a)(2)(F)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) in the case of the Department of Defense, limit the recognition of operation and maintenance savings associated with systems modernized or replaced with the implementation of energy conservation measures, water conservation measures, or any combination of energy conservation measures and water conservation measures.”.

(e) **MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITY.**—Section 801(a)(2) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) **MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may sell or transfer energy savings and apply the proceeds of the sale or transfer to fund a contract under this title.”.

(f) **PAYMENT OF COSTS.**—Section 802 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287a) is amended by striking “(and related operation and maintenance expenses)” and inserting “, including, in the case of the Department of Defense, related operations and maintenance expenses”.

(g) **DEFINITION OF ENERGY SAVINGS.**—Section 804(2) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287c(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “federally owned building or buildings or other federally owned facilities” and inserting “Federal building (as defined in section 551)” each place it appears;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) in the case of the Department of Defense—

“(i) the use, sale, or transfer of energy incentives, rebates, or credits (including renewable energy credits) from Federal, State, or local governments or utilities; and

“(ii) any revenue generated from a reduction in energy or water use, more efficient waste recycling, or additional energy generated from more efficient equipment.”.

SA 1983. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION E—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016”.

SEC. 5002. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term “Department” means the Department of State.

(3) **PEACEKEEPING CREDITS.**—The term “peacekeeping credits” means the amounts by which United States assessed peacekeeping contributions exceed actual expenditures, apportioned to the United States, of peacekeeping operations by the United Nations during a United Nations peacekeeping fiscal year.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of State.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORITIES AND ACTIVITIES

Subtitle A—Basic Authorities and Activities

SEC. 5101. AMERICAN SPACES REVIEW.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) the full costs incurred by the Department to provide American Spaces, including—

(A) American Centers, American Corners, Binational Centers, Information Resource Centers, and Science Centers; and

(B) the total costs of all associated—

(i) employee salaries, including foreign service, American civilian, and locally employed staff;

(ii) programming expenses;

(iii) operating expenses;

(iv) contracting expenses; and

(v) security expenses;

(2) a breakdown of the total costs described in paragraph (1) by each space and type of space;

(3) the total fees collected for entry to, or the use of, American Spaces and related resources, including a breakdown by the type of fee for each space and type of space; and

(4) the total usage rates, including by type of service, for each space and type of space.

SEC. 5102. IDENTIFYING BILATERAL INVESTMENT TREATY OPPORTUNITIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes a detailed description of—

(1) the status of all ongoing investment treaty negotiations, including a strategy and timetable for concluding each such negotiation;

(2) a strategy to expand the investment treaty agenda, including through—

(A) launching new investment treaty negotiations with foreign partners that are currently capable of entering into such negotiations; and

(B) building the capacity of foreign partners to enter into such negotiations, including by encouraging the adoption of best practices with respect to investment; and

(3) an estimate of any resources that will be needed, including anticipated staffing levels—

(A) to conclude all ongoing negotiations described in paragraph (1);

(B) to launch new investment treaty negotiations, as described in paragraph (2)(A); and

(C) to build the capacity of foreign partners, as described in paragraph (2)(B).

SEC. 5103. REINSTATEMENT OF HONG KONG REPORT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2020, the Secretary shall submit the report required under section 301 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5731) to the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) **PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) should be unclassified and made publicly available, including through the Department's public website.

(c) **TREATMENT OF HONG KONG UNDER UNITED STATES LAW.**—

(1) **SECRETARY OF STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall certify to Congress whether Hong Kong Special Administrative Region is sufficiently autonomous to justify different treatment for its citizens from the treatment accorded to other citizens of the People's Republic of China in any new laws, agreements, treaties, or arrangements entered into between the United States and Hong Kong after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) **FACTOR FOR CONSIDERATION.**—In making a certification under subparagraph (A), the Secretary should consider the terms, obligations, and expectations expressed in the Joint Declaration with respect to Hong Kong.

(C) **EXCEPTION.**—A certification shall not be required under this subsection with respect to any new laws, agreements, treaties, or arrangements that support human rights, rule of law, or democracy in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

(2) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may waive the application of paragraph (1) if the Secretary—

(A) determines that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States; and

(B) on or before the date on which such waiver would take effect, submits a notice of, and justification for, the waiver to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5104. INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism. For purposes of carrying out the duties described in paragraph (2), such officer shall have the title of "Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator".

(2) **DUTIES.**—The Coordinator shall have the following duties:

(A) Coordinate and direct all activities of the Federal Government relating to each hostage situation described in paragraph (1) to ensure efforts to secure the release of all hostages in the hostage situation are properly resourced and correct lines of authority are established and maintained.

(B) Establish and direct a fusion cell consisting of appropriate personnel of the Federal Government with purview over each hostage situation described in paragraph (1).

(C) Develop a strategy to keep family members of hostages described in paragraph

(1) informed of the status of such hostages and inform such family members of updates, procedures, and policies that do not compromise the national security of the United States.

(b) **LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.**—The authority of the Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator shall be limited to hostage cases outside the United States.

(c) **QUARTERLY REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On a quarterly basis, the Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the members of Congress described in paragraph (2) a report that includes a summary of each hostage situation described in sub-section (a)(1) and efforts to secure the release of all hostages in such hostage situation.

(2) **MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DESCRIBED.**—The members of Congress described in this subparagraph are, with respect to a United States person hostage covered by a report under paragraph (1), the Senators representing the State, and the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives representing the district, where a hostage described in subsection (a)(1) resides.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report under this subsection may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

(4) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Federal Government to negotiate with a state sponsor of terrorism or an organization that the Secretary has designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189) or any other hostagetakers.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **HOSTILE GROUP.**—The term "hostile group" means—

(A) a group that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a));

(B) a group that is engaged in armed conflict with the United States; or

(C) any other group that the President determines to be a hostile group for purposes of this paragraph.

(2) **STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.**—The term "state sponsor of terrorism"—

(A) means a country the government of which the Secretary has determined, for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or any other provision of law, to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; and

(B) includes North Korea.

SEC. 5105. UNITED STATES-CHINA STRATEGIC AND ECONOMIC DIALOGUE REVIEW.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, and in consultation with other departments and agencies, as appropriate, shall—

(1) conduct a review of the United States-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (referred to in this section as the "Dialogue"); and

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that contains the findings of such review.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report described in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a list of all commitments agreed to by the United States and China at each of the first 6 rounds of meetings;

(2) an assessment of the status of each commitment agreed to by the United States and China at each of the first 6 rounds of meetings, including a detailed description of—

(A) any actions that have been taken with respect to such commitments;

(B) any aspects of such commitments that remain unfulfilled; and

(C) any actions that remain necessary to fulfill any unfulfilled commitments described in subparagraph (B);

(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of the Dialogue in achieving and fulfilling significant commitments on United States priorities in the bilateral relationship, including—

(A) the security situation in the East and South China Seas, including a peaceful resolution of maritime disputes in the region;

(B) denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula;

(C) cybertheft of United States intellectual property;

(D) the treatment of political dissidents, media representatives, and ethnic and religious minorities;

(E) reciprocal treatment of United States journalists and academics in China, including issuance of visas;

(F) expanding investment and trade opportunities for United States businesses;

(G) repatriation of North Korean refugees from China to North Korea; and

(H) promoting and protecting rule of law and democratic institutions in Hong Kong; and

(4) recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of the Dialogue in achieving and fulfilling significant commitments on United States priorities described in paragraph (3), including consideration of the use of predetermined benchmarks for assessing whether the commitments achieved are significantly furthering such priorities.

SEC. 5106. REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN BURMA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that—

(1) describes in detail all known widespread or systematic civil or political rights violations, including violations that may constitute crimes against humanity against ethnic, racial, or religious minorities in Burma, including the Rohingya people; and

(2) provides recommendations for holding perpetrators of the violations described in paragraph (1) accountable for their actions.

SEC. 5107. COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for Diplomatic and Consular Programs, \$500,000 shall be made available to the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, to be used in support of efforts by American and European Jewish and other civil society organizations, focusing on youth, to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of religious, ethnic, or racial intolerance in Europe.

SEC. 5108. BIOTECHNOLOGY GRANTS.

Title I of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 63. BIOTECHNOLOGY GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State is authorized to support, through grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, outreach, and public diplomacy activities, activities

promoting the benefits of agricultural biotechnology, biofuels, science-based regulatory systems, and the application of such technologies for trade and development.

“(b) LIMITATION.—The total amount of grants provided pursuant to subsection (a) shall not exceed \$500,000 in any fiscal year.”.

SEC. 5109. DEFINITION OF ‘USE’ IN PASSPORT AND VISA OFFENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before section 1541 the following:

‘SEC. 1540. DEFINITION OF ‘USE’ AND ‘USES’.

“In this chapter, the terms ‘use’ and ‘uses’ shall be given their plain meaning, which shall include use for identification purposes.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 1541 the following:

“1540. Definition of ‘use’ and ‘uses’.”.

SEC. 5110. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS.

Section 504 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1979 (22 U.S.C. 2656d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS RELATED TO SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide grants or enter into cooperative agreements for science and technology fellowship programs of the Department of State.

“(2) RECRUITMENT; STIPENDS.—Assistance authorized under paragraph (1) may be used—

“(A) to recruit fellows; and

“(B) to pay stipends, travel, and other appropriate expenses to fellows.

“(3) CLASSIFICATION OF STIPENDS.—Stipends paid under paragraph (2)(B) shall not be considered compensation for purposes of section 209 of title 18, United States Code.

“(4) LIMITATION.—The total amount of assistance provided under this subsection may not exceed \$500,000 in any fiscal year.”.

SEC. 5111. NAME CHANGES.

(a) PUBLIC LAW 87-195.—Section 607(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2357(d)) is amended by striking “Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs” and inserting “Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science”.

(b) PUBLIC LAW 88-206.—Section 617(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7671p(a)) is amended by striking “Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs” and inserting “Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science”.

(c) PUBLIC LAW 93-126.—Section 9(a) of the Department of State Appropriations Authorization Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2655a) is amended—

(1) by striking “Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs” and inserting “Bureau of Oceans, Environment, and Science”; and

(2) by striking “Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs” and inserting “Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science”.

(d) PUBLIC LAW 106-113.—Section 1112(a) of the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (22 U.S.C. 2652c(a))

is amended by striking “Verification and Compliance.” and inserting “Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance (referred to in this section as the ‘Assistant Secretary’).”.

SEC. 5112. ANTI-PIRACY INFORMATION SHARING.

The Secretary is authorized to provide for the participation of the United States in the Information Sharing Centre located in Singapore, as established by the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery Against Ships in Asia, done at Singapore November 11, 2004.

SEC. 5113. REPORT REFORM.

(a) HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT.—Section 549 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347h) is repealed.

(b) ROUGH DIAMONDS ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 12 of the Clean Diamond Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 3911) is amended to read as follows:

‘SEC. 12. REPORTS.

“For each country that, during the preceding 12-month period, exported rough diamonds to the United States, the exportation of which was not controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, and if the failure to do so has significantly increased the likelihood that those diamonds not so controlled are being imported into the United States, the President shall submit a semi-annual report to Congress that explains what actions have been taken by the United States or such country since the previous report to ensure that diamonds, the exportation of which was not controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, are not being imported from that country into the United States. A country shall be included in the report required under this section until the country is controlling the importation and exportation of rough diamonds through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme.”.

SEC. 5114. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES ALLIANCE WITH JAPAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the alliance between the United States and Japan is a cornerstone of peace, security, and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and around the world;

(2) Prime Minister Shiuzo Abe’s visit to the United States in April 2015 and historic address to a Joint Session of Congress symbolized the strength and importance of ties between the United States and Japan;

(3) in 2015, which marks 70 years since the end of World War II, the United States and Japan continue to strengthen the alliance and work together to ensure a peaceful and prosperous future for the Asia-Pacific region and the world;

(4) the Governments and people of the United States and Japan share values, interests, and capabilities that have helped to build a strong rules-based international order, based on a commitment to rules, norms and institutions;

(5) the revised Guidelines for United States-Japan Defense Cooperation and Japan’s policy of “Proactive Contribution to Peace” will reinforce deterrence, update the roles and missions of the United States and Japan, enable Japan to expand its contributions to regional and global security, and allow the United States Government and the Government of Japan to enhance cooperation on security issues in the region and beyond;

(6) the United States remain resolute in its commitments under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security to respond to any armed attack in the territories under the administration of Japan;

(7) although the United States Government does not take a position on the ultimate sov-

ereignty of the Senkaku Islands, the United States Government acknowledges that they are under the administration of Japan and opposes any unilateral actions that would seek to undermine such administration;

(8) the United States Government reaffirms that the unilateral actions of a third party will not affect the United States acknowledgment of the administration of Japan over the Senkaku Islands;

(9) the United States Government and the Government of Japan continue to work together on common security interests, including to confront the threat posed by the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea;

(10) the United States Government and the Government of Japan remain committed to ensuring maritime security and respect for international law, including freedom of navigation and overflight; and

(11) the United States Government and the Government of Japan continue to oppose the use of coercion, intimidation, or force to change the status quo, including in the East and South China Seas.

SEC. 5115. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DEFENSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States has an upgraded, strategic-plus relationship with India based on regional cooperation, space science cooperation, and defense cooperation.

(2) The defense relationship between the United States and the Republic of India is strengthened by the common commitment of both countries to democracy.

(3) The United States and the Republic of India share a common and long-standing commitment to civilian control of the military.

(4) The United States and the Republic of India have increasingly worked together on defense cooperation across a range of activities, exercises, initiatives, and research.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue to expand defense cooperation with the Republic of India;

(2) welcome the role of the Republic of India in providing security and stability in the Indo-Pacific region and beyond;

(3) work cooperatively with the Republic of India on matters relating to our common defense;

(4) vigorously support the implementation of the United States-India Defense Framework Agreement; and

(5) support the India Defense Trade and Technology Initiative.

SEC. 5116. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES ALLIANCE WITH THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea has served as an anchor for stability, security, and prosperity on the Korean Peninsula, in the Asia-Pacific region, and around the world;

(2) the United States and the Republic of Korea continue to strengthen and adapt the bilateral, regional, and global scope of the comprehensive strategic alliance between the 2 nations, to serve as a linchpin of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, recognizing the shared values of democracy, human rights, free and open markets, and the rule of law, as reaffirmed in the May 2013 “Joint Declaration in Commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States of America”;

(3) the United States and the Republic of Korea continue to broaden and deepen the alliance by strengthening the combined defense posture on the Korean Peninsula, enhancing mutual security based on the Republic of Korea-United States Mutual Defense Treaty, and promoting cooperation for regional and global security in the 21st century;

(4) the United States and the Republic of Korea share deep concerns that the nuclear, cyber, and ballistic missiles programs of North Korea and its repeated provocations pose grave threats to peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia and recognize that both nations are determined to achieve the peaceful denuclearization of North Korea and remain fully committed to continuing close cooperation on the full range of issues related to North Korea;

(5) the United States and the Republic of Korea are particularly concerned that the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of North Korea, including North Korean efforts to miniaturize their nuclear technology and improve the mobility of their ballistic missiles, have gathered significant momentum and are poised to expand in the coming years;

(6) the Republic of Korea has made progress in enhancing future warfighting and interoperability capabilities by taking steps toward procuring Patriot Advanced Capability missiles, F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Aircraft, and RQ-4 Global Hawk Surveillance Aircraft;

(7) the United States supports the vision of a Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons, free from the fear of war, and peacefully reunited on the basis of democratic and free market principles, as articulated in President Park's address in Dresden, Germany; and

(8) the United States and the Republic of Korea share the future interests of both nations in securing peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia.

SEC. 5117. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States policy toward Taiwan is based upon the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96-8), which was enacted in 1979, and the Six Assurances given by President Ronald Reagan in 1982;

(2) provision of defensive weapons to Taiwan should continue as mandated in the Taiwan Relations Act; and

(3) enhanced trade relations with Taiwan should be pursued to mutually benefit the citizens of both countries.

SEC. 5118. REPORT ON POLITICAL FREEDOM IN VENEZUELA.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an assessment of the support provided by the United States to the people of Venezuela in their aspiration to live under conditions of peace and representative democracy (as defined by the Inter-American Democratic Charter of the Organization of American States, done at Lima September 11, 2001);

(2) an assessment of work carried out by the United States, in cooperation with the other member states of the Organization of American States and countries of the European Union, to ensure—

(A) the peaceful resolution of the current political situation in Venezuela; and

(B) the immediate cessation of violence against antigovernment protestors;

(3) a list of the government and security officials in Venezuela who—

(A) are responsible for, or complicit in, the use of force in relation to antigovernment protests and similar acts of violence; and

(B) have had their financial assets in the United States frozen or been placed on a visa ban by the United States; and

(4) an assessment of United States support for the development of democratic political processes and independent civil society in Venezuela.

SEC. 5119. STRATEGY FOR THE MIDDLE EAST IN THE EVENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN.

(a) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of State shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, other members of the National Security Council, and the heads of other appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government, develop a strategy for the United States for the Middle East in the event of a comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy shall include the following:

(1) Efforts to counter Iranian-sponsored terrorism in Middle East region.

(2) Efforts to reassure United States allies and partners in Middle East.

(3) Efforts to address the potential for a conventional or nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

(c) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 60 days after entering into a comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran, the Secretary shall submit the strategy developed under subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5120. DEPARTMENT OF STATE INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE POLICY STRATEGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall produce a comprehensive strategy, with a classified annex if necessary, relating to United States international policy with regard to cyberspace.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy required in subsection (a) shall include:

(1) A review of actions and activities undertaken by the Secretary of State to date to support the goal of the President's International Strategy for Cyberspace, released in May 2011, to “work internationally to promote an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable information and communications infrastructure that supports international trade and commerce, strengthens international security, and fosters free expression and innovation”;

(2) A plan of action to guide the Secretary's diplomacy with regard to nation-states, including conducting bilateral and multilateral activities to develop the norms of responsible international behavior in cyberspace, and status review of existing discussions in multilateral fora to obtain agreements on international norms in cyberspace.

(3) A review of the alternative concepts with regard to international norms in cyberspace offered by other prominent nation-state actors, including China, Russia, Brazil, and India.

(4) A detailed description of threats to United States national security in cyber-

space from other nation-states, state-sponsored actors and private actors, to United States Federal and private sector infrastructure, United States intellectual property, and the privacy of United States citizens.

(5) A review of policy tools available to the President of United States to deter nation-states, state-sponsored actors, and private actors, including, but not limited to, those outlined in Executive Order 13694, released on April 1, 2015.

(6) A review of resources required by the Secretary, including the Office of the Coordinator for Cyber Issues, to conduct activities to build responsible norms of international cyber behavior.

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall consult, as appropriate, with other United States Government agencies, the United States private sector, and United States non-governmental organizations with recognized credentials and expertise in foreign policy, national security, and cybersecurity.

(d) **RELEASE.**—The Secretary shall publicly release the strategy required in subsection (a) and brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives upon its release, including on the classified annex, should the strategy include such an annex.

SEC. 5121. WAIVER OF FEES FOR RENEWAL OF IMMIGRANT VISA FOR ADOPTED CHILD IN CERTAIN SITUATIONS.

Section 221(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **PERIOD OF VALIDITY; RENEWAL OR REPLACEMENT.**—

“(1) **IMMIGRANT VISAS.**—An immigrant visa shall be valid for such period, not exceeding 6 months, as shall be by regulations prescribed, except that any visa issued to a child lawfully adopted by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business, shall be valid until such time, for a period not to exceed 3 years, as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his service, employment, or business.

“(2) **NONIMMIGRANT VISAS.**—A non-immigrant visa shall be valid for such periods as shall be prescribed by regulations. In prescribing the period of validity of a non-immigrant visa in the case of nationals of any foreign country who are eligible for such visas, the Secretary of State shall, insofar as practicable, accord to such nationals the same treatment upon a reciprocal basis as such foreign country accords to nationals of the United States who are within a similar class, except that in the case of aliens who are nationals of a foreign country and who either are granted refugee status and firmly resettled in another foreign country or are granted permanent residence and residing in another foreign country, the Secretary of State may prescribe the period of validity of such a visa based upon the treatment granted by that other foreign country to alien refugees and permanent residents, respectively, in the United States.

“(3) **VISA REPLACEMENT.**—An immigrant visa may be replaced under the original number during the fiscal year in which the original visa was issued for an immigrant who establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer that the immigrant—

“(A) was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity because of reasons beyond his control and for which he was not responsible;

“(B) is found by a consular officer to be eligible for an immigrant visa; and

“(C) pays again the statutory fees for an application and an immigrant visa.

“(4) FEE WAIVER.—If an immigrant visa was issued, on or after March 27, 2013, for a child who has been lawfully adopted, or who is coming to the United States to be adopted, by a United States citizen, any statutory immigrant visa fees relating to a renewal or replacement of such visa may be waived or, if already paid, may be refunded upon request, subject to such criteria as the Secretary of State may prescribe, if—

“(A) the immigrant child was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity as a direct result of extraordinary circumstances, including the denial of an exit permit; and

“(B) if such inability was attributable to factors beyond the control of the adopting parent or parents and of the immigrant.”.

SEC. 5122. AMERICAN HOSTAGES IN IRAN COMPENSATION FUND.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that ensuring justice for United States victims of acts of terrorism by Iran who hold legal judgments against Iran relating to such acts is of paramount importance and should be expeditiously addressed.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the “American Hostages in Iran Compensation Fund” (in this section referred to as the “Fund”) for the purposes of—

(1) making payments to the Americans held hostage in Iran and their spouses who are identified as members of the proposed class in case number 1:00-CV-03110 (EGS) of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; and

(2) satisfying claims against Iran relating to the taking of hostages and treatment of personnel of the United States embassy in Tehran, Iran, between November 3, 1979, and January 20, 1981.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) IMPOSITION OF SURCHARGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is imposed a surcharge equal to 30 percent of the amount of—

(i) any fine or monetary penalty imposed, in whole or in part, for a violation of a law or regulation specified in subparagraph (B) committed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(ii) the monetary amount of a settlement entered into by a person with respect to a suspected violation of a law or regulation specified in subparagraph (B) related to activities undertaken on or after such date of enactment.

(B) LAWS AND REGULATIONS SPECIFIED.—A law or regulation specified in this subparagraph is any law or regulation that provides for a civil or criminal fine or monetary penalty for any economic activity relating to Iran that is administered by the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, or the Department of Energy.

(C) TERMINATION OF DEPOSITS.—The imposition of the surcharge under subparagraph (A) shall terminate on the date on which all amounts described in subsection (d)(2) have been distributed to all recipients described in that subsection.

(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require a person that is found to have violated a law or regulation specified in subparagraph (B) to pay a surcharge under subparagraph (A) if that person has not been assessed a fine or monetary penalty described in clause (i) of subparagraph (A) or entered into a settle-

ment described in clause (ii) of that subparagraph for that violation.

(2) DEPOSITS INTO FUND; AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—

(A) DEPOSITS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit in the Fund all surcharges collected pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), all contributions collected pursuant to paragraph (3), and any other funds made available pursuant to paragraph (4).

(B) PAYMENT OF SURCHARGE TO SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—A person upon which a surcharge is imposed under paragraph (1)(A) shall pay the surcharge to the Secretary without regard to whether the fine or penalty with respect to which the surcharge is imposed—

(i) is paid directly to the Federal agency that administers the law or regulation pursuant to which the fine or penalty is imposed; or

(ii) is deemed satisfied by a payment to another Federal agency.

(C) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS IN FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available, without further appropriation, to make payments under subsection (d).

(3) CONTRIBUTIONS.—The President may accept such amounts as may be contributed by individuals, business concerns, governments, or other entities for payments under this section and deposit such amounts into the Fund.

(4) OTHER RESOURCES.—The President may identify and use other funds available for compensating claims under this section and deposit such amounts into the Fund.

(d) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATION OF FUND.—Payments from the Fund shall be administered by the Secretary of State in accordance with such rules and procedures as the Secretary may prescribe.

(2) PAYMENTS.—Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), payments shall be made from the Fund to the following recipients in the following amounts:

(A) To each living former hostage identified as a member of the proposed class described in subsection (b)(1), \$6,750 for each day of captivity of the former hostage.

(B) To the estate of each deceased former hostage identified as a member of the proposed class described in subsection (b)(1), \$6,750 for each day of captivity of the former hostage.

(C) To each spouse of a former hostage identified as a member of the proposed class described in subsection (b)(1) if the spouse is identified as a member of that proposed class, \$600,000.

(3) PRIORITY.—Payments from the Fund shall be distributed under paragraph (2) in the following order:

(A) First, to each living former hostage described in paragraph (2)(A).

(B) Second, to the estate of each deceased former hostage described in paragraph (2)(B).

(C) Third, to each spouse of a former hostage described in paragraph (2)(C).

(4) CONSENT OF RECIPIENT.—A payment to a recipient from the Fund under paragraph (2) shall be made only after receiving the consent of the recipient.

(e) PRECLUSION OF FUTURE ACTIONS AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS.—

(1) PRECLUSION OF FUTURE ACTIONS.—A recipient of a payment under subsection (d) may not file or maintain an action against Iran in any Federal or State court for any claim relating to the events described in subsection (b)(2).

(2) RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS.—Upon the payment of all amounts described in subsection

(d)(2) to all recipients described in that subsection, all claims against Iran relating to the events described in subsection (b)(2) shall be deemed waived and forever released.

(f) DEPOSIT OF REMAINING FUNDS INTO THE TREASURY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any amounts remaining in the Fund after the date specified in paragraph (2) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(2) DATE SPECIFIED.—The date specified in this paragraph is the later of—

(A) the date on which all amounts described in subsection (d)(2) have been made to all recipients described in that subsection; or

(B) the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) NO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Decisions made under this section shall not be subject to review in any judicial, administrative, or other proceeding.

(h) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON COMPLETION OF PAYMENTS.—Not later than 60 days after determining that a law or regulation specified in subsection (c)(1)(B) is terminated or suspended or that amounts in the Fund will be insufficient for the payment of all amounts described in subsection (d)(2) to all recipients described in that subsection by the date that is 444 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress recommendations to expedite the completion of the payment of those amounts.

SEC. 5123. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ANTI-ISRAEL AND ANTI-SEMITIC INCITEMENT WITHIN THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that the 1995 Interim Agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, commonly referred to as Oslo II, specifically details that Israel and the Palestinian Authority shall “abstain from incitement, including hostile propaganda, against each other and, without derogating from the principle of freedom of expression, shall take legal measures to prevent such incitement by any organizations, groups or individuals within their jurisdiction”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) expresses support and admiration for individuals and organizations working to encourage cooperation between Israeli Jews and Palestinians, including—

(A) Professor Mohammed Dajani Daoudi, who took students from al-Quds University in Jerusalem to visit Auschwitz in March 2014 only to return to death threats by fellow Palestinians and expulsion from his teacher's union;

(B) the Israel Palestine Center for Research and Information, the only joint Israeli-Palestinian public policy think-tank,

(C) United Hatzalah, a nonprofit, fully volunteer Emergency Medical Services organization that, mobilizing volunteers who are religious or secular Jews, Arabs, Muslims, and Christians, provides EMS services to all people in Israel regardless of race, religion, or national origin; and

(D) Breaking the Impasse, an apolitical initiative of Palestinian and Israeli business and civil society leaders who advocate for a two-state solution and an urgent diplomatic solution to the conflict;

(2) reiterates strong condemnation of anti-Israel and anti-Semitic incitement in the Palestinian Authority as antithetical to the stated desire to achieve a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace settlement; and

(3) urges President Abbas and Palestinian Authority officials to discontinue all official incitement that runs contrary to the determination to put an end to decades of confrontation.

SEC. 5124. SUPPORT FOR THE SOVEREIGNTY, INDEPENDENCE, TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY, AND INVIOABILITY OF POST-SOVIET COUNTRIES IN LIGHT OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION AND INTERFERENCE.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress—

- (1) supports the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and inviolability of post-Soviet countries within their internationally recognized borders;

- (2) expresses deep concern over increasingly aggressive actions by the Russian Federation;

- (3) is committed to providing sufficient funding for the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs of the Department of State to address subversive and destabilizing activities by the Russian Federation within post-Soviet countries;

- (4) supports robust engagement between the United States and post-Soviet countries through—

- (A) the promotion of strengthened people-to-people ties, including through educational and cultural exchange programs;

- (B) anticorruption assistance;

- (C) public diplomacy;

- (D) economic diplomacy; and

- (E) other democratic reform efforts;

- (5) encourages the President to further enhance nondefense cooperation and diplomatic engagement with post-Soviet countries;

- (6) condemns the subversive and destabilizing activities undertaken by the Russian Federation within post-Soviet countries;

- (7) encourages enhanced cooperation between the United States and the European Union to promote greater Euro-Atlantic integration, including through—

- (A) the enlargement of the European Union; and

- (B) the Open Door policy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

- (8) urges continued cooperation between the United States and the European Union to maintain sanctions against the Russian Federation until the Government of Russia has—

- (A) fully implemented all provisions of the Minsk agreements, done at Minsk September 5, 2014 and February 12, 2015; and

- (B) demonstrated respect for the territorial sovereignty of Ukraine;

- (9) calls on the member states of the European Union to extend the current sanctions regime against the Russian Federation; and

- (10) urges the consideration of additional sanctions if the Russian Federation continue to engage in subversive and destabilizing activities within post-Soviet countries.

SEC. 5125. RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA REPORT.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

- (1) the Russian Federation is waging a propaganda war against the United States and our allies; and

- (2) a successful strategy must be implemented to counter the threat posed by Russian propaganda.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually for the following 3 years, the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal officials, shall submit an unclassified report, with a classified annex, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that contains a detailed analysis of—

- (1) the recent use of propaganda by the Government of Russia, including—

- (A) the forms of propaganda used, including types of media and programming;

- (B) the principal countries and regions targeted by Russian propaganda; and

- (C) the impact of Russian propaganda on such targets;

- (2) the response by United States allies, particularly European allies, to counter the threat of Russian propaganda;

- (3) the response by the United States to the threat of Russian propaganda;

- (4) the extent of the effectiveness of programs currently in use to counter Russian propaganda;

- (5) a strategy for improving the effectiveness of such programs;

- (6) any additional authority needed to counter the threat of Russian propaganda; and

- (7) the additional funding needed to successfully implement the strategy referred to in paragraph (5).

SEC. 5126. APPROVAL OF EXPORT LICENCES AND LETTERS OF REQUEST TO ASSIST THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) EXPORT LICENSE APPLICATIONS.—

(A) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all export license applications, including requests for marketing licenses, for the sale of defense articles and defense services to Ukraine.

(B) CONTENTS.—The list submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

- (i) the date on which the application or request was first submitted;

- (ii) the current status of each application or request; and

- (iii) the estimated timeline for adjudication of such applications or requests.

(C) PRIORITY.—The Secretary should give priority to processing the applications and requests included on the list submitted under subparagraph (A).

(2) LETTERS OF REQUEST.—The Secretary shall submit to the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all pending Letters of Request for Foreign Military Sales to Ukraine, including—

- (A) the date on which each such letter was first submitted;

- (B) the current status of each such letter; and

- (C) the estimated timeline for the adjudication of each such letter.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until the date set forth in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall submit a report to the specified congressional committees that describes the status of the applications, requests for marketing licenses, and Letters of Request described in subsection (a).

(2) TERMINATION DATE.—The date set forth in this paragraph is the earlier of—

- (A) the date on which the President certifies to Congress that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Government of Ukraine has been restored; or

- (B) the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “specified congressional committees” means—

- (1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

- (2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

- (3) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

- (4) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Additional Matters

SEC. 5131. ATROCITIES PREVENTION BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President is authorized to establish, within the Executive Office of the President, an Interagency Atrocities Prevention Board (referred to in this section as the “Board”).

(b) DUTIES.—The Board is authorized—

- (1) to coordinate an interagency approach to preventing mass atrocities;

- (2) to propose policies to integrate the early warning systems of national security agencies, including intelligence agencies, with respect to incidents of mass atrocities and to coordinate the policy response to such incidents;

- (3) to identify relevant Federal agencies, which shall track and report on Federal funding spent on atrocity prevention efforts;

- (4) to oversee the development and implementation of comprehensive atrocities prevention and response strategies;

- (5) to identify available resources and policy options necessary to prevent the emergence or escalation of mass atrocities;

- (6) to identify and propose policies to close gaps in expertise, readiness, and planning for atrocities prevention and early action across Federal agencies, including training for employees at relevant Federal agencies;

- (7) to engage relevant civil society and nongovernmental organization stakeholders in regular consultations to solicit current information on countries of concern; and

- (8) to conduct an atrocity-specific expert review of policy and programming of all countries at risk for mass atrocities.

(c) LEADERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be headed by a Senior Director, who—

- (A) shall be appointed by the President; and

- (B) shall report to the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Senior Director is authorized to have primary responsibility for—

- (A) recommending and, if adopted, promoting United States Government policies on preventing mass atrocities; and

- (B) carrying out the duties described in subsection (b).

(d) COMPOSITION.—The Board shall be composed of—

- (1) representatives from—

- (A) the Department of State;

- (B) the United States Agency for International Development;

- (C) the Department of Defense;

- (D) the Department of Justice;

- (E) the Department of the Treasury;

- (F) the Department of Homeland Security;

- (G) the Central Intelligence Agency;

- (H) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence;

- (I) the United States Mission to the United Nations; and

- (J) the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

- (2) such other individuals as the President may appoint.

(e) COORDINATION.—The Board is authorized to coordinate with relevant officials and government agencies responsible for foreign policy with respect to particular regions and countries to help provide a cohesive, whole of government response and policy direction to emerging and ongoing atrocities.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a classified report, with an unclassified annex, which shall include—

(1) an update on the interagency review mandated by Presidential Study Directive 10 that includes—

(A) an evaluation of current mechanisms and capacities for government-wide detection, early warning, information-sharing, contingency planning, and coordination of efforts to prevent and respond to situations of genocide, mass atrocities, and other mass violence, including such mass gender- and ethnicity-based violence;

(B) an assessment of the funding spent by relevant Federal agencies on atrocity prevention activities;

(C) current annual global assessments of sources of conflict and instability;

(D) recommendations to further strengthen United States capabilities to improve the mechanisms described in subparagraph (A); and

(E) evaluations of the various approaches to enhancing capabilities and improving the mechanisms described in subparagraph (A);

(2) recommendations to ensure burden sharing by—

(A) improving international cooperation and coordination to enhance multilateral mechanisms for preventing genocide and atrocities, including improving the role of regional and international organizations in conflict prevention, mitigation, and response; and

(B) strengthening regional organizations; and

(3) the implementation status of the recommendations contained in the interagency review described in paragraph (1).

(g) **MATERIALS AND BRIEFINGS.**—The Senior Director and the members of the Board shall brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives at least annually.

(h) **SUNSET.**—This section shall cease to be effective on June 30, 2017.

SEC. 5132. UNITED STATES ENGAGEMENT IN THE INDO-PACIFIC.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a comprehensive assessment to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States engagement in the Indo-Pacific, including with partners across the Indo-Pacific region.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a review of current and emerging United States diplomatic, national security, and economic interests and trends in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) a review of resources devoted to United States diplomatic, economic, trade, development, and cultural engagement and plans in the Indo-Pacific region during the 10-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(3) options for the realignment of United States engagement in the Indo-Pacific region to respond to new opportunities and challenges, including linking United States strategy more broadly across the Indo-Pacific region; and

(4) the views of noted policy leaders and regional experts, including leaders and experts in the Indo-Pacific region, on the opportunities and challenges to United States engagement across the Indo-Pacific region.

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary, as appropriate, shall consult with—

(1) other United States Government agencies; and

(2) independent, nongovernmental organizations with recognized credentials and expertise in foreign policy, national security, and international economic affairs that have access to policy experts throughout the United States and from the Indo-Pacific region.

SEC. 5133. JOINT ACTION PLAN TO COMBAT PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION AND TO FOSTER INCLUSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to enter into a bilateral joint action plan with the European Union to combat prejudice and discrimination and to foster inclusion (referred to in this section as the “Joint Action Plan”).

(b) **CONTENTS OF JOINT ACTION PLAN.**—The Joint Action Plan shall—

(1) address anti-Semitism;

(2) address prejudice against, and the discriminatory treatment of, racial, ethnic, and religious minorities;

(3) promote equality of opportunity for access to quality education and economic opportunities; and

(4) promote equal treatment by the justice system.

(c) **COOPERATION.**—In developing the Joint Action Plan, the Secretary shall—

(1) leverage interagency policy expertise in the United States and Europe;

(2) develop partnerships among civil society and private sector stakeholders; and

(3) draw upon the extensive work done by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe to address anti-Semitism.

(d) **INITIATIVES.**—The Joint Action Plan may include initiatives for promoting equality of opportunity and methods of eliminating prejudice and discrimination based on religion, race, or ethnicity, including—

(1) training programs;

(2) regional initiatives to promote equality of opportunity through the strengthening of democratic institutions;

(3) public-private partnerships with enterprises and nongovernmental organizations;

(4) exchanges of technical experts;

(5) scholarships and fellowships; and

(6) political empowerment and leadership initiatives.

(e) **DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall task an existing Deputy Assistant Secretary with the responsibility for coordinating the implementation of the Joint Action Plan with his or her European Union counterpart.

(f) **LEGAL EFFECTS.**—Any Joint Action Plan adopted under this section—

(1) shall not be legally binding; and

(2) shall create no rights or obligations under international or United States law.

(g) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize—

(1) the Secretary to enter into a legally binding agreement or Joint Action Plan with the European Union; or

(2) any additional appropriations for the purposes and initiatives described in this section.

(h) **PROGRESS REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a progress report on the development of the Joint Action Plan to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5134. REPORT ON DEVELOPING COUNTRY DEBT SUSTAINABILITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Treasury, shall submit a report

containing an assessment of the current external debt environment for developing countries and identifying particular near-term risks to debt sustainability to—

(1) the appropriate congressional committees;

(2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall assess—

(1) the impact of new lending relationships, including the role of new creditors;

(2) the adequacy of current multilateral surveillance mechanisms in guarding against debt distress in developing countries;

(3) the ability of developing countries to borrow on global capital markets; and

(4) the interaction between debt sustainability objectives of the developing world and the development-oriented investment agenda of the G-20, including the impact of—

(A) current debt sustainability objectives on investment in developing countries; and

(B) investment objectives proposed by the G-20 on the ability to meet the goals of—

(i) the Heavily Indebted Poor Country Initiative; and

(ii) the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative.

SEC. 5135. UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO PREVENT AND RESPOND TO GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE GLOBALLY.

(a) **GLOBAL STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter for 6 years, the Secretary of State shall develop or update a United States global strategy to prevent and respond to violence against women and girls. The strategy shall be transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees and made publicly available on the Internet.

(b) **INITIAL STRATEGY.**—For the purposes of this section, the “United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally”, issued in August 2012, shall be deemed to fulfill the initial requirement of subsection (a).

(c) **COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION.**—In developing the strategy under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall consult with—

(1) the heads of relevant Federal agencies;

(2) the Senior Policy Operating Group on Trafficking in Persons; and

(3) representatives of civil society and multilateral organizations with demonstrated experience in addressing violence against women and girls or promoting gender equality internationally.

(d) **PRIORITY COUNTRY SELECTION.**—To further the objectives of the strategy described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall identify no less than 4 eligible low-income and lower-middle income countries with significant levels of violence against women and girls, including within displaced communities, that have the governmental or nongovernmental organizational capacity to manage and implement gender-based violence prevention and response program activities and should, when possible, be geographically, ethnically, and culturally diverse from one another.

(e) **COUNTRY PLANS.**—In each country identified under subsection (d) the Secretary shall develop comprehensive, multisectoral, and holistic individual country plans designed to address and respond to violence against women and girls that include—

(1) an assessment and description of the current or potential capacity of the government of each identified country and civil society organizations in each such identified

country to address and respond to violence against women and girls;

(2) an identification of coordination mechanisms with Federal agencies that—

(A) have existing programs relevant to the strategy;

(B) will be involved in new program activities; and

(C) are engaged in broader United States strategies around development;

(3) a description of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms established for each identified country, and their intended use in assessing overall progress in prevention and response;

(4) a projection of the general levels of resources needed to achieve the stated objectives in each identified country, including an accounting of—

(A) activities and funding already expended by the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, other Federal agencies, donor country governments, and multilateral institutions; and

(B) leveraged private sector resources; and

(5) strategies, as appropriate, designed to accommodate the needs of stateless, disabled, internally displaced, refugee, or religious or ethnic minority women and girls.

(f) **REPORT ON PRIORITY COUNTRY SELECTION AND COUNTRY PLANS.**—Not more than 90 days after selection of the priority countries required under subsection (d), and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the priority country selection process, the development of specific country plans, and include an overview of all programming and specific activities being undertaken, the budget resources requested, and the specific activities to be supported by each Executive agency under the strategy if such resources are provided.

(g) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize any additional appropriations for the purposes and initiatives of this section.

SEC. 5136. INTERNATIONAL CORRUPTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than June 1 of each year, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this section as the “USAID Administrator”), the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of appropriate intelligence agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a Country Report on Corruption Practices, with a classified annex, which shall include information about countries for which a corruption analysis was conducted under subsection (b).

(b) **CORRUPTION ANALYSIS ELEMENTS.**—The corruption analysis conducted under this subsection should include, among other elements—

(1) an analysis of individuals and associations that comprise corruption networks in the country, including, as applicable—

(A) government officials;

(B) private sector actors;

(C) criminals; and

(D) members of illegal armed groups;

(2) the identification of the state functions that have been captured by corrupt networks in the country, including, as applicable functions of—

(A) the judicial branch;

(B) the taxing authority;

(C) the central bank; and

(D) specific military or police units;

(3) the identification of—

(A) the key economic activities, whether licit or illicit, which are dominated by members of the corrupt network; and

(B) other revenue streams that enrich such members; and

(4) the identification of enablers of corrupt practices, within the country and outside the country.

(c) **PUBLICATION AND BRIEFINGS.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) publish the Country Report on Corruption and Accountability submitted under subsection (a) on the website of the Department; and

(2) brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on the information contained in the report published under paragraph (1).

SEC. 5137. QUADRENNIAL DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW.

(a) **REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **QUADRENNIAL REVIEWS REQUIRED.**—Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of State shall every 4 years, during a year following a year evenly divisible by 4, conduct a review of United States diplomacy and development (to be known as a “quadrennial diplomacy and development review”).

(2) **SCOPE OF REVIEWS.**—Each quadrennial diplomacy and development review shall be a comprehensive examination of the national diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework of the United States for the next 4-year period until a subsequent review is due under paragraph (1). The review shall include—

(A) recommendations regarding the long-term diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework of the United States;

(B) priorities of the United States for diplomacy and development; and

(C) guidance on the related programs, assets, capabilities, budget, policies, and authorities of the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development.

(3) **CONSULTATION.**—In conducting each quadrennial diplomacy and development review, after consultation with Department of State and United States Agency for International Development officials, the Secretary of State should consult with—

(A) the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, including the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the Director of National Intelligence;

(B) any other Federal agency that provides foreign assistance, including at a minimum the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and, as appropriate, other members of Congress; and

(D) other relevant governmental and non-governmental entities, including private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts.

(b) **CONTENTS OF REVIEW.**—Each quadrennial diplomacy and development review shall—

(1) delineate, as appropriate, the national diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework of the United States, con-

sistent with appropriate national, Department of State, and United States Agency for International Development strategies, strategic plans, and relevant presidential directives, including the national security strategy prescribed pursuant to section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404a);

(2) outline and prioritize the full range of critical national diplomacy and development areas, capabilities, and resources, including those implemented across agencies, and address the full range of challenges confronting the United States in this regard;

(3) describe the interagency cooperation, and preparedness of relevant Federal assets, and the infrastructure, budget plan, and other elements of the diplomacy and development policies and programs of the United States required to execute successfully the full range of mission priorities outlined under paragraph (2);

(4) describe the roles of international organizations and multilateral institutions in advancing United States diplomatic and development objectives, including the mechanisms for coordinating and harmonizing development policies and programs with partner countries and among donors;

(5) identify the budget plan required to provide sufficient resources to successfully execute the full range of mission priorities outlined under paragraph (2);

(6) include an assessment of the organizational alignment of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development with the national diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework referred to in paragraph (1) and the diplomacy and development mission priorities outlined under paragraph (2);

(7) review and assess the effectiveness of the management mechanisms of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development for executing the strategic priorities outlined in the quadrennial diplomacy and development review, including the extent to which such effectiveness has been enhanced since the previous report; and

(8) the relationship between the requirements of the quadrennial diplomacy and development review and the acquisition strategy and expenditure plan within the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development.

(c) **FOREIGN AFFAIRS POLICY BOARD REVIEW.**—The Secretary of State should apprise the Foreign Affairs Policy Board on an ongoing basis of the work undertaken in the conduct of the quadrennial diplomacy and development review.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize any additional appropriations for the purposes and initiatives under this section.

SEC. 5138. DISAPPEARED PERSONS IN MEXICO, GUATEMALA, HONDURAS, AND EL SALVADOR.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States—

(A) values governance, security, and the rule of law in Mexico and Central America; and

(B) has reemphasized its commitment to this region following the humanitarian crisis of unaccompanied children from these countries across the international border between the United States and Mexico in 2014.

(2) Individuals migrating from Central America to the United States face great peril during their journey. Many go missing along the way and are often never heard from again.

(b) **REPORT OF DISAPPEARED PERSONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary, in close consultation with the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that includes—

(1) the number of cases of enforced disappearances in Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador;

(2) an assessment of causes for the disappearances described in paragraph (1);

(3) the primary individuals and groups responsible for such disappearances; and

(4) the official government response in those countries to account for such disappeared persons.

SEC. 5139. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF BAHRAIN OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE BAHRAIN INDEPENDENT COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an unclassified report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the implementation by the Government of Bahrain of the recommendations contained in the 2011 Report of the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (referred to in this section as the “Bahrain Report”).

(b) **CONTENT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the specific steps taken by the Government of Bahrain to implement each of the 26 recommendations contained in the Bahrain Report;

(2) an assessment of whether the Government of Bahrain has “fully complied with”, “partially implemented”, or “not meaningfully implemented” each recommendation referred to in paragraph (1); and

(3) an assessment of the impact of the findings in the Bahrain Report for the United States security posture in the Arab Gulf and the area of responsibility of the United States Central Command.

SEC. 5140. REPORT ON UNITED STATES HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO HAITI AND WHETHER RECENT ELECTIONS IN HAITI MEET INTERNATIONAL ELECTION STANDARDS.

(a) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Section 5(a) of the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2022”.

(b) **REPORT.**—Section 5(b) of the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) a determination of whether recent Haitian elections are free, fair and responsive to the people of Haiti; and

“(15) a description of any attempts to disqualify candidates for political officers in Haiti for political reasons.”

SEC. 5141. SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (in this section referred to as the “DPRK”) tested nuclear weapons on 3 separate occasions, in October 2006, in May 2009, and in February 2013.

(2) Nuclear experts have reported that the DPRK may currently have as many as 20 nuclear warheads and has the potential to possess as many as 100 warheads within the next 5 years.

(3) According to the 2014 Department of Defense report, “Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea” (in this subsection referred to as the “2014 DoD report”), the DPRK has proliferated nuclear technology to Libya via the proliferation network of Pakistani scientist A.Q. Khan.

(4) According to the 2014 DoD report, “North Korea also provided Syria with nuclear reactor technology until 2007.”

(5) On September 6, 2007, as part of “Operation Orchard”, the Israeli Air Force destroyed the suspected nuclear facility in Syria.

(6) According to the 2014 DoD report, “North Korea has exported conventional and ballistic missile-related equipment, components, materials, and technical assistance to countries in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.”

(7) On November 29, 1987, DPRK agents planted explosive devices onboard Korean Air flight 858, which killed all 115 passengers and crew on board.

(8) On March 26, 2010, the DPRK fired upon and sank the South Korean warship Cheonan, killing 46 of her crew.

(9) On November 23, 2010, the DPRK shelled South Korea's Yeonpyeong Island, killing 4 South Korean citizens.

(10) On February 7, 2014, the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on human rights in DPRK (in this subsection referred to as the “Commission of Inquiry”) released a report detailing the atrocious human rights record of the DPRK.

(11) Dr. Michael Kirby, Chair of the Commission of Inquiry, stated on March 17, 2014, “The Commission of Inquiry has found systematic, widespread, and grave human rights violations occurring in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It has also found a disturbing array of crimes against humanity. These crimes are committed against inmates of political and other prison camps; against starving populations; against religious believers; against persons who try to flee the country—including those forcibly repatriated by China.”

(12) Dr. Michael Kirby also stated, “These crimes arise from policies established at the highest level of the State. They have been committed, and continue to take place in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, because the policies, institutions, and patterns of impunity that lie at their heart remain in place. The gravity, scale, duration, and nature of the unspeakable atrocities committed in the country reveal a totalitarian State that does not have any parallel in the contemporary world.”

(13) The Commission of Inquiry also notes, “Since 1950, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has engaged in the systematic abduction, denial of repatriation, and subsequent enforced disappearance of persons from other countries on a large scale and as a matter of State policy. Well over 200,000 persons, including children, who were brought from other countries to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea may have become victims of enforced disappearance,” and states that the DPRK has failed to account or address this injustice in any way.

(14) According to reports and analysis from organizations such as the International Network for the Human Rights of North Korean Overseas Labor, the Korea Policy Research Center, NK Watch, the Asian Institute for Policy Studies, the Center for International and Strategic Studies, and the George W. Bush Institute, there may currently be as many as 100,000 North Korean overseas laborers in various nations around the world.

(15) Such forced North Korean laborers are often subjected to harsh working conditions under the direct supervision of DPRK officials, and their salaries contribute to anywhere from \$150,000,000 to \$230,000,000 a year to the DPRK state coffers.

(16) According to the Director of National Intelligence's 2015 Worldwide Threat Assessment, “North Korea's nuclear weapons and missile programs pose a serious threat to the United States and to the security environment in East Asia.”

(17) The Worldwide Threat Assessment states, “North Korea has also expanded the size and sophistication of its ballistic missile forces, ranging from close-range ballistic missiles to ICBMs, while continuing to conduct test launches. In 2014, North Korea launched an unprecedented number of ballistic missiles.”

(18) On December 19, 2015, the Federal Bureau of Investigation declared that the DPRK was responsible for a cyberattack on Sony Pictures conducted on November 24, 2014.

(19) From 1988 to 2008, the DPRK was designated by the United States Government as a state sponsor of terrorism.

(20) The DPRK is currently in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695 (2006), 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), and 2094 (2013).

(21) The DPRK repeatedly violated agreements with the United States and the other so-called Six-Party Talks partners (the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Russian Federation, and the People's Republic of China) designed to halt its nuclear weapons program, while receiving significant concessions, including fuel, oil, and food aid.

(22) The Six-Party Talks have not been held since December 2008.

(23) On May 9, 2015, the DPRK claimed that it has test-fired a ballistic missile from a submarine.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the DPRK represents a serious threat to the national security of the United States and United States allies in East Asia and to international peace and stability, and grossly violates the human rights of its own people;

(2) the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury should impose additional sanctions against the DPRK, including targeting its financial assets around the world, specific designations relating to human rights abuses, and a redesignation of the DPRK as a state sponsor of terror; and

(3) the President should not resume the negotiations with the DPRK, either bilaterally or as part of the Six-Party Talks, without strict preconditions, including that the DPRK—

(A) adhere to its denuclearization commitments outlined in the 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party Talks;

(B) commit to halting its ballistic missile programs and its proliferation activities;

(C) cease military provocations; and

(D) measurably and significantly improve its human rights record.

TITLE II—ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Subtitle A—Organizational Matters

SEC. 5201. RIGHTSIZING ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after receiving rightsizing recommendations pursuant to a review conducted by the Office of Management, Policy, Rightsizing, and Innovation relating to overseas staffing levels at United States overseas posts, the relevant chief of mission, in coordination with the relevant regional bureau, shall submit a response to the Office of Management, Policy, Rightsizing, and Innovation that describes—

- (1) any rightsizing recommendations that are accepted by such chief of mission and regional bureau;
- (2) a detailed schedule for implementation of any such recommendations;
- (3) any recommendations that are rejected; and

(4) a detailed justification providing the basis for the rejection of any such recommendations.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—On the date on which the President's annual budget request is submitted to Congress, the Secretary shall submit an annual report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the status of all rightsizing recommendations and responses described in subsection (a) from the preceding 5 years, including—

- (1) a list of all such rightsizing recommendations made, including whether each such recommendation was accepted or rejected by the relevant chief of mission and regional bureau;

(2) for each accepted recommendation, a detailed description of the current status of its implementation according to the schedule provided pursuant to subsection (a)(2), including an explanation for any departure from, or changes to, such schedule; and

(3) for any rejected recommendations, the justification provided pursuant to subsection (a)(4).

(c) REPORT ON REGIONAL BUREAU STAFFING.—In conjunction with each report required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit a supplemental report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an enumeration of the domestic staff positions in each regional bureau of the Department;

(2) a detailed explanation of the extent to which the staffing of each regional bureau reflects the overseas requirements of the United States within each such region;

(3) a detailed plan, including an implementation schedule, for how the Department will seek to rectify any significant imbalances in staffing among regional bureaus or between any regional bureau and the overseas requirements of the United States within such region if the Secretary determines that such staffing does not reflect—

(A) the foreign policy priorities of the United States; or

(B) the effective conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States; and

(4) a detailed description of the implementation status of any plan provided pursuant to paragraph (3), including an explanation for any departure from, or changes to, the implementation schedule provided with such plan.

SEC. 5202. INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in conjunction with the Under Secretary of Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment, shall establish—

(1) foreign economic policy priorities for each regional bureau, including for individual countries, as appropriate; and

(2) policies and guidance for integrating such foreign economic policy priorities throughout the Department.

(b) DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—Within each regional bureau of the Department, the Secretary shall task an existing Deputy Assistant Secretary with appropriate training and background in economic and commercial affairs with the responsibility for economic matters and interests within the responsibilities of such regional bureau, including the integration of the foreign economic policy priorities established pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) COORDINATION.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary given the responsibility for economic matters and interests pursuant to subsection (b) within each bureau shall—

(1) at the direction of the relevant Assistant Secretary, review and report to the Assistant Secretary of such bureau on all economic matters and interests; and

(2) serve as liaison with the Office of the Under Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment.

SEC. 5203. REVIEW OF BUREAU OF AFRICAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS JURISDICTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct a review of the jurisdictional responsibility of the Bureau of African Affairs and that of the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs relating to the North African countries of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya; and

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(A) the findings of the review conducted under paragraph (1); and

(B) recommendations on whether jurisdictional responsibility among the bureaus referred to in paragraph (1) should be adjusted.

(b) REVIEW.—The review conducted under subsection (a)(1) shall—

(1) identify regional strategic priorities;

(2) assess regional dynamics between the North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa regions, including the degree to which the priorities identified pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) are distinct between each such region; or

(B) have similar application across such regions;

(3) identify current priorities and effectiveness of United States Government regional engagement in North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa, including through security assistance, economic assistance, humanitarian assistance, and trade;

(4) assess the degree to which such engagement is—

(A) inefficient, duplicative, or uncoordinated between the North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa regions; or

(B) otherwise harmed or limited as a result of the current division of jurisdictional responsibilities;

(5) assess the overall coherence and effectiveness of the current division of jurisdictional responsibilities in Africa between the Bureau of African Affairs and the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, including with regard to coordination with other United States departments or agencies; and

(6) assess any opportunities and costs of transferring jurisdictional responsibility of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya from the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs to the Bureau of African Affairs.

SEC. 5204. SPECIAL ENVOYS, REPRESENTATIVES, ADVISORS, AND COORDINATORS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on special envoys, representatives, advisors, and coordinators of the Department, which shall include—

(1) a tabulation of the current names, ranks, positions, and responsibilities of all special envoy, representative, advisor, and coordinator positions at the Department, with a separate accounting of all such positions at the level of Assistant Secretary (or equivalent) or above; and

(2) for each position identified pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) the date on which the position was created;

(B) the mechanism by which the position was created, including the authority under which the position was created;

(C) the positions authorized under section 1(d) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(d));

(D) a description of whether, and the extent to which, the responsibilities assigned to the position duplicate the responsibilities of other current officials within the Department, including other special envoys, representatives, and advisors;

(E) which current official within the Department would be assigned the responsibilities of the position in the absence of the position;

(F) to which current official within the Department the position directly reports;

(G) the total number of staff assigned to support the position; and

(H) with the exception of those created by statute, a detailed explanation of the necessity of the position to the effective conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States.

SEC. 5205. CONFLICT PREVENTION, MITIGATION AND RESOLUTION, AND THE INCLUSION AND PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN.

Section 704 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4024) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) The Secretary, in conjunction with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall ensure that all appropriate personnel, responsible for, or deploying to, countries or regions considered to be at risk of, undergoing, or emerging from violent conflict, including special envoys, members of mediation or negotiation teams, relevant members of the civil service or foreign service, and contractors, obtain training, as appropriate, in the following areas, each of which shall include a focus on women and ensuring women's meaningful inclusion and participation:

“(1) Conflict prevention, mitigation, and resolution.

“(2) Protecting civilians from violence, exploitation, and trafficking in persons.

“(3) International human rights law and international humanitarian law.”.

SEC. 5206. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall regularly consult with the Director of the National Security Agency and any other departments or agencies the Secretary determines to be appropriate regarding the security of United States Government and non-government information technology systems and networks owned, operated, managed, or utilized by the Department, including any such systems or networks facilitating the use of sensitive or classified information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In performing the consultations required under subsection (a), the

Secretary shall make all such systems and networks available to the Director of the National Security Agency and any other such departments or agencies to carry out such tests and procedures as are necessary to ensure adequate policies and protections are in place to prevent penetrations or compromises of such systems and networks, including by malicious intrusions by any unauthorized individual or state actor or other entity.

(c) **SECURITY BREACH REPORTING.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the National Security Agency and any other departments or agencies the Secretary determines to be appropriate, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes in detail—

(1) all known or suspected penetrations or compromises of the systems or networks described in subsection (a) facilitating the use of classified information; and

(2) all known or suspected significant penetrations or compromises of any other such systems and networks that occurred since the submission of the prior report.

(d) **CONTENT.**—Each report submitted under subsection (c) shall include—

(1) a description of the relevant information technology system or network penetrated or compromised;

(2) an assessment of the date and time such penetration or compromise occurred;

(3) an assessment of the duration for which such system or network was penetrated or compromised, including whether such penetration or compromise is ongoing;

(4) an assessment of the amount and sensitivity of information accessed and available to have been accessed by such penetration or compromise, including any such information contained on systems and networks owned, operated, managed, or utilized by any other department or agency of the United States Government;

(5) an assessment of whether such system or network was penetrated by a malicious intrusion, including an assessment of—

(A) the known or suspected perpetrators, including state actors; and

(B) the methods used to conduct such penetration or compromise; and

(6) a description of the actions the Department has taken, or plans to take, to prevent future, similar penetrations or compromises of such systems and networks.

SEC. 5207. ANALYSIS OF EMBASSY COST SHARING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that assesses the cost-effectiveness and performance of the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system (referred to in this section as the “ICASS system”), including by assessing—

(1) the general performance of the ICASS system in providing cost-effective, timely, efficient, appropriate, and reliable services that meet the needs of all departments and agencies served;

(2) the extent to which additional cost savings and greater performance can be achieved under the current ICASS system and rules;

(3) the standards applied in the selection of the ICASS provider and the extent to which such standards are consistently applied; and

(4) potential reforms to the ICASS system, including—

(A) the selection of more than 1 service provider under certain circumstances;

(B) options for all departments or agencies to opt out of ICASS entirely or to opt out of individual services, including by debundling service packages;

(C) increasing the reliance on locally employed staff or outsourcing to local firms, as appropriate; and

(D) other modifications to the current ICASS system and rules that would incentivize greater effectiveness and cost efficiency.

SEC. 5208. PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

Section 433(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 241(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.**—

“(1) **INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.**—The Secretary of State shall convene and chair an interagency working group to prevent international parental child abduction, which shall be composed of presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed, officials from—

“(A) the Department of State;

“(B) the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(C) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(2) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—The Secretary of State shall convene an advisory committee to the interagency working group established pursuant to paragraph (1), for the duration of the working group’s existence, which shall be composed of not less than 3 left-behind parents, serving for 2-year terms, who—

“(A) shall be selected by the Secretary; and

“(B) shall periodically consult with such advisory committee on all activities of the interagency working group, as appropriate.”.

SEC. 5209. IMPROVING RESEARCH AND EVALUATION OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) conduct regular research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs and activities of the Department, including through the routine use of audience research, digital analytics, and impact evaluations, to plan and execute such programs and activities; and

(2) make the findings of the research and evaluations conducted under paragraph (1) available to Congress.

(b) **DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint a Director of Research and Evaluation in the Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources for the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs.

(2) **LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENT.**—The appointment of a Director of Research and Evaluation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not result in an increase in the overall full-time equivalent positions within the Department.

(3) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The Director of Research and Evaluation shall—

(A) coordinate and oversee the research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs of the Department—

(i) to improve public diplomacy strategies and tactics; and

(ii) to ensure that programs are increasing the knowledge, understanding, and trust of the United States by relevant target audiences;

(B) report to the Director of Policy and Planning;

(C) routinely organize and oversee audience research, digital analytics and impact evaluations across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department;

(D) support embassy public affairs sections;

(E) share appropriate public diplomacy research and evaluation information within the Department and with other Federal departments and agencies;

(F) regularly design and coordinate standardized research questions, methodologies, and procedures to ensure that public diplomacy activities across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices are designed to meet appropriate foreign policy objectives; and

(G) report quarterly to the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, through the Commission’s Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation established pursuant to subsection (e), regarding the research and evaluation of all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(4) **GUIDANCE AND TRAINING.**—Not later than 180 days after his or her appointment pursuant to paragraph (1), the Director of Research and Evaluation shall create guidance and training for all public diplomacy officers regarding the reading and interpretation of public diplomacy program evaluation findings to ensure that such findings and lessons learned are implemented in the planning and evaluation of all public diplomacy programs and activities throughout the Department.

(c) **PRIORITIZING RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of Policy, Planning, and Resources shall ensure that research and evaluation, as coordinated and overseen by the Director of Research and Evaluation, supports strategic planning and resource allocation across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(2) **ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES.**—Amounts allocated for the purposes of research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs and activities pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made available to be disbursed at the direction of the Director of Research and Evaluation among the research and evaluation staff across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(3) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Department should allocate, for the purposes of research and evaluation of public diplomacy activities and programs pursuant to subsection (a)—

(A) 3 to 5 percent of program funds made available under the heading “EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS”; and

(B) 3 to 5 percent of program funds allocated for public diplomacy programs under the heading “DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS”.

(d) **LIMITED EXEMPTION.**—The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) shall not apply to collections of information directed at foreign individuals conducted by, or on behalf of, the Department for the purpose of audience research and impact evaluations, in accordance with the requirements under this section and in connection with the Department’s activities conducted pursuant to the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act (22 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) or the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.).

(e) **ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.**—

(1) **SUBCOMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.**—The Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy shall establish a Subcommittee for Research and Evaluation to

monitor and advise on the research and evaluation activities of the Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

(2) **REPORT.**—The Subcommittee for Research and Evaluation established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall submit an annual report to Congress in conjunction with the Commission on Public Diplomacy's Comprehensive Annual Report on the performance of the Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors in carrying out research and evaluations of their respective public diplomacy programming.

(3) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Section 1334 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6553) is amended by striking “October 1, 2015” and inserting “October 1, 2020”.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AUDIENCE RESEARCH.**—The term “audience research” means research conducted at the outset of public diplomacy program or campaign planning and design on specific audience segments to understand the attitudes, interests, knowledge and behaviors of such audience segments.

(2) **DIGITAL ANALYTICS.**—The term “digital analytics” means the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, accumulated in digital format, to indicate the outputs and outcomes of a public diplomacy program or campaign.

(3) **IMPACT EVALUATION.**—The term “impact evaluation” means an assessment of the changes in the audience targeted by a public diplomacy program or campaign that can be attributed to such program or campaign.

SEC. 5210. ENHANCED INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY OF THE BUREAU OF AFRICAN AFFAIRS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall strengthen the institutional capacity of the Bureau of African Affairs to oversee programs and engage in strategic planning and crisis management by—

(1) establishing an office within the Bureau of African Affairs that is separate and distinct from the regional affairs office specifically charged with overseeing strategy development and program implementation related to security assistance;

(2) planning to facilitate the long-term planning process; and

(3) developing a concrete plan to rightsize the Bureau of African Affairs not later than 180 days after the date enactment of this Act.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the actions that have been taken to carry out subsection (a).

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts to carry out this section, and the Secretary shall use existing resources to carry out the provisions of this section.

Subtitle B—Personnel Matters

SEC. 5211. REVIEW OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER COMPENSATION.

(a) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall commission an independent assessment of Foreign Service Officer compensation to ensure that such compensation is achieving its purposes and the goals of the Department, including to recruit, retain, and maintain the world's premier diplomatic corps.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the

Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(A) the results of the independent assessment commissioned pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(B) the views of the Secretary regarding Foreign Service Officer compensation.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a list of all compensation received by Foreign Service Officers assigned domestically or overseas, including base salary and any other benefits, allowances, differentials, or other financial incentives;

(2) for each form of compensation described in paragraph (1)—

(A) an explanation of its stated purpose;

(B) a description of all relevant authorities, including statutory authority; and

(C) an assessment of the degree to which its historical and current use matches its stated purpose; and

(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of each form of compensation described in paragraph (1) in—

(A) achieving its stated purpose;

(B) achieving the recruiting and retention goals of the Department; and

(C) achieving the assignment placement needs of the Department.

SEC. 5212. REPEAL OF RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE.

Section 305 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3945) is amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 5213. COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR TRAVEL.

Section 5550b of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) The maximum amount of compensatory time off that may be earned under this section may not exceed 104 hours during any leave year (as defined in section 630.201(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations).”.

SEC. 5214. CERTIFICATES OF DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE.

Not later than 7 days after submitting the report required under section 304(a)(4) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3944(a)(4)) to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the President shall make the report available to the public, including by posting the on the website of the Department in a conspicuous manner and location.

SEC. 5215. FOREIGN SERVICE ASSIGNMENT RESTRICTIONS.

(a) **APPEAL OF ASSIGNMENT RESTRICTION.**—The Secretary shall establish a right and process for employees to appeal any assignment restriction or preclusion.

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—Upon full implementation of a right and process for employees to appeal an assignment restriction or preclusion, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) certifies that such appeals process has been fully implemented; and

(2) includes a detailed description of such process.

(c) **NOTICE.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) publish the right and process established pursuant to subsection (a) in the Foreign Affairs Manual; and

(2) include a reference to such publication in the report required under subsection (b).

(d) **PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION.**—Section 502(a)(2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3982(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) In making assignments under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure that a member of the Service is not assigned to, or restricted from, a position at a post in a particular geographic area, or domestically in a position working on issues relating to a particular geographic area, exclusively on the basis of the race, ethnicity, or religion of that member.”.

SEC. 5216. SECURITY CLEARANCE SUSPENSIONS.

(a) **SUSPENSION.**—Section 610 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4010) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

“**SEC. 610. SEPARATION FOR CAUSE; SUSPENSION.**”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) In order to promote the efficiency of the Service, the Secretary may suspend a member of the Service without pay when—

“(A) the member's security clearance is suspended; or

“(B) there is reasonable cause to believe that the member has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment may be imposed.

“(2) Any member of the Foreign Service for whom a suspension is proposed under this subsection shall be entitled to—

“(A) written notice stating the specific reasons for the proposed suspension;

“(B) a reasonable time to respond orally and in writing to the proposed suspension;

“(C) representation by an attorney or other representative; and

“(D) a final written decision, including the specific reasons for such decision, as soon as practicable.

“(3) Any member suspended under this subsection may file a grievance in accordance with the procedures applicable to grievances under chapter 11.

“(4) If a grievance is filed under paragraph (3)—

“(A) the review by the Foreign Service Grievance Board shall be limited to a determination of whether the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) have been fulfilled; and

“(B) the Board may not exercise the authority provided under section 1106(8).

“(5) In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘reasonable time’ means—

“(i) with respect to a member of the Foreign Service assigned to duty in the United States, 15 days after receiving notice of the proposed suspension; and

“(ii) with respect to a member of the Foreign Service assigned to duty outside the United States, 30 days after receiving notice of the proposed suspension.

“(B) The terms ‘suspend’ and ‘suspension’ mean placing a member of the Foreign Service in a temporary status without duties and pay.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 2 of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 610 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 610. Separation for cause; suspension.”.

SEC. 5217. ECONOMIC STATECRAFT EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

The Secretary shall establish curriculum at the Foreign Services Institute to develop the practical foreign economic policy expertise and skill sets of Foreign Service officers, including by making available distance-learning courses in commercial, economic, and business affairs, including in—

(1) the global business environment;

(2) the economics of development;

(3) development and infrastructure finance;

(4) current trade and investment agreements negotiations;

(5) implementing existing multilateral and World Trade Organization agreements, and United States trade and investment agreements;

(6) best practices for customs and export procedures; and

(7) market analysis and global supply chain management.

SEC. 5218. REPORT ON DIVERSITY RECRUITMENT, EMPLOYMENT, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and quadrennially thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a comprehensive report to Congress that—

(1) describes the efforts, consistent with existing law, including procedures, effects, and results of the Department since the period covered by the prior such report, to promote equal opportunity and inclusion for all American employees in direct hire and personal service contractors status, particularly employees of the Foreign Service, to include equal opportunity for all races, ethnicities, ages, genders, and service-disabled veterans, with a focus on traditionally underrepresented minority groups;

(2) includes a section on—

(A) the diversity of selection boards;

(B) the employment of minority and service-disabled veterans during the most recent 10-year period, including—

(i) the number hired through direct hires, internships, and fellowship programs;

(ii) the number promoted to senior positions, including FS-01, GS-15, Senior Executive Service, and Senior Foreign Service; and

(iii) attrition rates by grade, civil and foreign services, and the senior level ranks listed in clause (ii);

(C) mentorship and retention programs; and

(3) is organized in terms of real numbers and percentages at all levels.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall describe the efforts of the Department—

(1) to propagate fairness, impartiality, and inclusion in the work environment domestically and abroad;

(2) to eradicate harassment, intolerance, and discrimination;

(3) to refrain from engaging in unlawful discrimination in any phase of the employment process, including recruitment, hiring, evaluation, assignments, promotion, retention, and training;

(4) to eliminate illegal retaliation against employees for participating in a protected equal employment opportunity activity;

(5) to provide reasonable accommodation for qualified employees and applicants with disabilities;

(6) to resolve workplace conflicts, confrontations, and complaints in a prompt, impartial, constructive, and timely manner;

(7) to improve demographic data availability and analysis regarding recruitment, hiring, promotion, training, length in service, assignment restrictions, and pass-through programs;

(8) to recruit a diverse staff by—

(A) recruiting women, minorities, veterans, and undergraduate and graduate students;

(B) recruiting at historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic serving institutions, women's colleges, and colleges that typically serve majority minority populations;

(C) sponsoring and recruiting at job fairs in urban communities;

(D) placing job advertisements in newspapers, magazines, and job sites oriented toward women and people of color;

(E) providing opportunities through the Foreign Service Internship Program and other hiring initiatives; and

(F) recruiting mid- and senior-level professionals through programs such as—

(i) the International Career Advancement Program;

(ii) the Public Policy and International Affairs Fellowship Program;

(iii) the Institute for International Public Policy Fellowship Program;

(iv) Seminar XXI at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies; and

(v) other similar, highly respected, international leadership programs; and

(9) to provide opportunities through—

(A) the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Fellowship Program;

(B) the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program; and

(C) the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program.

(c) **SCOPE OF INITIAL REPORT.**—The first report submitted to Congress under this section shall include the information described in subsection (b) for the 3 fiscal years immediately preceding the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

SEC. 5219. EXPANSION OF THE CHARLES B. RANGEL INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS PROGRAM, THE THOMAS R. PICKERING FOREIGN AFFAIRS FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, AND THE DONALD M. PAYNE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) **ADDITIONAL FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED.**—Beginning in fiscal year 2016, the Secretary shall—

(1) increase by 10 the number of fellows selected for the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Program;

(2) increase by 10 the number of fellows selected for the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program; and

(3) increase by 5 the number of fellows selected for the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program.

(b) **PAYNE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.**—Undergraduate and graduate components of the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program are authorized to conduct outreach to attract outstanding students who represent diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds with an interest in pursuing a Foreign Service career.

SEC. 5220. RETENTION OF MID- AND SENIOR-LEVEL PROFESSIONALS FROM UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary should provide attention and oversight to the employment, retention, and promotion of underrepresented groups to promote a diverse ethnic representation among mid- and senior-level career professionals through programs such as—

(1) the International Career Advancement Program;

(2) Seminar XXI at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies; and

(3) other highly respected international leadership programs.

(b) **REVIEW OF PAST PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary should review past programs designed to increase minority representation in international affairs positions, including—

(1) the USAID Undergraduate Cooperative and Graduate Economics Program;

(2) the Public Policy and International Affairs Fellowship Program; and

(3) the Institute for International Public Policy Fellowship Program.

SEC. 5221. REVIEW OF JURISDICTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE TO AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN AND THE BUREAU OF SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIAN AFFAIRS.

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Secretary of State shall conduct a review of the jurisdictional responsibilities of the Special Representative to Afghanistan and Pakistan (SRAP) and the Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs (SCA).

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the findings of the review conducted under subsection (a), including recommendations on whether jurisdictional responsibility between the 2 offices should be adjusted.

SEC. 5222. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF COUNTRIES COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 110 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 30 days before the anticipated submission of each annual report under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary of State shall notify and brief the appropriate congressional committees concerning the countries that will be upgraded to a higher tier or downgraded to a lower tier in such report.”.

SEC. 5223. INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 708 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4028) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) in subsection (d), as redesignated, by inserting “REFUGEES” before “The Secretary of State”;

(3) in subsection (e), as redesignated, by inserting “CHILD SOLDIERS” before “The Secretary of State”; and

(4) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) **DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULUM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall develop a curriculum for Foreign Service Officers that includes training on—

“(A) the scope and strategic value of international religious freedom;

“(B) how violations of international religious freedom harm fundamental United States interests;

“(C) how the advancement of international religious freedom can advance such interests;

“(D) how United States international religious freedom policy should be carried out in practice by United States diplomats and other Foreign Service Officers; and

“(E) the relevance and relationship of international religious freedom to United States defense, diplomacy, development, and public affairs efforts to combat violent extremism.

“(2) **ROLE OF OTHER OFFICIALS.**—The Secretary of State shall carry out paragraph (1)—

“(A) with the assistance of the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom appointed under section 101(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6411(b));

“(B) in coordination with the Director of the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center and other Federal officials, as appropriate; and

“(C) in consultation with the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom established under section

201(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(a)).

“(3) RESOURCES.—The Secretary of State shall ensure the availability of sufficient resources to develop and implement the curriculum required under this subsection.

“(b) RELIGIOUS FREEDOM TRAINING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016, the Director of the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center shall begin training on religious freedom, using the curriculum developed under subsection (a), for Foreign Service officers, including—

“(A) entry level officers;

“(B) officers prior to departure for posting outside the United States; and

“(C) incoming deputy chiefs of mission and ambassadors.

“(2) ELEMENTS.—The training required under paragraph (1) shall be substantively incorporated into—

“(A) the A-100 course attended by Foreign Service Officers;

“(B) the specific country courses required of Foreign Service Officers prior to a posting outside the United States, with training tailored to—

“(i) the particular religious demography of such country;

“(ii) religious freedom conditions in such country;

“(iii) religious engagement strategies; and

“(iv) United States strategies for advancing religious freedom.

“(C) the courses required of incoming deputy chiefs of mission and ambassadors.

“(c) INFORMATION SHARING.—The curriculum and training materials developed pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall be shared with the United States Armed Forces and all other Federal departments and agencies whose personnel serve as attachés, advisors, detailees, or otherwise in United States embassies globally to provide training on—

“(1) United States religious freedom policies;

“(2) religious traditions;

“(3) religious engagement strategies;

“(4) religious and cultural issues; and

“(5) efforts to combat terrorism and violent religious extremism.”

TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Subtitle A—United States Contributions to International Organizations

SEC. 5301. REPORTS CONCERNING THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) REPORT ON ANTI-SEMITIC ACTIVITY AT THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS AGENCIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes—

(1) all activities at the United Nations and its subagencies that can be construed to exhibit an anti-Semitic bias, including official statements, proposed resolutions, and United Nations investigations;

(2) the use of United Nations resources to promote anti-Semitic or anti-Israel rhetoric or propaganda, including publications, internet websites, and textbooks or other educational materials used to propagate political rhetoric regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and

(3) specific actions taken by the United States Government to address any of the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) REPORT ON ALL UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NA-

TIONS.—Section 4(c) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287b(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A detailed description of all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind contributions, of the United States to the United Nations and to each of its affiliated agencies and related bodies—

“(i) during the preceding fiscal year;

“(ii) estimated for the fiscal year in which the report is submitted; and

“(iii) requested in the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for the following fiscal year.

“(B) CONTENT.—The description required under subparagraph (A) shall, for each fiscal year specified in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of that subparagraph, include—

“(i) the total amount or value of all contributions described in that subparagraph;

“(ii) the approximate percentage of all such contributions by the United States compared to all contributions to the United Nations and to each of its affiliated agencies and related bodies from any source; and

“(iii) for each such contribution described in subparagraph (A)—

“(I) the amount or value of the contribution;

“(II) whether the contribution was assessed by the United Nations or voluntary;

“(III) the purpose of the contribution;

“(IV) the department or agency of the United States Government responsible for the contribution; and

“(V) whether the United Nations or an affiliated agency or related body received the contribution and, if an affiliated agency or related body received the contribution, which such agency or body.

“(C) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 14 days after submitting a report required under this subsection to the designated congressional committees, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall post a text-based, searchable version of the description required by subparagraph (A) on a publicly available Internet website of that Office.”

SEC. 5302. ANNUAL REPORT ON FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 4(b) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287b(b)) is amended by striking “in which the United States participates as a member” and inserting “, including—

“(1) the amount of such contributions that were assessed by an international organization and the amount of such contributions that were voluntary; and

“(2) the ratio of United States contributions to total contributions received for—

“(A) the United Nations, specialized agencies of the United Nations, and other United Nations funds, programs, and organizations;

“(B) peacekeeping;

“(C) inter-American organizations;

“(D) regional organizations; and

“(E) other international organizations.”

SEC. 5303. REPORT ON PEACEKEEPING ARREARS, CREDITS, AND CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 4(c) of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287b(c)), as amended by section 5301(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) PEACEKEEPING CREDITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A complete and full accounting of United States peacekeeping assessments and contributions for United Nations peacekeeping operations, including the following:

“(i) A tabulation of annual United Nations peacekeeping assessment rates, the peacekeeping contribution rate authorized by the United States, and the United States public law that authorized the contribution rate for the United Nations peacekeeping budget for each fiscal year beginning in fiscal year 1995 through the fiscal year following the date of the report.

“(ii) A tabulation of current United States accrued shortfalls and arrears in each respective ongoing or closed United Nations peacekeeping mission.

“(iii) A tabulation of all peacekeeping credits, including—

“(I) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States;

“(II) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be unavailable to the United States;

“(III) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States from each open and closed peacekeeping mission;

“(IV) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be unavailable to the United States from each open and closed peacekeeping mission;

“(V) the total amount of peacekeeping credits applied by the United Nations toward shortfalls from previous years that are apportioned to the United States;

“(VI) the total amount of peacekeeping credits applied by the United Nations toward offsetting future contributions of the United States; and

“(VII) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States that could be applied toward offsetting United States contributions in the following fiscal year.

“(iv) An explanation of any claim of unavailability by the United Nations of any peacekeeping credits described in clause (iii)(IV).

“(v) A description of any efforts by the United States to obtain reimbursement in accordance with the requirements of this Act, including Department of Defense materiel and services, and an explanation of any failure to obtain any such reimbursement.

“(B) PEACEKEEPING CREDITS DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘peacekeeping credits’ means the amounts by which, during a United Nations peacekeeping fiscal year, the contributions of the United States to the United Nations for peacekeeping operations exceed the actual expenditures for peacekeeping operations by the United Nations that are apportioned to the United States.”

SEC. 5304. ASSESSMENT RATE TRANSPARENCY.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after each time the United Nations General Assembly modifies the assessment levels for peacekeeping operations, the Secretary shall submit a report, which may include a classified annex, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall describe—

(A) the change, by amount and percentage, of the peacekeeping assessment charged to each member state; and

(B) how the economic and strategic interests of each of the permanent members of the Security Council is being served by each peacekeeping mission currently in force.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF PEACEKEEPING ASSESSMENT DATA.**—The Secretary shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to urge the United Nations—

(1) to share the raw data used to calculate member state peacekeeping assessment rates; and

(2) to make available the formula for determining peacekeeping assessments.

Subtitle B—Accountability at International Organizations

SEC. 5311. PREVENTING ABUSE IN PEACEKEEPING.

Not later than 15 days before the anticipated date of a vote (or, in the case of exigent circumstances, as far in advance of the vote as is practicable) on a resolution approving a new peacekeeping mission under the auspices of the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or any other multilateral organization in which the United States participates, or to reauthorize an existing such mission, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on that mission that includes the following:

(1) A description of the specific measures taken and planned to be taken by the organization related to the mission—

(A) to prevent individuals who are employees or contractor personnel of the organization, or members of the forces serving in the mission from engaging in acts of trafficking in persons, exploitation of victims of trafficking, or sexual exploitation or abuse; and

(B) to hold accountable any such individuals who engage in any such acts while participating in the mission.

(2) An assessment of the effectiveness of each of the measures described in paragraph (1).

(3) An accounting and assessment of all cases in which the organization has taken action to investigate allegations that individuals described in paragraph (1)(A) have engaged in acts described in that paragraph, including a description of the status of all such cases as of the date of the report.

SEC. 5312. INCLUSION OF PEACEKEEPING ABUSES IN COUNTRY REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

Section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11)(C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (12)(C)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) for each country that contributes personnel to United Nations peacekeeping missions, a description of—

“(A) any allegations of such personnel engaging in acts of trafficking in persons, exploitation of victims of trafficking, or sexual exploitation and abuse while participating in such a peacekeeping mission;

“(B) any repatriations of such personnel resulting from an allegation described in subparagraph (A);

“(C) any actions taken by such country with respect to personnel repatriated as a result of allegations described in subparagraph (A), including whether such personnel faced prosecution related to such allegations; and

“(D) the extent to which any actions taken as described in subparagraph (C) have been communicated by such country to the United Nations.”.

SEC. 5313. EVALUATION OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) a comprehensive evaluation of current United Nations peacekeeping missions;

(2) a prioritization of the peacekeeping missions;

(3) plans for phasing out and ending any mission that—

(A) has substantially met its objectives and goals; or

(B) will not be able to meet its objectives and goals; and

(4) a plan for reviewing the status of open-ended mandates for—

(A) the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK);

(B) the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO); and

(C) the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP).

(b) **APPROVAL OF FUTURE PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS.**—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to ensure that no new United Nations peacekeeping mission is approved without a periodic mandate renewal.

(c) **FUNDING LIMITATION.**—The United States shall not provide funding for any United Nations peacekeeping mission beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act unless the mission has a periodic mandate renewal.

Subtitle C—Personnel Matters

SEC. 5321. ENCOURAGING EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS AT THE UNITED NATIONS.

Section 181 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (22 U.S.C. 276c-4) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 181. EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS BY CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

“Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report that provides—

“(1) for each international organization that had a geographic distribution formula in effect on January 1, 1991, an assessment of whether that organization—

“(A) is taking good faith steps to increase the staffing of United States citizens, including, as appropriate, as assessment of any additional steps the organization could be taking to increase such staffing; and

“(B) has met the requirements of its geographic distribution formula; and

“(2) an assessment of United States representation among professional and senior-level positions at the United Nations, including—

“(A) an assessment of the proportion of United States citizens employed at the United Nations Secretariat and at all United Nations specialized agencies, funds, and programs relative to the total employment at the United Nations Secretariat and at all such agencies, funds, and programs;

“(B) an assessment of compliance by the United Nations Secretariat and such agencies, funds, and programs with any applicable geographic distribution formula; and

“(C) a description of any steps taken or planned to be taken by the United States to

increase the staffing of United States citizens at the United Nations Secretariat and such agencies, funds and programs.”.

SEC. 5322. ENSURING APPROPRIATE UNITED NATIONS PERSONNEL SALARIES.

(a) **COMPENSATION OF UNITED NATIONS PERSONNEL.**—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations—

(1) to establish appropriate policies, procedures, and assumptions for—

(A) determining comparable positions between officials in the professional and higher categories of employment at the United Nations headquarters in New York, New York, and in the United States Federal civil service;

(B) calculating the margin between the compensation of such officials at the United Nations headquarters and the civil service; and

(C) determining the appropriate margin for adoption by the United Nations to govern compensation for such officials;

(2) to make all policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1) available to the public; and

(3) to limit increases in the compensation of United Nations officials to ensure that such officials remain within the margin range established by United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/40/244, or any subsequent margin range adopted by the United Nations to govern compensation for United Nations officials.

(b) **REPORT ON SALARY MARGINS.**—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the appropriate congressional committees, at the time of the submission of the budget of the President to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, that

(1) describes the policies, procedures, and assumptions established or used by the United Nations—

(A) to determine comparable positions between officials in the professional and higher categories of employment at the United Nations headquarters in New York, New York, and in the United States Federal civil service;

(B) to calculate the percentage difference, or margin, between the compensation of such officials at the United Nations headquarters and the civil service; and

(C) to determine the margin range established in United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/40/244, or any subsequent margin range adopted by the United Nations to govern compensation for United Nations officials;

(2) assesses, in accordance with the policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1), the margin between net salaries of officials in the professional and higher categories of employment at the United Nations in New York and those of comparable positions in the United States Federal civil service;

(3) assesses any changes in the margin described in paragraph (2) from the previous year;

(4) assesses the extent to which any changes in that margin resulted from modifications to the policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1); and

(5) provides the views of the Secretary on any changes in that margin and any such modifications.

TITLE IV—CONSULAR AUTHORITIES**SEC. 5401. VISA INELIGIBILITY FOR INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTORS.**

Section 212(a)(10)(C)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(10)(C)(iii)) is amended—

- (1) in subclause (I), by adding “or” at the end;
- (2) in subclause (II), by striking “; or” at the end and inserting a period; and
- (3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 5402. PRESUMPTION OF IMMIGRANT INTENT FOR H AND L VISA CLASSIFICATIONS.

Section 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(b)) is amended—

- (1) by striking “(other than a nonimmigrant described in subparagraph (L) or (V) of section 101(a)(15), and other than a nonimmigrant described in any provision of section 101(a)(15)(H)(i) except subclause (b) of such section)”;
- (2) by striking “under section 101(a)(15).” and inserting “under the immigration laws.”; and
- (3) by striking “he” each place such term appears and inserting “the alien”.

SEC. 5403. VISA INFORMATION SHARING.

Section 222(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(f)(2)) is amended—

- (1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “issuance or refusal” and inserting “issuance, refusal, or revocation”; and
- (2) in paragraph (2)—
 - (A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “and on the basis of reciprocity”;
 - (B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “illicit weapons; or” and inserting “illicit weapons, or in determining the removability or eligibility for a visa, admission, or another immigration benefit of persons who would be inadmissible to, or removable from, the United States.”;
 - (C) in subparagraph (B)—
 - (i) by striking “for the purposes” and inserting “for 1 of the purposes”;
 - (ii) by striking “or to deny visas to persons who would be inadmissible to the United States.” and inserting “; or”;
 - (D) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) with regard to any or all aliens in the database, specified data elements from each record, if the Secretary of State determines that it is in the national interest to provide such information to a foreign government.”.

TITLE V—EMBASSY SECURITY**Subtitle A—Allocation of Authorized Security Appropriations.****SEC. 5501. WORLDWIDE SECURITY PROTECTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in fiscal year 2016 for worldwide security protection shall, before any such funds may be allocated to any other authorized purpose, be allocated for—

- (1) immediate threat mitigation support in accordance with subsection (b) at facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531;
- (2) immediate threat mitigation support in accordance with subsection (b) at other facilities; and
- (3) locations with high vulnerabilities.

(b) IMMEDIATE THREAT MITIGATION SUPPORT PRIORITIZATION.—In allocating funding for immediate threat mitigation support pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall prioritize funding for—

- (1) the purchasing of additional security equipment, including additional defensive weaponry;

(2) the paying of expenses of additional security forces; and

(3) any other purposes necessary to mitigate immediate threats to United States personnel serving overseas.

SEC. 5502. EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in fiscal year 2016 for “embassy security, construction and maintenance” shall, before any funds may be allocated to any other authorized purpose, be allocated in the prioritized order of—

- (1) immediate threat mitigation projects in accordance with subsection (b) at facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531;
- (2) other security upgrades to facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531;
- (3) all other immediate threat mitigation projects in accordance with subsection (b); and
- (4) security upgrades to all other facilities or new construction for facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531.

(b) IMMEDIATE THREAT MITIGATION PROJECTS PRIORITIZATION.—In allocating funding for immediate threat mitigation projects pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall prioritize funding for the construction of safeguards that provide immediate security benefits and any other purposes necessary to mitigate immediate threats to United States personnel serving overseas.

(c) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.—No funds authorized to be appropriated shall be obligated or expended for new embassy construction, other than for high threat, high risk facilities, unless the Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

- (1) the Department has fully complied with the requirements of subsection (a);
- (2) high threat, high risk facilities are being secured to the best of the United States Government’s ability; and
- (3) the Secretary will make funds available from the Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance account or other sources to address any changed security threats or new or emergent security needs, including new immediate threat mitigation projects.

(d) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on—

- (1) funding for the priorities described in subsection (a);
- (2) efforts to secure high threat, high risk facilities as well as high vulnerability locations facilities; and
- (3) plans to make funds available from the Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance account or other sources to address any changed security threats or new or emergent security needs, including new immediate threat mitigation projects.

Subtitle B—Contracting and Other Matters.**SEC. 5511. LOCAL GUARD CONTRACTS ABROAD UNDER DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 136(c)(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (22 U.S.C. 4864(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) in evaluating proposals for such contracts, award contracts to technically acceptable firms offering the lowest evaluated price, except that—

“(A) the Secretary may award contracts on the basis of best value (as determined by a

cost-technical tradeoff analysis), especially for posts determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531 of the Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016; and

“(B) proposals received from United States persons and qualified United States joint venture persons shall be evaluated by reducing the bid price by 10 percent.”.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that includes—

- (1) an explanation of the implementation of section 136(c)(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, as amended by subsection (a); and
- (2) for each instance in which a contract is awarded pursuant to subparagraph (A) of such section, a written justification and approval that describes the basis for such award and an explanation of the inability of the Secretary to satisfy the needs of the Department by awarding a contract to the technically acceptable firm offering the lowest evaluated price.

SEC. 5512. DISCIPLINARY ACTION RESULTING FROM UNSATISFACTORY LEADERSHIP IN RELATION TO A SECURITY INCIDENT.

Section 304(c) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834 (c)) is amended—

- (1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;
- (2) by striking “Whenever” in the first sentence immediately following the subsection heading and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever”;
- (3) by inserting at the end the following:

“(2) CERTAIN SECURITY INCIDENTS.—

“(A) UNSATISFACTORY LEADERSHIP.—Unsatisfactory leadership by a senior official with respect to a security incident involving loss of life, serious injury, or significant destruction of property at or related to a United States Government mission abroad may be grounds for disciplinary action.

“(B) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—If a Board finds reasonable cause to believe that a senior official provided such unsatisfactory leadership, the Board may recommend disciplinary action subject to the procedures in paragraph (1).”.

“(A) UNSATISFACTORY LEADERSHIP.—Unsatisfactory leadership by a senior official with respect to a security incident involving loss of life, serious injury, or significant destruction of property at or related to a United States Government mission abroad may be grounds for disciplinary action.

“(B) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—If a Board finds reasonable cause to believe that a senior official provided such unsatisfactory leadership, the Board may recommend disciplinary action subject to the procedures in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 5513. MANAGEMENT AND STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF STATE.—Nothing in this division or in any other provision of law may be construed to prevent the Secretary from using all authorities invested in the office of Secretary to take personnel action against any employee or official of the Department that the Secretary determines has breached the duty of that individual or has engaged in misconduct or unsatisfactorily performed the duties of employment of that individual, and such misconduct or unsatisfactory performance has significantly contributed to the serious injury, loss of life, or significant destruction of property, or a serious breach of security, even if such action is the subject of an Accountability Review Board’s examination under section 304(a) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834(a)).

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Section 304 of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (c), by inserting “or has engaged in misconduct or unsatisfactorily performed the duties of employment of that

individual, and such misconduct or unsatisfactory performance has significantly contributed to the serious injury, loss of life, or significant destruction of property, or the serious breach of security that is the subject of the Board's examination as described in subsection (a)," after "breached the duty of that individual";

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) **MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY.**—Whenever a Board determines that an individual has engaged in any conduct described in subsection (c), the Board shall evaluate the level and effectiveness of management and oversight conducted by employees or officials in the management chain of such individual."

SEC. 5514. SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS FOR SOFT TARGETS.

Section 29 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2701) is amended, in the third sentence, by inserting "physical security enhancements and" after "Such assistance may include".

Subtitle C—Marine Corps Security Guard Program

SEC. 5521. ADDITIONAL REPORTS ON EXPANSION AND ENHANCEMENT OF MARINE CORPS SECURITY GUARD PROGRAM.

Section 1269(a)(2) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 10 U.S.C. 5983 note) is amended by inserting "and not less frequently than once each year thereafter until the date that is three years after such date" after "of this Act".

Subtitle D—Defending High Threat, High Risk Posts

SEC. 5531. DESIGNATION AND REPORTING FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, shall submit, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, a classified report, with an unclassified summary, evaluating Department facilities that the Secretary determines to be high threat, high risk in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) **CONTENTS.**—For each facility determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to subsection (a), the report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a narrative assessment describing the security threats and risks facing posts overseas and the overall threat level to United States personnel under chief of mission authority;

(2) the number of diplomatic security personnel, Marine Corps security guards, and other Department personnel dedicated to providing security for United States personnel, information, and facilities;

(3) an assessment of host nation willingness and capability to provide protection in the event of a security threat or incident, pursuant to the obligations of the United States under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24,

1963, and the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961;

(4) an assessment of the quality and experience level of the team of United States senior security personnel assigned to the facility, considering collectively the assignment durations and lengths of government experience;

(5) the number of Foreign Service Officers who have received Foreign Affairs Counter Threat training;

(6) a summary of the requests made during the previous calendar year for additional resources, equipment, or personnel related to the security of the facility and the status of such requests;

(7) an assessment of the ability of United States personnel to respond to and survive a fire attack, including—

(A) whether the facility has adequate fire safety and security equipment for safe havens and safe areas; and

(B) whether the employees working at the facility have been adequately trained on the equipment available;

(8) if it is a new facility, a detailed description of the steps taken to provide security for the new facility, including whether a dedicated support cell was established in the Department to ensure proper and timely resourcing of security; and

(9) a listing of any high threat, high risk facilities where the facilities of the Department and other government agencies are not collocated, including—

(A) a rationale for the lack of collocation; and

(B) a description of what steps, if any, are being taken to mitigate potential security vulnerabilities associated with the lack of collocation.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK FACILITY.**—In determining which facilities of the Department constitute high threat, high risk facilities under this section, the Secretary shall take into account with respect to each facility whether there are—

(1) high to critical levels of political violence or terrorism;

(2) national or local governments with inadequate capacity or political will to provide appropriate protection; and

(3) in locations where there are high to critical levels of political violence or terrorism or where national or local governments lack the capacity or political will to provide appropriate protection—

(A) mission physical security platforms that fall well below the Department's established standards; or

(B) security personnel levels that are insufficient for the circumstances.

(d) **INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW AND REPORT.**—The Inspector General for the Department of State and the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall annually—

(1) review the determinations of the Secretary with respect to high threat, high risk facilities, including the basis for making such determinations;

(2) review contingency planning for high threat, high risk facilities and evaluate the measures in place to respond to attacks on such facilities;

(3) review the risk mitigation measures in place at high threat, high risk facilities to determine how the Secretary evaluates risk and whether the measures put in place sufficiently address the relevant risks;

(4) review early warning systems in place at high threat, high risk facilities and evaluate the measures being taken to preempt and disrupt threats to such facilities; and

(5) provide to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) an assessment of the determinations of the Secretary with respect to high threat, high risk facilities, including recommendations for additions or changes to the list of such facilities; and

(B) a report on the reviews and evaluations undertaken pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (4).

SEC. 5532. DESIGNATION AND REPORTING FOR HIGH-RISK COUNTERINTELLIGENCE THREAT POSTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives

(2) **PRIORITY 1 COUNTERINTELLIGENCE THREAT NATION.**—The term "Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nation" means a country designated as such by the October 2012 National Intelligence Priorities Framework (NIPF).

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in conjunction with appropriate officials in the intelligence community and the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that assesses the counterintelligence threat to United States diplomatic facilities in Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nations.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the use of locally employed staff and guard forces and a listing of diplomatic facilities in Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nations without controlled access areas; and

(B) recommendations for mitigating any counterintelligence threats and for any necessary facility upgrades, including costs assessment of any recommended mitigation or upgrades.

SEC. 5533. ENHANCED QUALIFICATIONS FOR DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

The Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 206 (22 U.S.C. 4824) the following new section:

"SEC. 207. DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

"The individual serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for High Threat, High Risk Posts shall have 1 or more of the following qualifications:

"(1) Service during the last 6 years at 1 or more posts designated as high threat, high risk by the Secretary of State at the time of service.

“(2) Previous service as the office director or deputy director of 1 or more of the following Department of State offices or successor entities carrying out substantively equivalent functions:

“(A) The Office of Mobile Security Deployments.

“(B) The Office of Special Programs and Coordination.

“(C) The Office of Overseas Protective Operations.

“(D) The Office of Physical Security Programs.

“(E) The Office of Intelligence and Threat Analysis.

“(3) Previous service as the Regional Security Officer at two or more overseas posts.

“(4) Other government or private sector experience substantially equivalent to service in the positions listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).”

SEC. 5534. SECURITY ENVIRONMENT THREAT LIST BRIEFINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and upon each subsequent update of the Security Environment Threat List (SETL), the Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security shall provide classified briefings to the appropriate congressional committees on the Security Environment Threat List.

(b) CONTENT.—The briefings required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an overview of the Security Environment Threat List; and

(2) a summary assessment of the security posture of those facilities where the Security Environment Threat List assesses the threat environment to be most acute, including factors that informed such assessment.

SEC. 5535. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF BENGHAZI ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that describes the progress of the Secretary in implementing the recommendations of the Benghazi Accountability Review Board.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the progress the Secretary has made in implementing each specific recommendation of the Accountability Review Board; and

(2) a description of any impediments to recommended reforms, such as budget constraints, bureaucratic obstacles within the Department or in the broader interagency community, or limitations under current law.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 5536. FOREIGN AFFAIRS SECURITY TRAINING CENTER.

(a) OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees all documents and materials related to its consideration and analysis concerning the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center at Fort Picket, Virginia, and any alternative facilities.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF STATE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of

this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees all documents and materials related to the determination to construct a new Foreign Affairs Security Training Center at Fort Picket, Virginia, including any that are related to the development and adoption of all related training requirements, including any documents and materials related to the consideration and analysis of such facility performed by the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 5537. LANGUAGE TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title IV of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4851 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 416. LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Diplomatic security personnel assigned permanently to, or who are serving in, long-term temporary duty status as designated by the Secretary of State at a high threat, high risk post should receive language training described in subsection (b) in order to prepare such personnel for duty requirements at such post.

“(b) LANGUAGE TRAINING DESCRIBED.—Language training referred to in subsection (a) should prepare personnel described in such subsection—

“(1) to speak the language at issue with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on subjects germane to security; and

“(2) to read within an adequate range of speed and with almost complete comprehension on subjects germane to security.

“(c) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors shall—

“(1) review the language training conducted pursuant to this section; and

“(2) make the results of such review available to the Secretary of State and the appropriate congressional committees.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-399) is amended by inserting after the item relating to the section 415 the following:

“Sec. 416. Language requirements for diplomatic security personnel assigned to high threat, high risk posts.”

Subtitle E—Accountability Review Boards

SEC. 5541. PROVISION OF COPIES OF ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 2 days after an Accountability Review Board provides its report to the Secretary of State in accordance with title III of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4831 et seq.), the Secretary shall provide copies of the report to the appropriate congressional committees for retention and review by those committees.

SEC. 5542. STAFFING.

Section 302(b)(2) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4832(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Such persons shall be drawn from bureaus or other agency subunits that are not impacted by the incident that is the subject of the Board’s review.”

TITLE VI—MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 5601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Improving Department of State Oversight Act of 2015”.

SEC. 5602. COMPETITIVE HIRING STATUS FOR FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any employee of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction who completes at least 12 months of service at any time prior to the date of the termination of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (October 5, 2013), and was not terminated for cause shall acquire competitive status for appointment to any position in the competitive service for which the employee possesses the required qualifications.

SEC. 5603. ASSURANCE OF INDEPENDENCE OF IT SYSTEMS.

The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors, shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the Department has made reasonable efforts to ensure the integrity and independence of the Office of the Inspector General Information Technology systems.

SEC. 5604. PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF INTERNAL INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 209(c)(5) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3929(c)(5)) is amended by inserting at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) REQUIRED REPORTING OF ALLEGATIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS AND INSPECTOR GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each bureau, post or other office (in this subparagraph, an ‘entity’) of the Department of State shall, within five business days, report to the Inspector General any allegations of—

“(I) waste, fraud, or abuse in a Department program or operation;

“(II) criminal or serious misconduct on the part of a Department employee at the FS-1, GS-15, GM-15 level or higher;

“(III) criminal misconduct on the part of any Department employee; and

“(IV) serious, noncriminal misconduct on the part of any individual who is authorized to carry a weapon, make arrests, or conduct searches, such as conduct that, if proved, would constitute perjury or material dishonesty, warrant suspension as discipline for a first offense, or result in loss of law enforcement authority.

“(ii) INSPECTOR GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Inspector General may, pursuant to existing authority, investigate matters covered by clause (i).

“(iii) LIMITATION ON INVESTIGATIONS OUTSIDE OF OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—No entity in the Department of State with concurrent jurisdiction over matters covered by clause (i), including the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, may initiate an investigation of such matter unless it has first reported the allegations to the Inspector General as required by clause (i), except as provided in clause (v) and (vi).

“(iv) COOPERATION.—If an entity in the Department of State initiates an investigation of a matter covered in clause (i) the entity must, except as provided in clause (v), fully cooperate with the Inspector General, including—

“(I) by providing to the Inspector General all data and records obtained in connection with its investigation upon request of the Inspector General;

“(II) by coordinating, at the request of the Inspector General, such entity’s investigation with the Inspector General; and

“(III) by providing to the Inspector General requested support in aid of the Inspector

General's oversight and investigative responsibilities.

“(v) EXCEPTIONS.—The Inspector General may prescribe general rules under which any requirement of clause (iii) or clause (iv) may be dispensed with.

“(vi) EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.—Compliance with clauses (i), (iii), and (iv) of this subparagraph may be dispensed with by an entity of the Department of State if complying with them in an exigent circumstance would pose an imminent threat to human life, health or safety, or result in the irretrievable loss or destruction of critical evidence or witness testimony, in which case a report of the allegation shall be made not later than 48 hours after an entity begins an investigation under the authority of this clause and cooperation required under clause (iv) shall commence not later than 48 hours after the relevant exigent circumstance has ended.

“(vii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph may be interpreted to affect any duty or authority of the Inspector General under any provision of law, including the Inspector General's duties or authorities under the Inspector General Act.”.

SEC. 5605. REPORT ON INSPECTOR GENERAL INSPECTION AND AUDITING OF FOREIGN SERVICE POSTS AND BUREAUS AND OPERATING UNITS DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the requirement under section 209(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3929(a)(1)) that the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors inspect and audit, at least every 5 years, the administration of activities and operations of each Foreign Service post and each bureau and other operating unit of the Department.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF MULTI-TIER SYSTEM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall assess the advisability and feasibility of implementing a multi-tier system for inspecting Foreign Service posts featuring more (or less) frequent inspections and audits of posts based on risk, including security risk, as may be determined by the Inspector General.

(c) COMPOSITION.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include separate portions prepared by the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the Comptroller General of the United States, respectively.

SA 1984. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1274. REGIONAL STRATEGY TO ADDRESS THE THREAT POSED BY BOKO HARAM.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of

Defense shall jointly develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a regional strategy to enable the Government of Nigeria and its partners to counter the regional threat of Boko Haram and assist the Government of Nigeria and its neighbors to accept and address grievances of vulnerable populations in areas affected by Boko Haram.

(2) ELEMENTS.—At a minimum, the strategy must address the following elements:

(A) Enhance, pursuant to existing authorities and restrictions, the institutional capacity, including military capabilities, of the Government of Nigeria and partner nations in the region to counter the threat posed by Boko Haram.

(B) Provide humanitarian support to civilian populations impacted by Boko Haram's activity.

(C) Consider the provision of further assistance in the context of the recipient partner nation's actions in support of human rights and the respect for and implementation of the rule of law.

(D) Seek to provide appropriate assistance to willing and capable partner nations to address the underlying societal factors that contribute to the ability of Boko Haram to radicalize and recruit individuals, including poverty and the lack of economic opportunity and access to education, public health, and infrastructure.

(E) Strengthen the capacity of the civilian police and judicial system in Nigeria to promote the rule of law, enhance public safety, and prevent crime, including gender-based violence, while strengthening accountability measures to prevent corruption and abuses.

(F) Strengthen the long-term capacity of the Government of Nigeria to enhance security for schools to protect girls seeking an education, and to combat gender-based violence and gender inequality.

(G) Support the adoption of a United Nations Security Council Resolution authorizing a regional Multi-National Joint Task Force to counter Boko Haram.

(H) Identify and develop mechanisms for coordinating the implementation of the strategy with the Government of Nigeria, regional partners, and other relevant foreign partners.

(I) Identify the resources required, in an amount not less than \$25,000,000, to achieve the strategy's objectives.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an assessment (in classified form) regarding the willingness and capability of the Government of Nigeria to implement the strategy required by subsection (a), including the capability gaps, if any, of the government and military forces of Nigeria that would need to be addressed in order to enable the Government of Nigeria and the governments of its partner countries in the region to counter the threat of Boko Haram and to address grievances of vulnerable populations in areas affected by Boko Haram.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 1985. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON PRIVATE RELOCATION SERVICES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDERGOING A PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report, in conjunction with work on such matter being conducted by the Comptroller General as of the date of the enactment of this Act, on the use of private sector relocation services to assist members of the Armed Forces and their families with locating and transitioning to off-base or off-post housing in the course of a permanent change of station (PCS).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An identification of services, not currently available, that would be useful to members of the Armed Forces in undergoing a permanent change of station as described in subsection (a).

(2) An assessment whether private sector entities are available, or would likely be available, to provide the services described in paragraph (1) if the business opportunity existed.

(3) An assessment of the projected cost, if any, to the Department of Defense, members of the Armed Forces, or both in obtaining the services described in paragraph (1) from private sector entities for members of the Armed Forces relocating during a permanent change of station as described in subsection (a).

SA 1986. Ms. AYOTTE (for Mr. KIRK) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION E—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

TITLE LI—TAXPAYER PROTECTION PROVISIONS AND INCREASED ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 5101. REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZED AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING LOANS, GUARANTEES, AND INSURANCE.

Section 6(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **APPLICABLE AMOUNT DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘applicable amount’, for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, means \$135,000,000,000.

“(3) **FREELING OF LENDING CAP IF DEFAULT RATE IS 2 PERCENT OR MORE.**—If the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is 2 percent or more for a quarter, the Bank may not exceed the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding on the last day of that quarter until the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is less than 2 percent.”.

SEC. 5102. INCREASE IN LOSS RESERVES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) **RESERVE REQUIREMENT.**—The Bank shall build to and hold in reserve, to protect against future losses, an amount that is not less than 5 percent of the aggregate amount of disbursed and outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance of the Bank.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5103. REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.

Section 17(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-6(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and every 4 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

“(1) review the adequacy of the design and effectiveness of the controls used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to prevent, detect, and investigate fraudulent applications for loans and guarantees and the compliance by the Bank with the controls, including by auditing a sample of Bank transactions; and

“(2) submit a written report regarding the findings of the review and providing such recommendations with respect to the controls described in paragraph (1) as the Comptroller General deems appropriate to—

“(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 5104. OFFICE OF ETHICS.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) **OFFICE OF ETHICS.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an Office of Ethics within the Bank, which shall oversee all ethics issues within the Bank.

“(2) **HEAD OF OFFICE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of the Office of Ethics shall be the Chief Ethics Officer, who shall report to the Board of Directors.

“(B) **APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Ethics Officer shall be—

“(i) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

“(I) with a background in law who have experience in the fields of law and ethics; and

“(II) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Ethics Officer; and

“(ii) approved by the Board.

“(C) **DESIGNATED AGENCY ETHICS OFFICIAL.**—The Chief Ethics Officer shall serve as the designated agency ethics official for the Bank pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101 et seq.).

“(3) **DUTIES.**—The Office of Ethics has jurisdiction over all employees of, and ethics matters relating to, the Bank. With respect to employees of the Bank, the Office of Ethics shall—

“(A) recommend administrative actions to establish or enforce standards of official conduct;

“(B) refer to the Office of the Inspector General of the Bank alleged violations of—

“(i) the standards of ethical conduct applicable to employees of the Bank under parts 2635 and 6201 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(ii) the standards of ethical conduct established by the Chief Ethics Officer; and

“(iii) any other laws, rules, or regulations governing the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities that are applicable to employees of the Bank;

“(C) report to appropriate Federal or State authorities substantial evidence of a violation of any law applicable to the performance of official duties that may have been disclosed to the Office of Ethics; and

“(D) render advisory opinions regarding the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of an employee or contractor of the Bank, and issue general guidance on such matters as necessary.”.

SEC. 5105. CHIEF RISK OFFICER.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by section 5104, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) **CHIEF RISK OFFICER.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There shall be a Chief Risk Officer of the Bank, who shall—

“(A) oversee all issues relating to risk within the Bank; and

“(B) report to the President of the Bank.

“(2) **APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Risk Officer shall be—

“(A) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

“(i) with a demonstrated ability in the general management of, and knowledge of and extensive practical experience in, financial risk evaluation practices in large governmental or business entities; and

“(ii) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Risk Officer; and

“(B) approved by the Board.

“(3) **DUTIES.**—The duties of the Chief Risk Officer are—

“(A) to be responsible for all matters related to managing and mitigating all risk to which the Bank is exposed, including the programs and operations of the Bank;

“(B) to establish policies and processes for risk oversight, the monitoring of management compliance with risk limits, and the management of risk exposures and risk controls across the Bank;

“(C) to be responsible for the planning and execution of all Bank risk management activities, including policies, reporting, and systems to achieve strategic risk objectives;

“(D) to develop an integrated risk management program that includes identifying, prioritizing, measuring, monitoring, and managing internal control and operating risks and other identified risks;

“(E) to ensure that the process for risk assessment and underwriting for individual transactions considers how each such transaction considers the effect of the transaction on the concentration of exposure in the overall portfolio of the Bank, taking into account fees, collateralization, and historic default rates; and

“(F) to review the adequacy of the use by the Bank of qualitative metrics to assess the risk of default under various scenarios.”.

SEC. 5106. RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by sections 5104 and 5105, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) **RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a management committee to be known as the ‘Risk Management Committee’.

“(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The membership of the Risk Management Committee shall be the members of the Board of Directors, with the President and First Vice President of the Bank serving as ex officio members.

“(3) **DUTIES.**—The duties of the Risk Management Committee shall be—

“(A) to oversee, in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Bank—

“(i) periodic stress testing on the entire Bank portfolio, reflecting different market, industry, and macroeconomic scenarios, and consistent with common practices of commercial and multilateral development banks; and

“(ii) the monitoring of industry, geographic, and obligor exposure levels; and

“(B) to review all required reports on the default rate of the Bank before submission to Congress under section 8(g).”.

(b) **TERMINATION OF AUDIT COMMITTEE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall revise the bylaws of the Bank to terminate the Audit Committee established by section 7 of the bylaws.

SEC. 5107. INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF BANK PORTFOLIO.

(a) **AUDIT.**—The Inspector General of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall conduct an audit or evaluation of the portfolio risk management procedures of the Bank, including a review of the implementation by the Bank of the duties assigned to the Chief Risk Officer under section 3(l) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended by section 5105.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than every 3 years thereafter, the Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a written report containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out subsection (a).

SEC. 5108. PILOT PROGRAM FOR REINSURANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any provision of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.), the Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the “Bank”) may establish a pilot program under which the Bank may enter into contracts and other arrangements to share risks associated with the provision of guarantees, insurance, or credit, or the

participation in the extension of credit, by the Bank under that Act.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF RISK-SHARING.—

(1) PER CONTRACT OR OTHER ARRANGEMENT.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing pursuant to a contract or other arrangement entered into under subsection (a) may not exceed \$1,000,000,000.

(2) PER YEAR.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing during a fiscal year pursuant to contracts or other arrangements entered into under subsection (a) during that fiscal year may not exceed \$10,000,000,000.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2019, the Bank shall submit to Congress a written report that contains a detailed analysis of the use of the pilot program carried out under subsection (a) during the year preceding the submission of the report.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect, impede, or revoke any authority of the Bank.

(e) TERMINATION.—The pilot program carried out under subsection (a) shall terminate on September 30, 2019.

TITLE LII—PROMOTION OF SMALL BUSINESS EXPORTS

SEC. 5201. INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS LENDING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b)(1)(E)(v) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)(E)(v)) is amended by striking “20 percent” and inserting “25 percent”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 5202. REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.—The Bank shall include in its annual report to Congress under subsection (a) a report on the programs of the Bank for United States businesses with less than \$250,000,000 in annual sales.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the report of the Export-Import Bank of the United States submitted to Congress under section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) for the first year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE LIH—MODERNIZATION OF OPERATIONS

SEC. 5301. ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS AND DOCUMENTS.

Section 2(b)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(M) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Bank shall implement policies—

“(i) to accept electronic documents with respect to transactions whenever possible, including copies of bills of lading, certifications, and compliance documents, in such manner so as not to undermine any potential civil or criminal enforcement related to the transactions; and

“(ii) to accept electronic payments in all of its programs.”.

SEC. 5302. REAUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY UPDATING.

Section 3(j) of the Export-Import Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “2012, 2013, and 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “(I) the funds” and inserting “(i) the funds”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “2012, 2013, and 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”.

TITLE LIV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 5401. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2019”.

(b) DUAL-USE EXPORTS.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 103-428 (12 U.S.C. 635 note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date on which the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States expires under section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f)”.

(c) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date on which the authority of the Bank expires under section 7”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 30, 2015.

SEC. 5402. CERTAIN UPDATED LOAN TERMS AND AMOUNTS.

(a) LOAN TERMS FOR MEDIUM-TERM FINANCING.—Section 2(a)(2)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) with principal amounts of not more than \$25,000,000; and”.

(b) COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITIES RELATING TO INSURANCE.—Section 2(d)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(d)(2)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

(c) EXPORT AMOUNTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS LOANS.—Section 3(g)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(g)(3)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

(d) CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.—Section 11(a)(1)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635i-5(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000 or more” and inserting the following: “\$25,000,000 (or, if less than \$25,000,000, the threshold established pursuant to international agreements, including the Common Approaches for Officially Supported Export Credits and Environmental and Social Due Diligence, as adopted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Council on June 28, 2012, and the risk-management framework adopted by financial institutions for determining, assessing, and managing environmental and social risk in projects (commonly referred to as the ‘Equator Principles’) or more”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

TITLE LV—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 5501. PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (6 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this Act, the Bank may not—

“(A) deny an application for financing based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns; or

“(B) promulgate or implement policies that discriminate against an application based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns.

“(2) APPLICABILITY.—The prohibitions under paragraph (1) apply only to applications for financing by the Bank for projects concerning the exploration, development, production, or export of energy sources and the generation or transmission of electrical power, or combined heat and power, regardless of the energy source involved.”.

SEC. 5502. NEGOTIATIONS TO END EXPORT CREDIT FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11 of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Secretary of the Treasury (in this section referred to as the ‘Secretary’)” and inserting “President”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “(OECD)” and inserting “(in this section referred to as the ‘OECD’)”; and

(ii) by striking “ultimate goal of eliminating” and inserting “possible goal of eliminating, before the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015,”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “Secretary” each place it appears and inserting “President”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) REPORT ON STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the President shall submit to Congress a proposal, and a strategy for achieving the proposal, that the United States Government will pursue with other major exporting countries, including OECD members and non-OECD members, to eliminate over a period of not more than 10 years subsidized export-financing programs, tied aid, export credits, and all other forms of government-supported export subsidies.

“(d) NEGOTIATIONS WITH NON-OECD MEMBERS.—The President shall initiate and pursue negotiations with countries that are not OECD members to bring those countries into a multilateral agreement establishing rules and limitations on officially supported export credits.

“(e) ANNUAL REPORTS ON PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and annually thereafter through calendar year 2019, the President shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of any negotiations described in subsection (d).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to reports required to be submitted under section 11(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-5(b)) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5503. STUDY OF FINANCING FOR INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

(a) ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY USE OF

BANK PRODUCTS.—The Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the “Bank”) shall conduct a study of the extent to which the products offered by the Bank are available and used by companies that export information and communications technology services and related goods.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—In conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Bank shall examine the following:

(1) The number of jobs in the United States that are supported by the export of information and communications technology services and related goods, and the degree to which access to financing will increase exports of such services and related goods.

(2) The reduction in the financing by the Bank of exports of information and communications technology services from 2003 through 2014.

(3) The activities of foreign export credit agencies to facilitate the export of information and communications technology services and related goods.

(4) Specific proposals for how the Bank could provide additional financing for the exportation of information and communications technology services and related goods through risk-sharing with other export credit agencies and other third parties.

(5) Proposals for new products the Bank could offer to provide financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods, including—

(A) the extent to which the Bank is authorized to offer new products;

(B) the extent to which the Bank would need additional authority to offer new products to meet the needs of the information and communications technology industry;

(C) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide increased financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank;

(D) specific proposals that would enable the Bank to provide increased outreach to the information and communications technology industry about the products the Bank offers; and

(E) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide the financing to build information and communications technology infrastructure, in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank, to allow for market access opportunities for United States information and communications technology companies to provide services on the infrastructure being financed by the Bank.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bank shall submit to Congress a report that contains the results of the study required by subsection (a).

SA 1987. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such

fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1283. PROHIBITION ON DEPLOYMENT OF GROUND COMBAT TROOPS IN IRAQ AND SYRIA.

No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used to support the deployment of the United States Armed Forces for the purpose of ground combat operations in Iraq or Syria, except as necessary—

(1) for the protection or rescue of members of the United States Armed Forces or United States citizens from imminent danger posed by ISIL; or

(2) to conduct missions not intended to result in ground combat operations by United States forces, such as—

- (A) intelligence collection and sharing;
- (B) enabling kinetic strikes;
- (C) limited operations against high value targets;
- (D) operational planning; or
- (E) other forms of advice and assistance to coalition forces fighting ISIL in Iraq or Syria.

SA 1988. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ANNUAL MENTAL HEALTH SCREENINGS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that the Department of Defense and the Defense Health Agency are currently developing a standardized periodic health assessment tool that incorporates a screening for depression, post-traumatic stress, substance use, and risk for suicide through a person-to-person dialogue using the same question set used for mental health assessments provided to members of the Armed Forces undergoing deployment.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of mental health assessments provided to members of the Armed Forces under section 1074n of title 10, United States Code, that includes a description of—

- (1) the reliability of such assessments;
- (2) any significant changes in mental health concerns among members of the Armed Forces as a result of such assessments;
- (3) any areas in which the provision of such assessments to members of the Armed Forces needs to improve; and
- (4) such additional information as the Secretary considers necessary relating to mental health screening and treatment of members of the Armed Forces.

SA 1989. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1983 submitted by Mr.

CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 5701. ENSURING UNITED STATES CIVIL NUCLEAR COMPONENTS ARE NOT ILLEGALLY DIVERTED TO NUCLEAR NAVAL PROPULSION PROGRAMS.

Section 57 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2077) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary may not make an authorization under subsection b.(2) with respect to a foreign country with a nuclear naval propulsion program unless—

“(A) the Director of National Intelligence and the Chief of Naval Operations jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the risks of diversion, and the likely consequences of such diversion, of the technology and material covered by such authorization; and

“(B) following the date on which such assessment is submitted, the Administrator for Nuclear Security certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

“(i) there is sufficient diversion control as part of the authorization; and

“(ii) the authorization presents a minimal risk of diversion of such technology and material to a military program that would degrade the technical advantage of the United States.

“(2) The limitation under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to France or the United Kingdom.

“(3) In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the following:

“(A) The congressional defense committees (as defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code).

“(B) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

“(C) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”.

SA 1990. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1983 submitted by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 56. UNAUTHORIZED DEALINGS IN SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL.

Section 57b.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2077(b)(2)) is amended in the first sentence in the proviso by inserting "the Director of National Intelligence," after "Commerce,".

SA 1991. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 811. REPORT ON VALUE-BASED ACQUISITION APPROACHES.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisitions, Technology, and Logistics and each of the Service Acquisition Executives shall independently submit to the congressional defense committees reports that propose methodologies for quantitatively measuring and optimizing the targeted and returned value of the acquisition portfolio of each component of the Department of Defense, and the benefits of such assessments in supporting improved acquisition outcomes.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An analysis of the applicability of current industry and government best practices in value-centric management.

(2) An analysis of the implications of acquisition-related statutory and policy requirements on the implementation of a value-centric approach to portfolio management.

(3) A description of the impact of processes outside the acquisition system on the value of a delivered capability.

(4) One or more quantitative approaches that could be used to measure and compare the value of disparate programs within the component's acquisition portfolio.

(c) **VALUE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term "Value" means a quantifiable measure of benefit, which is composed of quantitative assessments of utility, life cycle cost, and development time for a given capability or set of capabilities.

SA 1992. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. REPEAL OF PER-AIRCRAFT LIMITATION FOR MODIFYING HC-130H AIRCRAFT FOR FIRE SUPPRESSION PURPOSES.

Section 1098(a)(2)(C) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 882) is amended by striking clause (i).

SA 1993. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 535 and insert the following:

SEC. 535. LIMITATION ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE WHILE RECEIVING POST-9/11 EDUCATION ASSISTANCE.

Section 8525 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "or" after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting "or"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) except for an individual described in subsection (c), an educational assistance allowance under chapter 33 of title 38."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) An individual described in this subsection is an individual—

"(1) who is otherwise entitled to compensation under this subchapter;

"(2) who is an individual described in section 3311(b) of title 38;

"(3) who is not receiving retired pay under title 10; and

"(4)(A) who—

"(i) did not voluntarily separate from service in the Armed Forces or the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (including through a reduction in force); and

"(ii) was discharged or released from such service under honorable conditions; or

"(B) who—

"(i) voluntarily separated from service in the Armed Forces or the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

"(ii) was employed after such separation from such service; and

"(iii) was terminated from such employment other than for cause due to misconduct connected with such employment.".

SA 1994. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 419, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 420, line 3 and insert the following:

(2) establish a process by which the contractor may appeal a determination by a contracting officer that an earlier determination was made in error or was based on inadequate information to the head of contracting for the agency; and

(3) establish a process by which a commercial item determination can be revoked by the head of the contracting activity in cases where the contracting officer is no longer able to make an assessment that the prior determination is appropriate and still applicable based on market research and value-based pricing analysis that demonstrates that the Department of Defense would pay more for the item than it had previously or another source could provide a similar item for a lower price.

SA 1995. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. REPORT ON ACTIONS TO ENSURE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF DISSENTERS HOUSED AT CAMP LIBERTY, IRAQ.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment whether the Central Government of Iraq is taking appropriate and sufficient actions to ensure the safety and security of dissidents housed at Camp Liberty, Iraq.

SA 1996. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . . EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Congress finds that—

(A) the Export-Import Bank of the United States administers—

(i) the Working Capital Loan Guarantee Program, which—

(I) facilitates finance for businesses, in particular small businesses, that have exporting potential but need working capital funds to produce or market goods or services for export;

(II) provides repayment guarantees to lenders on short- and medium-term working capital loans made to qualified exporters, which loans are secured by export-related accounts receivable and inventory;

(III) provides a guarantee of up to 90 percent of the principal and interest on a loan

made to an exporter by a private lender for export-related accounts receivable; and

(IV) provides a guarantee of up to 75 percent for export-related inventory;

(ii) the Global Credit Express Loan Program, which provides direct working capital loans to small businesses for a 6- or 12-month revolving line of credit of not more than \$500,000; and

(iii) the Export Credit Insurance Program, which—

(I) extends credit terms to foreign customers;

(II) insures against nonpayment by international buyers;

(III) covers both commercial and political losses with a 95 percent guarantee; and

(IV) arranges financing through a lender by using insured receivables as additional collateral;

(B) the export loan programs of the Export-Import Bank of the United States described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A) are less appealing to small businesses due to lending restrictions on loans under those programs, which provide that—

(i) the loans may not be used when the export product being financed has less than 50 percent United States content;

(ii) the loans may not be used to finance sales to foreign military buyers, with which a growing number of small businesses are contracting; and

(iii) contracts and purchase orders supported by letters of credit may not be used in determining the borrowing base; and

(C) the Small Business Administration administers—

(i) the Export Working Capital Program, established under section 7(a)(14) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(14)), which provides short-term working capital, including revolving lines of credit, of not more than \$5,000,000 with a 90 percent guarantee;

(ii) the International Trade Loan Program, established under section 7(a)(16) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(16)), which provides financing of not more than \$5,000,000 with a 90 percent guarantee for fixed assets, or to improve a competitive position that has been adversely affected by import competition; and

(iii) the Export Express Program, established under 7(a)(34) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(34)), under which—

(I) exporters are provided with a streamlined method to obtain financing backed by the Small Business Administration for loans and lines of credit of not more than \$500,000;

(II) lenders use their own credit decision process and loan documentation;

(III) the Small Business Administration determines eligibility and provides a loan approval in 36 hours or less; and

(IV) the guarantee is 90 percent for a loan that is not more than \$350,000 and 75 percent for a loan that is more than \$350,000 and not more than \$500,000.

(2) ADDITIONAL FINDINGS.—Congress further finds that—

(A) the export loan programs of the Small Business Administration described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of paragraph (1)(C)—

(i) are not restricted by the limitations described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of paragraph (1)(B); and

(ii) should be commended for their flexibility, quick turnaround times, and the one-on-one assistance from Small Business Administration personnel in structuring loan deals, negotiating payment terms, and ensuring that the financial needs of small businesses are met;

(B) the Export-Import Bank of the United States only has Regional Export Finance Managers co-located in 12 Department of Commerce United States Export Assistance Centers, whereas the Small Business Administration—

(i) has Regional Export Finance Managers co-located in 20 United States Export Assistance Centers; and

(ii) currently has Regional Export Finance Managers co-located in 10 additional United States Export Assistance Center locations that the Export-Import Bank of the United States does not, including in—

(I) Arlington, Virginia;

(II) Boston, Massachusetts;

(III) Charlotte, North Carolina;

(IV) Cleveland, Ohio;

(V) Denver, Colorado;

(VI) Los Angeles, California;

(VII) New Orleans, Louisiana;

(VIII) Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

(IX) Portland, Oregon; and

(X) St. Louis, Missouri;

(C) the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (15 U.S.C. 631 note) increased the maximum loan size under the 2 largest export loan programs administered by the Small Business Administration to \$5,000,000, which could cover approximately 80 percent of all small business export loans currently guaranteed by taxpayers through the Export-Import Bank of the United States;

(D) the export loan programs administered by the Small Business Administration and the export loan programs administered the Export-Import Bank of the United States are—

(i) duplicative of each other, except for the Export Credit Insurance Program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States; and

(ii) under the current structure, competing against each other for small business clients; and

(E) the Export Credit Insurance Program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States is a vital component of export loan programs.

(3) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—It is hereby declared to be the policy of this section—

(A) that, should the statutory authority for the export loan programs administered by the Export-Import Bank of the United States lapse, the Small Business Administration shall serve the small business clients of the Export-Import Bank of the United States under existing statutory authority of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.);

(B) to create an Export Credit Insurance Program within the Small Business Administration similar to the Export Credit Insurance Program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States; and

(C) to ensure that small business exporters are served by the programs of the Small Business Administration.

(b) EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM.—Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (1) as subsection (m); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (k) the following:

“(1) EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish a program under which the Administration shall provide insurance for the exports of small business concerns, including insurance against nonpayment by international buyers.

“(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations to carry out the program estab-

lished under paragraph (1), which shall be, to the maximum extent practicable, substantially similar to the Export Credit Insurance Program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this subsection.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Passenger Rail Safety: Accident Prevention and On-Going Efforts to Implement Train Control Technology.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 5 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Verification and Assessment: How do you create a successful Inspections Regime?”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Health Information Exchange: A Path Towards Improving the Quality and Value of Health Care for Patients.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 9 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 2:15 p.m., in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Addressing the Need for Victim Services in Indian Country."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 10, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Examining the Federal Regulatory System to Improve Accountability, Transparency and Integrity."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 1:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "Wasteful Spending in the Federal Government: An Outside Perspective."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on National Parks be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES ON AGING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled

"Ringling Off the Hook: Examining the Proliferation of Unwanted Calls."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Elizabeth Dysart, an intern on Senator LEAHY's personal office staff, be granted Senate floor privileges on Wednesday, June 10, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JOHN W. HUBER TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

NOMINATION OF EILEEN MAURA DECKER TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOMINATION OF ERIC STEVEN MILLER TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 142, 143, 144; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that following the disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations.

VOTE ON HUBER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John W. Huber, of Utah, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah for the term of four years?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON DECKER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Eileen Maura Decker, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of California for the term of four years?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MILLER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Eric Steven Miller, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION CONSOLIDATED REPORTING ACT OF 2015

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 100, S. 253.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 253) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 253

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Communications Commission Consolidated Reporting Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

Title I of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 13. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In the last quarter of every even-numbered year, the Commission shall publish on its website and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the state of the communications marketplace.

"(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall—

"(1) assess the state of competition in the communications marketplace, including competition to deliver voice, video, audio, and data services among providers of telecommunications, providers of commercial mobile service (as defined in section 332), multichannel video programming distributors (as defined in section 602), broadcast stations, providers of satellite communications, Internet service providers, and other providers of communications services;

“(2) assess the state of deployment of communications capabilities, including advanced telecommunications capability (as defined in section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302)), regardless of the technology used for such deployment;

“(3) assess whether laws, regulations, regulatory practices, or demonstrated marketplace practices pose a barrier to competitive entry into the communications marketplace or to the competitive expansion of existing providers of communications services; and

“(4) describe the agenda of the Commission for the next 2-year period for addressing the challenges and opportunities in the communications marketplace that were identified through the assessments under paragraphs (1) through (3).

“(c) EXTENSION.—If the Senate confirms the Chairman of the Commission during the third or fourth quarter of an even-numbered year, the report required under subsection (a) may be published on the website of the Commission and submitted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by March 1 of the following odd-numbered year.

“(d) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) ASSESSING COMPETITION.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1), the Commission shall consider all forms of competition, including the effect of intermodal competition, facilities-based competition, and competition from new and emergent communications services, including the provision of content and communications using the Internet.

“(2) ASSESSING DEPLOYMENT.—In assessing the state of deployment under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall include a list of geographical areas that are not served by any provider of advanced telecommunications capability.

“(3) CONSIDERING SMALL BUSINESSES.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1) and barriers under subsection (b)(3), the Commission shall consider market entry barriers for entrepreneurs and other small businesses in the communications marketplace in accordance with the national policy under section 257(b).

“(e) NOTIFICATION OF DELAY IN REPORT.—If the Commission fails to publish a report by the applicable deadline under subsection (a) or (c), the Commission shall, not later than 7 days after the deadline and every 60 days thereafter until the publication of the report—

“(1) provide notification of the delay by letter to the chairperson and ranking member of—

“(A) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

“(2) indicate in the letter the date on which the Commission anticipates the report will be published; and

“(3) publish the letter on the website of the Commission.”.

SEC. 3. CONSOLIDATION OF REDUNDANT REPORTS; CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) ORBIT ACT REPORT.—Section 646 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 765e) is repealed.

(b) SATELLITE COMPETITION REPORT.—Section 4 of Public Law 109–34 (47 U.S.C. 703) is repealed.

(c) INTERNATIONAL BROADBAND DATA REPORT.—Section 103(b)(1) of the Broadband Data Improvement Act (47 U.S.C. 1303(b)(1)) is amended by striking “the assessment and report” and all that follows through “the Federal Communications Commission” and inserting “its report under section 13 of the Communications Act of 1934, the Federal Communications Commission”.

(d) STATUS OF COMPETITION IN THE MARKET FOR THE DELIVERY OF VIDEO PROGRAMMING RE-

PORT.—Section 628 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 548) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);

(2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (g); and

(3) by transferring subsection (g) (as redesignated) so that it appears after subsection (f).

(e) REPORT ON CABLE INDUSTRY PRICES.—Section 623(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 543(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “annually publish” and inserting “publish with its report under section 13 of the Communications Act of 1934”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), in the heading, by striking “ANNUAL”.

(f) TRIENNIAL REPORT IDENTIFYING AND ELIMINATING MARKET ENTRY BARRIERS FOR ENTREPRENEURS AND OTHER SMALL BUSINESSES.—Section 257 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 257) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(g) STATE OF COMPETITIVE MARKET CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO COMMERCIAL MOBILE RADIO SERVICES.—Section 332(c)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(c)(1)(C)) is amended by striking the first and second sentences.

(h) PREVIOUSLY ELIMINATED ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 154) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (k); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (l) through (o) as subsections (k) through (n), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 9(i), by striking “In the Commission’s annual report, the Commission shall prepare an analysis of its progress in developing such systems and” and inserting “The Commission”; and

(B) in section 309(j)(8)(B), by striking the last sentence.

(i) ADDITIONAL OUTDATED REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 4—

(i) in subsection (b)(2)(B)(ii), by striking “and shall furnish notice of such action” and all that follows through “subject of the waiver”; and

(ii) in subsection (g)—

(I) by striking paragraph (2); and

(II) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(B) in section 215—

(i) by striking subsection (b); and

(ii) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b);

(C) in section 227(e)—

(i) by striking paragraph (4); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (9) as paragraphs (4) through (8), respectively;

(D) in section 303(u)(1)(B), by striking “section 713(f)” and inserting “section 713(e)”; and

(E) in section 309(j)—

(i) by striking paragraph (12);

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (13) through (17) as paragraphs (12) through (16), respectively; and

(iii) in paragraph (14)(C), as redesignated—

(I) by striking clause (iv); and

(II) by redesignating clauses (v) and (vi) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively;

(F) in section 331(b), by striking the last sentence;

(G) in section 336(e), by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) REPORT.—The Commission shall annually advise the Congress on the amounts collected pursuant to the program required by this subsection.”;

(H) in section 338(k)(6), by striking “section 396(k)(6)(B)” and inserting “section 396(j)(6)(B)”;

(I) in section 339(c)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1);

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively;

(iii) in paragraph (3)(A), as redesignated, by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”; and

(iv) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking “paragraphs (2) and (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (3)”;

(J) in section 396—

(i) by striking subsections (i) and (m);

(ii) by redesignating subsections (j) through (l) as subsections (i) through (k), respectively;

(iii) in subsection (j), as redesignated—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (F);

(II) in paragraph (3)(B)(iii)—

(aa) by striking subclause (V);

(bb) by redesignating subclause (VI) as subclause (V); and

(cc) in subclause (V), as redesignated, by striking “subsection (l)(4)(B)” and inserting “subsection (k)(4)(B)”;

(III) in paragraph (5), by striking “subsection (l)(3)(B)” and inserting “subsection (k)(3)(B)”;

and

(iv) in subsection (k), as redesignated—

(I) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “shall be included” and all that follows through “The audit report”; and

(II) in paragraph (4), by striking “subsection (k)” each place that term appears and inserting “subsection (j)”;

(K) in section 398(b)(4), by striking the third sentence;

(L) in section 399B(c), by striking “section 396(k)” and inserting “section 396(j)”;

(M) in section 615(l)(1)(A)(ii), by striking “section 396(k)(6)(B)” and inserting “section 396(j)(6)(B)”;

(N) in section 624A(b)(1)—

(i) by striking “REPORT; REGULATIONS” and inserting “REGULATIONS”;

(ii) by striking “Within 1 year after” and all that follows through “on means of assuring” and inserting “The Commission shall issue such regulations as are necessary to assure”; and

(iii) by striking “Within 180 days after” and all that follows through “to assure such compatibility.”; and

(O) in section 713—

(i) by striking subsection (a);

(ii) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (j) as subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively;

(iii) in subsection (a), as redesignated, by striking “subsection (d)” each place that term appears and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(iv) in subsection (b), as redesignated, by striking “subsection (b)” each place that term appears and inserting “subsection (a)”;

(v) in subsection (c), as redesignated, by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsection (a)”;

(vi) in subsection (e)(2)(A), as redesignated, by striking “subsection (h)” and inserting “subsection (g)”;

(vii) in subsection (f), as redesignated, by striking “subsection (e)(2)” and inserting “subsection (d)(2)”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2012.—Section 6401(b) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1451(b)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “(15)(A)” and inserting “(14)(A)”;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “(16)(B)” and inserting “(15)(B)”.

(B) TITLE 17.—Title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in section 114(d)(1)(B)(iv), by striking “section 396(k)” and inserting “section 396(j)”;

(ii) in section 119(a)—

(I) in paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

(aa) in subclause (I), by striking “section 339(c)(3)” and inserting “section 339(c)(2)”;

(bb) in subclause (II), by striking “section 339(c)(4)” and inserting “section 339(c)(3)”;

(cc) in subclause (III), by striking “section 339(c)(3)” and inserting “section 339(c)(2)”;

(II) in paragraph (3)(E), by striking “section 339(c)(2)” and inserting “section 339(c)(1)”;

(III) in paragraph (13), by striking “section 339(c)(2)” and inserting “section 339(c)(1)”.

SEC. 4. EFFECT ON AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to expand or contract the authority of the Federal Communications Commission.

SEC. 5. OTHER REPORTS.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise prevent the Federal Communications Commission from producing any additional reports otherwise within the authority of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The bill (S. 253), as amended, was passed.

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARIES OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE 13TH, 14TH, AND 15TH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 198, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 198) commemorating the 150th anniversaries of the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, often referred to as the “Second Founding” of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on September 17, 1787, George Washington, James Madison, and their fellow framers made the momentous decision to sign the Constitution and send it along to the American people for ratification—marking a new beginning in our Nation’s profound experiment in democracy.

While the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 established the firm foundation for our democracy, it was not complete because it did not ad-

dress the vexing issue of slavery. It would take more than seven decades and a bloody civil war before our founding charter would right that wrong.

This year marks the sesquicentennial, or the 150th anniversary, of the Thirteenth Amendment, which, along with the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, has been described by scholars as our Nation’s “Second Founding.” Ratified by President Lincoln and his generation after the Civil War, these second founding amendments transformed our original charter by ending slavery, banning racial discrimination in voting, and elevating liberty and equality to a central place in our constitutional order. While we rightly celebrate our original founding charter, we have often overlooked the importance of these subsequent amendments, which has served as the bedrock and inspiration to procuring equality for racial minorities and women.

On January 31, 1865, Congress passed the Thirteenth Amendment to end slavery and sent it to the States for ratification. Passage of that amendment was by no means an easy feat. As brilliantly captured by Steven Spielberg in his film “Lincoln,” the final vote was every bit as dramatic as the film’s portrayal. Doris Kearns Goodwin’s award-winning book, “Team of Rivals,” noted that before this historic vote: “Every available foot of space, both in the galleries and on the floor of the House, was crowded at an early hour,” and the attendees included Chief Justice Chase and the members of the Supreme Court, along with Secretary of State William Seward.

Without the support of five Democrats who became the swing votes, the amendment would never have passed. One Pennsylvania congressman, knowing that his vote could very well cost him his seat, said right before he cast his vote that “If by my action today I dig my political grave, I will descend into it without a murmur.” I am proud to say that both of Vermont’s Senators voted in favor of the amendment, including Senator Solomon Foot, who served as President pro tempore of the Senate during the Civil War, and Senator Jacob Collamer, who was called the “Green Mountain Socrates” by Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts. Upon the amendment’s passage, Secretary of War Edwin Stanton ordered 100 guns to fire with their heaviest charges while the names of those who voted in favor of the amendment were read aloud because “History [would] embalm them in great honor.”

Upon passage, President Lincoln received praise from even his most ardent critics, including the prominent abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison, who once burned a copy of the Constitution while calling it a proslavery document.

While this year marks the 150th anniversary of the passage and ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment, we should celebrate the second founding amendments together, for they are inextricably bound. The Fourteenth Amendment, passed in 1866 and ratified in 1868, is perhaps the single most influential amendment passed after the Bill of Rights. This week also marks the 149th anniversary of the passage of the 14th Amendment in the Senate. It was under the command of the Fourteenth Amendment providing equal protection for all citizens that the Supreme Court held that separate was inherently unequal in *Brown v. Board of Education*; that marriage is a fundamental right that cannot be tainted with racial discrimination in *Loving v. Virginia*; that women could not be denied admission into an all-male military institute because of their gender in *United States v. Virginia*; and many others, including hopefully, that the fundamental right to marriage extends to all individuals regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity in *Obergefell v. Hodges*.

Ratification of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments cannot be separated from the Fifteenth, which outlawed racial discrimination in voting. In 1865, one month after the end of the Civil War, William Lloyd Garrison called for disbanding an anti-slavery society of which Frederick Douglass and others were members. Prescient as ever, and about 100 years before the passage of the Voting Rights Act, Frederick Douglass responded that “Slavery is not abolished until the black man has the ballot.”

As we celebrate the second founding amendments, we must also take time to recognize that issues of race continue to plague our Nation. And as far as we have come, we still have a lot further to go in our march toward a more perfect union. There are some who would confine the fight for civil rights to a bygone era. They see it as a remnant of the distant past in our Nation’s history. And they cite the election of an African American president as evidence that we have somehow achieved full equality under the law. But we know the struggle for equality and for civil rights is ongoing. The fight for a more perfect union is one that every generation must contribute to—including this one.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 198) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2015

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 11; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the time be equally divided in the usual form; finally, that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:16 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 11, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CAROLYN PATRICIA ALSUP, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE GAMBIA.

PAUL WAYNE JONES, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND.

DANIEL H. RUBINSTEIN, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TUNISIA.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED:

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MAURA BARRY BOYLE, OF NEW YORK
PETER C. TRENCHARD, OF MARYLAND

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

BRADLEY DUANE ARSENAULT, OF FLORIDA
BRET THOMAS CAMPBELL, OF TEXAS
KAREN STONE EXEL, OF CALIFORNIA
GLORIA JEAN GARLAND, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL H. HRYSHCHYSHYN, JR., OF VIRGINIA
YING X. HSU, OF CALIFORNIA
STEPHEN S. KELLEY, OF VIRGINIA
MARY CATHERINE LEHERR, OF VIRGINIA
DENISE G. MANNING, OF VIRGINIA
PAUL KARLIS MARKOV, OF MICHIGAN

SCOTT CURRIE MCNIVEN, OF ARIZONA
HANH NGOC NGUYEN, OF CALIFORNIA
DENISE FRANCES O'TOOLE, OF MAINE
MARISOL E. PEREZ, OF NEW JERSEY
RONALD F. SAVAGE, OF NEW MEXICO
ADAM P. SCHMIDT, OF CONNECTICUT
ANNA TONESS, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL J. TORREANO, OF FLORIDA
NICHOLAS JOHN VIVIO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JAMSHED ZUBERI, OF CALIFORNIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ELISA RACHEL ADELMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
REID HARMON AHL, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JUDE EDMUND AIDOO II, OF MARYLAND
NABIL KHALED ALSOUFI, OF CALIFORNIA
LYLA J. ANDREWS BASHAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CARRIE KRISTIN ANTAL, OF WASHINGTON

LINDA ARMSTRONG, OF ARIZONA

AVANTI PATEL BALUCI, OF ILLINOIS

NOEL GEOFFREY BAUER, OF MISSOURI

ALLYSON PERRY BEAR, OF MARYLAND

AMY MARIE BEELER, OF CONNECTICUT

ALISON CORAL BIRD, OF NEW YORK

SANDRA SEO YEON BIRD, OF NEW YORK

JULIE L. BOCCANERA, OF VIRGINIA

ANDREW EDWARD BOEGEL, OF FLORIDA

JEREMY D. BOLEY, OF FLORIDA

MARC BONNENFANT, OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES BORGER, OF FLORIDA

PATRICK D. BOWERS, OF WASHINGTON

CRYSTAL N. BYRD, OF MARYLAND

ELIZABETH MICHELLE CAMPBELL, OF VIRGINIA

LAURA GOULART CAMPBELL, OF MAINE

MICHAEL FRANCIS CAPOBIANCO, JR., OF FLORIDA

DAWN CHERRIE CARMIN, OF COLORADO

ALISON J. CASE, OF MICHIGAN

JUDY CHANG, OF NORTH CAROLINA

MICHELLE CHEN, OF CALIFORNIA

MARK W. CHILDERHOSE, OF NEW YORK

ZACHARY CRAIG CLARKE, OF IDAHO

LEE COHEN, OF NEW YORK

CHRISTEAN JOSETTE COLE, OF MARYLAND

JOHN M. COLLINS, OF CALIFORNIA

CHAD WILLIAM CONLIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS

EUGENE ALVARO COOPER, OF CALIFORNIA

JESSICA HARPER COULIBALY, OF CONNECTICUT

MATTHEW PATRICK CULLINANE, OF MARYLAND

CHRISTOPHER J. DALY, OF ILLINOIS

CHRISTINE A. DANTON, OF FLORIDA

ADRIANA KRISTEN DAVIS, OF VIRGINIA

CHRISTINA T. DAVIS, OF TEXAS

JEFFRIES BLUNT DE GRAFFENRIED, JR., OF FLORIDA

CURTICE E. DORSEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

ERIN EPSTEIN DOSS, OF FLORIDA

BRIAN R. ELLIS, OF TEXAS

JENNIFER ERIE, OF MARYLAND

BRANDON E. L. FENLEY, OF VIRGINIA

COREY J. FORTIN, OF KANSAS

KEVIN CHRISTOPHER FOX, OF FLORIDA

MEREDITH ANNE FOX, OF TEXAS

CHRISTOPHER JOHN FREY, OF FLORIDA

IRA JOSEPH FRYDMAN, OF CALIFORNIA

BETHANY KATHARINE GADDIS, OF COLORADO

CONRADO A. GARCIA, OF VIRGINIA

TAYLOR HOWELL GARRETT, OF TEXAS

MARK D. GIZZI, OF CALIFORNIA

DION L. GLISAN, OF OREGON

LISA L. GODWIN, OF ALABAMA

JEAN-MARC GORELICK, OF NEW YORK

JESSE GUTIERREZ, OF CALIFORNIA

TRAVIS RAY GUYMON, OF IDAHO

ALEXANDRA MONTEALEGRE HADZI-VIDANOVIC, OF FLORIDA

MALICK HAIDARA, OF COLORADO

COREY A. HANCOCK, OF FLORIDA

KENNETH WOLF HASSON, OF TEXAS

JESSICA FORREST HEALEY, OF TEXAS

MARY TYLER HOLMES, OF PENNSYLVANIA

ANN HOPPER, OF VIRGINIA

TIMOTHY M. HURLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MATTHEW LOWELL HUTCHERSON, OF NORTH CAROLINA

STEPHANIE ELISE ICELAND-LEITZEL, OF CALIFORNIA

CHIDINMA U. IKONNE, OF MARYLAND

DEBBIE PATRICE JACKSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA

JUNO LAWRENCE JAFFER, OF VIRGINIA

LEIGH HAMILTON JONES, OF VIRGINIA

M. THOMAS KALUZNY, OF CALIFORNIA

MISCHERE KAWAS, OF FLORIDA

KISHORI KEDLAYA, OF CALIFORNIA

NANCY H. KLEINHANS, OF NEVADA

RYAN D. KNIGHT, OF COLORADO

BYRON C. KOMINEK, OF TENNESSEE

MICHELLE KOSCIELSKI, OF ILLINOIS

CLAUDIA OLIVIA KOZIOL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HARRY THORNTON KRIZ, OF FLORIDA

JOHN KARL KUEHNLE, OF MAINE

KAROLYN KUO, OF CALIFORNIA

AVIVA ESTHER KUTNICK, OF MARYLAND

JANNIE KWOK, OF CALIFORNIA

CARLOS ANDRES LAMADRID, OF CALIFORNIA
SANG E. LEE, OF CALIFORNIA
GREGORY CARL LEON, OF NEW YORK
BRONWYN BOWEN LLEWELLYN, OF NORTH CAROLINA
JAMES G. LYKOS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
JOHN P. MACY, OF WEST VIRGINIA
SABINA MALIK, OF NEW YORK

LEROY L. MARSHALL III, OF NEW JERSEY
BRIAN MEHLE MARTALUS, OF NEW JERSEY
KEVIN CHESLEY MARTIN, OF GEORGIA
SUSAN MATHEW, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANNA HARRISON MCCREERY, OF VIRGINIA
ANNMARIE MCGILLICUDDY, OF VIRGINIA
JASON EDWARD MCNABB, OF CALIFORNIA
SEAN R. MENDOZA, OF ARIZONA

BELAY ASMAW MENGISTU, OF MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER A. MILLER, OF FLORIDA
KIRA MICKIE MITRE, OF VIRGINIA
MONIQUE MURAD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JENNY PARRY NEVILLE, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL W. NICHOLSON, OF KENTUCKY
DANIELE HENRIETTE NYRANDUTYE, OF OHIO

NATHAN A. OLAH, OF VIRGINIA
FOLASADE A. OWOLABI, OF NEW YORK
CHRISTINE PAGEN, OF NEW YORK
ROBERT L. PARNELL IV, OF FLORIDA
LINDA JEANNE PERCY, OF FLORIDA
PAUL MICHAEL PLEVA, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREA M. PLUCKNETT, OF VIRGINIA
MONICA J. PONS, OF CALIFORNIA

CARRIE RASMUSSEN, OF WASHINGTON
ANDREW REESE, OF TEXAS
TARA M. REICHENBACH, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER RENQUIST HORSFALL, OF TENNESSEE
ERIN MICHELLE RICCI, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN PATRICK ROBERTS, OF CALIFORNIA
JUAN CARLOS RODRIGUEZ, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID MARTIN ROGERS, OF CALIFORNIA
EMILY MCCORMICK RUPP, OF VIRGINIA

BRET THOMAS SAALWAECHTER, OF CALIFORNIA
BRENDAN SANDERS, OF MISSOURI
SHANNON MIRIAM SCHISLER, OF NEW JERSEY
DEREK R. SEDLACEK, OF TEXAS
REBECCA SEMMES, OF TENNESSEE
PAUL AIYONG SEONG, OF VIRGINIA
PALAK VINOD SHAH, OF ILLINOIS
K. PRESTON SHARP, OF CALIFORNIA

MAURICE L. SHINES, OF MARYLAND
GARY SHU, OF NEW JERSEY
ADAM J. SILAGYI, OF FLORIDA
DANIEL SINCLAIR, OF FLORIDA
ERIK M. SINGER, OF TEXAS
B. JAMES SOUKAMNEUTH, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTOPHER NAIRN STEEL, OF NEW JERSEY
MOLLY I. STEINBAUER, OF CALIFORNIA

ERIC REED STRONG, OF CALIFORNIA
ROGER KATTIRATH SYDNEY, OF TEXAS
SOPHIE J. TAINTOR, OF TENNESSEE
DANIELLE TEDESCO, OF DELAWARE
ANANTHY MICHAEL THAMBINAYAGAM, OF WASHINGTON
ROD THOMPSON, OF FLORIDA

THEOPHILUS ANDREW THORPE, OF DELAWARE
SUZANNE MARIE TRUCHARD, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL A. TRUEBLOOD, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL C. VERSCHNEIDER, OF NEW YORK
MICHAEL KWESI VORDJORBE, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY ANN WANN, OF MISSOURI
SHERRY WARD, OF NEVADA

DENNIS MICHAEL WESNER, OF ILLINOIS
SARA A. WESSELS, OF OHIO
KERRY L. WEST, OF ILLINOIS
BRENDAN WHEELER, OF CONNECTICUT
NANCY D. WHITNEY, OF ARIZONA
ANDREW KIRK GERALD WILLIAMS, OF FLORIDA
ANTHONY WOLAK, OF MINNESOTA

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTOPHER P. AZZANO

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 10, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN W. HUBER, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

EILEEN MAURA DECKER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

ERIC STEVEN MILLER, OF VERMONT, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 10, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 10, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

TSA REPORT CARD IS A GRADE 4

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, TSA is the government agency that is supposed to keep us safe at airports, safe from would-be terrorists that would go through screening and get on America's airplanes. It comes about as a result of the 9/11 attacks on our Nation.

Anybody who flies has been through firsthand—no pun intended—the TSA experience at airports. I, like many Members of Congress, go through TSA screening two times a week, back and forth from my district in Texas. I know numerous TSA employees. Many of them are my friends.

My comments today are not about the TSA employees, but recent news reports about what is taking place at TSA generally, and these news reports are disturbing, Mr. Speaker.

Recent internal investigation has revealed that 67 out of 70 times banned items got through TSA screening at airports through undercover investigations. That is a 96 percent failure rate or, looking at it the other way, that is a grade of 4. TSA gets a grade of 4, Mr. Speaker.

Now, one example, there was an instance where a TSA screener failed to find a fake bomb strapped to the back of an undercover agent going through screening. This was even after the fake bomb set off the magnetometer. They still didn't find it. Now, isn't that lovely? Good thing it was a fake bomb. Fortunately, this was a test. This was part of the undercover investigation. It was not a terrorist seeking mischief at America's airports.

There is more alarming news. Not just the fact that the investigation shows a grade of 4 in folks that are going through the security system, it is also reported this week that TSA failed to identify 73 airport workers who were linked to terrorism. Now, what is this? These are not TSA employees. These are the folks that work behind the security area in the airport, and TSA was not able to identify 73 airport workers linked to terrorism. Now, isn't that lovely? These people, you see, are the people who go to the airport every day, maybe sometimes go through a special line to get behind the security area.

TSA claims it didn't have access to the terror watch list information, so it couldn't identify these potential bad guys. I personally find that difficult to believe that the agency in charge of security at the airport is not able to get security background information about people that work behind security at the airport. In any event, that is not an acceptable excuse for this type of action.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a grade of 4 would not be acceptable anywhere, anyplace in our society, at a business, at school, anywhere, the TSA grade of 4.

I will give you another example. Let's say you want to have a home security system at your residence, and you go out and you solicit different folks that are in the home security business. You meet one sales rep, and you start asking the sales rep, "How good is the security system?" The security guy says, "Well, we have a grade of 4. We have a 4 success rate. 96 percent failure rate." You probably wouldn't hire that guy to install the security system on your home.

If you ask him a few more questions and he says, "We are not only in charge of the security for your home, but we secure the folks that work on your residence when you are gone to work, the plumber, the welder, or the guy who comes in your house, whatever," then if you found out that those

people who are allowed to go in your home and work through this security system have a reputation for being burglars, you probably wouldn't hire this security agency to do the security on your home.

That is exactly what is happening at our airports. The success rate is only 4. We wouldn't hire that agency to do our home, but yet here is the agency that we have to guard our airports.

This is not an indictment about TSA employees, but I think it is an alarming concern about TSA's general management. The problem is the TSA model of security. It can only get a grade of 4—which would not be acceptable under any system.

You know, there really can't be mistakes and errors like this at our Nation's airports. One thing that we could do, one consideration is we could go to private screening at our airports. The law allows for that. Airports ought to consider those private screeners and maybe think it through, whether or not that is a better alternative to the TSA system that gets a grade of 4.

And that is just the way it is.

CHANGE THE CONVERSATION TO HELP AMERICA'S CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend and all day on cable news ever since, we watched a police officer in McKinney, Texas, wrestle with a 14-year-old teenager after what was reported to be a pool party. He throws her to the ground, pulls his gun out and points it at some other kids, screams at her, and then sits on the teenager, who is in her bikini, for a period of time. This is the latest installment of the hit cable television news story of the last year or more called "Cops Behaving Badly Caught on Tape."

This version was not the most deadly, although there have been versions of this story that end in death. It has caused a lot of hot air on radio and TV. Some of it is constructive, and some of it is just offensive.

But has it caused a more serious discussion of police and communities of color? Has it sparked a more serious discussion about how teenagers and police interact or should interact? I hope so, but I kind of doubt it.

Recently, I met with a young man from Chicago who made a real impression on me. He is from the Phoenix Military Academy, a smart teenager.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

He is going to go places. He said: You know what, Congressman? I have taught myself strategies to deescalate the situation whenever I come in contact with police.

Did you hear that? A teenager feels he needs to teach himself ways to deescalate tensions with adult police officers. We are apparently leaving it up to our teenagers to figure out ways to deal with the police, which is precisely backwards from how things ought to be.

What the videotape from Texas and the comment from my young friend at Phoenix Military Academy in Chicago have in common is that there does not seem to be any communication between adults on the police side and young people in our community, who the police are sworn to protect. Instead of a cooperative relationship between teenagers and adults who are there to protect them, there is an adversarial relationship.

A couple of weeks ago, I looked around while I was at a Judiciary Committee hearing on policing strategies in the 21st century, and all I saw were people who were 50, 60, and 70 years old. There were no young people called to testify, to tell us what they face, how they feel, and what we, as adults, should do to help them.

Very few of us are former or current law enforcement. And while all of us are former teenagers, still, for most of us, it has been quite awhile since we were a teenager, and our experiences may not be all that typical of what young people and the police face today.

I hope adults like me in places of influence and authority can be helpful in creating the conditions where avenues of communication are created, but a 3-hour hearing with political undertones and more than a little grandstanding is not nearly enough.

Almost every city in America is one bad incident, an overzealous policeman, or a videotaped moment of stupidity or hatred away from a riot. Michael Brown, Eric Garner, Walter Scott, and Freddie Gray are names we know, but knowing their names is just not enough. We need a sustained effort from Congress and from every institution in our society to address the chasm between young people, and especially young people in communities of color and the police hired to keep them safe.

And let's remember, while the country was transfixed with a video of the cop, the teenagers, and the pool party in Texas, two of my constituents were shot and killed this past weekend in Chicago. They were among 5 dead in Chicago and among 27 people shot from Friday to Monday. At least 5 people were killed and 25 others were shot in and around Chicago the weekend before; 12 dead and 56 were wounded over the long Memorial Day weekend.

Knowing the names of Sandy Hook, Newtown, and Columbine are not

enough when Baltimore, Chicago, and other cities are also losing young people—mostly young people—at this rate.

It goes beyond police practices and the easy availability of guns, but that is part of it. When legislators spend more time making guns easier to carry and stand-your-ground laws make murder wraps easier to beat, our priorities are skewed.

It goes beyond racial profiling, but that is part of it. When 84 percent of sobriety checkpoints in Chicago are set up in Black and Latino neighborhoods so that cops can stop anyone who drives by, that sends a message that is destructive.

It goes beyond economic opportunity, but that is also part of it. Honestly, we do not spend much time in this Congress thinking about how we help 10- and 12-year-olds know that a bright future is possible for them. We do not do much for children to help them achieve their future, but instead we cut things like Head Start and spend more and more money on jails.

Listen, in America, we must change the conversation so that we as a nation are working together to help make sure the next generation lives to adulthood first. We need to stop talking so much about what protects us from those kids and start talking more about what we as adults are going to do to protect those kids from the world we have created for them.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on some of the issues my friend from Chicago just stated, I couldn't disagree more. Let me explain why, why we have problems with our prisons in America and homelessness.

Nearly 10 million Americans have severe mental illness like schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression. Yet millions are going without treatment as families struggle to find care for loved ones.

Over the last 30 years, we have shut down the old asylums and what we have seen is an increase in incarceration, suicide, homelessness, emergency room visits, unemployment, substance abuse, and substance abuse deaths. We have failed on all these metrics.

Anyone who thinks we are being successful in helping those with severe mental illness is delusional. We have traded the old hospital bed for the prison cell, the emergency room gurney, the homeless shelter, and the cemetery. We have seen horrible and disturbing increases of the mentally ill being victims of crime, like sexual assault, robbery, and bullying. In fact, we

lose 40,000 Americans to suicide each year, and there are another 1.3 million suicide attempts.

These stories are haunting, and the numbers are staggering. Four million people with serious mental illness are not receiving treatment. There is a shortage of 1,000 psychiatric hospital beds nationwide, so there is often nowhere to go when there is a crisis.

How cruel and tragic it was when Senator Creigh Deeds of Virginia took his son to a hospital to be told there were no psychiatric beds, and we know the tragic outcome of that story and the thousands of times it is repeated every year.

We have one child psychiatrist for every 2,000 children with a mental health disorder. While we know that 50 percent of severe mental illness emerges by age 14 and 75 percent by age 24, we don't have a sufficient number of professionals to treat it, so it gets worse.

We have Federal rules to protect privacy, which has frustrated countless numbers of doctors and family members, generating 70,000 official complaints. It was meant to improve patient care, but it acts as an impossible barrier to breach because loving family members can't connect with someone with serious mental illness.

We have a mental health agency in this country that the Federal Government has that doesn't employ a single psychiatrist. This is what the American taxpayer buys for \$130 billion a year. Is this success from the over 112 Federal programs and agencies meant to deal with mental illness?

□ 1015

We have failed not because we don't know what to do when it comes to effectively identifying and treating mental illness, but it is because the Federal Government has stood in the way with poorly administered policies and antiquated attitudes.

Our ability to treat serious mental illness is in the 21st century. We know more effective treatments for this brain illness. However, our beliefs about mental illness are still mired in the 19th century. As long as we think that mental illness is an attitude or a difference in perception or that hallucinations and delusions are bizarrely labeled as nonconsensus reality, we are wrong.

Quite simply, we have created the most difficult system for those who have the most difficulty. Now is the time to change and turn this system from top to bottom.

That is why I have reintroduced the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 2646. It reforms Federal programs, removes Federal barriers to care, and refocuses research that is updated and innovative legislation that will produce a new paradigm of treatment for those with serious mental health problems.

This bill empowers parents and caregivers to access care before stage IV. It fixes shortages of inpatient beds, helps to reach underserved in rural populations, expands the mental health workforce, drives evidence-based care, provides alternatives to institutionalization. It integrates primary and behavioral care. It increases the mental health workforce in underserved areas by volunteerism. It increases minorities in the mental health workforce. It advances critical mental research and brings accountability to mental health and substance abuse parity in this Nation.

If we want to get people treatment, not jail time, not abandonment; if we want to help the tens of millions of people affected by mental illness and the hundreds of millions of friends and relatives who are emotionally strained; if we want accountability, transparency, and more effective spending of Federal dollars to get care in the community where it is needed; if we want to stop victimization of the mentally ill; if we want to prevent the next Newtown, Tucson, Aurora, Isla Vista, Columbine, or Navy Yard, we have to do something comprehensive and research based, and we have to do it now.

What we need is not only for Congress to act, but, during these next few weeks, we need to hear from every doctor and first responder and teacher and parent and patient and judge and consumer that we have to act thoroughly and thoughtfully and responsibly and now.

On every concern, America needs to speak up and speak out. We need to start treating mental illness as we do other diseases like AIDS or cancer or diabetes, and this legislation, H.R. 2646, gives us the tools to do so. We need evidence-based care before crisis; we need treatment before tragedy.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, because treatment delayed is treatment denied, and this legislation marks a new dawn for mental health in America.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, House action is expected on trade provisions this week. A vote on a package that establishes the rules for how the next major trade agreement will be handled, the trade promotion authority, may be voted on, this Friday.

It has been fascinating for me to hear the arguments at home and in Washington, D.C., of those who are opposed to trade promotion authority and have already decided against the Trans-Pacific Partnership before the agreement is even finished.

The critics often cite concerns about the environment, but what I hear from some of my friends on the other side of this question at home stands in stark contrast to what I think reality is. The dreaded "secret negotiations" are somehow raised as a negative.

To the best of my knowledge, all major serious agreements are negotiated in private like all labor union contracts. It is after they are negotiated that the Members have them and look at whether or not it is worthy of their support.

There are concerns about various corporate advisers whispering in the Trade Representative's ear and having access to confidential information tilting the playing field. Last week, I met with two of those sinister advisers who happen to be respected environmental leaders. Yes, the advisory panels include environmental leaders and, in fact, union leaders as well.

There was an interesting point that came forward in my conversation with environmentalists that the only way to stop, slow, and reverse the rape of the oceans is by an international trade agreement, and this one is actually shaping up to be pretty strong.

Oceans are threatened by overfishing, having fishery stocks collapse; yet the countries in the 12 countries that are negotiating this agreement have, on average, a 20 percent subsidy to encourage more fishing, overfishing, paying their fishermen to catch the very last fish. The only way to deal with this is by having a multinational agreement that is enforceable to reduce this destructive policy.

Along with the oceans, there is deep concern about what is going on with deforestation, the exploitation of endangered species in the forested areas. Since 2000, we have lost an area ten times the size of Great Britain to deforestation just in the Amazon basin alone. That is why, in the last round of trade negotiations, I fought hard to have provisions against illegal logging in Peru and for them to raise their standards.

We are struggling to make sure that they are fully enforced, but nobody that I have talked to seriously thinks that we wouldn't be better off without an agreement. It gives us leverage, and things are improving.

Well, likewise, we are seeing thugs illegally harvesting endangered species like elephants and rhinos. They are taking illegally harvested exotic timber and disrupting indigenous people.

No nation can prevent the exploitation by themselves, but many nations, armed with an enforceable agreement that we can use trade sanctions to be able to put teeth in it, can make a difference now and raise the bar for future agreements.

The package moving forward has faced some changes that I find troubling. All major legislation that I have

seen in my career in Congress is a mixed bag. They had some good things; they had some bad things; and some things that are hard to figure out.

That is going to be our job this week and beyond, to make that evaluation; but on balance, while we are trying to figure out whether we are better off with or without it, it is important that that decision be made on a factual basis, not hypothetical scare tactics.

RECOGNIZING THE TITUSVILLE HERALD ON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, The Titusville Herald newspaper will publish its 150th anniversary edition, and I rise today to congratulate them on a century and a half of countless memories and news reporting.

The Titusville Herald was first established in 1865 and was the first daily newspaper in the world's original oil region. For 150 years, The Herald has delivered the latest local and national news to the Titusville community and surrounding areas.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that, with today's technological advances, it is no small feat for a small newspaper to withstand the test of time. However, with an incredible and dedicated staff, The Titusville Herald has expanded in size, technology, and outreach and continues to be a vital part of the Titusville community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and congratulating The Herald's staff on reaching this important milestone. I know that they will continue to successfully deliver the news of the oil region to its readers for generations to come.

HUNTINGDON POST OFFICE CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, the Huntingdon Post Office, located in Huntingdon County, Pennsylvania, in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, will be celebrating its 100-year anniversary.

The post office, the first established in Huntingdon County, dates back to 1798 during a time when mail was delivered by post riders and stagecoaches.

In 1915, to accommodate the growing business needs of Huntingdon, then Pennsylvania Governor Martin Brumbaugh dedicated a building on Washington Street to house the post office, the Internal Revenue Service, and military recruiting offices. Since then, the post office on Washington Street has become a permanent fixture within the growing Juniata River community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Huntingdon County Post Office and all of

its employees on 100 years of dedicated community service.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the sciences and the facts don't lie. Congress has stood here for too long debating the truth about climate change. What is there to debate?

More than 12,000 peer-reviewed scientific studies are in agreement. Climate change is real, and humans are significantly to blame. For those of you keeping track at home, there are zero peer-reviewed scientific studies that state the opposite.

As we continue to harm the environment, we are ultimately hurting ourselves and human health. In the movie "Birdman," it was written: "A thing is a thing, not what is said of that thing."

I feel the need to remind my colleagues that climate change is a real thing, regardless of what is said of that climate change thing; just because you don't want to believe it doesn't make climate change any less real. It is rapidly becoming a threatening crisis in public health. As the planet warms, sea levels rise and lead to increased floods. Droughts are more frequent and intense. Heat waves and hurricanes are more severe.

Climate change makes existing diseases and conditions worse, but it also helps introduce new pests and pathogens into communities. Respiratory allergies and diseases are becoming more prevalent because of increased pollen, molds, air pollution, and dust. Higher concentrations of these particles in the air cause severe breathing problems and lead to heart disease, asthma attacks, inflammation, and lung cancer.

Every year, 220,000 people learn they have lung cancer, and 160,000 people die from lung cancer. That is twice the population size of my own neighborhood, Lakeview.

Children who are especially vulnerable to these pollutants are harmed by the air they breathe. Their lungs shouldn't be at risk when they go outside to play or walk to school, but asthma is the third leading cause of hospitalization among children under the age of 15.

Nearly half of this Nation—our Nation—lives in areas with dangerous levels of pollution, 44 percent. My own district is included. Chicago earned itself an F in an air quality study from the American Lung Association.

According to the same study, the Windy City is ranked in the bottom 5 percent for most polluted city in terms of short-term particle pollution in the Nation, and it is only getting worse. Not only is our air quality dangerous, but our most essential resource, which we all depend on, our water, is at risk due to climate change.

Water is vital to survival. As temperatures rise, people and animals need more water to maintain their health and thrive. Increases in water temperature, precipitation frequency and severity, and changes in coastal ecosystem health could increase the incidence of water contamination. Currently, more than 840,000 people die each year from water-related diseases. That is more than the entire city of San Francisco.

Climate change is expected to produce more frequent and severe extreme precipitation events worldwide. Over the past 50 years, the amount of rain falling during the most intense 1 percent of our storms increased by 20 percent. These turbulent changes breed outbreaks of waterborne diseases. In fact, in the United States, from 1948 to 1994, heavy rainfall correlated with more than half of the outbreaks of waterborne disease.

Water sustains our economy by producing energy at power plants, raising livestock, and growing food crops. Many water supply sources are already overallocated, and people are suffering from degraded water quality.

Given our current trajectory within the Western U.S. in severe drought, the competition for water resources will only increase, leading to great impacts on human health.

Albert Einstein once said: "We can't solve today's problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them." We need to adjust how we think about climate change. We need to understand that severe weather, pollution, and changes in our water are not only harmful to the planet, but harmful to the people who inhabit that planet.

Climate change is a direct threat to humanity, and it is time we reexamine how we think about it, talk about it, and respond to this growing problem. The health of humans worldwide is at stake.

CONGRATULATING CANON HUTCHESON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and celebrate my nephew, Canon Hutcheson, and his wife, Courtney, on the birth of their new daughter, their beautiful new daughter, Ella. Ella Brooke Hutcheson was born on June 9 in Warner Robins, Georgia. She weighed in at 8 pounds, 15½ ounces.

I know from experience, the experience of having been blessed with three sons, that parenthood is the most incredible and rewarding experience in the world. I could not be more excited for Canon and for Courtney and their new addition.

I would also like to congratulate Ella's grandparents: my sister, Cissie Hutcheson, and her husband, Craig, of Waycross, Georgia.

Canon was named in honor of my sister, Cissie, and my mother, Zena Cannon Carter, who was born on October 16, 1937, and passed on June 21, 2008. I know that my mother is very proud of her grandson and her namesake.

To the Hutcheson family, and especially to Ella, I wish you the very best, and I am so very proud to welcome a new member to our family.

□ 1030

PROFESSIONAL'S ACCESS TO HEALTH WORKFORCE INTEGRATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Professional's Access to Health Workforce Integration Act, better known as the PATH Workforce Integration Act, of 2015.

The National Center for Health Workforce Analysis predicts that, by 2020, the United States will have a shortage of as high as 20,000 physicians. Other projections are that we will have a shortage of up to 250,000 public health workers. In addition, the Department of Labor projects that, by the year 2025, we will need 500,000 more nurses, 46,000 more mental and behavioral health workers, 38,000 more pharmacists, and 15,000 more dentists.

There are a number of contributing factors to the projected health care workforce shortage. The U.S. population by 2030 is expected to rise by 18 percent. The population of those over the age of 65 is expected to increase three times its current rate, and the Bureau of Health Professions projects a 5.2 percent increase in the utilization of health services. This is all happening while our current health care workforce is retiring in greater numbers than we are able to graduate new workers.

While it is true the Affordable Care Act incorporated numerous provisions for addressing the workforce shortage, our Nation's current educational infrastructure lacks the capacity to train health care professionals fast enough to fill the projected health workforce shortages. In our country today, we have internationally trained health professionals, residing legally in the United States, who are unable to work in their chosen profession. They currently represent a missed opportunity to address our health care workforce shortages.

The PATH Act helps to address this shortage by providing the over 2 million foreign-trained health professionals legally residing in the United

States the guidance that they need to work in employment matching their health professional skills, education, and expertise. This includes internationally trained doctors, nurses, dentists, mental health providers, and pharmacists whose linguistic and cultural skills will also help improve the health needs of our diversifying Nation.

What the PATH Act would do is facilitate counseling and training opportunities to reduce barriers to the health workforce; provide access to accelerated courses in English as a second language; provide assistance in the evaluation of foreign credentials; and help in educating employers about the competency of health professionals trained outside of the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, our health care system is rapidly approaching a crisis due to a lack of qualified health professionals. The PATH Act of 2015 will help prevent this crisis, and I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH, NOT PEACE THROUGH ENDLESS WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I spoke to about 200 people at the famous Willard Hotel in Washington in a program put on by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. I had been told that this was a group of CEOs and owners of major companies in southern California—obviously, a very upper-income group.

I got to a point in my speech when I said: "It is long past the time we need to stop trying to run the whole world and start putting our own people in our own country first once again."

Much to my surprise, the audience broke into applause. Middle- and lower-income people have applauded when I have said similar things in my district and around the country. Many upper-income people claim to be moderates, and contrary to popular belief, conservatives lose most very wealthy areas 2-1 or worse. I have spoken to a very wide variety of groups in Washington and around the country and in my district, and I have gotten an overwhelmingly positive response every time I have said it has been a horrible mistake to spend trillions on unnecessary wars in the Middle East.

When I was a teenager, I remember reading a publication from the Republican National Committee that read: "Democrats start wars. Republicans end them."

There was a time, until recent years, when the Republican Party could make a legitimate claim to being the Peace Party. I sent my first paycheck as a bag boy at the A&P—\$19 and some

cents—as a contribution to the Barry Goldwater campaign. I have worked on Republican campaigns at the national, State, and local levels for over 50 years, and it saddens me to hear almost all of the Republican candidates for President try to outdo each other in their hawkishness. Based on the response I have gotten, I think it is a recipe for defeat if my Republican Party becomes known as the party favoring permanent, forever wars—wars without end.

All of our candidates try to convince people that they are like Ronald Reagan. President Reagan once wrote: "Our troops should be committed to combat abroad only as a last resort—when no other choice is available."

Reagan was certainly no warmonger Republican or a man eager to go to war.

President Eisenhower, one of our greatest military leaders, was another "peacenik" Republican. He knew of the horrors of war, unlike many modern day chickenhawks. He famously warned us at the end of his Presidency about the dangers of being controlled by a very powerful military-industrial complex. I think he would be shocked at how far we have gone down the road that he warned us against.

In his book "Ike's Bluff," Evan Thomas wrote: "Eisenhower would periodically sigh to Andy Goodpaster, his Chief of Staff: 'God help the Nation when it has a President who doesn't know as much about the military as I do.'"

Pat Buchanan wrote on March 20: "In November 1956, President Eisenhower, enraged he had not been forewarned of their invasion of Egypt, ordered the British, French, and Israelis to get out of Suez and Sinai. They did as told. How far we have fallen from the America of Ike."

Senator Robert Taft, who was sometimes referred to as "Mr. Republican" in the 1940s and 1950s, once said: "No foreign policy can be justified except a policy devoted . . . to the protection of the liberty of the American people, with war only as the last resort and only to preserve that liberty."

Most of the Republican Presidential candidates have attacked President Obama for acting in some ways that are unconstitutional, and he has. But where in our Constitution does it give us the authority to run other countries as we have been doing in Iraq and Afghanistan—even making small business loans and training local police forces?

My Republican Party was always the party of fiscal conservatism. Yet, with a national debt of over \$18 trillion, how can we justify continually spending megabillions in religious civil wars between the Shia and Sunni?

Some people and companies that make money off of an interventionist foreign policy always very quickly fall back on the slur of isolationism, but

most conservatives believe in trade and tourism and cultural and educational exchanges with other countries and in helping out during humanitarian crises. We just don't believe in endless war.

We are told, if we don't support an interventionist foreign policy, that this means we don't believe in American exceptionalism, but this Nation did not become exceptional because we got involved in every little war around the globe. It became exceptional because of our great free enterprise system and because we gave our people more individual freedom than any other country.

I have said in thousands of speeches that we are blessed beyond belief to live in this country and that the United States is, without question, the greatest country in the history of the world, but there was much less anti-Americanism around the world when we tried to mind our own business and take care of our own people, and this Nation had more friends when we followed the policy of peace through strength, not one of peace through endless war.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT- IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise this morning to sound the alarm, and I want my colleagues to understand that there are just 10 legislative days remaining for Congress to act before the Export-Import Bank shuts down. It is outrageous that we are here today, in this countdown, as the hands of the clock have become a knife-edge pressed against the future of American businesses and the jobs they create.

The Ex-Im Bank has a proven track record of supporting hundreds of thousands of jobs in every single congressional district across this country, and the fact that anyone would even consider shutting it down is shortsighted, and it is harmful to our economy. Ex-Im supports our businesses and our workers, all while not costing taxpayers a dime. In fact, over the past two decades, the Bank has generated a profit of close to \$7 billion—a true win-win for our taxpayers. Yet, for the ideologues who are committed to chopping away government programs that support our Nation's students and seniors, exporters, and others, the facts don't really matter. They just see ending the Bank as a conservative litmus test.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply shameful that the extremist, antigovernment wing of the Republican Party has, once again, pushed us to the brink of actively damaging our Nation's businesses and our competitiveness with

this standoff. It doesn't have to be this way. A majority of the House of Representatives is already on record in its support of a long-term reauthorization of the Bank. It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to intervene by immediately putting a measure up to keep its doors open for a vote on the House floor.

For 2 years, despite the calls from Democrats and Republicans, Chairman HENSARLING has made it clear that this manufactured crisis is exactly what he has wanted all along. This is not a fight between Democrats and Republicans. It is a fight between ideology and reason in the Republican Party. While the ideologically driven crusade to eliminate the Bank may be a game here in Washington, it certainly isn't a game for the hundreds of thousands of our businesses all over this country.

For example, let's take Michael Boyle, a Republican and a veteran, who recently testified that, thanks to the Bank, he has been able to quadruple his company's revenue and expand his business from just 8 employees to 60 currently.

Mr. Boyle's story is the American story of thousands of businesses, large and small, across this country that rely on the Bank to compete on the global stage. Nevertheless, in the United States Congress, we are talking about shutting down one of the best resources our businesses have—just to make a political statement.

As the deadline for reauthorizing the Bank nears, I have been encouraged to increasingly hear from some of my Republican colleagues who have come out and said, "Enough is enough." As a matter of fact, as I sat in committee, I was very pleased to hear Mr. FINCHER, a Republican, say that his wife told him:

You don't represent and you don't work for the chairman of the committee, Mr. Hensarling. You don't work for the Speaker, Mr. Boehner. You work for the people who elected you to come to Congress.

Mr. FINCHER basically said to his chairman that it is time to stop playing the game, that we have got to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

I want you to know that Mr. HENSARLING and those rightwing conservatives who want to use this as a political point will have you believe, "Oh, this Bank is only for Big Business," but that is absolutely not true. Not only does the Bank support thousands of small businesses, but the suppliers to the big businesses are small businesses all over this country who rely on the Export-Import Bank for their ability to create jobs and have businesses in their districts.

□ 1045

All of the Members on the Democratic side of the aisle support the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, and many of the Members on the opposite side of the aisle support the

Bank. So I don't know why the Members on the opposite side of the aisle can't rein in their chairman. I don't know why they are afraid of him. I don't know why they don't speak up.

We have 10 more days. Let's get busy and get this bill reauthorized and this Bank. I am asking Speaker BOEHNER to exercise his leadership and get it done.

JOIN ME IN OPPOSING THE INNOVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to alert my colleagues and to alert the American people that a bill is being marked up in the Committee on the Judiciary this coming Thursday, H.R. 9. This bill is a grave threat to the rights of the American people to own the intellectual property rights that they have created with their own hard work and their own innovative skills.

The bill that is being marked up is called, in fact, the Innovation Act. It is one of the worst misnomers that I have seen in my time in Congress. This should be called the "Anti-Innovation Act." This is yet the latest of a decades-long attack on the patent rights of the American people that were placed into the Constitution by our Founding Fathers.

For decades now, large multinational corporations, very powerful economic entities that have influence on government, have been trying to neuter the patent rights of the American people. Why have they been doing this? Why do they want to eliminate or to dramatically reduce the rights of our inventors to control what they have invented? Because these are big guys who don't want to pay the little guys when they steal from them.

The fact is that our Founding Fathers knew it was important for someone who has created something, whether it is a writer or an inventor, to have the right to control his or her creation for a certain period of time. The time period has been 17 years, traditionally, since the time of our Constitution. Our Founding Fathers knew this was important to our country's well-being, not just in terms of the rights of the individual, which we agree with as Americans and which were written into our Constitution as part of the Bill of Rights.

Only one place is the word "right" used in the body of the Constitution, and that is in the section dealing with providing our inventors and, yes, our writers with the right to control what they have created for a certain period of time in order to profit from it.

Our big corporations and these multinational corporations that have no loyalty to the United States, these people

who are continually going overseas to China and elsewhere are trying to neuter this so that they can take any new innovation without having to pay the person who has actually been the inventor and created this. That is totally contrary to what our country has been all about.

We have had the strongest patent system in the world—the strongest in the world. What has that given the American people? It has uplifted our standard of living of ordinary people. Yes, these folks in the multinational corporations, they live very well. Well, the American people have lived well because we have had the technology, whether it is agricultural technology or transportation technology or any of the other type of energy technologies that we have. These have uplifted us and created more wealth for our society.

Americans' security, prosperity, and, yes, freedom have been due to our technological advantages. It is not that our people worked harder. It is not that we had such natural resources. There are countries all over the world where people work hard and have natural resources. It is our freedom and our respect for the individual rights of our citizens that have given us prosperity and security and freedom.

Now these powerful multinational corporations have targeted our patent system; and, yes, their motive, as I say, is to steal, let the big guys steal from the little guys. That is what this supposed Innovation Act, which, as I say, should be called the "Anti-Innovation Act," is all about.

In fact, there is a legitimate problem of frivolous lawsuits in our country. There is no doubt about that. It is not just in the area of technology. It is throughout our medicine and everywhere else. But there have been a number of people who have taken patent law and claimed rights that they weren't given by the Patent Office and issued frivolous lawsuits to people to try to get them to pay money to them. They are called patent trolls.

This excuse for changing our patent system is a lame excuse in the sense that we don't need to destroy the patent rights of the little guy in order to cure this problem. Every provision of the Innovation Act—every provision—limits the rights of legitimate patent holders in order to protect their own creation.

Let's not eliminate our freedom to handle those people, those few people, who are abusing it. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing that and alerting the American people to this challenge to their freedom and their security and their prosperity.

AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES NEED THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I have a simple ask: let the Export-Import Bank answer the call. 2,655—2,655—that is how many small businesses called the Export-Import Bank last year and asked for their assistance in selling American-made goods and services around the globe. That is how many businesses the Export-Import Bank said yes to, without any impact on taxpayers—no cost to taxpayers whatsoever—in order to help those 2,655 businesses be competitive in a global market.

The truth is, in each district—Democratic districts, Republican districts, urban, rural, coastal, interior—each district is rich with businesses large and small. Every Member has small businesses that are the result of hard work, families pulling together to build something of value and worth that can be assisted by the Export-Import Bank—brand-new business as well, not just those that are intergenerational. These are the businesses that create jobs and employ millions of our loved ones and our neighbors and our family. When they want to export their goods and services, who do they call? They call the Export-Import Bank.

Alliance Rubber Company is just one of the 2,655 small businesses that made that call. Alliance is the largest manufacturer of rubberbands in America. It is a women-owned small business located in Hot Springs, Arkansas. They employ a whole 156 employees. Alliance plans to add 15 employees within the next year, but without exports, they will be cutting 10 jobs—our family members, our neighbors. Add 15 or cut 10? It seems like the choice is obvious to me.

Here is what another company said: “Thanks to credit insurance available through the Ex-Im, we have hired a salesman dedicated to growing international sales. Growing our traffic and safety business internationally will mean more jobs in our Fife facility and more business for our local vendors.”

That is in my district, Fife, Washington. The company is Pexco, another one of the 2,655 businesses. There are Pexcos in Republican districts and in Democratic districts all over this country. There are Alliance Rubber companies in Republican Districts and Democratic districts. And if you listen to these business leaders, it makes sense to help them do what they are doing.

Who will answer the call after June 30? Well, unfortunately, not local banks or even the big banks. If you don't believe me, ask them. They are the ones that usually refer the businesses to the Export-Import Bank.

We have 10 days left, 10 legislative days to act before the help on the other

end of the line is gone. Companies have 15 business days to make the call and see how they can sell their goods and expand their exports to foreign customers. If you are a small business looking to export, call 1-800-565-EXIM, 1-800-565-3949. That is why the Bank is there. That is why it should remain.

As a matter of fact, Chairman HENSARLING's own witness—I couldn't make this stuff up—who testified against the Bank as a small-business owner last week told her hometown newspaper this later: “The fact is that there are a lot of small businesses and large businesses that need the Bank right now, and to pull that rug out from under them would be devastating.” I couldn't make this up.

Hold a vote, Mr. Speaker. Hold a vote. Give your colleagues the opportunity to vote for our small businesses and the jobs they provide. They are the backbone of this community and this economy and this Nation; 2,655 of them and counting. Let the Export-Import Bank answer the call.

AMERICANS DESERVE TO KNOW WHO RAISED THEIR FOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, Americans want to know: Where does their food come from? Parents want to know before they give it to their children: How was this food raised? Where did it come from? Moms want to know, dads want to know, and today they can; but if proposed legislation passes this body this week, we won't have that information necessary to make those decisions for our family and our family's health.

What legislation am I talking about? I am talking about the country of origin labeling. In other words, right now, if you buy food and it comes from a foreign country, it must be labeled. If you buy pork, you buy beef, you buy chicken, wouldn't you want to know where that food came from?

Why would you want to know? Well, different countries have different rules and different cultures. If you remember back in 2007, we had some pet food that came from a foreign country that killed a lot of pets. It was enhanced with melamine to up the protein readings in it, and it was unsafe for pets. A lot of pets died as a result. Well, it came from a different country that has different ethics. I think Americans deserve to know who raised their food, which country did it come from. But the legislation that is in front of us this week will repeal that requirement to label beef, poultry, and pork.

Now, why are we doing this? Why are we in such a rush? Because we have been told that the World Trade Organization requires it.

What is the World Trade Organization, and who are they to tell Congress

what laws we have to pass? These judges weren't appointed by the President. They weren't confirmed by the Senate. These are not judges from our Constitution. These are extra-constitutional judges, yet they are telling us here in Congress you have got to do this or there will be repercussions.

I think our Founding Fathers would be appalled at this notion, that we have given up our sovereignty. I don't accept the premise that we have to make laws here based on what some world court agrees to, but I suppose somebody made a trade agreement in some Congress previous that bound us to decisions of this court.

Now, even if you accept the premise that we have to abide by the World Trade Organization, and because they have ruled that we can no longer label pork and beef as from foreign countries to inform our consumers, then you have got to ask the question: Why did we add chicken to this bill? The World Trade Organization is silent on the subject of chicken, yet it is in the bill.

We are going to remove the labeling requirements for chicken. I think it is a bad idea. I think it is probably motivated by some large meat packing companies; but they are represented here in Congress, and the American consumer and small livestock farmers are not.

□ 1100

I proposed voluntary country of origin labeling last night in the Rules Committee. I had an amendment. It said: Okay. Maybe we shouldn't mandate. Maybe we shouldn't force the foreigners to label their meat when it comes into the country; but how about voluntarily letting American producers put that proud stamp and know that it is the seal of approval that most consumers want so they know that beef, that pork, was raised in this country?

I was shot down in the Rules Committee. It was just a voluntary program. In fact, it was proposed 10 years ago by this Speaker of the House, by the former chair of the Ag Committee, by the current chair of the Ag Committee, and by the current chair of the Rules Committee; yet they wouldn't allow my amendment for a vote in the Rules Committee. All I sought to do was let American farmers proclaim that their beef is raised in the United States.

Today, Mr. Speaker, that is why I am here. I am here today to say that we need to assert our sovereignty, the sovereignty of this body. We all took an oath to the Constitution. We didn't take an oath to the World Trade Organization. We need to assert our sovereignty, and we need to uphold our commitment to the Americans who sent us here.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the repeal of the country of origin labeling bill later today.

ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, our Commander in Chief admitted that, in the fight against the Islamic State, the U.S. does not have “a complete strategy.”

It is hard to believe that it has been 1 year since the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria—ISIS, ISIL, or whatever you want to call them—began making headlines in American newspapers. It is hard to believe that it has been nearly 1½ years since the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency told members of the Senate Armed Services Committee that it was “likely ISIL will attempt to take territory in Iraq and Syria.”

But it goes back even farther. In January 2014, the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq said the Islamic State is “capable of taking and holding ground and causing a lot of trouble.” In November 2013, a State Department official testified before a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee and specifically cited the ineffectiveness of Iraq’s military.

Then Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Iraq and Iran said: “ISIL has benefited from a permissive operating environment due to inherent weaknesses of Iraqi security forces.”

Mr. Speaker, all of these warnings occurred after Iraq’s Prime Minister made an appeal to President Obama to help defeat the growing threat to his country. That was 2 years ago; so here we are.

In June 2015, the leader of the free world tells an international conference in Austria that the United States does not have a complete strategy to defeat an enemy he once called a JV squad. Well, that JV squad is responsible for the horrific murders of American citizens.

That JV squad has overtaken territory fought so hard for by American troops, territory that nearly 4,500 American servicemen and -women died to protect in the most violent battles witnessed by U.S. troops since the Vietnam war. That JV squad waves black flags while driving stolen military equipment through streets where Americans made the ultimate sacrifice.

From overlooked redlines to bypassed deadlines, the Obama administration will serve as a case study in how not to conduct foreign policy for future world leaders.

Today, the President wants us to believe that his administration’s negotiations with Iran are in Israel’s best interests. Ironically, Israel’s Prime Minister made a direct appeal to the American people expressing the contrary.

This past March, Prime Minister Netanyahu petitioned Congress from the podium right behind me because he, like so many, has lost faith in the abilities of our Commander in Chief.

He is right; he is right to be skeptical about the State Department’s “trust above all else” policy with Iran, whose leaders have publicly proclaimed their desire for Israel to be wiped off the map. Mr. Netanyahu has rightly questioned America’s once unwavering commitment to his homeland, Israel—our partner, our ally, but, most importantly, our friend.

As I have said before, for those who do not believe in the United States’ moral obligation to protect Israel, I remind them about the United States’ strategic obligation. Israel benefits from a secure America, just as America benefits in having a secure, stable, and trustworthy ally in a very volatile and dangerous region of the world.

The Obama administration’s inability to realize this twofold bond between the United States and Israel illustrates their lack of understanding. I suggest to the President and his advisers that, if they really want to salvage any remaining trace of foreign policy competence for their history books, they walk away from this deal.

I urge our President to pause and reflect on America’s role in the world. Mr. Speaker, I urge him to reassess our courses of action abroad. The President must start by determining what is important for America. Only then will he be capable of developing a strategy, let alone the right one.

In God we trust.

REAUTHORIZE THE ESEA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, across my congressional district, elementary and secondary school students are packing up their lockers, taking final exams, and saying goodbye to their classmates and homeroom desks for the summer.

While our students head into a well-deserved summer recess, our teachers have already started thinking ahead to the next academic year, setting up lesson plans and figuring out what their course curriculums will be.

Unfortunately, many of our teachers will be faced with yet another year of stifling one-size-fits-all testing requirements and deadlines. Instead of enabling our teachers to do what they love and inspiring our children to learn and succeed, they are forced to waste classroom time by preparing and administering redundant and often low-quality tests.

Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 15 weeks since I last spoke on the House floor about the need to provide relief from burdensome testing requirements for our teachers, students, and parents.

At the time, the House was actively considering H.R. 5, legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary

Education Act, as well as an amendment I was pleased to offer with my Democratic colleague, SUZANNE BONAMICI of Oregon. Our bipartisan amendment, which was adopted and included as part of H.R. 5, offers a solution to the overtesting problem that is taxing our schools and teachers.

Our amendment empowers teachers and parents by giving existing Federal funding to State and local education agencies to develop curriculum plans to make better use of tests for the students, with the ability to reduce testing.

It would also allow for quicker delivery of assessment data to educators and parents and a more qualitative analysis of how to shape curriculum for that student from the local school district and parent, not the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we need to continue our work on this bill and reauthorize the ESEA. We owe it to our colleagues who have worked for months on this bill and underlying policy. We owe it to our teachers who have dedicated their livelihood and careers to the betterment of our children.

Most of all, we owe it to our children, who deserve the best possible education that we can provide, an education that encourages them to think, learn, and succeed and not that simply tells them how to fill in the blanks on a generic test.

For those of my colleagues who may be undecided on advancing this bill and reauthorizing the ESEA, I ask you to consider: Are you happy with the status quo? Are you content to sit on the sidelines while Common Core standards and a myriad of tests are imposed on our students?

I would like to read into the RECORD a letter I received from the superintendent of my home school district. Let me preface this by saying it was not written to me as a Member of Congress, but rather as a taxpayer in the West Chester Area School District.

I read this because there is no better example of a need and an opportunity for us to help our families back home do our job and govern here in Congress. It reads:

Dear Parents, many of us are quick to fault the U.S. public education system, comparing it to other smaller European countries and finding deficits and gaps. The system and the way it is funded are far from perfect. However, we manage to educate generations of children who go on to do incredible things.

Now, we are asking our students to do something that is entirely unfair: to spend weeks and weeks filling in bubbles, taking standardized tests, and having their entire educational ambition directed toward passing them. This is not what public education was intended to do, nor should do.

As the superintendent of the West Chester Area School District, I believe in very high standards for our students. I believe in accountability. I do believe that tests can be a good thing, but not the way we are being forced by the government to give them.

We officially began the PSSA testing window on April 13, and we will continue to test through May 27, when we finish with the high school Keystone Exams, a new graduation requirement. Beginning with the class of 2017, even a straight-A student who doesn't do well on these tests won't receive a diploma under State law.

State and federally mandated testing has been around for a long time, and is certainly here to stay, but it has become a massive burden that is stifling creativity and love of teaching and learning.

While our district has embraced high standards and accountability, we now spend the first 7 months of the school year preparing to take three standardized tests; then we spend approximately 6 weeks giving tests to students. Unlike private and parochial schools, public schools are mandated to use these tests to determine graduation for students and for teacher and administrator evaluations. It is positively stressing us—and our system—to the max.

Our teachers, students, and parents all say the extreme amount of time focused on testing is causing ridiculous amounts of stress in the classroom, faculty room, and at home. The angst is palpable as you walk through our hallways.

Where is there time for creativity in teaching? Where is there time for exploration and collaboration? Our talented staff do their very best to find ways to incorporate what needs to be tested into their dynamic lesson plans, but it is difficult, given the time constraints and enormous amount of material being covered.

Ultimately, that negativity is going to drive down our test scores. Learning should be challenging, but also enjoyable and exciting. Teaching should be dynamic and creative. We are missing that because of these tests.

I am not advocating a system without any testing, rigor, or accountability, but what we are doing right now isn't working.

Teachers have literally sent me hundreds of examples of how students are worried, anxious, and depressed. The rules for taking these exams are crazy as well.

Springtime in a school should be full of excitement and learning—not anymore. The last 3 weeks, our schools have looked more like prisons than educational institutions. The rules allow students to take as much time as they need, but once they close the booklet, the session is over, and they can't return to it.

Let's reauthorize the ESEA. Let's reduce the Federal footprint over public education. It is the right thing to do.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 11 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi Claudio Kogan, Temple Emanuel, McAllen, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our ancestors, God of compassion, God of justice, and God of peace.

In this great Hall where dreams come true, we ask Your blessings upon these great men and women, the Representatives of the people. They have devoted their lives to our welfare. Give them wisdom and courage. Inspire them with the teachings of our prophets, as they answer Isaiah's call to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, Jeremiah's request to protect the orphan and the widow, and Ezekiel's plea to lift up those who cannot stand on their own in this land and all lands.

As an immigrant who came to this country 16 years ago and became an American citizen just 2 years ago, I join this House in a prayer of profound gratitude and deep appreciation for the blessings we, the people of the United States of America, are privileged to enjoy. I ask You, God, to let the lights of truth and harmony shine from this Chamber as beacons for the betterment of all Americans.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ZINKE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING RABBI CLAUDIO KOGAN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rabbi Claudio Kogan from Temple Emanuel in McAllen, Texas, for his service today as guest chaplain.

A native of Argentina, Rabbi Kogan and his wife, Anna, immigrated to the United States where he continued his studies, receiving several master's degrees.

Rabbi Kogan has served congregations all over the United States. He has worked to develop a strong interfaith connection with his Christian and Muslim counterparts. He has received numerous awards for his essays on religion and ethics.

In addition to his rabbinical duties, Rabbi Kogan is also a medical doctor. He has been a high school teacher in Cincinnati, Ohio, and has combined his religious and medical training by serving as a hospital chaplain at a variety of institutions.

Rabbi Kogan is joined here today by his lovely wife, Anna, and his two beautiful children, Milena and Ezekiel.

I want to thank him for his prayer and for his service to my community.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to offer my official resignation as a member of the House Committee on Science, Space & Technology, effective today, June 10, 2015. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve on this committee over the last four years.

Sincerely,

STEVEN M. PALAZZO,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 304

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Kelly of Mississippi.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Abraham.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Kelly of Mississippi.

Ms. FOXX (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CLEAR PATH FOR VETERANS CELEBRATES FEMALE VETERAN AND ACTIVE DUTY APPRECIATION DAY

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our female veterans and Active-Duty military in all branches and areas of service, as well as those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

This week, Clear Path for Veterans, an organization in central New York in my district, devoted to empowering servicemen and -women, veterans, and their families, will celebrate Female Veteran and Active Duty Appreciation Day to honor the countless women in our community who have served our country.

Women across our great Nation have and continue to put their lives on the line for our freedom and for our democracy. America's servicewomen, veterans, and their families are continually changing the way that our military is defined within our homes, our communities, our Armed Forces, and around the world.

With the number of female veterans at its highest percentage in United States history, Clear Path for Veterans is a pioneer in its commitment to empowering and inspiring women from all branches of service. I stand beside this organization in working to enable women veterans to reach their full potential.

These women have made our country stronger. Their courage and strength have given us freedom, and their sacrifices that they and their families have made should never be forgotten.

DAY OF PORTUGAL

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today is Dia de Portugal, a time when Portuguese Americans and families of Portuguese descent around the world come together to celebrate their shared heritage and rich cultural traditions.

Over the years, the United States and Portugal have shared a strong friendship, beginning in May of 1791 when Portugal became the first neutral country to recognize the new American Government and continuing today through the pursuit of our shared national security objectives, including our cooperation in the global war on terror.

I am particularly honored to celebrate Day of Portugal because my district, Rhode Island's First Congressional District, has a larger percentage of Portuguese American constituents than any other congressional district in the country.

As chair of the Portuguese American Caucus, I am proud to join my Portuguese American constituents in celebrating Dia de Portugal and working to strengthen U.S.-Portugal relations through my work in Congress today by fighting to maintain operations at Lajes Field in the Azores and working to promote better cooperation in the areas of agriculture, education, tourism, and health.

I wish everyone celebrating today a Happy Day of Portugal.

CELEBRATING BULGARIAN DEMOCRACY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today was one of the most meaningful of my life as I served as an election observer for the post-Communist parliamentary elections in the Republic of Bulgaria with the International Republican Institute, nominated by RNC Chairman Lee Atwater.

It was a dream come true to visit talented and enthusiastic people at polling locations in the Hissar, Plovdiv region and see a restoration of democracy amidst the amazing antiquities of ancient Thracian, Greek, and Roman cultures. I was welcomed by Professor Stefan Stoyanov, who was elected to the National Assembly and later re-instituted the Rotary Club of Sofia.

In Congress, I have been grateful to co-chair the Bulgarian Caucus; work with dynamic Ambassador Elena Poptodorova; and, this year, led a delegation to Sofia to meet with Prime Minister Boyko Borisov, who is courageously promoting reforms for the people of Bulgaria.

It has been uplifting to meet with dedicated Bulgarian troops, along with my son, serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, who now train with Americans at the Novo Selo training base.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

God bless Bulgaria.

REMEMBERING JOHN GRANVILLE

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, John Granville grew up in south Buffalo. He had a curiosity about the world and a desire to serve others. He was a Fulbright scholar and a Peace Corps volunteer who became a career diplomat for the United States Agency for International Development.

In 2007, John was distributing solar-powered radios to remote villages in South Sudan to ensure that the people could participate in upcoming elections. On New Year's Day in 2008, John and a colleague were targeted and assassinated by terrorists in Khartoum. He was 33 years old.

Four men were convicted of the murders, but 6 years ago today, they escaped with the aid of a man later pardoned by Sudanese President al-Bashir. Two of the killers remain at large, and the Department of Justice has offered a \$5 million reward for their arrest.

Today, I will introduce a resolution calling on the State Department to maintain Sudan on the state sponsors of terrorism list until al-Bashir's pardon is repealed and John's killers are captured.

When his family expressed concern about his safety, John would say that he knew his work was dangerous, but he wouldn't want to be doing anything else. Today, we remember a man of light and peace and pledge to bring to justice those who took him from us far too soon.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, my thanks to Chairman CONAWAY and the Agriculture Committee for their prompt, bipartisan response to the recent WTO ruling against country of origin labeling.

Since 2009, Canada and Mexico argued that our country of origin labeling policy distorts trade across our borders and increases the cost of meat and poultry. In the U.S., we had hoped for a favorable ruling from the WTO, but their rulings and appeals have all been against us. Today, it is time to act to address the problems posed by COOL and prevent the retaliation from our friends in Canada and Mexico.

If not addressed, Canada and Mexico have threatened \$3.6 billion in trade retaliation. This would be a major blow

to pork and beef producers in my district; but it is not just livestock producers that would feel the pain. Threatened retaliation would also impact the corn growers in my district, one of the most productive corn growing districts in the Nation, and candy makers like Hershey and Mars that have plants in my district.

Again, I am grateful to Chairman CONAWAY and his attention to this issue and his prompt response to the WTO's ruling. I support this bill to repeal COOL and end the years of uncertainty faced by our farmers, ranchers, and so many others and urge my colleagues to do the same.

INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, fixing our Nation's crumbling infrastructure to boost the economy and increase transportation safety should not be a partisan issue; yet Republicans in Congress continue to show neglect and indifference towards the Nation's infrastructure and transportation safety needs.

The 2-month extension of the highway trust fund they offered in their unacceptable T-HUD appropriation bill is the latest example. The T-HUD bill shows a dangerous disregard for safety measures on America's highways at a time when we well know transportation safety should be a priority.

It allows massive, double 33-foot tractor-trailers to travel at high speeds on America's Interstate Highway System, and it suspends Federal safety guidelines aimed at eliminating trucker fatigue, allowing long-haul truckers to work more than twice the average workweek for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the short-term highway trust fund does not solve the problem of deteriorating roads and bridges; it simply puts a Band-Aid on it.

Republicans kicked the can down the road, but it got stuck in a pothole. Now is the time to fix the infrastructure in our counties, and we need to put people back to work in order to do it, but what we really need is a robust, long-term commitment.

□ 1215

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT

(Mr. YOUNG of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

I want to thank Chairman CONAWAY for his leadership on this issue.

On May 18, the World Trade Organization ruled against the U.S. COOL requirements. This ruling gives Canada and Mexico the green light to retaliate against United States products, particularly beef, pork, and chicken products. We are not looking here at a slap in the face, ladies and gentlemen. Unless COOL is repealed, U.S. goods could be hit with retaliatory tariffs that total \$3.6 billion.

My home State of Iowa would be hit really hard. We have over 20 million hogs and almost 4 million cattle. Last year, Iowa exported almost \$2 billion of pork, with Canada and Mexico as our top export markets. We need to repeal the country of origin labeling requirements in pork, beef, and chicken, which could hurt American workers.

While COOL is well-intentioned, we have voluntary programs already in place that give consumers information and the right to know where these products came from. We are out of options. Other legislative and regulatory fixes have been ineffective.

As the U.S. and State economies recover, the choice is clear. We cannot wait and see what trade retaliation from our closest trading partners would look like. It is time to repeal COOL now.

THE TIM COLE EXONERATION REVIEW COMMISSION

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the Texas State Legislature in passing House Bill 48, establishing the Tim Cole Exoneration Review Commission. Tim Cole was wrongfully convicted of rape and was the first Texas man to be posthumously cleared by DNA testing.

I know that, oftentimes, when people hear these stories, they think: What did he do to get on the police department's radar? Had he done something previously in his life that would have made the police department suspect him? I can tell you that, in Tim Cole's case, Tim was an Army veteran from Fort Worth; he was a Texas Tech student; and he honorably served in the military. Sadly, it was just a very bad time to be a Black man living in Lubbock, Texas. Tim was sentenced to 25 years in prison, and he died behind bars without being able to prove his innocence.

I am happy to let you know that this 11-member panel will examine wrongful convictions to determine what went wrong and then will make recommendations aimed at avoiding in the future the mistakes that were made in Tim Cole's case. On June 1, Governor Abbott signed a bill into law affirming that all Americans are entitled to due process. Tim Cole's family can take some small solace in the

knowledge that his death has resulted in changes that can provide hope to those who are also wrongfully convicted.

I want to applaud Tim's brother, Cory Session, who has worked tirelessly for years to clear his brother's name. I also applaud his late mother, Ruby Session, who didn't get to see this bill signed into law, but she did get to see some changes made in Texas. I am just happy for this family. I am sad that this happened to Tim Cole, but I am glad that something positive has taken place.

PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. ZINKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the millions of men and women from the Armed Forces who are living with or who have died from the effects of post-traumatic stress disorder. June is PTSD Awareness Month.

In my home State of Montana, nearly 15,000 veterans, or 15 percent of the population of all veterans, suffer from PTSD. PTSD, no doubt, is a serious condition that touches every aspect of a person's life. Every day, 22 veterans commit suicide nationwide. Many of them struggle to live with PTSD. Many of our veterans who live with PTSD struggle to transition to civilian life because they have not been given essential resources in the care they need at VA hospitals and clinics or from their local communities.

I urge the Veterans Health Administration and local communities to work together to do everything we can to combat this epidemic.

God bless America and the men and women who serve and defend her.

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SALVATION ARMY

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of this year's being the 150th anniversary of the Salvation Army.

It all started in 1865 with a minister named William Booth. He took to the streets of London's slums to champion the poor and neglected, and he decided that we have got to do something. That "something" was transformed into innovative approaches to eliminate poverty by demonstrating faith and by offering practical support to those in need.

In my Third Congressional District and across the Nation, the Salvation Army provides assistance to families in need by providing clothes and furniture, food, job training, and much more. We have all seen the volunteers

with red kettles who ring the bells and ask for donations. Nationally, they have raised \$135 million and continue to make tremendous contributions locally in Ohio, nationally, and globally.

I thank the Salvation Army's members, staff, board, and volunteers in my district, and I honor their work and service throughout this yearlong celebration of their 150th anniversary.

Happy anniversary.

NEGOTIATION WITH IRAN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as the House debates giving guidelines to the President on opening up American trade, I rise to urge the President to secure a verifiable nuclear agreement with Iran.

America's response to Iran's nuclear program will be the most important foreign policy decision in a generation. This problem grows more urgent by the day. On June 1, The New York Times reported that Iran's nuclear stockpile had grown by 20 percent over the previous year and a half. Secretary of Energy Moniz revealed that Iran was 2 to 3 months away from a nuclear weapon in April, which was 2 months ago. A nuclear agreement without verifiability is not an agreement at all but an act of faith in the worst state sponsor of terrorism in the world.

I want to remind the President that he has repeatedly said that a nuclear-armed Iran is not a challenge that can be contained and that the United States will do what it must to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I hope that this will not be another vanished red line for the President, who has also said, "As President, I don't bluff."

TIME TO MAKE PROTECTING THIS NATION A PRIORITY

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my anger at what I saw on the video that was taken of the event down in McKinney, Texas, on Friday, in which a big and burly police officer, wearing white socks, man-handled a young, 15-year-old Black girl in a bathing suit and man-handled other young Black people who were there simply to attend a pool party.

That kind of heavyhanded, out-of-control police misconduct must be stopped in this country. We must do something about it. I was so angry that I could not be there to do something about it, but I am here to do something about it. I pledge to the people to do everything I can to make sure that we

eliminate those kinds of officers from police forces throughout the country.

TIME TO MAKE PROTECTING THIS NATION A PRIORITY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, much of the economic turmoil that has gripped this Nation is the result of the Federal Government's spending beyond its means. However, Democrats continue to insist on ignoring the consequences of our crushing debt burden. Last week, Democrats in the Senate announced they would block any appropriations bill, including legislation providing funds for the defense of this Nation, until Republicans meet their demands for increased government spending.

At a time of grave threats to our Nation, we must be vigilant, determined, and united in the full support of our military personnel. Providing for the common defense of the United States of America is the Federal Government's primary duty. Holding hostage the funding for our troops, their families, and the Nation's veterans in order to extract more taxpayer dollars for Washington bureaucracy is the worst kind of political gamesmanship. It is time to make protecting this Nation a priority.

EQUAL PAY ACT

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 52nd anniversary of the passage of the Equal Pay Act, I rise today to reflect on our commitment to equality and the work ahead to turn this commitment into a reality.

In 1963, our Nation declared that women deserved equal pay for equal work; yet, more than half a century later, we still have much work ahead to end pay discrimination against women. Today, women make just 77 cents for every dollar men earn, amounting to an \$11,000 gap per year between full-time men and women. That is almost \$1,000 each month to help with groceries, rent, and student loans.

The workforce disparities have disastrous effects on our Nation. According to the Census Bureau, 1 in 3 women lives 200 percent below the Federal poverty line compared to 1 in 4 men, and of the more than 100 million Americans who live paycheck to paycheck, almost 70 percent of them are women and their children. Meanwhile, of the S&P 500 companies, women make up just 14.2 percent of their leadership positions, and only 24 companies have female CEOs.

Women deserve a fair shot at the American Dream. I urge my colleagues

to work with me to address these issues. Together, let's eliminate gender disparities in our workforce.

CLEARWATER, FLORIDA'S CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. JOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the centennial anniversary of one of our Nation's most beautiful communities—the city of Clearwater, Florida.

Named for its abundant fresh springs and waters, the city was established by colonists in the 1830s and was originally named Clearwater Harbor until 1895. It was then renamed Clearwater and was later established as a municipality on May 27, 1915.

Clearwater is known internationally for its clear gulf waters, award-winning beaches, a rich history of Major League Baseball spring training, and it is even home to our very own movie star—Winter, the dolphin. Not only is Clearwater a great place to call home, but it is also a great place to visit year round. In fact, Clearwater currently holds the Guinness World Record for the most consecutive days of sunshine in a single year, which is why, today, Clearwater continues to warmly welcome hundreds of thousands of visitors each year.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent the people of Clearwater and our greater Pinellas County community. I urge this body to join me in recognizing this most significant milestone. Happy anniversary to Clearwater, Florida.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats continue to try to move this country forward, but the Republican majority continues to try to turn back the clock. The effort to eradicate the Export-Import Bank is just another example of a reckless act of legislative malpractice.

First, House Republicans shut down the government for 16 days, costing the American people \$24 billion in lost economic productivity. Then House Republicans attempted to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, risking the safety of the American people. Now House Republicans want to shut down the Export-Import Bank, risking tens of thousands of jobs for hard-working Americans.

What is your addiction to shutting things down?

The American people want us to lift them up, and the best way we can do it

right now is to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

ELIZABETH BARTA WIDEL

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize someone who is a very familiar voice to readers of The Okanogan-Okano County Chronicle newspaper, which is located in Okanogan County, in my district, in the State of Washington.

Elizabeth Barta Widel is one of the most senior journalists in the Pacific Northwest. For 61 years, she has shared her love of the outdoors, her photography, and her passion for all things concerning the Okanogan community. Since 1954, Elizabeth has written a column for the Chronicle, titled, "Exploring the Okanogan." So far, she has written almost 2,900 columns on an array of topics, and she continues to add to that number regularly. Through sharing her stories, her down-to-earth words of wisdom, and her curiosity of the world around her, Elizabeth has shown a profound connection with the Okanogan Valley and has inspired generations of readers and those who know her.

Please join me in celebrating the contribution and dedication of this remarkable lady, an explorer of things great and small.

□ 1230

BOKO HARAM

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today six young girls who escaped Boko Haram will join us at a press conference after votes on Wear Red Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram has launched a terrifying slew of attacks that have killed more than 109 people in the last 2 weeks. As its ties to the jihadi group, the Islamic State, strengthen, Boko Haram becomes an even greater global and domestic threat. Boko Haram and ISIS have now joined together.

We must act now to ensure that our young people are not enticed by this terrorist group. I can see African American children this summer become infatuated and move in that direction. These extremists exploit this, filling young people's heads with terrible lies and destructive ideas.

Every day that Boko Haram is left undefeated is one more day that our young people are at risk. We are in danger. Tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls. Tweet, tweet, tweet #joinrepwilson. We must destroy Boko Haram and ISIS.

THE INNOVATION ACT STIFLES INNOVATION

(Mr. MASSIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to think about where the hotbeds of innovation are in this country. They are at universities, where students and professors come up with new ideas. They are at our startups, where inventors and entrepreneurs pursue their dreams late into the night, toiling away, backed by venture capitalists who fund their dreams and their ideas.

But why would venture capitalists, entrepreneurs, inventors, and universities be against a bill called the Innovation Act? I will tell you why. Because the Innovation Act stifles innovation.

Mr. Speaker, would you take a lawnmower to your flower garden if you saw a weed in it? I sure wouldn't, but that is what the Innovation Act does. It will destroy and degrade our patent system in this country.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Innovation Act, H.R. 9.

RECOGNIZING LG ELECTRONICS' COMMITMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize LG Electronics for winning the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries' Design for Recycling Award.

Recycling is one of the most consequential activities each and every one of us can do on a daily basis to protect the environment and conserve natural resources. Contestants in the ISRI's Design for Recycling are some of our country's largest and best manufacturers, all working to preserve our environment by improving the recyclability of their products.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of recycled material comes from items such as automobiles, refrigerators, old tires, and electronics such as televisions and computers. This year, LG Electronics won for their 4K Ultra HD OLED and LED TVs. These TVs include innovative new technologies that were designed with recycling in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the ISRI in recognizing LG Electronics for their commitment to the environment and recycling.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN JOHN J. DEARBORN

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life, service, and valor of Captain John J. Dearborn, a Granite Stater, family man, and American hero.

Captain Dearborn, a lifelong resident of Deerfield, was New Hampshire's oldest living U.S. marine, having served in World War II as a Corsair fighter. During his service, Dearborn witnessed history in the making, having seen the final Japanese surrender aboard the USS *Missouri* on September 2, 1945, marking the end of World War II.

Dearborn remained as an active member of the veterans community and just this April traveled from Manchester, New Hampshire, to Washington, D.C., to participate in an Honor Flight with other veterans from around the Nation. His service, legacy, and courage live on.

We will never forget the service and sacrifice that Captain Dearborn made for our freedoms and our liberty. It is because of our Nation's heroes like Dearborn that our Nation remains the land of the free and the home of the brave. For that, we are forever grateful.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MARISSA BARTELS

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Marissa Bartels on winning an astounding four gold medals at the recent Minnesota State track and field meet.

Marissa was born with spina bifida but refuses to let that slow her down. In middle school, when no longer able to participate in the sports she knew and loved, Marissa discovered wheelchair sports. This was her third year participating at State, and Marissa dominated, winning the 100 and 800 meter races as well as shot put and discus.

Marissa's athletic abilities extend beyond track and field. She is also a national champion in baseball and basketball. It is no surprise that this impressive competitor will be heading to the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater in the fall as a student athlete.

Best of luck and congratulations, Marissa. You are an inspiration to each of us to never give up, no matter what obstacle or adversity we may face.

LET'S DELAY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW CFPB RULE

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today relating to the

new CFPB rule combining the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act and Truth in Lending Act disclosure that is scheduled to take effect on August 1.

On behalf of home buyers across this country, the real estate industry has requested a grace period or hold harmless period for 90 days. To date, the CFPB will only commit to saying they will have relaxed enforcement for a period similar to that of the qualified mortgage/ability to repay rule.

Now, leaving aside whether this rule will provide more clarity or more confusion to the real estate purchaser, leaving aside whether it will provide more protection to buyers or be more problematic for them to close on a real estate transaction, I want to focus on the August 1 deadline.

I spent 10 years in the real estate industry working with real estate agents, banks, mortgage professionals, title insurance agents, and it is well known that June, July, and August tend to be the most active months for real estate transactions. Changing disclosure requirements in the middle of the busiest part of the calendar year for real estate deals causes difficulty for those involved in conducting settlements. And changing them without the ability for professionals to test their systems and procedures doesn't make much sense, either.

It is also unfair to consumers in that you are compelling their retained professionals to receive the training during the busiest months, implement new procedures, and account for unanticipated disruptions. Any hiccup along the way is actually to the detriment of the consumer.

Let's make the rule effective in January or February of 2016, which are historically the slowest months of the year, and when it is most fair to real estate consumers.

HONORING ALL THE ROSIE THE RIVETERS

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Mae Krier of Levittown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, was a young woman when our country went to war in 1941. As men answered their Nation's call, millions of women left their homes for factory jobs, working as riveters, buckers, welders, and electricians.

Mae Krier, who is approaching her nineties, still beams with pride when she recalls her days as a riveter on Boeing's B-17 warplane assembly line. American women like Mae gained notoriety as Rosie the Riveters, and they remain a symbol of strength and confidence for our Nation.

In paying tribute to these American heroes who served our country during World War II, let us also gratefully ac-

knowledge the women who served patriotically on the home front with continued recognition of a national Rosie the Riveter Day.

To all the Rosie the Riveters, on behalf of Pennsylvania's Eighth District, thank you for your contributions to our country and your role in the legacy of the Greatest Generation.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2685, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2393, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 303 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 303

Resolved, That (a) at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to

beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule, H. Res. 303, providing for consideration of two important pieces of legislation: H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, and H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2393 under a closed rule and H.R. 2685 under the customary modified open rule process, which allows any Member to offer an amendment to the bill so long as the amendment complies with the rules of the House. The only restriction is on the amount of time that will be allotted for debating each amendment.

H.R. 2393 is an urgent and critical response to the World Trade Organization's ruling on May 18 of this year, which found country of origin labeling, or COOL, for muscle meat cuts to be in violation of the U.S. trade obligations with Canada and Mexico. H.R. 2393 will simply repeal the COOL meat cut provisions, making the U.S. compliant and prevent retaliation.

Critics of H.R. 2393 will say we have more time, but in truth, we don't. This final ruling is the fourth time the WTO has ruled against the U.S. for various versions of COOL, and on this final appeal, the WTO has given both Canada and Mexico the authority to impose more than \$3 billion in combined retaliatory tariffs against U.S. products within 60 days of the ruling.

□ 1245

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are now down to just 37 days to respond before these tariffs are imposed. This could deal an enormous blow to U.S. companies and the workers they employ, just when our economy is beginning to rebound.

There is also an argument floating around that this will prevent all labeling or that a "Made in North America" label will satisfy our trade obligations. A North American label will not necessarily satisfy our obligations and can in no way, no matter how fast we try, be negotiated in the remaining 37 days to prevent retaliation.

Also, it is important to note that repealing mandatory COOL doesn't prevent voluntarily labeling, as some companies already do.

Finally, it is worth noting that some critics claim that this will weaken inspections for meat imports. Nothing can be further from the truth.

The United States Department of Agriculture has and will continue to provide the most rigorous, science-based import inspections, inspections of foreign plants which export to the United States. Whether or not the product has a mandatory country of origin label on it will not affect these rigorous inspections.

This legislation is desperately needed. Our manufacturers, pork producers, grape growers, confectionary exporters, and ranchers have repeatedly asked Congress to ensure that we repeal the COOL provisions and bring the U.S. back into compliance with our WTO obligations fully and quickly.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2393 is important to ensure our economy is protected and that the U.S. plays by the rules we agreed to with two of our biggest trading partners, which are by far our largest export markets.

This rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, which funds our Nation's national defense and provides the resources necessary to continue our essential military efforts abroad, as well as the funding for health and quality of life programs for the brave men and women of our Armed Forces.

Overall, the bill provides \$578.6 billion in discretionary funding, \$800 million more than the President's request and \$24.4 billion above the fiscal year 2015 funding level. Within this amount, \$88.4 billion is appropriated for our war efforts in the global war on terrorism.

H.R. 2685 is an imperative measure that funds our critical national security programs and addresses the vital needs of our men and women in the armed services. An effective military, one that is well equipped and well trained, is indispensable to the common defense of our country and is in the best interest of all Americans. This bill includes vital funding for the U.S.

military and intelligence community as they remain engaged in responding to instability abroad.

This bill contains \$133 billion to provide for 1.3 million Active-Duty troops and 820,000 National Guard and Reserve troops; \$219 billion is included for operations and maintenance, which provides for the funding of readiness programs that prepare our troops for combat and peacetime missions.

The Constitution charges the Congress to provide for our national defense, and this bill ensures we will fulfill that obligation. Our highest national priority should always be the protection of our country, and the funding levels in this bill will ensure our military remains the most capable, prepared, and exceptional armed force anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we must provide the resources necessary to fight America's enemies abroad. With the rise of ISIS, the continued presence of al Qaeda, the growth of terrorist groups in North Africa, instability throughout the Middle East, and Russian aggression in Ukraine, our military must be prepared for not only current threats, but for future ones as well.

We also need to support those willing to fight alongside us, which is why H.R. 2685 includes critical support for our allies who are also facing this unprecedented instability due to the aggression of nation-states and terrorist organizations alike.

This bill makes difficult budgetary choices without undermining the safety, security, and success of our servicemembers and their families. It uses every tax dollar responsible to give our Armed Forces the resources they need to stay prepared, safe, and in peak fighting form.

Supporting the men and women of our armed services—who, day in and day out, risk their lives in the service of our country—is one of the most important functions that we perform as Members of Congress, and this responsibility should not be taken lightly.

I am proud to support this bill and the important funding it provides for our Nation's military, security, and our courageous men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for consideration of two very critical pieces of legislation that will protect our economy, provide necessary funding for our servicemembers and the defense of our country, and I support its adoption.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule, as well as the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this grab bag rule and both underlying pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 18th time in this Congress that House Republicans have brought to the floor a grab bag rule, a single rule that governs floor debate for two or more unrelated pieces of legislation.

Since the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, the use of grab bag rules has dramatically increased by over 400 percent. Using one rule to govern multiple, oftentimes unrelated bills stifles debate, which I guess is the point of them merging all these bills under one rule on the House floor, and leads to disjointed and confusing discussion between two sides.

Ranking Member SLAUGHTER and my Democratic colleagues on the House Rules Committee have raised these concerns with Chairman SESSIONS, but unfortunately, we are back on the floor today to consider one rule for two completely unrelated measures.

Today's rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act, also known as COOL, under a completely closed process. No amendments are allowed, none.

Clearly, this is an issue that we need to address sooner rather than later, but H.R. 2393 is not the answer. It was introduced just 2 days after the World Trade Organization ruled against the United States' country of origin labeling requirements for meat.

H.R. 2393 is a knee-jerk reaction to the WTO ruling that completely does away with labeling requirement for beef, pork, and chicken, which wasn't even addressed in the WTO ruling.

We know from past WTO disputes that there are several steps that need to occur before retaliation would take place. The arbitration panel takes at least 60 days, but in the U.S.-Brazil cotton case, it took 15 months to produce a ruling. The sky is not falling; we have some time to come up with a workable solution.

Instead of H.R. 2393, we ought to be working toward a more thoughtful approach that balances consumers' right to know where their meat comes from with our trade obligations.

More than 60 countries have successfully implemented COOL-like labeling requirements that comply with WTO standards, and we ought to look toward these programs for a workable solution.

Such an important issue that impacts the safety of food we eat and the health of American families deserves the most robust debate possible, but this closed rule from House Republicans prevents us from having that kind of debate. As I said, not a single Member, Democratic or Republican, is allowed to offer an amendment to this bill. It is completely closed.

Today's rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations

Act, there is much to praise about the bill. It contains many important provisions and strong funding for suicide prevention and training, improved response to sexual assault and prevention, and medical research.

I applaud the hard work put into drafting this bill by Defense Subcommittee Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY, along with Appropriations Committee Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY. However, this bill suffers from two major—I emphasize the word “major”—flaws, which to my mind makes it difficult, if not impossible, to support.

First and foremost, this bill continues to use the overseas contingency operations account, or OCO, as a slush fund to get around parts of the Budget Control Act that Republicans don’t like—namely, the caps on defense spending—while ignoring the damage the caps are doing to all our non-defense programs.

This bill, like the Defense Authorization bill before it, completely bypasses the caps set down by the BCA by increasing OCO funding by \$38 billion above the President’s request. The bill shifts \$38 billion from the defense base budget and shoves those moneys into the off-budget OCO meant to cover the costs of our various wars.

Rather than wrestle with the hard question of how to get rid of the sequester and the budget caps and bring our spending back into regular order, the Republicans have decided to wallow in a slush fund. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, don’t you think it is about time that we found a way to provide for our national security needs without relying on war contingency slush funds to pay for the everyday expenses of the Department of Defense?

Members on both sides of the aisle have recognized that the sequester does not work. Shouldn’t we be honest about that? Shouldn’t we negotiate a workable plan, rather than play these games of smoke and mirrors that actually undermine the Pentagon’s ability to budget and plan for the long term?

Second, Mr. Speaker, this bill continues to appropriate billions of dollars to carry out the war against the Islamic State in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere; but Congress has not even debated, let alone authorized that war.

The leadership of this House continues to fail in carrying out its responsibilities under the Constitution and bring an AUMF before this body to authorize the military operations that have been ongoing since last August.

In fact, just last night, we learned that the U.S. presence in Iraq will increase even further, with the administration planning to establish a new military base in Anbar province and send hundreds of additional American military trainers.

This move is aimed at helping Iraqi forces to retake the city of Ramadi from the Islamic State, but it is clear our involvement is getting bigger and bigger and bigger—but still, no word from this leadership that it has the political will or intention to bring an AUMF to the House floor this month, next month, or the month after.

With Americans investing more and more in this conflict—we are told that we spend about \$3.5 million an hour on this latest war against the Islamic State—there has never been a greater urgency for this Congress to debate and to vote on this war.

Time and again, bipartisan letters have been sent to the Speaker asking him to bring an AUMF to the House floor. Time and again, individual Members have sought to bring amendments up for debate that would authorize military operations in Iraq and Syria, only to have the Republican majority on the House Rules Committee reject them, depriving them of consideration and depriving them of debate.

Just last night, I offered an amendment that simply states that no funds in this act may be obligated or spent on military operations in Iraq and Syria in the absence of an AUMF for such operations. It was also rejected by the Republicans of the House Rules Committee.

Some stated that they voted to reject it because 10 minutes, which is the amount of time limiting debate on all amendments to the defense bill, is simply not enough time to debate a serious question. Well, I agree. Ten minutes is not enough time, but the Rules Committee has the power to increase that limit to as much time as it feels appropriate, and it failed to do so.

The Rules Committee could provide 2 hours of debate or 2 days of debate or 2 weeks of debate; that is the power of the Rules Committee. Don’t hide behind this excuse as a reason for Congress not to live up to its constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that we can always find the time and find a way to spend billions of billions of dollars to fund wars; we can always find a way to send our brave men and women overseas to fight and die in these wars, but we can’t ever seem to find the backbone or the time to debate and authorize them.

Each night, each week, the Members of this House get to go home to their families and their communities, surrounded by loved ones and people who support them. If we don’t have the stomach to take responsibility for sending our troops into danger, then the least we can do is bring them home to their families so that they might enjoy the same peace and privileges that we take so much for granted.

□ 1300

If we want to spend our Nation’s treasure on these wars, if my col-

leagues believe that the war in Iraq and Syria is a priority for our Nation and our national security, then we should carry out our constitutional mandate and debate and vote on an AUMF.

Now, I welcome the fact that the House Appropriations Committee, in a bipartisan vote, supported an amendment by the honorable gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, that says: “Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force against ISIL.”

That provision is in the Defense Appropriations bill. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we shouldn’t just be saying that Congress has a constitutional duty; we should actually be carrying out our constitutional duty.

So I hope that every single one of my colleagues will remember that when they cast their votes for final passage of this bill, you are providing money and equipment and lives to carry out a war that this House doesn’t even have the courage to debate and vote on.

The leadership of this House has to stop whining and stop trying to shift the responsibility on to anyone and everyone except to whom the responsibility really falls. It falls upon each of us to say to this leadership that the time has come to bring an AUMF before this body, and for the leadership to let us debate it and vote on it.

It is time that we stopped acting like cowards and started behaving like Members of Congress our constituents elected to make the tough decisions. So I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, just let me say before I turn to some of my colleagues who have joined me on the floor that I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts. These are important issues, especially when we are talking about appropriations for the Defense Department. We do need an AUMF, and I remain committed to work with the gentleman from Massachusetts to accomplish that; that we should have that open debate and that discussion through the committee system.

This is not the vehicle. But we will do that. We need to do that, and I agree with the gentleman.

Today, I am very happy to have with me several people who would like to speak on this issue. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule and the underlying legislation to repeal country of origin labeling for

meat products, and I believe this effort is long past due.

I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for bringing this rule to the floor, and I appreciate Agriculture Committee Chairman CONAWAY's expeditious response to the WTO's final ruling that sets the table for a huge hit to America's struggling economy.

Not only has COOL been a costly burden on our Nation's meat industry for more than a decade, but now massive retaliatory tariffs from Canada and Mexico will inflict pain on a vast amount of U.S. industries and jobs.

At a time when American GDP is actually shrinking, and U.S. farmers and manufacturers are desperately seeking export markets, the worst thing we can do is allow this policy to damage our ability to get American-made to market.

COOL represents yet another failed government mandate imposing heavy costs on private sector industry for no defensible purpose. While the primary goal of COOL is to give American-grown meat a competitive advantage, the result has been exactly the opposite.

Even the Department of Agriculture agrees that COOL has actually negatively impacted the industry that it was supposed to benefit. As a direct result of this policy, we have not only seen sharp increases in the cost of marketing and selling beef and pork, but looming trade retaliation is already costing American industries that contract for future delivery of goods into these export markets.

If we allow these retaliatory tariffs to go forward, our Nation's businesses will experience billions of dollars of market loss, which will kill jobs, harm our U.S. competitiveness, and have a long-term negative impact on America's economic health.

Fortunately, today we have a chance to end the harmful impact of this policy. I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation to repeal COOL once and for all.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say to my colleague on the Rules Committee, I am glad he supports my position that we ought to have a debate on an AUMF when it comes to these wars against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

But my question is, what are we waiting for?

Eleven months ago, Congressman WALTER JONES, a Republican, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, a Democrat, and myself actually brought a resolution to the floor saying that if we are going to be engaged in combat operations in Iraq, that we ought to have a vote on an AUMF, and that passed overwhelmingly.

We have been at war now for over 10 months. I mean, bombing every day. We have thousands of troops over

there. The President is going to send several hundred more over there. What are we waiting for?

We were told in the 113th Congress that we ought to wait till the 114th Congress. I don't know why, given the fact that the war began under the 113th Congress. But anyway, January came, and we are in the 114th Congress.

Then we were told we have got to wait for the President to submit a strategy or an AUMF. He did.

Now, I know you don't like it. I don't like it. Some people want it broader and bigger. Some of us want it more restrictive. But nonetheless, he did what he is supposed to do. What we are supposed to do is deliberate.

And here we are, 10 months later, and we are all told we will get to it. We will get to it. We will get to it.

We announced yesterday that we are going to establish a new military base in Iraq, and close to 500 more American troops are going to go over there. What are we waiting for?

We ought to be debating these AUMFs before we put people into harm's way, before we start getting engaged in hostilities.

So I have to tell you, I am frustrated not only by the inaction of the leadership of this House, the excuses of the leadership of this House. I am frustrated by my friends who say, I am with you, but we will just get to it at some other point. I mean, how many months, how many years have to go by before we do our job?

The gentleman talked about our constitutional duty to protect the people of the United States. We also have a constitutional duty when it comes to war, and we are not living up to that at all. We are failing miserably, and it really is a disgrace, and it is a disservice to the men and women whom we put into harm's way.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, on the COOL legislation, let me remind my colleagues that consumers, the American people, the people we are supposed to represent, are increasingly seeking more information and want more information about food source and production methods and want to make purchases from a trusted source.

A 2013 Consumer Federation of America study found that 90 percent of Americans strongly support mandatory COOL for fresh meat and strongly favor requiring meat to be labeled with specific information about where the animals were born, raised, and processed.

A 2010 Consumer Union study shows that 93 percent of consumers would prefer to have the country of origin label on the meat that they buy. That is what the American people want.

And yet, rather than trying to respond to that, the first inclination in the aftermath of this WTO ruling is to basically cave, saying, We don't really care what the American people want. We are just going to cave.

I think that is the wrong way to proceed, and I would urge my colleagues to vote against this COOL legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington State for giving me the opportunity to testify today regarding the rule governing debate on H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

Country of origin labeling, or COOL for short, was first enacted for meat products as part of the 2002 farm bill. Implementation of the law was delayed until 2008.

Less than 5 months after the COOL implementing rule was published, Canada and Mexico challenged the rule at the WTO, arguing that it had a trade-distorting impact by reducing the value and number of cattle and hogs shipped to the United States.

The process has since progressed through the dispute settlement panel phase and a U.S. appeal to the WTO's Appellate Body. In both instances, the WTO found that the way the regulations were implemented violated WTO obligations by discriminating against imported livestock.

The United States was given until May 13, 2013, to bring its COOL regulations into compliance. In response, USDA issued a revised COOL rule in May of 2013 which required that production steps—born, raised, and slaughtered by origin country—be included on meat labels. The revised rule also prohibited the commingling of meat from imported and domestic livestock.

At the request of Canada and Mexico, the WTO established a compliance panel to determine if the revised rule brought the United States into compliance with the previous ruling. Canada and Mexico claimed that not only did the revised rule fail to bring the United States into compliance, but certain parts, especially the prohibition on commingling, were even more onerous than the original rule.

A key criterion for current COOL implementation is that it requires "segregation" of animals by country of origin, which significantly raises the cost of utilizing imported livestock. The compliance panel report, released October 20, 2014, upheld the earlier findings of discrimination.

The United States appealed the compliance panel report and on May 18, 2015, the WTO rejected, again, the United States appeal, and found for the fourth and, believe it or not, final time that the U.S. COOL requirements for beef and pork were unavoidably discriminatory.

The final rule kick-starts the WTO process to determine the level of retaliatory tariffs that Canada and Mexico

can now impose on the United States, which has been widely predicted to have effects in the billions of dollars.

During a hearing in the House Agriculture Committee's Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee to examine the implications of potential retaliation against the U.S., witnesses made it clear that losing the final appeal to the WTO and the inevitable impacts of retaliation against the United States would have a devastating impact on our economy.

Witnesses included representatives from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Confectioners Association, the Wine Institute of California, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Pork Producers Council, and the National Farmers Union.

Some have asked why we should act on the basis of a WTO decision. If COOL worked, perhaps there would be a response other than a repeal, but the fact is COOL is a marketing failure. In an April 2015 report to Congress, USDA explained that COOL requirements result in extraordinary costs with no quantifiable benefits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CONAWAY. In response to those who argue that COOL enhances food safety, I have also maintained for over 10 years now that is simply not the case. If it were, then all meat served at restaurants would come with an information label of the meat's origin. But it doesn't, and that is because retail food establishments are exempt from the COOL requirements.

In a May 1, 2015, letter to Congress, Secretary Vilsack reaffirmed the need for Congress to repeal the disputed COOL label requirements. In other words, if we go down this path with Canada to try to negotiate something they have no reason to negotiate on, it will fail as well.

Repeal is the only viable option for us to avoid these retaliatory statements. Canada and Mexico have both said they are uninterested in negotiation. We are now at a point of fixing this.

COOL repeal is the answer. This bill does that. I support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

We have been involved with a long struggle in this Congress and Congresses before, dating back some 13 years, and even before that, about country of origin labeling. Do people have the right to know where their food comes from?

As the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, the American public supports this.

We have had a ruling from the WTO that does not prohibit country of origin labeling. To the contrary, the case upheld the country's right to require food labeling when it serves a broad public interest that does not lead to treatment of a foreign product in a less favorable way than a domestic one.

We are rushing in a repeal that goes beyond just the disputed elements, adding poultry, and raising questions, I think, about our commitment to being able to give consumers what they want.

There are those that would attach cost to this, but it also is in terms of what people want.

And I think, we ought to take a deep breath. There is not going to be any retaliatory tariffs that are going to be actually inflicted quickly. This is a process that is going to take months.

The Brazilian cotton subsidies, about which I personally think Brazil was right—we had inappropriate cotton subsidies, and we are paying Brazilian cotton interests now because of our refusal to make our own cotton policies WTO-compliant.

□ 1315

That is another scandal, in my judgment, that we are giving \$148 million to Brazilian cotton farmers, because we are giving inappropriate subsidies to American cotton farmers when we have other priorities.

But in this case, we have plenty of time in this Congress to follow regular order, to be able to carve out specific provisions that speak to the weakness in what the United States did. Because the United States, in enacting this for meat products, it was pretty convoluted, and the American Government had been told before that it would not be WTO compliant.

So this isn't a surprise. It is not an emergency. It is a responsibility we have to try to make these adjustments.

I don't want to have our other industries penalized with retaliatory tariffs, and they won't be, but we don't have to pass this bill. We ought to deal with the underlying problems, be narrow, be specific, and uphold the right of American consumers to have as much information as we can give them.

So I would strongly recommend that we reject the rule and the underlying bill. Let's have this conversation. Let's do it right. And let's make sure that we defend our right under WTO to have appropriate food labeling.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

This very important legislation is a direct response to the fourth and final World Trade Organization ruling that mandatory country of origin labeling, or COOL, is anticompetitive and will allow Canada and Mexico to seek over \$3 billion in tariffs on American products, directly placing American producers at a competitive disadvantage.

H.R. 2393 removes cattle, hogs, and chicken from COOL labeling to allow our producers to maintain access to two of our largest trading markets and protect U.S. exports from destructive sanctions.

Again, I urge my colleagues to adopt this combined rule and vote in support of the COOL Amendments Act. I encourage the Senate to move this legislation as quickly as possible so our producers can compete on a level playing field.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, country of origin labeling stands for the proposition that knowledge is power. The more knowledge you have, the better decisions that you can make. This is true about the food that you eat, and it is also true about the trade deals that we are being asked to swallow this week.

With Fast Track hurtling down on us for a vote the day after tomorrow, this recent World Trade Organization decision against the United States ought to serve as more than a blinking yellow light. It ought to be viewed as a giant red stoplight.

The World Trade Organization ruled that it just isn't "cool" to supply consumers more information. And while this decision may not actually overrule our law, what you are seeing today is the possibility—indeed, the probability—of expensive retaliation against American exports unless we yield to this WTO decision. If you support local decisionmaking, you need to consider the significance of our experience at the World Trade Organization.

There have previously been some challenges to United States laws just like this, and the record of the United States at the World Trade Organization when it is challenged is not one to be really proud of. We have had 6 wins and 66 losses. These are losses that have been sustained when other countries challenge our laws.

Only recently, as my colleague from Connecticut ROSA DELAUNO and I attempted to present an amendment to a bill to say that corporate deserters—those that leave our country and renounce their charters here in order to dodge taxes—ought not to be given government business paid for by our taxpayers, we had some organizations who came and said: You can't do that. You can't deny corporate deserters an opportunity to get money from other

taxpayers for government work because the World Trade Organization wouldn't like it.

So there is already a range of threats being used based on existing trade laws. Consider now what will happen when the number of those who can challenge decisions in this Congress, at the State level, and at the local level is multiplied geometrically because of the fact that now, under an investor-state dispute settlement provision, thousands of foreign corporations can challenge our regulations and our laws. Taxpayers will be exposed to unprecedented amounts of liability because of our decision to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the people that we represent.

At least the World Trade Organization, the group that decided this case, has an appeal process. There is no such appeal process for these cases that will be brought by foreign corporations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. And the panels that will decide them are usually made up of a majority of private lawyers, who one day are litigating cases for multinationals and the next day are deciding these cases.

If you agree that foreign investors should not receive greater rights than American investors, if you support local and State decisionmaking to keep our air and water and our environment clean without having to pay foreigners for the privilege of doing so, then there should be great concern about these trade deals that are being fast-tracked this week.

We don't have to look far to see the damage that could occur, because only three months ago, in Canada, it happened when a local decision about expanding a quarry in an environmentally sensitive area was challenged successfully. That is an unfortunate decision.

We need to be wary of these Fast-Track proposals and insist that they put us on the right track for more trade without jeopardizing the health and safety of Americans. I tried to do that in the Ways and Means Committee, but, like every other amendment to put us on the right track, it was rejected. We need to reject that wrong track approach this week.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the good gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for this rule and for the underlying bill, H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act. This bill repeals the country of origin labeling requirement for certain meat products because, as it currently stands, it threatens the economic live-

lihood of farmers and ranchers in northeast Georgia and, really, across the Nation.

Like so many other regulations that have been promulgated and upheld by this administration, it has achieved nothing but harm to our economy—not what it was “intended to do.” It does not improve food safety, and it now threatens to further devastate the ability of America's agriculture industry to provide for their families by violating our trade obligations and encouraging retaliation from two of our largest trading partners, Canada and Mexico.

I was sent to Washington to be the voice of 700,000 Americans who live in northeast Georgia. These hard-working Americans produce more chicken than any other district in the United States. And now, like so many other Americans, they are facing devastating financial harm because of the COOL requirement, which arbitrarily mandates that meat products have a label that shows what country they were produced in.

You see, the WTO has ruled on four separate occasions that mandatory COOL requirements violate our obligation to treat our trade partners fairly, just as we demand to be treated fairly by them. Now Canada and Mexico may seek to impose retaliatory tariffs against not only our meat exports, but exports on virtually every industry in the United States.

Now I can't imagine how knowing that a pork chop came from a pig that was born in Canada could possibly improve food safety, and I really can't imagine it when we already require that all meat imports be inspected by at least the same standards that the USDA uses to inspect meat here at home, but I can tell you that it takes no imagination to foresee how this will impact our economy. Our trade partners will retaliate against us by taxing our exports.

Retaliatory tariffs are expected on \$493 million worth of Georgia exports alone. Nationally, tariffs will impact billions of dollars worth of exports. Chicken exports from my district will be taxed the moment they leave the country, and with 20 percent of chicken produced in the United States being exported, the impact will be overwhelming.

So what will happen if we fail to repeal these mandates? The hard-working farmers in my district and in districts across the country will be unable to compete in the international market.

We need to support this rule and the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, again, let me say that this COOL repeal I think is a rash over-reaction to the WTO ruling, and I think that we owe it to the American people to try to figure out whether there is a middle ground here.

And to answer my friend from Georgia, who was like: Well, why do people want to know? Well, maybe the American people want to support American farmers. Maybe they want to support the small- and medium-sized farms that are doing such incredible work all across this country. I don't think that that is an outrageous idea. As I mentioned before, there is overwhelming support for this. Ninety percent of the American people support this country of origin labeling.

Let me suggest to my colleagues, let's do something really radical. Let's actually give the American people something that they want.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, as well as the rule.

Mr. Speaker, we oftentimes hear the debate that the mandatory COOL label is about food safety and protecting our food supply. Let me be clear. Mandatory COOL labeling is not about food safety. No matter where our food comes from, regulations remain in place to ensure safety and traceability, regardless of origin. This debate is about the cost that a government-mandated marketing program is having on our economy.

The World Trade Organization has ruled against the United States four times in favor of Mexico and Canada, our largest trading partners. Over the next month, Canada and Mexico will begin seeking retaliatory damages against U.S. products from all over the country. In fact, Canada has already announced that it will seek more than \$3 billion in retaliatory sanctions. These damages are real. They will affect farmers, manufacturers, and small-business owners in my State of Michigan and around the country.

Michigan's First District produces 70 percent of the tart cherries in the country. We export a lot of these cherries to Canada. Canada has placed cherries on the list for retaliatory sanctions.

We also produce other things in my district, like apples, pork, wine, maple syrup. Michigan is also famous for its auto and steel industry. Canada plans to target all of these things. These penalties are real. They will cost jobs, which is the last thing we can afford to lose right now.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), another fine member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California for their leadership in bringing this legislation to the House floor. I will make my remarks short and simple.

Country of origin labeling, or COOL, has been a 13-year failed experiment in public policy. It provides little to no value for the consumer, raises costs for all producers, and has created a significant trade dispute with our number one and number two trading partners, Canada and Mexico.

It is an embarrassment to our country that we have lost four times in the WTO court and now are facing significant retaliation from our two closest trading partners. This is particularly concerning when you consider that my home State of Missouri alone could face up to \$623 million in economic losses from retaliation.

America should be a leader in creating free and fair trade around the world by focusing on removing tariff and nontariff trade barriers, not creating our own.

Americans expect labels on their meat and other food products to clearly state the health and safety information. COOL goes beyond that, though, and has amounted to nothing more than a government-mandated marketing program that provides little to no value to producers and consumers. The only solution to this failed experiment in public policy is full repeal of the country of origin labeling law.

I support the underlying bill and encourage my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2393.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentlewoman from Missouri that a lot of small- and medium-sized farmers strongly disagree with her. There are a lot of consumers who would like to support American farmers. Nine out of 10 Americans support country of origin labeling. Repealing this law would restrict their access to critical information about the food they feed their families, making it impossible to avoid food from countries with poor safety records.

□ 1330

The WTO has repeatedly ruled that using country of origin labels to inform consumers about the source of the food that they eat is a legitimate goal. More than 60 other countries have done this successfully without sanctions. So instead of throwing out COOL entirely, we should study the successful models and develop an alternative system that still maintains our constituents' access to the information that they demand.

The legislation that we are talking about here today goes beyond the scope of the WTO case and repeals labeling requirements for ground beef, ground pork, and chicken, ultimately putting the interests of industrial meat pro-

cessors above the concerns of 90 percent of the American public.

Again, it shouldn't be a radical idea around here to try to do what the American people want. They want to know where their food is grown, where their food is produced. Let's give it to them. Let's try to work a compromise out here rather than just this knee-jerk bill that kind of throws the baby out with the bathwater.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, on the COOL repeal, I include for the RECORD a letter to Chairman CONAWAY and to Ranking Member PETERSON signed by hundreds of organizations—farm organizations, consumer groups, labor groups, food safety groups, and I could go on and on and on—basically saying that this legislation that we are considering here today is a bad idea.

JUNE 8, 2015.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee, 1301 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. COLLIN PETERSON,
Ranking Member, House Agriculture Committee, 1301 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY AND RANKING MEMBER PETERSON: The undersigned 283 farm, rural, faith, environmental, labor, farmworker, manufacturer and consumer organizations respectfully urge you to reject the repeal of the Country-of-Origin Labeling (COOL) law and support commonsense food labeling. Polls show that nine out of ten Americans support COOL. Consumers continue to demand more information about their food and producers want to share that information.

Although the World Trade Organization (WTO) Appellate Body has issued its decision on COOL, the United States has a sovereign right to allow the dispute process to proceed to its completion and then decide how and whether to implement the adverse ruling. Our organizations remain steadfast in their opposition to any efforts to undermine COOL through repeal or any other measures.

It is premature for the Congress to unilaterally surrender to saber-rattling from our trading partners in the midst of a long-standing dispute. COOL opponents have highlighted Mexico and Canada's threats of retaliation as if their aspiration to seek billions of dollars in penalties were already approved by the WTO. But these unapproved, unrealistically high retaliation claims are merely aggressive litigation tactics designed to frighten the United States—a standard practice in WTO disputes. Congress should not fall for it.

The WTO can only authorize penalties based on the extent to which COOL caused a reduction in the volume and price of live-

stock imports. But the economic recession was the driving factor behind declining livestock imports, not the application of a simple label.

Cattle imports are higher today than when COOL went into effect and hog imports are rapidly rebounding, even with COOL in place. This straightforward logic is buttressed by a recent economic report from Auburn University that demonstrates that COOL has not impacted the livestock trade and that any harm to our trading partners has in fact been negligible at most.

Moreover, retaliation is only relevant if the United States, Canada and Mexico cannot reach an agreement after the parties have undergone the full WTO arbitration process. In past WTO disputes that the United States has lost, the United States has waited for the process to conclude and then has successfully avoided WTO-authorized trade sanctions by negotiating a settlement with the other country in the dispute.

Finally, the proposed COOL repeal legislation is particularly extreme in that it would roll back commonsense labels that the WTO actually supported or that never even were raised in the WTO dispute. The legislation would repeal COOL for ground beef and ground pork as well as for chicken, but the WTO explicitly ruled that the COOL label on ground meat was WTO-legal, and the dispute never addressed chicken or other covered commodities (including seafood, fresh and frozen fruits and vegetables, goat, venison and some nuts).

COOL is extremely important to our organizations and to the American public. We oppose any legislation that would repeal any portion of the COOL law. We urge Congress to stand up for America's consumers, farmers and ranchers by rejecting any effort to unilaterally repeal a popular food label even before the WTO process has concluded. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

AFL-CIO; AFL-CIO of Nebraska; Alabama Contract Poultry Growers Association; Alabama State Association of Cooperatives; Alaska Farmers Union; Alianza Nacional de Campesinas; Alternative Energy Resources Organization (AERO) (MT); American Agriculture Movement; American Corn Growers Institute for Public Policy; American Federation of Government Employees (AFL-CIO), Local 3354, USDA-St. Louis; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 2748 (WI); American Grassfed Association; American Indian Mothers, Inc. (NC); American Raw Milk Producers Pricing Association; Angelic Organics Learning Center and Farm (IL); Arkansas Farmers Union; Ash-tabula, Geauga, Lake County (OH) Farmers' Union; Berks (PA) Gas Truth; Berkshire Organics (MA); BioRegional Strategies;

Bold Nebraska; Boots on the Ground, LLC; Boston Food & Farm PBC (MA); Buckeye Quality Beef Association (OH); Buffalo Mountain Coop (VT); California Dairy Campaign; California Farmers Union; Campaign for Contract Agriculture Reform; Campaign for Family Farms and the Environment; Caney Fork Headwaters Association (TN); Carbon County Resource Council (MT); Carolina Farm Stewardship Association (NC); Catholic Charities of Central and Northern Missouri-Social Services Office/Diocese of Jefferson

- City; National Catholic Rural Life Conference; Cattle Producers of Louisiana; Cattle Producers of Washington; Center for Earth Spirituality and Rural Ministry (MN); Center for Family Farm Development (GA); Center for Food Safety; Center for Foodborne Illness Research & Prevention;
- Center for Media and Democracy's Food Rights Network; Center for Rural Affairs; Central Co-op (WA); Chicago Consumer Coalition; Church Women United in New York State; Citizen Action Coalition of Indiana; Citizens for Sanity.Com, Inc. (FL); City Market Union River Co-op (VT); Cleanwater Action Council of Northeast Wisconsin; Coalition for a Prosperous America; Colorado Independent CattleGrowers Association; Communication Workers of America; Communication Workers of America Nebraska State Council; Community Alliance for Global Justice (WA); Community Farm Alliance (KY); Community Food and Justice Coalition (CA); Connecticut Families Against Chemical Trespass; Consumer Action; Consumer Assistance Council, Inc.; Consumer Federation of America; Consumer Federation of California;
- Consumers Union; Contract Poultry Growers Association of the Virginias; Cooperative Grocer Network; The Cornucopia Institute; Cornucopia Network NJ/TN Chapter; Cottonwood Resource Council (MT); Crawford Stewardship Project (WI); Cumberland Countians for Ecojustice (TN); Dakota Resource Council; Dakota Rural Action of SD; Dawson Resource Council (MT); Detroit Coalition Against Tar Sands; East New York Farms! United Community Centers; EcoHermanas; Ecological Farming Association (CA); The Ecology Center (CA); The Ecology Party of Florida; Endangered Habitats League (CA); Equal Exchange; Fair World Project (OR);
- Family Farm Defenders (WI); Farm Aid; Farm and Ranch Freedom Alliance; Farmworker Association of Florida; Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Land Assistance Fund; Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Rural Training and Research Center (AL); Fiddleheads Natural Food Cooperative (CT); Florida Alliance for Consumer Protection; Food & Water Watch; Food Chain Workers Alliance; Food Democracy Now!; Food for Maine's Future; Friends of the Earth U.S.; Global Justice Ecology Project; GMO Free New Jersey; GMO Free Pennsylvania; GMO-Free Florida; Grand Forks County Citizens Coalition (ND); Grassroots International; Grow Youngstown (OH);
- Hanover Consumer Cooperative Society, Inc. (NH); Hawaii Farmers Union United; Hmong National Development, Inc.; Hunger Action Los Angeles; Idaho Organization of Resource Councils; Illinois Farmers Union; Illinois Stewardship Alliance; Independent Beef Association of North Dakota (I-BAND); Independent Cattlemen of Nebraska; Independent Cattlemen of Wyoming; Independent Cattlemen's Association of Texas; Indian Nations Conservation Alliance; Indiana Farmers Union; Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy; Institute for Rural America (IA); Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska; International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Intertribal Agriculture Council; Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement; Iowa Farmers Union; Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future (MD);
- Kansas Cattlemen's Association; Kansas Farmers Union; Kansas National Farmers Organization; Kansas Rural Center; LabelGMOS.org; Land Stewardship Project (MN); Leverett Village Coop (MA); Local Futures/International Society for Ecology and Culture; Long Beach Food Policy Council (CA); Lowcountry Local First (SC); MA Right to Know GMOs; Maine Fair Trade Campaign; Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association (MOFGA); The Manufacturers Association of Central New York; Massachusetts Consumers' Council, Inc.; Michael Fields Agricultural Institute (WI); Michigan Farmers Union; Michigan Food & Farming Systems; Michigan Organic Food and Farm Alliance; Middlebury Natural Foods Co-op (VT);
- Midwest Organic Dairy Producers Association; Midwest Environmental Advocates, Inc. (WI); Milwaukee Fair Trade Coalition (WI); Minnesota Farmers Union; Minnesota National Farmers Organization; Mississippi Assoc. of Cooperatives; Missouri Farmers Union; Missouri National Farmers Organization; Missouri Rural Crisis Center; Missouri's Best Beef Cooperative; Monadnock Food Co-op (NH); Montana Farmers Union; Montana Women Involved in Farm Economics; Montgomery Countryside Alliance; Murray County (OK) Independent Cattlemen's Association; National Center for Appropriate Technology; National Co-op Grocers; National Consumers League; National Family Farm Coalition; National Farmers Organization;
- National Farmers Union; National Hmong American Farmers, Inc.; National Latino Farmers & Ranchers Trade Association; National Organic Coalition; National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition; National Young Farmers Coalition; Nature Abounds; Near East Side Cooperative Market (OH); Nebraska Alliance for Retired Americans; Nebraska Easement Action Team; Nebraska Farmers Union; Nebraska League of Conservation Voters; Nebraska Sierra Club; Nebraska State Grange; Nebraska Sustainable Agriculture Society; Nebraska Wildlife Federation; Nebraska Women Involved in Farm Economics; Nebraskans for Peace; Neighboring Food Co-op Association (MA); Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ;
- Nevada Live Stock Association; New England Farmers Union (CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT); New York National Farmers Organization; New York Women Involved in Farm Economics; NH Right to Know GMO; North Carolina Consumers Council; North Dakota AFL-CIO; North Dakota Farmers Union; Northeast Organic Dairy Producers Alliance; Northeast Organic Farming Assoc.—MA; Northeast Organic Farming Assoc.—NH; Northeast Organic Farming Assoc.—NJ; Northeast Organic Farming Assoc.—NY; Northern New Mexico Stockman's Association; Northern Plains Resource Council (MT); Northern Wisconsin Beef Producers Assoc.; Northwest Atlantic Marine Alliance (MA); Northwest Farmers Union; Oglala Sioux Livestock and Land Owners Association (SD); Ohio Ecological Food and Farm Association; Ohio Environmental Council; Ohio Environmental Stewardship Alliance; Ohio Farmers Union; Oklahoma Black Historical Research Project; Operation Spring Plant, Inc. (NC); Oregon Rural Action; Oregon Rural Action Blue Mountain Chapter Food & Ag Policy Team; Oregonians for Safe Farms and Families; Organic Consumers Association; Organic Farmers' Agency for Relationship Marketing (OFARM); Organic Seed Alliance; Organic Seed Growers & Trade Association (OSGATA); Organizacion en California de Lideres Campesinas, Inc.; Organization for Competitive Markets; PCC Natural Markets (WA); Peach Bottom Concerned Citizens Group (PBCCG) (PA); Pennsylvania Farmers Union; Pennypack Farm and Education Center (PA); Pesticide Action Network North America;
- Powder River Basin Resource Council (WY); Progressive Agriculture Organization (PA); Provender Alliance (OR); Public Citizen; R-CALF United Stockgrowers of America; Raritan Headwaters Association (NJ); Real Food Challenge (MA); Real Food for Kids—Montgomery (MD); Real Pickles Cooperative, Inc. (MA); Right to Know Minnesota; River Valley Market (MA); Rocky Mountain Farmers Union; Roots of Change (CA); Rosebud Protective Association (MT); Rural & Agricultural Council of America; Rural Advancement Foundation International—USA (RAFIUSA); Rural Coalition/Coalicion Rural; Rural Development Leadership Network (NY); Rural Vermont;
- Rutland Area Food Co-op (VT); Sacramento Natural Foods Co-op (CA); Seacoast Eat Local (NH); Slow Food Nebraska; Slow Food USA; Small Planet Institute; Socially Responsible Agricultural Project; Society of Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace, IFPTE Local 2001 (WA, KS); South Agassiz Resource Council (ND); The South County Food Co-op (RI); South Dakota Farmers Union; South Dakota Livestock Auction Markets Association; South Dakota Stockgrowers Association; South Dakota Women Involved in Farm Economics; Southwest Nebraska Women Involved in Farm Economics; Springfield Food Co-op (VT); Stone Valley Coop & Café (VT); Texas Farmers Union; Tilth Producers of Washington;
- Tooling, Manufacturing and Technologies Assoc. (MI); Toxics Information Project; U.S. Cattlemen's Association; U.S. Public Interest Research Group (USPIRG); United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries; United Steel Workers Local 1188 (ME); United Steel Workers Local 900 (ME); Vermont National Farmers Organization; Virginia Association for Biological Farming; Virginia Citizens Consumer Council; Walter's Signs (NJ); Waterkeeper Alliance; Western Colorado Congress; Western Organization of Resource Councils (WORC); Western Sustainable Agriculture Working Group; Western Wisconsin AFL-CIO; Wild Oats Market (MA); Willimantic Food Coop (CT); Wisconsin Fair Trade Coalition; Wisconsin Farmers Union; Women Involved in Farm Economics; Women's Environmental Institute;

World Farmers; Yellowstone Valley Citizens Council (MT).

Mr. McGOVERN. Again, I would just say to my colleagues on this legislation, the American people do not want a total repeal. Nine out of ten Americans support country of origin labeling. We ought to work out a good compromise so the American people can get what they want and have access to the knowledge about their food that they want. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule with regard to this and "no" on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say a few words about the Defense Appropriations bill. And for the viewing public who are watching this and who are trying to figure out what does country of origin labeling have to do with a Defense Appropriations bill, I would again remind them that the Republican leadership and the Republicans on the Rules Committee have this new technique of bunching diverse pieces of legislation together under one rule to stifle debate and to make it more difficult for people to have their say on these important bills and to try to confuse things.

But I do think that it is important that people understand that the Defense Appropriations bill is given a role under this rule, and I would urge my colleagues to think long and hard before they vote. I would urge them to vote "no" on the Defense Appropriations bill for a whole number of reasons, notwithstanding the slush fund, the so-called OCO account, that is playing fast and loose with the numbers so that my Republican colleagues don't have to deal with the issue of sequestration. But I would also urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this, because this bill will appropriate billions of more dollars for a war in the Middle East that Congress hasn't had the guts to debate and vote on.

It has been 10 months—10 months—thousands of our troops have been deployed into harm's way. The President announced last night we are establishing a new base in Iraq. Close to 500 more American troops are going to be deployed in Iraq, and not a single debate in this Congress, not a single vote on whether this is the best strategy.

The President has submitted his AUMF. I think it is too broad; some people think it is too restrictive. But it is up to the Congress to fashion an AUMF that gets 218 votes or to vote to bring our troops home. That is the choice. But doing nothing is not a choice. That is an abrogation of our constitutional responsibilities.

Every single Member should be ashamed of the fact that 10 months into this war we haven't done a thing. How do you explain that to your constituents whose sons and daughters have been placed into harm's way? How do you explain that to your constituents that we are mostly borrowing \$3.5

million an hour to pay for these wars, but we don't have the time to debate it or to vote on it?

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD two articles. The first one is an Associated Press article, entitled, "U.S. to Send More Troops to Iraq for Expanded Training Mission"; and the other is a New York Times article, entitled, "U.S. Embracing a New Approach on Battling ISIS in Iraq."

[From the Associated Press, Jun. 10, 2015]

U.S. TO SEND MORE TROOPS TO IRAQ FOR EXPANDED TRAINING MISSION

(By Robert Burns and Lolita C. Baldor)

JERUSALEM.—An expected White House decision to send several hundred more troops to Iraq to expand training of Iraqi forces in Anbar province is not a shift in U.S. strategy but is aimed at helping Iraq retake the provincial capital, Ramadi, and eventually blunt the Islamic State's battlefield momentum.

The decision, which could be announced as soon as Wednesday, would increase the number of U.S. training sites in Iraq from four to five and enable a larger number of Iraqis—mostly Sunni tribal volunteers, in this case—to join the fight against the Islamic militant group. It is consistent with the overall U.S. approach of building up Iraqi forces while simultaneously conducting aerial bombing of Islamic State targets.

U.S. officials have said repeatedly that getting the Sunnis more deeply involved in the war is critical to ousting IS from Anbar.

It leaves open, however, the larger question of whether the Shiite-led Iraqi government will make the troop commitments necessary to oust the Islamic State from Ramadi, which the militants captured last month, and Fallujah, which they have held for more than a year. Up to now, Iraqi officials have chosen to deploy most U.S.-trained Iraqi troops in defensive formations around Baghdad, the capital.

President Barack Obama has ruled out sending U.S. ground combat forces to Iraq. There now are slightly fewer than 3,100 U.S. troops there in training, advising, security and other support roles. The U.S. also is flying bombing missions as well as aerial reconnaissance and intelligence-gathering missions to degrade the Islamic State's forces, while counting on Iraqi ground troops to retake lost territory.

A U.S. official said Wednesday that the extra U.S. training site will be at al-Taqqadum, a desert air base that was a U.S. military hub during the 2003-2011 war. Establishing the training camp will require between 400 and 500 U.S. troops, including trainers, logisticians and security personnel, the official said, speaking on condition of anonymity because a final administration decision had not been announced.

The U.S. already is training Iraqi troops at four sites—two in the vicinity of Baghdad, one at al-Asad air base in Anbar province and one near Irbil in northern Iraq.

The addition of one training site is a modest tweak to the existing U.S. approach in Iraq. It was unclear Wednesday how many more Iraqi troops could be added to the fight against IS in coming months by opening one new training base. One official said the training at al-Taqqadum is likely to begin this summer.

Over the past year the U.S. has trained approximately 9,000 Iraqi troops.

The new plan is not likely to include the deployment of U.S. forces closer to the front

lines to either call in airstrikes or advise smaller Iraqi units in battle, officials said. One official, however, said the adjustment may include a plan for expediting the delivery of arms and military equipment to some elements of the Iraqi military.

On Tuesday, Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in Jerusalem that he has recommended changes to President Barack Obama but he offered no assessment of when decisions would be made and announced. He suggested the president was considering a number of questions, including what adjustments to U.S. military activities in Afghanistan and elsewhere in the world might be needed if the U.S. does more in Iraq.

Dempsey said the Pentagon also is reviewing ways to improve the effectiveness of its air campaign, which is a central pillar of Obama's strategy for enabling Iraqi ground forces to recapture territory held by the Islamic State.

Obama said Monday that the United States still lacks a "complete strategy" for training Iraqi forces. He also urged Iraq's Shiite-dominated government to allow more of the nation's Sunnis to join the campaign against the violent militant group.

Dempsey said Obama recently asked his national security team to examine the train-and-equip program and determine ways to make it more effective. Critics have questioned the U.S. approach, and even Defense Secretary Ash Carter has raised doubts by saying the collapse of Iraqi forces in Ramadi last month suggested the Iraqis lack a "will to fight."

The viability of the U.S. strategy is hotly debated in Washington, with some calling for U.S. ground combat troops or at least the embedding of U.S. air controllers with Iraqi ground forces to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of U.S. and coalition airstrikes. Dempsey was not specifically asked about that but gave no indication that Obama has dropped his resistance to putting U.S. troops into combat in Iraq.

"What he's asked us to do is to take a look back at what we've learned over the last eight months of the train-and-equip program, and make recommendations to him on whether there are capabilities that we may want to provide to the Iraqis to actually make them more capable . . . whether there are other locations where we might establish training sites," and look for ways to develop Iraqi military leaders, he said.

Dempsey said there will be no radical change to the U.S. approach in Iraq. Rather, it is a recognition that the effort has either been too slow or has allowed setbacks where "certain units have not stood and fought." He did not mention the Ramadi rout specifically, but Dempsey previously has said the Iraqis drove out of the city on their own.

"Are there ways to give them more confidence?" This, he said, is among the questions Obama wanted Dempsey and others to answer.

[From the New York Times, June 10, 2015]

U.S. EMBRACING A NEW APPROACH ON BATTLING ISIS IN IRAQ

(By Michael R. Gordon)

WASHINGTON.—In a major shift of focus in the battle against the Islamic State, the Obama administration is planning to establish a new military base in Anbar Province, Iraq, and to send up to 450 more American military trainers to help Iraqi forces retake the city of Ramadi.

The White House on Wednesday is expected to announce a plan that follows months of

behind-the-scenes debate about how prominently plans to retake Mosul, another Iraqi city that fell to the Islamic State last year, should figure in the early phase of the military campaign against the group.

The fall of Ramadi last month effectively settled the administration debate, at least for the time being. American officials said Ramadi was now expected to become the focus of a lengthy campaign to regain Mosul at a later stage, possibly not until 2016.

The additional American troops will arrive as early as this summer, a United States official said, and will focus on training Sunni fighters with the Iraqi Army. The official called the coming announcement “an adjustment to try to get the right training to the right folks.”

The troops will set up the training center primarily to advise and assist Iraqi security forces and to engage and reach out to Sunni tribes in Anbar, a senior United States official said. The focus for the Americans will be to try to accelerate the integration of Sunni fighters into the Iraqi Army, which is dominated by Shiites. That will be an uphill task as many of the Sunni fighters in the area do not trust the Iraqi Army.

But the Obama administration hopes is that the outreach will reduce the Iraqi military's reliance on Shiite militias to take back territory from the Islamic State. “The Sunnis want to be part of the fight,” the official said, speaking on the condition of anonymity. “This will help empower them, creating more recruits and more units to fight ISIL,” he added, using another acronym for the Islamic State.

He said the arms and equipment sent will go to the Iraqi government forces in Anbar, not directly to the Sunni tribes, adding that the new strategy was not a change in policy to directly arm Sunnis, but rather a faster way to get equipment and arms to the battlefield, which the Iraqi government had requested.

The United States Central Command's emphasis on retaking Mosul depended critically on efforts to retrain the Iraqi Army, which appear to have gotten off to a slow start. Some Iraqi officials also thought the schedule for taking Mosul was unrealistic, and some bridled when an official from the Central Command told reporters in February that an assault to capture the city was planned for this spring.

Now, pending approval by the White House, plans are being made to use Al Taqqadum, an Iraqi base near the town of Habbaniya, as another training hub for the American-led coalition.

Alistair Baskey, a National Security Council spokesman, said that the administration hoped to accelerate the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces, and that “those options include sending additional trainers.” The United States now has about 3,000 troops, including trainers and advisers, in Iraq. But the steps envisioned by the White House are likely to be called half-measures by critics because they do not call for an expansion of the role of American troops, such as the use of spotters to call in airstrikes.

There has long been debate within the administration about what the first steps in the campaign should be. Led by Gen. Lloyd J. Austin III, the Central Command has long emphasized the need to strike a blow against the Islamic State by recapturing Mosul, Iraq's second-largest city, which was taken by the group in June 2014. Mosul is the capital of Nineveh Province in northern Iraq and was the site of a sermon that Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the leader of the Islamic State,

defiantly delivered in July. The Baiji refinery, a major oil complex, is on a main road to Mosul.

While General Austin was looking north, State Department officials have highlighted the strategic importance of Anbar Province in western Iraq.

Anbar is home to many of Iraq's Sunni tribes, whose support American officials hope to enlist in the struggle against the Islamic State. Ramadi, the provincial capital of Anbar, is less than 70 miles from Baghdad, and the province borders Saudi Arabia and Jordan, two important members of the coalition against the Islamic State. The differing perspectives within the administration came to the fore in April when Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, asserted that Ramadi was not central to the future of Iraq. The Islamic State's capture of Ramadi last month also punctured the administration's description that the group was on the defensive.

Iraqis are ISIS, are Sunni, are Shia. But we'll train whomever shows up and give them weapons and air support. At what point does U.S. . . .

Suddenly, it appeared that the Islamic State, not the American-led coalition, was on the march. Prime Minister Haider al-Abadi of Iraq scrambled to assemble a plan to regain the city.

The Islamic State now controls two provincial capitals, as well as the city of Falluja. With the help of American air power, the Iraqis have retaken Tikrit, northwest of Baghdad, but so many buildings there are still rigged with explosives that many of its residents have been unable to return.

To assemble a force to retake Ramadi, the number of Iraqi tribal fighters in Anbar who are trained and equipped is expected to increase to as many as 10,000 from about 5,500.

More than 3,000 new Iraqi soldiers are to be recruited to fill the ranks of the Seventh Iraqi Army division in Anbar and the Eighth Iraqi Army division, which is in Habbaniya, where the Iraqi military operations center for the province is also based.

But to the frustration of critics like Senator John McCain, Republican of Arizona, who say that the United States is losing the initiative to the Islamic State, the Obama administration has yet to approve the use of American spotters on the battlefield to call in airstrikes in and around Ramadi. Nor has it approved the use of Apache helicopter gunships to help Iraqi troops retake the city.

General Dempsey alluded to the plan to expand the military footprint in Iraq during a visit to Israel on Tuesday, saying that he had asked war commanders to look into expanding the number of training sites for Iraqi forces. The United States is not the only country that is expanding its effort.

Britain's prime minister, David Cameron, said this week that his country would send up to 125 additional troops to train Iraqi forces, including in how to clear improvised bombs.

Italy is also expected to play an important role in training the Iraqi police.

Helene Cooper contributed reporting from Jerusalem.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this House, this Congress, is not working. The fact that we can be in the middle of a new war, spending all these resources, committing all these young lives into harm's way, and we can't even bring an AUMF to the floor to have a debate, it is appalling. I don't

know how we can face our constituents, look them in the eye, and say we are doing our job here. We are not. I don't know anything more important that we should debate and deliberate on than war. I mean, war is a big deal. The unfortunate thing in this institution, war has become too easy. I am tired of the excuses, and I am tired of the whining. The President has done what he is supposed to do. Everybody has done what they are supposed to do except us. I am not going to vote for any bill that appropriates more money for a war that we don't even have the guts to authorize.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this grab bag rule, vote “no” on this ridiculous COOL repeal, and vote “no” on the defense appropriations bill. Let's vote these down and come back and do our job the way the American people expect us to do our job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and let me say thank you to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the points he raises. I enjoy serving on the Rules Committee with Mr. MCGOVERN.

Let me just say, this Congress, we are on track to be one of the most productive Congresses in many, many years, and part of the reason is the use of the compound rule, which provides for separate consideration of each underlying measure under a single rule. It helps expedite legislative business. Consideration of one rule allows the House more time to debate the underlying measures. It has given us the opportunity to achieve that efficiency and that effectiveness and productivity.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield for a 10-second question?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for a 10-second question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. How does this rule give us more time to debate the COOL repeal? It is a pretty straightforward, limited debate that we are given. I would argue that what you are doing is denying us the right to debate appropriately these important issues. We are not saving time. What the Republican majority is doing is limiting our opportunity.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Reclaiming my time after that 10-second question, the Agriculture Committee has had ample time for debate on that question. We are bringing forward what is a very critical decision that has to be made in a very limited timeframe, and so it is an appropriate approach to addressing this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the issues we are considering today have serious consequences for the security and economic well-being of our country, which is why I am urging my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bills.

H.R. 2685 is an important measure that funds our Nation's national defense and its critical national security programs. It provides the resources needed to continue our essential military efforts abroad and addresses the vital needs of our men and women in uniform.

An effective, well-equipped, well-trained military is in the best interest of all Americans and is indispensable to the common defense of our country. This bill includes vital funding for the U.S. military and intelligence community as they remain engaged in responding to these challenges abroad. This bill also makes difficult budgetary choices that will help us save taxpayer dollars wherever possible, but it does so without undermining the safety, the security, and the success of our troops and their families.

With the rise of ISIS, the continued presence of al Qaeda, the emergence and growth of terrorist groups in North Africa, near systemic instability across the Middle East, and the ongoing situation in Ukraine, our military must remain strong and ready to address evolving threats both at home and abroad.

Our highest national priority should always be the protection of our country, and the funding levels in this bill will ensure our military remains the most capable, prepared, and exceptional armed force anywhere in the world. To me the choice is clear. What side are we on? We choose to be on the side of our troops, and I am proud to support this bill and the important funding it provides our Nation's military, security, and our courageous men and women in uniform.

This rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act, a measure that warrants immediate and serious consideration by both Houses of Congress, because the ramifications of doing nothing will be severe and could imperil many sectors of our country, from ranchers and grape growers to manufacturers and exporters.

With only 37 days left to respond, the threat of retaliation is very real. My friends on the other side of the aisle may argue that we have more time to address this issue, but the reality is time is simply running out. For over 7 years, we have been trying to rectify this issue. WTO's latest verdict, handed down on May 18, is our fourth and final loss in the court proceedings. Now both Canada and Mexico have publicly stated they will retaliate against the United States, and the official request for retaliation is set to occur on June 17. This is not an idle threat. It is not saber rattling. Last week, Canada announced that it will seek \$3 billion in retaliatory measures, and Mexico stated it will be seeking tariffs totaling \$635 million.

Even before retaliation, COOL has had a negative economic impact in

many areas across the country. Tyson Foods has a plant in my district, and given the proximity to Canada, this plant in Pasco depends on Canadian cattle. However, under COOL, the plant cannot commingle U.S. and Canadian cattle. They have to be run in separate lines, and the plant has to use multiple labels depending on the origin of those cattle. COOL has increased the Pasco facility's operating costs due to the requirements and inefficiencies involved with the segregation of the cattle; and with less animals available across the Pacific Northwest, the plant is currently operating at less than 40 hours per week, leading to less money being put into the local economy from less compensation from employers.

Mr. Speaker, COOL threatens the trade relationships we have with two of our biggest markets for the export of U.S. meat and agricultural products. If we don't repeal the requirements of COOL, we are in violation of our WTO obligations. As I said, we could face billions of dollars in retaliation that would hurt farmers and ranchers, small businesses, and, yes, American consumers. We need this legislation now in order to prevent those retaliatory actions and to bring the United States into compliance with our WTO obligations, which can only be done by repealing these provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the discussion we have had over the last hour. Although we may have some differences of opinion—we usually do—I believe this rule and the underlying bills are strong measures that are important to the future of our country. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 303 and the underlying bills.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise against yet another closed rule on an issue that deserves weeks of open, transparent debate: trade.

This House is debating whether or not to repeal a consumer protection measure that 9 in 10 Americans support—country of origin labeling on meat in our grocery stores. This essential provision could be reversed in one fell swoop all because the World Trade Organization has decided that those labels hurt Mexico and Canada, our so-called "Trading Partners," who have threatened the United States with billions of dollars in sanctions if we don't capitulate.

The WTO's ruling highlights yet another example of a trading system that benefits foreign competitors and global corporations at the expense of the American consumer.

I hope my colleagues will remember this vote when the House turns its attention to fast track and the Trans-Pacific Partnership free trade agreement.

Advocates of fast track are selling the American people a flawed trade deal which has been negotiated in secret by multi-national corporations. This trade deal, which proponents will tell you will reinvigorate the middle class, create jobs, and strengthen the American economy, will do just the opposite. What's more, the president wants to cir-

cumvent congressional authority by stopping debate and using fast track to ram a bad deal through this chamber.

Not only will fast track and the Trans-Pacific Partnership cause serious harm to the American worker, they threaten American sovereignty, and this repeal bill is a prime example of that.

Not only does this silence the voice of the American people, it cuts out the People's House and would topple even more consumer protections.

From changing fuel efficiency standards, limiting access to prescription drugs, weakening the Clean Air Act, and more, the TPP is not simply about trade, it puts every facet of our daily lives at risk.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider their path forward and work for the American people, not against them.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 303 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 295 and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 187, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

YEAS—244

Abraham	Collins (GA)	Gibbs
Aderholt	Collins (NY)	Gibson
Allen	Comstock	Gohmert
Amash	Conaway	Goodlatte
Amodei	Cook	Gosar
Babin	Costa	Gowdy
Barletta	Costello (PA)	Granger
Barr	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Barton	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Benishek	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Bilirakis	Culberson	Griffith
Bishop (MI)	Curbelo (FL)	Grothman
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Guinta
Black	Denham	Guthrie
Blackburn	Dent	Hanna
Blum	DeSantis	Hardy
Bost	DesJarlais	Harper
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Brady (TX)	Dold	Hartzler
Brat	Donovan	Heck (NV)
Bridenstine	Duffy	Hensarling
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Hice, Jody B.
Buchanan	Elmers (NC)	Hill
Buck	Emmer (MN)	Holding
Bucshon	Farenthold	Hudson
Burgess	Fincher	Huelskamp
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga (MI)
Calvert	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Carter (GA)	Fleming	Hunter
Carter (TX)	Forbes	Hurd (TX)
Chabot	Fortenberry	Hurt (VA)
Chaffetz	Fox	Issa
Clawson (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (KS)
Coffman	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins (WV)
Cole	Garrett	Johnson (OH)

Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Rouzer
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)

Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Rooney (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Smith (NJ)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

Adams
Flores

NOT VOTING—2

□ 1411

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 295) supporting local law enforcement agencies in their continued work to serve our communities, and supporting their use of body worn cameras to promote transparency to protect both citizens and officers alike, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 6, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—421

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene

Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bera
Burchon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer

Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Burchon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill

Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks

Meng
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarella
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema

Sires	Tonko	Waters, Maxine	Doggett	Labrador	Ross	Kelly (IL)	Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda
Slaughter	Torres	Watson Coleman	Donovan	LaMalfa	Rothfus	Kilmer	Murphy (PA)	T.
Smith (MO)	Trott	Weber (TX)	Doyle, Michael	Lamborn	Royce	Kind	Neal	Sarbanes
Smith (NE)	Tsongas	Welch	F.	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz	Kinzinger (IL)	Noem	Schakowsky
Smith (NJ)	Turner	Westman	Duncan (SC)	Latta	Ruppersberger	Kirkpatrick	Nolan	Schiff
Smith (TX)	Upton	Westerman	Duncan (TN)	Lawrence	Rush	Lance	Norcross	Schrader
Smith (WA)	Valadao	Westmoreland	Edwards	Lipinski	Russell	Langevin	Nugent	Sewell (AL)
Speier	Van Hollen	Whitfield	Emmer (MN)	Loeb	Ryan (WI)	Larson (CT)	Palazzo	Shuster
Stefanik	Vargas	Williams	Engel	Loeb	Salmon	Lee	Pallone	Sinema
Stewart	Veasey	Wilson (FL)	Eshoo	Lofgren	Sanchez, Loretta	Levin	Paulsen	Slaughter
Stivers	Vela	Wilson (SC)	Esty	Long	Sanford	Lewis	Payne	Smith (MO)
Stutzman	Velázquez	Wittman	Farr	Lowenthal	Scalise	Lieu, Ted	Pearce	Stivers
Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky	Womack	Fattah	Lowey	Schweikert	LoBiondo	Perry	Thompson (CA)
Takai	Wagner	Woodall	Fincher	Lucas	Scott (VA)	Loudermilk	Peters	Thompson (MS)
Takano	Walberg	Yarmuth	Fleischmann	Luftkemeyer	Scott, Austin	Lynch	Peterson	Thompson (PA)
Thompson (CA)	Walden	Yoder	Forbes	Lujan Grisham	Scott, David	MacArthur	Pittenger	Tiberi
Thompson (MS)	Walker	Yoho	Fortenberry	(NM)	Sensenbrenner	Maloney,	Poe (TX)	Tipton
Thompson (PA)	Walorski	Young (AK)	Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray	Serrano	Carolyn	Poliquin	Turner
Thornberry	Walters, Mimi	Young (IA)	Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Sessions	Maloney, Sean	Price, Tom	Valadao
Tiberi	Walz	Young (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Sherman	Marchant	Ratcliffe	Vargas
Tipton	Wasserman	Zeldin	Frelinghuysen	Marino	Shimkus	Matsui	Reed	Veasey
Titus	Schultz	Zinke	Gabbard	Massie	Simpson	McDermott	Renacci	Velázquez
			Gallego	McCarthy	Smith (NE)	McGovern	Rice (NY)	Visclosky
			Garamendi	McCaul	Smith (NJ)	McKinley	Richmond	Walberg
			Garrett	McClintock	Smith (TX)	McSally	Rigell	Watson Coleman
			Goodlatte	McCollum	Smith (WA)	Meehan	Rohrabacher	Weber (TX)
			Gosar	McHenry	Speier	Messer	Ros-Lehtinen	Woodall
			Gowdy	McMorris	Stefanik	Miller (FL)	Rouzer	Yoder
			Graham	Rodgers	Stewart	Moore	Roybal-Allard	Yoho
			Granger	McNerney	Stutzman	Mulvaney	Ryan (OH)	Young (AK)
			Grayson	Meadows	Swalwell (CA)			
			Green, Al	Meeks	Takai			
			Griffith	Meng	Takano			
			Grothman	Mica	Thornberry			
			Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Titus			
			Hahn	Moolenaar	Torres			
			Hardy	Mooney (WV)	Trott			
			Harper	Moulton	Tsongas			
			Harris	Mullin	Upton			
			Heck (WA)	Nadler	Van Hollen			
			Hensarling	Napolitano	Vela			
			Higgins	Neugebauer	Wagner			
			Hill	Newhouse	Walden			
			Himes	Nunes	Walker			
			Hinojosa	O'Rourke	Walorski			
			Huelskamp	Olson	Walters, Mimi			
			Huffman	Palmer	Walz			
			Hultgren	Pascarelli	Wasserman			
			Hurt (VA)	Pelosi	Schultz			
			Issa	Perlmutter	Waters, Maxine			
			Jeffries	Pingree	Webster (FL)			
			Johnson (GA)	Pocan	Welch			
			Johnson, Sam	Polis	Westman			
			Jolly	Pompeo	Westmoreland			
			Kaptur	Posey	Whitfield			
			Katko	Price (NC)	Williams			
			Keating	Rangel	Wilson (FL)			
			Kelly (MS)	Ribble	Wilson (SC)			
			Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)	Wittman			
			Kennedy	Roe (TN)	Womack			
			Kildee	Rogers (AL)	Yarmuth			
			King (IA)	Rogers (KY)	Young (IA)			
			King (NY)	Rokita	Young (IN)			
			Kline	Rooney (FL)	Zeldin			
			Knight	Roskam	Zinke			
			Kuster					

NAYS—6

Harris
Nugent

Palazzo
Perry

Rooney (FL)
Ross

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Jolly

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Byrne

Flores
Messer

Webster (FL)

□ 1421

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 331 I was unable to register my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 256, nays 168, answered "present" 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

YEAS—256

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine

Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole

Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell

Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Bass
Benishchek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman

NAYS—168

Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Foxy
Fudge
Gibbs
Gibson
Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert

Tonko

Adams
Flores
Grijalva

Pitts
Quigley
Reichert

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1433

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1314. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 10, 2015 at 11:14 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 653.

That the Senate passed S. 611.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

AUTHORIZING THE REPRINTING OF THE 25TH EDITION OF THE POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 54, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 54

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution shall be reprinted as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 285,400 copies of the document, of which 235,400 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 50,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$135,312, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

(c) DISTRIBUTION.—The copies of the document reprinted for the use of the House and the Senate under subsection (a) shall be distributed in accordance with—

(1) a distribution plan approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the House; and

(2) a distribution plan approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE TAKEN WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN ACTUAL SESSION ON A DATE DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 292, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 292

Resolved, That on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives may designate, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 303, I call up the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2393

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING REQUIREMENTS FOR BEEF, PORK, AND CHICKEN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 281 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (7);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (1)(A) (as so redesignated)—
(A) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following new clause:

“(i) muscle cuts of lamb and venison;”;

(B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

“(ii) ground lamb and ground venison;”;

(C) by striking clause (viii); and

(D) by redesignating clauses (ix), (x), and (xi) as clauses (viii), (ix), and (x), respectively.

(b) NOTICE OF COUNTRY OF ORIGIN.—Section 282 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “BEEF, LAMB, PORK, CHICKEN,” and inserting “LAMB,”;

(B) by striking “beef, lamb, pork, chicken,” and inserting “lamb,” each place it appears in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D); and

(C) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “GROUND BEEF, PORK, LAMB, CHICKEN,” and inserting “GROUND LAMB,”; and

(ii) by striking “ground beef, ground pork, ground lamb, ground chicken,” each place it appears and inserting “ground lamb,”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 2393.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

Mandatory country of origin labeling is really a marketing program, a heavy-handed approach by this Federal Government to demand a marketing program that may or may not work.

Those were my words before this very Chamber, spoken more than 10 years ago today. It turns out that my doubts were well founded. The program has not worked, and it is time to put this failed experiment behind us once and for all.

Country of origin labeling, or COOL for short, was first enacted for meat products as a part of the 2002 farm bill. Implementation of the law was actually delayed until 2008.

Less than 5 months after the COOL-implementing rule was published, Canada and Mexico challenged the rule at the WTO, arguing that it had a trade-distorting impact by reducing the value and number of cattle and hogs shipped to the United States market.

The WTO process has since progressed through the dispute settlement phase, a U.S. appeal to the WTO's appellate body, review by a WTO compliance panel, and an appeal by the U.S. of that decision. In all four instances, Mr. Speaker, the United States lost.

In the fourth and final decision, released on May 18, the WTO rejected the United States' argument and found that the U.S. COOL requirements for beef and pork are unavoidably discriminatory. The final rule kick-starts the process to determine the level of retaliatory tariffs Canada and Mexico can now impose on the U.S., which has widely been predicted to have effects in the billions of dollars.

During a hearing of the House Agriculture Committee's Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee to examine the implications of potential retaliation against the U.S., witnesses

made it clear that losing the final appeal to the WTO and the inevitable impacts of retaliation against the United States and its economy would be devastating.

Some have asked why we should act on the basis of a WTO decision. If COOL worked, perhaps there would be a response other than repeal, but the fact is COOL has been a marketing failure. In an April 2015 report to Congress, USDA explained that COOL requirements result in extraordinary costs with no quantifiable benefits.

Although some consumers desire COOL information, there is no evidence to conclude that this mandatory labeling translates into measurable increases in consumer demand for beef, pork, or chicken.

In response to those who argue that COOL enhances food safety, as I have maintained now for 10 years, that is simply not the case. If it were, then all meat served at restaurants would come with information regarding the meat's origin, but it doesn't. That is because retail food establishments are exempt from COOL requirements.

Meat sold in the U.S. will continue to be inspected for safety by the USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service. This bill does nothing to change that and will simply repeal a heavy-handed, government-mandated marketing program that has proven to be unsuccessful.

Here we are with a policy that imposes high costs, no benefits, and if we keep it in place, our national economy will suffer significant damage that can reach into the billions of dollars.

Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack has been quoted numerous times acknowledging that repeal of the COOL requirements is a viable option for bringing the U.S. into compliance with its WTO obligations and avoiding retaliatory measures.

In a recent letter to Congress, Secretary Vilsack reaffirmed the need for Congress to repeal the disputed COOL requirements or develop a generic North American label. However, Canada and Mexico have previously rejected the North American label, rendering that option unacceptable.

In other words, if we go down this path which Canada and Mexico have already rejected, we will continue to face retaliation unless and until we can demonstrate we are in compliance with our trade obligations. Repeal is the only viable option before us to avoid this retaliation.

I urge all Members to support this simple, straightforward legislation so that we can, in the best bipartisan tradition of this House, avoid damage to our economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this bill. H.R. 2393 is a premature reaction to the

WTO ruling against the U.S. country of origin labeling, or COOL, law. Rather than taking the time to find a workable solution, the committee passed a repeal just 2 days after the WTO issued a ruling. We understand that this needs to be dealt with.

My problem with this whole process is that it just is not giving people enough time to look at this and figure out what is a reasonable solution. Most other countries have labeling. The American people want to know where their ag products come from.

If we repealed this on meat, we wouldn't be able to know where meat comes from, but we would be able to know where your carrots, lettuce, and all these other things come from. They all have mandatory country of origin labeling.

We understand that this needed to be worked on, and we understand that we can't get into a situation with the retaliation, but this is a rush to judgment that is not necessary because this retaliation process is going to take a while.

We had the Step 2 cotton case. It went 2 or 3 years before it got resolved; this is going to go faster, but the first thing that has to happen is they have to figure out what the damage is. That is going to take them a while, a month or two, and then they are going to have to have an arbitration panel to get everybody to agree that that is exactly what it is.

□ 1445

So this Canadian claim that there are \$3 billion in economic losses due to COOL is ridiculous and is based on unsubstantiated and not publicly available data. The U.S. studies, using USDA data, have found little, if any, economic harm.

As I said, more than 60 other countries, including Canada, have their own version of COOL. In fact, Canada has a host of protectionist agriculture laws in place that damage the U.S. dairy, poultry, and egg sectors.

The Canadian system puts U.S. products at a disadvantage every day. And yet, the Canadians take issue when we try to give consumers additional information on where their meat comes from, claiming it disadvantages Canadian producers.

Additionally, consumers are demanding more and more information about where their food comes from and how it is produced. The WTO has repeatedly ruled that COOL is a legitimate goal.

Rather than abandon our efforts to provide consumers with this information, we need to have the time so we will be able to find a reasonable solution to work this out without WTO sanctions. I believe it can be done, and it can be done in fairly short order.

So, as I said, my biggest problem is that this bill is premature. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. CONAWAY, for his leadership on yet another important issue for agriculture this week in the Congress.

I rise in strong support of the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, which would repeal mandatory country of origin labeling for meat and bring the United States back into international trade compliance.

I have always had concerns about mandatory country of origin labeling, and now the WTO's continued rulings against this practice, as well as Canada's and Mexico's threats to seek \$3 billion in retaliatory tariffs, make the hard and fast case for repeal.

For my home State of Virginia, it is estimated the potential economic impact of retaliation from Mexico and Canada could add up to tariffs of \$331 million worth of exports on products like paper, aluminum, and bread.

Mandatory COOL has failed and threatens our trade relationship with two of our strongest partners. Our markets, producers, and consumers cannot afford the cost of this failed policy. We will all benefit by its repeal.

Mandatory COOL for meat has been debated for almost 15 years. Within 5 months of its 2009 implementation, Canada and Mexico challenged COOL at the WTO, arguing that it had trade-distorting impact by reducing the value of cattle and hogs shipped to the U.S. market. The WTO ruled in favor of Canada and Mexico four times.

Now that the U.S. has lost its final appeal, it is imperative that the Congress act quickly to avoid billions of dollars in retaliation.

In the case of cattle, hogs, and chicken, it has proved to be a failed experiment, imposing significant costs on producers, packers, and consumers with no quantifiable benefit.

United States Department of Agriculture Secretary Vilsack has stated the Department has no further options for administrative remedies. The issue has to be fixed legislatively through Congress, and this way of repeal is, by far, the best.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure to repeal the country of origin labeling.

I want to thank the chairman for bringing this measure up. I also want to thank the ranking member always for his efforts to be balanced and to try to solve problems.

But I have been saying—and he and I disagree on this measure—for years that this country of origin labeling has simply not worked. So I am pleased that we are here today to debate the legislation that, in fact, repeals the country of origin labeling for beef, pork, and chicken products. Hopefully we can move on to figure out a solution to this problem.

That said, let's be clear: I want to emphasize, this measure has nothing to do with food safety. Let me repeat. It has nothing to do with food safety. The inspection process by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration remains in place for all consumable products that the American public eats.

So what this has to do with is simply about how we market beef, pork, or chicken across the country.

Going further, to ensure that we act on this measure, we do not want to have to deal with a devastating blow to our economy through economic retaliation.

Last month, as has been noted by my colleagues, the World Trade Organization rejected the United States appeal. This was our last and final appeal. And for many of us, we felt it was predictable.

We now face harsh trade retaliations from two of our largest export markets, Canada and Mexico, against products that are produced in America. This especially impacts California, the number one agricultural State in the Nation. The Canadian Government has already published its list of commodities that will be subject to tariff increases and estimates the impact could reach in excess of \$3 million, with the direct effect in California being over \$1 billion.

This is real. They prepared the list, and it could be implemented as early as this fall.

For example, Canada imports 90 percent of its table wine from my home State of California. If the tariff is increased to 100 percent, that will mean customers in Canada will have to pay double for a bottle of good California wine. If consumers in Canada see that price double, I suspect they are going to buy their wine elsewhere.

This will be detrimental to U.S. trade, as an example, but to all products that are produced in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COSTA. The bottom line is, we don't want to see any retaliatory efforts made by Canada and Mexico, and I don't think they want to impose them.

This bill is our only option right now to satisfy the WTO compliance. In addition, as has been noted, the Secretary of Agriculture has stated a legislative fix is required to resolve this problem.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this measure, and let's take action. And the Senate will need to then act, and then we have a chance to come together and fix this legislation.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I also rise in support of H.R. 2393, which, as has been mentioned, provides a long-overdue repeal of the country of origin labeling requirements for beef, pork, and poultry products.

Over the years, this law has forced USDA to use limited resources to implement and enforce a program that has nothing to do with food safety, and there is little to no evidence that it has increased consumer demand, according to a USDA-commissioned survey.

Serving as chairman of the House Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee, I am very aware of the economic harm that this burdensome law has already caused U.S. livestock producers, and more economic harm is on the horizon.

The World Trade Organization, the WTO Appellate Body, has ruled in favor of Canada and Mexico and found the U.S. country of origin labeling requirements are in violation of international trade obligations.

Both the Governments of Canada and of Mexico have clearly expressed their intent to seek authority from the WTO to retaliate. This could end up suffering economic impact in this country of almost \$4 billion.

The FY 2015 exploratory statement accompanying the omnibus appropriation bill directed the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a report with his recommendation for establishing a trade-compliant country of origin labeling program. In his response, repeal of this provision was a clear solution.

I know that there are some here in the Chamber this afternoon that will not agree with the answer, but there have been ample opportunities to craft another labeling program that meets our trade responsibilities.

This could have been addressed in the farm bill, or those individuals wanting a labeling program could have been working on it since last October, when the WTO ruled again that this law violated our trade obligations.

We are out of time, and the repeal is the only option that we have at hand. I urge my colleagues to support the bill that is before us today in order to prevent harm to U.S. jobs, to prevent harm to the United States economy, and to protect the trading relations with our Nation's strongest partners.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me

this time and for taking up this important issue and helping us to better understand the importance of it.

In my opinion, we shouldn't even be here today debating a repeal of this important consumer protection law. I don't know if this bill is a huge overreaction to the WTO decision or it is just an excuse to gut these common-sense country of origin labeling requirements.

For years, we have required labels on virtually everything imported into the United States. Every piece of clothing you wear has to have a label showing where it was made. Your smartphone has to have a label showing where it was manufactured. Even umbrellas and tablecloths have to list their country of origin.

But for some reason we are here considering a bill that would make it impossible for parents to know whether the chicken they are serving their family came from the United States or China. Think about that. What consumer, what parent would tell you they don't care what country the food came from that they are about to serve their children?

Let's just talk about the WTO ruling for a minute. First of all, the World Trade Organization ruling said that the labels for ground beef were acceptable but doesn't even consider any complaints from Canada or Mexico about chicken. So why are we voting on a repeal of the labeling requirement for those products?

Secondly, the WTO has not even ruled about the extent to which country of origin labeling affects exports from Canada and Mexico. And it can't be much, since Mexico exports more beef into the United States than before this law went into effect.

We do not have to give in to the WTO this easily. These kinds of disputes are frequently settled by negotiations with Canada and Mexico, not by giving up and throwing out an entire set of consumer protections.

We don't back down this easily, and we shouldn't back down this easily.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. PINGREE. So maybe the powerful special interests behind this repeal are really using this WTO ruling as an excuse to roll back basic right-to-know for American consumers. I don't think we should let them get away with it.

I doubt there is a single consumer in America who says, "I want to know less about the food I am eating." In fact, the opposite is true.

Now more than ever, Americans want to know where their food comes from, and they want to buy local food when they can. Buying local has created huge new markets for American farmers, great economic growth in States like mine, like Maine.

If this bill passes, it will be harder to know if the pork chop or hamburger you are buying came from around the corner or around the world.

Country of origin labeling is good for consumers; it is good for our farmers and ranchers. Please don't gut these commonsense requirements.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify. We do not import chicken from China, period. And the economic impact estimated for the State of Maine will be something on the order of \$74 million every single year in imports that won't happen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee, I rise in support of this bill, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, which repeals the country of origin labeling law, also known as COOL.

After numerous failed attempts to make COOL compliant with the World Trade Organization, it has become apparent that full repeal of COOL is unquestionably the right thing to do.

That said, I am sure there are some who are concerned that repeal of COOL may compromise food safety. America had the safest, most trusted food supply in the world before COOL and, let me assure you, we will continue to have the safest food supply after this law is repealed.

□ 1500

Let me explain why. Regardless of origin, if an animal is imported as a live animal, it is harvested in USDA-inspected facilities. Additionally, cattle, hogs, and poultry are inspected prior to harvesting as live animals and throughout processing as a meat product.

If the animal originates and is harvested in a different country, the plant has to have equivalent U.S. safety inspection standards and must be regularly audited by the USDA. The U.S. only imports meat products from countries that meet our standards. Furthermore, a foreign plant that does not fully comply with our standards is not permitted to ship meat into this country.

In short, the fundamental protocols ensuring food safety are apart and separate from country of origin labeling. Suppliers in foreign countries will still be expected to comply with the same inspection standards as they have now.

In closing, I would like to thank Chairman CONAWAY, subcommittee Ranking Member COSTA, and the committee staff for their tremendous help and guidance on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to my colleagues and appreciate their support.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture and the former co-chair of the Congressional Chicken Caucus, I rise in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

More importantly, as a Congressman for a heavily rural district, with lots of poultry and beef production in middle and southwest Georgia, I rise to support ending this failed experiment and repealing this harmful government mandate.

Since its passage in 2002, the country of origin labeling law has caused severe tension between the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Canada and Mexico argue that country of origin labeling has hurt their livestock industries, and they have taken their argument to the World Trade Organization, which has ruled in their favor and against the United States four times. We are now out of appeals.

Because of the WTO rulings, Canada and Mexico can now request authorization to retaliate against the United States in order to repair the damages they claim our labeling law has caused to their economies.

Therefore, we must act decisively to repeal the current COOL regulations on beef, pork, and chicken. If we fail to do so, Canada and Mexico have made clear that they will retaliate against a range of U.S. products within a matter of months by imposing onerous tariffs, resulting in higher costs and lost market share for U.S. producers up to \$3.5 billion a year. A hit of that magnitude would be devastating to the U.S. pork, beef, and chicken industries.

While some say we need to hold out for arbitration, I believe we need to repeal this harmful law and correct the situation ourselves before facing overwhelming retaliatory tariffs from Canada and Mexico.

By the way, it should be noted that this bill will not entirely undo the country of origin labeling law, only parts of it.

I urge support for H.R. 2393 because it will safely remove unnecessary burdens on our beef, pork, and poultry industries; bring us into compliance with our trade obligations; and ensure that we avoid damaging retaliatory tariffs.

Please join me in supporting H.R. 2393.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), the ranking member on the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's make no mistake about it. I will just tell you this retaliation situation is real from Canada and from Mexico.

The question is: Why should we here put our agriculture foundation at such a tremendous risk? Canada and Mexico are right now moving to institute retaliatory tariffs against U.S. exports.

It is critical that Congress also take this corrective legislation and act on it right away before the August recess—it is just that important—so we can send a powerful, quick message because Canada has already issued a preliminary retaliation list, targeting our commodities and our manufactured products not just in one State, not just in two States, but in every State in the United States of America, totaling over \$3.5 billion in the first year alone. My own State of Georgia will have an impact of losing \$180 million.

Mr. Speaker, let's deal with this right. This country of origin labeling is not about food safety. Let's not scare the American people into thinking that; we don't need to make the American people confused or feel that we are doing something to make the food unsafe.

What we are doing is protecting our American economy. We are protecting our agricultural interests. More than anything else, at a time when America needs it the most, we are standing up for America for a change. Protect our farmers. Protect our agricultural economy. Protect our people.

Make sure we pass H.R. 2393. Send a powerful message that we are not going to stand for Mexico and Canada putting their tariffs on us. We are going to stand firm and protect American interests.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) for yielding and for all of his work on this issue. He has been great at trying to mitigate the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a strong supporter of the idea of country of origin labeling, and I think it is a good idea.

I refute what some have said, that there is no benefit to this. There is great benefit to this. Area of origin labeling allows people to get to know from where their food comes, and that is, I think, incredibly important.

I don't think that repeal is the number one preference here. I don't think that is what we should be doing; we should be fixing the problem, but, because the majority hasn't been willing to work to fix the problem, we are in a real catch-22.

I rise today in support of this bill because, if it is not repealed, we are going to face tremendous retaliatory acts from both Mexico and Canada, and these are going to be of great fiscal impact to our economy.

My home State of California, for instance, it is estimated that we will be hit by \$1.8 billion worth of retaliatory

action. A good part of that comes from my home industry, the wine community; they will be hit heavily. We know what happens. We have seen this movie before, and the end is not good.

When Congress put in place the trucking program to deal with the Mexican trucking problems, we were sued. The wine industry was hit with retaliatory actions, and we saw a 25 percent reduction in our business. That was financially devastating not only to California, but this is an industry that puts \$160 billion a year into the national economy. This hurt us all. That was bad enough, but it took us 3 years to get back that market share that we had lost.

It is important that we repeal this and then get on to fixing it right away. I ask that we vote in favor of this bill today.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who has worked really hard on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the chairman for yielding and for leading on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I just would remark that wine has informed the meat debate several times here today, and I am glad of that.

I rise in support of this legislation to repeal these components of country of origin labeling. I have long held the position that this is a North American market. We don't treat our best trading partners as well as we should, Mr. Speaker, and that includes Mexico, and it especially includes Canada.

I often have to go through the list of things we have done that turn out to be something that looks like trade protection at least to them. We have done it with steel. We have done it with softwood timber. We have done it when we have BSE circumstances with beef, which did originate in Canada, spilled over to the United States, and they opened up their foreign trade before we did.

This is one of these examples of what happens when you go a little overboard in an effort to try to establish some trade protectionism. This was driven by the people, especially in the Northwest, that thought that they would get an advantage on their cattle industry in that part of the country.

Now, we are looking at these sanctions which, by my numbers, likely go to somewhere in the area of \$3.15 billion in sanctions between Canada and Mexico. Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of our consumers don't even look at the label to see where that comes from.

Consumers still have a choice. There is nothing that would prohibit in the aftermath of this legislation. The consumer is saying: I would like to know if this pig was born in Canada and fed in the United States.

To give you an example of how this is, there is a lot of U.S. capital that is

invested also, especially in farrowing operations in Canada. When the exchange rate was even more advantageous than it is today, a lot of U.S. dollars went into Canada to establish farrowing operations to raise pigs up there because they could isolate in order to do disease prevention and because it was a good investment; then those isowean pigs came down to the United States.

The numbers that I had was 6 million pigs coming down; 4 million of them came to Iowa. A third of the pork raised in the United States is from my State, and they are at a disadvantage because of this country of origin labeling. It penalizes, Mr. Speaker, the very people we are trying to help.

I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act.

As it has been discussed in this debate, the WTO has made its fourth and final ruling against the United States. Farmers and ranchers in my district in Texas will be hit with tariffs if we don't act right away. COOL has already put a burden on the beef, chicken, and pork producers in the State of Texas.

For example, Texas cattlemen are required to spend another \$35 to \$45 per animal just to comply with complex cattle identification requirements mandated by COOL. This cost will only get worse if retaliatory tariffs are implemented on our exports, tariffs which are completely legal under the World Trade Organization agreement that we have.

For example, I have spoken to my friends on the other side of the river, on the Mexican side, and they said that the American products that will be hit by tariffs include beef, wine, corn, corn syrup, furniture, dairy products, machinery, and a range of fruits and vegetables. That doesn't even include the tariffs that the Canadians will put, which probably includes jewelry, bread, beef, tomato products, and other goods.

Again, we cannot afford these tariffs, and we should pass the amendments to this COOL bill that we have to remove the threat of those tariffs completely.

In Texas, we raise beef, chicken, and pork that is "made in the U.S." We only ask that this be voluntary labeling. We should act quickly to avoid those tariffs, so we don't punish those farmers and ranchers in the State of Texas.

I thank the ranking member and the chairman for all the good work they have done.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 16 minutes re-

maining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH).

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Chairman CONAWAY for his leadership in bringing the repeal of the COOL amendments to the House floor so quickly.

I would like to thank my fellow Agriculture Committee colleagues for their bipartisan support in passing the repeal of the COOL amendments out of the committee.

The COOL amendments, or country of origin labeling, has nothing to do with food safety. It is a mandatory marketing program. The USDA stamp of inspection ensures consumers the meat we eat is safe and wholesome, not COOL.

Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. The U.S. has lost its last three appeals in the WTO to Canada and Mexico regarding COOL. Both countries are ready to retaliate against us, as we have heard, to the tune of billions of dollars, thus hurting our ag sector and American jobs.

Agriculture Secretary Thomas Vilsack has said that only a legislative fix of COOL would bring the U.S. back into compliance.

Again, I thank and congratulate Chairman CONAWAY and urge all of my fellow colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

□ 1515

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Let me first point out the irony that we are considering this bill in what could be a matter of days before we will vote on the administration's request for trade promotion authority.

Last month, President Obama said in his speech at Nike: "Critics warn that parts of this deal, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, would undermine American regulation—food safety, worker safety, even financial regulations. They're making this stuff up. This is not true. No trade agreement is going to force us to change our laws."

Country of origin labeling was passed by the Senate, passed by the House. It is the law of the land. Yet today, the House of Representatives is getting ready to repeal country of origin labeling. Why? Because the World Trade Organization ruled against it, a trade agreement ruled against it.

Contrary to what the President has said, trade agreements have a direct effect on our sovereignty. They have the ability to uproot domestic laws here in the United States. Members and the public need to know what we are opening ourselves up to when we sign these

trade agreements. Literally no area of United States law is safe: food safety, drug safety, consumer protection, environmental protection, health care, label rights, Dodd-Frank, even the minimum wage.

In fact, today's trade agreements, including the TPP, go further than the WTO rules. They allow challenges to U.S. laws not only by governments, but also by foreign and domestic multinational corporations who can circumvent U.S. courts and seek a remedy in an independent tribunal.

Today, the casualty is country of origin labeling. I was conferee on the farm bill in 2008 with my colleague Ranking Member PETERSON. I helped to work to author the language that expanded the country of origin labeling. I have worked on this issue for many years as a member and a former chair of the Agriculture Appropriations Committee. I am proud of that record.

People deserve to know where their food comes from. American farmers and ranchers deserve the opportunity to distinguish their products. It is an economic truism that complete and accurate information is one of the cornerstones of a free market. More than a decade of polling data proves that American consumers consistently and overwhelmingly want country of origin labeling, and frequently by majorities of more than 90 percent.

The World Trade Organization itself has repeatedly ruled provision of information to consumers to be a legitimate goal for domestic regulations. In light of that ruling, I agree that we should seek to protect American exporters by avoiding retaliatory sanctions, but that has not yet become necessary. It has been less than a week since Canada and Mexico filed their retaliatory tariff requests. The WTO Dispute Settlement Body will not consider it for another week.

We do not know whether retaliation will be approved. Canada and Mexico have asked for \$3 billion, but they must prove that they have been harmed, and that could be difficult.

A study by Dr. Robert Taylor of Auburn University found that in the case of Canada, COOL had no significant negative impact on either imports of cattle or the price of imported cattle relative to domestic cattle. Instead, Dr. Taylor concluded the decrease in exports was likely the result of the global recession and a weak recovery. Even if harm is found and retaliation is approved, it will probably not go into effect for several months.

There is plenty of time to look for a reasonable resolution, as we have done previously. More than 60 other countries have mandatory labeling requirements. So it seems there is a scope to find an acceptable way forward without compromising U.S. sovereignty. It is much too early for outright appeal, but that is what this bill does. Indeed, it is

unprecedented for Congress to intervene so early in the WTO process.

Moreover, this bill goes well beyond the scope of the WTO ruling. It would repeal country of origin labeling on chicken, which is not addressed in the ruling, and on ground beef and ground pork, which the tribunal explicitly found compliant.

Why are we rushing to judgment on this issue? I am forced to conclude that this bill is, in fact, a veiled attempt by the meatpacking industry to deny consumers their right to know where their meat and poultry is coming from. Is it coming from China? Is it coming from Australia? Is it coming from New Zealand? Where is it coming from?

Earlier this week, a broad coalition of 283 agricultural organizations wrote to Chairman CONAWAY and to Ranking Member PETERSON urging them to reject the repeal of country of origin labeling. Farmers, rural advocates, faith groups, environmentalists, labor unions, farmworkers, manufacturers, consumer groups all oppose this ill-conceived and premature repeal. Why are we not listening to them?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. As I mentioned at the outset, the context for this bill is a failure of U.S. trade policy. The administration tells us that trade agreements do not alter domestic laws. Clearly, this is false.

I admonish my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, beware of the road that you go down today. Beware of a trade agreement that puts American sovereignty at risk.

I hope that Members will bear that in mind and in that context as we vote on this bill today and, in addition to that, when we come to debate the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement and grant fast-track authority on that agreement.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentlewoman referenced a letter opposing what we are trying to do here today. As you look through that list of organizations that is cited, it is not surprising to find that several have consistently advocated for policies that are intentionally destructive to animal agriculture. So it is no wonder that these groups support a policy that imposes a heavyhanded financial burden on livestock producers, processors, and, ultimately, consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act.

In my home State of Illinois, we are a rich agricultural State, and we have

a rich agricultural heritage. Illinois is a national leader in corn and soybean, but also beef and pork production. If Congress does not act to address this issue of labeling, products in my State could face higher tariffs from Canada and Mexico to the tune of \$880 million worth of goods.

I urge my colleagues to stand with American agriculture and support the underlying legislation in order to avoid this harmful measure.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PETERSON for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of maintaining food labeling for the American people.

Polls show 9 out of 10 Americans overwhelmingly support country of origin labeling. I certainly look for those labels when I go to the store. It ensures that the public knows the source of their food. What could be more important? In fact, American producers want to share that information because it is a way to differentiate their products in an increasingly international marketplace.

Country of origin labeling is strongly supported by America's farmers and ranchers, who are proud of what they produce. Restoring local food markets, in fact, is a growing trend across the Midwest and the whole country. Farmers and ranchers know that people are demanding more and more information about their food. Restaurateurs are putting on their menus "local beef," "local pork," and "local chicken."

COOL allows farmers and ranchers the ability to market their products with pride because the label has integrity. The widespread support for country of origin labeling is what led to its enactment and implementation in the 2002, 2008, and 2014 Farm Bills. The trend is very clear.

Current efforts in Congress to repeal country of origin labeling are simply veiled attempts to gut these laws for meat—for beef, for pork, for chicken, three arenas that are completely controlled by a few processing companies. It is just like the book that Upton Sinclair wrote at the beginning of the 20th century. We are back to the jungle. We are back to the jungle.

Opponents are pressing for less information for consumers, not more. They want to hide the product's origin.

H.R. 2393 is a premature attempt to undermine food labeling. They argue it is necessary because of the World Trade Organization decision that puts Canada and Mexico at a disadvantage. Well, this bill, as such, was never even raised in the WTO dispute, and labeling is supported by the WTO. The WTO dispute never addressed chicken. It has explicitly ruled U.S. labeling requirements for pork and beef are legal. And more importantly, Canada's claims of

\$3 billion in economic loss due to COOL are absolutely unfounded. The data is not even publicly available, and they are unsubstantiated.

The bottom line is the rationale behind this bill is a clear example of what is wrong with our trade policy. Congress should not let a few meatpacking companies use trade disputes as an excuse to gut important consumer protections and the rights of farmers in this country. It is our duty to protect American consumers, American farmers, and American ranchers, not the trade interests of any other country. Our people deserve a right to know where their food is produced and where it comes from.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The previous speaker made reference to the current animal agriculture businesses as being associated with those horrible circumstances of the Upton Sinclair book. My guess, Mr. Speaker, is they would be vehemently opposed to that comment because their practices today do not remotely reflect those in Upton Sinclair's book.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a valued member of the committee.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

Agriculture is the backbone of many communities in Michigan's Fourth Congressional District. With over 10,000 farms and 15,000 farm operators, approximately \$1.7 billion in products from our area are sold across the country and around the world.

The law on the books right now that mandates country of origin labeling threatens the success of agricultural exports. It is unnecessary. It imposes a heavy burden on our farmers. It puts our agricultural exports at risk, and it needs to be repealed.

Recently, based on the ruling from the World Trade Organization, it is apparent that severe consequences could result and that our trading partners and neighbors could penalize American-made products sold in those countries with steep tariffs.

Already, Canada has announced that it will put tariffs on beef, pork, and cherries if the current labeling law is not repealed. Manufactured goods, including office furniture, would also be subjected to tariffs.

H.R. 2393 passed the Agriculture Committee on a bipartisan vote of 38-6. It is a good bill, and it repeals the current labeling law. It will eliminate the possibility of steep tariffs and let Michigan farmers and manufacturers focus on creating jobs and growing their businesses without worrying about more regulations or retaliation.

I am pleased to cosponsor this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

□ 1530

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

COOL was perhaps a worthwhile effort at the time but, unfortunately, has outlived its usefulness and its appropriateness. Country of origin labeling, well intended, has started to cause irreparable harm to producers in the Pacific Northwest. Beef and hog producers are facing serious problems trying to work things through the packing plant.

We have international trade now; we have a global market. That needs to be recognized. It is harming not just Canada and Mexico, but Pacific Northwest producers. That point has to be driven home.

We are now facing huge retaliatory tariffs in the Pacific Northwest. Some of our premier crops are wine, cherries, apples, cheese, potatoes.

COOL may have been well intended, but we lost four times at the WTO. We tried to fix it. We worked on it in the farm bill last go-around last year—couldn't get it done. We are facing these retaliatory tariffs right now. Let's repeal it, and let's move on.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM).

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and your committee for your hard work on this most important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support to the passage of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

This important legislation repeals country of origin labeling requirements for muscle cuts of beef and pork. Unfortunately, the World Trade Organization issued the final judgment of a long-running case brought by Canada, ending all doubt that COOL violates U.S. trade obligations.

Now, America's two largest export markets, Canada and Mexico, are moving to institute retaliatory duties against U.S. products, including \$1.3 billion of products from Iowa. Canada has published their list of retaliatory targets, including those aforementioned meat cuts, but also corn, fructose, cereals from my district, along with products from districts all across the United States.

Mexico has not yet published their list, but is likely to include some of the same corn-based products and perhaps even include ethanol.

It is critically important that COOL requirements be repealed to comply with existing trade obligations as soon as possible. Implementations of these tariffs would negatively affect a great deal of farmers and processors in my district and across Iowa.

I urge the House to pass this legislation today and the Senate to act swiftly to avoid these potentially devastating economic consequences.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to join my colleagues in rising in opposition to this important consumer and farmer protection legislation. Someone said it earlier; knowledge is power. When people know where something comes from, it gives them some very clear ideas about what the content of it may be.

Furthermore, the legislation, as has been pointed out here, is really quite, quite, quite premature. We need to let this process play itself out. There may very well need to be a fix here on this whole matter, but right now, it hasn't really been conclusively proven that the Canadian and the Mexican claims are valid. There has been some suggestions that perhaps they are not. Of course, this legislation goes way beyond the scope of the dispute at hand here.

I want to thank my ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, and all my other colleagues for standing up in opposition to this legislation. Let's let the process play itself out, and then, when and if it is necessary, we can fix things at that time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I don't think anybody on our side wants to have retaliation, but, again, we believe this is premature right at this moment.

We don't know how much damages are going to be found, if any. We just feel that repeal is not where we are going to end up and where we should end up. We understand this needs to be fixed, but I think there is another way to do it short of repeal.

At this point, because of that, I encourage people to vote against the bill. I kind of understand where this is going, but, as it gets over to the Senate, we will figure out a way to work through this so that we end up not having any retaliation.

We still have a system where people can figure out where their food is coming from. It would be ironic, if this repeal would happen to get through the Senate and signed by the President, you wouldn't be able to find out where your chicken or beef or pork came from, as I said earlier, but you will be able to find out where all the other ag products come from, which I think most consumers would see as kind of ridiculous.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that no one wants the retaliatory measures to be put into place. A "yes" vote on this bill that we will take up

on the floor here shortly will assure that of happening.

Arguments that it is premature fall on deaf ears. Four years of arguing with the Canadians and the Mexicans in the world court in this deal has left ample time to have come to some sort of conclusion if, in fact, there was a deal out there.

Quite frankly, if we had won a trade issue as decisively and resoundingly as Canada and Mexico did, we wouldn't negotiate either. We have no leverage; we have none to leverage against Mexico and Canada to get some sort of a deal that might fix this without the repeal.

Frankly, this is not about the merits of country of origin labeling; it is not about the merits of people knowing where their food comes from. We are beyond that point. We lost four straight times.

If those merits or those arguments upheld in the court in our trade obligation, then it would have prevailed, but it didn't. This isn't about people knowing where their food comes from. This is about avoiding the retaliatory measures that will be implemented by Canada and Mexico.

The argument that folks want to know where their food comes from, if you walk up to a normal person on the street and ask them that question, I am surprised it is not 100 percent of Americans who would say: Yes, I want to know where that food comes from.

But, if you follow that person into the grocery store and they go up to the meat counter, they buy based on price and quality of the meat and what it looks like. They are not looking at the label; 85 percent of them couldn't care less.

If you go into every single restaurant and you order chicken or beef or pork or fish or whatever, you have no clue where that came from. You trust the safety network that we have in place at USDA to make sure that that beef or that chicken, that pork, that whatever, is, in fact, safe for you.

The argument that we are somehow depriving the American people of information that they desperately need in order to make informed consumer decisions, again, falls on deaf ears.

Mexico is not a stranger to retaliatory measures. As my colleague from California mentioned earlier, they implemented those measures in 2011 as a result of a trucking case that we also lost in that regard, and it took the wine industry 3 years to recoup and get back to where they were when those retaliatory measures went in.

If you are not a wine connoisseur, pork rinds were also targeted. We had testimony from an individual from New Mexico that said they lost 15 percent of their business as a result of Mexico including pork rinds on the retaliatory measure. Somewhere between pork rinds and wine, you have got some

products that are going to be impacted by this.

These retaliatory threats that are going to come happen are already having a chilling effect on commerce between our three countries. If you are a wine distributor in Canada, you are not going to make any kind of long-term deals with the United States until you know whether or not what the impact is going to be. Commerce right now is being affected; hence, time is of the essence to get this behind us and move forward.

I would also argue that most Members down here would be very quick to argue and demand, quite frankly, that our trading partners around the world live up to their obligations, and we demand that. We get on our high horse, and we thump our chest like crazy, demanding that other folks live up to their agreements. That is what this is.

We have lost the appeals every step of the way. We have an agreement that says we will treat our trading partners certain ways. We crafted a law that broke that deal. We are now being demanded and required to live up to our trade obligations. This is no different than us trying to force all the other countries around the world to live up to their obligations as well.

This is about protecting American exports from these retaliatory measures that are unnecessary to happen. If consumers want their business and want to know where their food comes from, we can certainly craft a voluntary program that allows the market to exploit that information if, in fact, consumers want that.

Nothing that we are doing today will prevent us from creating some sort of a voluntary program that would, in fact, give consumers that information without being in violation of our trade agreements with our partners.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, avoid these retaliatory measures, which are totally unnecessary, if we would, in fact, do the work we are supposed to do.

I also want to thank my team that put together the work on this. They have been incredibly diligent. I know the folks on the other side as well have worked hard on this.

We have tried to come to a bipartisan agreement; we just couldn't get there, but I want to thank my team for the great work that they have done in getting us to that point.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, consumers deserve greater access to information about where their meat comes from, which is why I have always believed Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) is a critical tool for American families and ranchers.

I join many South Dakotans in being deeply disappointed by the World Trade Organization's recent ruling against COOL. While I

don't necessarily concur with the WTO's conclusions, I agree with my colleagues that something ought to be done to make COOL workable and prevent any damages against our agriculture industry. After all, it is essential that South Dakota farmers and ranchers can continue to be competitive in the export market.

The COOL repeal bill that the House is considering today, however, is premature. By moving on this legislation just weeks after the WTO ruling, we do not have the time necessary to explore what other options may be available. We owe it to consumers and producers to thoroughly consider alternatives. For these reasons, I am voting against the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015. This bill represents a hasty response to a recent WTO ruling on Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) and fails to take into account the wide-ranging views of multiple stakeholders, including consumer, labor, farm, environmental and faith-based groups.

The WTO Appellate Body ruled against United States COOL regulations only a few weeks ago and two days after, H.R. 2393 was pushed through the House Agriculture Committee. While the WTO ruled that COOL discriminated against imported livestock, it also determined that COOL is a "legitimate objective" to provide consumers information on food origin. COOL has been successfully implemented for various nuts, fruits, vegetables, seafood and other food products. Congress must support this progress and take its time to develop a COOL policy that is WTO compliant and reflects the views of consumers and other stakeholders.

While critics have pointed to the retaliatory threats issued by Canada as a reason to expedite this legislation, it is too soon to know whether these threats have merit. Canada and Mexico still must seek WTO authority to impose retaliatory tariffs. The WTO must determine whether this amount equals the damages incurred by Canada and Mexico under COOL. The U.S. can appeal these claims and request that the WTO appoint an arbitrator to determine the proper level of damages. Arbitration cases generally last several months. There is still ample time for the U.S., Canada and Mexico to come to an agreement before retaliation can take effect. The Congress should let this process play out before taking action.

I also have concerns about the level of damages Canada is seeking in response to COOL. Its claims cite data that is not publicly available, while studies from the U.S. supported by data from USDA show that COOL has not had a negative impact on Canadian and Mexican livestock imports.

Consumers have a right to know where their food comes from and studies show that Americans strongly support country of origin labeling. Congress should support the desires of consumers and wait for the WTO process to run its course before taking action. I urge a no vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS AND POLICIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF BELARUS AND OTHER PERSONS TO UNDERMINE BELARUS'S DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-42)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2015.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights

abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 10, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2685 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1545

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I rise to present the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation for the fiscal year 2016 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, there are nearly 200,000 servicemen and -women serving abroad, doing the work of freedom on every continent, and there are many more at home who are serving in every one of our States—Active, Guard and Reserve—all volunteers. We are grateful to them and their families.

They are certainly not all experts in some of the language and terms that will be part of our vocabulary during this debate over the next 24 hours—

phrases like “sequester” and “continuing resolution,” “Budget Control Act,” “overseas contingency account,” and the “global war on terrorism account”—but they have every expectation that they will have our united, bipartisan support for this bill whether they serve aboard a ship, fly through airspace, or provide overwatch on land to support a military mission. This legislation was developed after 12 hearings, many briefings, travel to the Middle East and Europe, and countless staff hours, with those who serve us, military and civilian, very much in mind.

This is a product of a very bipartisan and cooperative effort, for which I thank my good friend, the ranking member, PETE VISCLOSKEY. It has been a pleasure to work with him. We are both fortunate to have committee members who are engaged and committed so much to this product. We are grateful for the support of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY.

In total, the bill provides just over \$578 billion in discretionary spending, an increase of \$24.4 billion over the fiscal year 2015 enacted level. This topline includes \$88.4 billion in the global war on terrorism funding for war efforts, and it is at the level assumed in the House-Senate budget conference agreement. I would point out that our House total is very close to the number President Obama submitted in his fiscal year 2016 budget request for national defense. Of course, the base funding recommendation is just over \$490 billion, which reflects the budget caps enacted in 2011 as part of the Budget Control Act, signed by President Obama.

To reach our reduced allocation, we reviewed in detail the President's submission and found areas and programs where reductions were possible without harming military operations, warfighter readiness, or critical modernization efforts. Please be assured we made every dollar count. To do so, we have taken reductions from programs that have been restructured or terminated, subject to contract or schedule delays, contain unjustified cost increases or funding requested ahead of need, or because of historical under-execution and rescissions of unneeded funds.

Of course, our bill keeps faith with our troops and their families by including a 2.3 percent pay increase, a full percentage above the President's own request. It also provides general funding to their benefits and critical defense health programs. In another key area, this package contains robust funding to counter serious worldwide cyber threats—now an everyday occurrence.

But I think we would all agree that the world is a much more dangerous, unstable, and unpredictable place than it was in 2011 when the Budget Control Act was signed into law by President

Obama. The budget caps developed back then could never have envisioned the emerging and evolving threats that we are seeing today in the Middle East, North Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere.

So, to respond to current and future threats and to meet our constitutional responsibilities to provide for the common defense, we developed, in a bipartisan way, a bill that adheres to the current law and provides additional resources to end catastrophic cuts to military programs and people. These additional resources are included in title IX, the global war on terrorism account. That account has been carefully vetted to assure its war-related uses.

Our subcommittee scrubbed the President's base budget for this year and past budget requests, and it has identified those systems and programs that are absolutely connected to our ongoing fight against threats presented by ISIL, al Qaeda, al-Nusrah, the Khorasan Group, Boko Haram, and other radical terrorist organizations, including the Iranian Quds Force.

We also projected what resources the military and intelligence community will need to meet ongoing challenges of nation-state aggressors like Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and others. Not surprisingly, we have heard objections about the use of title IX to boost our topline national security spending in this bill. Frankly, I do not believe there is anyone on either side of the Capitol who believes this should be our first go-to option. Rather, it is a process we undertake as a last resort to make sure our troops can answer the

call amid a worsening threat environment around the world.

Again, we have been very careful about what went into this global war on terrorism account. We resisted the temptation to simply transfer large portions of the base bill's operations and maintenance accounts into the global war on terrorism account. We painstakingly worked to provide needed resources for the preparation of our forces in the field whenever a crisis may exist or develop in the future, like the current unfolding disaster which is Iraq.

In a recent Statement of Administration Policy, the White House asserted that the global war on terrorism funding—the old OCO account, the overseas contingency account—in their words is a “funding mechanism intended to pay for wars.” I could not agree more, and that is why we enforce that account to provide President Obama with the funding resources he needs to lead us as Commander in Chief. Within that account, I want to highlight two areas of critical importance—ISR and readiness.

We believe that a strong intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance—ISR—capability is a critical component of the global war on terror; yet a succession of combatant commanders has testified before our committee that only a fraction of their ISR requirements is being met, in essence, leaving them blind to the enemy's activities, movements, and intentions. Accordingly, the global war on terrorism account contains an additional \$500 million above the President's 2016 request to improve our ISR capabilities: the

procurement of additional ISR aircraft and ground stations, the training of ISR pilots and other personnel, and the processing of that type of derived data.

Likewise, we share the concern of the Army, Air Force, and Marines about the overall erosion of readiness in the force. So, to begin to reinvest in readiness, title IX includes an additional \$2.5 billion above the President's request for this purpose to be distributed to all of our services and to the Guard and Reserves. I would add that this sum must be detailed and justified to Congress 30 days before it is spent.

Again, this bill is structured to give the President the tools he needs to act. For example, when he finally does develop a long-awaited, complete, and comprehensive strategy to combat ISIL and other terrorist groups, we have provided in this bill the resources he will need to execute his plans. I think we would all agree that America must lead, and this bill enables leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I will allow myself a closing thought:

The Washington Post recently editorialized on the defense authorization bill: “There isn't much bipartisan governance left in Washington, but if anything fits that description, it's probably the annual defense bill.”

Mr. Chairman, this bill deserves bipartisan support, and after many hours of productive debate, I look forward to a bipartisan vote. Our troops deserve it. Our national security requires it. Our adversaries need to see it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army.....	41,116,129	41,130,748	37,295,571	-3,820,558	-3,835,177
Military Personnel, Navy.....	27,453,200	28,262,396	26,711,323	-741,877	-1,551,073
Military Personnel, Marine Corps.....	12,828,931	13,125,349	12,586,679	-242,252	-538,670
Military Personnel, Air Force.....	27,376,462	27,969,322	26,226,952	-1,149,510	-1,742,370
Reserve Personnel, Army.....	4,317,859	4,550,974	4,463,164	+145,305	-87,810
Reserve Personnel, Navy.....	1,835,924	1,884,991	1,866,891	+30,967	-18,100
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps.....	660,424	706,481	705,271	+44,847	-1,210
Reserve Personnel, Air Force.....	1,653,148	1,696,283	1,689,333	+36,185	-6,950
National Guard Personnel, Army.....	7,643,832	7,942,132	7,980,413	+336,581	+38,281
National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....	3,118,709	3,222,551	3,202,010	+83,301	-20,541
Total, Title I, Military Personnel.....	128,004,618	130,491,227	122,727,607	-5,277,011	-7,763,620
=====					
TITLE II					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	31,961,920	35,107,546	28,349,761	-3,612,159	-6,757,785
Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....	37,590,854	42,200,756	40,548,336	+2,957,484	-1,652,418
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	5,610,063	6,228,782	5,338,793	-271,270	-889,989
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....	34,539,965	38,191,929	36,094,484	+1,554,519	-2,097,445
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide.....	30,824,752	32,440,843	30,182,187	-642,565	-2,258,656
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve.....	2,513,393	2,665,792	2,644,274	+130,881	-21,518
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	1,021,200	1,001,758	999,621	-21,579	-2,137
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	270,846	277,036	276,761	+5,915	-275
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	3,026,342	3,064,257	2,815,862	-210,480	-248,395
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	6,175,951	6,717,977	6,731,119	+555,168	+13,142
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	6,408,558	6,956,210	6,605,400	+196,842	-350,810
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.....	13,723	14,078	14,078	+355	---
Environmental Restoration, Army.....	201,560	234,829	234,829	+33,269	---
Environmental Restoration, Navy.....	277,294	292,453	300,000	+22,706	+7,547
Environmental Restoration, Air Force.....	408,716	368,131	368,131	-40,585	---
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide.....	8,547	8,232	8,232	-315	---
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites..	250,853	203,717	228,717	-22,136	+25,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid.....	103,000	100,266	103,266	+266	+3,000
Cooperative Threat Reduction Account.....	365,108	358,496	358,496	-6,612	---
Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund.....	83,034	84,140	84,140	+1,106	---
Total, Title II, Operation and maintenance.....	161,655,679	176,517,228	162,286,489	+639,810	-14,230,739
=====					

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army.....	5,216,225	5,689,357	5,336,971	+120,746	-352,386
Missile Procurement, Army.....	1,208,692	1,419,957	1,160,482	-48,210	-259,475
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.....	1,722,136	1,867,073	1,805,773	+83,637	-81,300
Procurement of Ammunition, Army.....	1,015,477	1,233,378	1,007,778	-7,699	-225,600
Other Procurement, Army.....	4,747,523	5,899,028	5,230,677	+483,154	-668,351
Aircraft Procurement, Navy.....	14,758,035	16,126,405	16,871,819	+2,113,784	+745,414
Weapons Procurement, Navy.....	3,137,257	3,154,154	2,998,541	-138,716	-155,613
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps.....	674,100	723,741	559,141	-114,959	-164,600
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy.....	15,954,379	16,597,457	16,852,569	+898,190	+255,112
Other Procurement, Navy.....	5,846,558	6,614,715	6,696,715	+850,157	+82,000
Procurement, Marine Corps.....	935,209	1,131,418	973,084	+37,875	-158,334
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force.....	12,067,703	15,657,769	14,224,475	+2,156,772	-1,433,294
Missile Procurement, Air Force.....	4,629,662	2,987,045	2,334,165	-2,295,497	-652,880
Space Procurement, Air Force.....	---	2,584,061	1,935,034	+1,935,034	-649,027
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force.....	659,909	1,758,843	253,496	-408,413	-1,505,347
Other Procurement, Air Force.....	16,781,266	18,272,438	15,098,950	-1,682,316	-3,173,488
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,429,303	5,130,853	5,143,095	+713,792	+12,242
Defense Production Act Purchases	51,638	46,680	76,680	+25,042	+30,000
Total, Title III, Procurement.....	93,835,072	106,914,372	98,559,445	+4,724,373	-8,354,927
=====					
TITLE IV					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army.....	6,675,565	6,924,959	7,372,047	+696,482	+447,088
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy.....	15,958,460	17,885,916	17,237,724	+1,279,264	-648,192
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force...	23,643,983	26,473,669	23,163,152	-480,831	-3,310,517
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	17,225,889	18,329,861	18,207,171	+981,282	-122,690
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	209,378	170,558	170,558	-38,820	---
Total, Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	63,713,275	69,784,963	66,150,652	+2,437,377	-3,634,311
=====					
TITLE V					
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds.....	1,649,468	1,312,568	1,634,568	-14,900	+322,000
National Defense Sealift Fund.....	485,012	474,164	474,164	-10,848	---
Total, Title V, Revolving and Management Funds....	2,134,480	1,786,732	2,108,732	-25,748	+322,000
=====					

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

TITLE VI					
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
Defense Health Program					
Operation and maintenance.....	30,030,650	30,889,940	29,489,521	-541,129	-1,400,419
Procurement.....	308,413	373,287	373,287	+64,874	---
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	1,730,709	980,101	1,577,201	-153,508	+597,100
Total, Defense Health Program 1/ 3/.....	32,069,772	32,243,328	31,440,009	-629,753	-803,319
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense:					
Operation and maintenance.....	196,128	139,098	139,098	-57,030	---
Procurement.....	10,227	2,281	2,281	-7,946	---
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	595,913	579,342	579,342	-16,571	---
Total, Chemical Agents 2/.....	802,268	720,721	720,721	-81,547	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense..	---	---	---	---	---
Counter-narcotics support.....	669,631	739,009	616,811	-52,820	-122,198
Drug demand reduction program.....	105,591	111,589	113,589	+7,998	+2,000
National Guard counter-drug program.....	175,465	---	147,898	-27,567	+147,898
Total, Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense 4/.....	950,687	850,598	878,298	-72,389	+27,700
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund.....	---	99,701	---	---	-99,701
Support for International Sporting Competitions 1/.....	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Office of the Inspector General 1/.....	311,830	316,159	316,159	+4,329	---
Total, Title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	34,144,557	34,230,507	33,355,167	-789,370	-875,320
=====					
TITLE VII					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund.....	514,000	514,000	514,000	---	---
Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA).....	507,600	530,023	507,923	+323	-22,100
Total, Title VII, Related agencies.....	1,021,600	1,044,023	1,021,923	+323	-22,100
=====					

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VIII					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Additional transfer authority (Sec.8005).....	(4,500,000)	(5,500,000)	(4,500,000)	---	(-1,000,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (Sec.8017).....	175,000	---	---	-175,000	---
FFRDC (Sec.8023).....	-40,000	---	-88,400	-48,400	-88,400
Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery (Sec.8028).....	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000	---
Rescissions (Sec.8040).....	-1,228,020	---	-869,429	+358,591	-869,429
National grants (Sec.8046).....	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
O&M, Defense-wide transfer authority (Sec.8050).....	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	---	---
Global Security Contingency Fund (O&M, Defense-wide transfer).....	(200,000)	---	---	(-200,000)	---
Fisher House Foundation (Sec.8067).....	4,000	---	5,000	+1,000	+5,000
Revised economic assumptions (Sec.8074).....	-386,268	---	-1,152,206	-765,938	-1,152,206
Fisher House O&M Army Navy Air Force transfer authority (Sec.8090).....	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	---	---
Defense Health O&M transfer authority (Sec.8094).....	(146,857)	(121,000)	(121,000)	(-25,857)	---
Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund.....	540,000	---	---	-540,000	---
Basic allowance for housing (Sec.8114).....	88,000	---	400,000	+312,000	+400,000
Military pay raise (Sec.8124).....	---	---	700,000	+700,000	+700,000
Working Capital Fund excess cash balances (Sec.8125)....	---	---	-359,000	-359,000	-359,000
Revised fuel costs (Sec.8126).....	---	---	-814,000	-814,000	-814,000
John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund (O&M, Navy transfer authority).....	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	(-1,000)	(-1,000)
Total, Title VIII, General Provisions.....	-803,288	1,000	-2,133,035	-1,329,747	-2,134,035
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IX					
GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM (GWOT)					
Military Personnel					
Military Personnel, Army (GWOT).....	3,259,970	1,828,441	5,664,570	+2,404,600	+3,836,129
Military Personnel, Navy (GWOT).....	332,166	251,011	1,643,136	+1,310,970	+1,392,125
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT).....	403,311	171,079	555,998	+152,687	+384,919
Military Personnel, Air Force (GWOT).....	728,334	726,126	2,376,095	+1,647,761	+1,649,969
Reserve Personnel, Army (GWOT).....	24,990	24,462	24,462	---	---
Reserve Personnel, Navy (GWOT).....	13,953	12,693	12,693	-1,260	---
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT).....	5,069	3,393	3,393	-1,676	---
Reserve Personnel, Air Force (GWOT).....	19,175	18,710	18,710	-465	---
National Guard Personnel, Army (GWOT).....	174,778	166,015	166,015	-8,763	---
National Guard Personnel, Air Force (GWOT).....	4,894	2,828	2,828	-2,066	---
Total, Military Personnel.....	4,966,640	3,204,758	10,467,900	+5,501,260	+7,263,142
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation & Maintenance, Army (GWOT).....	18,108,656	11,382,750	18,910,604	+801,948	+7,527,854
Operation & Maintenance, Navy (GWOT).....	6,253,819	5,131,588	6,747,313	+493,494	+1,615,725
Coast Guard (by transfer) (GWOT).....	---	(160,002)	(160,002)	(+160,002)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps (GWOT).....	1,850,984	952,534	1,871,834	+20,850	+919,300
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force (GWOT).....	10,076,383	9,090,013	10,799,220	+722,837	+1,709,207
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide (GWOT).....	6,211,025	5,805,633	7,559,131	+1,348,106	+1,753,498
Coalition support funds (GWOT).....	(1,260,000)	(1,260,000)	(1,260,000)	---	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve (GWOT).....	41,532	24,559	124,559	+83,027	+100,000
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve (GWOT).....	45,876	31,643	34,187	-11,689	+2,544
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (GWOT).....	10,540	3,455	3,455	-7,085	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (GWOT).....	77,794	58,106	209,606	+131,812	+151,500
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard (GWOT).....	77,661	60,845	160,845	+83,184	+100,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard (GWOT).....	22,600	19,900	225,350	+202,750	+205,450
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance.....	42,776,870	32,561,026	46,646,104	+3,869,234	+14,085,078
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (GWOT).....	1,300,000	2,100,000	2,060,000	+760,000	-40,000
European Reassurance Initiative (GWOT).....	175,000	---	---	-175,000	---
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (GWOT).....	4,109,333	3,762,257	3,762,257	-347,076	---
Iraq Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	1,618,000	715,000	715,000	-903,000	---
Syria Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	---	600,000	600,000	+600,000	---
Total, Operation and Maintenance.....	49,979,203	39,738,283	53,783,361	+3,804,158	+14,045,078

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Procurement					
Aircraft Procurement, Army (GWOT).....	196,200	164,987	759,073	+562,873	+594,086
Missile Procurement, Army (GWOT).....	32,136	37,260	572,735	+540,599	+535,475
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (GWOT).....	5,000	26,030	647,630	+642,630	+621,600
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (GWOT).....	140,905	192,040	431,640	+290,735	+239,600
Other Procurement, Army (GWOT).....	773,583	1,205,596	1,648,312	+874,729	+442,716
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (GWOT).....	243,359	217,394	722,274	+478,915	+504,880
Weapons Procurement, Navy (GWOT).....	66,785	3,344	---	-66,785	-3,344
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (GWOT).....	154,519	136,930	105,459	-49,060	-31,471
Other Procurement, Navy (GWOT).....	123,710	12,186	12,186	-111,524	---
Procurement, Marine Corps (GWOT).....	65,589	48,934	234,741	+169,152	+185,807
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (GWOT).....	481,019	128,900	1,297,726	+816,707	+1,168,826
Missile Procurement, Air Force (GWOT).....	136,189	289,142	773,638	+637,449	+484,496
Space Procurement, Air Force (GWOT).....	---	---	452,676	+452,676	+452,676
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (GWOT).....	219,785	228,874	1,673,358	+1,453,573	+1,444,484
Other Procurement, Air Force (GWOT).....	3,607,526	3,859,964	7,045,550	+3,438,024	+3,185,586
Procurement, Defense-Wide (GWOT).....	250,386	212,418	217,701	-32,685	+5,283
National Guard and Reserve Equipment (GWOT)	1,200,000	---	1,500,000	+300,000	+1,500,000
Total, Procurement	7,696,691	6,763,999	18,094,699	+10,398,008	+11,330,700
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army (GWOT)...	2,000	1,500	1,500	-500	---
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy (GWOT)...	36,020	35,747	217,647	+181,627	+181,900
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force (GWOT).....	14,706	17,100	1,366,242	+1,351,536	+1,349,142
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (GWOT).....	174,647	137,087	199,264	+24,617	+62,177
Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	227,373	191,434	1,784,653	+1,557,280	+1,593,219
Revolving and Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Funds (GWOT).....	91,350	88,850	88,850	-2,500	---

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Other Department of Defense Programs					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance (GWOT).....	300,531	272,704	272,704	-27,827	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (GWOT).....	205,000	186,000	275,300	+70,300	+89,300
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (GWOT)....	444,464	493,271	443,271	-1,193	-50,000
Office of the Inspector General (GWOT).....	10,623	10,262	10,262	-361	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	960,618	962,237	1,001,537	+40,919	+39,300
TITLE IX General Provisions					
Additional transfer authority (GWOT) (Sec. 9003).....	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	---	---
Rescissions (GWOT)	-1,236,580	---	---	+1,236,580	---
Unexploded ordnance (GWOT)	250,000	---	---	-250,000	---
Assistance to Ukraine (GWOT) (Sec. 9014).....	---	---	200,000	+200,000	+200,000
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (GWOT) (Sec. 9016).....	---	---	500,000	+500,000	+500,000
Readiness (GWOT) (Sec. 9017).....	1,000,000	---	2,500,000	+1,500,000	+2,500,000
Total, General Provisions.....	13,420	---	3,200,000	+3,186,580	+3,200,000
Total, Title IX.....	63,935,295	50,949,561	88,421,000	+24,485,705	+37,471,439
=====					
TITLE X					
EBOLA RESPONSE AND PREPAREDNESS					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Procurement, Defense-wide (emergency).....	17,000	---	---	-17,000	---
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide (emergency).....	95,000	---	---	-95,000	---
Total, Title X.....	112,000	---	---	-112,000	---
(Emergency).....	(112,000)	---	---	(-112,000)	---
=====					
Grand Total.....	547,753,288	571,719,613	572,498,000	+24,744,712	+778,387
Appropriations.....	(484,934,013)	(520,770,052)	(484,946,429)	(+12,416)	(-35,823,623)
Emergency appropriations.....	(112,000)	---	---	(-112,000)	---
Global War on Terrorism (GWOT).....	(65,171,875)	(50,949,561)	(88,421,000)	(+23,249,125)	(+37,471,439)
Rescissions.....	(-1,228,020)	---	(-869,429)	(+358,591)	(-869,429)
Rescissions (GWOT).....	(-1,236,580)	---	---	(+1,236,580)	---
=====					

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Lease of defense real property (permanent).....	31,000	33,000	33,000	+2,000	---
Disposal of defense real property (permanent).....	8,000	8,000	8,000	---	---
DHP, O&M to DOD-VA Joint Incentive Fund (permanent):					
Defense function.....	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	---	---
Non-defense function.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
DHP, O&M to Joint DOD-VA Medical Facility					
Demonstration Fund (Sec. 8102):					
Defense function.....	-146,857	-120,000	-120,000	+26,857	---
Non-defense function.....	146,857	120,000	120,000	-26,857	---
O&M, Defense-wide transfer to Department					
of State:					
Defense function.....	-30,000	---	---	+30,000	---
Non-defense function.....	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---
Navy transfer to John C. Stennis Center for Public					
Service Development Trust Fund:					
Defense function.....	---	-1,000	---	---	+1,000
Non-defense function.....	---	1,000	---	---	-1,000
Title IX O&M, Navy transfer to Coast Guard, Op.Exp					
(By transfer).....	---	(160,002)	(160,002)	(+160,002)	---
Tricare accrual (permanent, indefinite auth.) 5/.....	6,963,000	6,631,000	6,631,000	-332,000	---
(GWOT).....	84,700	---	---	-84,700	---
Less emergency appropriations.....	-112,000	---	---	+112,000	---
Total, scorekeeping adjustments.....	6,954,700	6,672,000	6,672,000	-282,700	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel.....	128,004,618	130,491,227	122,727,607	-5,277,011	-7,763,620
Title II - Operation and Maintenance.....	161,655,679	176,517,228	162,286,489	+630,810	-14,230,739
Title III - Procurement.....	93,836,072	106,914,372	98,559,445	+4,724,373	-8,354,927
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation...	63,713,275	69,784,963	66,150,652	+2,437,377	-3,634,311
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds.....	2,134,480	1,786,732	2,108,732	-25,748	+322,000
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs.....	34,144,557	34,230,507	33,355,187	-789,370	-875,320
Title VII - Related Agencies.....	1,021,600	1,044,023	1,021,923	+323	-22,100
Title VIII - General Provisions (net).....	-803,288	1,000	-2,133,035	-1,329,747	-2,134,035
Title IX - Global War on Terrorism (GWOT).....	63,935,295	50,949,561	88,421,000	+24,485,705	+37,471,439
Title X - Ebola Response and Preparedness.....	112,000	---	---	-112,000	---

Total, Department of Defense.....	547,753,288	571,719,613	572,498,000	+24,744,712	+778,387
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	6,954,700	6,672,000	6,672,000	-282,700	---

Total mandatory and discretionary.....	554,707,988	578,391,613	579,170,000	+24,462,012	+778,387
=====					

1/ Included in Budget under Operation and Maintenance
2/ Included in Budget under Procurement
3/ Budget request assumes enactment of DoD's
pharmacy/Consolidated Health Plan proposals
4/ Budget request does not break out total recommended
in bill language
5/ Contributions to Department of Defense
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund
(Sec. 725, P.L. 108-375). Amount does not include
Budget proposals to amend TRICARE

NOTE: In FY 2015, the amount provided for Space
Procurement, Air Force was included in the
appropriation for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The
House reported table counts the FY 2015 amount
for Space Procurement, Air Force (\$2,658,789)
twice--as part of Missile Procurement, Air Force
and as a separate appropriation

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to my good friend, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and to congratulate him on the collegial and the transparent manner in which he has crafted this legislation.

I also want to express my sincere appreciation for the efforts of Chairman HAL ROGERS, Ranking Member NITA LOWEY, and of all the members of the Defense Subcommittee.

This bill, obviously, could not have been written without the dedication, long hours, discerning judgment, and thoughtful input of our committee staff and personal staffs. I thank them very much.

The chairman has fully and fairly described the bill we are considering today. I believe he has accurately described the very dangerous and unpredictable world in which we live. As such, I will enter my detailed comments on the bill for the RECORD. Instead, I want to use my time during general debate to discuss the albatross around Congress' neck—the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Despite near universal disdain and plenty of buyer's remorse from the 187 current House Members who voted in favor of the Budget Control Act, it has proven to be an extremely resilient—yet utterly ineffective—piece of law. We have seen short postponements of sequestration. We have seen 2-year alleviations of the budget caps. Yet we find ourselves nearly 5 years since its enactment far from the consensus needed to repeal the law. Further, the continued halfhearted attempts to fix the Budget Control Act are almost as detrimental to the law, itself, as they add to the Nation's uncertainty.

Additionally, it is becoming increasingly difficult to point to any positive changes in our fiscal situation as a result. While intended to reduce the budget deficit through spending limits and reductions, our national debt has increased by 24.5 percent since the enactment of the legislation, mainly because the committees that are not truly constrained by discretionary spending caps continue to push politically popular legislation with little regard for its impact on the Federal budget.

For example, in April of this year, Congress passed legislation that permanently fixed the longstanding issues with Medicare's payment rates for physician services. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this fix will result in a \$141 billion increase in Federal budget deficits over the next 10 years; yet the measure sailed through both Houses of Congress with very little opposition, and it was greeted by a cheerful signing statement at the White House. After 17 temporary measures, it is clear that a permanent doc-

tor fix was long overdue. However, I believe it illustrates my larger point that we are nowhere close to having a sincere conversation about our deficits while nondiscretionary spending and a lack of revenue continue to, largely, get a free pass.

Until the President and Congress stop whistling past the graveyard and confront the continued growth and mandatory spending, while simultaneously increasing revenues, our committee—the Appropriations Committee—has no choice but to carry out the implausible mandate contained in the Budget Control Act and try to control deficits with jurisdiction over only 34 percent of one half of the Federal Ledger.

It does not help, I fear, that a majority of our colleagues have no idea when the fiscal year starts except that that is when you shut the government down. I despair that most think continuing resolutions are the norm and that sequestration is not all that bad, and that there is some delight every time a civilian Federal employee is furloughed. To me, all are symptoms of failure.

□ 1600

The time we have caused people to waste by not finishing Congress' work on time, enacting innumerable continuing resolutions, and vacillating from one top line to another is deplorable. Whether it is a Federal agency, a State, other political subdivisions, a nonprofit organization, contractors, or an allied nation all have been less efficient in recent years because of the constant uncertainty surrounding the Federal Government's finances.

To illustrate, in nearly every fiscal year since the Budget Control Act's enactment, there have been attempts to alter the caps on defense and non-defense spending. Two years ago, the House and Senate had allocations that were \$91 billion apart, yet the sub-allocation for defense was only about \$4 billion as far as a difference. Both were in excess of the caps. Needless to say, we ended up at a point somewhere between the two, but only after we wasted an incredible amount of time, and shut down the Federal Government.

While not a mirror image of 2 years ago, the fiscal year 2016 process is careening toward a similar fate. This fiscal year, the President got the process started by submitting a budget request that did not comply with the limitations mandated by the Budget Control Act across all budgeted fiscal years. The majority party's response to the President was to pass a budget resolution that purports to abide by the caps for fiscal year 2016 for defense and non-defense discretionary spending, yet evades the defense cap by proposing \$38 billion above the President's budget request for overseas contingency oper-

ations—for purposes of this act, the global war on terror. Despite the objections of the Secretary of Defense, this additional funding was further entrenched by the recently passed fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act.

There is no question that Presidents Bush and Obama, the Department of Defense, and Congress have been complicit since 2001 in using emergency war funding to resource enduring requirements for the military. For the past few years, despite the constraints of the Budget Control Act, the Defense Subcommittee, led by my good friend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, has begun to make strides in limiting what is an eligible expense for OCO and shift activities to the base budget; and he is doing exactly the right thing. This was done because it is increasingly difficult, after 14 years, to argue that this operational tempo for our military is a contingency and not the new normal in defending our great Nation and our interests.

Needless to say, I find the increased reliance on contingency funding very troubling—and not because I object to providing additional funds for the Department of Defense. I agree with the Department, and I agree with the chairman that sticking to the caps for defense spending would necessitate our forces assuming unreasonable risk in carrying out our national defense strategy.

But at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we need a strong nation as well as a strong defense. We cannot continue to let our country deteriorate, with interstate bridges that collapse and kill our citizens, meaningful scientific research that atrophies, and a population whose educational attainment falls further and further behind.

Looking ahead, only the most Pollyannaish among us fails to see that we will be in the throes of another crisis in December. Our time, our staff's time, Congress' time, the country's time should not be wasted any longer. The President of the United States and the leaders of both parties of both Houses ought to start meaningful negotiations now so that they can conclude before October 1 to allow this great committee, the Committee on Appropriations, to again do the business of the country in an orderly, thoughtful, and timely fashion.

I stress, this is not an issue of process. Congress should not be searching for ways to alter the process in order to avoid making hard decisions on an annual basis. This is a matter of will, and we need to use the power of the purse to its fullest.

I expressed a number of concerns, but I would close, relative to the legislation before us, given the constraints that this committee faces, by observing that Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the subcommittee have done an exceptional job in putting this bill together.

In particular, the chairman has been meticulous with the \$37.5 billion added to title IX of this bill. He has avoided the easy path. Rather, he has painstakingly worked to provide the needed resources for the preparation of our forces in the field. Further, the chair was very thoughtful in his construction of the base portion of the bill, and I believe it and the report provide the stability needed for our military personnel—as the chairman emphasized, its readiness—and it preserves our industrial base.

I close by indicating I look forward to the debates on the amendments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Defense Appropriations bill.

The demands on our military are high. We are confronted with escalating Russian and Chinese aggression, threats from ISIL and other Islamic terrorist groups, burgeoning nuclear programs in countries like North Korea, and ongoing war in Syria, Yemen, Libya, and other places. We just don't know what may sprout up next.

But in the face of this uncertainty, we can ensure that our military forces are ready and able to meet whatever challenges may arise. We can make very sure that our troops and commanders have the tools and support that they need to protect this great Nation and our way of life.

To this end, the bill provides \$578.6 billion in discretionary funding. That is \$24.4 billion above last year's level and includes \$88.4 billion to ensure that we can meet the needs of our military as they fight the global war on terrorism.

This level of funding complies with the caps set by the Budget Control Act, as well as the House-passed Defense Authorization bill. Within this total, the bill prioritizes military readiness, providing \$219 billion for operation and maintenance programs that keep our troops trained and prepared to respond quickly and decisively.

The bill also provides priority funding to ensure that our Armed Forces are supplied with the equipment and the weapons that they need to conduct successful military operations.

Mr. Chairman, our military is the best in the world, and this bill ensures that it stays that way. We invest \$67.9 billion in research and development that will keep us on the cutting edge of defense technology and enable us to meet a wide range of future threats to our security.

But our military is nothing without the brave men and women in uniform who sacrifice so much in their service

to this Nation. We must keep morale high and provide for the health and well-being of our warfighters and their families. So the bill includes a 2.3 percent pay raise for our troops. That is more than the President requested.

The bill contains \$31.7 billion for the Defense Health Program to meet all estimated needs this year. This funding includes important increases above the President's request for things like cancer research, traumatic brain injury and psychological health research, and suicide prevention outreach.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, that this appropriations bill accomplishes all of this but also takes important steps to streamline spending at the Pentagon, ensuring that no dollar goes to waste and that we live within our means.

I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his subcommittee staff and members and his very trusted ranking member for their good bipartisan teamwork on this bill. The chairman and ranking member demonstrated ironclad commitment to our troops and to the security of this Nation with this bill. I would also like to acknowledge the hard-working staff, Mr. Chairman. They spent many, many hours preparing this bill for consideration by us today.

Mr. Chairman, above all else—above all else—we must provide for the national defense of the United States. Nothing can exist—not our domestic government, not our private enterprise, not our freedoms—without ensuring that that basic need is met.

Our national security is far too important to fall victim to political games. We can't risk having an underfunded military during these uncertain times, and our troops deserve unfailing, unanimous support as they lay their lives on the line. No political games on this bill, Mr. Chairman. This is for real.

I urge Members to support this bill. These are bipartisan priorities addressed in a bipartisan way, and I want to see that our colleagues send a strong message to our military showing our support and our willingness to sacrifice for them. I urge support of this bill on this floor.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY, and Chairman ROGERS for their efforts. I particularly want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for working in such a cooperative manner.

However, the two parties remain very far apart in their approach to the appropriations process. Our differences were plainly evident during consideration of the fiscal year 2016 budget resolution. Not one of my Democratic col-

leagues supported the majority's budget because it maintained sequestration levels. As the President said: the majority has returned our economy to the same top-down economics that has failed us before and slashes investments in the middle class that we need to grow the economy.

During debate on the previous five appropriations bills, my majority colleagues argued strenuously that allocations at the sequester level were non-negotiable. They argued our committee was hamstrung by the Budget Control Act and that we were powerless to renegotiate another sequester relief package, as had been done under the Murray-Ryan agreement 2 years ago. At the same time, others on our committee told the press that "pressure would build" to address sequestration or pass a continuing resolution because sequester-level bills cannot be enacted.

The Defense bill before us appears to be operating under a different set of rules, with funding over the magical sequester level, a level we were told was the law of the land. It was not cut below the President's request, as were all the other nondefense bills. By using \$38 billion in overseas contingency operations funding to plug the hole created by the budget caps, this bill fully funds defense programs and avoids the inadequacies facing the other bills.

Let me be very, very clear. I am not making a case that the Defense bill is too high or advocating that it should be reduced. We live in a very dangerous world. We need to attend to our defense, but we should do so in a responsible fashion.

□ 1615

Our military leaders have discouraged the use of the overseas contingency operations/global war on terror budget to fund regular defense costs. They contend that doing so undermines the Defense Department's ability to plan over the long term. Funding \$38 billion of the Pentagon's regular base budget activities with war funds creates future-year budget caps that would be difficult to fill.

This practice irresponsibly addresses only one of the budget imperatives, creating clear losers in most of the other appropriation bills.

If this bill were to move forward as is, I fear my majority colleagues would mentally move on; the urgency facing the entire appropriations process would fade because we have "taken care of" our national security needs.

That, my friends, is a dangerous strategy, especially given that we know none of these bills are likely to be signed into law by the President as they are currently written.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I yield the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LOWEY. We can deal with that fact now or deal with it again over the holidays, but we are going to have to deal with it.

Members of the armed services and their families live in every one of our communities. They drive on crowded highways and over crumbling bridges. Most of them send their kids to public schools.

These families expect the meat and products they buy to be safe and the airplanes in which they fly to be protected. If they should ever get sick, they need to have the biomedical research in place so that safe and effective treatments are available to them.

These are reasonable expectations. What is not reasonable is to put forward several annual spending bills that mindlessly cut these priorities simply because we can't agree on a reasonable budget.

National security and economic strength are inextricably linked. Let's get back to the table and set realistic spending caps to provide what is needed both for our national security and to create jobs, improve infrastructure, fund biomedical research, and grow the economy.

Let's get together. Let's vote "no" on this bill and move on.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee and a member of my subcommittee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for yielding.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for the hard work they have put into bringing the bill before us today. I think, arguably, this is the most important issue we face every year.

Last year, I pointed out the fact that I think the number one responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect American lives, and we work to do that every day. We talked about the fact that the best way to keep America safe is to keep America strong. I think that, if you look back, here we are a year later, and not much has changed.

National security is still a critical element of what we do here. Back home in northeast Florida, the constituents that I represent are greatly concerned about national security. They are greatly concerned about the men and women in uniform and greatly concerned that they will have the necessary resources to accomplish their mission successfully and return home safely.

They are also concerned that we don't get caught up in the politics of

the moment and lose sight of the fact that we have a constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense.

I just want to say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that, when we look at the ever-increasing dangerous world that we live in, I think we have to meet these challenges head on.

I want to remind my colleagues that most of everything that we have accomplished as a great nation, we have accomplished with the foundation built on national security. This bill moves us forward down that path.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this bill.

Please allow me to acknowledge the tremendous work of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and the Appropriations staff in moving this Defense bill forward.

This bill deserves better treatment by the leadership of this House than to have it cloaked in unfinished budget wrangling that could force future changes harmful to the defense of our Nation.

The bill before us funds key priorities, such as assuring the strongest, most agile and resilient military on Earth; securing base and operational independence through energy innovation; improving defense health for the lives of our military and civilian forces; advancing cutting-edge research at our defense labs to improve efficiency on the battlefield and drive technology transfer to the private sector to grow our economy; and maintaining and upgrading essential defense facilities across our Nation and globe.

Moving forward, our Nation must still address lingering veteran unemployment of over half a million Americans, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. A majority are 45 years of age or older, but over 200,000 are between the ages of 18 and 44.

The capabilities of our National Guard can be leveraged to address this imperative, engaging their talents to meet domestic needs.

Globally, too, as leader of the free world, the United States holds a special responsibility to uphold commitments made in the Budapest Memorandum to Ukraine and our allies in Central Europe. This was recently reaffirmed by President Obama and German Chancellor Merkel at the G7 summit.

A threat to liberty anywhere is a threat to liberty everywhere. Russia's invasion of Ukraine cannot be tolerated. Tough sanctions on Russia and enforcement of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act lay the base for liberty's advance.

Those Members who in good conscience ultimately will vote "no" on this measure will do so to fight for a responsible budget plan that not only meets the needs of our men and women in uniform, but builds up the Nation and citizenry they are fighting to protect.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), a member of the Appropriation Committee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. PALAZZO. Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I would like to thank you and your staff for all your hard work in crafting this Defense Appropriations bill.

As a marine veteran, a current member of the Mississippi National Guard, and a former member of the House Armed Services Committee, I fully understand the importance of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, the United States Navy and Marine Corps are the Nation's forward-deployed, fast-response force in times of crisis. The ability to respond to all types of conflict, as well as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, is what separates the United States Navy and the Marine Corps team from the rest of the world.

However, as a result of declining resources, the Navy has struggled to reach its own stated goal of 306 ships. A not-insignificant portion of this fleet consists of amphibious ships to support the requirements of the Marine Corps.

The current number of amphibious ships in the fleet does not meet validated national requirements to accomplish the tasks the Marine Corps is responsible to carry out in time of war or national emergency; this is the very Marine Corps that is tasked to be the most ready when our Nation is the least ready.

I know this issue also concerns you, and I request your thoughts on how we might get our Navy shipbuilding program back on track.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and concerns and for his own military service. I share his concern.

The gentleman is correct. The Navy has been struggling to maintain its shipbuilding program for many years. Despite a requirement for 306 ships, the Navy's fleet has seemed to reach a plateau of about 285 ships for the last several years.

It is our responsibility to work with you and the Navy to ensure that our sailors and marines have the finest ships and equipment this Nation can provide.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working closely with you on this important issue. I can tell you I know where the finest warships are built by the finest craftsmen, that is right there in Mississippi's Fourth Congressional District.

I look forward to continuing to work with you on this important issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his passion and his remarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, for more than a decade, this House has been committed to providing our troops with the body armor they need. Body armor is essential to our deployed troops.

In order to provide our troops with modern, lightweight body armor, the Department requires a viable industrial base to produce the body armor and to continually work to improve it.

The fiscal year 2015 NDAA Defense Appropriations bill sustaining the industrial base was prioritized; \$80 million was appropriated to the Army to specifically sustain the industrial base for body armor.

Those FY15 funds have not been obligated, and as a result, the industrial base for body armor is laying off workers and about to go out of business. The Army has ignored Congress' directions and put this industry at risk.

The FY16 Defense Appropriations report makes a commitment to body armor, saying:

The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the body armor industrial base is able to continue to develop and manufacture more advanced body armor.

Unfortunately, the supplier of boron carbide powder to make armor plates will be out of business before this bill is enacted. Furthermore, this bill provides zero funds for the procurement of body armor, another blow to the industrial base.

We all share a strong commitment to our troops, fully understanding how important body armor is to soldier protection.

To the chairman and ranking member, I would like to work with you to ensure that the existing body armor industrial base is not driven out of business by the Army's inability to follow directions from Congress and mismanagement of this vital supply chain.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today to echo the concerns expressed by my colleague across the aisle from Minnesota in concern for our Nation's warfighters and our military base.

As you know, the FY15 NDAA authorized and the FY15 Defense Appropriations bill provided \$80 million for a body armor industrial base initiative in the Army's operations and maintenance program. However, the U.S. Army is not properly utilizing the ap-

propriated funds in the manner Congress intended.

Congress has been clear on this matter. Report language for both the FY15 and FY16 Defense Appropriations measure demonstrates that the importance of body armor is critical to protecting our soldiers in combat.

Because of the Army's repurposing of these funds at odds with congressional intent and the safety of our troops, the Army and the U.S. body armor industry will lose the unique capability critical for meeting high-tech U.S. lightweight body armor standards.

After the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we must rehabilitate and replace used body armor to ensure the readiness and the safety of our troops in the field if they are called to serve in another conflict.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BARR. If we do not act now to ensure that the body armor industrial base is able to continue the development and manufacturing of more advanced lightweight body armor, there will not be a capable body armor industrial base left in the future to fund.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for giving me the opportunity to discuss something that will assist in our natural disaster response.

The Air National Guard employs advanced capabilities to assist in civil search and rescue operations during natural disasters and is capable of locating and rescuing people where civilian authorities cannot.

The Air National Guard uses sophisticated technology to assist in time-sensitive emergency operations, including the AS-4 Pod, which includes wide-area infrared sensors optimized for survivor detection, integrated communications, and specialized radar for maritime, flood, and swift water recovery.

Lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina, the California wildfires, and Superstorm Sandy highlight the need to outfit the Air National Guard with this important capability. I hope you will consider adding this vital piece of equipment to the list of equipment considered for priority purchasing with the use of the National Guard and Reserve equipment account, which is governed by this legislation.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I want to thank the gentleman from California for bringing this to our attention. We look forward to working with you on this important

issue as we move forward with the legislation.

□ 1630

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) for the purpose of a colloquy. He is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, for his work to bring this important bill to the floor.

Mr. Chair, this legislation includes billions of dollars to programs that are vital to the Nation's security and the men and women who have volunteered to serve our Nation.

However, I do have a question regarding a recommended reduction of \$61 million from the Missile Defense Agency request for the Redesigned Kill Vehicle.

Does the gentleman share my belief that this is a critically important program, and that it, and the 2020 goal for deployment of this capability, are vital to a robust and reliable national missile defense system, which is paramount to the defense of the Nation against ever more capable adversary ballistic missiles?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman, and I know the gentleman from Alabama will agree that the oversight of scarce defense dollars is important. The request for this program has spiked significantly between fiscal years 2015 and 2016. Yet, there is no real acquisition plan.

The Department owes us this information if we are to be responsible stewards of these taxpayer dollars.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for that explanation, and I hope he will let me know if there is anything the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces can do to make sure that the Department knows that the acquisition strategy needs to be delivered to the Congress without further delay.

Can the gentleman also assure me that the deployment of the Aegis Ashore site in Poland remains a priority of his and that its deployment by not later than December of 2018 will not be affected by any of the marks in the bill before the House today?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes, I absolutely agree with the gentleman from Alabama that this deployment is vital to our missile defense, and the United States should be grateful for strong allies like Poland.

Nothing in the bill today will in any way impact the one-time deployment of the European Phased Adaptive Approach Phase III.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman. I look forward to supporting the bill today and urge the

House to do the same to get this vital bill passed and to the President for his support of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, if I could ask how much time remains for both sides, please.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 8¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank our ranking member for yielding, and for your tremendous leadership on this subcommittee.

I also want to thank the ranking member and our chair for including report language on the Department of Defense's efforts to achieve auditability by the end of fiscal 2017.

Ensuring that the Pentagon is auditable is common sense, and it is something that Congress mandated, mind you, 25 years ago. It is long past time to address the culture of unlimited spending and zero accountability at the Pentagon, and I know this issue has strong bipartisan support.

Yet, there are many provisions of this bill which I cannot support. The appropriations bill includes an additional \$38 billion over budget caps in the overseas contingency operations slush fund, and that is what it is; it is a slush fund. This is simply outrageous and this fund, quite frankly, in my opinion, it should be eliminated.

We should have transparency, and the public should know how much it is costing to fight these wars.

This bill also includes \$1.3 billion for DOD operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant. Mr. Chair, it has been 10 months since the war started and 4 months since the President submitted his draft authorization to Congress, and Congress has yet to act. Now we see additional troops being sent into this war zone. Again, no congressional debate, no vote.

Congress cannot continue to fund a war—and that is what this is—without a robust debate on an ISIL-specific authorization. That is why I offered an amendment in committee, which was adopted on a bipartisan basis, that simply reaffirms that Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force.

It is also why I am offering two amendments to this bill that would prohibit funding for the 2001 and 2002 authorizations for the use of military force. With these authorizations still on the books, Congress is allowing this President—and any President really—to wage war against anyone, at any time, anywhere.

I hope we defeat this bill because we have got to stop this policy of endless wars.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to express my support for the fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations bill and my appreciation for the hard work of the chairman in drafting this very good bill, which will provide essential funding to our national security.

However, I have a serious concern with the proposed reduction of funding in this bill for an existing weather collection satellite called the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program, or DMSP.

As early as 2017, our military is facing a critical capability gap in the Department of Defense's two highest priority weather requirements. As the Air Force continues to work through its plan for addressing weather requirements, launching DMSP will help address these issues.

Much has been spent on DMSP already, and it would be a shame to waste those dollars when the satellite could be put to good use.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that the Air Force has not properly managed the space weather program, and they must submit a better plan. However, I ask for your support in working with me in conference to ensure that our military and intelligence professionals have the tools they need to safely prosecute our missions.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And congratulations on producing a very good bill that will provide the necessary funding to properly defend our Nation.

And let me express my appreciation for providing \$26 million in your bill to fund an Air Force pilot program for the acquisition of commercial SATCOM services.

Aligned with the House-passed fiscal year 2016 NDAA, the program has the potential to lower costs and increase utilization of commercial satellites.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me the opportunity to discuss military satellite communications, or SATCOM. As you are aware, the demand for SATCOM has increased by a factor of 10 since the outset of our simultaneous commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it continues to grow.

Further, the need for protection against jamming, spoofing, and other interference has also increased as our adversaries deploy more sophisticated countermeasures to deny and degrade communications to our warfighters.

The government-owned, government-operated SATCOM system, Wideband

Global Satellite Communications System, or WGS, cannot keep up with demand—not even close. As a result, the Air Force has sought less expensive, more protected SATCOM solutions from the commercial sector to augment national capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, the military needs more SATCOM capacity, and it needs SATCOM that is better protected. Congress can help by restoring \$32.8 million for development and testing activities associated with the Protected Tactical Testbed.

We also need additional funding for the Protected Tactical Wave Form itself. This effort will help make both commercial and WGS satellites more robust and protected against jamming. Alongside the Air Force's pilot program I referenced earlier, the Protected Tactical Testbed and Wave Form may begin to give warfighters access to a global architecture of protected commercial SATCOM.

That said, I understand the Air Force has programmatic challenges with the Protected Tactical Testbed that must be addressed. However, I urge the committee to keep an open mind in conference. If the Air Force addresses your concerns, then I hope the committee will consider restoring funding for the Protected Tactical Testbed and Wave Form.

I thank you again for this opportunity to speak on such an important issue to our military servicemen and -women.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlemen from Alabama and Oklahoma, both veterans, for bringing these matters to our attention, and we look forward to working with you on these important issues.

However, in both instances you both highlight important warfighter capabilities that are stymied by poor program planning and execution by the Air Force. Their lack of programmatic and financial discipline has led directly to these weather collection and satellite communications issues.

Consequently, our appropriations bill highlighted each of these concerns and strongly encouraged the Air Force to make adjustments. None, unfortunately, were made in a timely manner.

Based on existing capability, I see no evidence that launching the DMSP is part of that plan, but I am willing to work with both gentlemen in conference if things change. I thank the gentlemen for their support and work.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY.

I have been working to provide our World War II merchant mariners the thanks they deserve. I would prefer to offer an amendment to the Defense bill which would have provided a token

thank you, but it would have been the subject of a point of order.

These brave men suffered the highest losses of any military branch in World War II and did not receive veterans benefits under the GI Bill.

Moving forward, I look forward to working with the ranking member to give our brave merchant mariners the recognition they rightly deserve. It is unfathomable that these merchant mariners who served this Nation so valiantly have never had full veterans benefits.

They were not eligible for tuition subsidies, home loan guarantees, or other provisions of the GI Bill that helps millions of veterans transition seamlessly into civilian life.

Time is running out. These merchant mariners are now in their eighties and nineties, and there are only 5,000 left. Let's act now to right this wrong.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. HAHN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman from California for bringing this to our attention and, particularly, given the fact that my father is a Naval veteran and 99 years old. So I understand the circumstances of what you speak, and we do look forward to working with you on this issue as we move forward with the legislation. Thank you very much.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the dean of the New Jersey delegation, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding, and I rise to raise an issue of particular importance to my constituents in New Jersey.

Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst was created by the 2005 BRAC round. And while joint basing has been successfully implemented at MDL, there remains an outstanding issue of gross unfairness for some employees.

The overwhelming majority of employees at the joint base are included in the New York pay locality area; yet, the wage grade employees on the former McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix remain in the Philadelphia locality area. These employees work on the same installation, but they are paid 7 percent less than their counterparts for the same work.

Joint Base MDL made a formal request for realignment of the Philadelphia to New York wage survey area to OPM's Advisory Committee, FPRAC, in 2010, and the base leadership continues to believe pay parity should be a priority.

Mr. Chairman, the joint base is a critical asset to DOD and our National security. Their missions could not be carried out effectively without the skills of the men and women stationed

there and those working in civilian support roles across the base.

Joint Base MDL is one installation, and the men and women who work there are part of the same workforce. It is timed to fix this outdated policy.

Accordingly, I am hopeful that you will work with me to bring about fairness to the roughly 20 percent of the workforce that does not receive equally earned pay.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank my colleague for his leadership and for bringing my attention to this important issue. And I can assure him we will look forward to working with him as we move forward with our bill into conference.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, the chairman, for your commitment to the men and women who support our warfighters. I look forward to working with you to move the pay parity for all joint base employees forward.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY.

Mr. Chair, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

As you are aware, our Nation's Federally Funded Research and Development Centers, or FFRDCs, play a critical role in advancing national security goals and ensuring that our Nation stays at the cutting edge of technological innovation.

Mr. Chair, I wanted to engage in this colloquy to clarify Congress' intent in section 802(3)(c), which states:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the Department from any source during fiscal year 2016 may be used by a defense FFRDC through a fee or other payment mechanism for construction of new buildings."

□ 1645

Mr. Chair, I am concerned that some could take an expansive interpretation of this provision and view it as preventing the execution of critical facilities modernization projects, even when authorized by Congress through military construction projects.

I am also concerned about the provision's medium-and long-term implications for building maintenance and facility modernization projects that are necessary to continue important innovation programs for decades to come.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, is it the committee's understanding that this provision is not intended to apply to military construction projects or to advanced planning and design funds that are authorized by Congress?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. TSONGAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Ms. TSONGAS, yes, that is my understanding.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I look forward to working with you, and I appreciate that construction.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee. Is that your understanding?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. That is my understanding as well.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you both, and I look forward to working with you.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, could you give us the time that we each have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my support for the Vets4Warriors program, a program in my district that is operated by Rutgers University Behavioral Health Care. This successful program has provided invaluable assistance to the military in their efforts to prevent suicide among veterans. The program ensures that those veterans who are struggling with depression or psychological concerns get the support they need: peer-to-peer.

Sadly, the Department of Defense has terminated this program without any public notice. Our nation is now faced with a crisis: since the start of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, more than 3,000 active-duty personnel have taken their own lives. Programs like Vets4Warriors help us to combat this troubling trend.

The Vets4Warriors program is unique and will be difficult to replace. It allows veterans a safe space in which they can find help apart from the DOD structure. Service members are often hesitant to reach out to their superiors regarding personal concerns like mental health. By integrating these programs into the Department's Military OneSource program, many service members will lose the sense of confidentiality provided by Vets4Warriors.

We must fulfill our responsibility to care for those who put themselves in harm's way to protect our nation. It is my hope that the DOD will reconsider their decision so that we can assure our veterans have access to the best mental health resources possible.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment aiming to expedite cleanup within a neglected category of defense sites in my state and nationwide.

During World War II, while our troops were fighting abroad, facilities across the nation here at home were busy creating the supplies and provisions that fueled our efforts. One such site is Gopher Ordnance Works in my district. The Gopher Ordnance Works site was built and operated by the federal government during World War II for the production of smokeless gunpowder and nitric and sulfuric acids. The then-existing War Department acquired approximately 12,000 acres of farmland

near Rosemount, Minnesota for the construction of the plant. After the war was won and the efforts at home wound down, the Department of the Army declared the Gopher Ordnance Works to be surplus property, and the facilities on the land were partially deconstructed. Unfortunately, some of the structures and many of the contaminants remain to this very day, more than 60 years later.

Over the years the federal government realized sites like Gopher Ordnance Works must be cleaned up. Accordingly, Congress created the Formerly Used Defense Sites—or FUDS—program as part of the Defense Environmental Restoration Program in the mid-1980s. The goal of the FUDS program is to clean up these sites so they can be put back into productive use and no longer pose a potential health threat to our constituents.

Mr. Chair, the site in my district is not unique. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers maintains an inventory of FUDS properties nationwide, and per the Army Corps, there are almost 10,000 potential properties that could qualify, with up to 2,700 of those requiring some sort of cleanup. Every single state in our nation, the District of Columbia, and our territories all have sites within their respective borders. This issue affects all of our constituents.

It is unacceptable to take so long to make so little progress in addressing these sites. It is worse if the cleanup delay is due to legal disputes over FUDS properties or simple lack of knowledge about what contaminants are present. This is the case in one subset of the FUDS program categorized as Potentially Responsible Party—or PRP—sites. PRP sites are locations where the Department of Defense as well as other parties potentially contributed to the contamination. Instead of acting on these sites and putting them back into productive use, PRP sites get mired in extensive site studies and disputes over who left what at the site.

Mr. Chair, Gopher Ordnance Works in my district is a PRP site that has not received appropriate attention from the federal agencies delegated with the authority to resolve liability and move forward with cleanup. For more than a decade, I have advocated tirelessly to the Army Corps in an attempt to facilitate cleanup and navigate its backlogged bureaucracy. Enough is enough. I am asking the Army Corps to prioritize PRP sites and move forward expeditiously toward a solution for environmental investigation and pollution cleanup costs at Gopher Ordnance Works. I am here, ready, and available to offer what assistance is necessary in Congress on behalf of my constituents. I expect the Army Corps and the Department of Defense to fulfill their mission, committing to their responsibilities toward real, productive solutions.

The underlying bill funds environmental restoration for all FUDS properties. My amendment would have required no less than \$10,000,000 of the Environmental Restoration—Formerly Used Defense Sites funds to be available for remedial investigations on the too often neglected PRP sites, removing one obstacle that is preventing these sites from becoming usable.

While it is regrettable the House Parliamentarians ruled that procedures and protocols of

the House prevent this particular bill from being a vehicle to fix this problem, I will continue my efforts so these sites can finally be cleaned and restored, resolving this issue once and for all in support of our communities.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my support for the Space-Based Infrared Systems (SBIRS) Wide Field of View (WFOV) effort.

Unfortunately, the House's Defense Appropriations bill for FY16 would completely eliminate SBIRS WFOV funding due to concerns that the initiative was being used to develop new technology rather than making evolutionary upgrades to existing programs.

I believe that these concerns are misplaced, and I am concerned that eliminating funding will derail this valuable effort at a critical juncture. It is my understanding that SBIRS WFOV does in fact support evolutionary development of the Program of Record (POR). Data gathered from WFOV efforts will support risk mitigation efforts to the POR and will facilitate cost savings by maturing technologies before implementing them on the POR.

It is worth noting that the Senate and House Armed Services Committees fully funded the WFOV effort in their respective versions of the FY16 National Defense Authorization Act, as did the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

The SBIRS WFOV initiative is designed to lower future costs while evolving vital components of our national security space architecture. I urge my colleagues to support full funding for this initiative during conference negotiations.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment. No pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Amendments so printed shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2685

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$37,295,571,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$26,711,323,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 31, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to encourage the Secretary of Defense to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking, and their impact on women and girls across the globe.

Let me thank the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense for the work they have done in the backdrop of the very overwhelming sequester, which I certainly oppose so that all of the appropriators will have the ability to provide the resources that they need.

In particular, my amendment is recognizing the new face of war and the new fight of terrorism.

I hold up these pictures of the numbers of countries who are adding women to their forces. America, of course, has had women in different parts of its military for a number of years, going back to nurses in World War I and II and in the various types of work that have been done recently in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the women are enormously proud and very effective.

My amendment simply says that, in this new war on terrorism and human trafficking, we would have the opportunity to use the women in the United States military who have achieved levels of rank that are extremely important to be able to train and to provide technical assistance to those who are just adding women to their military.

The United States Armed Forces possesses an unparalleled expertise and technological capability that will aid not only in combating and defeating terrorists, who hate our country and prey upon innocent persons—especially women, girls, and the elderly—but we must also recognize that, notwithstanding our extraordinary technical military capabilities, we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality: the Caliphate, ISIL, ISIS, Boko Haram, al Shabaab, al Qaeda, all. We are also finding that these organizations are using women, but then, of course, the institutionalized militaries are also putting more women in.

What better interface than that of the United States military and women, in particular.

I have an article that I would like to submit into the RECORD, “Turkey’s Women Expand Role in Military.”

TURKEY’S WOMEN EXPAND ROLE IN MILITARY

At the 24th International Defence Film Festival in Rome, a documentary by film director Elif Ovar of the Turkish Army’s Photo-Film Center was selected for the Jury’s Award.

Her documentary “Light of Hope”—about Senay Haydar, Turkey’s first female gendarme commander and senior non-commissioned officer (NCO), against the backdrop of gender discrimination and violence against women in the small Anatolian town of Mesudiye—attracted much interest.

Haydar works closely with local officials and families and has been credited for eradicating violence against women among the 40,000 residents of Mesudiye. Thanks to Haydar’s actions, there hasn’t been a single case of violence against women in the last nine months in Mesudiye.

Ovar told Al-Monitor that as a woman she has been much impressed with Haydar’s accomplishments in a small Anatolian town where traditional culture prevails. “NCO Senay’s success, as much as this is due to [her own accomplishments], is also the success of the commanders who believed in her,” Ovar said. “Appointing a female NCO as a representative of law and order to a town with 40,000 residents is truly a revolution for the Turkish army.”

Over the last three years, there have been extensive changes in the personnel policy of

the Turkish army with the increase of the number of female officers and NCOs and, as was the case with Haydar, in assigning women to active field positions instead of just to administrative work at the headquarters.

In an interview with Al-Monitor Haydar said: “I always wanted to be a field commander who takes decisions instead of working at a desk. I was encouraged by the Gendarmerie General Command. When the results [of my employment] turned out to be positive, scores of female officers and NCOs followed in my footsteps.” According to a source at the Gendarmerie School in Beykent, Ankara, in October alone, 67 female NCOs have been assigned to Gendarmerie General Command field posts after they completed their basic training; another 90 female NCOs and 30 officers will follow.

Capt. Hulya Ercan, an instructor of the UH-60 Sikorsky helicopter at Ankara’s Gendarmerie Aviation School, is the first female gendarmier pilot in Turkey. In an interview with Al-Monitor she said: “My husband is a captain. I raised my daughters Bensu and Beren without giving up my profession. I actually flew until the third month of my pregnancy with my youngest. My most memorable moment was one time when my husband was away on a mission and I was ordered to fly an urgent mission. I had to leave my 1½-year-old daughter with the duty officer at the base. When I returned five hours later, I found the duty officer and many soldiers entertaining my daughter. That was memorable and funny.”

A source at the Turkish General Staff who works on planning of the personnel policies told Al-Monitor that today there are 1,350 female officers in the Turkish army, which is 3.3% of the total number of officers. The target is to increase this to 5% in the next three years. The Turkish army wants to further increase the number of female NCOs, which today stands at 843 (0.9%). The aim is to also increase this to 5% by 2018, which means the employment of an additional 4,000 female NCOs. To achieve these objectives, the Turkish army has been trying to embrace more female-friendly personnel policies.

The Turkish army employs 96 female colonels, 140 female lieutenant colonels and 360 female majors.

Colonels generally work at headquarters while majors are usually unit commanders. Staff Maj. Bilgehan Bulbul is the commander of the largest transport fleet of the Air Force Command in Ankara and is also the first female fleet commander. There is a noticeable increase of Turkish female staff officers in important headquarter posts in the army and NATO. For example, naval staff officer Maj. Yasemin Bayraktutan is Turkey’s current naval attaché in London. Within six-seven years, she may well become the first female admiral of the country. In an email to Al-Monitor, she said she wants to return home after excelling in her current position and before becoming an admiral she wants to command a frigate.

What is behind the Turkish army’s decision to increase the number of female officers and NCOs?

There are two practical reasons and one ideological one.

The first practical reason is the relative reduction in the number of personnel called up for compulsory military service, as the Turkish army is moving toward becoming a professional entity—increasing the number of females in the army makes up for this loss in man power.

The second practical reason is a need for female personnel because of a change in se-

curity issues the Turkish army is dealing with—notably, the shift from rural to urban areas of the Kurdistan Workers Party violence in Turkey’s southeast. In addition, there is a need for female personnel in international missions that the Turkish armed forces are undertaking in Afghanistan, Kosovo and Bosnia, among others.

To have ranking female officers provides significant advantages in communicating with the local population, especially with women, and carrying out civil-military cooperation projects effectively in the health care and education sectors. Thus, the Turkish army is determined to establish more effective links with local populations in low-intensity conflict areas and peace support missions.

The ideological reason for increasing the number of females in the Turkish army is that the latter has always been the leading cause of modernization and Westernization of the republic. The army sees itself as a pioneer in all transformation processes in society, and more females and an increase in the visibility of their presence in the Turkish army delivers crucial messages—especially to the rural population—on equality for women and a more active participation of women in society.

A female in uniform backed by the Turkish army can better dissuade a man in rural Turkey, for instance, inclined to violence against his wife. “Because of my uniform and as stipulated by law, I will go after anyone committing violence against his wife or any other female,” Haydar said.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So my amendment, of course, is to provide that pathway for the collaboration of U.S. military women with other excellent forces to be able to help these women and to be able to fight the global war on terrorism through technical assistance, counsel, and advice, which I think will add to the expertise of those militaries but, more importantly, to the work of the United States military.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe and for their work in ensuring that they have resources needed to keep our Armed Forces the greatest fighting force for peace on earth.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward and affirms an example of the national goodness that makes America the most exceptional nation on earth.

The purpose of the Jackson Lee amendment is to provide the Secretary of Defense flexibility to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking.

Mr. Chair, the United States is committed to combating violent extremism, protecting our borders and the globe from the scourge of terrorism.

The United States Armed Forces possess an unparalleled expertise and technological capability that will aid not only in combating and defeating terrorists who hate our country and prey upon innocent persons, especially women, girls, and the elderly.

But we must recognize that notwithstanding our extraordinary technical military capabilities, we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality and decency.

Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, ISIS/ISIL and other militant terrorists, including the Sinai's Ansar Beit al-Maqdis in the Sinai peninsula which poses a threat to Egypt.

The Jackson Lee amendment will help provide the Department of Defense with the resources needed to provide technical assistance to countries on innovative strategies to provide defense technologies and resources that promote the security of the American people and nation states.

Terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking and their impact on women and girls across the globe has had a great adverse impact on us all.

According to a UNICEF report, rape, torture and human trafficking by terrorist and militant groups have been employed as weapons of war, affecting over twenty thousand women and girls.

Looking at the history of terrorism alone highlights the importance of providing technical assistance through our military might, as this enables us to chip at terrorism which has plagued us here in the United States.

The Jackson Lee amendment will help curb terrorism abroad by making available American technical military expertise to military in other countries, like Nigeria, who are combating violent jihadists in their country and to keep those terrorists out of our country.

Time and again American lives have been lost at the hands of terrorists.

These victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, health care providers, relief workers, schoolchildren, and members of the diplomatic corps and the Armed Services.

This is why the technical assistance offered by our military personnel is integral to promoting security operation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft for missions to empower local forces to combat terrorism.

Terrorists across the globe have wreaked havoc on our society and cannot not be tolerated or ignored, for their actions pose a threat to our national security and the security of the world.

Mr. Chairman, from the United States to Africa to Europe to Asia and the Middle East, it is clear that combating terrorism remains one of highest national priorities.

Collectively, through every action and effort towards empowering our neighbors and their military to combat terrorism, eradicate human trafficking, stop narcotics trafficking and negate their impact on women and girls across the globe is in our national interest.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read.

The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would like to take this moment to thank the chairman and the ranking member and their staff for working with me on this matter. I am hoping to be able to revise or to resubmit this.

At this time, if the chairman would allow me, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to accept the withdrawal.

I thank the gentlewoman for her advocacy.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$12,586,679,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$26,226,952,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for

payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$4,463,164,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,866,891,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$705,271,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,689,333,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under sections 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$7,980,413,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under sections 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$3,202,010,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law, \$28,349,761,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$12,478,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, providing science, technology, engineering, and math education to America's youth is critical to the global competitiveness of our Nation. The STARBASE program engages local fifth-grade elementary students by exposing them to STEM subjects through an inquiry-based curriculum and is currently active in 56 congressional districts throughout the Nation.

Today I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their strong leadership in reestablishing funding for the program over the past 2 years. I am respectfully requesting an additional \$5 million to help expand the program nationwide.

Today I am offering STARBASE amendment No. 18 to H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. My amendment increases funding to the STARBASE Youth Program by \$5 million, and while providing support for the program, it also reduces spending by \$1 million.

The STARBASE program is carried out by the military services because the lack of STEM-educated youth in America has been identified as a future national security issue by the Department of Defense. Two years ago, both the House and Senate rejected the Office of Management and Budget's, the OMB, proposal to terminate this critical program.

As a Member of Congress, I appreciate OMB's desire to consolidate STEM's programs across the spectrum into one funding line. However, this is a national defense item and has been identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as such. STARBASE was created under the auspices of the Department of Defense to meet its critical needs in STEM-related fields.

Regrettably, the funding uncertainty caused by OMB's action during that time resulted in the elimination of all programs operated by the Navy and reduced in fiscal year 2014 the number of DOD STARBASE programs from 79 to 56. DOD currently has 25 sites on the waiting list for a program, and that is why we need a small increase in funding for a number of STARBASE programs. It is one of the most cost-effective programs across the Federal Government, costing an average of \$343 per student.

Last year, 3,062 classes were conducted in 1,267 schools in 413 school districts across the country. More than 70,000 students attended the programs, bringing the total to 825,000 students since its inception in 1993.

It is one of the most effective STEM programs as well. The students demonstrate undisputed improvement in STEM.

I will conclude by reading Warrant Officer Stacey Hendrickson of the California State Military Reserve and director of the STARBASE program at the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base in my district, who said:

“Congressman LOWENTHAL, I wanted to let you know that one of our schools, 96th Street Elementary in Watts, earned their highest science standardized test scores ever last year. This is significant because the class is second-year remediation and has English language learners and special needs students. Every student's score went up, so this is a class that was very special to us. We were all very excited to hear that, as those students had all shown a big increase in our own pre and post test scores. We were happy to see that the improvement was seen on their Academic Performance Index scores as well.”

Mr. Chair, STARBASE inspires America's youth to discover technical career fields that are imperative. During this time of economic recovery we cannot lose this battle and concede our technical edge to the rest of the world. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I know the gentleman is a strong supporter of it. Indeed, it is a program that does incredible things for students that has a proven record.

Unfortunately, once again, the President's fiscal year 2016 budget did not support the program. There were no funds requested. As a result, the committee provided an additional \$25 million in fiscal year 2016 to restore funding for the program.

However, I can't support an amendment that would cut the Army's operations, the maintenance accounts, to pay for it. This account provides funding for critical training, operations, maintenance, and readiness programs. After over a decade of war, restoring readiness is one of the key objectives of our bill this year.

We need to have soldiers who are ready and able to respond to contingency. It is a top priority in our bill for the Army and for us. While I appreciate the gentleman's intent, I cannot support his amendment, reluctantly.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, \$40,548,338,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,055,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, \$5,338,793,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law, \$36,094,484,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$7,699,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, \$30,182,187,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$15,000,000 may be used for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund authorized under section 166a of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this

heading, not less than \$35,045,000 shall be made available for the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program, of which not less than \$3,600,000 shall be available for centers defined in 10 U.S.C. 2411(1)(D): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: *Provided further*, That \$9,031,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary of Defense to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,200,000)”.

Page 12, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment with the intent of bolstering funds for a worthwhile program in the National Guard that assists with securing our southwest border.

In my State of Arizona, we are under attack. The Arizona border is a main thoroughfare for the black market and trafficking. Guns, money, drugs, and people are smuggled over the border at an alarming rate. Once the smugglers make it to Interstate 10 in Tucson, they can make easier runs to Phoenix, Los Angeles, and beyond.

Let's be clear, the Guard's southwest border mission has bipartisan support. Even President Obama supported this program during his time in the White House. In fact, since 1981, Congress has authorized military support to civilian law enforcement agencies.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois seek recognition?

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I rise to ask which of the three amendments I have before me is the one that we are now considering in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GOSAR. 107.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I have got it.

Thank you very much.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment once again.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. In fact, since 1981, Congress has authorized military support to civilian law enforcement agencies, and those narrow authorizations are prescribed in title 10, chapter 18 of the United States Code. In sum, they act to support law enforcement efforts, but they do not direct them.

Finally, I will remind my colleagues that a similar amendment was offered last year by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), and the amendment was accepted by voice vote. This amendment today seeks to achieve the same goal. The amendment is offset by a reduction to the defensewide operations and maintenance account, \$30.2 billion account.

Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas are all struggling. We are in desperate need of expertise and support at our southwestern border. If you support efforts to secure the border and interdict illegal trafficking in guns, money, drugs, and humans, including sex slaves, then you should support this amendment.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their tireless efforts to prioritize resources in this bill.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time, but I am in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand the Representative from Arizona has firsthand knowledge of the value of the southwest border mission, and I support his amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the chairman for accepting my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,500,000) (increased by \$5,500,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for providing \$212 million for suicide prevention outreach programs, \$20 million above the President's request.

I am offering this amendment with my colleagues, Representatives PAL-LONE, SMITH, LOBIONDO, GARRETT, LANCE, SIRE, PAYNE, MACARTHUR, NORCROSS, and WATSON COLEMAN, to continue support and funding for the successful confidential peer-to-peer Vets4Warriors program, a Pentagon-funded call center operated by Rutgers University Behavioral Health Care that provides troops struggling with depression and other psychological or emotional concerns support by veterans.

Despite the troubling increase in Active Duty military suicides after 9/11, the Defense Department announced last month it would stop funding the Vets4Warriors program, which has provided valuable assistance to reduce these incidents.

Through Vets4Warriors, servicemembers have been able to find confidential assistance from peers who share lived experiences and who can quickly connect and listen in highly effective ways. Since December 2011, the program has had over 130,000 contacts.

The Defense Department's plan to integrate these services into the Military OneSource without a public process is concerning because we know that many servicemembers are reluctant to contact superiors for assistance with mental health needs. Military OneSource is only billed as available to veterans and their families within 180 days after leaving the service.

Vets4Warriors provides a deep place for veterans to seek help outside the Defense Department. We believe removing funding for this program is shortsighted. This move will also result in the layoff of approximately 30 well-trained, talented veterans who have been providing support services around the clock. We want the Defense Department to use this funding to fully fund the Vets4Warriors program, ensuring our troops receive the best mental health resources available.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to support your amendment.

I think all of us are particularly shocked that they would shut something down in our home State that actually serves the rest of the Nation. They enjoy a good reputation. It sort of falls into the category of “what were they thinking?”

We appreciate your standing for the Vets4Warriors.

Mr. LANCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. PASCRELL for his leadership on this issue, as he has led on so many other issues. I also thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN. It is due to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's leadership on this legislation that we stand well-equipped to keep our Nation safe and secure.

The Vets4Warriors program has saved lives in New Jersey. It has made a great difference during very challenging times for servicemen and servicewomen. Their peers offer support and a friendly ear at a time when it matters most. Their voices of encouragement, friendship, and support on the other end of the telephone remind our brave heroes of their great potential, the love of a grateful nation, and what they can accomplish in their lives.

The program has been proven effective. Thousands of veterans have received critical care and assistance. It works and it should be maintained. The statistics on veterans' suicides are heartbreaking, but programs like Vets4Warriors are the types of efforts that we can implement to make a lasting difference.

I thank Lloyd Deans of Bridgewater, New Jersey, and the district I serve for his support and leadership in this area, and for fighting for this program and for being a great friend and resource to other veterans.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 36, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I too am offering an amendment to bolster suicide prevention programs. I rise to offer an amendment which would provide additional resources for mental health programs for our Nation's serv-

icemembers. Traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder have been consistently contributing to behavioral issues with our veterans, and all too often these ongoing mental health issues result in suicide. With an average of 18 to 20 veteran suicides per day, more resources are desperately needed.

The DOD is already an expansive bureaucracy, and I appreciate the work of the committee to prioritize resources and to provide appropriation levels for the defensewide operations and maintenance that are actually lower than those in fiscal year 2015.

My amendment takes a relatively small amount from that account—\$1.5 million out of a \$30.2 billion budget. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says the amendment would have no impact on budget authority or outlays.

Too many of our men and women in uniform are struggling with traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder as a result of serving in combat. If you support improved mental health for our servicemembers, you should support this amendment. Let's prevent future suicides amongst our troops and ensure they are getting the help they need. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I strongly admire the advocacy on behalf of suicide prevention by the gentleman from Arizona. It is very needed, but I insist on my point of order because the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read.

The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the level of budget authority or outlays in the bill.

Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

□ 1715

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$7,463,000)".

Page 88, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Maryland and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to start by thanking the chairman and the ranking member for their unwavering support of our national defense and our veterans.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases the funding for a program called Fisher House from \$5 million to \$10 million, and it funds that increase by reducing the amount in the operation and maintenance account by \$5 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Fisher House is a very successful and very well-regarded nonprofit with a single mission, which is to provide free housing and lodging to families of veterans. The facilities are located near veterans hospitals and military hospitals in VA facilities.

The purpose of this housing is to allow the families of veterans to be with their loved ones, the servicemen or -women who have served our country and are receiving medical care at one of these facilities. Mr. Chairman, we know how important that is for the families and for the loved ones, but we know in particular how important that is for our veterans when they are receiving care incurred in the service to our great Nation for them to have their families with them.

The Fisher House program has been in business for 25 years, and they have been a proven and exceptional steward of taxpayer money. They operate 65 facilities all around the country. Again, these facilities are near military hospitals or a veterans facility.

They operate to a very high standard. They have a deep pipeline of new facilities that they want to build. Unfortunately, there is a great need for these facilities, which is why we are proposing to increase their funding from \$5 million to \$10 million.

I have introduced this amendment for the past 3 years. It has enjoyed bipartisan support. This year, it also has the support of the gentlewoman from Michigan.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding and for his leadership on

this critically important issue. I rise in very strong support of this amendment.

For many years, I have worked with hospitalized veterans and their families who have often had to travel far from home to get treatment and have seen what the Fisher House has done. The Fisher House Foundation does wonders in being a home away from home during very difficult times for our veterans and their families.

As Congress continues to address veterans issues, it is critical that their families also have support systems in place and a safe place to stay while the veterans are receiving treatment.

We should be building more Fisher House facilities across the country. We are currently trying to put one in Michigan and, as I explored that public-private partnership, discovered that there is more than a 5-year wait in that pipeline. This bill isn't a silver bullet, but it would help reduce that timeline.

I want to thank my good friend Congressman DELANEY for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all Members to support this bipartisan amendment that helps veterans and their families.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition and will use that time to say that I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Fisher House Foundation does incredible work. Both my predecessors, Mr. Murtha and Mr. Young, were strong supporters.

Just for the record, my bill already includes an additional \$5 million for the Department as a grant to the Fisher House Foundation and allows each service to transfer up to \$11 million for Fisher House operations, so each of our services recognizes the incredible private contribution and also the U.S. taxpayer contribution.

I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for his support and, once again, thank him for his singular leadership and for his insights into the importance of the Fisher House program.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that we can build, as the gentlewoman from Michigan said, more Fisher House facilities to allow the family members of our veterans to be with them at this great time of need.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for allowing me to offer this amendment to this year's Defense Appropriations bill to establish and reestablish the Commission to assess the threat to the United States from electromagnetic pulse attack, which was authorized in the House-passed FY16 NDAA.

Mr. Chairman, as your committee knows so very well, the United States faces many threats and challenges today, perhaps more than ever before in her history. One of those threats is the reliance across all critical infrastructure sectors on an aging and highly vulnerable electric grid.

As the GAO reported, the Department of Defense relies upon that very same electric grid for 99 percent of its electricity needs within the continental United States without which it cannot effect its mission.

The previous EMP Commission stated that a collapse of large portions of the electrical system will result in significant periods of power outage and loss of significant portions of that system.

Should the electrical power system be lost for any substantial period of time, the consequences are likely to be catastrophic to civilian society. They concluded that negative impacts on the electrical infrastructure are certain in an EMP event unless practical steps are taken to provide protection for critical elements of the electrical system.

The Commission must be established, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that research into addressing these vulnerabilities continues within the Department of Defense to enable practical steps to actually secure and harden the grid. The House Armed Services Committee has already acted this year and authorized \$2 million to reestablish the Commission.

I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that these funds are appropriated as well.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman brings up a huge issue, EMP, electromagnetic pulse. I accept the amendment.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my amendment would transfer \$1 million from the Secretary's some \$30 billion general operation and maintenance fund to lung cancer research under the Defense Health Program.

I would like to begin by thanking Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for the additional funds that have already been placed into the legislation for cancer research. My amendment is presented out of the hope that we can still do better and get us back to a point where we were some years ago.

I know \$1 million won't make a dent in the Secretary's general operating fund, but it would make an enormous difference—an enormous difference—in battling lung cancer, a disease that already affects many of our military men and women and kills over 159,000 Americans every year.

As many of you know, my daughter, Katherine, a young mother of four, ages 9 to 16, was diagnosed with non-smoking lung cancer earlier this year. I would be remiss if I didn't thank my many colleagues for their prayers and their good will and all their expressions of hope and concern and thank the committee for the money that they have provided here for medical research because, make no mistake about it, the combined prayers, good will, and medical research have provided Katherine and her family and her friends and many people throughout this country with hope for their recovery.

We have come a long way, and we are getting very close to discovering a cure for this and many of the other cancers that so tragically take the lives of our loved ones.

It is my hope that with this amendment, we can do a little bit better, get us a little bit closer to that cure, and

give people going forward the same hope that my daughter, Katherine, has been able to receive as a result of these prayers and this research.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and ask for its support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, formed in 1993, the Youth ChalleNGe is a 17-month program run by individual State National Guards. Its mission is to give troubled youth a second chance and addresses our Nation's dropout rate by providing them the opportunity to obtain a high school diploma.

Youth ChalleNGe has transformed the lives of over 120,000 young people since 1993 and has expanded to 35 sites in 27 States, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico—young people like Tatiana Zambrano, a 2011 Puerto Rico ChalleNGe Academy graduate, who with the help of Youth ChalleNGe overcame much adversity to gain admission to Valparaiso University from which she graduated last month. Society may have given up on these young people, but Youth ChalleNGe hasn't.

Along with my colleague, Congresswoman NAPOLITANO, we have written letters and offered amendments in support of Youth ChalleNGe and have been buoyed by its successful intervention over the last number of years, the program seeks now to expand its help into California, Georgia, North Carolina, and Texas, but that requires \$25 million above the funding level.

□ 1730

Our amendment doesn't go to that level. Instead, we hope that we can ask for just a modest \$5 million amount for Youth ChalleNGe to carry out its modest expansion of this program to reach at-risk children. It has proven to be a cost-effective investment.

We thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his staff for their efforts and their interest in this issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs.

NAPOLITANO), my co-chair of the Youth ChalleNGe Caucus.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my colleague who is the co-chair on the Congressional National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Caucus—bipartisan, may I add—to help our throwaway kids. They are 16- to 18-year-olds who have fallen through the cracks, so we work in a bipartisan manner to ensure that some of these youngsters have a second chance.

We thank the Appropriations Committee for the funding increase over President Obama's 2016 request of \$145 million.

The 2016 Defense Appropriations will fund the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program at \$150 million, with the current funding of \$135 million. As my colleague has stated, this amendment increases by \$5 million the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program to \$155 million, and it reduces the operation and maintenance, defense-wide account by the same amount. It helps to start new programs in four States. Each new program is \$4 million. The California third program will cost \$10 million to \$15 million due to the Superfund site.

It is critical for hundreds of youth who are dropouts to have the same options to be able to have a second chance. The ChalleNGe program has graduated, as was stated, over 120,000 nationally. It is voluntary, free, with no cost to the child or to his or her family. It is a 22½-week residential boot camp program that is led by the National Guard cadre. It also prepares them to reenter society and to be successful, to build employment potential, and to return to school. A 2012 RAND study finds, for every dollar spent, it results in a return of \$2.66 to the taxpayer.

It is rated as the best youth program in the Nation. It effectively addresses part of our Nation's dropout epidemic on a small level. It is beneficial to business, communities, and the Nation's ability to compete in our future economy. We need more programs, not fewer. More than 12,000 applicants are rejected due to no space, so we ask our colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is all about just trying to help these young kids get a second chance. By expanding this program as we are doing, which is a modest expansion to reach into some other States, we know we are going to reach some other lives that society has given up on. I don't want to give up on them, and I don't think our Nation wants to give up on them. This is a chance to do it, and I thank the committee for its support.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I would just point out to all of my colleagues that we are on page 9 of a 163-page bill. This bill deals with the national security of this country. It contains \$578,656,000,000, and we have already received two amendments that have been offered on the floor that were not made available to us. I would hope that this does not continue to be a practice during the coming debate on the remainder of the bill given the gravity of the bill, the subject matter, and the amendments, themselves.

I would ask all of the Members to have the courtesy to make sure both the majority and the minority have their amendments in a timely fashion and, certainly, before we begin 5 minutes of debate on the floor of the House of Representatives. I would ask for that civility on behalf of all of the Members.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$21,300,000)”.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$21,300,000)”.

Mr. SABLAN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, we all agree that the Department of Defense has the responsibility to defend our Nation, but the Department also has a responsibility to clean up after itself when it contaminates our environment or threatens public health, and we in Congress have a responsibility to give the military the money it needs for that cleanup.

The amendment I offer adds \$21.3 million to the Formerly Used Defense Sites program.

I plan to withdraw the amendment out of respect for Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his subcommittee, which actually added \$25 million to the FUDS program above the President's budget request. Yet I want to make the point

that we ought to keep the funding at the same level we appropriated in fiscal year 2015, which was \$250 million, and that is what my amendment would do, because now is not the time for the military to backslide on its cleanup.

There are 5,000 sites—in every State and territory—that we know are contaminated, and these sites are not in someone else's backyard. There are 87 of the Formerly Used Defense Sites in Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's State of New Jersey, and there are 42 FUDS sites in Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY's State of Indiana.

In the district I represent, which is the Northern Mariana Islands, there are 24 contaminated areas, dating back to World War II, that are still waiting to be cleaned up. For example, there are 17 rusted fuel tanks in the little village of Tanapag that have been leaking oil into the ground since Harry Truman was President, and, every day, there are kids who are walking by on their way to school; there are fishermen in the lagoon just a few feet away; and there are families who are living with the smell of oil in their homes.

This is not just an environmental issue. This unfinished cleanup damages our military's ability to defend our Nation. Let me explain.

In the Northern Mariana Islands today, the Defense Department wants to expand training activities—using live fire, running pipelines, building more fuel tanks—doing the very things we know contaminate the environment and threaten public health. The people I represent are saying “no” to this expanded military activity.

Now, restoring FUDS funding will not change anyone's mind about the military's proposed buildup in my district, but at least the military will have a little more credibility when it promises that it will clean up after itself because, if the people I represent see Congress cutting funding for FUDS, then the military's promise has no credibility at all.

This is not just about the Northern Mariana Islands. This is a national issue. We have 5,000 sites currently identified for cleanup nationwide and another 10,000 on the list of potentially contaminated sites. Even if we appropriate \$250 million for 2016, it is not enough. The Army Corps of Engineers estimates a full cleanup cost of \$14 billion. So, at \$250 million a year, we will still be having this same discussion 50 years from now.

Again, I commend the chairman and his subcommittee for adding the \$25 million to the Formerly Used Defense Sites program, but, ultimately, we all have to do better.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman's statement before the floor

and for his bringing the issue to the Members' attention.

As you frankly point out, not only for the constituency you represent but whether it was in any of our districts, as you also rightfully point out, this is a national problem. It tends to be forgotten because it is not seen visually by the average constituent. It is a very serious health and environmental problem, and I do appreciate your raising it during this particular debate.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to an amendment offered last year that passed this body by a voice vote.

Veterans of the first gulf war suffered from persistent symptoms, including chronic headaches, widespread pain, cognitive difficulties, debilitating fatigue, gastrointestinal problems, respiratory symptoms, and other abnormalities that are not explained by traditional medicine or by psychiatric diagnoses.

Research shows that, as veterans from the first gulf war age, they are twice as likely to develop Lou Gehrig's disease as are their nondeployed peers. There also may be connections to multiple sclerosis and to Parkinson's disease. Sadly, there are no known treatments for this lifelong pain and affliction that these veterans must endure through this disease.

For decades, the Veterans Health Administration has downplayed any neurological basis for the disease, but recent research has shown unequivocally that this disease is biological in nature. The time has come for us to right the wrong that our servicemen and -women have had to live with now for over 20 years. In this Department of Defense Appropriations bill, we allocate more money for breast cancer,

orthopaedic, and prostate cancer research than we do for finding a cure for Gulf War Illness. Equivalent funds are appropriated for ovarian cancer research.

I think if we are going to spend money on medical research within the Department of Defense, which I am in favor of, the Department must adequately fund research on those diseases that originate in war and wholly affect our servicemen and -women. Over a quarter of a million veterans display symptoms of this disease, and the time has come to find and to fund a cure for it.

The offset for my amendment today comes from the \$30 billion operation and maintenance, defensewide account. Congress has a responsibility to ensure that the gulf war veterans, who put it all on the line and are paying for that with a lifetime of pain, are not left behind. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help find a cure for the Gulf War Illness.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, my amendment would increase funding for prostate cancer research by \$10 million under the Defense Health Program.

Prostate cancer is the second-most commonly diagnosed cancer in men and is the second-most common cause of a man's death. In 2015, approximately 220,800 men in the United States will be diagnosed with prostate cancer, and an estimated 27,540 will die from it.

The Prostate Cancer Research Program is a unique research program in that it prioritizes research that will lead to the elimination of death from prostate cancer while enhancing the well-being of men who are experiencing the impact of that disease.

To date, the Prostate Cancer Research Program has resulted in a total appropriation of over \$1.3 billion, including \$80 million last year. This

unique partnership among the military, prostate cancer survivors, clinicians, and scientists has changed the landscape of biomedical study, energizing the research community in conducting high-risk investigations that are more collaborative, innovative, and impactful on prostate cancer.

This increase would result in a total funding level of \$90 million, which is still \$10 million below what this account was funded at in 2001, more than a decade ago. The offset for my amendment comes from the \$30 billion operation and maintenance, defensewide account.

This amendment passed the House by a voice vote last year and as part of an en bloc amendment the year before. I hope that we will all agree on its passage again this year.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to thank the gentleman for his previous amendment, which I supported, and also for this amendment, which supports greater funds for prostate cancer research.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of history, my predecessor died from prostate cancer, and, of course, around this room and around the country, we know too many men who haven't done what they should do to look after their health and, therefore, the welfare of their families.

□ 1745

I want to commend the gentleman for his advocacy in this area and also remind those who are on the Hill that I think next week the House will be sponsoring a screening for all men here. It is a good way not only to look after yourself, but the people who love you. I want to commend the gentleman for his advocacy on an annual basis and thank him for yielding the time. I accept the amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. I reclaim my time.

I want to thank the chairman for his kind and insightful words, and I want to thank the chairman for his leadership in making sure that the healthcare needs of those who serve are met.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Alzheimer's disease is a threat to our country—not a direct threat like ISIS or al Qaeda, but it is an insidious, persistent threat to the minds and bodies of our family members and to the fiscal health of our country.

The Alzheimer's Association estimates that the cost of caring for people with Alzheimer's right now through the Medicare system is \$226 billion. By the year 2050, it will be \$1.1 trillion. This is a genuine budgetary threat. If it grows unchecked, the cost to Medicare from a single disease will zap our ability to pay for national security. Interestingly enough and timely enough, on the front page of USA Today is a story that reads how 15 percent of seniors account for nearly one-half of Medicare spending.

We also have an epidemic among our soldiers. It is called traumatic brain injury, known as the signature wound of veterans from Afghanistan and Iraq. It affects our soldiers at a much higher rate than the civilian population, and the VA projects its 10-year costs at \$2.2 billion.

TBI is also closely linked to Alzheimer's. For 30 years, we have known about a clear correlation between TBI and the risk of developing Alzheimer's disease and other types of dementia. By researching the link between TBI and Alzheimer's, we can help cure both.

I applaud the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations for increasing the funding for the Peer Reviewed Alzheimer's Research Program from \$12 million to its presequestration levels of \$15 million, but the funding for Alzheimer's research in the United States is still underresourced.

Today, I am offering this amendment to increase the funding for the Peer Reviewed Program by \$5 million, which would take it up to \$20 million. This modest investment on the front end in research can eventually yield billions in savings in the future on the cost of care. That is why I urge my colleagues to support our servicemembers with TBI and Alzheimer's and vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKAI

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$25,000,000) (increased by \$25,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Hawaii and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would first like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Our bipartisan amendment would increase DOD's supplemental impact aid to \$55 million, \$25 million more than appropriated in the bill currently. This would benefit schools in almost every school district that hold a military installation. Schools that had 20 percent average daily attendance of military-dependent students in the preceding year as counted on their Federal impact aid application are eligible to receive funding on an annual basis.

Congress has recognized the needs faced by many school districts educating a large number of military children and has consistently provided increases in this aid; yet last year, in fiscal year 2015, this funding was dropped from \$45 million to \$25 million. This is not enough. With the stress put on military kids throughout the past years, this aid should be increasing, not decreasing.

The education of a military child is a military readiness issue. The men and women serving in the military today have to rely on local school districts to provide quality education and counseling programs for their students and children.

Earlier this year, a letter signed by many Members of this Congress and endorsed by multiple organizations asking for this critical program to be fully supported at \$50 million for DOD impact aid, with \$5 million for children of military families with severe disabilities, was sent to the House Committee on Appropriations. As we know, we have to offset any funding increase for one program with another if we play by the rules, and I have done so with this amendment.

Our amendment is fully offset by using funding from an Office of the Secretary of Defense servicewide administration account, O&M defensewide. The children are our future, and many that grow up in our military families today will be the military leaders of our future. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000)”.

Page 74, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 74, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this amendment is designed specifically to support the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and to dramatically improve their quality of life while they are deployed.

On a daily basis, the United Service Organizations, USO, reaches United States military members in numerous ways. They provide calling cards at deployed locations for servicemembers to call their families. They provide toiletries and necessities for deployed servicemembers and those in austere locations. They are the first persons to welcome back redeploying servicemembers. They volunteer to run morale and welfare tents offering Internet connectivity for deployed locations. Connecting troops to their families through calling cards and the Internet is just part of the USO's 40-plus program repertoire, but it is incredibly important to our deployed men and women and to their spouses, parents, siblings, and children.

In an era where our servicemembers are fighting prolonged wars, connecting them to their families and friends back home is a service to our military that we cannot afford to underfund. In fact, 93 percent of troops surveyed in 2012 agreed that USO services boost morale, ease separation from friends and family, and convey a feeling of support to the servicemember. Unfortunately, however, our deployed servicemembers too often go to the USO tent only to find that USO provisions, including supplies and calling cards, have run out. Increasing funding to the USO will help alleviate this unacceptable problem.

In the proposed fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations bill, the USO is funded at just \$20 million. This amendment will reduce the operations and maintenance defensewide account by less than one two-thousandths, while having an immeasurable impact on the quality of life of our servicemen and -women.

It is past time that we direct sufficient funds to the quality of life of the men and women that sacrifice every-

thing to defend our Nation. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to salute the dean of the House for his strong support of the USO. Over 40 years ago, I was one of those soldiers, and it made a real difference in my life.

All of us want to thank the gentleman for his significant leadership here over so many years and for choosing this incredibly wonderful organization to plus up.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 20, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. We haven't received a copy of the amendment. We would like to see a copy of the amendment if that would be possible. That is the reason for the reservation.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will distribute copies of the amendment.

A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to add an additional \$1 million for research and development for Duchenne muscular dystrophy. Duchenne muscular dystrophy is the most common lethal genetic disorder affecting American children today.

□ 1800

It is a progressive neuromuscular disorder that affects approximately 1 in every 3,500 boys or 200,000 babies born each year worldwide. Over time, patients experience severe loss of muscle strength and control.

Most boys diagnosed with Duchenne lose their ability to walk by the time they become teenagers. There is no known cure for Duchenne, and life expectancies for individuals with this disease are significantly shortened. Many do not live past their 21st birthday.

Like many of my colleagues, I have met with many Duchenne patients and their families and have seen the impact this disease has and what it impacts on their daily lives.

There have been very promising advances in recent years, including development of a new drug which has achieved success in early clinical trials. I have had one child in my district confined to a wheelchair who, under this clinical trial, is able to walk by himself currently. However, much more work needs to be done to find a cure for this disease and to better understand what causes Duchenne in the first place.

This amendment will directly benefit the thousands of Duchenne patients throughout the United States, as well as their countless loved ones who care for them every day. By increasing funding for peer-reviewed research, institutions across the country will have additional resources necessary to make progress on eliminating this devastating disease.

We as a nation are on the cusp of historic progress in advancing critical research. Now is the time to recommit to robust support of our country's biomedical research for this disease.

In closing, I would like to thank the countless physicians, researchers, and scientists who work tirelessly to find a cure for Duchenne. I would also like to thank the Jett Foundation, which has long been a national leader in increasing awareness and providing support for patients and their families.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I thank the chair and ranking member for their consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order. We are doing a little more homework on the amendment. Certainly, I am supportive of it.

I claim the time in opposition, although I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I understand the gentleman's concern is the lack of the copy of the amendment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think we wanted to make sure we have the figures that go with what it is set against.

Mr. Chairman, we want to make sure it comports to the rule of the House.

We are not against it. We just want to make sure it is in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I apologize. We had moved this with a later change to the defensewide operations and maintenance fund for the pay-for for this; that probably explains this balance, but it is coming from that portion. The \$1 million, I think, is in excess, if my memory is correct, of the \$3.5 million that is already there.

We are able to leverage this for a greater opportunity to move quickly on this. That is the rationale. That is where it came from.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. While I check the figures to make sure that it is properly offset, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. KEATING. I would just like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman, if that information is currently being analyzed now.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will yield, there is some consultation going on at the desk. At the conclusion of those consultations with the Parliamentarian, I will have a better opportunity to respond in, hopefully, a more positive fashion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the chairman for the effort he is going through and the consideration he is giving with this.

Many times, we have the opportunity to talk to families and deal with issues. In this particular instance, we have an opportunity. As I mentioned, we are right on the cusp of very significant research. Leveraging a small additional amount now would have tremendous ramifications.

I was just completely struck by the fact that I saw a person—a young boy in his teens, confined to a wheelchair, like so many of those afflicted with this terrible disease have had to suffer through, and as a result of those clinical trials, to see that person no longer in a wheelchair and up and ambulatory and walking, those are the type of dramatic improvements we are on the cusp of right now.

That is why this amendment just seeks to get an incremental increase with that because I think it would be leveraged and have enormous significance as a result.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. While I continue to reserve, let me compliment the gentleman on his amendment, as we do further investigation on the off-sets.

Medical research for diseases that affect our military members and their families are a priority of our committee; you can be sure of that. That is why our bill includes \$3.2 million, again, this year for the Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy Research Program.

The committee has provided, which I think would be of interest, more than \$43 million for this research area since fiscal year 2003, and you have alluded to it, but research breakthroughs in this area will only help those suffering from this debilitating disease, but will also help research in other various muscular and motor neuron diseases.

I think the research is absolutely essential, and I think we are closer to a resolution of the issue that would allow me to withdraw my reservation. I thank the gentleman for his indulgence.

I would be happy to withdraw my reservation of the point of order and support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his indulgence and patience and the good work he has done in this respect, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$2,644,274,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$999,621,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$276,761,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$2,815,862,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), \$6,731,119,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplying and equipping the Air National Guard, as authorized by law; expenses for repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment, including those furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, \$6,605,400,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, \$14,078,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, \$234,829,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Again, I want to begin by thanking the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee and their staff because I have worked on this in past appropriations and had the privilege of receiving the support of both the chair and the ranking member on the question of post-traumatic stress disorder.

I heard the chairman mention both Chairman Young and Chairman Murtha. Over the years, I have had the privilege of working with them on this question of post-traumatic stress disorder.

I just want to use a little anecdote, particularly as it relates to Vietnam vets. Many of us remember Vietnam vets coming back and, some long years later, getting a better understanding of Agent Orange. I remember a Vietnam vet telling me about it, but as he indicated, they mentioned it or spoke about it or tried to explain it when they came back directly from Vietnam.

It was a long time before the understanding came about Agent Orange, and in years going forward, there was great medical care needed, medical costs needed, because those veterans had been suffering for a long time.

We now understand post-traumatic stress disorder; and, as I look over the landscape of the last years of war, Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, about 11 to 20 out of every 100 veterans, or 11 to 20 percent, who served have post-traumatic stress disorder in any given year.

In the Gulf war, Operation Desert Storm, about 12 out of every 100 Gulf war veterans who still live have PTSD in any given year. In the Vietnam war, about 15 out of every 100 Vietnam vets, or 15 percent, are currently diagnosed with PTSD. In a recent study in the late 1980s, the National Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Study stated that it is estimated about 30 out of every 100.

Other factors contribute to it, and, if you listen to individuals who have PTSD, they seek to be part of a normal life and to work and survive and provide for their families.

My amendment is simple. It adds an extra \$1 million to increase funding for PTSD. These funds will be used to outreach activities targeting hard-to-reach veterans, especially those who are homeless and reside in underserved urban and rural areas who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder.

I had the privilege a couple of years ago to provide a PTSD facility that was offsite of a veterans hospital in a small, community-based hospital. Mr. Chairman, the response from veterans was amazing because they were able to come to an offsite location for counseling in PTSD.

We know that the tragedies of war last with men and women for a very long time. I am hoping that my colleagues will support this amendment again to ease the trauma of the thoughts that these men and women have, the nightmares when they sleep, because they really want to be—as they are—contributing members of society.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me commend the gentlewoman for your strong advocacy.

Just for the record, our bill does provide \$155 million, including a plus up of \$1 million above the request level of \$55 million, for traumatic brain injury and psychological health research.

Additionally, our bill includes \$676 million in operation and maintenance funding within the Department of Health program to care for service-members affected by TBI and psychological health injuries.

We welcome the additional money; we accept your amendment, and I commend you for your efforts.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Reclaiming my time, I applaud the compassion that the chairman and the ranking member have had in the writing of this legislation, highlighting several very important points needed for our servicemen and -women, and I am grateful for the support of the additional resources, continuing the advocacy for them.

In closing, let me thank this Congress for the wounded warrior that I have in my office. He is someone who suffers from PTSD. He has been an excellent staff person in reaching out to the veterans throughout my community.

He is an example of the fact that, when you have treatment, you can be part of contributing to society, as they all want to be, even with some of the challenges they have.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is virtually identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted in last year's Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 2685).

My amendment increases funding for the PTSD by \$1,000,000. These funds should be

used toward outreach activities targeting hard to reach veterans, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas, who suffer from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Mr. Chair, along with traumatic brain injury, PTSD is the signature wound suffered by the brave men and women fighting in Afghanistan, Iraq, and far off lands to defend the values and freedom we hold dear.

For those of us whose daily existence is not lived in harm's way, it is difficult to imagine the horrific images that American servicemen and women deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theaters of war see on a daily basis.

In an instant a suicide bomber, an IED, or an insurgent can obliterate your best friend and right in front of your face. Yet, you are trained and expected to continue on with the mission, and you do, even though you may not even have reached your 20th birthday.

But there always comes a reckoning. And it usually comes after the stress and trauma of battle is over and you are alone with your thoughts and memories.

And the horror of those desperate and dangerous encounters with the enemy and your own mortality come flooding back.

PTSD was first brought to public attention in relation to war veterans, but it can result from a variety of traumatic incidents, such as torture, being kidnapped or held captive, bombings, or natural disasters such as floods or earthquakes.

People with PTSD may startle easily, become emotionally numb (especially in relation to people with whom they used to be close), lose interest in things they used to enjoy, have trouble feeling affectionate, be irritable, become more aggressive, or even become violent.

They avoid situations that remind them of the original incident, and anniversaries of the incident are often very difficult.

Most people with PTSD repeatedly relive the trauma in their thoughts during the day and in nightmares when they sleep. These are called flashbacks. A person having a flashback may lose touch with reality and believe that the traumatic incident is happening all over again.

Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is that most veterans with PTSD also have other psychiatric disorders, which are a consequence of PTSD. These veterans have co-occurring disorders, which include depression, alcohol and/or drug abuse problems, panic, and/or other anxiety disorders.

My amendment recognizes that these soldiers are first and foremost, human. They carry their experiences with them.

Ask a veteran of Vietnam, Iraq, or Afghanistan about the frequency of nightmares they experience, and one will realize that serving in the Armed Forces leaves a lasting impression, whether good or bad.

My amendment will help ensure that “no soldier is left behind” by addressing the urgent need for more outreach toward hard to reach veterans suffering from PTSD, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas of our country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, \$300,000,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 13, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$10,290,000)”.

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,290,000)”.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will be offering and then withdrawing this amendment because of a point of order on the timing of the budget outlays that we are not able to reconcile at this point in time.

But I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY, for their leadership.

Now, this is an important amendment though. My amendment would protect from possible cancellation an innovative program that promises to provide a breakthrough capability for a very small amount of money.

Right now, if Iran or North Korea launches a ballistic missile attack on our homeland, we, unfortunately, have no enhanced way of knowing whether

or not our defensive missiles actually hit the target or not.

That is why the Missile Defense Agency is executing a promising and groundbreaking space sensor system called Space-based Kill Assessment.

The U.S. desperately needs improved sensors in space to provide tracking, discrimination, and more. A robust, multimission space sensor network will be vital to ensuring a strong missile defense program. Without this, we might otherwise waste extremely expensive ground-based interceptors, costing the taxpayer more money, and depleting our limited number of interceptors.

The Space-based Kill Assessment program cannot survive a 50 percent cut. Program cancellation may result, and it would waste taxpayer dollars already invested and would also fail to meet congressional intent to have an initial operating kill assessment capability by 2019.

This experiment, up until today, has had zero scheduling delays since it was conceived in fiscal year 2014.

Finally, this program is a great example of the cost savings and other benefits the government can leverage through commercially-hosted satellite payloads. This program, and other similar efforts, are critical to ensuring that the United States stays ahead of future ballistic missile threats.

I would hope that this amendment would have been adopted because it would take money from a lower priority fund and put it into critical ballistic missile defense against our homeland.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Allow me to commend the gentleman from Colorado for pointing up the value of what he talks about here. And let me promise to him that I am sure I will be working very closely with Mr. VISCLOSKEY to see what we can do to elevate our investment and our knowledge and support for this program.

I do appreciate your willingness to withdraw the amendment and regret that the outlay issue somewhat has complicated matters on the floor this evening.

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the subcommittee chairman's words, and I will certainly work with him on that effort.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, \$368,131,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, \$8,232,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY
USED DEFENSE SITES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, \$228,717,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND
CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title

10, United States Code), \$103,266,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union and, with appropriate authorization by the Department of Defense and Department of State, to countries outside of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components, and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contacts, \$358,496,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, \$84,140,000.

TITLE III PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$5,336,971,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,160,482,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,805,773,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

chine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,805,773,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000) (increased by \$100,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would direct the Army to prioritize the modernization of the oldest Bradley Fighting Vehicles in the fleet.

The Army maintains a program to modify and standardize its Bradley Fleet to two digital configurations, the M2A3 and the M2A2 ODS-SA. These two variants are the most advanced versions of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and provide our soldiers significant improvements in survivability and force protection.

These upgrades feature advanced digitized electronics to provide troops with optimal situational awareness, network connectivity, and enhanced communication hardware within the heavy brigade combat team.

Almost all units within the Active Army components and prepositioned stocks are fielded with these digital configurations. Unfortunately, there are still National Guard units that have not yet received these upgrades and are fielded with obsolete, non-standard, nondigital M2A2 Operation Desert Storm variants.

Maintaining these outdated vehicles within the National Guard will severely restrict our servicemembers' ability to maintain proficiency in the technical requirements necessary to operate the advanced digital Bradleys utilized in combat operations.

This will result in significant degradation of combat effectiveness of these units and poses a significant risk to units who deploy with the older Bradley variant, or train on the older variant but fall in on the newer models in theater.

Furthermore, servicemembers within these units will face significant and unnecessary challenges in maintaining their Military Occupational Specialty qualifications.

Mr. Chairman, the Army has an existing program of record for the re-manufacturing of Bradley vehicles to attain updated digital configurations. It exists within the President's budget under Procurement of Weapons and

Tracked Vehicles: Bradley Modifications.

This year's budget request includes \$225 million for Bradley modifications. Unfortunately, none of these funds were designated for the Bradley Fighting Vehicles digital upgrades. In fact, the President's budget does not provide funding for these upgrades over the entire FYDP.

So it is unclear whether or not these Operation Desert Storm-era Bradley vehicles will ever receive the upgrades necessary to make them combat effective or adequate training platforms. It is for this reason I am offering this amendment.

My amendment would designate and fence off \$100 million of the \$1.8 billion under the Army's procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles accounts to prioritize and upgrade the oldest Bradley Fighting Vehicles in the fleet. This is 0.005 percent of the total appropriation.

The \$100 million is less than half of what is necessary to upgrade the remaining nondigital, nonstandard variants, but it is an important step to ensuring that the combat formations within our National Guard maintain the combat effectiveness and readiness they have attained over the last decade.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I very much regret that I must rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I very much regret that I rise in opposition to the amendment, knowing what a strong supporter of our national defense the gentleman from Nevada is and what a strong supporter he is of the National Guard, not only across the Nation, but in his own State. And I regret even more so since we have been talking about this for several weeks. I feel badly that I have to rise.

The amendment, as the gentleman has stated, directs the Secretary of the Army to repurpose approximately one-half of the \$225 million in the budget request that was requested and included for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle Upgrade Program.

The amendment would direct the Army to revise the schedule for the Bradley Upgrade Program by accelerating the schedule for providing more modern Bradley Fighting Vehicles to the 1st Squadron of the 221st Armored Cavalry of the Nevada National Guard, which I am sure is most deserving because, as he said, they have the oldest of the oldest.

Having said that, the schedule change would disrupt, as I am advised, a carefully synchronized plan for Abrams Tank and Bradley Fighting Vehicle modernization and would cause

production breaks at both manufacturing lines.

The production break would also add significant startup costs to the Bradley Engineering Change Proposal 2. In other words, this amendment would throw out of balance the Army-wide armor modernization plans and drive up costs in order for one squadron of one State's Guard forces to receive more modern vehicles.

As you can tell, Mr. Chairman, from my rather convoluted response, I am prepared to work with the gentleman from Nevada to assist him, but at this point, I need to regretfully oppose his amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the chairman's offer to work with the gentleman as we proceed but would associate myself with the chairman's concerns relative to the amendment that has been offered and, particularly, with an emphasis to the break in production, which I think is a very serious issue.

So I do want to associate myself with the chairman's concerns and objection that he has raised, but again, his willingness to work with the gentleman in the future.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I do recommend a "no" vote, but I certainly make a, I hope, valid offer to work with the gentleman because I know that he is going to be working on me to make sure that this occurs, and I want to be helpful to him. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Thank you both, Mr. Chairman and ranking member, for your offer to work with me to try to rectify the situation where we have an important National Guard unit that is dealing with and working with Desert Storm-era Bradley Fighting Vehicles and, yet, expected to be ready to deploy on to the newer materiel in theater should they ever be called.

With your assurance to work with me on this effort, I appreciate that.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be ac-

quired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,007,778,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$5,230,677,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$16,871,819,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$2,998,541,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$559,141,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier Replacement Program,	
\$1,559,977,000;	
Carrier Replacement Program (AP-CY),	
\$874,658,000;	
Virginia Class Submarine, \$3,346,370,000;	
Virginia Class Submarine (AP),	
\$1,971,840,000;	
CVN Refueling Overhaul, \$637,588,000;	
CVN Refueling Overhauls (AP),	
\$14,951,000;	
DDG-091000 Program, \$433,404,000;	
DDG-0951 Destroyer, \$3,012,904,000;	
Littoral Combat Ship, \$1,347,411,000;	
LPD-0917, \$550,000,000;	
Afloat Forward Staging Base,	
\$635,000,000;	
LHA Replacement (AP-CY), \$277,543,000;	
TAO Fleet Oiler, \$674,190,000;	
Moored Training Ship (AP), \$138,200,000;	
Ship to Shore Connector, \$255,630,000;	
Service Craft, \$30,014,000;	
YP Craft Maintenance ROH/SLEP,	
\$21,838,000;	
LCAC Service Life Extension Program,	
\$80,738,000; and	
For outfitting, post delivery, conver-	
sions, and first destination transportation,	
\$601,008,000.	
Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding	
Programs, \$389,305,000.	

In all: \$16,852,569,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2020, of which \$389,305,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, to fund completion of prior year shipbuilding programs: *Provided*, That amounts made available for prior year shipbuilding programs may be transferred to and merged with appropriations made available for such purposes in prior Acts: *Provided further*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2020, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and

procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$6,696,715,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, \$973,084,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, \$14,224,475,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading for F-35A Joint Strike Fighter airframes and contractor furnished equipment, no more than the amount necessary to fully fund procurement of 36 airframes and associated contractor furnished equipment may be obligated until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department of Defense has accepted Autonomic Logistics Information System equipment that meets requirements to support a declaration of Air Force initial operating capability for the Joint Strike Fighter.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor; ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, \$2,334,165,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor; ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion

of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, \$1,935,034,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$253,496,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$15,098,950,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

□ 1830

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$35,000,000)”.

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$49,000,000)”.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment, and I will later withdraw that amendment.

The amendment I am offering today is a simple, commonsense amendment

that fulfills a critical need for our Air National Guard, who stand watch while performing the 24/7 Aerospace Control Alert mission as diligently today as they have after the attacks on 9/11. This mission is carried out by several Guard units across the country, including the 180th Fighter Wing in Toledo, Ohio, whom I have the great honor to represent, and by the D.C. Air National Guard, who are less than 15 miles away from this Capitol. These servicemen and -women also serve in combat theater operations overseas when they are called upon and play a vital role in fighting foreign threats.

This amendment would provide funding for an additional ARC-210 or equivalent radio in the Air National Guard's F-16s. These radios have a capability for secure line-of-sight and beyond line-of-sight communication, providing the ability to securely communicate with ground forces and command and control. However, one radio in the aircraft does not allow for the simultaneous contact with them.

Currently, Air National Guard F-16s only have one ARC-210 radio that works on an ultrahigh frequency band, and it is this band that most command and control and air traffic control agencies use. An additional second radio will simultaneously allow Air National Guard F-16s to communicate with command and control agencies and coalition troops on the ground in places like Iraq and Afghanistan and dense threat environments.

Members of the Air National Guard, along with fulfilling their duties of protecting our borders against those who wish to do us harm, also deploy with our Active Duty military, side by side, on the front lines in overseas conflicts. In fact, the request to have these additional radios comes from the combat commanders in such theaters around the world. So not only is this needed at home, but also abroad. The Air National Guard designates the need to have this capability as “critical.”

My offset for this amendment is the Defense Rapid Innovation program, a program intended to take off-the-shelf technology and put it in the hands of the warfighter as soon as possible. My amendment would do just that. It takes low-cost existing technology and puts it to work for our warfighters today.

As I said, I am prepared to withdraw the amendment, but I want to say I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey and his committee staff and all the members of the committee for their hard work on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to speak on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his strong support of national defense, his incredible dedication to the National Guard, and his great service to the State of Ohio.

His amendment, while it will be withdrawn, as he said, is intended to provide radio equipment for the Air National Guard F-16s but was only recently brought to our committee's attention. Should the Air Guard choose to purchase the ARC-210 radios with NGREA funding, which the committee has provided quite a lot of money for, the committee would support their decision.

We are sensitive to the need of the Air Guard, yet the committee needs to do its due diligence. Ranking Member VISCLOSKY and I look forward to working with you and your staff on this important issue, as we have already been doing, and appreciate your indulgence and willingness to withdraw the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his willingness and especially for his dedication and support for our Air National Guard.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for bringing this bill to the floor.

The Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment is not a reflection of concern with what is a good bill under the circumstances. The Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment would appropriate \$25 million to fund military responses to Russia's continuing violation of the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, the INF Treaty. This is the exact same amount that the House Armed Services Committee, the HASC, authorized recently in a bipartisan and noncontroversial provision in H.R. 1735, which passed the House Armed Services Committee on a 60-2 vote.

Senior DOD officials, from the Secretary of Defense to lesser Senate-confirmed officials, have testified that the United States is considering a range of military options to respond to Russia's violation of the INF Treaty. DOD defines these as countervailing and counterforce options. What do these include?

Number one, extending the range of the Army's current Army Tactical Missile System, ATacMS; land-basing Tomahawk or otherwise modifying similar capabilities; and also other capabilities per classified DOD reporting.

The emphasis should be on modifying current systems as opposed to developing brand-new capabilities, which would take longer and cost far more.

This amendment is imperative to ensuring that another year isn't allowed to go by before Russia's President, Vladimir Putin, is made to understand that he cannot profit by his violation of the INF Treaty.

As The New York Times reported on June 5, following the submission of the most recent State Department annual report on arms control compliance: "American officials have made no discernible headway in persuading the Russians to acknowledge the compliance problem, let alone resolve it. . . . In December, the Pentagon told Congress that it had developed a range of military options to pressure Russia to remedy the violation or neutralize any advantages it might gain if diplomatic efforts fail. Brian P. McKeon, a senior Pentagon official, told Congress that . . . if a diplomatic solution was not found, 'This violation will not go unanswered.'"

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of all Members for the Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's concern relative to Russia and his desire to make sure that they do abide by the existing treaty.

Certainly, I would acknowledge that they have invaded the country of Ukraine. They control a quarter of that country's industrial production, and as the gentleman has indicated, are very concerned about their violation potentially of the treaty that exists.

My concern is that the gentleman's amendment is premature. He is absolutely correct that the authorizing committee in this body did pass legislation that you are trying to address with your amendment. The other body has not yet acted.

Additionally, I would point out—and again, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct—that DOD is consid-

ering a range of options. You have enumerated at least three of them, I think, very correctly.

Again, I think it is premature, given the fact that we are still, as a country, considering what options should be utilized to deal with this very serious question that the gentleman raises. Given the fact that we don't have direct authorization and we are considering options, while I agree with the intent, I would have to object to the timing of the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chair, I would just argue that, while it is true that the other body has not acted on this yet, it is also true that this body has already acted in the Defense Authorization bill. It came through committee, and certainly it had overwhelming support in committee and overwhelming support on the floor of the House.

I think that the will of this body ought to be done by all of my colleagues supporting this very important amendment and to make sure that Russia understands that they cannot go unchecked when they violate a treaty of this magnitude.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I will simply conclude by again expressing sympathy for the aim of the gentleman but pointing out that to appropriate money, we need authority. We do not yet have that, given the absence of action by the Senate and signature of the authorization into law by the President. I would ask my colleagues to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$5,143,095,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the staff, first, for working with Members and getting Members in order to be able to present their amendments; and then I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their understanding of this amendment and, again, make the point that this amendment that I am offering at this time I have been able to work on with the appropriators over the years.

I am a breast cancer survivor, and as I, myself, was going through that period, I met women who were experiencing triple negative, which is a very deadly aspect of breast cancer.

My amendment increases funding for Defense Health Program's research and development by \$10 million, and these funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

Just the fact, to take note of the point, that more than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times, 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer just between 2000 and 2001.

My amendment will add additional research dealing with this question. And the good news is that, when the military research component works on this, there is a great possibility of moving forward.

Breast cancer strikes relatively young military women at an alarming rate, but male servicemembers, veterans, and their dependents are at risk as well.

“Military people in general, and in some cases very specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer,” says Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University. Clapp, who works for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues, says life in the military can mean exposure to a witch's brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.”

Just a moment about the triple-negative breast cancer, when I saw firsthand a very wonderful professional in my community go very quickly, first at the diagnosis and then the short-term survival that she experienced.

It is a term used to describe breast cancer whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors and do not have an excess of the HER2 protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells.

So what does that mean? TNBC accounts for between 13 and 25 percent of

all breast cancer in the United States. It is a higher grade, onset is younger, is more aggressive, and is likely to metastasize.

Currently, 70 percent of women with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer do not live more than 5 years after being diagnosed, and it impacts various ethnicities and ethnic groups in a far different way.

□ 1845

We find that African American women are more likely to be diagnosed with large tumors, but it impacts women of all backgrounds, racial backgrounds as well.

So I ask my colleagues to consider this amendment that I have had the privilege of offering in years past. Might they also take note of the fact that the amendment would not change the overall level of budget authority, and it would lower the overall level of outlays.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I add this article into the RECORD, “A New Drug for Triple Negative Breast Cancers Seems Promising,” dated June 5, 2015.

Again, the research that the United States military can do under the research development test and evaluation is powerful. There are many women and men in the military and many women throughout the Nation and around the world who would benefit greatly from the additional focus on this very deadly disease, deadly form of breast cancer.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted in last year's Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 4870).

My amendment increases funding for the Defense Health Program's research and development by \$10 million. These funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

Women in the military have had to fight battles against Triple Negative Breast cancer and far too many of them are losing the battle.

My amendment is designed to advance the study of triple negative breast cancer which is an aggressive and deadly type of breast cancer.

Currently, 70% of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed. TNBC accounts for between 13% and 25% of all breast cancer in the United States.

It is essential to support research to identify multifaceted targeted treatments for this type of breast cancer.

TNBC is an extremely deadly form of breast cancer.

Unlike traditional forms of breast cancer there are no targeted treatments for TNBC.

Additional research is necessary to find the molecular cause for TNBC in order to develop an effective treatment regime.

It is only in the last few years that professionals studying breast cancer have concluded that breast cancer is not one disease, but many different forms of cancer all originating in the breast.

Triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) is a term used to describe breast cancers whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors, and do not have an excess of the HER2 protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells

Triple Negative Breast Cancer (TNBC) cells: TNBC accounts for between 13% and 25% of all breast cancer in the United States; usually of a higher grade and size; onset at a younger age; are more aggressive; and are more likely to metastasize.

Currently, 70% of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

African American women are 3 times more likely to develop triple-negative breast cancer than White women.

African-American women have prevalence TNBC of 26% vs. 16% in non-African Americans women.

The survival rate for breast cancer has increased to 90% for White women but only 78% for African American Women.

African-American women are more likely to be diagnosed with larger tumors and more advanced stages of breast cancer.

Currently no targeted treatment for TNBC exists.

Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

There continues to be a need for research funding for biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trial designs that will lead to the early detection of TNBC and to the development of multiple targeted therapies to treat this awful disease.

Depending on its stage of diagnosis, triple negative breast cancer can be extremely aggressive and more likely to recur and metastasize than other subtypes of breast cancer.

It typically is responsive to chemotherapy, although it can be more difficult to treat because it is unresponsive to the most effective receptor targeted treatments.

There is no question that researchers are increasingly recognizing the importance of TNBC as an entity and focusing their efforts on several key areas.

On June 5, 2015, it was reported that “A New Drug For Triple Negative Breast Cancer Seems Promising—Enzalutamide.”

Research on effective treatment options for triple negative breast cancer is critically need to improve the survival rates of women who are diagnosed with the disease.

We must also improve upon tests that can detect triple negative breast cancer while it is in its early stages, which could increase survival rates.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

[From The Inquisitr, June 7, 2015]

A NEW DRUG FOR TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER SEEMS PROMISING—ENZALUTAMIDE

Breast cancer. The two words strike fear in nearly everyone's heart, as, by far, it is the most common cancer that women can get. In fact, one-out-of-eight women will be diagnosed at some point in their lives. Early detection remains the most important tool we have against fighting breast cancer, but it's only one tool. Not at all tests reliably show all breast cancers in their early stages, and many breast cancers are not detected until they begin to metastasize, or spread to remote locations in the body, which makes them incurable. They can be treated, but it is medically deemed impossible to cure at that point in time, with various metastatic lesions having to be handled as they appear—which means more chemo, more radiation, more lost quality of life.

What many people don't realize is that there are actually several kinds of breast cancer—not all are the same or are treated the same. Many breast cancers have hormone receptors which are considered easier to treat the other types, because when biological therapy denies the tumor of the particular hormone that feeds it, the tumor dies.

Triple-negative breast cancer, however, does not respond to hormone or biological therapies—that's because the tumor does not have those receptors. It also is a particularly aggressive cancer that usually strikes women in their childbearing years and moves quickly to the brain and bones. Lumpectomies, mastectomies, chemotherapy, and radiation have been the medical standard, but often with dismal results—the five year prognosis for triple-negative breast cancer is not good.

However, a new drug on the market seems promising in the fight against this disease that takes far too many young women. A drug used to treat prostate cancer in men seems promising—called Enzalutamide—shows promise in a subset of women with advanced triple-negative breast cancer. For women whose tumors express the androgen receptor (approximately 40 percent) the drug shrank or stopped tumor activity.

Tiffany Traina, a medical oncologist at Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center in New York, who specializes in breast cancer, spoke about the trial which included 118 women, 47 percent of which had triple-negative breast cancer with androgen receptors.

"Enzalutamide is an oral therapy and extremely well tolerated. We are seeing impressive improvements in progression-free survival [PFS] and in the clinical benefit rate. AR by immunohistochemistry is not perfect in predicting who is going to respond. This is not the whole story. We found that even those with really low AR expression level have had great responses [on trial]. Combining AR expression with the gene signature has allowed us to enrich for the population that appears to truly benefit from enzalutamide. This is the most exciting data we have had in triple-negative breast cancer and certainly supports moving this therapy forward in development."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment. Again, I thank the staff, the chairman, and the ranking member for their commitment to the betterment of the lives of our young men and women in the United States military.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), \$76,680,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$7,372,047,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$17,237,724,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V-22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$23,163,152,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$18,207,171,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That of the funds made available in this paragraph, \$250,000,000 for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program shall only be available for expenses, not otherwise provided for, to include program management and oversight, to conduct research, development, test and evaluation to include proof of concept demonstration; engineering, testing, and validation; and transition to full-scale production: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program to appropriations for research, development, test and evaluation to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That

the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 30 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,543,000) (increased by \$3,543,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from New Mexico and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, at a time when the United States is facing constantly evolving global threats from a wide range of enemies, our military urgently needs the technology to monitor and respond to these threats.

Our military does not have the time to wait decades or even years for the development and launch of surveillance or communications satellites.

Operationally Responsive Space, or ORS, allows the U.S. to quickly respond to the emerging and often unanticipated needs of the warfighter. The program rapidly develops new capabilities, giving our military the ability to launch field-ready satellites extremely quickly.

These cost-effective satellites provide transformational advantages on the battlefield. They provide surveillance, tactical communications, countercommunications, space protection, space situational awareness, and weather data from around the world to assist our military in combating our enemies.

You don't have to take my word for it. Air Force leadership has consistently praised the program as an effective national security tool. General Schwartz, the former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, said: "ORS is exactly what we need. Innovation and greater efficiency as we contend with ongoing fiscal constraints and changing space posture."

General Welch, current Chief of Staff of the Air Force, recently said that we "have to look at space now as a warfighting domain," and he went on to say that doing so requires us to "look at different ways of building, maintaining, and improving the assets we currently have in space and the capabilities they provide in new and different ways than the very functionally developed, large program, large investment over long periods of time that have dominated the space architecture up until this point."

ORS plays a critical role beyond immediate response to our needs on the battlefield.

The U.S. also needs to have the ability to relaunch crucial military communication and even weather satellites that are lost to countermeasures by other countries. In 2007, China used a ground-based missile to destroy a satellite orbiting more than 500 miles in space, demonstrating their capacity to target our national security satellites and space defense systems.

The U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission's 2014 report to Congress notes that "China, in 2014, continued to pursue a broad counterspace program to challenge U.S. information superiority in a conflict and disrupt or destroy U.S. satellites if necessary . . . China likely will be able to hold at risk U.S. national security satellites in every orbital regime in the next 5 to 10 years."

Currently, Russia is developing a sea-based missile and space defense system capable of destroying satellites. As other countries modernize their military, the threat level to our communications, navigation, and guided munitions satellites intensifies.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for including some funding for ORS in this year's bills, but I do not believe that it is fully adequate to fund this vital program. Without sufficient funds, ORS cannot produce the space systems that give our military an advantage on the battlefield. It is not in our best interest to solely focus on building satellites that take decades to develop, build, and launch, and cost billions of dollars.

While I believe that ORS is integral to maintaining our advantage in space and bringing much-needed capabilities to our warfighters, I understand the committee is not at this time able to reallocate additional funds to this very important program. I hope to continue to work with the committee as the appropriations process moves forward.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this amendment with Congressman ROONEY, my co-chair of the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force.

Traumatic brain injury continues to be the signature injury among our Nation's servicemembers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. More than 300,000 troops have been diagnosed with mild TBI since 2000. This number continues to increase as identification and detection methods become more accurate. Despite these staggering figures, there was a decrease of 20 percent from last year's funding level. Our amendment would restore the same funding level to the TBI program.

The program supports the DOD's Psychological Health and TBI Center of Excellence in its efforts to educate servicemembers and their families, enhance clinical and management approaches, and facilitate other vital services to best serve the needs of our servicemembers impacted by TBI and psychological health problems.

In recent years, the DOD has made significant strides in improving both in-theater and post-incident assessment and diagnosis, but still more needs to be done in evaluating troops' ability to return to duty. As it is, we are not living up to our responsibility in caring for servicemembers who have already been diagnosed with TBI. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to use this time to heap compliments upon my colleague from New Jersey who heads up the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force and has been providing that leadership and support, and it is certainly bipartisan.

Just for the record, our committee has been very active in supporting this type of work and research. And for the record, our bill provides \$155 million, which includes a plus up of \$100 million above the request level of \$55 million for traumatic brain injury and psychological health research.

In addition, our bill provides \$676 million in operation and maintenance funding within the Defense Health Program to care for servicemembers affected by traumatic brain injuries and psychological maladies.

There has been an issue about the slow spend down of some of the money. Of course, if we are here on the floor advocating, as we should, for such an important program, we need to ensure that the bureaucracy gets the money spent. I am sure my colleague from New Jersey would agree that if we are

going to put money on the table, let's make sure they spend it rapidly to address this ever-growing problem which affects so many people who come off the battlefield. I commend the gentleman and support his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$170,558,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, \$1,634,568,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), and for the necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, \$474,164,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes: *Provided further*, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels, including procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

TITLE VI
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense as authorized by law, \$31,440,009,000; of which \$29,489,521,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed one percent shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017, and of which up to \$13,972,542,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which \$373,287,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, shall be for procurement; and of which \$1,577,201,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount made available under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than \$8,000,000 shall be available for HIV prevention educational activities undertaken in connection with United States military training, exercises, and humanitarian assistance activities conducted primarily in African nations: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than \$597,100,000 shall be made available to the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command to carry out the congressionally directed medical research programs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment that would set aside \$1 million for studying a neglected segment of suicides within our Armed Forces. Our brave men and women in uniform risk their lives every day to keep us safe and free, yet they often don't get the care that they deserve.

While attention has been given to the subject in the past, we have recently seen a need for research that deals with high suicide rates among our female servicemembers and veterans. This week, the Los Angeles Times reported on a recently released study which found female military veterans commit suicide at nearly six times the rate of other women.

□ 1900

This new government research released in the journal of Psychiatric Services went even further, reporting that female veterans between the ages

of 18 and 29 are nearly twelve times more likely to commit suicide than nonmilitary women. We need to do better by the women who risk their lives to protect our Nation. We cannot sit idly by while our female servicemembers and veterans suffer in silence.

My amendment would set aside \$1 million to study the possible causes for this level of suicides among our women in uniform. Service-related causes like traumatic brain injuries and PTSD, in addition to nonservice related factors such as adverse childhood experiences, financial troubles, and other external stressors, must be investigated if we hope to seriously confront this travesty head on.

In addition, according to the VA, the suicide gap between men and women is shrinking. Men typically have higher suicide rates than women. When military service is incorporated, the gap between the two shrinks significantly.

This is a serious problem and one that we don't know enough about to confront. Until we understand why we are seeing this horrific trend, we cannot help the women who bravely serve.

When we are faced with rising generations where female veterans are twelve times more likely than nonmilitary women to commit suicide, we need to take action. My amendment will conduct a study to understand how we got here, so we can move forward and take real action to address this crisis.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR). The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS
DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, \$720,721,000, of which \$139,098,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than \$50,743,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of \$21,289,000 for activities on military installations and \$29,454,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, to assist State and local governments; \$2,281,000 shall be for procurement, to remain available until September 30, 2018, of which \$2,281,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; and \$579,342,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which \$569,339,000 shall only be for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG
ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for

transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for operation and maintenance; for procurement; and for research, development, test and evaluation, \$878,298,000, of which \$616,811,000 shall be for counter-narcotics support; \$113,589,000 shall be for the drug demand reduction program; and \$147,898,000 shall be for the National Guard counter-drug program: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$316,159,000, of which \$314,059,000, shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed \$700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on the Inspector General's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; and of which \$2,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT
AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, \$514,000,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT
ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, \$507,923,000.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service

Act of 1980: *Provided further*, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$4,500,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2016: *Provided further*, That transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

SEC. 8006. (a) With regard to the list of specific programs, projects, and activities (and the dollar amounts and adjustments to budget activities corresponding to such programs, projects, and activities) contained in the tables titled "Explanation of Project Level Adjustments" in the explanatory statement regarding this Act, the obligation and expenditure of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for those programs, projects, and activities for which the amounts appropriated exceed the amounts requested are hereby required by law to be carried out in the manner provided by such tables to the same extent as if the tables were included in the text of this Act.

(b) Amounts specified in the referenced tables described in subsection (a) shall not be treated as subdivisions of appropriations for purposes of section 8005 of this Act: *Provided*, That section 8005 shall apply when transfers of the amounts described in subsection (a) occur between appropriation accounts.

SEC. 8007. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by budget activity and program, project, and activity as detailed in the Budget Appendix; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) Notwithstanding section 8005 of this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional defense committees, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8008. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: *Provided*, That transfers may be made between such funds: *Provided further*, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense" appropriation and the "Operation and Maintenance" appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer: *Provided further*, that except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8010. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of \$20,000,000 in any one year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of \$20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of \$20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement

contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed \$500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 30-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used for a multiyear contract executed after the date of the enactment of this Act unless in the case of any such contract—

(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to Congress a budget request for full funding of units to be procured through the contract and, in the case of a contract for procurement of aircraft, that includes, for any aircraft unit to be procured through the contract for which procurement funds are requested in that budget request for production beyond advance procurement activities in the fiscal year covered by the budget, full funding of procurement of such unit in that fiscal year;

(2) cancellation provisions in the contract do not include consideration of recurring manufacturing costs of the contractor associated with the production of unfunded units to be delivered under the contract;

(3) the contract provides that payments to the contractor under the contract shall not be made in advance of incurred costs on funded units; and

(4) the contract does not provide for a price adjustment based on a failure to award a follow-on contract.

SEC. 8011. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported as required by section 401(d) of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99-239: *Provided further*, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities, on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8012. (a) During fiscal year 2016, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 2017 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation

supporting the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2017.

(c) As required by section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) civilian personnel at the Department of Army Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories may not be managed on the basis of the Table of Distribution and Allowances, and the management of the workforce strength shall be done in a manner consistent with the budget available with respect to such Laboratories.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

SEC. 8013. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: *Provided further*, That this section applies only to active components of the Army.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8015. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8016. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, the term "manufactured" shall include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): *Provided further*, That for the purpose of this section substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States: *Provided further*, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense in the current fis-

cal year or any fiscal year hereafter may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M-1 Carbines, M-1 Garand rifles, M-14 rifles, .22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M-1911 pistols, or to demilitarize or destroy small arms ammunition or ammunition components that are not otherwise prohibited from commercial sale under Federal law, unless the small arms ammunition or ammunition components are certified by the Secretary of the Army or designee as unserviceable or unsafe for further use.

SEC. 8018. No more than \$500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8019. Of the funds made available in this Act, \$15,000,000 shall be available for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): *Provided*, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code, shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544) whenever the prime contract or subcontract amount is over \$500,000 and involves the expenditure of funds appropriated by an Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense with respect to any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1906 of title 41, United States Code, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code.

SEC. 8020. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8021. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed \$350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: *Provided*, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8022. (a) Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than \$39,500,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) \$27,400,000 shall be available from "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force" to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counter-drug activities, and drug demand reduction activities involving youth programs;

(2) \$10,400,000 shall be available from "Air-craft Procurement, Air Force"; and

(3) \$1,700,000 shall be available from "Other Procurement, Air Force" for vehicle procurement.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force should waive reimbursement for any funds used by the Civil Air Patrol for counter-drug activities in support of Federal, State, and local government agencies.

SEC. 8023. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administered by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: *Provided*, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2016 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2016, not more than 5,750 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for defense FFRDCs: *Provided*, That of the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,125 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to staff years funded in the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Military Intelligence Program (MIP).

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department's fiscal year 2017 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for FFRDCs is hereby reduced by \$88,400,000.

SEC. 8024. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: *Provided*, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement

may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8025. For the purposes of this Act, the term “congressional defense committees” means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8026. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: *Provided*, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or Defense Agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: *Provided further*, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8027. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary’s blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2016. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term “Buy American Act” means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 8028. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8029. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air

Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Ellsworth Air Force Base, and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the request for such units that are submitted to the Secretary by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington. Any such conveyance shall be subject to the condition that the housing units shall be removed within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) The Operation Walking Shield Program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of Indian tribes for housing units under subsection (a) before submitting requests to the Secretary of the Air Force under subsection (b).

(d) In this section, the term “Indian tribe” means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

SEC. 8030. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than \$250,000.

SEC. 8031. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) disestablish, or prepare to disestablish, a Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps program in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction Number 1215.08, dated June 26, 2006; or

(2) close, downgrade from host to extension center, or place on probation a Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps program in accordance with the information paper of the Department of the Army titled “Army Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (SROTC) Program Review and Criteria”, dated January 27, 2014.

SEC. 8032. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2017 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted

for in a proposed fiscal year 2017 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8033. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Services Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal year shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3093) shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

SEC. 8034. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8035. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, not less than \$12,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8036. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term “Buy American Act” means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a “Made in America” inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8037. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to insure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than \$25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8038. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program;

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats;

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense; or

(4) an Air Force field operating agency established to administer the Air Force Mortuary Affairs Program and Mortuary Operations for the Department of Defense and authorized Federal entities.

SEC. 8039. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by Department of Defense civilian employees unless—

(1) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that, over all performance periods stated in the solicitation of offers for performance of the activity or function, the cost of performance of the activity or function by a contractor would be less costly to the Department of Defense by an amount that equals or exceeds the lesser of—

(A) 10 percent of the most efficient organization's personnel-related costs for performance of that activity or function by Federal employees; or

(B) \$10,000,000; and

(3) the contractor does not receive an advantage for a proposal that would reduce costs for the Department of Defense by—

(A) not making an employer-sponsored health insurance plan available to the workers who are to be employed in the performance of that activity or function under the contract; or

(B) offering to such workers an employer-sponsored health benefits plan that requires the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than the amount that is paid by the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(b)(1) The Department of Defense, without regard to subsection (a) of this section or subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, and notwithstanding any administrative regulation, requirement, or policy to the contrary shall have full authority to enter into a contract for the performance of any commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that—

(A) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (section 8503 of title 41, United States Code);

(B) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or

(C) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under at least 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)), or a Native Hawaiian Organization, as defined in section 8(a)(15) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15)).

(2) This section shall not apply to depot contracts or contracts for depot maintenance as provided in sections 2469 and 2474 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) The conversion of any activity or function of the Department of Defense under the authority provided by this section shall be credited toward any competitive or outsourcing goal, target, or measurement that may be established by statute, regulation, or policy and is deemed to be awarded under the authority of, and in compliance with, subsection (h) of section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, for the competition or outsourcing of commercial activities.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 8040. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism or as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended:

(1) "Other Procurement, Army", 2014/2016, \$40,000,000;

(2) "Aircraft Procurement, Navy", 2014/2016, \$91,571,000;

(3) "Weapons Procurement, Navy", 2014/2016, \$888,000;

(4) "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", 2014/2016, \$2,300,000;

(5) "Missile Procurement, Air Force", 2014/2016, \$1,000,000;

(6) "Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force", 2014/2016, \$12,600,000;

(7) "Other Procurement, Air Force", 2014/2016, \$14,000,000;

(8) "Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army", 2015/2017, \$30,000,000;

(9) "Other Procurement, Army", 2015/2017, \$30,000,000;

(10) "Aircraft Procurement, Navy", 2015/2017, \$49,377,000;

(11) "Weapons Procurement, Navy", 2015/2017, \$15,422,000;

(12) "Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps", 2015/2017, \$8,906,000;

(13) "Procurement, Marine Corps", 2015/2017, \$88,996,000;

(14) "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", 2015/2017, \$108,870,000;

(15) "Missile Procurement, Air Force", 2015/2017, \$75,000,000;

(16) "Other Procurement, Air Force", 2015/2017, \$8,000,000;

(17) "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", 2015/2016, \$232,228,000; and

(18) "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force", 2015/2016, \$60,271,000.

SEC. 8041. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military technicians (dual status) of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military technicians (dual status), unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8043. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program: *Provided*, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8044. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8045. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such

an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of "commercial items", as defined by section 103 of title 41, United States Code, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end items.

SEC. 8046. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, \$44,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, the Secretary shall make grants in the amounts specified as follows: \$20,000,000 to the United Service Organizations and \$24,000,000 to the Red Cross.

SEC. 8047. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8048. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the Small Business Innovation Research program and the Small Business Technology Transfer program set-asides may be taken from programs, projects, or activities to the extent they contribute to the extramural budget.

SEC. 8049. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8050. During the current fiscal year, no more than \$30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8051. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101-510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note): *Provided*, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and recorded against the expired account: *Provided further*, That the total amount charged to a current appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8052. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8053. Using funds made available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: *Provided*, That in the City of Kaiserslautern and at the Rhine Ordnance Barracks area, such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: *Provided further*, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

□ 1915

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 4 that is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8053.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Each year, the Department of Defense ships coal from Tamaqua, Pennsylvania, about 3,000 miles away to an Air Force base in Germany, costing taxpayers millions of dollars more than if we simply treated this particular base like every other military base in the world.

Why do we do this?

Since 1972, each Defense Appropriations act has included an earmark re-

quiring that the Pentagon purchase anthracite coal from Pennsylvania to heat this base in Kaiserslautern, Germany. This is wasteful spending, pure and simple.

My bipartisan amendment, which I am offering with my colleague TOM MCCLINTOCK, would finally remove this zombie earmark and save taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

At its peak, this earmark mandated that the government purchase more than a million tons of anthracite coal each year to power overseas bases and installations, but today, the Department of Defense purchases only about 5,000 to 9,000 tons of coal annually, and it is to meet the requirements of this specific base in Kaiserslautern. It costs taxpayers millions of dollars each time. According to the last study we did on this, which was way back in 1989, the Department of Defense, the State Department, and the Department of Commerce jointly concluded that these mandates had cost U.S. taxpayers \$1.1 billion, and that was 26 years ago, so it is a lot more since then.

For decades, the Pentagon has urged Congress to remove this wasteful earmark and allow the use of cheaper fuel to power our military base in Germany. President after President has urged the removal of this earmark—both Republicans and Democrats—every President since Jimmy Carter and including President Ronald Reagan. Today, we have an opportunity to finally achieve that goal.

I want to thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for his leadership in introducing this amendment with me.

The passage of this amendment would be proof positive, I think, to Americans back home that Republicans and Democrats can work together to cut wasteful spending. I urge my colleagues to support the Huffman-McClintock amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I don't support the war on coal that is waged by some of my friends on the left, but I do support the war on waste, and I support this amendment based upon that fiscal imperative.

Just a few weeks ago, so-called defense hawks demanded spending well in excess of budget caps because, they said, our defense spending had been stretched to the breaking point. In light of those warnings, I find it inexcusable that these scarce defense dollars would be so recklessly squandered to continue to fund a corrupt earmark from a disgraced and deceased Pennsylvania Congressman, an earmark that dates back more than 40 years.

That earmark, as my friend has just said, requires that one—and only one—

American Air Force base must purchase 9,000 tons of Pennsylvania anthracite coal a year at the grossly inflated price that is estimated to be about \$20 million. That is about 80 percent more expensive than commonly used coal, and that doesn't include the cost of transporting this overpriced coal across the Atlantic Ocean and halfway across the European continent—a cost that is absorbed elsewhere in the Air Force budget. The excuse is that we would otherwise be dependent on Putin, but that doesn't hold water. No other U.S. military base in all of Europe is required to buy this coal, only Kaiserslautern.

The Pentagon and successive Presidents have consistently protested this waste, but these protests have fallen on deaf ears in Congress even while we are told our defense spending has been cut to the bone.

If we don't change the spending trajectory of this government, the Congressional Budget Office warns, in the next 10 years, just paying the interest on the national debt will greatly exceed our entire Defense budget. That makes rooting out waste like this a national defense imperative.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not an expert in coal, and I am not an expert in what these men describe as an earmark, but I do know that coal is reliable, that it is cost-effective, that it is domestically produced, and that it has been used at this Air Force base for a long time. This provision both promotes domestic resources of energy and ensures that our bases and that particular base have a reliable, continuous source of energy for their daily operations.

I don't think we ought to dismiss the notion that Germany is under attack by Russian aggression, and Russia would at any time cut off fuel supplies, as they have done to other countries in Eastern Europe. Europe, as an area, as a continent, remains heavily reliant on Russia for its energy, and Russia uses its leverage on an annual basis to quiet potential opposition to that aggression in Ukraine and other parts of the region. This is a stark reminder of how important it is to ensure that our military has a reliable domestic source of energy wherever it is in the world. This may be an unusual circumstance, but I see no reason to change it. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have well over 30 other defense installations in Germany and hundreds of others across the globe. To my knowledge—and I have made inquiries on this subject—not a single one of those in-

stallations operates with a congressionally mandated fuel source like the one we are talking about here. The Kaiserslautern facility is, truly, one of a kind.

This is a commonsense amendment that provides the Pentagon the flexibility to ensure that our military installations continue to have reliable, cheaper, and cleaner energy sources in the years ahead. The congressional mandate in question was added to the Defense Appropriations bill over 40 years ago to an accumulated cost of well over \$1 billion to the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about our national security. This is not a weapons system. This is not funding to support or protect our troops. This isn't doing anything for our country or our national security except wasting taxpayer dollars and making one particular coal company in eastern Pennsylvania a little bit richer.

I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" and support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8054. Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide", \$20,000,000 shall be for support of high priority Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program requirements and activities, including the training and funding of personnel: *Provided*, That the funds are made available for transfer to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force: *Provided further*, That funds transferred shall be merged with and available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which the funds are transferred: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

SEC. 8055. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: *Provided*, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: *Provided further*, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Intelligence Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8056. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with re-

spect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country, or would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section XI (chapters 50–65) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 7304.49, 7306.40, 7502 through 7508, 8105, 8108, 8109, 8211, 8215, and 9404.

SEC. 8057. (a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any training, equipment, or other assistance for a unit of a foreign security force if the Secretary of Defense has credible information that the unit has committed a gross violation of human rights.

(2) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to provide any training, equipment, or other assistance to a unit of a foreign security force full consideration is given to any credible information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by such unit.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that the government of such country has taken all necessary corrective steps, or if the equipment or other assistance is necessary to assist in disaster relief operations or other humanitarian or national security emergencies.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish, and periodically update, procedures to ensure that any information in the possession of the Department of Defense about gross violations of human rights by units of foreign security forces is shared on a timely basis with the Department of State.

(e) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the application of any exception under subsection (b) or the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report—

(1) in the case of an exception under subsection (b), providing notice of the use of the exception and stating the grounds for the exception; and

(2) in the case of a waiver under subsection (c), describing the information relating to

the gross violation of human rights; the extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the waiver; the purpose and duration of the training, equipment, or other assistance; and the United States forces and the foreign security force unit involved.

SEC. 8058. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Department of Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8059. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide" for any new start advanced concept technology demonstration project or joint capability demonstration project may only be obligated 45 days after a report, including a description of the project, the planned acquisition and transition strategy and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8060. The Secretary of Defense shall provide a classified quarterly report beginning 30 days after enactment of this Act, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Subcommittees on Defense on certain matters as directed in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

SEC. 8061. Notwithstanding section 12310(b) of title 10, United States Code, a Reserve who is a member of the National Guard serving on full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, may perform duties in support of the ground-based elements of the National Ballistic Missile Defense System.

SEC. 8062. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any non-governmental entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a center-fire cartridge and a United States military nomenclature designation of "armor penetrator", "armor piercing (AP)", "armor piercing incendiary (API)", or "armor-piercing incendiary tracer (API-T)", except to an entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8063. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in section 508(d) of title 32, United States Code, or any other youth, social, or fraternal nonprofit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

SEC. 8064. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds for resale (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia, in which the military installation is located: *Provided*, That in a case in which the military installation is located in more than one State, purchases may be made in any State in which the installation is located: *Provided further*, That such local procurement requirements for malt beverages and wine shall apply to all alcoholic beverages only for military installations in States which are not contiguous with another State: *Provided further*, That alcoholic beverages other than wine and malt beverages, in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8065. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$76,611,750 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects carrying out the purposes of this section: *Provided further*, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: *Provided further*, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local law to the maximum extent consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8066. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to take any action to modify—

(1) the appropriations account structure for the National Intelligence Program budget, including through the creation of a new appropriation or new appropriation account;

(2) how the National Intelligence Program budget request is presented in the unclassified P-1, R-1, and O-1 documents supporting the Department of Defense budget request;

(3) the process by which the National Intelligence Program appropriations are apportioned to the executing agencies; or

(4) the process by which the National Intelligence Program appropriations are allotted, obligated and disbursed.

(b) Nothing in section (a) shall be construed to prohibit the merger of programs or changes to the National Intelligence Program budget at or below the Expenditure Center level, provided such change is otherwise in accordance with paragraphs (a)(1)-(3).

(c) The Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense may jointly, only for the purposes of achieving auditable financial statements and improving fiscal reporting, study and develop detailed proposals for alternative financial management processes. Such study shall include a comprehensive counterintelligence risk assessment to ensure that none of the alternative processes will adversely affect counterintelligence.

(d) Upon development of the detailed proposals defined under subsection (c), the Di-

rector of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) provide the proposed alternatives to all affected agencies;

(2) receive certification from all affected agencies attesting that the proposed alternatives will help achieve auditability, improve fiscal reporting, and will not adversely affect counterintelligence; and

(3) not later than 30 days after receiving all necessary certifications under paragraph (2), present the proposed alternatives and certifications to the congressional defense and intelligence committees.

(e) This section shall not be construed to alter or affect the application of section 1623 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 to the amounts made available by this Act.

SEC. 8067. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, \$5,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8068. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the headings "Procurement, Defense-Wide" and "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", \$487,595,000 shall be for the Israeli Cooperative Programs: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$55,000,000 shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats, subject to the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome Procurement Agreement, as amended; \$286,526,000 shall be for the Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) program, including cruise missile defense research and development under the SRBMD program, of which \$15,000,000 shall be for production activities of SRBMD missiles in the United States and in Israel to meet Israel's defense requirements consistent with each nation's laws, regulations, and procedures; \$89,550,000 shall be for an upper-tier component to the Israeli Missile Defense Architecture; and \$56,519,000 shall be for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range, ground and airborne, detection suite: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this provision for production of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and equipment, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8069. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", \$389,305,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: *Provided*, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds to the following appropriations in the amounts specified: *Provided further*, That the amounts

transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred to:

(1) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2008/2016: Carrier Replacement Program \$123,760,000;

(2) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2009/2016: LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program \$22,860,000;

(3) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2012/2016: CVN Refueling Overhauls Program \$20,029,000;

(4) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2012/2016: DDG-51 Destroyer \$75,014,000;

(5) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2012/2016: Littoral Combat Ship \$82,674,000;

(6) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2012/2016: Amphibious Transport Dock Program \$38,733,000;

(7) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2012/2016: Joint High Speed Vessel \$22,597,000; and

(8) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2013/2016: Joint High Speed Vessel \$3,638,000.

SEC. 8070. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094) during fiscal year 2016 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

SEC. 8071. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8072. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2017 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces’ participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Operation and Maintenance accounts, the Procurement accounts, and the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation accounts: *Provided*, That these documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, troop strength for each Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include budget exhibits OP-5 and OP-32 (as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation) for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years.

SEC. 8073. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system.

SEC. 8074. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to

favorable foreign exchange rates, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by \$1,152,206,000.

SEC. 8075. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act: *Provided*, That the Air Force shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season.

SEC. 8076. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information has been lawfully collected and processed during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: *Provided*, That information pertaining to United States persons shall only be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No. 12333.

SEC. 8077. (a) At the time members of reserve components of the Armed Forces are called or ordered to active duty under section 12302(a) of title 10, United States Code, each member shall be notified in writing of the expected period during which the member will be mobilized.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 8078. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to transfer research and development, acquisition, or other program authority relating to current tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAVs) from the Army.

(b) The Army shall retain responsibility for and operational control of the MQ-1C Gray Eagle Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in order to support the Secretary of Defense in matters relating to the employment of unmanned aerial vehicles.

SEC. 8079. Up to \$15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Navy” may be made available for the Asia Pacific Regional Initiative Program for the purpose of enabling the Pacific Command to execute Theater Security Cooperation activities such as humanitarian assistance, and payment of incremental and personnel costs of training and exercising with foreign security forces: *Provided*, That funds made available for this purpose may be used, notwithstanding any other funding authorities for humanitarian assistance, security assistance or combined exercise expenses: *Provided further*, That funds may not be obligated to provide assistance to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

SEC. 8080. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for research and technology, which shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

SEC. 8081. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion,

Navy” shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy” appropriations in any prior fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8082. (a) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President’s budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation by Expenditure Center and project; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional intelligence committees, unless the Director of National Intelligence certifies in writing to the congressional intelligence committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

SEC. 8083. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to eliminate, restructure, or realign Army Contracting Command-New Jersey or make disproportionate personnel reductions at any Army Contracting Command-New Jersey sites without 30-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8084. None of the funds made available by this Act for excess defense articles, assistance under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 119 Stat. 3456), or peacekeeping operations for the countries designated annually to be in violation of the standards of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-457; 22 U.S.C. 2370c-1) may be used to support any military training or operation that includes child soldiers, as defined by the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008, unless such assistance is otherwise permitted under section 404 of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8085. Of the funds appropriated in the Intelligence Community Management Account for the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment, \$20,000,000 is available for transfer by the Director of National Intelligence to other departments and agencies for purposes of Government-wide information sharing activities: *Provided*, That funds transferred under this provision are to be merged with and available for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Office of Management and Budget must approve any transfers made under this provision.

SEC. 8086. (a) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(d)) that—

(1) creates a new start effort;

(2) terminates a program with appropriated funding of \$10,000,000 or more;

(3) transfers funding into or out of the National Intelligence Program; or

(4) transfers funding between appropriations, unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(d)) that results in a cumulative increase or decrease of the levels specified in the classified annex accompanying the Act unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

SEC. 8087. The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress each year, at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress that year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years intelligence program (including associated annexes) reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such future-years intelligence program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 8088. For the purposes of this Act, the term "congressional intelligence committees" means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 8089. The Department of Defense shall continue to report incremental contingency operations costs for Operation Inherent Resolve, Operation Freedom's Sentinel, and any named successor operations, on a monthly basis and any other operation designated and identified by the Secretary of Defense for the purposes of section 127a of title 10, United States Code, on a semi-annual basis in the Cost of War Execution Report as prescribed in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation Department of Defense Instruction 7000.14, Volume 12, Chapter 23 "Contingency Operations", Annex 1, dated September 2005.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8090. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed \$11,000,000 from each of the appropriations made in title II of this Act for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", and "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force" may be transferred by the military department concerned to its central fund established for Fisher Houses and Suites pursuant to section 2493(d) of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8091. Funds appropriated by this Act may be available for the purpose of making remittances and transfers to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund in accordance with section 1705 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8092. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public Web site of that agency any report required

to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

SEC. 8093. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract for an amount in excess of \$1,000,000, unless the contractor agrees not to—

(1) enter into any agreement with any of its employees or independent contractors that requires, as a condition of employment, that the employee or independent contractor agree to resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention; or

(2) take any action to enforce any provision of an existing agreement with an employee or independent contractor that mandates that the employee or independent contractor resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract unless the contractor certifies that it requires each covered subcontractor to agree not to enter into, and not to take any action to enforce any provision of, any agreement as described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), with respect to any employee or independent contractor performing work related to such subcontract. For purposes of this subsection, a "covered subcontractor" is an entity that has a subcontract in excess of \$1,000,000 on a contract subject to subsection (a).

(c) The prohibitions in this section do not apply with respect to a contractor's or subcontractor's agreements with employees or independent contractors that may not be enforced in a court of the United States.

(d) The Secretary of Defense may waive the application of subsection (a) or (b) to a particular contractor or subcontractor for the purposes of a particular contract or subcontract if the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary personally determines that the waiver is necessary to avoid harm to national security interests of the United States, and that the term of the contract or subcontract is not longer than necessary to avoid such harm. The determination shall set forth with specificity the grounds for the waiver and for the contract or subcontract term selected, and shall state any alternatives considered in lieu of a waiver and the reasons each such alternative would not avoid harm to national security interests of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall transmit to Congress, and simultaneously make public, any determination under this subsection not less than 15 business days before the contract or subcontract addressed in the determination may be awarded.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8094. From within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this Act, up to \$121,000,000, shall be available for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, Public Law 111-84: *Provided*, That for purposes of section 1704(b), the facility operations funded are operations of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110-417: *Provided further*, That additional funds may be transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 8095. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall not employ more senior executive employees than are specified in the classified annex.

SEC. 8096. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used for the purchase of heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of \$450,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 8097. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used by the Department of Defense or a component thereof in contravention of sections 1661, 1662, or 1663 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

SEC. 8098. The Secretary of Defense shall report quarterly the numbers of civilian personnel end strength by appropriation account for each and every appropriation account used to finance Federal civilian personnel salaries to the congressional defense committees within 15 days after the end of each fiscal quarter.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8099. Upon a determination by the Director of National Intelligence that such action is necessary and in the national interest, the Director may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act for the National Intelligence Program: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen intelligence requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2016.

SEC. 8100. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HARDY). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8100.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Indiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered deals with the detainees at Guantanamo Bay. I would suggest to my colleagues that the continued operation of the facility at Guantanamo Bay reduces our Nation's credibility and weakens our national security by providing terrorist organizations with recruitment material.

I do regret that the bill and other relevant appropriations acts continue this or any attempts to close Guantanamo by prohibiting viable alternatives. Also, as we are debating an appropriation bill, and this committee has to pay for things, I think it is appropriate to discuss the cost of the detention facility at Guantanamo. We are now spending approximately \$2.7 million annually per inmate, which is about 35 times the cost per inmate in a super-maximum Federal prison in the United States.

The United States Government has transferred approximately 620 detainees from Guantanamo since May of 2002, with 532 transfers occurring during President Bush's administration and slightly in excess of 88 transfers occurring during the current administration.

Nearly 500 defendants charged with crimes related to international terrorism have been—and I would emphasize this to my colleagues—successfully convicted in the United States since 2001. It includes one former GTMO detainee who was tried in New York City, the Times Square bomber; Richard Reid, the shoe bomber; and others. All of them are incarcerated in our Federal prisons throughout the United States, and there have been no security incidents. Further, there are six Defense Department facilities where Guantanamo Bay detainees could be held in the United States that are currently only at 48 percent of their end capacity.

I would ask my colleagues to adopt this amendment so we could move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), who is a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. These important provisions that are already included in the law have been included in the past several appropriations bills for several years running, and there is a reason that they are there. This wording represents a strong and enduring consensus in Congress that Guantanamo should remain open and that detainees should not be transferred to the United States for any reason. This is debated back and forth in agreement on both sides of the aisle.

Striking these provisions would have unknown consequences for a number of U.S. communities, and it is impossible for any of us to know how many detainees might be brought there, where they might be held, and the impacts on communities and facilities that are holding them. It is also impossible to know what the cost might be, so we are asking for this unknown to be pursued without knowing the risks or knowing the costs.

Putting detainees in U.S. prisons, as the administration originally proposed, would be disruptive and potentially disastrous. We know former FBI Director Mueller had stated: To transfer detainees to local jails could affect or infect other prisoners or have the capability of affecting events outside the prison system.

The last thing we need today in the face of ISIS is to convert more folks to extremism. The idea of bringing detainees for trials in the United States quickly collapsed as local jurisdictions voiced their strong opposition. We heard that across the United States.

As everyone here is aware, several detainees that have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and killed and wounded Americans. The threat is real, and Guantanamo is already equipped to handle the detention and military trial of these individuals as appropriate. Any proposal that results in these detainees being sent to the United States for any reason is simply the wrong policy. We have tread this ground time and time and time again.

I therefore oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, let me thank the gentleman for his comments, and may I add emphasis to what he said.

The thought that people that have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and been involved in the killing of Americans in the Middle East is repugnant and

makes all of us angry. That is literally what has happened. We read about it in open sources, and we can speculate because I think sometimes these things are not reported, that a lot of these people that have been released have gone back and actually headed up efforts to ambush our soldiers and kill our soldiers and seek vengeance. In reality, I am glad these people continue to be locked away.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would simply say that the gentleman from Virginia noted that there is supposition and unknown in the future, and that is certainly correct. What is known is that we are a nation of laws, and our military protects this country so that we can continue to be governed by those laws. I, for one, happen to think that the indefinite detention of any human being without a trial is violative of those laws, and that that is a foundational principle of our Nation, and we ought to conduct ourselves accordingly. I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8101. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8101.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which would strike the section of the bill restricting the use of funds for building and modifying facilities in the United States to house prisoners presently at Guantanamo Bay.

The argument for why we should strike this section is straightforward. The detainees at Guantanamo Bay must be brought to justice. Those who are guilty of terrorism need to be tried and punished in a swift and judicious manner. Any detainee who is innocent should, with equal speed and sincerity, be released.

Two cases exemplify this argument and underline the importance of this amendment. The first is Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind behind the attack on the United States on 9/11. Since 2006, Mr. Mohammed has been detained at Guantanamo, where he has yet to be tried, convicted, or appropriately punished for his heinous actions. Justice for the victims, for the families who lost loved ones at the World Trade Center, at the Pentagon, and in Pennsylvania must be carried out. So far, this has not happened.

At the same time, while they haven't managed to try and convict anyone at Guantanamo, more than 400 terrorists, including the 9/11 conspirator Zacarias Moussaoui, have been tried, convicted, and sentenced in the Federal courts in the United States without incident and in a manner befitting the American justice system. No convicted terrorist has ever escaped from a U.S. prison, and no prison has ever been compromised or been subject to an attack because of the dangerous persons being held within.

The second case I want to mention is of Mr. Shaker Aamer, which came to my attention in a recent New York Times editorial or op-ed piece authored by a bipartisan group of British members of Parliament. In November 2001, Mr. Aamer, a British permanent resident, was doing charity work in Afghanistan when he was picked up by the Northern Alliance, sold to Americans for a bounty, and taken to Bagram prison before being moved to Guantanamo in February 2002. He was cleared for release by President Bush in 2007 and cleared again by President Obama in 2010. Six different U.S. agencies agreed, including the CIA, the FBI, the Departments of State and Defense, while Prime Minister David Cameron and the House of Commons unanimously have called for Mr. Aamer's immediate release and transfer to Britain.

□ 1945

So far, this has not happened. Mr. Aamer has never been charged with anything and has twice been cleared for transfer. Every American agency that has looked at this says that he has not been a terrorist and did not fight against the United States. There is no reason for him to remain in this custodial purgatory; yet he remains a detainee at the Guantanamo Bay facility.

As long as this provision remains in the bill, people like Mr. Aamer, guilty of nothing—not terrorists, not fighters against the United States—will be unjustly imprisoned, and people like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed who are guilty—probably, we think—of terrorism will not be tried.

For too long, the terrible people in Guantanamo have avoided facing the consequences of answering to a U.S. court for their horrendous actions, while innocent detainees are denied recourse for continuing their detention.

The United States must not keep people in prison indefinitely for no reason, with no trial. The opponents of this amendment must not share my faith in America's courts to deliver justice. For hundreds of years, our legal system has kept Americans safe by imprisoning dangerous individuals while protecting those who are innocent of any charges.

Time and time again, Federal courts have successfully proven their ability to convict criminals and terrorists without violating the rights of due process. This amendment represents a return to our founding principles, that no person may be deprived of liberty without due process of law.

Without this amendment, we will continue to hold terrorists and innocents alike, indefinitely and without charge, contrary to every tradition this country stands for.

We must close this facility, try these people, release the innocent, and restore our national honor.

I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise again in opposition to this amendment.

We see that today, Guantanamo is equipped to hold these detainees. The military tribunals there, if allowed to do so, are able to try these detainees. Again, they were captured under the rules of engagement as enemy combatants. Let's make sure that we are putting them in that situation to be tried as such.

Another element, too, is localities have spoken vocally to say, No, we do not want these detainees here, for a va-

riety reasons. One is they are worried about security there. I know the argument is, Well, the facilities here in the United States can hold them. That is not the single issue. The issue is the communities' concern about what the outcomes of the movement of these detainees will be here today.

We see today radicalization across the United States from outside the United States by forces like ISIS. Think about the opportunity as those detainees are moved here and the notoriety that they will attain and how the press will cover it and that being used in addition to radicalize folks on the side of extremism. That is another issue that I believe needs to be addressed.

Again, GTMO is working. It is detaining these individuals, enemy combatants that have been picked up on the battlefield. It has been, I believe, the determination of this body through extensive debate that we shouldn't build facilities here specifically for that purpose and that GTMO is well suited to do the job.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. The continued repetition of untruths does not make them true.

Not all these people were captured on the battlefield. Mr. Aamer, whom I referenced, for example, was picked up doing charity work in Afghanistan. He was picked up by a faction of the Northern Alliance, which then sold him for a bounty to the United States. He was not a fighter. He was not on the battlefield. He was a victim of a kidnapping by a foreign faction.

Everyone who has looked at this—President Bush, President Obama, the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, the British Parliament—agrees on the facts with him; yet we hear that everybody was a fighter. No, they weren't. Some were; probably most were.

We are told that military tribunals will try these people. Well, Mr. Aamer has been in Guantanamo for 9 years. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed has been in Guantanamo for 15 years. They can't get their act together. Every time they try to hold military tribunals, there is another legal objection. Federal courts have tried, convicted, and imprisoned 400 terrorists.

We have to do justice. Keeping people in jail indefinitely because we repeat that they were caught on the battlefield, when some were not, hoping for a military tribunal that doesn't occur, is not American. It is un-American.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8102. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity except in accordance with section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8102.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third of the three amendments that have the same purpose. This one would strike the section of the bill that makes it more difficult to transfer Guantanamo detainees to other countries.

I find it surrealistic. We have now debated two amendments tonight, and all we hear in opposition are repeated statements that everyone at Guantanamo is a terrorist—not true—and that everyone in Guantanamo is picked up on the foreign battlefield, fighting—not true. It is demonstrably not true.

These are not debatable propositions. Some of the people in Guantanamo are terrorists. Some of the people in Guantanamo are picked up on the battlefield. Some were not.

I gave you the example of Mr. Aamer, who was picked up by a foreign faction in the Northern Alliance and sold for a bounty because the United States offered a bounty for people who someone claimed was a terrorist. Everyone looked into it and said he wasn't a terrorist, he wasn't a combatant; yet he stays in Guantanamo.

It costs us \$3 million per prisoner, per year. There are communities in the United States which can handle these trials. I can think of no honest reason why we would not want the terrorists to be tried.

The terrorists cannot be tried by military tribunal; let them try it, but the fact is they haven't been able to. They have been trying the military tribunals for 10 years now, and they haven't succeeded in convicting one person. They have had three plea bar-

gains, no convictions, and no trials in the last 8 or 9 years.

The Federal courts are functioning. Why not save money, try the people we think are guilty, get a guilty verdict, put them in maximum security prisons, and not hold people indefinitely without charge and without trial? That is simply un-American.

Finally, we are engaged in an ideological war. Someone referenced radicalizing people. What radicalizes people more, what gives more evidence of the American bad faith and of anti-Islamic sentiments of terrible behavior than Guantanamo? It is a symbol worldwide. It is a radicalizing influence. Our own generals have said that nothing has recruited more enemy soldiers than Guantanamo.

Let's close it, take care of the people who are there one way or the other, and do justice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. I thank the chairman for yielding.

The gentleman from New York raised a good question. He said:

I can think of no honest reason why these terrorists have not been prosecuted in a military tribunal.

I can give him the answer to that. I don't know if my friend from New York has actually been to Guantanamo Bay, but in 2010, I went there. As the administration came into office, if the gentleman met with the prosecutor at that time, he had assembled a team that had worked for over 2 years trying and prosecuting the terrorists of the World Trade Center attack.

That prosecutor had gone through a stack of hearings this tall that he had prevailed on. His life had been threatened. His team's life had been threatened. He told all of us, Democrats and Republicans who went down there, that he would have guilty pleas on all those terrorists within 6 months.

To answer the gentleman as to why that didn't happen, it is because, when the administration came into office, they canceled that prosecution, took him off the case, disbanded that whole prosecution; and to this day, they have not allowed that prosecution to go forward.

If you want to ask the real, honest question of why we haven't prosecuted them in the military tribunals—the gentleman from Virginia said the facilities are there, the will was there, the hearings were there. The reason is because this administration has refused to prosecute them.

I hope we will defeat these amendments, keep those terrorists there, or let this administration prosecute them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, what is really surrealistic around here, to use the gentleman's word, is that we spend more time on these Guantanamo detainees than we do on Americans locked up in Iranian prisons and jails—that is unconscionable—or with Americans detained in North Korea.

Let's focus on liberty for some of the people in those countries that we are trying to work with on the nuclear deal, such as the Iranians holding Americans prisoners.

You have the right to focus on these detainees. Ninety-nine percent of them are guilty as hell, but we seem to be doing little in the public way to release Americans held in prisons in various parts of the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, we all obviously want to free Americans unjustly held by North Korea or Iran or anybody else. I suspect the reason that we don't spend a lot of time on the floor is because we all agree. There is nothing to debate. We obviously want them freed.

I hope our government behind the scenes is doing whatever we can to do it; we should do whatever we can publicly, but that has nothing to do with Guantanamo.

The fact of the matter is it isn't that the administration decided not to prosecute people by military tribunals. That is not the case. It is that every time the Bush administration or the Obama administration tried to prosecute—and they have continued to try—another legal obstacle comes up. They have never worked it out.

Appeal after appeal has shut the process down. I should say judicial decision after judicial decision as a result of appeal after appeal has shut the process down because they haven't managed to find a military tribunal procedure that gives enough constitutional rights to pass judicial muster, but is short of a Federal article III court. That is why 400 terrorists have been convicted in article III Federal courts—and no terrorists—let them be tried properly, and let the innocent be freed.

We can't simply stand here and say they are all guilty. How do we know that? How do we know that every single one of them is guilty? We know that some are not. By what right do we hold those who are guilty of nothing forever? It is a blot on American justice; it is a blot on our country's representation, and we should stop it.

I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8103. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

SEC. 8104. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for any agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

SEC. 8105. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense, or any other official or officer of the Department of Defense, to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, or make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to Rosoboronexport or any subsidiary of Rosoboronexport.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, determines that it is in the vital national security interest of the United States to do so, and certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that, to the best of the Secretary's knowledge:

(1) Rosoboronexport has ceased the transfer of lethal military equipment to, and the maintenance of existing lethal military equipment for, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic;

(2) the armed forces of the Russian Federation have withdrawn from Crimea, other than armed forces present on military bases subject to agreements in force between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of Ukraine; and

(3) agents of the Russian Federation have ceased taking active measures to destabilize the control of the Government of Ukraine over eastern Ukraine.

(c) The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall conduct a review of any action involving Rosoboronexport with respect to a waiver issued by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (b), and not later than 90 days after the date on which such a waiver is issued by the Secretary of Defense, the Inspector General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of the review conducted with respect to such waiver.

SEC. 8106. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the purchase or manufacture of a flag of the United States unless such flags are treated as covered items under section 2533a(b) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8107. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended by the United States Government for the direct personal benefit of the President of Afghanistan.

SEC. 8108. (a) Of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Department of Defense, amounts may be made available, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to local military commanders ap-

pointed by the Secretary, or by an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, to provide at their discretion ex gratia payments in amounts consistent with subsection (d) of this section for damage, personal injury, or death that is incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces in a foreign country.

(b) An ex gratia payment under this section may be provided only if—

(1) the prospective foreign civilian recipient is determined by the local military commander to be friendly to the United States;

(2) a claim for damages would not be compensable under chapter 163 of title 10, United States Code (commonly known as the "Foreign Claims Act"); and

(3) the property damage, personal injury, or death was not caused by action by an enemy.

(c) NATURE OF PAYMENTS.—Any payments provided under a program under subsection (a) shall not be considered an admission or acknowledgement of any legal obligation to compensate for any damage, personal injury, or death.

(d) AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—If the Secretary of Defense determines a program under subsection (a) to be appropriate in a particular setting, the amounts of payments, if any, to be provided to civilians determined to have suffered harm incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces under the program should be determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary and based on an assessment, which should include such factors as cultural appropriateness and prevailing economic conditions.

(e) LEGAL ADVICE.—Local military commanders shall receive legal advice before making ex gratia payments under this subsection. The legal advisor, under regulations of the Department of Defense, shall advise on whether an ex gratia payment is proper under this section and applicable Department of Defense regulations.

(f) WRITTEN RECORD.—A written record of any ex gratia payment offered or denied shall be kept by the local commander and on a timely basis submitted to the appropriate office in the Department of Defense as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(g) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall report to the congressional defense committees on an annual basis the efficacy of the ex gratia payment program including the number of types of cases considered, amounts offered, the response from ex gratia payment recipients, and any recommended modifications to the program.

(h) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to provide any new authority to the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8109. None of the funds available in this Act to the Department of Defense, other than appropriations made for necessary or routine refurbishments, upgrades or maintenance activities, shall be used to reduce or to prepare to reduce the number of deployed and non-deployed strategic delivery vehicles and launchers below the levels set forth in the report submitted to Congress in accordance with section 1042 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

SEC. 8110. The Secretary of Defense shall post grant awards on a public Web site in a searchable format.

SEC. 8111. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to realign forces at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, Portugal, until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of Defense has determined, based on an analysis of operational requirements,

that Lajes Air Force Base is not an optimal location for the Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex.

SEC. 8112. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to fund the performance of a flight demonstration team at a location outside of the United States: *Provided*, That this prohibition applies only if a performance of a flight demonstration team at a location within the United States was canceled during the current fiscal year due to insufficient funding.

SEC. 8113. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency to—

(1) conduct an acquisition pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 for the purpose of targeting a United States person; or

(2) acquire, monitor, or store the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication of a United States person from a provider of electronic communication services to the public pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8114. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for basic allowance for housing for military personnel, including active duty, reserve and National Guard personnel, \$400,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to military personnel accounts: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8115. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the Treaty.

SEC. 8116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer or divest AH-64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to the active Army in fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall ensure the continuing readiness of the AH-64 Apache aircraft and ensure the training of the crews of such aircraft during fiscal year 2016, including the allocation of funds for operation and maintenance and personnel connected with such aircraft: *Provided further*, That this section shall continue in effect through the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

□ 2000

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 115, line 2, strike "in fiscal year 2016" and insert "prior to June 30, 2016".

Page 115, beginning line 7, strike the proviso.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, since its establishment, the National Guard has answered the call to defend our Nation and respond in times of crises.

They have fought bravely with the Active Component, while continuing to achieve their mission here at home.

At the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, nearly 50 percent of the Army's total force was a mix of Reservists and members of the National Guard. The Pennsylvania National Guard alone contributed more than 42,000 individual deployments.

Unfortunately, the Army's Aviation Restructuring Initiative, or ARI, will have devastating impacts on all that the National Guard has achieved. ARI will result in the transfer of all National Guard Apache helicopters to the Active Component, leaving the National Guard less combat-ready.

It will also deprive our Nation of an operational reserve for these aircraft, which is essential to the retention of talented aircrews. ARI represents a fundamental shift in the nature and role of the National Guard.

Last year, Congress wisely created the National Commission on the Future of the Army to offer a deliberate approach to addressing force structure issues such as ARI. Yet, as it stands now, many of these transfers will be long done before the Commission has examined the proposal and reported its recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, once these transfers begin, it will be all but impossible to reverse them. We need to allow the Commission time to do its work before the Army takes any harmful and irreversible actions.

In the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, the House adopted an amendment to delay some Apache transfers until June 30, 2016. This amendment extends that responsible limitation to all National Guard Apaches, while also taking important steps to ensure continued readiness of the Apache fleet.

Together, these provisions strike a proper balance between safeguarding our national security and preventing any premature Apache transfers. Only this can truly ensure that the irreparable harm is not done to the National Guard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of colleagues who want to speak, so I will be brief.

But I would point out that this amendment, if adopted, will undo last year's compromise legislation that supported the Army's critically important Aviation Restructuring Initiative. Part of that compromise was to establish a commission to study the force structure of the United States Army. I believe we should await that report.

The Army has indicated that if they are restricted under the gentleman's

amendment, they would have to inactivate—and I would repeat this—they would have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in States such as New York, Kansas, and Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going on into the remanufacture plant in 2016.

Each battalion inactivation will result in the unplanned transfer of approximately 500 soldiers and 1,000 family members, driven by the absence of the aircraft needed to train the unit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), my good friend, who is also an Apache pilot.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. ROTHFUS for the amendment.

Without this amendment, as he said, we will see the transfer of all National Guard Apache helicopters to the Active Component while, just last year, this Congress created the National Commission on the Future of the Army to deliberate this change in force, this restructuring issue.

You say, why should we care? I mean, isn't this a squabble between one big brother and a little brother? And it kind of is.

But we should care because the taxpayers have invested billions and billions of dollars over years to create the infrastructure within the Guard.

But more importantly, this imposes on and weakens our national security because the Guard and the Reserve component is the repository for experience in Apache pilots.

When you get tired of flying the Apache on deployment over and over again on Active Duty but want to continue to serve your country, what do you do? You join the Reserve component. You come to the Guard.

And those pilots have the most experience because they have flown on Active Duty and they have flown in the Guard for years and years and years. So when they deploy, that is who you want to fly with. That is who units want to fly with because they have the experience.

The operational depth is in the Guard.

It is not that Governors need the Apache; it is that the United States needs the Apache. And should we transfer the Apache because the Army wants to pick on its little brother and can? And that is exactly what is happening here.

I have heard the arguments. I have listened to all the arguments. I have spent 34 years in uniform. None of them make any sense, and they can't justify any of them. They talk big around this place in all kinds of acronyms that most people don't understand, but none of it is justified.

I don't understand why we would do this, why we wouldn't wait just till February to get the report from a Commission that we sponsored, that we au-

thorized in this body. Why wouldn't we wait till then?

Why would we transfer the aircraft, and when the Commission comes back and says don't transfer the aircraft, oh, well, sorry, we already did that. Won't we look foolish.

But more importantly, isn't this important for national security to have the experience there when called upon to go fight—and as the gentleman said, make up 50 percent of the force in the fight.

Let's not do this for all the wrong reasons.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to prohibit funding for any transfer of Apaches from the National Guard to the Active Army.

In committee, Chairman WILSON and I worked very closely to authorize a congressional review no less than 60 days following the Commission's report release.

And on the House floor, as an amendment to the NDAA, Mr. PALAZZO and I thoroughly examined and determined a fixed transfer date of Apaches no later than June 30.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is being used as a backdoor scheme and a delay tactic. This ploy places devastating impacts and potential deactivation of the Army's Combat Aviation Brigades in States like New York, Kansas, Hawaii, Arizona, and overall Black Hawk modernization in California.

As the Representative of Fort Drum, home of the 10th Mountain Division, any delay would cause this high operational tempo unit to be left without an Aviation Brigade.

Let me be abundantly clear. Any Apache delay will have grave consequences on our Army's readiness, deployment schedule, and our soldiers' dwell time. A delay would severely limit the Army's ability to meet expected operational requirements and place an even greater burden on our Nation's brave servicemembers.

So, Mr. Chairman, where I think some may be confused I want to clarify. In exchange for Apaches, the National Guard is set to receive fully modernized Black Hawks, which are essential to lift-and-rescue operations and remain critical to a State's emergency response. Derailing, delaying, or limiting Apache transfers would, therefore, halt this Black Hawk modernization.

This is merely a ploy to prevent our soldiers from receiving the equipment they need to protect American lives overseas, and it is unconscionable. I am appalled that this is even being discussed and will continue to fight for an ontime transfer of the Apaches from the National Guard to the Active Army.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I only have one more speaker left, and it is my understanding that, as a member of the committee, I have the right to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is correct.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman concludes his remarks.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would just urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important amendment to prevent the premature transfer of Apaches out of the National Guard until the Commission has had the opportunity to do its work.

This Congress created the National Commission for the very purpose of studying the impact of transfers such as Apaches out of the Guard after spending billions of dollars, as my colleague from Pennsylvania has said.

This was an investment on the part of the taxpayers to build an operational reserve. We should not take this step until the Commission has completed its work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield my remaining time to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), my colleague from the Appropriations Committee, to close the debate.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman.

I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment. I will enter into the RECORD a letter from General Odierno that I received, as well as others. It references the FY15 NDAA, which expressly allows for the transfer of Apaches with no restrictions on additional moves thereafter.

And it says: "If we are restricted from transferring any portion of the 72 Apaches, or must count aircraft inducted into the remanufacture line as part of that 72, we will have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in New York, Kansas, or Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going in the remanufacture plant in 2016."

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2015.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

We are writing to inform you that pending legislation may cause great damage to the readiness of the United States Army, create enormous disruption to the lives of thousands of military family members, harm our industrial base, and require us to send Soldiers into combat who may not be fully trained. Specifically, provisions in both the House and Senate versions of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), and the House version of the Defense Appropriations Act will, if enacted,

undo last year's compromise legislation that supported the Army's critically important Aviation Restructuring Initiative (ARI). The proposals drastically alter the statutorily permitted movement of AH-64 Apache helicopters between the Army National Guard (ARNG) and the Regular Army in 2016—a transfer authorized in the FY15 NDAA. Accordingly, as discussed below, to protect our Soldiers and their Families, we request that you continue to support our comprehensive ARI plan.

The FY15 NDAA provisions were based on the following factors, none of which has changed:

The National Guard Bureau's (NGB) alternative to ARI proposed the transfer of 72 AH-64 Apaches to the Regular Army;

The decision to transfer the remaining AH-64 Apaches from the ARNG to the Regular Army would be resolved based on recommendations by the National Commission on the Future of the Army; and

The GAO and the Office of the Secretary of Defense CAPE would conduct independent reviews of both ARI and the NGB alternative, both of which have since confirmed that the ARI plan is less costly and provides greater warfighting capacity than the NGB alternative.

With these principles in mind, the FY15 NDAA allowed the Army, with the certification of the Secretary of Defense, to transfer 48 AH-64 Apaches between October 2015 and March 2016, with no restrictions on additional moves thereafter. Nevertheless, recognizing Congressional concern, the Army specifically committed to transferring no more than 24 additional Apaches in FY16 for a total of 72, which precisely matched the number in the National Guard's alternative proposal. Our FY16 plan provided Congress with time to act upon the results the Commission's report (to be delivered in February 2016); allowed for the normal induction of aircraft into the AH-64 remanufacture line in Arizona; and preserved the Army's ability to deploy trained and equipped Soldiers and units into combat. We strictly adhered to FY15 NDAA and made critical programmatic and operational decisions based upon it.

The key points of the Army plan for FY16, which is based on the FY15 NDAA, are below: Transferring 24 AH-64 Apaches from the ARNG to the 25th Infantry Division (ID) in Hawaii;

Transferring 24 AH-1-64 Apaches from the ARNG to the 1st ID in Kansas;

Transferring 24 AH-64 Apaches from the ARNG to the 10th Mountain Division in New York after 31 March 2016; and

Inducting 24 ARNG and 32 Regular Army AH-64 Apaches for remanufacture in Arizona.

Should Congress now dismantle this carefully crafted plan, it would not only be disruptive, but also dangerous for our Soldiers. As you know, several proposed legislative changes either prohibit our ability to transfer any or part of the 72 aircraft or require us to count airframes, which were inducted into the remanufacture process in 2014, against the permitted transfers in FY16. The potential impacts of these provisions are stark.

If we are restricted from transferring any portion of the 72 Apaches (24 in October 2015, 24 in February 2016, and 24 in July 2016), or must count aircraft inducted into the remanufacture line as part of that 72, we will have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in New York, Kansas, or Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going into the remanufacture plant in 2016:

Each battalion inactivation will result in the unplanned transfer of approximately 500

Soldiers and 1,000 family members, driven by the absence of the aircraft needed to train the unit;

Up to three Combat Aviation Brigades (CAB) of 2,500 Soldiers each, will become combat ineffective, because they will be missing their reconnaissance units, which is half of their attack capability, thus depriving the entire brigade this crucial capability;

Nearly 30% of the entire Regular Army combat aviation force could be rendered ineffective, leaving only eight fully ready CABs in 2016—compared to the 13 Regular Army CABs that existed prior to the inactivation of two in FY15; it should be noted that the ARNG has not reduced a single aircraft or unit in this same time frame;

We will not be able to meet PACOM requirements for a "no-notice" Korea warfight;

We will have to send Soldiers into combat in Iraq and Afghanistan without the proper training in Joint Combined Arms maneuver from the 25th ID, 1st ID, and 10th Mountain Division; additionally, the remaining Apache Battalions would have to extend the amount of time they are deployed (note, they are already operating at a 1:1.5 deploy to dwell ratio); and

We may have to stop inductions into the AH-64E remanufacture line, because we could not, under certain provisions, process 24 Apaches from the ARNG. Additionally, the risk of losing 32 Regular Army AH-64's for a year, which are planned for induction, without the backfill transfer of the 72 Apaches from the ARNG could be too high. This stoppage could jeopardize a workforce of 4,100 employees in 22 states, including 2,200 in Arizona, 360 in Alabama, 350 in Florida, 285 in California, and lesser numbers in WA, TX, MO, IL, MS, OH, WV, PA, NY, VT, NH, CT, NC, SC, and GA.

We face an unprecedented and unpredictable global environment that continues to morph in dangerous and unforeseen ways. Now more than ever, we need a force that provides the capabilities necessary to execute the missions that we know are coming, as well as the versatility, agility and depth to handle contingencies we cannot predict. An absolutely critical component of our force is our aviation formations, and we must be able to effectively restructure them to meet current and future demands. Accordingly, we need your support to ensure that the framework created by the FY15 NDAA remains in place. We owe this to our Soldiers, their Families, our industry partners and, most importantly, the American people. Simply put, delaying or derailing ARI jeopardizes your Army, and our Nation's security.

We appreciate your time and thoughtful consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND T. ODIERNO,
General, United States
Army Chief of Staff.

JOHN M. MCHUGH,
Secretary of the Army.

Mrs. ROBY. Look, friends and colleagues, we have heard from several Members about the devastating impacts that any delay in ARI would have on our Army.

But let's take time to revisit why we are here in the first place. We are here because this Congress put the Army in the position to have to make these difficult decisions in the first place. We are here because of a thing called sequestration. And if there has ever been

a time for a stronger argument to revisit this so that we can properly fund all of our military across all branches so that they are not put in this box where the Army has to make these tough decisions, now is the time.

We have got to properly fund the United States military. So here we have a letter from a highly respected Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army to Congress saying, If you do this, if you delay these helicopter transfers, you will create a domino affect that will result in the United States of America sending our soldiers to Afghanistan and Iraq who are neither fully trained or in fully equipped.

We have to do better. We have to do better. And this is the case. Again, I oppose this amendment, and I call on my colleagues to revisit fully funding our military and repealing the sequester.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8117. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated for activities authorized under section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1621) to initiate support for, or expand support to, foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals unless the congressional defense committees are notified in accordance with the direction contained in the classified annex accompanying this Act, not less than 15 days before initiating such support: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used under such section 1208 for any activity that is not in support of an ongoing military operation being conducted by United States Special Operations Forces to combat terrorism: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibitions in this section if the Secretary determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances and, by not later than 72 hours after making such waiver, notifies the congressional defense committees of such waiver.

SEC. 8118. (a) Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to assess whether the justification and approval requirements under section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2405) have, inconsistent with the intent of Congress—

(1) negatively impacted the ability of covered entities to be awarded sole-source contracts with the Department of Defense greater than \$20,000,000;

(2) discouraged agencies from awarding contracts greater than \$20,000,000 to covered entities; and

(3) been misconstrued and/or inconsistently implemented.

(b) The Comptroller General shall analyze and report to the congressional defense committees on the sufficiency of the Department's report in addressing the requirements; review the extent to which section 811 has negatively impacted the ability of covered entities to be awarded sole-source contracts with the Department, discouraged agencies from awarding contracts, or been misconstrued and/or inconsistently implemented.

SEC. 8119. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Iraq in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed forces into hostilities in Iraq, into situations in Iraq where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Iraqi territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of such Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

SEC. 8120. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any A-10 aircraft, or to disestablish any units of the active or reserve component associated with such aircraft.

SEC. 8121. Of the funds provided for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide" in this Act, not less than \$2,800,000 shall be used to support the Department's activities related to the implementation of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act (Public Law 113-101; 31 U.S.C. 6101 note) and to support the implementation of a uniform procurement instrument identifier as described in subpart 4.16 of Title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, to include changes in business processes, workforce, or information technology.

SEC. 8122. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be transferred to the National Sea Based Deterrent Fund established by section 2218a of title 10, United States Code.

□ 2015

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8122.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is rare to find an amendment to an appropriation bill that has already been supported by 375 Members of this House; yet this amendment has, 90 percent of the House. It is rare to find an amendment to an appropriation bill that has such bipartisan support; yet this amendment has.

This is an amendment not put in by just me, but by my good friend Mr. COURTNEY, by Mr. WITTMAN, by Mr. LANGEVIN, by Mr. ROGERS, by Ms. DeLAURO—three HASC subcommittee chairmen, two HASC ranking members, and a Defense appropriator. It is an amendment that is supported by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

It is rare to find such different groups in support, the Navy League, the United Auto Workers, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, AFL-CIO; yet this amendment has that support.

The reason these planets are all aligning in this rare configuration is because it is also rare—in fact, once every other generation—that we have to build something like the *Ohio* class submarine; yet it falls upon this generation.

In 4 years, we will begin the procurement. In 6 years, we will start construction of 12 ships—they call boats—that will carry 70 percent of the nuclear deterrence of this country—\$92 billion.

The national sea-based deterrence fund we formed last year helps us prepare for that in advance, instead of waiting until the night before to come up with \$92 billion. It transfers \$1.4 billion into a fund and allows the Department of Defense to find other moneys, a rare thing for the government to actually prepare in advance, instead of waiting until the last minute to prepare. It will help to purchase in bulk and save perhaps millions, maybe even billions of dollars.

Now, I know there are voices that say in this world, with all the threats we see and all the demands we have for national defense, we cannot find creative solutions, and we have to do everything the way we have always done it.

We disagree because, if we are not creative, if we don't find other solutions, CRS says we could lose—32 other ships, including as many as 8 *Virginia* class subs, 8 destroyers, and 16 combatant ships.

Those same voices will say, We can't set up a fund like that; yet they have already set up four different funds very similar to that.

We ask for your support for this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, our committee strongly supports the *Ohio* class submarine. We have done it for years.

Both the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) and I not only serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and provide its leadership,

but we have also supported this program on Energy and Water, which is the other part of the package.

With respect, the gentleman from Virginia's amendment proposes to strike a provision of the bill, prohibits the transfer of funds to the national sea-based deterrence fund, a reserve established but not funded last year in the NDAA.

We recognize this submarine will be expensive; however, the national sea-based deterrence fund will not make the submarine any less expensive, and it will not increase resources available to the Department of Defense.

This Congress has an important responsibility to provide resources to all of our military services and the intelligence community. Under the structure of this special fund, the Secretary of Defense has the authority to divert dollars into this new fund from the Army, Marines, Air Force, Special Forces, missile defense, ISR, and other types of essential programs. This is the wrong approach. It removes, furthermore, congressional oversight from the Secretary of Defense.

Secondly, if the President determines the *Ohio* class replacement is a must-fund platform, then the Navy should buy it, just as it has every other submarine in its inventory that our committee has supported. Establishing a special fund to pay for the submarine is an attempt to have other military services pay for what is a Navy responsibility.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, could I ask how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt for a second the sincerity of the chairman and the ranking member and their support for the *Ohio* replacement program.

This chart, which the Navy produced, showing the 30-year shipbuilding plan, if we fully fund the *Ohio* class program, as well as a 300-ship Navy, demonstrates exactly the problem that confronts us today.

It shows, again, a red line across, which shows the modern era of shipbuilding at about \$15 billion a year; and, with the yellow portion of the chart, it shows how, for 13 years, Congress, starting in the 2020s, is going to be asked to raise unprecedented amounts of money for the shipbuilding account.

The fact of the matter is this is an asset that is not just the Navy's; it is the country's. Under New START, 70 percent of the nuclear triad will be borne by the Navy through its submarine program, far greater than in the past.

The Air Force and their long-range bombers and the Army, with their ground-based systems, are not going to be bearing the same burden as a result of the *Ohio* class' planned burden under New START.

We have an opportunity to do something sensible, which is based in clear precedent, as the gentleman from Virginia indicated.

The sealift fund was funded out of the shipbuilding account. The missile-based system was funded on a separate account because these are national assets that provided assistance and national security across the board for the Pentagon.

Support this amendment if you support a strong shipbuilding account and protect the shipbuilding industrial base of this country.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), the chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment to restore the national sea-based deterrence fund. This amendment is critical to maintaining our Nation's nuclear deterrence and ensure a robust Navy shipbuilding budget.

It makes sense now to set aside funding for the *Ohio* class submarine replacement program. This makes sure that, down the road, we are not forced to choose between building a replacement ballistic missile submarine or a destroyer or an aircraft carrier.

The Navy already faces challenges in building enough warships to meet the global threats our Nation faces. Funding the national sea-based deterrence fund is the best solution to maintaining national strategic deterrence without hollowing out the Navy's shipbuilding budget.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is the ranking member of the Emerging Threats Subcommittee for the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the national sea-based deterrence fund is critical to the future of our national security. It provides space outside the shipbuilding fund for the most survivable piece of our national deterrence, a bill that last came due in the 1980s in the Reagan defense buildup.

Mr. Chairman, these boats are absolutely essential. This is not just a Navy

issue, as Secretary of Defense Connor has said. This is a national priority. The deterrence fund allows us to treat it accordingly and avoid pressuring the Navy out of badly needed investments in other ships and capabilities.

Unless Congress acts, these boats will consume half of the projected shipbuilding funding for a decade, causing crippling shortages that would echo in our fleet for decades after.

We and many of our colleagues have worked on a bipartisan basis to rise to this challenge, and the result is this sea-based deterrence fund.

Earlier this year, this body spoke loudly and clearly in overwhelming support of the fund and its purposes.

I urge my colleagues to reaffirm that position with this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, this is where reality comes into play. We talked about this earlier. Having a fund that is set up does not evade the responsibility of providing the long-term funding.

All of these things in the Department of Defense are priorities, and our friends on the Appropriations Committee have the difficult job of trying to balance these priorities and have the big picture available to them.

I think they have done exactly the right thing. I think this needs to be subsumed within the overall budget. There is no magic money. Having something that subverts the hard work that we ask the Appropriations Committee to do, I think, is the wrong thing to do.

It is not easy to stand up and make this argument, but I appreciate what they have done. They did it last year, and it was appropriate. They have done it this year, and it is appropriate. We have to be able to deal with this in a comprehensive way and not use sleight of hand.

I appreciate what the chair and ranking member have done.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join in opposition to the amendment in the strongest possible terms. I certainly respect the position of my colleagues on the other side of this argument, but I do remind my colleagues that the CBO estimates that this program is going to cost somewhere between \$102 and \$107 billion.

You are absolutely correct. This is a very expensive program, and we ought to be very, very careful. Given the tremendous financial resources that we will be required to modernize or replace the U.S. nuclear delivery systems

and weapons over the next two decades, it is imperative that Congress begin to make tough decisions now and not set up segregated funds.

Unfortunately, this fund is a means to avoid those tough decisions. Firstly, the fund in no way solves the problem of where are we going to get the money. It is not going to make the next generation of ballistic missile submarines any cheaper. It simply shifts the burden for paying for their construction from the Department of the Navy to the entire Department of Defense.

I categorically disagree with the amendment's sponsor relative to this replacement program and the suggestion that it should exist outside the existing Navy shipbuilding account.

The sponsors are correct that the funding for that shipbuilding account has been relatively flat in recent years. However, if the Ohio class replacement and the 300-ship Navy are priorities of this Nation and consistent with our national defense strategy, then we ought to pay for both in a transparent manner by increasing the resources in the shipbuilding account and not resort to setting up independent funds.

Further, the sponsors indicate that this is a national priority, and I would not argue that point. These systems play a very important role in our nuclear deterrence, so do our long-range bombers and the weapons that they carry.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, long-range bombers also provide protection for this country as well as the weapons they carry. I think they qualify as national asset distinctions. Should we then set up funds for these programs?

Let's think about other priorities within the Department. Should we set up a fund for the Army's 82nd Airborne? Should we set up a fund for the Air Force combat rescue officers? They are very deserving. Should we set up a fund for the special Marine Air-Ground Task Force? They are very deserving.

Another concern that I have is it really expands and transfers authority to the Secretary of Defense. The last time I looked, we have a constitutional responsibility to make decisions ourselves.

The fact is we already have a segregated fund that has drawn a lot of attention to this bill that is called the overseas contingency operations fund. Should we start picking between services now as to which one should receive special treatment? Should we then pick programs within particular services? I think not.

Again, I strongly oppose the amendment and am pleased to join with the chairman in opposition.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2030

Mr. FORBES. Can I request how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The gentleman from Virginia has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, the last two speakers have made my point for me. Mr. BLUMENAUER made the same arguments 4 weeks ago. It was defeated by 375 votes.

The last gentleman that spoke said it is \$102 billion. The question is whether we wait until the night before to come up with \$102 billion or whether we start now and make sure we have it. This is a national priority. I hope we will pass this amendment and build these ships.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8123. None of the funds provided in this Act for the T-AO(X) program shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of the following components unless those components are manufactured in the United States: Auxiliary equipment (including pumps) for shipboard services; propulsion equipment (including engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8124. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for military personnel pay, including active duty, reserve and National Guard personnel, \$700,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to military personnel accounts: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8125. The amounts appropriated in title II of this Act are hereby reduced by \$359,000,000 to reflect excess cash balances in Department of Defense Working Capital Funds, as follows:

(1) From "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$138,000,000;

(2) From "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", \$221,000,000.

SEC. 8126. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to lower than anticipated fuel prices, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by \$814,000,000.

SEC. 8127. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the end strength levels for the Army National Guard

of the United States below the levels specified for the Army National Guard of the United States in subtitle B of title IV of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291): *Provided*, That this section shall continue in effect through the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 8128. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

TITLE IX

GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Army", \$5,664,570,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Navy", \$1,643,136,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", \$555,998,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$2,376,095,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Army", \$24,462,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Navy", \$12,693,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", \$3,393,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Air Force", \$18,710,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/

Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Army", \$166,015,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", \$2,828,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$18,910,604,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 123, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$80,000,000)".

Page 123, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$80,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering with my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) uses the global war on terrorism funds for the Army operations and maintenance to provide \$80 million in the same account for hard body armor for the Soldier Protection System Vital Torso Protection equipment program.

Now, every warfighter deployed or scheduled to be deployed deserves to be provided with the most advanced and the lightest hard body armor. The amendment will ensure that the deployed soldiers are protected with the modern body armor they need. Presently, this bill provides no funds for the Army hard body armor.

This amendment will also help to ensure that the industrial base producing the specialized boron carbide powder, fabricating ceramic plates, and producing finished hard body armor can stay in business and sustain production of the lifesaving soldier protection equipment.

The body armor industry is in crisis, and that puts our troops at risk.

Last year, the House and Senate appropriated \$80 million to the Army for

industrial preparedness body armor. All four congressional defense committees explicitly directed the Army to ensure that the industrial base is able to continue the development and manufacture of more advanced body armor.

Despite this clear and explicit direction, the Army has completely ignored Congress. The Army's failure to sustain the body armor industrial base has put a vital industry at risk and is causing layoffs among very specialized employees, which puts the entire industry at risk.

There is no doubt that our troops deserve modern, lightweight body armor that requires a strong, reliable, and fully capable industrial base.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), my good friend, my colleague on this issue.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her leadership on this issue and partnership in supporting this important and critical mission of our military to make sure that the United States warfighter in combat has the most advanced, lightweight body armor available to protect that soldier in the field against the enemy, and we must act now to make sure that the U.S. Army does what is the intent of the Congress.

As the gentlewoman pointed out, despite the fact that Congress has been clear on this matter, despite the fact that report language for both the FY15 and FY16 Defense Appropriations measures recognize the importance of lightweight body armor protecting soldiers in combat, we encouraged the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the body armor industrial base was able to continue the development and manufacture of more advanced body armor by implementing the body armor modernization through a replenishment program.

Despite all of that, despite the articulation of the clear will of this body, the Army has not used and deployed the funds appropriated properly, and the Department of Defense was at odds because the Army did not deploy the resources appropriated until, or expressed the intent of not deploying those resources until the end of the fiscal year.

What this amendment will do is make sure that congressional intent is honored, make sure that the armor industrial base is properly maintained, and most importantly and most critically, when our men and women are called into combat to defend liberty and freedom, that we give them the tools that they need to keep them safe and carry out their mission with victory and honor.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, this \$80 million is to provide body armor for the Soldier Protection System Vital Torso Protection equipment program. I ask for Members' support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but, in fact, I support the amendment put forward by a member of our committee.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her amendment, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky for his strong advocacy.

Supporting our industrial base is a strong priority of mine and our committee's. We think this amendment is a good idea. It sends another message to the bureaucracy that we mean what we say.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCOLLUM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$6,747,313,000: of which up to \$160,002,000 may be transferred to the Coast Guard "Operating Expenses" account, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2215 of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", \$1,871,834,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$10,799,220,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", \$7,559,131,000: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed \$1,260,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access, provided to United States military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq

and the Levant: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used to support the Government of Jordan, in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense may determine, to maintain the ability of the Jordanian armed forces to maintain security along the border between Jordan and Syria, upon 15 days prior written notification to the congressional defense committees outlining the amounts reimbursed and the nature of the expenses to be reimbursed: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$15,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided further*, That the authority in the preceding proviso may only be used for emergency and extraordinary expenses associated with activities to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, up to \$30,000,000 shall be for Operation Observant Compass: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 124, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$430,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment cuts aid to Pakistan in half. Pakistan is the Benedict Arnold nation in the list of countries that we call our allies.

Before Osama bin Laden met his maker in 2011 in one of the greatest

U.S. military raids ever conducted, bin Laden was living in plain sight in a bustling military town. To think that the most senior levels of the Pakistani Government did not know that he was there requires, as Secretary Clinton said, “the willing suspension of disbelief.”

This February, the former head of Pakistan’s version of the CIA, called the ISI, said that Pakistan most likely sheltered Osama bin Laden. And just last month, three U.S. intelligence sources told NBC News that Pakistan knew where Osama bin Laden was hiding all the time. Not only did Pakistan not help us get Osama bin Laden, Pakistan threw the doctor who did help us under the bus and put him in jail for 33 years for cooperating with America.

Pakistan did not help us because Pakistan was working with Osama bin Laden. Newly released documents retrieved from bin Laden’s compound show that Pakistan’s intelligence service was in contact with bin Laden and was working with him to convince U.S. leaders to negotiate with al Qaeda.

There are some who say we need Pakistan to help us fight the war in Afghanistan, but Pakistan is on the wrong side. Pakistan is helping the terrorists, not us. Pakistan’s intelligence service gives safe haven, resources, and training to terrorist groups, like the Haqqani network that has killed dozens of Americans.

On September 22, 2011, Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee: “With ISI support, Haqqani operatives planned and conducted the truck bomb attack, as well as the assault on our Embassy.”

The truck bombing he mentions wounded more than 70 U.S. and NATO troops. Admiral Mullen went on to say: “The Haqqani network acts as a veritable arm of Pakistan’s Inter-Services Intelligence agency.”

Throughout 2011, Pakistan tried to cheat the United States by filling out bogus reimbursement claims for allegedly going after terrorists when they weren’t even doing that. That is the same account this money funds.

There are others who say we need Pakistan’s southern supply route to help our troops in Afghanistan. But for 7 months in 2012, Pakistan closed off the supply route, and we did just fine. What we really need access to is Pakistan’s tribal areas. Terrorists that kill our troops in Afghanistan run back and forth across the Pakistan border and hide in these tribal areas, but Pakistan won’t let our troops chase them there. And so the terrorists kill Americans, and they get away with it.

Pakistan did do some military operations in the tribal areas last year, but they tipped off the Haqqani network before they got there that they were coming. Pakistan tipping off terrorists is nothing new. Last fall, Leon Pa-

netta, Secretary of Defense at the time of the bin Laden raid, says of the Pakistanis, “We just can’t trust them.” I agree. We can’t trust Pakistan.

My amendment does not cut money to protect Pakistan’s nuclear weapons. The amendment does recognize the U.S.-Pakistan relationship for what it is. We don’t need to pay Pakistan to be our enemy; they will do it for free. Pakistan has already received over \$30 billion of our money since 2002. After 13 years of giving Pakistan more and more money, it is time to do something different. My amendment simply cuts the money we give Pakistan in half.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I certainly understand the gentleman’s passion, and at times, I share some of the same concerns he stated in his remarks.

Just to put a little perspective on it, the coalition support fund allows the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for logistical and military support, including access, specialized training to personnel, procurement and provision of supplies and equipment provided by that nation in connection with the U.S. military operations in Operation Enduring Freedom.

Receipts for reimbursements are submitted by cooperating nations and are fully vetted by the Pentagon and follow strict criteria to meet the standard for reimbursement, and all payments are made in arrears and follow a notification to Congress, so there is a notification to Congress.

Regarding Pakistan, the coalition support fund remains a critical tool to enable Pakistan to effectively deal with future challenges emerging from the U.S. drawdown. At times, I wonder whether we are withdrawing.

It is also a cost-effective tool, some would say, for the U.S. to remain engaged in the region. I know all too well that our relationship with Pakistan is an uncomfortable one; I feel it, but these funds are sent to reimburse Pakistan for actions to protect our interests.

These reimbursements are made to maintain some 186 Pakistani forces along 1,600 miles of border between Pakistan and Afghanistan to deter cross-border conflict, movement, and counterterrorism-counterinsurgency operations throughout the FATA, the Federally Administered Tribal Areas.

The focus of this core level is against TTP, an al Qaeda-allied organization that conducts regional terrorist and insurgent attacks. Nearly 28,000 militants were killed, injured, or arrested due to these operations. Pakistan

itself—and this doesn't get much press—has suffered a lot of casualties themselves, about 5,000, while attempting to secure this treacherous border.

Continued support of the deployment of the Pakistan Armed Forces in FATA and other areas in the future is needed for the long-term stability of the area.

I must oppose the amendment, although I understand the passion with which the gentleman has made his argument because I think it is in our long-term interest to have this relationship.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and would acknowledge the gentleman from Texas' legitimate concern.

I would associate myself with the chairman's remark, but make one important addition, and that is the chairman has been adamant that we be very, very careful about our relationship with Pakistan, and the bill recognizes difficulties we face.

I would draw the Member's attention to section 9015 that prohibits funds to Pakistan if the government is engaged in activities that present a concern to the government of the United States.

I appreciate that the chairman insisted on that language. That is included in the bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the committee.

Pakistan cannot be trusted. They lie about the reimbursements. They have not met the criteria that the ranking member has talked about the last 4 years, and they got the money anyway. They are playing us, Mr. Chairman, and we pay them; and they use that money to hurt us, to hurt Americans.

This amendment says: we are cutting the money in half because of your prior conduct that shows you can't be trusted.

That is all this amendment does.

I would hope Members of Congress would send a message to Pakistan: we are not going to pay you to hate us and pay you to kill us; we are going to cut the money off.

And that is just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", \$124,559,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", \$34,187,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", \$3,455,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve", \$209,606,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard", \$160,845,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard", \$225,350,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the "Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund", \$2,060,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to provide support and assistance to foreign security forces or other groups or individuals to conduct, support, or facilitate counterterrorism and crisis response activities pursuant to section 1534 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall transfer the funds provided herein to other appropriations provided for in this Act to be merged

with and to be available for the same purposes and subject to the same authorities and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That the funds available under this heading are available for transfer only to the extent that the Secretary of Defense submits a prior approval reprogramming request to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall comply with the appropriate vetting standards and procedures established elsewhere in this Act for any recipient of training, equipment, or other assistance: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

For the "Afghanistan Security Forces Fund", \$3,762,257,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Afghanistan, including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, construction, and funding: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may obligate and expend funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title for additional costs associated with existing projects previously funded with amounts provided under the heading "Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund" in prior Acts: *Provided further*, That such costs shall be limited to contract changes resulting from inflation, market fluctuation, rate adjustments, and other necessary contract actions to complete existing projects, and associated supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may not use more than \$50,000,000 under the authority provided in this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall notify in advance such contract changes and adjustments in annual reports to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of any proposed new projects or transfer of funds between budget sub-activity groups in excess of \$20,000,000: *Provided*

further, That the United States may accept equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts that was transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan and returned by such forces to the United States: *Provided further*, That equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts, and not yet transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan or transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan and returned by such forces to the United States, may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon written notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than \$10,000,000 shall be for recruitment and retention of women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces, and the recruitment and training of female security personnel: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 130, beginning line 2, strike "Provided" and all that follows through line 17.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer a bipartisan amendment with Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. COHEN of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island that works to assure the appropriate use of American taxpayer dollars in Afghanistan.

This amendment is in keeping with the clear position of the House, as we have voted numerous times in bipartisan fashion to limit funds for the Afghanistan infrastructure fund, a program which has been poorly run and is lacking in oversight.

This amendment would specifically strike the language which allows \$50 million in funds for the Afghanistan security forces fund to be redirected toward the Afghanistan infrastructure fund account.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent billions of dollars toward rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan, and Congress has provided \$1.3 billion to the Afghanistan infrastructure fund since it was created in 2011. However, funds have been slow to be spent; and, as of March 31, 2015, more than 55 percent of AIF funds remain to be expended.

Additionally, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, SIGAR, has repeatedly found that DOD has experienced challenges in executing large infrastructure projects and that many projects underway are

behind schedule and face serious cost overruns.

SIGAR's audits have also found that we have inadequate sustainment plans and that projects lack an identifiable counterinsurgency benefit. SIGAR has also expressed reservations about the Afghans' ability to even operate and maintain these energy projects upon completion.

Now, it is my understanding that DOD requested this repurposing of funds because the budget authority on previously authorized funds is about to expire. I know we all look to our commanders in the field for guidance on what they need to finish the job in Afghanistan, but with over half of existing funds remaining to be expended, I ask: Mr. Chairman, why should we take away from other programs and give to this one?

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's deep concern over the tax dollars that have been, if you would, wasted—is probably the most polite term I can think of—in some of the infrastructure investment in Afghanistan and would not in any way argue that point.

The gentleman mentions the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. He and his office have been in mine, the chairman's, the committee, and there is no question that the gentleman makes a very, very important point about making sure that those funds we are spending, despite the best of intentions, be spent carefully.

I would note to my colleagues that we do have within somewhat recent time, the last year or so since August, a new government in place in Afghanistan. The administration has made a decision to maintain troop levels at their current position given that change of government and, if you would, after all of the loss of life, the suffering, and loss of treasury for the last 14 years, to give that nation one last good chance.

I rise in opposition, essentially, to do that for Afghanistan and to give them that last good chance for these few remaining significant projects.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me echo some of the sentiments of Mr. VISCLOSKY about some of the concerns and some of the reports that have been issued by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. It should be worrisome.

A hell of a lot of money has been wasted.

I do think there are some projects that need to be completed. One that comes to mind is the Kandahar bridging solution, the plan to bring electric power to Kandahar. It ends in 3 months. We need to continue that investment. This was a top counterinsurgency priority. Most road projects are completed. The second is the Kajaki Dam has less than a year's work remaining and will supply renewable electric power to the grid.

These are elements of stability that sometimes get lost in reports of empty buildings where there are no occupants and no electricity. I think we need to continue to give a helping hand to the Afghan people because, if they don't have an economy, then they are not going to have any national security. They need a stable economy, and some of these projects near completion need to be continued.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply suggest, again, we have a new government. I certainly think their concern for ethics, as well as care in investment, is worth taking that last good chance to give them a last good chance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the words, the sentiments, the compassion of both my colleagues; but this is an issue that we have addressed for quite some time. It is not new.

I am as concerned about our administration of the funds, our Department of Defense encouragement of Afghans to use the funds, and to make sure that contractual arrangements are in place so completion will take place. We have not seen that.

I think it is time that reality strikes home. While I understand the need to encourage a new government, sometimes, the best way is tough love and a clear indication that comes through finances as well.

I, again, encourage my colleagues to adopt my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

□ 2100

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND

For the "Iraq Train and Equip Fund", \$715,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds

shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, pursuant to section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3558), to provide assistance, including training, equipment, logistics support, supplies, and services, stipends, infrastructure repair, renovation, and sustainment to military and other security forces of or associated with the Government of Iraq, including Kurdish and tribal security forces or other local security forces, with a national security mission, to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that prior to providing assistance to elements of any forces such elements are appropriately vetted, including at a minimum, assessing such elements for associations with terrorist groups or groups associated with the Government of Iran; and receiving commitments from such elements to promote respect for human rights and the rule of law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments, including the Government of Iraq, and other entities, to carry out assistance authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any foreign government or other entities, may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated or expended until not fewer than 15 days after (1) the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees, describing the plan for the provision of such training and assistance and the forces designated to receive such assistance, and (2) the President submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees on how assistance provided under this heading supports a larger regional strategy: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, not more than 60 percent may be obligated or expended until not less than 15 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that an amount equal to not less than 40 percent of the amount provided under this heading has been contributed by other countries and entities for the purposes for which funds are provided under this heading, of which at least 50 percent shall have been contributed or provided by the Government of Iraq: *Provided further*, That the limitation in the preceding proviso shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense determines, in writing, that the national security objectives of the United States will be compromised by the application of the limitation to such assistance, and notifies the appropriate congressional committees not less than 15 days in advance of the exemption taking effect, including a justification for the Secretary's determination and a description of the assistance to be exempted from the application of such limitation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive a provision of law relating to the acquisition of items and support services or sections 40 and 40A of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780 and 2785) if the Secretary determines such provisions of law would prohibit, restrict, delay or otherwise limit the provision of such assistance and a notice of and justification for such waiver is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the term

"appropriate congressional committees" under this heading means the congressional defense committees, the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 132, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$0)".

Page 162, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$715,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by taking a moment to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY. As one who served a long time ago when everything came up under an open rule, we don't see as much of that. I can't commend both of the gentlemen and their committees enough. I wish everybody in America could see how hard they have worked in their committees and here on the House floor. The country should know that there are no two more highly regarded people who are serving in this Chamber than our chairman and our ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that will save us a lot of money and, quite frankly, end a sad chapter in American history. My amendment eliminates funding for the Iraq Train and Equip Program and applies that money to reducing the deficit. The administration, as we all know, is now urging strategic patience with Iraq. The truth is we have had a failed strategy there from the very beginning. The fact is that this is a century-old conflict. The fact is that we have no friends in this conflict. The history of it is clear.

I happened to be up in Tora Bora back in the seventies, and I learned that we were funding and training and equipping the Mujahedeen to fight against the Russians under the notion that the enemy of our enemy is our friend. We were wrong. They morphed into al Qaeda, and they were the people who bombed the World Trade Center. Then we supported Saddam Hussein in the war against Iran. We knew he had used chemical weapons, because we had the sales receipts. We had supplied them. After that, we deposed him. Then we put the Shiites in power, and

the Shiites proceeded to tell all of the Christians and the Jews and the Catholics, "Get out of town, or we will kill you." They shut down all of the synagogues and the Catholic churches. Then we decided we would have a Sunni awakening. That was supplying arms and weapons to the Sunnis because the Shiites were persecuting them. They ultimately morphed into what we now have as ISIL. Now here we are. We find ourselves fighting the Shiites in Yemen, and we are supporting the Shiites in Iraq. We are not sure if we are for them or against them in Syria.

The simple truth is that we have been on every side of this conflict. We really have no friends in this conflict. Inevitably, our goodwill, our good intentions have resulted in the arms and the weapons, as Judge POE just said, ending up in the hands of our enemies, and they use them against us.

The fact is we have spent \$3 trillion on this conflict. Think about that—\$3 trillion. For \$1 trillion of that, we could have graduated debt free every kid in America from college and vocational school. Just think about it. We could have rebuilt our transportation and infrastructure system in this country. For another \$1 trillion, we could have given the Americans a tax break.

Mr. Chairman, instead of 13 years of war, the administration now admits that we have no strategy. The Secretary of Defense admits that the Iraqi Army has no will to fight ISIL. When they took over Ramadi, all they did was growl at them, and they ran like rabbits. They left their Humvees, and they left their tanks, and they left all of their weapons, and we resupplied ISIL, once again, to use those weapons against us. The weapons we have supplied and the people we have trained have ended up in enemy hands time and time again and have been used against us.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, you know the old definition of insanity is repeating the same behavior, is repeating the same behavior, is repeating the same behavior over and over and expecting some different result. To paraphrase the old Serenity Prayer, let me say, Mr. President and colleagues: Let us change what we have the power, the wisdom, and the courage to do before we bankrupt this country.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I share quite a lot of the gentleman's sentiments.

I have said on a number of occasions, when you put the Defense bill forward, sometimes you have to support things

that the Commander in Chief and the President want that you are highly dubious about. I have been very conflicted about this Train and Equip. At times, I think the enemy is doing a better job of training and equipping their own than we are, and, at times, it has been pretty deplorable. I want the gentleman to know I do support this effort. Let me just put some meat on the bones to, maybe, even make his point but, in reality, tell a little truth about the program.

The Iraq Train and Equip Program provides about \$715 million in both funding and authority to assist military and other forces associated with the Government of Iraq, including Kurdish and tribal security forces, with a national security mission to counter ISIL. We do know in the overall mix—and the gentleman from Minnesota knows it—there are some good guys over there. Of course, a lot of the good guys have been taken over by the Quds Force and the Iranians to the south, but, in reality, we do have some good allies in the north with the Kurds, so I haven't given up on all parts of Iraq.

I think we need to continue to support the program. Evidently, our President does as well. We are sending 400 more advisers over to, shall we say, set up a new base camp in Ramadi in Anbar province to sort of respond to a huge crisis there when that city was taken over. I would hate to abandon the people of Iraq without giving it one more try.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's motivation in offering this. In a sense, the three of us are agreed given the skepticism that has been expressed here today.

I would also add that I do believe this institution needs to have a resolution that defines with some specificity what our projection of force should be as to the disposition of our military personnel and assets. Certainly, I am grievously disappointed for those countries in that region in their lack of clarity and purpose. Also, in using, if you would, a religious theme, I was taught that we should have hope in the future, and my concern is, if we cease this training program for those who want a change in government, for those who want to do the right thing in Syria, they will lose what shred of hope still exists.

Principally, for that reason, I join with the chairman in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, but I do appreciate the gentleman's motivation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In reclaiming my time, I have a few other comments.

Mr. Chairman, I said I do work on behalf of the President of the United States and our Commander in Chief, and I have to say I have concerns about our continued investment in Pakistan. We debated that. We have had talk about the Afghan infrastructure fund, which has been troubled with projects, and this is an ongoing area which has not been trouble free. Yet it is interesting that nobody from the White House, since the budget was introduced, has reached out to me relative to defending these programs.

I think the people of these countries deserve protection and support, but it is interesting that we carry the water on these issues and on many other issues on this committee. Do we get any reinforcements? Actually, our entire bill has been put together for all of our military services without any assistance from those military services to get us across the finish line. I think it is remarkable. The standoffishness—the ambivalence—about working with us, I think, is a total disgrace.

I have to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and he certainly knows more about my sentiments publicly than I have expressed in the past.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND

For the "Syria Train and Equip Fund", \$600,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, stipends, construction of training and associated facilities, and sustainment, to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups and individuals for the following purposes: defending the Syrian people from attacks by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and securing territory controlled by the Syrian opposition; protecting the United States, its friends and allies, and the Syrian people from the threats posed by terrorists in Syria; and promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in Syria: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign govern-

ments and other entities to carry out activities authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any foreign government or other entities may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may provide assistance to third countries for purposes of the provision of assistance authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That the term "appropriately vetted" shall be construed to mean, at a minimum, assessments of possible recipients for associations with terrorist groups including the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Jabhat al Nusrah, Ahrar al Sham, other al-Qaeda related groups, Hezbollah, or Shia militias supporting the Governments of Syria or Iran; and for commitment to the rule of law and a peaceful and democratic Syria: *Provided further*, That none of the funds used pursuant to this authority shall be used for the procurement or transfer of man-portable air-defense systems: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances, in accordance with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLAWSON OF FLORIDA

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment before the floor for consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 135, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$0)".

Page 162, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$600,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to start tonight by saying that my mother is gravely ill in Florida this evening, and I can't be with her, but I want her to know that I am with her right now, and I am always with her.

We all want to end U.S. involvement in conflicts where there is no long-term strategy, no vision of success in the end, and the disproportional sacrifice of our brave military forces, Mr. Chairman. U.S. involvement against ISIS in Syria fits this characterization. The administration even admits that there is no comprehensive strategy in place. Therefore, by amendment, we are proposing to defund U.S. support for the Syrian rebels and move the funds to the spending reduction account.

Last September, Congress allocated \$500 million to train and arm Syrian

rebels. This program, however, is fraught with uncertainties and doubts, and the launch of the program has been less than impressive. Of the 15,000 Syrian rebels we planned to train and equip over a 3-year period, so far, only about 400 have been vetted and deemed ready. Meanwhile, other Syrian rebels have either disappeared from the battlefield or have defected to extremist factions, and ISIS has expanded its ground forces, its operations, and its territories. Other jihadist factions in Syria are also gaining strength, and the Assad regime continues its atrocities.

The civil war in Syria has now resulted in 220,000 Syrian deaths and in 11.5 million people—over half the population—displaced within Syria. The U.S. continues to provide, by far, the bulk of the military might, most of it air power. It is hard to imagine defeating ISIS without substantial ground forces to combat it at this point. The Defense Appropriations bill includes \$600 million to train and arm Syrian rebels as part of this needed boots-on-the-ground.

□ 2115

But whatever the number of Syrian rebels we ultimately introduce into the battlefield, they alone, I believe, are unlikely to turn the tide. Nor are these rebels expected to end the Assad government, even though that, too, is one of our stated goals.

History has shown that when we arm untested and difficult-to-vet rebel forces, the weapons we provide too often wind up being aimed at our U.S. troops. I am told that the last time our country funded a foreign war through vicarious fighters was the Taliban fighting against the Russians in the 1970s.

Please join us in saying “no” to additional funding for these untested Syrian rebels unless and until Congress receives clear answers to the following questions: Where is the accounting for the first \$500 million? I don’t have it. Why isn’t the second \$600 million, if appropriate, funded by other folks in the coalition? What is the objective? What does success look like in the Syrian civil war? Does victory require the end of the Assad government? What is the comprehensive strategy for defeating ISIS in Iraq and beyond?

In our view, without the answers to these questions, it makes no sense to proceed. It is our job to review and assess. I ask that defunding of the Syrian train and equip fund be accomplished by this amendment to H.R. 2685.

I acknowledge my deep admiration for the chairman and ranking member and what they have accomplished in this bill and acknowledge so many good things in the bill, but it is hard for me to accept this war that is going nowhere.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to join my colleague. I have enormous respect for the chairman and the ranking member’s good and noble intentions, but, again, the fact is we have no friends in these conflicts. The weapons that we send inevitably are being used against us. I was here during the Vietnam war conflict, and the arguments that we hear today for continuing this involvement is to somehow make something good out of what hasn’t been quite so good, and we finally ended that conflict by cutting off the funds for it. That is how we are going to end our wars of choice in the Middle East, wars of choice that are bankrupting this country and costly in blood and treasury.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure, on behalf of everybody on the floor, we extend to Mr. CLAWSON our sympathy and hope that his mother will recover. I am sure if she has the ability to be watching the television tonight, she is already very proud of his courageous remarks on the floor.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Heartfelt. Thanks.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the sentiment of the amendment, this is a complicated issue—that is an understatement—with multifaceted policy ramifications that really can’t be fully debated in 5 or 10 minutes. The situation in Syria remains highly complicated and complex and poses imminent threats to the United States and allied interests, particularly Israel, Jordan, and Iraq.

Recognizing congressional concerns regarding potential U.S. military involvement in Syria, our bill appropriates funds in the GWOT account, the title IX that I talked about several hours ago to train and equip Syrians. It also further prohibits the introduction of U.S. military forces into hostilities in Syria except in accordance with the War Powers Act.

However, this amendment, in my judgment, goes too far, for it attempts to tie the U.S. Government’s hands in navigating the complicated situation we—or, more importantly, our allies Israel and Jordan—face related to threats emanating from ISIL in Iraq and Syria every day. We have to be realistic. There are many countries, including our allies, as well as other groups already involved in Syria.

This amendment would do nothing to stop the arming of the Syrian opposition. What this amendment would do is remove the possibility of the U.S. engaging under any circumstances, even

if such engagement would be in the best interests of the United States or allies. Even at this rate, the U.S. is paying just a portion of the costs.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member, for any comments he may wish to make.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also want to express my best wishes for the gentleman’s mother. It is hard to oppose a gentleman who went to Purdue University. I know he is a very smart individual. I have my other colleague here from Minnesota.

I have spoken to our colleagues on the previous amendment. I think people understand my position. I simply would add my voice to the chairman and emphasize, this is a very tough problem, and we ought to maintain as large a degree of flexibility as we can.

I appreciate the chairman’s remarks and associate myself with them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I urge a “no” vote on this amendment, but I certainly understand the sentiments behind it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Army”, \$759,073,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Missile Procurement, Army”, \$572,735,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED

COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army”, \$647,630,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, \$431,640,000, to

remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Army”, \$1,648,312,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Navy”, \$722,274,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps”, \$105,459,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Navy”, \$12,186,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Marine Corps”, \$234,741,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”, \$1,297,726,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Missile Procurement, Air Force”, \$773,638,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Space Procurement, Air Force”, \$452,676,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section

251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force”, \$1,673,358,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Air Force”, \$7,045,550,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, \$217,701,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT ACCOUNT

For procurement of covered items for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, \$1,500,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That the Chiefs of National Guard and Reserve components shall, not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this paragraph, the term “covered items” means items that— (1) are not major weapon systems, aircraft, or other items central to the mission of an organization; and (2) are useful for both missions performed under title 10, United States Code, and missions performed under title 32, United States Code, when applicable, including radios, generators, computers, trucks, and other dual-use items: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, \$1,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, \$217,647,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of

the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force”, \$1,366,242,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, \$199,264,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for “Defense Working Capital Funds”, \$88,850,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for “Defense Health Program”, \$272,704,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for “Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense”, \$275,300,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the “Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund”, \$443,271,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall,

not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for the “Office of the Inspector General”, \$10,262,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 9001. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

SEC. 9002. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9003. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to \$3,500,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: *Provided further*, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in section 8005 of this Act.

SEC. 9004. Supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance or the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund” provided in this Act and executed in direct support of overseas contingency operations in Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction include all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 9005. From funds made available in this title, the Secretary of Defense may purchase for use by military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility: (a) passenger motor vehicles up to a limit of \$75,000 per vehicle; and (b) heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of \$450,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 9006. Not to exceed \$10,000,000 of the amounts appropriated in this title under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Army” may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Com-

mander’s Emergency Response Program (CERP), for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Afghanistan to respond to urgent, small-scale, humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility: *Provided*, That each project (including any ancillary or related elements in connection with such project) executed under this authority shall not exceed \$2,000,000: *Provided further*, That not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the end of each month, the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees monthly commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the Commander’s Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein for a project with a total anticipated cost for completion of \$500,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing each of the following:

(1) The location, nature and purpose of the proposed project, including how the project is intended to advance the military campaign plan for the country in which it is to be carried out.

(2) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, and completion date for the proposed project, including any other CERP funding that has been or is anticipated to be contributed to the completion of the project.

(3) A plan for the sustainment of the proposed project, including the agreement with either the host nation, a non-Department of Defense agency of the United States Government or a third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance of any equipment or facilities to be provided through the proposed project.

SEC. 9007. Funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 9008. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

SEC. 9009. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Na-

tions Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) Sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–148).

SEC. 9010. None of the funds provided for the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund” (ASFF) may be obligated prior to the approval of a financial and activity plan by the Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council (AROC) of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That the AROC must approve the requirement and acquisition plan for any service requirements in excess of \$50,000,000 annually and any non-standard equipment requirements in excess of \$100,000,000 using ASFF: *Provided further*, That the Department of Defense must certify to the congressional defense committees that the AROC has convened and approved a process for ensuring compliance with the requirements in the preceding proviso and accompanying report language for the ASFF.

SEC. 9011. Funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than \$250,000: *Provided*, That, upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations overseas, such funds may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than \$500,000.

SEC. 9012. From funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, up to \$140,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to support United States Government transition activities in Iraq by funding the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction, and site closeout activities prior to returning sites to the Government of Iraq: *Provided*, That to the extent authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the operations and activities that may be carried out by the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, include non-operational training activities in support of Iraqi Minister of Defense and Counter Terrorism Service personnel in an institutional environment to address capability gaps, integrate processes relating to intelligence, air sovereignty, combined arms, logistics and maintenance, and to manage and integrate defense-related institutions: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days following the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for transitioning any such training activities that they determine are

needed after the end of fiscal year 2016, to existing or new contracts for the sale of defense articles or defense services consistent with the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq at each site where such operations and activities will be conducted during fiscal year 2016: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 9013. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, to the Government of Jordan for purposes of supporting and enhancing efforts of the armed forces of Jordan and to sustain security along the border of Jordan with Syria and Iraq: *Provided*, That up to \$600,000,000 of funds appropriated by this Act for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund may be used for activities authorized by this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments to carry out activities as authorized by this section and shall be credited to the appropriate appropriations accounts, except that any funds so accepted by the Secretary shall not be available for obligation until a reprogramming action is submitted to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the President and the Secretary of Defense shall comply with the reporting requirements in section 149(b)(1), (b)(2), (c), and (d) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (Public Law 113-164): *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances, in accordance with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

SEC. 9014. For "Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine", \$200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary's designee, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of providing assistance, including training, equipment, lethal weapons of a defensive nature, logistics support, supplies and services, and sustainment to the military and national security forces of Ukraine, for the purposes of securing the sovereign territory of Ukraine against foreign aggressors, protecting and defending the Ukrainian people from attacks posed by Russian-backed separatists, and promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict: *Provided further*, That the authority to pro-

vide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to Ukraine: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not less than 15 days prior to obligating funds provided under this heading, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the United States may accept equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts that was transferred to the security forces of Ukraine and returned by such forces to the United States: *Provided further*, That equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts, and not yet transferred to the military or National Security Forces of Ukraine or returned by such forces to the United States, may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon written notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

SEC. 9015. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" for payments under section 1233 of Public Law 110-181 for reimbursement to the Government of Pakistan may be made available unless the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Government of Pakistan is—

(1) cooperating with the United States in counterterrorism efforts against the Haqqani Network, the Quetta Shura Taliban, Lashkar e-Tayyiba, Jaish-e-Mohammed, Al Qaeda, and other domestic and foreign terrorist organizations, including taking steps to end support for such groups and prevent them from basing and operating in Pakistan and carrying out cross border attacks into neighboring countries;

(2) not supporting terrorist activities against United States or coalition forces in Afghanistan, and Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies are not intervening extra-judicially into political and judicial processes in Pakistan;

(3) dismantling improvised explosive device (IED) networks and interdicting precursor chemicals used in the manufacture of IEDs;

(4) preventing the proliferation of nuclear-related material and expertise;

(5) implementing policies to protect judicial independence and due process of law;

(6) issuing visas in a timely manner for United States visitors engaged in counterterrorism efforts and assistance programs in Pakistan; and

(7) providing humanitarian organizations access to detainees, internally displaced persons, and other Pakistani civilians affected by the conflict.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, may waive the restriction in subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national security interest to do so: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, exercises such waiver authority, the Secretaries shall report to the congressional defense committees on both the justification for the waiver and on the requirements of this section that the Government of Pakistan was not able to meet: *Provided further*, That such report may be submitted in classified form if necessary.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike subsection (b) of section 9015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 2130

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is very simple. It makes it so the Secretary of Defense cannot waive the conditions that are in the bill on giving money to Pakistan.

Since 2010, Congress has put conditions on our aid to Pakistan because Pakistan, frankly, can't be trusted. In 2011, Pakistan tipped off terrorists who had IED factories that the U.S. Government knew where they were. Pakistan tipped off the Haqqani network before the Pakistan military went to the tribal areas last year.

We didn't tell Pakistan before we launched the raid that killed Osama bin Laden because, according to Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, "We just can't trust them."

This bill puts seven conditions on our aid to Pakistan. They are good conditions. Earlier this evening, about an hour ago, the ranking member mentioned these conditions for aid to Pakistan. They are commonsense things like, if Pakistan wants our money, it shouldn't support terrorist activity against the United States—imagine that—or the Pakistan Government should dismantle the IED factories run by terrorists in Pakistan. These IED factories have killed many of our troops.

Here is the problem. Each year, we put conditions on our aid. The bill also gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to give the money to Pakistan even if Pakistan doesn't meet those conditions, and this year is no exception. Once again, in this bill, we give the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the conditions Congress puts in the bill.

Four of the last 5 years, Pakistan has failed to meet the conditions Congress has imposed on this type of legislation, and then the Secretary of Defense went ahead and gave the waiver, thus giving the money to Pakistan anyway.

The administration has never not given Pakistan money because it failed to meet our conditions—conditions set by Congress—normal, commonsense conditions like: you don't get this money unless you meet these conditions.

This amendment does one simple thing. It says: you meet the conditions, or you get no money from the United States; you don't give money to terrorists, or you get no money from the United States.

It does not allow the Secretary of Defense to waive Congress' conditions and give the money anyway.

That is what this legislation does. I would ask that the House support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. This amendment would strike, as he said, the waiver that is used by the Secretary of Defense and also the Secretary of State. I think it would affect our national security.

We need the cooperation of the Pakistanis. If we don't have any, we lose insight into the actions of those who would do our country harm.

I oppose this amendment as potentially damaging to our national security, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I thank the chair for yielding, and I associate myself with his remarks.

Again, I am not unsympathetic to the position the gentleman has raised, but I do not think we are in a very difficult relationship, that we restrain our flexibility to meet the moment.

For that reason, I join the chairman in his opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank both the ranking member and the chairman for their comments and their work on this legislation.

My amendment says, to quote the chairman earlier, "We mean what we say." We say as a Congress that, if we are going to give American money to Pakistan to help us, they can't do certain things with that money. They can't support terrorism. They can't

allow IEDs to be built that are used to kill Americans. These conditions are commonsense, good ideas.

In the past, we have done this before. If we mean what we say, then we should require these conditions before we give Pakistan American money; but the law has allowed that Secretary of Defense to waive Congress' conditions and give them our money anyway.

Pakistan has proven they didn't meet the conditions in 4 years of the last 5. They got the money anyway because the Secretary waived the rule of law or waived our conditions.

This bill does something very simple. It says: Congress says there are certain rules to get American money; you follow the rules, or you don't get the money. Nobody can waive the condition and give you a pass and give you American money anyway.

I would ask that this amendment be adopted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for the work that he has done on this.

I understand that I had an amendment earlier today. There had been ongoing discussions about that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on my amendment to the end that the amendment stands disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the noes have it and the amendment is not adopted.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9016. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this Act, \$500,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to the operations and maintenance, military personnel, and procurement accounts, to improve the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority provided

elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days prior to exercising the transfer authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the proposed uses of these funds: *Provided further*, That the funds provided in this section may not be transferred to any program, project, or activity specifically limited or denied by this Act: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9017. In addition to amounts appropriated in title II or otherwise made available in this Act, \$2,500,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer to the operation and maintenance accounts of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force (including National Guard and Reserve) for purposes of improving military readiness: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 9018. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Syria in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed or military forces into hostilities in Syria, into situations in Syria where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Syrian territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of that law (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10001. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) the United States has been engaged in military operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) for more than 8 months;

(2) President Obama submitted an authorization for the use of military force against ISIL in February 2015; and

(3) under article 1, section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the authority to "declare war".

(b) Therefore, Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force against ISIL.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 10002. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that

that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 300, nays 131, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—300

Abraham	Crawford	Himes
Adams	Crenshaw	Hinojosa
Aderholt	Cuellar	Holding
Aguilar	Culberson	Hudson
Allen	Curbelo (FL)	Huelskamp
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Huffman
Amodei	DelBene	Huizenga (MI)
Ashford	Denham	Hultgren
Babin	Dent	Hunter
Barletta	DeSantis	Hurd (TX)
Barr	DesJarlais	Hurt (VA)
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Israel
Benishkek	Doggett	Issa
Bera	Dold	Jackson Lee
Billrakis	Donovan	Jeffries
Bishop (GA)	Duckworth	Jenkins (KS)
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Black	Ellmers (NC)	Johnson, E. B.
Blackburn	Emmer (MN)	Johnson, Sam
Blum	Eshoo	Jolly
Bost	Farenthold	Jordan
Boustany	Farr	Joyce
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Katko
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Kelly (IL)
Brat	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (MS)
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (AL)	Fleming	Kilmer
Brooks (IN)	Flores	Kind
Brown (FL)	Forbes	King (IA)
Buchanan	Foster	King (NY)
Buck	Fox	Kinzing (IL)
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Kirkpatrick
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Bustos	Fudge	Knight
Butterfield	Garrett	Labrador
Byrne	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Calvert	Gibson	Lamborn
Capps	Gohmert	Lance
Carney	Goodlatte	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Gosar	Latta
Carter (GA)	Graham	LoBiondo
Carter (TX)	Granger	Lofgren
Castro (TX)	Graves (GA)	Long
Chabot	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Love
Clawson (FL)	Griffith	Lucas
Cleaver	Grothman	Luetkemeyer
Clyburn	Guinta	Lummis
Coffman	Guthrie	MacArthur
Cole	Hanna	Maloney, Sean
Collins (GA)	Hardy	Marchant
Collins (NY)	Harper	Marino
Comstock	Harris	Matsui
Conaway	Hartzler	McCarthy
Cook	Heck (NV)	McCaul
Cooper	Hensarling	McClintock
Costa	Herrera Beutler	McHenry
Costello (PA)	Hice, Jody B.	McKinley
Cramer	Hill	

McMorris	Richmond	Stutzman
Rodgers	Rigell	Swalwell (CA)
McNerney	Roby	Thompson (CA)
McSally	Roe (TN)	Thompson (MS)
Meadows	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Meeks	Rokita	Tiberi
Messer	Rooney (FL)	Tipton
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Torres
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Trott
Miller (MI)	Ross	Turner
Moolenaar	Rothfus	Upton
Mullin	Rouzer	Valadao
Mulvaney	Roybal-Allard	Vargas
Murphy (PA)	Royce	Veasey
Neugebauer	Ruiz	Vela
Newhouse	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
Nugent	Russell	Wagner
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
O'Rourke	Salmon	Walden
Olson	Sanchez, Loretta	Walker
Palazzo	Sanford	Walorski
Palmer	Scalise	Walters, Mimi
Pascarell	Schrader	Weber (TX)
Paulsen	Schweikert	Webster (FL)
Pearce	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Westerman
Perry	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Peters	Sessions	Whitfield
Pittenger	Sewell (AL)	Williams
Pitts	Shinkus	Wilson (SC)
Poe (TX)	Shuster	Wittman
Pompeo	Simpson	Womack
Price, Tom	Sinema	Woodall
Quigley	Smith (MO)	Yoder
Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Young (IA)
Reichert	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)
Renacci	Stefanik	Zeldin
Ribble	Stewart	Zinke
Rice (SC)	Stivers	

NAYS—131

Bass	Green, Al	Noem
Beatty	Green, Gene	Nolan
Becerra	Grijalva	Norcross
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Blumenauer	Hahn	Payne
Bonamici	Hastings	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)	Peterson
F.	Higgins	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Pocan
Capuano	Hoyer	Poliquin
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Cartwright	Jones	Posey
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Rangel
Cicilline	Kildee	Rice (NY)
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Rohrabacher
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Rush
Clay	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	Lawrence	Sánchez, Linda
Connolly	Lee	T.
Conyers	Levin	Sarbanes
Courtney	Lewis	Schakowsky
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
Cummings	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Loebsack	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sherman
DeFazio	Lowe	Sires
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
Delaney	(NM)	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Takai
Deutch	Lynch	Takano
Dingell	Maloney,	Titus
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn	Tonko
F.	Massie	Tsongas
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Van Hollen
Edwards	McDermott	Visclosky
Ellison	McGovern	Walz
Engel	Meng	Wasserman
Esty	Mooney (WV)	Schultz
Fortenberry	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Gallego	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Grayson	Neal	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—2

Keating

□ 2205

Ms. CHU, Messrs. MOONEY of West Virginia, SHERMAN, LEWIS, LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. GRAYSON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. RICHMOND, SIMPSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. JACKSON LEE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 2207

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. HUFFMAN of California.

Amendment by Mr. VISCLOSKEY of Indiana.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment by Mr. FORBES of Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. POE of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. WALBERG of Michigan.

Amendment by Mr. NOLAN of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. POE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 237, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

AYES—195

Adams	Duncan (TN)	Lipinski
Aguilar	Edwards	Loeb sack
Ashford	Ellison	Lofgren
Bass	Emmer (MN)	Lowenthal
Beatty	Engel	Lowey
Becerra	Eshoo	Lujan Grisham
Benishkek	Esty	(NM)
Bera	Farr	Lujan, Ben Ray
Beyer	Fattah	(NM)
Bishop (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Lynch
Blumenauer	Foster	Maloney,
Bonamici	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Boyle, Brendan	Fudge	Matsui
F.	Gabbard	McCollum
Brady (PA)	Galleo	McDermott
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	McGovern
Brownley (CA)	Gibson	McKinley
Bustos	Graham	Meeks
Butterfield	Grayson	Meng
Capps	Green, Al	Miller (MI)
Capuano	Green, Gene	Moore
Cárdenas	Grijalva	Moulton
Carney	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Carson (IN)	Hahn	Nadler
Cartwright	Hanna	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Hastings	Neal
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Nolan
Chu, Judy	Higgins	Pallone
Cicilline	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Clark (MA)	Honda	Payne
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Pelosi
Clay	Huffman	Perlmutter
Cleaver	Hurt (VA)	Peters
Clyburn	Israel	Pingree
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Comstock	Jeffries	Polis
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Courtney	Jones	Rangel
Cramer	Kaptur	Reichert
Crowley	Katko	Rice (NY)
Cummings	Keating	Richmond
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Roby
Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Kildee	Royce
DeGette	Kilmer	Ruiz
Delaney	Kind	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Rush
DelBene	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Dent	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)	T.
Deutch	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Loretta
Dingell	Lawrence	Sanford
Dold	Lee	Sarbanes
Doyle, Michael	Levin	Schakowsky
F.	Lewis	Schiff
Duckworth	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

NOES—237

Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mooleenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Torres
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—1
Gowdy

□ 2211

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 179, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

AYES—252

Adams	DeSantis	Johnson (GA)
Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Johnson, Sam
Amash	DesJarlais	Jolly
Ashford	Deutch	Jones
Babin	Dingell	Jordan
Bass	Doggett	Kaptur
Becerra	Duckworth	Katko
Bera	Duffy	Keating
Beyer	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (IL)
Bilirakis	Duncan (TN)	Kennedy
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Kildee
Bishop (MI)	Ellison	Kilmer
Black	Ellmers (NC)	Kind
Blackburn	Engel	Kinzing (IL)
Blum	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Blumenauer	Esty	Knight
Bonamici	Farenthold	Kuster
Brat	Farr	Labrador
Bridenstine	Fleming	LaMalfa
Brownley (CA)	Forbes	Langevin
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Larsen (WA)
Buck	Foster	Lawrence
Burgess	Foxy	Lee
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Butterfield	Gabbard	Lewis
Capps	Galleo	Lieu, Ted
Capuano	Garamendi	Lipinski
Cárdenas	Garrett	Loeb sack
Carney	Gibson	Lofgren
Carson (IN)	Gohmert	Lowenthal
Castor (FL)	Gosar	Lowey
Castro (TX)	Graham	Lujan Grisham
Chu, Judy	Grijalva	(NM)
Cicilline	Guinta	Lujan, Ben Ray
Clark (MA)	Gutiérrez	(NM)
Clarke (NY)	Hahn	Lynch
Clay	Hanna	Maloney,
Cleaver	Harris	Carolyn
Clyburn	Hastings	Maloney, Sean
Cohen	Heck (NV)	Marchant
Comstock	Heck (WA)	Massie
Connolly	Hensarling	Matsui
Conyers	Herrera Beutler	McCarthy
Courtney	Higgins	McClintock
Cramer	Himes	McCollum
Crowley	Hinojosa	McDermott
Cummings	Holding	McGovern
Davis (CA)	Honda	McNerney
Davis, Danny	Hoyer	McSally
DeFazio	Huelskamp	Meeks
DeGette	Huffman	Meng
Delaney	Hurd (TX)	Messer
DeLauro	Israel	Miller (FL)
DelBene	Issa	Moore
Denham	Jackson Lee	Moulton
	Jeffries	Murphy (FL)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)

Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart

Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—179

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Emmer (MN)
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Williams
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer

Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Stefanik
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—2
Gowdy
Rice (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2216

Mr. MCCARTHY changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKEY
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.
The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.
A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 257, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

AYES—174

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell

Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence

Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier

Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas

Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—257

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer

Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perrin
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—2

Gowdy
Quigley

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2219

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from New York (Mr. NAD-
LER) on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 173, noes 259,
not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

AYES—173

Adams	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)
Amash	Deutch	Larson (CT)
Bass	Dingell	Lawrence
Beatty	Doggett	Lee
Becerra	Doyle, Michael	Levin
Bera	F.	Lewis
Beyer	Duckworth	Lieu, Ted
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Loeb sack
Blumenauer	Ellison	Lofgren
Bonamici	Engel	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan	Eshoo	Lowe
F.	Esty	Lujan Grisham
Brady (PA)	Farr	(NM)
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Luján, Ben Ray
Bustos	Foster	(NM)
Butterfield	Frankel (FL)	Lynch
Capps	Fudge	Maloney,
Capuano	Gabbard	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Galleo	Matsui
Carney	Garamendi	McCollum
Carson (IN)	Gibson	McDermott
Cartwright	Grayson	McGovern
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Chu, Judy	Hahn	Meng
Cicilline	Hastings	Moore
Clark (MA)	Heck (WA)	Moulton
Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Murphy (FL)
Clay	Himes	Nadler
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Clyburn	Honda	Neal
Cohen	Hoyer	Nolan
Connolly	Huffman	Norcross
Conyers	Israel	O'Rourke
Cooper	Jeffries	Pallone
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Pascrell
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Crowley	Kaptur	Pelosi
Cummings	Keating	Perlmutter
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Peters
Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Peterson
DeFazio	Kildee	Pingree
DeGette	Kilmer	Pocan
Delaney	Kind	Polis
DeLauro	Kuster	Price (NC)
DelBene	Langevin	Quigley

Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader

Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko

NOES—259

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cullar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Elmiers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar

Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from New York (Mr. NAD-
LER) on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 181, noes 251,
not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

AYES—181

Adams	DeGette	Jones
Amash	Delaney	Kaptur
Ashford	DeLauro	Keating
Bass	DelBene	Kelly (IL)
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Kennedy
Becerra	Deutch	Kildee
Bera	Dingell	Kilmer
Beyer	Doggett	Kind
Bishop (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Kuster
Blumenauer	F.	Langevin
Bonamici	Duckworth	Larsen (WA)
Boyle, Brendan	Edwards	Larson (CT)
F.	Ellison	Lawrence
Brady (PA)	Engel	Lee
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Levin
Bustos	Esty	Lewis
Butterfield	Farr	Lieu, Ted
Capps	Fattah	Lipinski
Capuano	Foster	Loeb sack
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Lofgren
Carney	Fudge	Lowenthal
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lowe
Cartwright	Galleo	Lujan Grisham
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Gibson	Luján, Ben Ray
Chu, Judy	Grayson	(NM)
Cicilline	Green, Al	Lynch
Clark (MA)	Grijalva	Maloney,
Clarke (NY)	Gutiérrez	Carolyn
Clay	Hahn	Massie
Cleaver	Hastings	Matsui
Clyburn	Heck (WA)	McCollum
Cohen	Higgins	McDermott
Connolly	Himes	McGovern
Conyers	Hinojosa	McNerney
Cooper	Honda	Meeks
Costa	Hoyer	Meng
Courtney	Huffman	Moore
Crowley	Israel	Moulton
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Nadler
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Neal

Nolan	Sánchez, Linda T.	Thompson (CA)	Thompson (PA)	Walden	Wilson (SC)	Hartzler	McCollum	Sánchez, Linda T.
O'Rourke	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (MS)	Thornberry	Walker	Wittman	Hastings	McGovern	T.
Pallone	Sanford	Titus	Tiberi	Walorski	Womack	Heck (NV)	McHenry	Sanchez, Loretta
Pascarell	Sarbanes	Tonko	Tipton	Walters, Mimi	Woodall	Heck (WA)	McKinley	Sanford
Payne	Schakowsky	Torres	Trott	Weber (TX)	Yoder	Hensarling	McMorris	Sarbanes
Pelosi	Schiff	Tsongas	Turner	Webster (FL)	Yoho	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers	Scalise
Perlmutter	Schrader	Van Hollen	Upton	Westerman	Young (AK)	Higgins	McSally	Schakowsky
Peters	Scott (VA)	Vargas	Valadao	Westmoreland	Young (IA)	Himes	Meehan	Schiff
Peterson	Scott, David	Veasey	Vela	Whitfield	Young (IN)	Hinojosa	Messer	Schweikert
Pingree	Sensenbrenner	Velázquez	Wagner	Williams	Zinke	Honda	Mica	Scott (VA)
Pocan	Serrano	Visclosky	Walberg			Hoyer	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin
Polis	Sherman	Walz				Hudson	Moore	Scott, David
Price (NC)	Sires	Wasserman				Huffman	Moulton	Sensenbrenner
Quigley	Slaughter	Schultz				Huizenga (MI)	Mullin	Sessions
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Waters, Maxine				Hultgren	Murphy (FL)	Shuster
Rice (NY)	Scott, David	Watson Coleman				Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Sinema
Richmond	Speier	Welch				Hurd (TX)	Napolitano	Sires
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)				Hurt (VA)	Neal	Slaughter
Rush	Takai	Yarmuth				Issa	Neugebauer	Smith (MO)
Ryan (OH)	Takano					Jackson Lee	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)
						Jenkins (KS)	Noem	Smith (TX)
						Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Smith (WA)
						Johnson (OH)	Norcross	Speier
						Johnson, Sam	Nugent	Stefanik
						Jones	O'Rourke	Stewart
						Jordan	Olson	Stivers
						Katko	Pallone	Stutzman
						Keating	Palmer	Swalwell (CA)
						Kelly (PA)	Pascarell	Takai
						Kennedy	Paulsen	Takano
						Kildee	Payne	Thompson (CA)
						Kilmer	Pearce	Thompson (MS)
						King (IA)	Pelosi	Thompson (PA)
						Kinzingler (IL)	Perlmutter	Thornberry
						Kline	Perry	Tiberi
						Knight	Peters	Tipton
						Kuster	Peterson	Titus
						LaMalfa	Pingree	Tonko
						Lamborn	Pittenger	Torres
						Langevin	Pitts	Tsongas
						Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Turner
						Larson (CT)	Poe (TX)	Valadao
						Latta	Poliquin	Van Hollen
						Lawrence	Pompeo	Vargas
						Levin	Posey	Veasey
						Lieu, Ted	Rangel	Vela
						Lipinski	Ratcliffe	Wagner
						Loeb sack	Reed	Walberg
						Lofgren	Reichert	Walker
						Long	Renacci	Walorski
						Love	Ribble	Walters, Mimi
						Lowenthal	Rice (NY)	Walz
						Lucas	Rice (SC)	Wasserman
						Luetkemeyer	Richmond	Schultz
						Lujan Grisham	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)
						(NM)	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
						Lujan, Ben Ray	Rohrabacher	Welch
						(NM)	Rokita	Wenstrup
						Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams
						Lynch	Roskam	Wilson (FL)
						Maloney,	Ross	Wilson (SC)
						Carolyn	Rothfus	Wittman
						Maloney, Sean	Rouzer	Woodall
						Marchant	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth
						Marino	Royce	Young (AK)
						Massie	Ruiz	Young (IN)
						Matsui	Russell	Zeldin
						McCarthy	Ryan (OH)	Zinke
						McCaul	Ryan (WI)	
						McClintock	Salmon	

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2225

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 321, noes 111,
not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

AYES—321

Abraham	Garrett	McSally	Adams	Chabot	Duffy	Abraham	Cuellar	Hill
Aderholt	Gibbs	Meadows	Aguilar	Chaffetz	Duncan (SC)	Aderholt	Davis, Danny	Holding
Aguilar	Gohmert	Meehan	Allen	Chu, Judy	Edwards	Amash	DeFazio	Huelskamp
Allen	Goodlatte	Messer	Amodiei	Cicilline	Ellmers (NC)	Bass	Dent	Israel
Amodiei	Gosar	Mica	Ashford	Clay	Emmer (MN)	Becerra	DeSantis	Jeffries
Babin	Graham	Miller (FL)	Babin	Cleaver	Eshoo	Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins (WV)
Barletta	Granger	Miller (MI)	Barletta	Clyburn	Esty	Blum	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Barr	Graves (GA)	Moolenaar	Barr	Coffman	Farenthold	Blumenauer	Donovan	Jolly
Barton	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Barton	Cohen	Farr	Bonamici	Duncan (TN)	Joyce
Benishek	Graves (MO)	Mullin	Beatty	Cole	Fattah	Boustany	Ellison	Kaptur
Bilirakis	Graves (NE)	Mulvaney	Benishek	Collins (NY)	Fincher	Brown (FL)	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (MI)	Green, Gene	Murphy (PA)	Bera	Comstock	Fitzpatrick	Buck	Fleischmann	Kelly (MS)
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Neugebauer	Beyer	Conaway	Fleming	Burgess	Frankel (FL)	Kind
Black	Grothman	Newhouse	Bishop (GA)	Cannolly	Flores	Calvert	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Blackburn	Guinta	Noem	Bishop (MI)	Cook	Forbes	Cárdenas	Granger	Kirkpatrick
Blum	Guthrie	Noem	Bishop (UT)	Cooper	Fortenberry	Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Labrador
Bost	Hanna	Norcross	Black	Costa	Foster	Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Lance
Boustany	Hardy	Nugent	Blackburn	Costello (PA)	Fox	Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	Lee
Brady (TX)	Harper	Nunes	Bost	Courtney	Franks (AZ)	Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Lewis
Brat	Harris	Olson	Boyle, Brendan	Cramer	Fudge	Clawson (FL)	Hanna	LoBiondo
Bridenstine	Hartzler	Palazzo	F.	Crawford	Gabbard	Collins (GA)	Hardy	Loudermilk
Brooks (AL)	Heck (NV)	Palmer	Brady (PA)	Crowley	Gallego	Conyers	Harris	Lowey
Brooks (IN)	Hensarling	Paulsen	Brady (TX)	Cuberson	Garamendi	Crenshaw	Hice, Jody B.	MacArthur
Brownley (CA)	Herrera Beutler	Pearce	Brat	Cummings	Garrett			
Buchanan	Hice, Jody B.	Perry	Bridenstine	Curbelo (FL)	Gibbs			
Buck	Hill	Pittenger	Brooks (AL)	Davis (CA)	Gibson			
Bucshon	Holding	Pitts	Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Gohmert			
Bucshon	Hudson	Poe (TX)	Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Goodlatte			
Burgess	Huelskamp	Poliquin	Buchanan	Delaney	Gosar			
Byrne	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo	Bucshon	DeLauro	Graham			
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Posey	Bustos	DelBene	Graves (LA)			
Carter (GA)	Hunter	Price, Tom	Butterfield	Denham	Graves (MO)			
Carter (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe	Byrne	DesJarlais	Grayson			
Chabot	Hurt (VA)	Reed	Capps	DeSantis	Griffith			
Chaffetz	Issa	Reichert	Capuano	DeGette	Grothman			
Clawson (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Renacci	Carney	Dingell	Guinta			
Coffman	Jenkins (WV)	Ribble	Carson (IN)	Dold	Guthrie			
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	Carter (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Gutiérrez			
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rigell	Castro (TX)	F.	Hahn			
Collins (NY)	Jolly	Roby			Harper			
Comstock	Jordan	Roe (TN)						
Conaway	Joyce	Rogers (AL)						
Cook	Katko	Rogers (KY)						
Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Rohrabacher						
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rokita						
Crawford	King (IA)	Rooney (FL)						
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen						
Cuellar	Kinzingler (IL)	Roskam						
Culberson	Kirkpatrick	Ross						
Curbelo (FL)	Kline	Rothfus						
Davis, Rodney	Knight	Rouzer						
Denham	Labrador	Royce						
Dent	LaMalfa	Ruiz						
DeSantis	Lamborn	Ruppersberger						
DesJarlais	Lance	Russell						
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Ryan (WI)						
Dold	LoBiondo	Salmon						
Donovan	Long	Scalise						
Duffy	Loudermilk	Schweikert						
Duncan (SC)	Love	Scott, Austin						
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Sessions						
Ellmers (NC)	Luetkemeyer	Sewell (AL)						
Emmer (MN)	Lummis	Shimkus						
Farenthold	MacArthur	Shuster						
Fincher	Maloney, Sean	Simpson						
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Sinema						
Fleischmann	Marino	Smith (MO)						
Fleming	McCarthy	Smith (NE)						
Flores	McCaul	Smith (NJ)						
Forbes	McClintock	Smith (TX)						
Fortenberry	McHenry	Stefanik						
Fox	McKinley	Stewart						
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Stivers						
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Stutzman						

NOES—111

Abraham	Cuellar	Hill
Aderholt	Davis, Danny	Holding
Amash	DeFazio	Huelskamp
Bass	Dent	Israel
Becerra	DeSantis	Jeffries
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins (WV)
Blum	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Donovan	Jolly
Bonamici	Duncan (TN)	Joyce
Boustany	Ellison	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Buck	Fleischmann	Kelly (MS)
Burgess	Frankel (FL)	Kind
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Cárdenas	Granger	Kirkpatrick
Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Labrador
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Lance
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	Lee
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Lewis
Clawson (FL)	Hanna	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Hardy	Loudermilk
Conyers	Harris	Lowey
Crenshaw	Hice, Jody B.	MacArthur

McDermott Price, Tom
McNerney Quigley
Meadows Rigell
Meeks Roby
Meng Rogers (KY)
Miller (FL) Rooney (FL)
Moolenaar Ruppertsberger
Mooney (WV) Rush
Mulvaney Schrader
Nadler Serrano
Nunes Sewell (AL)
Palazzo Sherman
Polis Shimkus
Price (NC) Simpson

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2230

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Messrs. PAYNE and BUCSHON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 117, noes 315, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—117

Allen	Gohmert	Marchant
Amash	Goodlatte	Massie
Babin	Gosar	McCaul
Barton	Grayson	McClintock
Bishop (MI)	Green, Gene	McMorris
Blum	Griffith	Rodgers
Blumenauer	Hardy	Messer
Bost	Harris	Mica
Brat	Heck (NV)	Mooney (WV)
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney
Buck	Higgins	Murphy (PA)
Burgess	Holding	Neugebauer
Carter (GA)	Honda	Newhouse
Clawson (FL)	Hudson	Nolan
Clay	Huelskamp	Olson
Cohen	Huizenga (MI)	Pallone
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Palmer
Collins (NY)	Hurt (VA)	Perry
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Pingree
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Denham	Jones	Poliquin
DesJarlais	Jordan	Posey
Doggett	Katko	Price, Tom
Duffy	Keating	Ratliffe
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Reed
Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Renacci
Fincher	Lofgren	Ribble
Gabbard	Loudermilk	Rice (SC)
Garrett	Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)
Gibson	Lummis	Rohrabacher

Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Salmon
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguliar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Doudcham
Diaz-Balart
Dingell

NOES—315

Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuskam
Lamborn
Lance

Sessions
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tonko
Trott

Upton
Walden
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

Royce
Ruppertsberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)

Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg

Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2233

Mr. COFFMAN changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 199, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

AYES—233

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Cramer
Adams	Buck	Crowley
Allen	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Amash	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Babin	Capps	DeFazio
Barletta	Capuano	DeLauro
Becerra	Carney	DelBene
Benishek	Carter (GA)	DeSantis
Bera	Cartwright	DeSaulnier
Beyer	Castor (FL)	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Chabot	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Chaffetz	Doggett
Bishop (MI)	Cicilline	Doyle, Michael F.
Blackburn	Clark (MA)	Duffy
Blum	Clay	Duncan (SC)
Blumenauer	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Bonamici	Cohen	Ellmers (NC)
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Emmer (MN)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Collins (NY)	Engel
Brady (PA)	Conaway	Esty
Brat	Costello (PA)	Farenthold
Bridenstine	Courtney	Fattah

Fincher	Latta	Reed	Lynch	Rice (NY)	Takano	Takano	Tonko	Watson Coleman
Flores	Lawrence	Renacci	MacArthur	Rice (SC)	Thompson (CA)	Titus	Tsongas	Welch
Forbes	Lee	Ribble	Maloney,	Rigell	Thompson (MS)			
Foster	Lieu, Ted	Richmond	Carolyn	Roby	Thornberry		NOES—375	
Fox	Lipinski	Roe (TN)	Marino	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi	Abraham	DesJarlais	Kildee
Frankel (FL)	Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Matsui	Rogers (KY)	Titus	Adams	Deutch	Kilmer
Franks (AZ)	Long	Rokita	McCollum	Rooney (FL)	Torres	Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Kind
Gabbard	Loudermilk	Ros-Lehtinen	McNerney	Roskam	Turner	Aguilar	Dingell	King (IA)
Gallego	Love	Ross	McSally	Rouzer	Valadao	Allen	Doggett	King (NY)
Garamendi	Luetkemeyer	Rothfus	Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Vargas	Amodei	Dold	Kinzing (IL)
Garrett	Lummis	Royce	Meeks	Ruiz	Veasey	Ashford	Donovan	Kirkpatrick
Gibson	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Meng	Ruppersberger	Vela	Babin	Duckworth	Kline
Goodlatte	Marchant	Salmon	Miller (FL)	Rush	Velázquez	Barletta	Duffy	Knight
Gosar	Massie	Sánchez, Linda	Moore	Russell	Visclosky	Barr	Duncan (SC)	Labrador
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	T.	Moulton	Ryan (WI)	Wagner	Barton	Ellison	LaMalfa
Grayson	McCauley	Sanford	Mullin	Sanchez, Loretta	Walorski	Bass	Ellmers (NC)	Lamborn
Green, Gene	McClintock	Scalise	Nadler	Sarbanes	Wasserman	Beatty	Emmer (MN)	Lance
Griffith	McDermott	Schakowsky	Napolitano	Schiff	Schultz	Becerra	Engel	Langevin
Grothman	McGovern	Schrader	Noem	Scott (VA)	Serrano	Benishek	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Guinta	McHenry	Schweikert	Norcross	Sessions	Sewell (AL)	Bera	Esty	Larson (CT)
Guthrie	McKinley	Scott, Austin	Nugent	Shimkus	Smith (WA)	Beyer	Farenthold	Latta
Gutiérrez	McMorris	Scott, David	Nunes	Shuster	Smith (NJ)	Bishop (GA)	Farr	Levin
Hanna	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner	Palazzo	Simpson	Smith (WA)	Bishop (MI)	Fattah	Lieu, Ted
Harris	Meadows	Sherman	Pelosi	Smith (NJ)	Stefanik	Bishop (UT)	Fincher	Lipinski
Hartzler	Messer	Sinema	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)	Stewart	Black	Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo
Hastings	Mica	Sires	Peters	Stefanik	Swalwell (CA)	Blackburn	Fleischmann	Loeb sack
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Slaughter	Poliquin	Stewart	Takai	Bonamici	Fleming	Long
Hice, Jody B.	Mooney (WV)	Smith (MO)	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)		Bost	Flores	Loudermilk
Higgins	Mulvaney	Smith (NE)	Rangel			Boustany	Forbes	Love
Himes	Murphy (FL)	Smith (TX)	Reichert			Fortenberry	Forbes	Lowe
Holding	Murphy (PA)	Speier				Boyle, Brendan	Foster	Lucas
Honda	Neal	Stivers				F.	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Hudson	Neugebauer	Stutzman				Brady (PA)	Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham
Huelskamp	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)				Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	(NM)
Huffman	Nolan	Tipton				Brat	Frelinghuysen	Lujan, Ben Ray
Huizenga (MI)	O'Rourke	Tonko				Bridenstine	Fudge	(NM)
Hultgren	Olson	Trott				Brooks (AL)	Gabbard	Lummis
Hurd (TX)	Pallone	Tsongas				Brooks (IN)	Gallego	Lynch
Hurt (VA)	Palmer	Upton				Brown (FL)	Garamendi	MacArthur
Issa	Pascarella	Van Hollen				Brownley (CA)	Garrett	Maloney,
Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen	Walberg				Buchanan	Gibbs	Carolyn
Jenkins (WV)	Payne	Walden				Bucshon	Gibson	Maloney, Sean
Johnson (OH)	Pearce	Walker				Bustos	Goodlatte	Marchant
Johnson, Sam	Perry	Walters, Mimi				Butterfield	Gosar	Marino
Jones	Peterson	Walz				Byrne	Graham	Matsui
Jordan	Pingree	Watson Coleman				Calvert	Granger	McCarthy
Keating	Pittenger	Weber (TX)				Capp	Graves (GA)	McCauley
Kennedy	Pitts	Webster (FL)				Cárdenas	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Kind	Pocan	Welch				Carney	Graves (MO)	McCollum
Kline	Poe (TX)	Wilson (FL)				Carson (IN)	Green, Al	McHenry
Knight	Polis	Wittman				Carter (GA)	Green, Gene	McKinley
Kuster	Pompeo	Woodall				Carter (TX)	Griffith	McMorris
Labrador	Posey	Yarmuth				Cartwright	Grothman	Rodgers
LaMalfa	Price (NC)	Yoder				Castor (FL)	Guinta	McNerney
Langevin	Price, Tom	Yoho				Castro (TX)	Guthrie	McSally
Larson (CT)	Ratcliffe	Zeldin				Chabot	Gutiérrez	Meadows
						Chaffetz	Hanna	Meehan
						Chu, Judy	Hardy	Meeks
						Clay	Harper	Meng
						Cleaver	Harris	Messer
						Clyburn	Hartzler	Mica
						Coffman	Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)
						Cohen	Heck (WA)	Miller (MI)
						Cole	Hensarling	Moolenaar
						Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)
						Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Moore
						Comstock	Higgins	Mullin
						Conaway	Hill	Murphy (FL)
						Connolly	Himes	Murphy (PA)
						Conyers	Hinojosa	Nadler
						Cook	Holding	Napolitano
						Cooper	Hoyer	Neugebauer
						Costa	Hudson	Newhouse
						Costello (PA)	Huelskamp	Noem
						Courtney	Huizenga (MI)	Norcross
						Cramer	Hultgren	Nugent
						Crawford	Hunter	Nunes
						Crenshaw	Hurd (TX)	Olson
						Crowley	Hurt (VA)	Palazzo
						Cuellar	Israel	Palmer
						Culberson	Issa	Pascarella
						Cummings	Jeffries	Paulsen
						Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Payne
						Davis (CA)	Jenkins (WV)	Pearce
						Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
						Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Perlmutter
						DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Peters
						Delaney	Johnson, Sam	Peterson
						DeLauro	Jolly	Pittenger
						DelBene	Joyce	Pitts
						Dent	Kaptur	Poe (TX)
						DeSantis	Katko	Poliquin
						DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)	Pompeo
							Kelly (MS)	Price (NC)
							Kelly (PA)	Price, Tom

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2237

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”
So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.
A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 56, noes 375, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

AYES—56

Amash	Hahn	McGovern
Blum	Hastings	Moulton
Blumenauer	Honda	Mulvaney
Burgess	Huffman	Neal
Capuano	Lance	Nolan
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	O'Rourke
Clark (MA)	Jones	Pallone
Clarke (NY)	Jordan	Perry
Clawson (FL)	Keating	Pingree
DeFazio	Kennedy	Pocan
Doyle, Michael	Kuster	Polis
F.	Lawrence	Posey
Duncan (TN)	Lee	Rohrabacher
Edwards	Lewis	Sanford
Gohmert	Lofgren	Schrader
Grayson	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Grijalva	Massie	Speier
	McDermott	

Quigley	Schiff	Vargas	Himes	McGovern	Rooney (FL)	Mooney (WV)	Roskam	Takai
Rangel	Schweikert	Veasey	Honda	Meadows	Rothfus	Moore	Ross	Thompson (CA)
Ratcliffe	Scott (VA)	Vela	Huelskamp	Miller (FL)	Salmon	Mullin	Rouzer	Thompson (MS)
Reed	Scott, Austin	Velázquez	Huffman	Moulton	Sanford	Murphy (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Thornberry
Reichert	Scott, David	Visclosky	Hurt (VA)	Mulvaney	Schrader	Murphy (PA)	Royce	Tiberi
Renacci	Sensenbrenner	Wagner	Johnson, Sam	Neal	Scott, Austin	Nadler	Ruiz	Torres
Ribble	Serrano	Walberg	Jolly	Neugebauer	Slaughter	Napolitano	Ruppersberger	Trott
Rice (NY)	Sessions	Walden	Jones	Nolan	Speier	Newhouse	Rush	Turner
Rice (SC)	Sewell (AL)	Walker	Jordan	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)	Noem	Russell	Upton
Richmond	Sherman	Walorski	Katko	Takano	Takano	Norcross	Ryan (OH)	Valadao
Rigell	Shimkus	Walters, Mimi	Keating	Palmer	Thompson (PA)	Nugent	Ryan (WI)	Vargas
Roby	Shuster	Walz	Kennedy	Paulsen	Tipton	Nunes	Sánchez, Linda	Veasey
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Wasserman	Labrador	Payne	Titus	Olson	T.	Vela
Rogers (AL)	Sinema	Schultz	Lieu, Ted	Perry	Tonko	Palazzo	Sanchez, Loretta	Velázquez
Rogers (KY)	Sires	Waters, Maxine	Lofgren	Pingree	Tsongas	Pascarell	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Rokita	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)	Loudermilk	Pocan	Van Hollen	Pearce	Scalise	Wagner
Rooney (FL)	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)	Lowenthal	Poe (TX)	Watson Coleman	Pelosi	Schakowsky	Walberg
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)	Lummis	Polis	Welch	Perlmutter	Schiff	Walden
Roskam	Smith (TX)	Westerman	Lynch	Posey	Westmoreland	Peters	Schweikert	Walker
Ross	Smith (WA)	Westerman	Massie	Price, Tom	Williams	Peterson	Scott (VA)	Walorski
Rothfus	Stefanik	Westmoreland	McClintock	Rangel	Woodall	Pittenger	Scott, David	Walters, Mimi
Rouzer	Stewart	Whitfield	McCollum	Ribble	Yarmuth	Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Walz
Roybal-Allard	Stivers	Williams	McDermott	Rohrabacher	Yoho	Poliquin	Serrano	Wasserman
Royce	Stutzman	Wilson (FL)				Pompeo	Sessions	Schultz
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (SC)				Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Waters, Maxine
Ruppersberger	Takai	Wittman	Abraham	Cummings	Hurd (TX)	Quigley	Sherman	Weber (TX)
Rush	Thompson (CA)	Womack	Adams	Curbelo (FL)	Israel	Ratcliffe	Shimkus	Webster (FL)
Russell	Thompson (MS)	Woodall	Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Issa	Reed	Shuster	Westerman
Ryan (OH)	Thompson (PA)	Yarmuth	Aguiar	Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee	Renacci	Simpson	Whitfield
Ryan (WI)	Thornberry	Yoder	Allen	Davis, Rodney	Jeffries	Rice (NY)	Sinema	Wilson (FL)
Salmon	Tipton	Yoho	Amodei	DeGette	Jenkins (KS)	Rice (SC)	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Sánchez, Linda	Torres	Young (AK)	Ashford	Delaney	Jenkins (WV)	Richmond	Smith (NE)	Wittman
T.	Trott	Young (IA)	Babin	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)	Rigell	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Sanchez, Loretta	Turner	Young (IN)	Barletta	DeBene	Johnson (OH)	Roby	Smith (TX)	Yoder
Sarbanes	Upton	Zeldin	Barr	Denham	Johnson, E. B.	Roe (TN)	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Scalise	Valadao	Zinke	Barton	DeSantis	Joyce	Rogers (AL)	Stefanik	Young (IA)
Schakowsky	Van Hollen		Bass	DeSaulnier	Kaptur	Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Young (IN)
			Beatty	Deutch	Kelly (IL)	Rokita	Stivers	Zeldin
			Becerra	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman	Zinke
			Benishek	Dingell	Kelly (PA)			
			Bera	Dold	Kildee			
			Beyer	Donovan	Kilmer			
			Bilirakis	Duffy	Kind			
			Bishop (GA)	Edwards	King (IA)			
			Bishop (MI)	Ellison	King (NY)			
			Bishop (UT)	Ellmers (NC)	Kinzing (IL)			
			Black	Emmer (MN)	Kirkpatrick			
			Blackburn	Engel	Kline			
			Bonamici	Eshoo	Knight			
			Boustany	Esty	Kuster			
			Boyle, Brendan	Farenthold	LaMalfa			
			F.	Farr	Lamborn			
			Brady (PA)	Fattah	Lance			
			Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Langevin			
			Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)			
			Brown (FL)	Flores	Larson (CT)			
			Brownley (CA)	Forbes	Latta			
			Buchanan	Foster	Lawrence			
			Buck	Fox	Lee			
			Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Levin			
			Bustos	Frelinghuysen	Lewis			
			Butterfield	Fudge	Lipinski			
			Byrne	Galleo	LoBiondo			
			Calvert	Garamendi	Loeb			
			Capps	Gibbs	Loeb			
			Cárdenas	Goodlatte	Love			
			Carney	Graham	Lowey			
			Carson (IN)	Granger	Lucas			
			Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer			
			Cartwright	Graves (LA)	Lujan Grisham			
			Castor (FL)	Graves (MO)	(NM)			
			Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Luján, Ben Ray			
			Chabot	Green, Gene	(NM)			
			Chaffetz	Griffith	MacArthur			
			Chu, Judy	Grothman	Maloney,			
			Cleaver	Guinta	Carolyn			
			Clyburn	Guthrie	Maloney, Sean			
			Coffman	Gutiérrez	Marchant			
			Cole	Hanna	Marino			
			Collins (GA)	Hardy	Matsui			
			Collins (NY)	Harper	McCarthy			
			Comstock	Harris	McCaul			
			Conaway	Hartzler	McHenry			
			Connolly	Hastings	McKinley			
			Cook	Heck (WA)	McMorris			
			Cooper	Hensarling	Rodgers			
			Costa	Herrera Beutler	McNerney			
			Costello (PA)	Higgins	McSally			
			Courtney	Hill	Meehan			
			Cramer	Hinojosa	Meeks			
			Crawford	Holding	Meng			
			Crenshaw	Hoyer	Messer			
			Crowley	Hudson	Mica			
			Cuellar	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (MI)			
			Culberson	Hunter	Moolenaar			

NOES—323

NOT VOTING—3

NOT VOTING—2

Gowdy Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2239

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLAWSON OF
FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 107, noes 323,
not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—107

Amash	Clay	Fleming
Blum	Cohen	Fortenberry
Blumenauer	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Brat	DeFazio	Gabbard
Bridenstine	Dent	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	DesJarlais	Gibson
Burgess	Doggett	Gohmert
Capuano	Doyle, Michael	Gosar
Carter (GA)	F.	Grayson
Cicilline	Duckworth	Grijalva
Clark (MA)	Duncan (SC)	Hahn
Clarke (NY)	Duncan (TN)	Heck (NV)
Clawson (FL)	Fincher	Hice, Jody B.

Bost Gowdy Hultgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2242

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on
which further proceedings were post-
poned and on which the noes prevailed
by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 114, noes 318,
not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—114

Amash	Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney
Babin	Brownley (CA)	Denham
Barletta	Buchanan	DesJarlais
Barton	Buck	Doggett
Bilirakis	Burgess	Duffy
Black	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Blackburn	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (TN)
Blum	Coffman	Engel
Blumenauer	Cohen	Farenthold
Bost	Collins (GA)	Fincher
Brat	Collins (NY)	Flores

Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hahn
Harris
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Labrador

LaMalfa
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nolan
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pearce
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom

Ratcliffe
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Rouzer
Salmon
Sanford
Schradler
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Woodall
Yoho

Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neom
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry

Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—318

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cole
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson

Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)

Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
McSally

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2245

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MACARTHUR

Mr. MacARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I
have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOONEY of
West Virginia). The Clerk will desig-
nate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
lows:

At the end of the bill (before the short
title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available
by this Act may be used to divest or retire,
or to prepare to divest or retire, KC-10 air-
craft.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to
House Resolution 303, the gentleman
from New Jersey and a Member op-
posed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from New Jersey.

Mr. MacARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I
yield myself such time as I may con-
sume.

I have an amendment regarding the
KC-10 air-to-air refueling tanker.

Air superiority is critical if we are
going to protect our men and women
on the ground and our interests, and
that requires that we have fighters in
the air. It is of vital importance. It is

why the Air Mobility Command is so
important. It may not be as exciting as
fighters and close air support, but it is
every bit as essential. The KC-10 air-
to-air refueler is the larger, newer of
the tankers, and the KC-135 is the
smaller, older version.

This is the problem. The KC-46 is a
new tanker that the Air Force is intro-
ducing. It has had development prob-
lems, and it is not ready for prime
time. General Welch of the Air Force
confirmed that the new tanker was not
intended to replace the KC-10 but that
it is at risk of being replaced due to
budget cuts, and he has confirmed that
it would cost more in the midterm to
replace the KC-10.

Just to put the difference in capabili-
ties in perspective, the KC-10 can carry
350,000 pounds of fuel. The other tank-
er—the older KC-135—and the new KC-
46 can only carry 200,000. It is 200,000
versus 350,000. The KC-10 carries double
the payload, and it carries more pas-
sengers. The long and the short is that
this tanker is essential for our ability
to project force, and in this world of in-
creased global threats, we cannot af-
ford to deteriorate our capabilities.

The answer, I believe, is to prohibit
the early retirement of the KC-10 tank-
er. We did that in the National Defense
Authorization Act. There is no provi-
sion in the budget to replace the KC-10.
I am simply looking to close the loop
tonight and prohibit in the Defense Ap-
propriations bill any funding for the
early retirement of the KC-10.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gen-
tleman yield?

Mr. MacARTHUR. I yield to the gen-
tleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me con-
gratulate the gentleman from New Jer-
sey, my colleague, for his advocacy on
behalf of the KC-10.

Mr. Chairman, none of the good work
we have done in the Middle East could
have been done without the remarkable
history of the men and women who
work on those KC-10s and these tank-
ers, allowing so many flights to go
without any problems, any issues. That
is a remarkable plane. I support the
gentleman's amendment, and I con-
gratulate him for introducing it.

Mr. NORCROSS. Will the gentleman
yield?

Mr. MacARTHUR. I yield to the gen-
tleman from New Jersey.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman and
my colleagues from New Jersey, I
stand in support of this amendment,
and I appreciate the fact that Con-
gressman MACARTHUR has kept in the
forefront how important this is, not
just for New Jersey but for our Nation
as a whole.

We are strategically located in that
one area that makes it extremely effi-
cient to refuel. More importantly, we
have two ways of getting the fuel to
those planes, which is so strategically
important. It is over land and it is un-
derground. That has been why

McGuire-Fort Dix has been the place for this command to be joined together for years and years. I think this is not only strategically smart for our country, but this is an efficient way of spending the taxpayers' money to make sure that we get the best bang for the buck.

Mr. MacARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used after March 31, 2016, for Operation Inherent Resolve in the absence of a law enacted by Congress before such date that specifically authorizes the use of military force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, 10 months ago, we entered into the war against ISIS. During the course of that war, we have put our pilots and other servicemembers at considerable risk, and we have suffered casualties. We have expended hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars, and, as yet, there is no end in sight to this conflict.

In the beginning of the conflict and our participation in it, the administration took the position that it didn't need an authorization from Congress although it desired one. The administration relied on the authorities that were passed in 2001 and 2002. The authority in 2001, passed in the hours after 9/11, authorized the use of force against those responsible for 9/11. That is al Qaeda. He also relied on the authorization passed in 2002, which authorized the use of force against Iraq. In fact, neither of those authorities is on point. The use of force that we are employing now against ISIL is being used against an organization that didn't exist on 9/11 and, in fact, is often at war with the organization that was responsible for 9/11. That is al Qaeda.

Nonetheless, the administration has asserted that it can rely on these authorities, and it asked Congress to pass a new authorization because it felt that was the preferential course. At the time and before the midterm elections, the leadership in the House of Representatives took the position that a lame duck Congress should not be voting on a new war and that a vote

must wait until after the elections. So the Congress abdicated its constitutional responsibility to have a debate and a war declaration, and, instead, we awaited the elections.

The elections came and the elections went, and those of us who raised the cry that it was time for Congress to do its job were met with a new response: we couldn't vote on an authorization now because the administration had not sent us one, even though there is nothing in the Constitution that provides that Congress shall declare war only when asked by the Executive or only when asked politely by the Executive. Nonetheless, we sat, once again, derelict until the administration sent us a draft authorization.

□ 2300

Then there was a new explanation for inaction. We couldn't act on this new authorization because we didn't like the terms of it. This was irrespective of the fact that the Congress has all the power it needs to change that draft or operate under a completely new draft authorization, and still we did nothing.

Then the explanation was given we couldn't act on a war authorization because we had to have a vote on the negotiations with Iran, even though those negotiations were not yet complete. So we had a vote on the negotiations with Iran, in fact, a vote to later have a vote.

Now we are here once again with a series of shifting rationales for why we don't have a debate on this war ongoing now for 10 months. This must come to an end. The amendment that I have offered this evening would provide that no funds shall be expended for the war against ISIS after a certain date in March of next year unless Congress authorizes a war against ISIS. If this is worth fighting—and I believe it is; I believe this ought to be authorized—it is worth having Congress do its job. If we are going to ask our servicemembers to risk their lives, we ought to have the courage ourselves to make a vote on this war.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, currently, U.S. forces are conducting multiple airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. Without this authority, these campaigns would stop immediately.

Should this Authorization for Use of Military Force be replaced? Perhaps it should. On May 19, Speaker BOEHNER urged President Obama to start from scratch on a measure to legally authorize the Islamic State conflict, declaring, "We don't have a strategy." I agree with the Speaker, we have no strategy with regard to ISIL.

Recently, President Obama stated he still does not have a complete strategy for defeating the Islamic State. A sad commentary—shifting rationale, shifting strategy, no strategy. At a time when sectarian tensions are at their highest levels since the end of Operation Iraqi Freedom in December of 2001, the terrorists have once again succeeded in capturing control of major cities in Iraq, killing innocent citizens, causing thousands of families to flee.

What kind of message are we sending with this amendment to both the Iraqi people, to our soldiers and marines who have valiantly served and sacrificed, and even now the President suggesting sending another 400 advisers to advise and to train and equip Iraqis to recapture Ramadi?

This amendment is not about substance; it is about symbolism. Unfortunately, its effect would be much more than symbolism. Acceptance of this amendment would rob our Nation of one of the key authorities our Commander-in-Chief relies on to keep us safe. I strongly urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. May I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), my colleague.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, if I could make a comment. As the chairman indicated, this is a very complicated situation. Because lives are at stake, it is all the more reason, I think, to support the gentleman's amendment to force this body, if you would, to very carefully define what our purpose is, what our policy is, and how we should go about its implementation. I do support the gentleman's amendment and thank him for yielding time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman and would like to respond to my colleague's points.

First of all, the effect of this is not to end funding immediately. The effect of this would end funding in 9 months if we fail to take up and pass an authorization. Certainly, 10 months into the war and 9 months from now ought to be ample time for the Congress to do its constitutional duty.

Second, my colleague makes the point that he doesn't agree with the President's strategy. We may take issue with the President's strategy, and we all have our opinions about how this war ought to be waged, but one thing is clear: it is not going to impact the strategy if Congress does its job or not. That impacts our institution; that doesn't impact the Presidency. It is our institutional interest in having a voice in the war-making authority that is at stake here.

Finally, the gentleman asked: What kind of a message are we sending with an amendment like this? I would say the message we are sending is that we value our Constitution; we respect the requirements of our Constitution. Our Constitution says that Congress—not the Executive, but Congress—shall have the power to declare war.

My colleague says this is merely a symbolic act. I suppose that is true if you think that the constitutional clause that gives the Congress the power to declare war is only symbolic, but I think it is far more than symbolic and key to the balance of power.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10003. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate Directive 293, issued December 16, 2010, by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment that would reiterate Congress' objection to a proposed policy change by the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, OFCCP, that would treat healthcare providers as Federal contractors.

In December of 2010, OFCCP quietly issued directive 293, asserting that contractual arrangements under Medicare, TRICARE, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program will trigger OFCCP jurisdiction. This is absurd. This directive would reclassify a majority of hospitals in the United States as Federal contractors, subjecting hospitals in your district and mine to OFCCP's often crushing regulatory burden.

With respect to TRICARE, the agency aggressively asserted its jurisdiction in a 2009 administrative case, OFCCP v. Florida Hospital of Orlando. OFCCP argued the hospital was a Federal subcontractor by virtue of its par-

ticipation as a provider of a TRICARE network of providers. The agency took this troubling position despite the fact that the Department of Defense, which regulates TRICARE, previously concluded, Mr. Chairman: "It would be impossible to achieve the TRICARE mission of providing affordable health care for our Nation's Active Duty and retired military members and their families if onerous Federal contracting rules were applied to the more than 500,000 TRICARE providers in the United States."

Unfortunately, the administrative law judge in the case did not heed DOD's warning and failed to see this policy change for what it is—an expansion of government power over the healthcare sector. As such, Congress acted to oppose this outreach, and in 2012 the National Defense Authorization Act clarified that a TRICARE network healthcare provider is not—is not—a Federal contractor or subcontractor.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I am deeply concerned by this attempt by OFCCP to expand its jurisdiction through executive fiat. In response, I introduced the Protecting Health Care Providers from Increased Administrative Burdens Act in the 113th Congress, which clarified that healthcare providers are not Federal contractors subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's OFCCP.

Our actions on the committee in bringing attention to this issue have been successful in prompting OFCCP to place a moratorium on the policy. However, as OFCCP has previously defied Congress and the Department of Defense, I believe this amendment is necessary. Therefore, I ask the House support my amendment that would prohibit funds to be used under this act for implementing this overreaching policy and affirmatively show the House will not support such actions by the Department of Labor and OFCCP.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a colloquy.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

As you know, TRICARE provides coverage to over 9.5 million people worldwide, including Active Duty, activated Guard and Reserve members, retiree survivors, and their families. To ensure coverage, they must choose between independently practicing TRICARE

certified medical health counselors and/or supervised mental health counselors.

I entered my amendment and withdrew it, but it is important that we get this on the RECORD.

The independent providers must have a master's degree from a mental health counseling program accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, which we call CACREP. They must also pass the National Clinical Mental Health Counseling Exam by January 1, 2017.

But this rule unfortunately has unintended consequences that require counselors to complete their education at an institution that only has been accredited by CACREP. This freezes out some of our most respected institutions, including Harvard, Columbia, and, in my home State of Michigan, the University of Michigan and Michigan State University.

I am extremely concerned about and would ask for the committee's support in addressing this issue. With more time, we can get this right, ensure our military members have as much access to care as possible.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for bringing this issue to the committee's attention. I look forward to working with her on it to address the unintended consequences of the existing DOD rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10003. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Defense Logistics Agency to implement the Small Business Administration interim final rule titled "Small Business Size Standards; Adoption of 2012 North American Industry Classification System" (published August 20, 2012, in the Federal Register) with respect to the procurement of footwear.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer this amendment that will ensure a fair and open bidding process to supply our men and women on the front lines with one of the most indispensable pieces of equipment that they use every day—their boots.

My amendment would prohibit the use of funds by the Defense Logistics

Agency to implement the 2012 Small Business Administration's rule in regard to footwear preventing the Defense Logistics Agency from bidding the contract as a small business set-aside.

When SBA released this rule, there was significant concern that they did not go through the normal rulemaking and public comment process, and more specifically did not perform due diligence on how the changes would actually affect the footwear industry and military supply base, which the SBA has acknowledged.

This rule dramatically changed the competitive landscape amongst companies supplying very compliant footwear to the U.S. military. There are very few of these manufacturers here in the United States, and even fewer that manufacture Berry Compliant footwear. This amendment would ensure that all businesses capable of supplying high-quality footwear to our warfighters are able to compete for that contract.

□ 2315

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that last year, we had been able to get language inserted in that would call for a study. I just wanted to have a quick quote from that on the impact of jobs. This is from the report that was issued:

Although the overall impact on the industrial base is low, the abrupt and drastic change in the small business size standards is likely to have an impact. The DOD footwear industry is highly capable, but also very dependent on DOD orders. It's important to consider both the short-term and long-term health of the industrial base.

The industry is also a critical element to the Nation's national security because of the enduring need to meet wartime footwear requirements.

The emphasis here is mine. Given the industry's sensitive and critical position, such abrupt and drastic policy changes that impact the competitive landscape should be executed with greater moderation.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is the concern here today, and that is why I would urge my colleagues to support this vital amendment.

I do appreciate the opportunity for dialogue that I have been having with my colleague from Illinois and also with the Small Business Committee on that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, as you may know, the reason I stand in opposition is the Small Business Administration sets these standards. As of 2012, this standard was set in place.

Though I am more than willing to work with the gentleman in the future

on what might come forward actually through the Small Business Committee, the concern I have is that those that do qualify under small business inadvertently, through his language, would be removed from that.

The concern I have also is that is located in my district, with a company that has already received a contract under that.

It is a process that we have in place. We know that there may be flaws in the process, and in the Small Business Committee, we are going to be working on those. I believe that the gentleman has sincere hopes to try to straighten this problem out for his district. I understand that.

I believe that this is not the way to do this. I stand in opposition. I hope that others will join me in voting "no" on this, but I do give the commitment that, if a "no" vote does occur, I will be working with him.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOST. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I simply would add my voice to his in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

It is certainly my belief and understanding that the Defense Logistics Agency is executing an acquisition program that maximizes to every extent possible long-term contracts and multiple award strategies that limit variability to limit each vendor's economic risk.

The gentleman mentions small manufacturers. Some of the largest companies in the country are involved at the Department of Defense, which is fine. They do wonderful work for our country. We ought to make sure that we protect the prerogatives of small businesses to make sure that they are on equal footing for these contracts so that you have that limit on economic risk for all vendors, big and small.

I appreciate the gentleman's objection, and I would join him in it.

Mr. BOST. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I do appreciate my colleague from Illinois and other members from the Small Business Committee who are committed to working at this.

The concern, again, would be one of our capacity and our industrial base and being able to supply that most vital of needs for our men and women in uniform, which is their footwear. When we talk about large, we talk about small at the same time because 400 is the number of west Michigan jobs that are in the balance here; but we wouldn't be able to reach the full capacity if we needed to surge again in a very unstable world, as we have been dealing with a number of crises around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) after December 31, 2015.

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is really very simple. It is cosponsored by Representatives GRIJALVA and ELLISON. It prohibits any funding in this bill pursuant to the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force after December 31, 2015.

This timeline gives the President and the Congress sufficient time—that is 8 months after this is signed into law—to determine what if any authorization would be needed to replace the 2001 AUMF.

This amendment is not only timely, but it really is necessary. On September 14, 2001, I could not vote for the 2001 AUMF. That was an authorization that I knew would provide a blank check to wage war any time, for any length, anywhere.

In the last 14 years, it has become increasingly clear that this authorization has essentially provided the President—this is any President—President Bush, now President Obama—the authority to wage war against anyone, anywhere, at any time, against any country, with no authorization from Congress.

In fact, the Congressional Research Service has found that the 2001 AUMF has been used more than 30 times to justify military action and other activities, including warrantless surveillance and wiretapping, indefinite detention practices at GTMO, targeted killing operations using lethal drones, and the open-ended expansion of military operations abroad, which have nothing to do with the original congressional intent.

In addition to the activities I mentioned, the AUMF has reportedly been

invoked to deploy troops in Afghanistan, Yemen, Djibouti, Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Somalia. The 2001 AUMF is now being cited as the authority for the now 10-month-long war against ISIL—and, yes, we are in a war.

We know that ISIL must be degraded and dismantled, but Congress must do our job. We should debate and vote on the use of force. That is our constitutional responsibility.

I know that, while many of us may not share a common position on how to deal with the 2001 authorization, many of us do agree that the overly broad authority is a major and concerning deterioration of congressional oversight and warmaking authority.

I think many of us can agree that a robust debate and vote is necessary, long overdue, and must take place, whatever we believe about how we should vote. The American people deserve to have their Representatives speak for them on these grave matters which the Constitution requires.

Let me be clear. With the 2001 authorization still on the books in its current form, any administration can continue to rely on this blank check to wage endless war. That is why my amendment to prohibit funding for the 2001 AUMF after December 31, 2015, is so important.

There was very little debate. I remember that very moment that we had this debate on this resolution 12 years ago. I think the debate maybe was about 1 hour—pro and con, 30 minutes. I probably was the only one who voted and said “no” in terms of the debate, but it wasn’t a very long debate, and I am sure, if we had had more time to debate this, more Members would have realized that this was a blank check.

Let’s repeal this. I have introduced this legislation once again to get this off the books. Congress cannot continue to abdicate its constitutional responsibility while the United States now is embroiled in yet another open-ended war in the Middle East.

We can begin to address this today by passing this amendment, providing Congress and the President with plenty of time to decide what measures should replace this authorization before the end of the year.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), our ranking member, and thank him for his leadership.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I join in support of her amendment.

As she indicated, more than 14 years have passed. The United States withdrew their large troop presence and marked the end of combat operations in Iraq since then. Security operations for Afghanistan were transferred to the Afghan National Security Forces in June of 2013. The basic mission of U.S. and NATO forces in Afghanistan has been to train those forces, including the Afghan Army.

I think the gentlewoman made a very good point. She and I may not agree on what that resolution and authority should look like in the end, all the more reason for all of us collectively, both parties, to have a fulsome debate on that issue.

Ms. LEE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman’s amendment.

In order to prosecute the global war on terrorism, one of our primary current missions, the President, our Commander in Chief, relies on this Authorization for the Use of Military Force, which he is trying and attempting to repeal.

This AUMF, better known as the 9/11 AUMF, is necessary for the Department of Defense and U.S. military forces to address conducting campaigns against al Qaeda and al Qaeda-related affiliated forces worldwide by using this authority. It has been used by both this President and his predecessor since 2001.

Granted, this amendment was written to sunset on the last day of this calendar year, but without a follow-on authority in place, killing the 9/11 AUMF would tie our Nation’s hands and our Commander in Chief’s hands with regard to combating worldwide terrorism in 7 short months.

This amendment cripples our ability to conduct counterterrorism operations with partner nations and our allies against al Qaeda and their affiliates.

Once again, the gentlewoman attempts to put in place a major policy change that does not belong in an appropriations bill, this Defense bill.

The terrorist threat today is no less real and, in many ways, far more dangerous than it was when Congress overwhelmingly gave the President that authority in 2001 to protect us against those who want to do us harm.

These terrorist organizations pose a real threat to United States persons and interests. It is my judgment this amendment erroneously assumes that al Qaeda and its affiliates ended their terrorist acts once major military operations ceased in Afghanistan. Obviously, they haven’t.

Recent disastrous events in Yemen and, most recently, frightening developments in Iraq and Syria have shown its affiliates and new terrorist groups are on the rise.

This amendment would effectively eliminate the President’s ability to address that threat or other emerging threats from al Qaeda and like-minded groups in north Africa, the Horn of Africa, and elsewhere and leave our Na-

tion and our allies more vulnerable to attacks.

Therefore, I strongly urge opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

□ 2330

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1295, TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 1295, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House, one, concur in the Senate amendment to the title and, two, concur in the Senate amendment to the text with the amendment printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 1; that the Senate amendments and the motion be considered as read; that the motion be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

Will the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2331

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any EC-130H aircraft.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for including funds to support our fleet of EC-130H Compass Call aircraft in this bill. The underlying legislation restores \$27.3 million to support 15 EC-130H aircraft next year.

My amendment today does not cost a dime. The chairman has already provided full funding for our entire EC-130H fleet, and my amendment simply ensures that the chairman's intentions are carried out, and that the Air Force does not use backdoor means to try to retire these important aircraft.

The Compass Call is the only dedicated U.S. Air Force electronic warfare aircraft. I can tell you in this unclassified setting that it can perform electronic warfare, suppression of enemy air defenses, and offensive counter-information operations.

It was successfully employed during Desert Storm, Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom, and provided electronic warfare support in operations in Kosovo, in Haiti, Panama, Serbia, and Afghanistan. It was the most heavily-tasked special mission C-130 in operations in Afghanistan.

Despite plans to divest 50 percent of the fleet, the Air Force has not identified a follow-on capability, and no other platform currently performs this mission. In fact, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff Lieutenant General James Holmes confirmed there are things that only the EC-130H does and does best.

Right now, the Compass Call is currently deployed both in Afghanistan and in the fight against ISIS. Divesting it without a replacement for the unique capabilities it offers would be irresponsible, especially given its high rate of deployment.

I restate that my amendment would not cost a dime, simply ensures the chairman's decision to fund the fleet is carried out. This is a critical capability, and we cannot afford to dispose it without a replacement.

I want to thank the chair, and urge support of my amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MCSALLY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are pleased to accept your amendment. May I also say, we are proud of your service to our Nation. Thank you for the time.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

VACATING PROCEEDINGS ON AMENDMENT NO. 2
OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings on the vote on amendment No. 2 be vacated to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the vote on the amendment is vacated, and the Chair will put the question de novo.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA
OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funding pursuant to the 2002 Iraq Authorization for Use of Military Force. And once again I am proud to offer this amendment with my colleagues, Representative ELLISON and GRIJALVA.

Now, why is this amendment necessary?

Three years ago, mind you, President Obama declared that the Iraq war was over. Since then, the President has stated a number of times that the 2002 AUMF is no longer necessary, and that Congress should work to repeal it. Yet, Congress has allowed this war authorization to remain on the books indefinitely.

Now, we all are familiar with the report, and we know what is taking place in Iraq, Syria, and across the Middle East as it relates to ISIL. We all agree that they must be degraded and dismantled.

But just as with the 2001 resolution, the 2002 AUMF is completely inappropriate to deal with this threat.

This is a new war, Mr. Chairman, not an old war. This is a new war, which the people of this country have a right to have their Members of Congress debate and vote on.

Even the President included a repeal of the 2002 AUMF in the proposed authorization he sent to Congress in February. Yet, we can't even get that authorization brought up for a debate and a vote.

So, simply put, the 2002 authorization is no longer necessary. We need to come back to the drawing board and decide, based on what this body wants to do, should we vote for a new authorization or not.

If we want to commit the United States to another war in Iraq, then Congress must have that debate and decide whether or not to authorize another war.

I am pleased that my sense of Congress resolution—it was an amendment actually—affirming this was passed on a bipartisan basis in committee and is included in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is common sense, and we cannot continue to leave authorizations for the use of military force on the books indefinitely. It is time for us to reassert our constitutional prerogative to declare war or not, to debate and vote on any military action in Iraq.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I will just reiterate my comments in the gentleman's last amendment and that is, after the passage of 13 years, things have changed. And one of the changes we ought to make in this Chamber is to have, again, that fulsome debate as to what the parameters of our military involvement overseas is going forward from this point in time, not the beginning of the previous decade. I appreciate the gentleman offering the amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me just say with regard to this amendment, Congress has a constitutional responsibility. It is our prerogative to declare war or not. It is our prerogative to debate and vote on any military action anywhere in the world. More than a prerogative, it is our constitutional responsibility.

We represent the American people. The American people deserve to have a voice in such grave matters. That is why the Constitution required that. And for us not to do our job and to continue to rely on old authorizations from 13 and 14 years ago really is an abdication of our responsibility.

People did not elect us to Congress to duck and dodge the hard questions and the hard issues. Some of us agree that we need to go to war. Some of us don't agree. But that is not the issue, and that is not what this amendment, nor my prior amendment, was about.

It was about doing our job here, laying out the pros and cons, making some heavy-duty decisions—and that is what they are, but that is why we are here—and then instructing our Commander in Chief what Congress believes should be the appropriate course of action.

Many would vote for it; many would vote against it, but, again, not to have this debate and vote when we are now 10 months into another war is downright wrong. It is almost lawless. It is something that it is hard to imagine getting away with this long.

So I hope that we get a good bipartisan vote on this. It is about time that we do debate this again. If the Speaker did not like the President's authorization that he brought forward, then let's get another authorization. Let's write

one ourselves. I have one. I know other Members have one. Let's bring forth an authorization and debate what we want to do moving forward. That is the wise thing to do. That is the smart thing to do. That is the right thing to do. We have troops in harm's way. They need to know what their Members of Congress believe, what the Constitution requires in terms of doing our job. They deserve us to do better.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I said a few minutes ago, currently U.S. forces are conducting multiple airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. Without this authority, those campaigns would stop. And certainly, much has happened since the authority was first given. As a matter of fact, things are getting far worse than they have been in the past.

Acceptance of this amendment would rob our country of one of the key authorities our Commander in Chief needs and relies on to keep us safe and to address these types of crises, which seem to occur all over the Middle East. Therefore, I strongly reject and oppose the amendment and urge others to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 2483(b)(5) of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the chairman from New Jersey and just thank him for the wonderful job he has done protecting our troops and our people around world and

making sure that the world remains a safer place than it would be otherwise without the United States there.

□ 2345

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that would prohibit the Department of Defense from increasing the prices paid by our troops and their families, our veterans and their families at military commissaries, especially overseas.

The commissary benefit is one of a number of benefits that our servicemembers receive upon joining the military, and it is one that our servicemembers and their families rely upon to maintain their access to wholesome, affordable, and healthy food.

The Defense Commissary Agency, or DeCA, has embarked upon a poorly researched plan to raise prices on commissary consumers as part of a move towards what they call a "commercial" business model.

This amendment requires the Department of Defense to continue using the existing model of produce sourcing for commissaries in Asia and the Pacific unless and until the Secretary of Defense can certify that a new sourcing model will not raise prices on the shelves. This maintains the promised benefits that our warriors and their families expected to receive when they raised their right hand and became a United States sailor, airman, soldier, or marine.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to establish any live-fire range, training course, or maneuver area within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in contravention of section 801 of Public Law 94-241 or section 2663 of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. SABLAN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, many of us in this Chamber share a concern that the Federal Government has so much power and so many resources

that it can overwhelm and even intimidate smaller State and local governments.

The amendment I am offering responds to that concern. It requires, before any funds are expended in the Northern Mariana Islands for expanded activities by the military, that the Secretary of Defense reach agreement with the government of the Northern Mariana Islands on the nature and scope of those activities.

My amendment levels the playing field between the very powerful Federal Government and a very small territorial government.

A little history: in 1975, the people of the Northern Marianas elected to become a part of the United States, and 78 percent of the people voted for the negotiated agreement that defined our political union. Part of that agreement includes the lease of two-thirds of our island of Tinian to the U.S. military for 100 years and the lease of the entire island of Farallon de Medinilla. The cost to the United States—\$175,000 a year. That is a Manhattan Island deal.

The people of the Northern Marianas committed those lands for the purpose of national defense willingly because we understood that with citizenship comes responsibility, and the United States recognized in the agreement negotiated with us that we have very little land and that any future acquisition, therefore, would be “only the minimum area necessary.”

Today, however, the U.S. military is proposing the takeover of another entire island. It is called Pagan. One more out of only 14 islands in the Northern Marianas, when we have already given up all of Farallon de Medinilla and two-thirds of Tinian—25 percent of our total land area of only 183 square miles. The military is proposing to use these lands for live-fire ranges, training courses, and maneuver areas.

I should explain that these are public lands and that decisions about the use of public lands in the Northern Marianas rests in the hands of the Governor and our legislators.

To lease lands to the military or not, what the terms and conditions of any lease may be, those decisions are an exercise in local self-government, and I will respect those local decisions. But as the official in Congress representing the people of the Northern Marianas, I want to be sure that the Federal Government also respects the decisions of the government of the Northern Marianas.

Again, that is what my amendment would do. My amendment simply assures that none of the funds we appropriate today will be used for the activities the military is proposing for public lands in the Northern Marianas without first obtaining the consent and the agreement of the Northern Marianas government and actually obtain-

ing an agreement for the use of that land.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman raising the issue. Obviously, he is a wonderful representative of the Mariana Islands.

However, given the way this amendment is written, it is unclear to me the impact that this may have on our military's future ability to train. So, regrettably, I must oppose this amendment, but I look forward to working with the gentleman to address his concerns.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABLAN. I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN very much.

Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way. You have a piece of property, and it belongs to you in title. I come over; and without asking you if I could use your land, I come in with a yardstick. I bring surveyors. I bring architects and engineers to your land, and I start drawing up my plans.

Would any person alive allow that to happen in the United States of America? They won't. Two-thirds of Tinian they already have. They are asking for an entirely new island, Mr. Chairman, and they would own 25 percent of the Northern Marianas.

They are going to fire howitzers in our community. They have claimed that on this one island there are no inhabitants. I happen to live two doors from these people. And that they are from Pagan. They live in Pagan. They are residents of Pagan. Many of them are in Saipan for work, just like many of us, 541 Members of Congress who come to Washington to work and go home every break—except for one, the Delegate from the District of Columbia. This is her home. All of us come to D.C. to work. Some of us, even those who don't have homes in our districts, claim that we go back to our districts because that is our home.

Present Federal law says that the United States Government, the military must first seek permission and obtain access to the property. They don't have that access. And in the meantime, until they obtain that access or an agreement for the use of that land, then they should cease and desist from any plans that they are making for the use of an island that they don't own.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the compassion and his conviction and would join in wanting to work with you, as the chairman has indicated, to see if there is some resolution to your concern.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I don't own the land. I am just bringing out facts here and bringing out the sentiments of my constituents.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading “Iraq Train and Equip Fund” may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, since August 8, 2014, in Iraq—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The committee is prepared to accept your amendment.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under section 9014 for “Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine” may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman

from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are prepared to accept your amendment.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10003. None of the funds made available by this Act may be expended by the Department of the Navy to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, any search and rescue units from the Marine Corps.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which would preserve a very important component of the Marine Corps: its search and rescue units.

According to the most recent Marine aviation plan, the Corps had these units slated for a divestiture by the end of the calendar year. I was glad to see that, after some public backlash on that plan, the Corps decided to temporarily postpone those divestiture plans. But just as easily as the Marines postpone their decision, they could also recommence.

I still believe such actions would be a bad decision, and I am not alone. That is why I am offering this bipartisan amendment with my colleagues, Representatives JONES, SINEMA, and BUTTERFIELD.

After many years, there were only two remaining search and rescue units left: one at Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, Arizona, and one at MCAS Cherry Point, North Carolina.

Marine Corps Air Station Yuma search and rescue unit performed 72 rescue missions to aid surrounding communities from 2010 to 2014. Last October, the Yuma unit facilitated the rescue of 28 Boy Scouts and four chaperones who were lost during a canoe trip.

MCAS Cherry Point's search and rescue unit, known as VMR-1, performs roughly 50 missions annually to help retrieve lost paddlers and hikers. Just this past March, VMR-1 rescued a man who was reported missing during a

kayaking trip near Cedar Island, North Carolina. This was not only a nighttime mission, but there was a heavy fog as well, so much so that the first rescue helicopter, known affectionately as Pedro, had to abort its first landing at a hospital in Morehead and ultimately travel 75 miles to Greenville, where the man was finally admitted for treatment.

But none of us have yet heard a viable alternative to sustain the mission of these search and rescue units. Law enforcement and first responders do not have these capabilities, and, apparently, no contractor does either. This proposed divestiture would literally cost lives.

I ask: What would have happened to these Boy Scouts if these marines didn't come to help? I ask my colleagues to support this amendment which was meant to save lives.

I thank the chair and ranking member.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, respectfully, I rise in opposition to the gentleman from Arizona's amendment.

The Marine Corps has an aviation plan calling for the orderly transfer of this capability to other entities. The East Coast mission will be assumed by the Coast Guard, while the West Coast mission will be competitively contracted out, as I understand it, in fiscal year 2017.

While we respect the gentleman's concerns, this amendment takes a rifle shot approach against the Department of Defense's force structure plan, and we believe that this is not good policy. Therefore, I urge opposition to the amendment and would appreciate the gentleman making the case for his position.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I join with the chairman in expressing my opposition.

Again, I appreciate the gentleman's concern, but we have had a series of amendments like this brought to the debate limiting transfers, limiting consideration of any movement or decisions or changes at the Department of Defense. At some point, we are going to have to allow the Department of Defense to run itself as well and not to second-guess that maybe sometime they actually will make improvements because of a decision they make, and for that reason, I do support my chairman in his opposition.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0000

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the idea that the East Coast may be absorbed may be one thing; but accordingly, from what I have heard down in Yuma, there is no viable option or contractor that has been and will be found for Yuma.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a flash-bang grenade under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, on May 28, 2014, narcotics agents, assisted by members of the Habersham County, Georgia, Special Response Team, executed a no-knock search warrant on a home on a quiet street. Officers terrified the sleeping family but did not find any drugs when they entered the home.

During the raid, a 2-year-old child, baby Bou Bou, was badly burned when the officers tossed a flash-bang grenade into his playpen which was located in a darkened room. The officers justified their actions by saying that their intelligence indicated that there would be no children present.

Mr. Chairman, as an editorial in The Washington Post noted: "A flash-bang grenade is an explosive device that emits a deafening boom and a blinding flash of light. It is designed to temporarily stun the occupants of a building so that the armed men who deployed it can clear the building. It is an instrument of war."

My amendment is simple. It would prohibit the transfer of flash-bang grenades from the Department of Defense to local law enforcement. The Department of Defense's 1033 program has helped to sometimes distort the relationship between the police and the

communities they serve by allocating over \$5 billion in surplus military equipment to local police, including flash-bang grenades. Nothing in current law prevents the military from giving police, including school and university police departments, flash-bang grenades. Allowing this loophole to exist puts our communities at risk of increasing militarization.

Mr. Chairman, while we have real tensions across the country, our police and their communities are not at war. Funneling free military equipment to the police, however, helps to further deepen the divide in our communities. The same Washington Post article I mentioned earlier cited over a dozen incidents in recent years where police injured themselves or others while using flash-bang grenades.

This amendment is not about regulating what types of equipment law enforcement agencies should or should not have. Instead, it is about whether this Congress should purchase flash-bang grenades for fighting wars abroad and then allow these flash-bang grenades to be transferred by the Department of Defense back to local law enforcement agencies for use here at home.

Local governments, in consultation with law enforcement agencies that they oversee, should decide what types of equipment the law enforcement agencies can acquire. Law enforcement agencies should not unilaterally make that decision independent of civilian authority. The local government can purchase whatever equipment they deem necessary for use by the agencies under their control through the local budgeting process, and they can also seek financial assistance through Federal grants.

This amendment doesn't touch grant money or State or local governments' freedom to purchase the equipment they need. The local budget process and Federal grant programs involve making choices based on need and funding. The 1033 program is an unregulated pipeline of free equipment directly from the Pentagon to the law enforcement agency. When the equipment is free and is plentiful and civilian authority is not involved, the calculus is very simple: why not accept free gifts of military equipment. However, if acquiring this equipment militarizes our police departments beyond comprehension, what kind of community policing are we actually performing? Or are we just simply occupying?

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very common sense. We should consider whether or not we want our country to move in this direction of militarization, and we certainly need our civilian authorities to be involved in that process. So the consequences are too dangerous to keep proliferating this weaponry on our streets, and I

would ask that my colleagues support this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's amendment and rise in support of it. There is no question that every law enforcement officer in our country is in possession of a very dangerous job.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BOST). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) to finish his remarks.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the chairman yielding, and I do recognize the very tough and dangerous job that local enforcement officers have, every last one of them, and what an important job they do. I certainly have been active over my career in Congress working with the Department of Defense to transfer necessary equipment to law enforcement agencies.

But I would agree with the assertion of the gentleman that we do have to make a distinction with some of these types of materials between civil law enforcement and military action.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. The Department of Defense excess property program does provide valuable surplus equipment to State and local law enforcement agencies for its use in counternarcotics and counterterrorism operations and to enhance officer safety.

It has, on occasion, provided aircraft, including helicopters and small planes, four-wheel-drive vehicles, pickup trucks, ambulances, and mobile command vehicles. It has provided vests and helmets to protect officers, all sorts of important protection equipment, including binoculars, radios, clothing, and information technology.

In a time of declining budgets, at the Federal level but also at the State and local level, this program is a good example of a Federal-local partnership that ensures that we get the most out of each tax dollar spent.

This amendment would restrict the Department's ability to put equipment they no longer need to use protecting our citizens within our local communities. We think it is a good program. It obviously ought to be monitored, and things ought to be only put in proper hands.

□ 0010

On occasion, horrible incidents do occur, but all in all, this program has been a valuable thing to many communities across America.

I do rise in opposition to the amendment and urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure any Army Aircrew Combat Uniforms.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a cost-saving amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2016.

Last year, it was brought to my attention by numerous sources in my district that in 2009, the Department of Army fully phased out the CWU-27/P Army aviation flight uniform and moved to the Army aircrew combat uniform, also known as the A2CU.

Those constituents of mine—many of whom are Active Duty, retired, or are friends and family of military personnel—have expressed a desire for the Army to go back to the CWU-27/P model uniform. There are multiple reasons to switch back to the CWU model uniform. The most important reasons to switch back to the CWU model are safety and efficiency.

To sweeten the deal when making the pitch to me, my constituents explained that moving back to the CWU model would also save the Department millions of dollars a year in procurement costs. All these factors led me to offer this same commonsense amendment last Congress, and it passed this body by a voice vote.

The CWU model has a proven track record of safety and practicality. The CWU model is still authorized for Army special operation aviators, all of the aviators in the other service branches of the U.S. military, and most air forces and navies around the world.

Yes, these points are a testament to the safety and efficiency of the CWU model, and the safety aspects are of paramount importance to our Army aviators because the chances of a fire in an aviation crash are very high.

The CWU model flight suits have an antistatic fiber woven into them to prevent sparks which, for obvious reasons, are not that desirable when operating an aircraft with thousands of pounds of highly volatile jet fuel on board. The one-piece design of the CWU model is also extremely important as it does not, in the event of fire, leave any opportunities for exposed skin.

Speaking to the cost savings, the A2CU model costs an average of 56 percent more than the CWU model, and the A2CU was proven to wear out faster than the CWU. Further, every time the Army decides to change the camouflage pattern of the duty uniform, they have to spend millions more purchasing the new flight uniform.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office stated that this amendment does not score as it is written, but, being that the intent is to move back to the CWU model, the effects of the policy should actually net some cost savings. Conservative estimates show that the Army could save around \$5 million a year in procurement costs if it were to move back to the CWU model.

Further, it should not cost anything to reintroduce the CWU model back into the supply system, as the rest of the service branches still use them. In other words, there is no need to reboot the supply chain.

The cost savings are tantalizing for someone like me, who was sent to this town to rein in spending, but more importantly, I listen to these Army aviators and flight operators. They tell me it is safer. Being that they are the ones doing the training and flying, I am going to have to take them at their word.

Given the safety and practicality applications and given that the United States is not exactly running a budget surplus right now, saving a few millions here and a few millions there in the name of safety and practicality is something we should all strive to achieve.

I urge my colleagues to once again support this commonsense amendment which cuts costs and improves safety.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me commend the gentleman from Arizona on his interest in the safety of our Army aviation personnel.

This amendment would prohibit the Army from spending additional funds to purchase the Army aircrew combat uniform. As an alternative, the Army could resume using a previous flight suit, the CWU-27/P that has not been authorized since 2009, except for special operators.

I understand this amendment is based on discussions with flight crews during visits with airfields and tactical training sites. The old model is a one-piece design. It is said to cost less and be more durable than the current model Army aircrew combat uniform.

The committee is interested in providing our soldiers with the best equipment possible; however, conclusions based on what appear—and I want to say this respectfully—on somewhat anecdotal information and brief discussions rarely lead to wise spending decisions.

I reluctantly urge a “no” vote on this amendment, and I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would want to associate myself with the chairman's remarks and again reiterate my previous comments that at some point, we ought to trust some judgments being made down at the Department of Defense and not just say no to everything. We ought to be making some decisions.

I appreciate the chairman's explanation of the situation and join him in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the two individuals that the one-piece has been preferred by the aviators for the safety aspects because of the woven cloth. I think sometimes we have to have the administration start looking to the people that are actually in harm's way in this regard.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide arms, training, or other assistance to the Azov Battalion.

Mr. CONYERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I begin by thanking Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. VISCLOSKY in conducting the amendments around these important considerations.

This amendment that I propose this evening limits arms, training, and other assistance to the neo-Nazi Ukrainian militia, the Azov Battalion.

Foreign Policy magazine has characterized the 1,000-man Azov Battalion as “openly neo-Nazi” and “fascist.” Numerous other news organizations, including The New York Times, The Guardian, and the Associated Press have corroborated the dominance of White supremacist and anti-Semitic views within the group; yet Ukraine's Interior Minister recently announced the Azov Battalion will be among the units to receive training and arms from Western allies, including the United States.

Azov's founder, Andriy Biletsky, organized the neo-Nazi group the Social-National Assembly in 2008. Azov men use neo-Nazi symbolism on their banner.

□ 0020

These groups run counter to American values, and once the fighting ends, they pose a significant threat to the Ukrainian Government and to the Ukrainian people. As we have seen many times, most notably within the Mujahedeen in Afghanistan, these groups will not lay down their arms once the conflict is over. They will turn their arms against their own people in order to enforce their hateful views.

I urge the support of my amendment and to make it U.S. law that we will not equip this dangerous neo-Nazi militia.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I think I speak for the committee in suggesting that we accept the gentleman's amendment and appreciate the fact that he wants to exercise care, as we do on the committee, to make sure whoever is trained is someone who is, if you would, a person of good intent, as opposed to someone who is not. I appreciate the gentleman's concern and for his offering the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, sheriff's departments and local police departments are local peace officers. They enforce the law and maintain peace and order. Ideally, they are members of the communities in which they serve.

The Department of Defense's 1033 program has helped to sometimes distort the relationship between police and their communities by providing over \$5 billion in surplus military equipment to local police, including armored vehicles and military grade weapons. Police who patrol the streets and neighborhoods in armored MRAPs, while armed to the hilt, can easily lose sight of their role, which is to protect and serve, and, instead, take on the mindset of a paramilitary occupation force. The routine showing of military authority on our streets creates mistrust that only further deepens the divide between law enforcement and the people they are sworn to protect and serve.

My amendment is simple. It would prohibit the transfer of mine resistant ambush protected vehicles, or MRAPs—for free—straight from the Department of Defense to local law enforcement agencies.

This amendment is not about regulating what types of equipment law enforcement agencies and police should not have. Instead, it is about whether this Congress should purchase MRAPs for fighting wars abroad and then allow the Department of Defense to give that equipment away to civilian law enforcement here at home, for free, to use on the streets of America.

Local governments, in consultation with the law enforcement agencies they oversee, should decide what types of equipment their law enforcement agencies can acquire. Law enforcement

agencies should not unilaterally make that decision independent of civilian authority. The local governments can purchase whatever equipment they deem necessary for use by the agencies under their control through their local budgeting process, and they can seek financial assistance to purchase necessary equipment from Federal grant programs.

This amendment doesn't touch grant money or the State's or local government's freedom to purchase the equipment it needs. The local budget process and application for Federal grant programs involve making choices based on need and funding, while the 1033 program is an unregulated pipeline of free equipment directly from the Pentagon to the law enforcement agency.

When the equipment is free and in plentiful supply and civilian authority is not involved, the calculus is very simple: Why not accept free equipment? Why not obtain equipment based on desire rather than need? However, if acquiring the equipment required the use of local funds or involved applying for grant money, the decision would be more deliberative and inclusive of civilian authority. Other factors would be considered, including whether there is a need for such equipment, how the equipment would be used, and whether the community consents to being policed with such equipment.

This amendment simply shuts off the pipeline of military equipment from the battlefield to our main streets. This amendment forces us to consider whether MRAPs, designed and purchased for battle in the Iraqi desert, are suitable for our local police. It forces us to consider whether an ordinary American citizen would truly feel comfortable in approaching an officer for help if the officer were behind the wheel of a 15-ton armored vehicle that had just been returned from combat in Afghanistan.

This amendment would end the transfer of these armored vehicles to school systems and to universities across the country. Are our children so unruly that order can only be maintained with the use of an MRAP?

Unless this amendment passes, a vote for the underlying bill will ultimately fund the purchase of MRAPs, which will, one day, be transferred back home for use against our constituents. The consequences are too dangerous to continue this indiscriminate flow of weaponry to the streets of this Nation. I urge support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Rather than repeat myself, I think the Department of Defense excess property program

does provide some very valuable equipment to local law enforcement. Of course, it is invaluable if it is used properly and with care. As a consequence, I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out a furlough (as defined in section 7511(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code) that—

(1) includes in the notice of the furlough made pursuant to section 752.404(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, "sequestration" as the reason for the furlough; and

(2) is of a civilian employee of the Department of Defense who is paid from amounts in a Working Capital Fund Account pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. COLE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am offering a bipartisan amendment which prohibits the furlough of civilian employees while funds remain in the defense working capital fund. The services provided by working capital fund employees are already fully funded apart from the appropriations process. In fact, imposing furloughs actually costs the taxpayers more through delayed production, overhead increases, and the need for overtime or the transfer of workload to more expensive sources of work. The amendment will prevent that from happening again as it did in 2013.

□ 0030

If working capital fund employees are furloughed, as they were in the last government shutdown, there will be no

direct savings. Indeed, it will actually cost the taxpayers more money.

The furloughs delay production, increase the overhead, and in some cases transfer workload to more expensive sources of work. Indeed, senior military officials have expressed publicly that working capital fund employees, such as depot and shipyard workers, should be considered for exemption from furloughs because the furloughs actually hurt readiness and increase costs associated with production delays.

It is important to note that under this provision, DOD still has the authority to furlough working capital fund employees for disciplinary purposes. Further, working capital fund employees could be furloughed if funded workload dried up due to budget cuts or downsizing. Therefore, ending the threat of furloughs for these employees will save money, improve military readiness, and prevent needless delays and cost overruns from work that has already been funded.

I urge the support of the amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend and a member of our subcommittee, puts me in a very difficult position.

I complained in my opening remarks that some of our colleagues in the Congress, as I said earlier in the day, delight every time a civilian employee is furloughed. So I certainly appreciate the gist of the gentleman's amendment. We have a much larger problem that we and the administration need to address, and I know he feels the same way.

My concern with the particular amendment is we have other departments as well, whether it be the Department of Labor, Internal Revenue Service, EPA, Housing and Urban Development, and the list goes on, and ought not to select one agency over the other. I don't think it is the proper way to go.

We ought to collectively understand that the government actually does many good things to help the people of this country. We ought to value the work of each of our Federal employees, and we ought to block the furlough of any of them in any agency, not a particular one.

So I certainly do not disagree with the intent of the gentleman. I realize we are talking about the Department of Defense, but do believe that we ought to be looking at the broader question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to quickly respond to my friend. I

share many of his sentiments. I certainly don't like to see anybody furloughed. I was not in favor of previous government shutdowns. I thought they were quite counterproductive.

This is, however, a unique case. The funds are already in existence. There is no savings. We are literally taking people out of work when we have funds set aside outside the appropriations process for them to continue their work. So in this case they really deserve to be excepted if we happen to make a mistake and stumble into a process like this again.

Again, I don't disagree with my friend's sentiments about the larger workforce. I have never found these things to be particularly productive. Indeed, as I recall, in every case we have always gone back and made everybody whole, so really the ultimate loser has usually been the taxpayer because we paid for work, created uncertainty that our Federal employees didn't deserve, but ultimately compensated them.

In this case, the funds are available. We should just keep people at work. They are doing an important job for the national security. So again, I would urge the passage of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principal—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading, please.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, the chairman of the committee has shown a great deal of courtesy and kindness and consideration, so I am going to try to keep this as short as possible.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are prepared to accept your amendment because it is so incredibly reasonable.

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for Government Travel Charge Card expenses by military or civilian personnel of the Department of Defense for gaming, or for entertainment that includes topless or nude entertainers or participants, as prohibited by Department of Defense FMR, Volume 9, Chapter 3 and Department of Defense Instruction 1015.10 (enclosure 3, 14a and 14b).

Mr. GOSAR (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer one final amendment to the DOD Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2016.

Let me express again my sincerest thanks to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their dedication.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we will be pleased to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

Sec. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consult, as the term is used in reference to the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, in contravention of the assurance provided in section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g3(c)(1)(A)).

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that we waive the reading, please.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to an amendment offered last year that passed the House by voice vote. The amendment seeks to prohibit the intelligence community from subverting or interfering with the integrity of any cryptographic standard that is proposed, developed, or adopted by NIST. I urge continued support for this amendment by both sides of the aisle.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Frankly, we don't know its full impact. It could have some unintended consequences. This amendment could hamper legitimate communications between the intelligence community and NIST regarding security standards. This amendment is very broadly drafted. It could prevent NIST from consulting with other intelligence community agencies about that agency's internal computer system.

I know it was reported that the 2006 NIST cryptographic standard had a NASA back door. I want to make it clear that NIST says they did not deliberately weaken cryptographic standards at the behest of other government agencies. They assure us they will not do so in the future. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, given that assurance.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and would associate myself again with his remarks and objection to the bill. We go to great pains on the subcommittee to protect the privacy of the American people, and I would agree with the assertions the chairman has made. I appreciate him yielding to me.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, let me see if I can try to allay some of the concerns that have been expressed.

My amendment seeks to address a serious problem. A year-and-a-half ago it was revealed that the National Security Agency deliberately subverted American cryptographic standards. Cryptographic standards for the national security community and the commercial software industry are developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, known as NIST. These standards are intended to protect Americans from foreign intelligence agencies, from cyber criminals, from industrial espionage, and from privacy violations by those who wish us harm.

□ 0040

They are embedded in software products which are used and sold widely—in fact, almost universally—in this country and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, media reports have confirmed that the National Security Agency successfully and deliberately weakened encryption standards promulgated by NIST to further NSA surveillance goals at the cost of privacy of ordinary U.S. citizens. This is extremely dangerous. It leaves users of those standards vulnerable to anybody who is familiar with those weaknesses, friend or foe.

As World Wide Web inventor Tim Berners-Lee put it:

It is naive to imagine that, if you deliberately introduce a weakness into a system, you will be the only one to use it.

My amendment would seek to address this issue and resolve it once and for all by prohibiting the intelligence community from subverting or interfering with the integrity of any cryptographic standard that is proposed, developed, or adopted by NIST.

To be clear about it, the intelligence community can continue to provide advice. What the intelligence community cannot do is deliberately set out to weaken cryptographic standards because whatever it does in that regard will certainly be understood and exploited by our enemies, as we saw just last week when we witnessed the decryption of information regarding classified information and U.S. employees.

It is only common sense that we should not want taxpayers' dollars that

are appropriated to one agency to be used to deliberately and actively subvert the work of another agency.

Therefore, I respectfully request support for this amendment on both sides of the aisle, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk replacing amendment No. 3 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any of the following:

(1) Sections 2(b), 2(d), 2(g), 3(c), 3(e), 3(f), or 3(g) of Executive Order 13423.

(2) Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f)(iii-iv), 2(h), 7, 9, 12, 13, or 16 of Executive Order 13514.

(3) Sections 3(b), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), 3(g), 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15 of Executive Order 13963.

(4) Subsections (c)(4), (c)(9), (c)(10), (c)(12), or (e) of section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

(5) Sections 400AA or 400FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374, 6374e).

(6) Section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

(7) Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment forbids scarce defense dollars from being allocated to fund three executive orders and several other provisions of law that require our military to squander billions of dollars in so-called green energy. The House adopted this amendment by a voice vote last year.

I would again remind the House that, just a few weeks ago, the so-called defense hawks warned that our defense budget has been strangled by sequestration, that every dollar wasted long ago had been wrung out of the Pentagon budget, and that our national security was directly imperiled as a result.

That argument carried the day, even though it will add billions of dollars to the national debt; yet, although we were told we didn't have enough money to adequately pay and supply troops in the field, it seems that we do have

plenty of defense money to indulge the “green energy” mandates that are imposed on our Armed Forces.

What truly troubles me is that this was all aired during debate on the DOD Appropriations bill last year. The limiting amendments were adopted by voice vote; yet we see the same waste being allowed in this year’s bill.

Let me refresh memories about the green energy mandates. The GAO reports that these mandates have cost the Navy as much as \$150 per gallon for jet fuel. In 2012, the Navy was forced to purchase 450,000 gallons of biofuel for its so-called green fleet at the cost of \$26.60 per gallon, when conventional petroleum cost just \$2.50 per gallon.

These mandates forced the Air Force to pay \$59 per gallon for 11,000 gallons of biofuel in 2012. That is 10 times more than regular jet fuel costs.

It is not just biofuels. Last year, the Pentagon was required to purchase over 1,000 Chevy Volts at a subsidized price of \$40,000 each. As Senator Coburn’s office pointed out: “Each one of these \$40,000 Chevy Volts represents the choice not to provide an entire infantry platoon with all new rifles or 50,000 rounds of ammunition that cannot be used for realistic training.”

These green energy mandates have required the Army and Navy to install solar arrays at various facilities. At Naval Station Norfolk, for example, the Navy spent \$21 million to install a 10-acre solar array which will supply a grand total of 2 percent of the base electricity.

According to the inspector general’s office, this project will save enough money to pay for itself in just 447 years. It is too bad solar panels only last about 25 years.

We don’t know exactly how much these mandates waste because, as the GAO reports: “There is currently no comprehensive inventory of which Federal agencies are implementing renewable energy-related initiatives and the types of initiatives they are implementing.”

Outside estimates are as much as \$7 billion for the Department of Defense last year, a figure that is expected to grow in the future.

We are told this program is necessary for flexibility. Really? Shouldn’t “flexibility” free us to get cheaper and more plentiful fuels, not more expensive and more exotic ones?

We are told the military should do its part for the environment as if it is possible to fight an environmentally sensitive war. That, I fear, is the real reason for this wasteful spending, to sacrifice our military budget on the altar of climate change.

This is part of an ideological crusade imposed on our military that will pointlessly consume billions of defense dollars mainly to keep money flowing to politically well-connected “green energy” companies that can’t get anyone else to buy their products.

There is a reason that Admiral Mullen warned us that, in his professional military judgment, the greatest threat to our national security is our national debt. We just increased that debt because of assurances that we had stretched the defense budget to the breaking point.

As long as this program continues to consume billions of our defense dollars, that claim cannot be taken seriously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would start my remarks by saying the gentleman from California has me at a disadvantage because we just received a copy of the final amendment that was offered in the House. Lines 7 and 8 are new to the amendment and refer to Executive Order No. 13963, which is in addition to other items that I am opposed to.

I am told that those sections in that executive order refer to planning for sustainability, but I cannot confirm that to the Members of the House.

I do rise in strong opposition to the gentleman’s amendment. He talks about exotic items—exotic items. The Department of Defense would be blocked from purchasing recycled paper. Let’s not buy recycled paper at the Department of Defense. Now, there is a great idea.

The Department would be blocked from generating renewable energy that might include using tents with photovoltaic materials that generate solar power onsite for our troops in God-forsaken places on this planet with no other access to energy sources.

The Department would be blocked from considering sites for new Federal facilities that are pedestrian friendly and accessible to, God forbid, public transit. Perhaps we should move the Pentagon because it is near a Metro stop.

The Department would be blocked from cooperating with the Department of Energy’s efforts to maximize the use of alternative fuels for our Federal fleet.

The Department of Defense is the largest purchaser of energy in the United States of America. As a former member of the Congress, I have a profound respect for Senator Dick Lugar from Indiana, as he characterized energy. It is not an energy problem so much as it is a national security issue, given where and how much energy we import.

The Department would also be blocked from advancing sustainable acquisition by trying to procure either less toxic or more water-efficient alternatives. My sense is that, in some portions of the State of California and other areas, they are desperate for a

couple of extra drops of water, but that might just be too exotic.

□ 0050

These are programs and initiatives that make sense, both for the environment and for fiscal responsibility. Moreover, the Department has been a leader in spurring new technologies, and I thought that is what drives the economy in America.

This amendment is terribly ill-advised, and I would strongly urge all of my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely right. The military is the largest purchaser of energy in our economy. That is exactly the point.

They should not be forced to purchase energy at vastly inflated prices to soothe the ideological itch of the environmental left.

No one in his right mind would pull into a gas station to pay \$26.60 per gallon for fuel when the gas station next door is selling it for \$2.50. That is exactly what these executive orders are requiring our military to do. It is squandering billions of our dollars and making a mockery of any claim that we are stretching our defense dollars to the utmost.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUINTA) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1314, ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 644, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-146) on the resolution (H. Res. 305) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue

Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) kindly resume the chair.

□ 0053

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. BOST (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term "Fair Labor Standards Act" and such disposition is listed as "willful" or "repeated".

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from State?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, no hard-working American should ever have to worry that her employer will refuse to pay her when she works overtime or takes money out of her paycheck, especially if she works for a Federal contractor. This practice is known as wage theft.

Right now, Federal contractors who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act are allowed to apply for Federal contracts. This amendment will ensure that funds may not be used to enter into a contract with a government contractor that willfully, and this is important, Mr. Chairman, willfully or repeatedly violates the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Other iterations of this amendment have simply identified any violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This one identifies only those contracts wherein the violator has been found to have been willfully or repeatedly in violation.

Now, I hope that both Republicans and Democrats can agree that willful and repeated violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act are unacceptable; that we can find other contractors who do not violate the Fair Labor Standards Act willfully and repeatedly. And this amendment ensures that those in violation of the law do not get taxpayer support.

It also ensures that honest, good contractors who do not willfully and repeatedly violate the Fair Labor Standards Act can have contracts.

Why shouldn't the Federal Government work with contractors who have some modicum of respect for their employees and who do not willfully and repeatedly violate the Fair Labor Standards Act?

This amendment relies upon the violations reported to the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System.

Again, when a contractor applies for a Federal contract, there is documentation they have to fill out, including the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System, and that system looks back to look at the prior 5 years worth of criminal, civil, or administrative agency actions which have a final disposition.

None of these things are pending. None of these things are under appeal. They have been decided.

And this amendment says that wherein violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act have been decided and determined conclusively, and only in the category of those that have been willful and/or repeated, then those particular contractors are contractors whom the U.S. Government shouldn't be doing business with, at least for 5 years, until they clean their act up.

Now, I hope that no one in this body would want to stand on the side of the willful and repeated violators of the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is impos-

sible to me that any Member would want to do that, particularly when we are trying to promote and do business with honest, decent contractors, or at least average and mediocre contractors.

This one has gone to the, again, willful and repeated violators. Very difficult to stand next to them, and I hope no Member of this body would do such a thing.

The amendment would ensure that a single inadvertent violation would not disqualify a contractor. And that is important. I have had some people say, well, what if somebody just messes up one time?

Well, no, that particular individual wouldn't be hit by this amendment. But the willful and repeated ones would.

So I think taxpayer money should be spent wisely. I think that as the largest purchaser of goods and services, the Federal Government must find a way to make sure funds are going to companies that treat their workers fairly and give American families a chance to succeed.

This is a serious problem, Mr. Chairman. The Economic Policy Institute found that "In total, the average low-wage workers lose a stunning \$2,634 per year in unpaid wages, representing as much as 15 percent of their earned income."

A report by the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee of the U.S. Senate revealed that 32 percent of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors.

This is a problem. This is a situation that must be remedied.

□ 0100

Similarly, the National Employment Law Project study found that 21 percent of Federal contract workers were not paid overtime, and 11 percent have been forced to work "off the clock."

Upholding the rule of law is a bipartisan issue. I think that we may disagree on many things; taxes, spending, we disagree on that. There have even been people in this body who disagree that any violator of the Fair Labor Standards Act should get a contract, but I certainly hope that those people who are repeated—let me repeat—repeated and willful violators should be excluded at least for 5 years.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we all agree that bad actors who deny workers basic protections, including wage and overtime pay, shouldn't be rewarded with government contracts funded by taxpayer dollars, but this amendment is unnecessary.

There is a suspension and debarment process already in place under the current law. If an employer has a history of bad behavior, including "willful" and "repeated" violations of FLSA, the Fair Labor Standards Act, Federal agencies know about it and have the authority to deny that employer Federal contracts.

A report by the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office found that litigation stemming from such claims continues to be a significant problem.

These aren't all bad actors. Often, they are employers trying to do the right thing, but are simply tripped up by an overly complex regulatory system.

I may add, Mr. Chairman, this amendment was voted down in the Transportation-HUD, Commerce-Justice-State, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Subcommittees; and likewise, it should also be on this floor.

I urge a "no" vote and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to provide for defense counsel for any individual described in section 8101(c).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds from being used to provide defense counsel to foreign terrorists detained at Guantanamo Bay.

Simply put, Mr. Chairman, our tax dollars should not be going to defend foreign terrorists. Hard-working taxpayers should not foot the legal bill of noncitizen terrorists who plotted to kill innocent Americans.

I recently visited Guantanamo Bay and learned firsthand of the outrageous amount of time these detainees spend with their taxpayer-funded counsel. I have asked the Department of Defense

to provide me with the exact amount they have spent in legal defense services for detainees, but I have received no response. Mr. Chairman, I am sure millions of dollars have been spent defending these foreign terrorists.

Legal resources provided by the Department of Defense should be prioritized for American servicemembers. The pool of judge advocates that represents detainees at Guantanamo is a stand-alone unit. They are only assigned to act as defense attorneys for suspected terrorists. Meanwhile, there is another pool of military lawyers to represent all other American servicemembers.

Why should the DOD resources be assigned to defend foreign terrorists when they could, instead, be used to defend our own men and women in uniform? I am confident most Americans would agree that this money could be better spent within the Department of Defense, perhaps by making sure that our servicemembers are provided their legal counsel ahead of noncitizen terrorists.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

We have a Constitution in this country. It contains language talking about the right to be assisted by counsel, and there are many other provisions relative to the protection of individual human beings from the State.

We are a very large country with approximately 2 million people in the military. I think one of the great foundational issues in the United States is to protect any human being from that incredible amount of power so that you avoid abuse.

We have seen enough instances of abuse because of allegations of terrorists, many of whom are very real, mean, despicable people; but to now say that no one should have protection to make sure that that incredible power of the state is used justly and wisely is absolutely wrong.

We have had any number of Members, our colleagues here yesterday and today on this bill, offering amendments because they believe the Department of Energy made a mistake on uniforms for airmen, the Department of Defense made mistakes as far as whether or not we should move helicopters from one base to another, we have made mistakes as far as how we should have life-saving rescue missions for various aspects of the Department of Defense positioned throughout our great country.

What if, God forbid, all these allegations that the Department of State may make mistakes from time to time

would actually have an impact on a human being, whoever they are, and that in the last instance, we don't give them one iota of protection that we give to murderers and rapists and burglar and arsonists in this country?

I think it is absolutely wrong for the gentleman to offer this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it simple.

This amendment is quite clear. If you don't want American tax dollars being spent to protect foreign terrorists who plotted to attack and kill innocent Americans, then vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that, if we are talking about the protection of taxpayers dollars, we should be talking about the protection of a human life and to make sure that that life, no matter whose life it is, is protected from the arbitrary use of power.

I again strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment that I think is just contrary to the foundational principles of the United States of America. We don't torture people. We protect people's lives in the United States, and now, to withdraw any protection for them is absolutely wrong.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

□ 0110

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the authority of the President pursuant to Article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, the responsibilities of the President and the responsibilities of the Defense Department continue in this new climate to grow. This has been a long journey in the Defense Appropriations process and amendments on the floor,

and I would like to at this hour thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for their patience and their participation in the list of amendments that we have had the opportunity to present.

I am a member of the Homeland Security Committee. Therefore, I see a lot of the new approaches.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I believe the committee would be delighted to accept your amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am delighted, and I will finish up.

I thank the chairman and ranking member. The amendment deals with countering violent extremism. I look forward to working on this issue.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the security of our country and the world.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward:

SEC. _____. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to contravene the authority of the President under article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

The purpose of Jackson Lee Amendment 177 is to affirm the President's authority under the Constitution.

Countering violent extremism and preventing the recruitment of American youth into violent extremism and preventing them from becoming foreign fighters for dangerous groups such as ISIL and other radical groups around the globe is a national imperative.

Earlier this year, I introduced the "No Fly For Foreign Fighters Act," legislation that will help keep foreign fighters and terrorists out of our country.

In introducing this legislation, I was particularly concerned about terrorist groups recruiting our youth.

In fact, I was part of a special roundtable along with DHS Secretary Johnson, in Houston, Texas on "Youth Engagement and Countering Violent Extremism".

During the discussion, Secretary Johnson and I addressed the importance of community engagement in preventing the recruitment of young Americans into terrorist groups.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help to prevent the recruitment of American youth as foreign fighters, a phenomenon that is unfortunately already taking root.

In March 2009, two-hundred schoolchildren in Britain (some as young as thirteen) had been identified and reported by community members—including parents, imams, and teachers—as being at risk of extremism or of being "groomed by radicalisers."

At least six boys between the ages of 13 and 16 were captured by U.S. Forces in Afghanistan in the initial fighting there.

In Iraq, U.S. forces detained more than 100 juveniles in the first year following the invasion, and more than 600 to date.

In the last few years a number of Somali-American young men have traveled to Somalia, possibly to train and fight with al-Shabaab.

At least one of these young men was killed during a suicide bombing attack in northern Somalia in October 2008, which is the first known instance of a U.S. citizen participating in a suicide attack.

Moreover, over 140 United States persons have traveled to Syria or Iraq to fight alongside ISIL, the Nusra Front, and other terrorist organizations.

Although there are no known instances of a U.S. person attempting to return from the region after participating in conflict, we must be vigilant against this prospect.

The Jackson Lee Amendment 177, seeks to protect youth and combat the actions of terrorist groups like Boko Haram and others who are using social media to bring them to their side.

The Jackson Lee Amendment is important because data shows that individuals recruited as foreign fighters from nations in Africa, Europe, and the Middle East have crossed borders and wreaked havoc and committed terrorist acts including kidnapping of youth similar to what Boko Haram has done.

Mr. Chair, the United States is committed to protecting our youth, preventing and combating violent extremism, protecting our borders and the globe from the scourge of terrorism and violent extremism.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will do just that.

Jackson Lee Amendment 177 prevents terrorism by ascertaining that American youth are not seduced into becoming terrorists.

The Jackson Lee Amendment promotes the United States military's unparalleled expertise and technological capability to combat and defeat terrorists who hate our country and prey upon our children, innocent persons, women and the elderly across the globe.

Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, ISIS/ISIL and other militant terrorists, including the Sinai's Ansar Beit al-Maqdis in the Sinai Peninsula are all global and national security threats that must be stopped.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will support the Department of Defense's efforts to prevent the recruitment of American youth into terrorism and the recovery of the still missing Chibok girls from Nigeria.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute a new or additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman

from New Hampshire and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill to prevent any funds from being used to conduct a new round of military base closures through a process known as Base Realignment and Closure, also known as BRAC.

While President Obama continues to discuss the possibility of another round of BRAC as a way to reduce defense spending, we know all too well the negative impacts closing military bases have on our communities, States, national security, and military preparedness.

For more than 200 years, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has provided thousands of Granite Staters with jobs and contributed millions in revenue and military equipment for the United States Navy.

Today, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has roughly 100 naval officers and enlisted personnel assigned to the facility. In addition, the shipyard employs roughly 4,700 civilian employees and offers an active apprentice and engineer recruitment program in the communities surrounding the facility. This base is more than just helpful to our local economy and our military readiness. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is absolutely essential to New Hampshire. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is one of only four shipyards remaining in the country. Each of these facilities has a mission to overhaul, repair, and modernize our Nation's submarine fleet. These services are vital toward maintaining fleet readiness.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment to show our unwavering support for our men and women in arms.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, while I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, I wouldn't express it, if you would, that I will oppose his amendment, but I do want to express some very serious concerns.

The concern I have is that we do need to begin to think about future budgets for the Department of Defense; and as I have mentioned repeatedly tonight, we are going to have to start making some hard decisions, and changes will have to be made and cuts will have to be made. I am very concerned about Congress' continued failure to confront the challenges that we face at the Department of Defense and simply saying no, no, no, and that we shouldn't even consider any possible changes.

The Department of Defense has continuously proposed significant initiatives to provide for future flexibility to meet our national security strategy, and Congress has said no, no, no. I simply do not think we should foreclose any options to consider in order to possibly, God forbid, save money in the outyears.

A BRAC round is a reasonable approach that provides Congress a chance to say yes or no, and I would make the observation again that we have got to stop saying no to everything that the Department of Defense considers. In this case, I am not even aware there is a proposal for a BRAC, but let's say no anyway. I think we have to stop doing it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's concerns. While I certainly hope that there is no BRAC round, there are concerns expressed by Members relative to the President's comments in this area as a method of reducing defense spending.

We have gone through sequestration. I have seen firsthand the concerns expressed by the civilian employees at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. They are the best and the brightest in the business, and I feel very strongly that this is important to New Hampshire and important to the defense of our Nation.

I certainly share the concern and welcome the opportunity to look at the Department of Defense to try to find efficiencies and effectiveness to make sure that our men and women are properly prepared, but I feel that a BRAC realignment would be inappropriate at this time. I hope that Members would support this amendment.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the rest of the committee for their hard work on this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by an officer or employee of the United States to query a collection of foreign intelligence information acquired under section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) using a United States person identifier.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to queries for foreign intelligence information authorized under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805; 1842; 1881b; 1881c;

1881d), or title 18, United States Code, regardless of under what Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act authority it was collected.

(c) Except as provided for in subsection (d), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency or the Central Intelligence Agency to mandate or request that a person (as defined in section 101(m) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(m))) alter its product or service to permit the electronic surveillance (as defined in section 101(f) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1801(f))) of any user of such product or service for such agencies.

(d) Subsection (c) shall not apply with respect to mandates or requests authorized under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

Mr. MASSIE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, the American people don't want to be spied on by their own government. Our Founding Fathers included the Fourth Amendment for a reason: to require probable cause and a warrant before the government and government agents can snoop on anyone.

During the 113th Congress, the House of Representatives passed the bipartisan amendment I am offering today by a 293-123 vote. This year, our bipartisan group is reuniting once again to shut down unconstitutional surveillance that does not meet the expectations of our constituents or the standards required by our Constitution.

Our amendment shuts one form of backdoor surveillance by prohibiting warrantless searches of government databases for information that pertains to U.S. citizens.

The Director of National Intelligence has confirmed that the government searches vast amounts of data, including the content of emails and telephone calls without individual suspicion or probable cause.

□ 0120

At this time, I submit for the RECORD a letter from the Director of National Intelligence, which confirms this warrantless spying.

DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, March 28, 2014.

Hon. RON WYDEN,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WYDEN: During the January 29, 2014, Worldwide Threat hearing, you cited declassified court documents from 2011 indicating that NSA sought and obtained the authority to query information collected under Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence and

Surveillance Act (FISA), using U.S. person identifiers, and asked whether any such queries had been conducted for the communications of specific Americans.

As reflected in the August 2013 Semiannual Assessment of Compliance with Procedures and Guidelines issued Pursuant to Section 702, which we declassified and released on August 21, 2013, there have been queries, using U.S. person identifiers, of communications lawfully acquired to obtain foreign intelligence by targeting non U.S. persons reasonably believed to be located outside the U.S. pursuant to Section 702 of FISA. These queries were performed pursuant to minimization procedures approved by the FISA Court as consistent with the statute and the Fourth Amendment. As you know, when Congress reauthorized Section 702, the proposal to restrict such queries was specifically raised and ultimately not adopted.

For further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact Deirdre M. Walsh in the Office of Legislative Affairs.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. CLAPPER.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, the Director of the FBI has also confirmed that he uses the information to build criminal cases against U.S. persons, but the Director of National Intelligence and the FBI are not above the Fourth Amendment, and this practice should end.

At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding in support of the Massie-Lofgren amendment.

As mentioned, the declassified FISA court decision has indicated that substantially more warrantless communications are collected through 702 than 215.

We had a bill up to recently, the USA FREEDOM Act, that alleged that we were stopping bulk collection, but we didn't. During the markup of that bill in the Judiciary Committee, we offered this amendment; and everyone on the committee, including the chairman of the committee, said they were for this provision, but it wasn't the right time. Well, this is the right time.

That is why we have this broad support. It is the Massie-Lofgren-Sensenbrenner-Conyers-Poe-Gabbard-Jordan-O'Rourke. It is broad; it is bipartisan. It is supported by groups like the American Civil Liberties Union, as well as the Campaign for Liberty, Demand Progress, as well as FreedomWorks. This has broad bipartisan support.

The American people deserve this. When we have an interest in querying the 702 database for American citizens, get a warrant. That is what the Fourth Amendment requires.

Finally, this closes the opportunity to require backdoors on technology. As has been mentioned earlier by technologists and scientists, to do that just opens a door wide open for the bad guys and the hackers to break in.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague stated, my amendment also

prohibits NSA and the CIA from placing backdoors into commercial products.

This is important because, in December of 2013, it was reported that a U.S. security company had received \$10 million from the NSA to use a flawed encryption method. Our government should strengthen technology that protects our privacy, not take advantage of it.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restricts the use of section 702 of FISA, which is not currently up for reauthorization.

The law does not sunset until December of 2017. Any reform to this authority should be fully vetted by the authorizing committees and not inappropriately attached to our spending bill.

This amendment would impose greater restrictions on the intelligence community's ability to protect national security and create an impediment to our government's ability to locate threat information already in our government's possession. Such an impediment would potentially put American lives at risk of another terrorist attack.

Colleagues, the House recently passed H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act, with overwhelmingly bipartisan support. It was signed into law last week. This amendment seeks to relitigate an issue fully litigated in the drafting of that legislation. A similar amendment was offered and rejected by the House Judiciary Committee during its markup of that bill.

The USA FREEDOM Act does include two reforms related to section 702 collection. These were reforms properly considered during the authorization process, not slapped on an appropriations bill without consideration and deliberation.

The first limits the government's use of information about U.S. persons that is obtained under section 702 that the FISA court later determines to be unlawful. The second provision requires the Director of National Intelligence to report annually the number of U.S. person queries under section 702.

Under current law, a U.S. person can only be the target of an intelligence gathering under FISA pursuant to an individualized court order based upon probable cause. The intelligence community is allowed to query communications it legally collects from foreigners for information about a U.S. person, so long as the query itself has foreign intelligence value.

This is no different from traditional criminal law. If the government has a legal wiretap on a drug dealer's cell phone and records a conversation

where a second drug dealer talks about committing a murder, police can use that phone call as evidence against a second drug dealer in a murder trial. What matters is that the initial wiretap—or, here, the initial targeting of the foreign terrorist—was legal.

Colleagues, this is an issue critical to our national security, and it is complicated. Any changes to section 702 should be fully evaluated and voted on using the authorization committee process, which is the appropriate channel for considered review and debate on this critical issue.

Unfortunately, this amendment has not benefited from the work of the authorization process and would potentially put American lives at greater risk for another terrorist attack. That is not a risk many of us or certainly I am willing to take.

For this reason and many others, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. At this time, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The unclassified FISA court reported that the 702 search had, in fact, scooped up vast amounts of wholly domestic information. How does this work?

The upstream communications are tapped into by the NSA. In the digital world, your digital information, your domestic information is stored throughout the world. It is scooped up, and it is used.

The FBI has indicated it is used and the DNI has indicated it is used for wholly domestic purposes without a warrant routinely thousands, tens of thousands of times. It is in violation of the Fourth Amendment, and it must stop.

I would just say, on the Judiciary Committee, every member of the committee who declined to support this amendment said they were for the amendment and said we should offer it to the DOD appropriations bill.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, now, it has been said here tonight that this is not the time or the place to address these problems with 702, but, look, we have a constitutional crisis, and this was the excuse we were given in the Judiciary Committee when my colleague tried to get the amendment allowed there.

It was the same excuse I was given in the Rules Committee when we had an opportunity to address this, and I would maintain that 2017, 2 years from now, is too long to go in this constitutional crisis situation where we recog-

nize something that illegal and/or unconstitutional is occurring; yet we don't do anything about it. This is the time to do something about it; this is the place to do something about it.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ELLMERS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to deactivate the 440th airlift wing, or to move the personnel or aircraft of the 440th airlift wing, or to otherwise degrade the capabilities of the 440th airlift wing.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

□ 0130

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to continue my fight against the Air Force's misguided decision to shutter the 440th Airlift Wing.

As I have stated time and time again, the removal of the 440th Airlift Wing at Pope Army Airfield injects avoidable and unreasonable risks to our military readiness. Given the instability and uncertainty in the Middle East and around the world, I find it baffling that the Air Force has chosen to close such an efficient airlift wing that provides critical training to special operations forces and units such as the 82nd Airborne's Global Response Force.

I have failed to see the true cost savings and any benefits associated with this shortsighted proposal, and I will continue working with my colleagues to pursue every option possible in order to prevent the closure of the wing. Furthermore, I find it troubling that the Air Force has made a concerted effort to hollow out this wing before allowing

congressional efforts to come to fruition.

Mr. Chairman, I simply lack the confidence that there will be no negative impacts to the training of Fort Bragg paratroopers and special operations forces. I will, therefore, continue to work with my North Carolina colleagues to prevent its closure.

I believe that this is a necessary effort to preserve the 440th Airlift Wing because of the vital and unique training mission that it has at Fort Bragg with our paratroopers. Our paratroopers have to be packed and ready at any given moment for their Global Response Force. I have paratroopers who simply live day-to-day, ready to leave at a moment's notice—within hours—around the world.

I believe that this is, again, a short-sighted, myopic decision on the Air Force's part, and I believe we need to be protected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law, and it constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill. Therefore, it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

“An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.”

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination by the relevant Federal official of which actions would degrade given capabilities.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to Pakistan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 2685, which would prevent any funds in this bill from being provided to Pakistan.

Over the last 15 years, the United States has provided Pakistan with over \$25 billion, the vast majority of which has gone to its military and security services. With this money, which we are giving them at a time when we are borrowing hundreds of billions of dollars, Pakistan is using it to subsidize terrorists, some of whom are targeting Americans.

Just as bad, our largess enables Pakistan to repress its own citizens. Our military aid is being used to murder and brutalize the Baloch and Sindhi peoples, who are citizens of Pakistan. The Baloch people are being slaughtered as part of a campaign by Pakistan, in partnership with China, to steal the natural resources of the Baloch people. With our money, the Pakistanis are, in fact, murdering and repressing their own people, and they are aggressing upon their neighbors in Afghanistan and in India.

They also have, as we have heard, a much hyped cooperation against terrorism. I would suggest to my colleagues that this is a charade. This is the same Pakistan establishment that gave shelter to Osama bin Laden for years—Osama bin Laden, the mass murderer of Americans on 9/11. The establishment of Pakistan gave him shelter and gave him a place to hide all of those years, making a fool out of us as we provided them money.

In case there is any doubt that they knew about Osama bin Laden's hiding next-door, they rubbed our noses in their arrogance and hostility when they arrested Dr. Afridi, the Pakistani doctor who helped us find Osama bin Laden and bring him to justice. As we talk tonight, Dr. Afridi still painfully languishes in a Pakistani dungeon. While Dr. Afridi is imprisoned, Pakistan should not get 1 cent of aid from our country. This is an insult to us, and it is an insult to the victims of 9/11 that we are even considering giving money to the country which hid Osama bin Laden from us, much less giving them borrowed money, perhaps, from China.

Now we see we borrow money from China and give it to Pakistan, which then gives it to China. In exchange, of course, China is getting the natural resources of Pakistan, of the Baloch people, and they are, in fact, getting a pork facility in Qatar.

Our aid to Pakistan does not make us safer or the world more peaceful. The Pakistanis and other enemies of ours see it as a weakness on our part. This payoff we hope, of course, will bring more peace and will pay the Pakistanis off. No. It emboldens the Pakistani establishment in their criminal violence against their own people and in their

destabilizing violence against Afghanistan and India. Let us note: if we want to have a peaceful situation in Afghanistan someday, we cannot keep subsidizing the ISI and the military in Pakistan, which is primarily responsible for that mayhem that is going on in Afghanistan.

□ 0140

The people of Afghanistan know that, and our own specialists know that. We are just hoping if we pay people off, things will settle down. It hasn't accomplished that mission. We have emboldened our enemies by being stupid by giving money to a country like Pakistan, which obviously hates our guts, when they hide the man who murdered thousands of people on 9/11 and then suggest they didn't know it, and then arrest the person who helped us find that murderer.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in prohibiting any more of our money—especially borrowed money, as we are borrowing it today—from going to these people in Pakistan, the leadership who are committing crimes against us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to retire conventionally armed air launched cruise missiles (AGM-86 C/D).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a very simple amendment that would help keep America's strategic forces strong and robust. My amendment would make sure that the U.S. Air Force keeps the air-launched cruise missile in their arsenal. That is the AGM-86 and its variants C and D.

The replacement missile, which I agree needs to happen, the long-range standoff weapon, has faced continuous delays. At this point, the replacement missile still remains years and years away from fielding.

I would like to applaud Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the committee for taking action in light of the numerous setbacks and delays of this program by appropriately rephrasing funds in the underlying bill.

With such development uncertainty, I am disappointed to say that further delays are almost guaranteed.

In this high-threat environment, with heightened Russian aggression, their violations of the INF Treaty, which are now public, and also hostile Chinese adventurism in the South Pacific, we need to ensure that this Nation's defense is without a gap.

We simply can't afford to take these weapons out of the arsenal at this current moment until a replacement is up and operational. It is critically important that we maintain our existing inventory.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUGENT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Let me say, we admire his strong conviction and advocacy for this program. We are prepared to accept his amendment with the understanding that we will need to study and discuss it with the Air Force to understand its full impact.

Mr. NUGENT. I absolutely appreciate the chairman doing that and would love to work with him.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NUGENT. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. ____ (a) Notwithstanding section 8005 and 9003, of the unobligated funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2016 and made available in this Act, \$3,500,000,000 is available to transfer to the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund established by section 2218a of title 10, United States Code, as authorized by subsection (b) of section 1022 of Public Law 113-291.

Mr. FORBES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we waive the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, this is the second part of a two-part amendment that deals with the sea-based deterrence fund. We began this 4 weeks ago when the Armed Services Committee put in this fund. We, at that particular point in time, transferred

\$1.4 billion to the fund. In addition to that, we gave authorities for additional moneys to be transferred by the Department of Defense. Four weeks ago, we had 375 Members who voted in favor of that provision. When it was challenged on the floor a few hours ago, we had 321 Members who have supported that. All of the same individuals are supporting this fund that did so earlier.

I could repeat all that, but we have already done that, so I would just say all of the arguments we had earlier and all of the people who supported it then continue to support it now. I hope the will of the House will prevail and that the amendment will be accepted. If not, I hope it will be adopted by the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FORBES) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE TO THE UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. LARSON, Connecticut
Mr. DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
Ms. FRANKEL, Florida
Mr. CONNOLLY, Virginia

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 611. An act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 653. An act to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources re-

search and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 11, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1772. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael T. Linnington, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1773. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criterion — First in the World Program [Docket No.: ED-2015-OPE-0001; CFDA Nos.: 84.116F and 84.116X] received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1774. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Clarification for Energy Conservation Standards and Test Procedures for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts [Docket No.: EERE-2009-BT-TP-0016] (RIN: 1904-AB99) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1775. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Synthetic Iron Oxide; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2013-C-1008] received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1776. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Postmarketing Safety Reports for Human Drug and Biological Products; Electronic Submission Requirements; Delay of Compliance Date; Safety Reporting Portal of Electronic Submission of Postmarketing Safety Reports for Human Drugs and Nonvaccine Biological Products [Docket No.: FDA-2008-N-0334] (RIN: 0910-AF96) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1777. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Banned Devices; General Provisions; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-

0011] received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1778. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Veterinary Feed Directive [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0155] (RIN: 0910-AG95) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1779. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Iowa; Grain Vacuuming Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Rescission Rules [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0358; FRL-9928-90-Region 7] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1780. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District, Feather River Air Quality Management District, and San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0246; FRL-9928-09-Region 9] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1781. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Decommissioning of Stage II Vapor Recovery Systems and Amending Stage I Vapor Recovery Requirements [EPA-R01-OAR-2013-0818; A-1-FRL-9928-86-Region 1] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1782. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standard and Repeal of Cement Kilns Rule [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0821; FRL-9928-80-Region 6] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1783. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Transportation Conformity and Conformity of General Federal Actions [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0938; FRL-9928-79-Region 6] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1784. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0423; FRL-9928-78-Region 3] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1785. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Republic of Korea, pursuant to Sec.

36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 15-24; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1786. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that the President has directed the Secretary of State to inform the Speaker of the House of Representatives of his intent to exercise his authority to designate Tunisia as a Major Non-NATO Ally, pursuant to Sec. 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, (FAA), (22 U.S.C. 2321k); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1787. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting for consideration, draft legislation to extend, by 15 years, the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the Quarterly Financial Report program; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1788. A letter from the Chairwoman, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014, to March 31, 2015, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1789. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Pub. L. 95-452, the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1790. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, transmitting the 2014 Statement on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106, and the Bank's 2014 audited financial statements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1791. A letter from the Director of National Intelligence, Intelligence Community, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 103H of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1792. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period of October 1, 2014, to March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5 of Pub. L. 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1793. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the "Fiscal Year 2014 Naval Petroleum Reserves Annual Report of Operations", prepared by the Office of Fossil Energy, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7431(c); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1794. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Lakeside July 4th Fireworks, Lake Erie; Lakeside, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0388] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1795. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zones, Captain of the Port New Orleans Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1069] (RIN: 1625-AA00) re-

ceived June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1796. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones: Fireworks Displays in the Sector Columbia River Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0300] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1797. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Great Lakes Pilotage Rates — 2015 Annual Review and Adjustment [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0481] (RIN: 1625-AC22) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1798. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Loading and Outbound Transit of TUG THOMAS and BARGE OCEANUS, Savannah River; Savannah, GA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0280] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1799. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Biscayne Bay, Miami Beach, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0719] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1800. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Detroit Belle Isle Grand Prix, Detroit River; Detroit, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0389] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1801. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Special Local Regulation, Annual Dragon Boat Races, Portland Oregon [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0453] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1802. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0415; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-18152; AD 2015-09-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 305. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to

an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory (Rept. 114-146). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2709. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants for career support for skilled internationally educated health professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COOK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 2710. A bill to revise various laws that interfere with the right of the people to obtain and use firearms for all lawful purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2711. A bill to delay the provision of the Affordable Care Act premium and cost-sharing subsidies until the eligibility verification process for such subsidies is completed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2712. A bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the health care premium tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 2713. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend ad-

vanced education nursing grants to support clinical nurse specialist programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2714. A bill to provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2715. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BUCK, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 2716. A bill to empower States with authority for most taxing and spending for highway programs and mass transit programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2717. A bill to modify the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act of 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 2718. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2719. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to Indian tribes to further achievement of tribal coastal zone objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2720. A bill to require institutions of higher education to report annually on the use of race, color, or national origin in the admissions process; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms.

SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2721. A bill to strengthen and expand proven anti-poverty programs and initiatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, Rules, the Budget, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BERRA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BARR, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. LEE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CUREBELO of Florida, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DENT, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HARDY, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TROTT, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HILL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. PALMER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr.

COSTA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. MOOLenaar, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YODER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. TURNER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOLD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BLUM, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2722. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the fight against breast cancer; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2723. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Rabbi Arthur Schneier in recognition of his pioneering role in promoting religious freedom and human rights throughout the world, for close to half a century; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARR, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2724. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize hydroelectric production incentives and hydroelectric efficiency improvement incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2725. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to expand the use of telehealth under the TRICARE program and in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 2726. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the first manned landing on the moon; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2727. A bill to authorize a land exchange involving Fort Hood, Texas, and the City of Copperas Cove, Texas, to support the city's efforts to improve arterial transportation routes in the vicinity of Fort Hood and to promote economic development; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all trade agreements the United States enters into, should provide reasonable access and collaboration of each nation involved in such an agreement, for the purpose of search and recovery activities relating to members of the United States Armed Forces missing in action from prior wars or military conflicts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOX:

H. Res. 304. A resolution electing certain Members to standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COHEN:

H. Res. 306. A resolution recognizing the centennial of the wreck of the USS Memphis

and encouraging the commemoration of such wreck with appropriate events and activities; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MENG, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIRE, and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H. Res. 307. A resolution condemning the Republic of the Sudan for its actions to pardon Mubarak Mustafa, who was responsible for the escape of two men convicted of the assassination of John Granville on January 1, 2008, and calling on the United States Department of State to continue to include Sudan on the list of state sponsors of terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. MOORE):

H. Res. 308. A resolution recognizing the importance of the Wisconsin Idea and the University of Wisconsin System for the benefit they have brought and continue to bring to the State of Wisconsin, the United States, and the world; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

53. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, urging the United States Congress and United States Fish and Wildlife Service to take certain actions to reduce the impact of common ravens on the greater sage grouse and desert tortoise populations in this State; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

54. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 5, expressing support for the 2014 Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan developed by the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council and urging the United States Fish and Wildlife Service not to list the greater sage-grouse as an endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 2710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Second Amendment of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. DeSANTIS:

H.R. 2716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. FARR:

H.R. 2717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18; the Commerce clause and Necessary and Proper clause, which grant Congress the power to make laws that regulate commerce.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 2718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I of the Constitution of the United States of America:

"All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

14th Amendment, U.S. Constitution; Article 1, U.S. Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 2721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. "The Congress shall have Power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;"

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clauses 12

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 167: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 210: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 213: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 217: Mr. CARTER of Texas and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 232: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 276: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 287: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 335: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 427: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 448: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 449: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 465: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 472: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 492: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 525: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 528: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 563: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 653: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 676: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 686: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 692: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. FOX, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 699: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 702: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 721: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 746: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 766: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 767: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 794: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 825: Mr. DOLD and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 829: Mr. COHEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SIREs, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 835: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 842: Mr. HARDY and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 846: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. PALONE.

H.R. 868: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 885: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 911: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 912: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 918: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. Pittenger, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 920: Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 923: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 940: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 953: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 985: Mr. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 994: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 999: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1002: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DENT, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1057: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1089: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1090: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1151: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1157: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1174: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1180: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1194: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1197: Mrs. DINGELL and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1199: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1271: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1278: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1310: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1321: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1333: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1338: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1340: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1375: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1384: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1388: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1399: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1427: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1434: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1453: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1462: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1475: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1516: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1537: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 1553: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1559: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 1567: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1571: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1598: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1600: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1610: Mr. RUIZ and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1635: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1665: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1671: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1674: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1676: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1725: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1728: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1737: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1766: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1779: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1786: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1804: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1817: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1844: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 1855: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1856: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1875: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1877: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1941: Mr. WOODALL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1943: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1969: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. JONES, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1977: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1994: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 2010: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2016: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2019: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2031: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2050: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2061: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 2072: Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2133: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 2142: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2152: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2170: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2177: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2191: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2212: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 2216: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2233: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2238: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2251: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2255: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 2259: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2280: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2303: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2304: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2309: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2315: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2350: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2355: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2358: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KLINE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KIND, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2366: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2378: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2398: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2400: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 2404: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2406: Mr. KLINE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. Tipton, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 2407: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2410: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 2429: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2477: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2505: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2513: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2524: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 2530: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2560: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 2563: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2603: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 2607: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2611: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 2639: Mr. JONES and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2646: Mr. KATKO, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2652: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2653: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2663: Ms. TITUS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 2675: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 2680: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2689: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 2692: Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 2698: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. YODER.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. ROSS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. HARDY.

H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 12: Mr. POMPEO.

H. Res. 54: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 110: Mr. SALMON.

H. Res. 183: Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Res. 207: Mr. PERRY and Mr. VARGAS.

H. Res. 233: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H. Res. 294: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 297: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CARDENAS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1295

OFFERED BY: Mr. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Findings.

Sec. 103. Extension of African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Sec. 104. Modifications of rules of origin for duty-free treatment for articles of beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 105. Monitoring and review of eligibility under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 106. Promotion of the role of women in social and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 107. Biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

Sec. 108. Deepening and expanding trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States.

Sec. 109. Agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 110. Reports.

Sec. 111. Technical amendments.

Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Sec. 201. Extension of Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 202. Authority to designate certain cotton articles as eligible articles only for least-developed beneficiary developing countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 203. Application of competitive need limitation and waiver under Generalized System of Preferences with respect to articles of beneficiary developing countries exported to the United States during calendar year 2014.

Sec. 204. Eligibility of certain luggage and travel articles for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Sec. 301. Extension of preferential duty treatment program for Haiti.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

Sec. 401. Tariff classification of recreational performance outerwear.

Sec. 402. Duty treatment of protective active footwear.

Sec. 403. Effective date.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Report on contribution of trade preference programs to reducing poverty and eliminating hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

Sec. 601. Customs user fees.

Sec. 602. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

Sec. 603. Elimination of modification of the Medicare sequester for fiscal year 2024.

Sec. 604. Payee statement required to claim certain education tax benefits.

Sec. 605. Special rule for educational institutions unable to collect TINs of individuals with respect to higher education tuition and related expenses.

Sec. 606. Penalty for failure to file correct information returns and provide payee statements.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost six-fold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(b) AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(g)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(2) EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “11 succeeding” and inserting “21 succeeding”; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(3) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “SEPTEMBER 30, 2015” and inserting “SEPTEMBER 30, 2025”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.”.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff treatment symbol “D” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol “A” or “A*” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “If the President” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s inten-

tion to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”.

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

“(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

“(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

“(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

“(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

“(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

“(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

“(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

“(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

“(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

“(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”.

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.”.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “for men and women” after “rights”.

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as “AGOA utilization strategies”);

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider requesting the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) CONTENTS.—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) PUBLICATION.—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in

sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest” and inserting “, through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have”; and

(B) by striking “and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States” and inserting “, complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) by inserting after “from those countries” the following: “, particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) COORDINATION.—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.”.

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) **POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) **TERMINATION.**—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “beneficiary sub-Saharan African country” means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) **SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “sub-Saharan African country” has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking “July 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013, and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1),

shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) **REQUESTS.**—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after

the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) **PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.**—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **COVERED ARTICLE.**—The term “covered article” means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) **ENTER; ENTRY.**—The terms “enter” and “entry” include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.”.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “October 1” for “July 1” each place such date appears.

(b) **ARTICLE DESCRIBED.**—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (5)”;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking “Footwear” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (5), footwear”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or (E) of paragraph (1), the President may designate the following as eligible articles under subsection (a):

“(A) Articles classifiable under subheading 4202.11.00, 4202.12.40, 4202.21.60, 4202.21.90, 4202.22.15, 4202.22.45, 4202.31.60, 4202.32.40, 4202.32.80, 4202.92.15, 4202.92.20, 4202.92.45, or 4202.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

“(B) Articles classifiable under statistical reporting number 4202.12.2020, 4202.12.2050, 4202.12.8030, 4202.12.8070, 4202.22.8050, 4202.32.9550, 4202.32.9560, 4202.91.0030, 4202.91.0090, 4202.92.3020, 4202.92.3031, 4202.92.3091, 4202.92.9026, or 4202.92.9060 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as such statistical reporting numbers are in effect on the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (cc) to read as follows:

“(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking “succeeding 11 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(II) by striking “December 19, 2018” and inserting “December 19, 2025”.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking “September 30, 2020” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 401. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) **AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.**—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking “For the purposes of subheadings” and all that follows through “6211.20.15” and inserting “For purposes of this chapter”;

(B) by striking “garments classifiable in those subheadings” and inserting “a garment”; and

(C) by striking “D 3600-81” and inserting “D 3779-81”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new notes:

“(3. (a) For purposes of this chapter, the term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ means trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants, and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar

articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with 5 or more of the following features:

“(i) Insulation for cold weather protection.
“(ii) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

“(iii) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

“(iv) Venting, not including grommet(s).

“(v) Articulated elbows or knees.

“(vi) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

“(vii) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

“(viii) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

“(ix) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

“(x) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

“(xi) Odor control technology.

The term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ does not include occupational outerwear.

“(b) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

“(i) The term ‘treated with plastics’ refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

“(ii) The term ‘sealed seams’ means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

“(iii) The term ‘critically sealed seams’ means—

“(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the

front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

“(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

“(iv) The term ‘insulation for cold weather protection’ means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

“(v) The term ‘venting’ refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

“(vi) The term ‘articulated elbows or knees’ refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

“(vii) The term ‘reinforcement’ refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

“(viii) The term ‘weatherproof closure’ means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

“(ix) The term ‘multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar’ means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar component, to allow volume adjustments around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

“(x) The terms ‘adjustable powder skirt’ and ‘inner protective skirt’ refer to a partial lower inner lining with means of tightening

around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

“(xi) The term ‘arm gusset’ means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

“(xii) The term ‘radial arm movement’ refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

“(xiii) The term ‘odor control technology’ means the incorporation into a fabric or garment of materials, including, but not limited to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

“(xiv) The term ‘occupational outerwear’ means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion, or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

“(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as ‘recreational performance outerwear’.

“(d) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.”

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:			
	6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
	6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
					”.

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%	
	6201.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	...
	6201.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	...
	6201.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	...
	6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6201.19.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%	
	6201.91.10	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%	
	6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6201.92.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6201.92.15	Other: Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 heading 6201.93.05 having the same degree of subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day through 6201.93.35 and inserting the fol- indentation as the article description for before the date of the enactment of this Act):
lowing, with the article description for sub-

“	6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6201.93.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6201.93.20	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6201.93.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6201.93.30	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):
the article description for subheading

“	6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	
	6201.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	”.

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in ef-

fect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:							
	6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%				
	6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%				”.

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%				
	6202.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%				
	6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%				”.

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%				
	6202.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%				
	6202.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%				
	6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%				”.

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6202.19.10	Other:				
	6202.19.90	Containing 70 percent or more by weight or silk or silk waste	Free	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other	2.8%			”.

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	02.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	58.5%	
	6202.91.10	Other:				
		Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 5.6% (OM)	58.5%	
	6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6202.92.10	Other:				
		Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6202.92.15	Other:				
		Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 heading 6202.93.05 having the same degree of subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day through 6202.93.50 and inserting the fol- indentation as the article description for before the date of the enactment of this Act): lowing, with the article description for sub-

“	6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6202.93.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6202.93.20	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6202.93.40	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.93.45	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6202.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6202.99.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:							
	6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%				
	6203.41.10	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen ...	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.8% (AU) 3% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	”.			

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%				
	6203.42.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%				
	6203.42.20	Other: Bib and brace overalls	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%				
	6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	”.			

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.43.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.43.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%				
	6203.43.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%				
	6203.43.15	Other: Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%				
	6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%				
		Other:							

6203.43.25	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.43.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6203.43.35	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%	
6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	”.

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6203.49 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.49	Of other textile materials:							
	6203.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%				
	6203.49.10	Other: Of artificial fibers: Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%				
	6203.49.15	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%				
	6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%				
	6203.49.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%				
	6203.49.80	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%				”.

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.10	Other: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	”.

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.62.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
	6204.62.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
	6204.62.20	Other: Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6204.62.30	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%	
	6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	”.

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 heading 6204.63.05 having the same degree of subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day through 6204.63.35 and inserting the fol-indentation as the article description for before the date of the enactment of this Act):
 lowing, with the article description for sub-

“	6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	
	6204.63.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
	6204.63.12	Other: Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6204.63.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine ani- mal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.63.30	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	”.

6204.69	Of other textile materials:			
04.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
6204.69.10	Other: Of artificial fibers: Bib and brace overalls	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6204.69.20	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%
6204.69.25	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6204.69.40	Of silk or silk waste: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste ..	1.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%
6204.69.60	Other	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
6204.69.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%

6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%
6210.40.30	Other: Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%
6210.40.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6210.50.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.50.30	Other: Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	”.

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in ef-

fect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.32	Of cotton:				
	6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
	6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in ef-

fect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.33	Of man-made fibers:				
	6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	
	6211.33.10	Other	16%	6.4% (OM) Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	”.

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6211.39.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6211.39.10	Other: Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%	
	6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	4.8% (OM) Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	

6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.
------------	-------------	------	--	-----	----

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.42	Of cotton:				
6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	7.2% (AU) Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.43	Of man-made fibers:				
6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
6211.43.10	Other	16%	8% (AU) 6.4% (OM) Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.49.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR) Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%	
6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	4.8% (OM) 8% (AU) Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

SEC. 402. DUTY TREATMENT OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the

United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

“6. For the purposes of subheadings 6402.91.42 and 6402.99.32, the term ‘protective active footwear’ means footwear (other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1)

that is designed for outdoor activities, such as hiking shoes, trekking shoes, running shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over \$24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by

the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.”.

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Har-

monized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the arti-

cle description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

“ 6402.91.42	Protective active footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	”.
--------------	---	-----	---	-----	----

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new sub-

heading, with the article description for subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of

indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

“ 6402.99.32	Protective active footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P) 1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35%	”.
--------------	----------------------------------	-----	--	-----	----

(c) STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall—

(1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

SEC. 601. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “July 7, 2025”.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking “June 30, 2021” and inserting “June 30, 2025”.

SEC. 602. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is other-

wise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 5.25 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 603. ELIMINATION OF MODIFICATION OF THE MEDICARE SEQUESTER FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), section 251A(6)(D)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a(6)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking “0.25 percent” and inserting “0.0 percent”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not take effect unless the Trade Act of 2015 is enacted and if the Trade Act of 2015 is enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, such amendment shall be executed as if this Act had been enacted after the date of the enactment of such other Act.

SEC. 604. PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIRED TO CLAIM CERTAIN EDUCATION TAX BENEFITS.

(a) AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY CREDIT, HOPE SCHOLARSHIP CREDIT, AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 25A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no credit shall be allowed under this section unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.”.

(2) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—Section 25A(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a statement described in paragraph (8) and received by such individual shall be treated as received by the taxpayer.”.

(b) DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—Section 222(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph

(6) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.

“(B) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—The receipt of the statement referred to in subparagraph (A) by an individual described in subsection (c)(3) shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as received by the taxpayer.”.

(c) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED ON PAYEE STATEMENT.—Section 6050S(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the information required by subsection (b)(2).”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. SPECIAL RULE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS UNABLE TO COLLECT TINS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—No penalty shall be imposed under section 6721 or 6722 solely by reason of failing to provide the TIN of an individual on a return or statement required by section 6050S(a)(1) if the eligible educational institution required to make such return contemporaneously makes a true and accurate certification under penalty of perjury (and in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary) that it has complied with standards promulgated by the Secretary for obtaining such individual’s TIN.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 606. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS AND PROVIDE PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6721(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”, and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(b) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(1) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6721(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”,

(B) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”, and

(C) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(2) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6721(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”,

(B) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$250”, and

(C) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(c) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6721(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”, and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”, and

(B) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”, and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”, and

(B) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(d) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6721(e) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”, and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(e) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6722(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”, and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(2) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(A) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6722(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”,

(ii) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”, and

(iii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(B) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6722(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”,

(ii) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by clause (i)) and inserting “\$250”, and

(iii) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(3) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6722(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”, and

(ii) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”,

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”, and

(ii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”, and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”, and

(ii) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(4) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6722(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”, and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to returns and statements required to be filed after December 31, 2015.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. DELANEY

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$7,463,000)”.

Page 88, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) after December 31, 2015.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. NOLAN

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. SABLAN

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$21,300,000)”.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$21,300,000)”.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. TAKAI

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$25,000,000) (increased by \$25,000,000)”.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ Not more than \$50,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used on the ground-based strategic deterrence unless the annual report that is submitted in 2016 under section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1576) includes a 25-year cost estimate of modernizing and sustaining the nuclear enterprise.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ Not more than \$500,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used on the research and development of the long-range strike bomber until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report on the justification for procuring both the long-range strike bomber and the long-range standoff weapon.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 3, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 31, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,543,000) (increased by \$3,543,000)”.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consult, as the term is used in reference to the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, in contravention of the assurance provided in section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3(c)(1)(A)).

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT No. 20: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by any department or agency of the United States other than the Armed Forces to operate an armed unmanned aerial vehicle.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT No. 21: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Iraq Train and Equip Fund" may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT No. 22: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under section 9014 for "Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine" may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT No. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deploy United States troops on the ground of Iraq or Syria (other than deployment of such troops for purposes of protecting United States embassies and consulates) unless Congress has enacted a specific authorization for the deployment of such troops.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. SABLAN

AMENDMENT No. 24: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to establish any live-fire range, training course, or maneuver area within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in contravention of section 801 of Public Law 94-241 or section 2663 of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT No. 25: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any of the following:

(1) Sections 2(b), 2(d), 2(g), 3(c), 3(e), 3(f), or 3(g) of Executive Order 13423.

(2) Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f)(iii-iv), 2(h), 7, 9, 12, 13, or 16 of Executive Order 13514.

(3) Sections 3(b), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), 3(g), 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15 of Executive Order 13963.

(4) Subsections (c)(4), (c)(9), (c)(10), (c)(12), or (e) of section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

(5) Sections 400AA or 400FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374, 6374e).

(6) Section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

(7) Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHIFF

AMENDMENT No. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used after March 31, 2016, for Operation Inherent Resolve in the absence of a law enacted by Congress before such date that specifically authorizes the use of military force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 27: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 28: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a flash-bang grenade under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. CONYERS

AMENDMENT No. 29: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide arms, training, or other assistance to the Azov Battalion.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. ROHRABACHER

AMENDMENT No. 30: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to Pakistan.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DON'T MESS WITH TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ART CONTEST WINNER VIVIAN WANG

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Vivian Wang of Sugar Land's Cornerstone Elementary for being one of only thirteen winning students of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

Vivian Wang, who is currently in the fifth grade, is one of the thirteen winners selected from the 8,228 elementary school students from across Texas who entered the contest. Keep Texas Beautiful and the Texas Department of Transportation selected the contest winners who displayed tremendous artistic talent, dedication, and creativity. Vivian's submission will appear in the 2016 Don't Mess with Texas Calendar and will be displayed on the Keep Texas Beautiful and Don't Mess with Texas websites. Her work will even be showcased at the Keep Texas Beautiful's 2015 Annual Conference.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Vivian for being selected as one of the winners of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

RECOGNIZING SUNNY HILLS SERVICES

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to recognize Sunny Hills Services in San Anselmo, California, on the occasion of their 120th Anniversary Celebration, held on June 5, 2015.

For more than a century, Sunny Hills Services has dedicated itself to protecting, nurturing and healing at-risk youth in Marin County and the greater Bay Area. Originally founded as an orphanage and farm, today Sunny Hills helps children and adolescents across the region grow up in safe, healthy environments, develop life skills, achieve academically, and engage positively with our community. They have worked tirelessly on behalf of our most vulnerable citizens, and remain a leader in best practices for child welfare programs.

Sunny Hills' relentless advocacy on behalf of our youth has left a lasting impact on individuals, families, and neighborhoods. In the past year alone, they have helped more than 1,600 minors and 1,100 families and caregivers—and that does not include the count-

less friends, teachers, and classmates affected by their work. From providing mental health services for children experiencing behavioral and emotional difficulties to organizing transitional housing for former foster youth, Sunny Hills continues to engender meaningful change in the lives of our young people and enrich the fabric of our community.

Future generations rely upon the support today's children receive. We are all better off because of the vital work Sunny Hills performs by giving youth the tools they need to thrive. Mr. Speaker, we urge our colleagues to join us in congratulating Sunny Hills Services on this milestone and wishing them continued success for years to come.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MRS. SHIRLEY MAE EDDY

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mrs. Shirley Mae Eddy of Canfield, Ohio who will forever be remembered as a loving wife, mother, and grandmother as well as a devoted Christian. Mrs. Eddy spent the early parts of her life in Pennsylvania, however, when she married the love of her life Bob Eddy, the two relocated to Warren, Ohio. Tomorrow Mr. and Mrs. Eddy would have celebrated their 60th anniversary. Mrs. Eddy valued her family above all else, and she enjoyed spending time with her six grandchildren and great-grandson. All who knew her could attest to her life being built on the strong foundation of her faith. She could always be found lending a helping hand to the less fortunate and giving her all wherever she noticed an unmet need. Mrs. Eddy's carefree laughter and service to the less fortunate are only a few of the attributes that made her special to her friends and family.

Mrs. Eddy was preceded in death by her loving parents, Kenneth and Isabelle; as well as her brother William; she leaves behind her husband of over fifty years Bob; her son, Chuck; daughters Lana and Lindy; brothers Kenneth, Robert, and Tom; sister Nancy; grandchildren Kelly, Chuckie, Bobby, Adam, Morgan, and Paige; and great-grandson, Georgie. Mrs. Eddy was a beloved part of the Canfield community for over forty years, and she will be deeply missed. I extend my condolences to her family and loved ones, rest assured her light will continue to live on through the hearts and lives she has touched.

HONORING RABBI HILLEL COHN

HON. PETE AGUILAR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and work of Rabbi Hillel Cohn, a vital figure in the Inland Empire's Jewish community and of greater San Bernardino. As a representative of Congregation Emanu El of Redlands, Rabbi Cohn worked passionately to honor the precious customs and practices that have been cultivated by the congregation for over one hundred years.

Rabbi Cohn has played a crucial role in our community, making incredible contributions to the interfaith sector of the Inland Empire, bringing our friends and neighbors closer together and fostering a deep respect and admiration for our respective backgrounds and traditions.

Today we thank Rabbi Cohn for his contributions. His story and achievements will live on through those he has inspired and guided. I'm pleased to join members of the Inland Empire community in recognizing his incredible life legacy and wish him the best of luck and much happiness in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, on June 3rd I voted in support of an amendment to H.R. 2578, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2016, which I intended to oppose. Let the record show that it was my intention to vote no on roll call vote 280 and oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Oregon.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. QUENTIN BURNETT

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Quentin Burnett, who is retiring after four decades of public service. After an exemplary career in education, his expertise will be greatly missed. Dr. Burnett earned both his undergraduate and master's degrees from Texas A&M—Commerce, then obtained a doctorate in Educational Leadership from the University of Texas—Austin.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Beginning his career as a math teacher, Dr. Burnett then served as a coach and a principal. From there, he became a Texas Education Agency administrator before serving as Superintendent of three school districts: Johnson City, Greenwood, and Argyle ISDs. In addition, he has taught at the highest level of education, as an instructor of graduate finance classes at the University of Texas—Permian Basin as well as at the University of North Texas. At the state level, Dr. Burnett served as a trainer for the Texas Association of School Boards and an officer and past-president of the Texas Association of School Administrators. In 2011, after serving for nine years as the Associate Superintendent for Finance for Birdville ISD, he joined Lewisville ISD as the Chief Financial Officer.

As Dr. Burnett retires, his leadership within the education field and dedication to students and teachers will continue to positively impact Lewisville ISD and Denton County. Best wishes to Dr. Burnett as he enters a well-deserved retirement. It is a privilege to serve such an outstanding public servant in the U.S. House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for Rollcall No. 319. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CELEBRATING THE ROTARY CLUB OF HILLSBOROUGH

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Rotary Club of Hillsborough for 60 years of tremendous humanitarian service. Rotary has been a major part of community life in Hillsborough.

Rotary International is a global network of community volunteers with reach and influence across many spheres of interest, from service and volunteerism to promoting public health education. Rotary is one of the largest and most influential international service organizations worldwide. Rotary members, from New Jersey to the developing world, conduct projects to address today's humanitarian challenges, including illiteracy, disease, hunger, poverty and lack of clean water while encouraging high standards in all vocations. Rotary members strive to build goodwill and the members of the Rotary Club of Hillsborough are known ambassadors for dedicated public service.

The Rotary Club of Hillsborough has accomplished numerous projects to improve the lives of individuals needing assistance. Through annual fundraising events and community building activities, Rotary outings have assisted the Hillsborough Food Pantry, Homes For Hope,

veterans services, families, those with special needs and projects in the public schools. Rotary has played a role in making Hillsborough what it is today—a wonderful place to build a life, raise a family and retire.

Service above self is vital to Rotary and the members of the Rotary Club of Hillsborough have for 60 years been a pillar of community spirit in Hillsborough.

CONGRATULATING MARY KUPRIANCZYK

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cadet Captain Mary Kuprianczyk on earning the Amelia Earhart Award.

The Amelia Earhart Award is presented to individuals upon completion of the first 11 achievements of the Civil Air Patrol Cadet Program. These achievements show personal growth in five program areas: aerospace education, leadership, special activities, physical fitness, and moral and ethical values. Once each of these achievements has been satisfied, the cadet must pass a comprehensive 100 question examination covering aerospace topics, leadership theory, and staff duties. To illustrate how prestigious this honor is, only 5 percent of all cadets earn this distinction.

At the young age of 16, Mary Kuprianczyk has proven to be a role model we can all look up to. While working hard to fulfill these requirements, she has been an exemplary honor roll student at Rockover Naval Academy in Chicago. All of these accomplishments have been earned while being the first female Cadet Captain at the Palwaukee Squadron.

After completing her education at Rockover, Mary plans to continue serving her country by pursuing an appointment to a military academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Cadet Captain Mary Kuprianczyk and her exceptional accomplishments through the Civil Air Patrol Cadet Program.

HONORING THE 2015 AMHERST CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SMALL BUSINESS AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the honorees of the 2015 Amherst Chamber of Commerce's Small Business Awards Luncheon here today. Each business and business leader has done their part to lead by example, demonstrating leadership in the business community and a shared dedication to improving the economic conditions of Western New York.

Marketing Technologies of Western New York is dedicated to provide the best technology and services to fellow businesses. In

recent years the company has been rapidly growing, in result Marketing Tech has been expanding its services and improving quality of support to businesses across Western New York. I commend this year's Trailblazer Award recipient, Don Papaj, The President and CEO of Marketing Technologies of WNY.

Allen Dembski from Buffalo First Wealth Management, LLC has utilized his expertise to better serve his clients and his strong record of accomplishments have led him to being recognized here today. Mr. Dembski's ability to go beyond his role to ensure the small businesses in the community thrive is exemplary. His contributions promote the continued prosperity of other small businesses in the Western New York community. I am pleased to recognize this year's Small Business Advocate of the Year, Allen Dembski of Buffalo First Wealth Management.

Cure the Blue of the Buffalo Bills Alumni Association sets out to raise awareness of prostate cancer in the Western New York Region and beyond. The foundation has devoted superior dedication to research, awareness and early detection of prostate cancer. It is my honor to recognize Booker Edgerson of the Cure the Blue, Buffalo Bills Alumni Association as this year's Presidents Award recipient.

O'Connell and Company functions as a theatre company, although it exceeds that title by having an expansive impact on the community. O'Connell and Company's mission is to give back to the community which it entertains, by organizing fundraisers to aid women and children's charities. O'Connell and Company invests deeply in its community and strives to make Western New York a better place to work and live. I commend this year's Award of Excellence recipient, Mary Kate O'Connell founder of O'Connell and Company.

Empire Genomics is on the precipitous of genomic research and technology. They strive to utilize the best in genomic technologies to advance research in their field. Empire Genomics is a global leader in the field of personalized medicine and assists clinicians, drug developers and researchers to answer key questions in disease diagnostics, prognosis and disease therapy. I applaud the work of founder Dr. Norma Nowak, and all those at Empire Genomics and congratulate them on their Sponsor's Award presented by First Niagara Bank.

Tony Martin Awards, Inc. provides high quality services for all customers throughout Western New York. Tony Martin Awards has been serving the Western New York community for over 50 years with extraordinary contributions to the regional economy and professional expertise. I am pleased to recognize Tony Martin Awards, Inc. as the recipient of the Small Business of the Year Award.

Santora's Pizza Pub and Grill has been a staple in Western New York, since 1927. They have been dedicated members of the community since their inception and it is my honor to commend this year's Family Owned Business Award recipient, Paul Santora of Santora's Pizza Pub & Grill.

This impressive list of Small Businesses being honored at this year's Luncheon and Showcase deserve the extra recognition and I thank the Amherst Chamber of Commerce for bringing these distinguished business leaders

together. I ask my colleagues to join me and wish the award recipients continued success in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA SORORITY, INC. OMICRON CHI OMEGA CHAPTER

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 30th anniversary of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. Omicron Chi Omega Chapter.

Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority was founded on the campus of Howard University January 15, 1908, as the first Greek-letter organization established by collegiate black women. Inaugurated with the founding principle, "To be supreme in service to all mankind," Chapters today continue to be conscientious members of their communities, sensitive to the needs and struggles of underserved populations.

Prince William County's Omicron Chi Omega Chapter was founded August 26, 1984, and chartered May 19, 1985, by five exceptional women: Roslyn Dunn, Venus Miller, Jannette Smithson, Alice Taylor and Mary Williams. During its 30-year history, the Chapter has received many local community awards and recognition from the Commonwealth of Virginia and Alpha Kappa Alpha for its involvement in the Back to School/Stay in School Program, its support of SAVAS (Sexual Assault Victim's Advocacy Services), and its contributions to ACTS and the American Heart Association.

The 2014–2018 International Program focuses on five areas of engagement: Educational Enrichment, Health Promotion, Family Strengthening, Environmental Ownership, and Global Impact. Working under the banner of Environmental Ownership, Omicron Chi Omega recently restored the Dumfries Elementary School playground. In addition to the global program, Omicron Chi Omega provides \$10,000 annually in scholastic scholarships to graduating high school seniors, sponsors food drives for the Hilda Barg Homeless Prevention Center and SERVE Family Shelter, provides school supplies and coats to Prince William County Public Schools students, sponsors programs on physical and mental awareness for senior citizens and their caregivers, and established a drive to deliver black dolls to the Children's National Medical Center in Washington, D.C., to reflect the diverse cultures of children in need. In 2014, I had the honor of participating in the Chapter's Restoration of Voting Rights forum.

One of the Chapter's longest standing initiatives, the Little Miss AKA Scholarship Pageant, is now in its sixteenth year. The pageant highlights the Chapter's dedication to the young women of our community. The six-month long program allows for young girls between the ages of five and seventeen to enhance their personal development, build self-esteem, increase social skills, and meet women of diverse professions and positive role models.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the 30th anniversary of the founding of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. Omicron Chi Omega Chapter. The Chapter continues the legacy of Alpha Kappa Alpha's founders and continues to be an invaluable force for good in our community.

DON'T MESS WITH TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ART CONTEST WINNER ANNE CHRISTIONO

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Anne Christiono of Sugar Land's Cornerstone Elementary for being one of only thirteen winning students of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

Anne, who is currently in the third grade, is one of the thirteen winners selected from the 8,228 elementary school students from across Texas who entered the contest. Keep Texas Beautiful and the Texas Department of Transportation selected the contest winners who displayed tremendous artistic talent, dedication, and creativity. Anne's submission will appear in the 2016 Don't Mess with Texas Calendar and will be displayed on the Keep Texas Beautiful and Don't Mess with Texas websites. Her work will even be showcased at the Keep Texas Beautiful's 2015 Annual Conference.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Anne for being selected as one of the winners of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

INTRODUCTION OF BREAST CANCER AWARENESS COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, every October Breast Cancer Awareness Month is recognized—acknowledging the toll the disease takes on individuals and families, and the importance of continued research and awareness efforts. Since 1989, thanks to earlier detection, increased understanding, and improved treatment, the death rates for breast cancer have continued to decrease. Yet breast cancer remains the second leading cause of cancer death in women, with one in 36 women dying from the disease. Just this year, it is estimated that 231,840 women will be diagnosed with and 40,290 women will die of cancer of the breast in the United States. In addition, it is estimated that 2,350 men will be diagnosed with invasive breast cancer and 440 men will die from breast cancer in 2015 in the United States.

We need to do more to combat this disease. In 2014 alone it is estimated that \$17.2 billion

will be spent on breast cancer care in the United States. While the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program remain the largest funders of breast cancer research in the United States, the National Cancer Institute funding was reduced by nearly \$66 million from 2011 to 2013. The funding level for the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program has remained consistent since 2012; however this amount represents a 20 percent decrease from 2011 funding levels.

Additional private sector support will help us find cures for breast cancer even faster. That is why my colleague Representative PETE SESSIONS and I are introducing the Breast Cancer Awareness Commemorative Coin Act. Proceeds from the sale of the coins will benefit the Breast Cancer Research Foundation and Susan G. Komen for the Cure. These two organizations have raised more than \$500 million and \$847 million, respectively, for research funding. By leveraging the proceeds of the coins we will be able to increase the much needed support for breast cancer research and awareness.

Clearly, more needs to be done to find better treatments and cures for breast cancer. Our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, cannot afford to wait. I encourage you to support this bipartisan legislation.

TRIBUTE TO IOWA WATER ENVIRONMENT ASSOCIATION

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Iowa Water Environment Association (IAWEA) on their 100th year anniversary. This is an important milestone in their history of service to the state of Iowa through their efforts to advance water quality and water pollution control techniques.

On June 3, 1915, the first formal training for wastewater operators in the United States was held at Iowa State College in Ames, Iowa. This meeting was an effort to address water quality problems with a personal touch, in order to explain the best practices for the successful operation of the state's water treatment facilities. The association was formally founded in 1927 and except for brief interruptions during times our nation was at war, has continued their legacy of improving the quality of our state's water to this day.

Throughout the many years the IAWEA has thrived to meet the needs of the people in the area by providing excellent information on many aspects of water pollution control, water quality, and protection of the environment. I congratulate the Iowa Water Environment Association on this historic anniversary. It is an honor to represent IAWEA members in the United States Congress, and I wish the Iowa Water Environment Association continued success well into the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF IRA GOLDSTEIN

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the retirement of Ira Goldstein, National Director, U.S. Federal Practice at Deloitte LLP. Ira will soon retire after 13 years with Deloitte and a distinguished career serving the public and private sector spanning four decades.

Since joining Deloitte in 2003, Ira created and developed Deloitte's Federal client service capabilities. He has served a broad range of Federal clients, including Cabinet agencies, and has been a member of Deloitte's Federal leadership team—most recently as its Civilian Sector Leader bringing innovative and leading edge solutions to the Federal government.

Ira's roots are embedded in public service where he spent 17 years working for the Federal government, including as U.S. Assistant Comptroller General and Chief Operating Officer at the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO)—now renamed the Government Accountability Office. In this capacity, Ira was responsible for GAO operations, including performance management, strategic planning, financial management, quality assurance, workforce development and information systems. Previously, he served as Acting Associate Commissioner of Social Security and Director of Policy for Family Assistance, with oversight of the \$14 billion Aid to Families with Dependent Children (cash welfare) Program. Ira began his Federal career in the Office of Planning and Evaluation at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (now Health and Human Services) and served as Director of the HEW Secretary's Policy Statement Staff.

Prior to entering government, Ira was Deputy Program Manager for Infiltration Surveillance services at Hazeltine Corporation serving the Naval Air Systems Command during the Vietnam War.

Ira received his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Pennsylvania and his Masters of Business Administration with Distinction from Harvard Business School. He has served on various boards and community organizations and is currently a Fellow at the National Academy of Public Administration, a Director at the National College Access Network, and a Washington Regional Board Member at the Anti-Defamation League.

Ira's passion for improving the way the government works and operates, ultimately to service the citizen, has been a theme throughout his professional career. He is currently working on a book focused on the keys to managing success in the federal government. Ira's federal management experience and private sector insights will help professionals and students better understand how to be effective in the federal environment.

On behalf of the people of the 8th Congressional District in Maryland, I would like to thank Ira for his years of service and wish him, his wife Linda and his family all the best in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE BUFFALO CHAPTER OF THE LINKS FOR ITS OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO THE BUFFALO COMMUNITY FOR 65 YEARS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor the Buffalo Chapter of the Links for its work in the Buffalo community. The Buffalo Chapter of the Links has dedicated their time to aiding the Buffalo area through individual and collective volunteerism, as well as charitable giving and scholarship awards.

The Buffalo Chapter of the Links is one of 281 chapters in the United States that encompasses national and area initiatives while addressing the needs of the local community through 6 main facets: Services to the Youth, the Arts, National Trends and Services, International Trends and Services, Health and Human Services, and Women's Issues. Several members of the Buffalo Chapter have held area and national offices, including Link Thelma Hardiman, who served as National Vice President and Eastern Area Director, and Link Cecilia Henderson, who served as Eastern Area Vice Director, Eastern Area Director, and National Secretary. Being the 14th chapter chartered in the East and the 20th chapter chartered nationally, the Buffalo Chapter has a long history of service to the community, now celebrating 65 years.

Throughout the Chapter's 65 years, they have collected over \$600,000 in money for scholarships and have performed 150,200 hours, collectively, of service to the community. The Buffalo Chapter of the Links has worked on various projects in the Western New York region. They have supported local school districts through projects including but not limited to after school book clubs. As well, the Buffalo Chapter has also volunteered with the Buffalo Philharmonic Fund Drive for membership, with an emphasis on enrolling people of color; built 2 schools in South Africa, and have assisted women transitioning from service to their county to reentering the community.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize the Buffalo Chapter of the Links. I ask that my colleagues join me congratulating the Buffalo Chapter of the Links on an accomplished history of charitable giving, and to commend them for the exemplary work they have done to enrich the communities of Western New York for the last 65 years.

RECOGNIZING THE KOREA TIMES 10,000TH ISSUE AND 46TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate the Korea Times as

the newspaper celebrates its 10,000th edition and its 46th anniversary of providing news to the Korean-American community. It is the Korean-American community's largest and oldest newspaper.

In my congressional district, across Northern Virginia and the Washington region, and across the nation, the Korea Times fills an invaluable role in providing the community with a daily mix of news and features highlighting local, regional, national, and international issues of interest to Korean-Americans.

Here in the United States, the Korea Times provides its readers with insightful coverage of the latest news and events from the Korean Peninsula. When 304 people, many of them secondary school students, perished in the tragic sinking of the ferry MV Sewol in April of 2014, the Korea Times served as a lifeline to those Korean-Americans seeking information about family and friends involved in the disaster.

During my more than 20 years of elected office as a district supervisor and Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and as the current Congressman for the 11th District of Virginia, I've had considerable interaction with the professional staff of the Korea Times, based in my district and in Washington, D.C.

On issues I have worked on as co-chair of the Congressional Korea Caucus and as a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee ranging from Korean family reunification and North Korea sanctions to the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, Korea Times' journalists have diligently reported on the importance of these matters to their readers.

In print, on the Internet, and via social media, the Korea Times is an important asset to the Korean-American community in my Northern Virginia district and across the nation. I join my Korean-American constituents and community leaders in congratulating the Korea Times on its 46 years of service and wish the newspaper many more years of success.

DON'T MESS WITH TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ART CONTEST WINNER JESSICA CHAI

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jessica Chai of Katy's Roosevelt Alexander Elementary School for being one of only thirteen winning students of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

Jessica, currently in the fourth grade, is one of the thirteen winners selected from the 8,228 elementary school students from across Texas who entered the contest. Keep Texas Beautiful and the Texas Department of Transportation selected the contest winners who displayed tremendous artistic talent, dedication, and creativity. Jessica's submission will appear in the 2016 Don't Mess with Texas Calendar and will be displayed on the Keep

Texas Beautiful and Don't Mess with Texas websites. Her work will even be showcased at the Keep Texas Beautiful's 2015 Annual Conference.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Jessica for being selected as one of the winners of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

IN RECOGNITION OF DÍA DE
PORTUGAL

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues Mr. VALADAO of California, Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island, Mr. NUNES of California, Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island, Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, Mr. KEATING of Massachusetts, and Mr. HONDA of California to recognize Día de Portugal and to champion the strong bond between the United States and Portugal. Celebrated on June 10 each year, Día de Portugal recognizes Portugal's beautiful heritage and culture.

Día de Portugal honors the death of the revered Portuguese poet Luís Vaz de Camões in 1580. Camões is famously known for *Os Lusíadas*, one of Portugal's most treasured literary works. The poem pays tribute to Portugal's golden age of exploration and celebrates the many monumental discoveries made by Portuguese explorers in the 15th century.

Vibrant Portuguese American communities can be seen across our nation from Massachusetts, New Jersey and Rhode Island, to California and Hawaii. These communities are filled with over 1.3 million Americans of Portuguese descent who have been making positive contributions to our society for generations. We are a nation of immigrants, and celebrations like Día de Portugal remind us all that it is important to remain connected to our own individual heritage.

The United States and Portugal maintain a robust relationship, and have been connected ever since the Portuguese were among the first to recognize the U.S. as an independent nation at the conclusion of the Revolutionary War. President George Washington formalized diplomatic relations on February 21, 1791, and our oldest continuously-operated U.S. Consulate in the world is located in Ponta Delgada on the island of São Miguel in the Azores.

Mr. Speaker, on this Día de Portugal, we are reminded that our special relationship with Portugal must be continuously strengthened. As U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry has said, "The strong partnership between our two countries is more vital than ever." This day celebrates the accomplishments of Portuguese and Portuguese Americans, and we congratulate these communities on their global impact and achievement.

IN HONOR OF ALAN SLOBODIEN,
UPON HIS RETIREMENT FROM
VERNON YOUTH SERVICES

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize an exceptional public servant from my hometown of Vernon, Connecticut, Mr. Alan Slobodien, and mark his retirement from Vernon Youth Services.

Over the past 20 years, Alan has ably served as the director of Vernon Youth Services, an organization devoted to ensuring that "all Vernon children birth to age 18 are safe, healthy, and productive." It is with this goal in mind that Alan has developed forward-thinking programming and policies to engage young people in our town, ensure that they have safe places to learn and play, and have opportunities for success in the future. His commitment to Vernon's youth is unparalleled, and his optimism about Vernon's future has resulted in real, recognizable benefits for our community. With Al at the helm, Vernon Youth Services through summer nutrition programs, to mentoring, to homework support, has continued to make Vernon an ideal place to raise children.

On a personal note, I first met Al over 30 years ago when I was the Assistant Public Defender at the Rockville Superior Court and Al was an invaluable contact to get help for young clients. He was incredibly resourceful, sizing up the needs of young people in trouble with the law and designing treatment programs that helped both the community and the person. He had a wonderful combination of compassion and smarts that I really admired. Despite the sometimes hopeless circumstances he tried to fix, he never lost his optimism about people and their potential to change for the better. What an inspiration to all of us.

Please join me in congratulating Alan on his decades of remarkable service to his community, and wishing him and his family a rewarding, and well-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL MESSINA

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary life and achievements of my friend, Michael Messina, former Mayor and City Councilmember of Alhambra, who passed away on April 10, 2015.

Michael was devoted to his city and his community. A lifelong resident of Alhambra who attended Ramona Elementary School and Alhambra High School, he graduated from California State University Los Angeles, and remained a resident of Alhambra until his passing.

In 1979, Michael began his public service career, serving on the Alhambra City Council from 1979 to 1986, and as Mayor in 1982 and

1986. During this time, Michael dedicated himself to improving the city and community he loved.

Michael was driven to help businesses to flourish in Alhambra and thanks to his efforts, downtown Alhambra is now a thriving commercial center with restaurants and businesses, giving the intersection of Main and Garfield streets a "Main Street USA" feel. Michael worked to expand development, tackling things as instrumental as repaving streets and sidewalks to paving the way for Price Club (now Costco) to come to Alhambra, which has become the largest retail tax producer in the city. He also personally led a city delegation to meet with the founder and CEO of Mervyns Department stores, as he was convinced that such an addition would bring even more business to the city center, and he was right. Mervyns planted its roots in Alhambra, and stores followed, including the Alhambra Place shopping center, which is still the center of retail in the city today, and every year hosts the "Taste of Alhambra" Festival. This is all thanks to Michael's vision for his city.

As the population of Los Angeles County grew in the past 20 years, Michael fought to increase his community's access to transportation and to bring down congestion in the area. He was a champion of seniors, expanding programs like Senior Ride and Senior Housing, and he believed deeply in the public spaces of Alhambra, increasing the capacity of the Parks and Recreation department, so everyone in the city could enjoy the beautiful outdoor spaces in the San Gabriel Valley. For him, civil service was about the people and the community he loved.

Even when he left the Alhambra City Council, Michael remained as a key figure in the community, eventually sitting on the Oversight Board for the city. He was a devoted parishioner of All Souls Church, and volunteered with Meals on Wheels, Knights of Columbus, the Alhambra Exchange Club, the Foundation for the Blind, and was president of the local St. Vincent de Paul Society. No matter what he did, Michael was determined to give back. Michael's dedication to Alhambra was an inspiration, and when I was first elected Mayor of the neighboring city of Monterey Park in 1988, I looked to Michael as an example of a true public servant.

There is no doubt that Alhambra has lost one of its most devoted citizens and most stalwart champions. We are thankful for his many years of service, and will continue to honor his legacy of leadership and commitment to our community.

RECOGNIZING BILL MURPHY FOR
HIS OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT
TO THE SOUTH BUFFALO COM-
MUNITY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor Mr. Bill Murphy for his work in the South Buffalo community. Mr. Murphy has dedicated his career to

helping area labor unions and injured workers in their legal battles against insurance companies and those that caused them harm.

Mr. Murphy is a Bishop Timon high school class of 1989 graduate as well as a graduate of Medaille College where he earned his Bachelor's Degree. He would then go on to enroll in the University at Buffalo Law School where he developed the skills which made him a partner at the law firm Maxwell Murphy. Mr. Murphy prides himself on his Buffalo roots and on his ability to help those who live in his native town.

The contributions that Mr. Murphy has made to the South Buffalo community are many and varied. He has served as a Chairman of the Timon Lawn Fete and Timon Sports Night. Both he and his law firm have donated to various community events throughout Western New York, and they have supported such events as the "Run Jimmy Run" Charity Race, the annual Cystic Fibrosis Foundation Golf Outing, and the Mount Mercy Academy 5K. Additionally Mr. Murphy's law firm helped the students of Saints Peter and Paul Grade School to purchase new hockey uniforms to replace their worn jerseys.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize Mr. Bill Murphy. I ask that my colleagues join me congratulating Mr. Murphy on an accomplished career, and to commend him for the exemplary work he has done to enrich the communities of Western New York.

RECOGNIZING DR. LUKE TORIAN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 20TH PASTORAL ANNIVERSARY AT FIRST MOUNT ZION BAPTIST CHURCH OF DUMFRIES

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my dear friend, the Reverend Dr. Luke E. Torian, on the occasion of his 20th Pastoral Anniversary at First Mount Zion Baptist Church of Dumfries, Virginia.

First Mount Zion Baptist Church has a long, prosperous history starting with its founding in 1867, which now continues under the tutelage of Dr. Torian, who became its first and only full time pastor in 1995. Since his installation, Dr. Torian has served an instrumental role in the growth of the church. More than 4,000 now call First Mount Zion Baptist Church their religious and spiritual home and approximately 70 different ministries now serve the needs of the congregation and community.

Not only has Dr. Torian served his congregation, but he also has dedicated his time to serve the community at large. He is currently a member of the Prince William County Ministerial Association. He has served on the Cardinal Bank Advisory Board; the Board of Directors of the Baptist General Convention, and is a member of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. In June 2004, former Governor Mark Warner appointed Dr. Torian to the Virginia Board of Counseling. He also served on the ACTS Board of Directors for three years. In addition,

in 2009 he was elected to the Virginia House of Delegates, representing the 52nd District.

Dr. Torian's dedication to his faith and his congregation, combined with his exceptional leadership abilities have been recognized by others. In 2002, Howard University presented him with the James Floyd Jenkins Pillar of Faith Award in recognition of his outstanding contributions that he has made to his church and the community. In the fall of 2003 and 2004, Dr. John Maxwell, renowned expert in leadership development, selected Dr. Torian as one of 50 leaders from across the country to participate in a special leadership institute in Atlanta.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my Colleagues join me in recognizing Dr. Luke E. Torian and the First Mount Zion Baptist Church congregation as they celebrate this significant milestone in their history and in wishing them continued success and prosperity.

DON'T MESS WITH TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ART CONTEST WINNER ANNABELLE DU

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Annabelle Du of Katy's James E. Williams Elementary School for being one of only thirteen winning students of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

Annabelle, who is currently in the fourth grade, is one of the thirteen winners selected from the 8,228 elementary school students from across Texas who entered the contest. Keep Texas Beautiful and the Texas Department of Transportation selected the contest winners who displayed tremendous artistic talent, dedication, and creativity. Annabelle's submission will appear in the 2016 Don't Mess with Texas Calendar and will be displayed on the Keep Texas Beautiful and Don't Mess with Texas websites. Her work will even be showcased at the Keep Texas Beautiful's 2015 Annual Conference.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Annabelle for being selected as one of the winners of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 2015 I was absent for recorded votes #309–#318 due to a flight cancellation from Knoxville. I would like to reflect how I would have voted had I been present:

On Roll Call #309, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #310, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #311, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #312, I would have voted Yes.

On Roll Call #313, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #314, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #315, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #316, I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #317, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #318, I would have voted Yes.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,778,985,959.44. We've added \$7,525,901,937,046.36 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE BIRTHDAY OF HONOR DOLD

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish my daughter, Honor Dold, a happy birthday.

Honor turned eight years old yesterday. She was born in Evanston, Illinois, and since that day in 2007, has kept me, her mother, Danielle, her sister Harper, and brother Bobby always smiling.

Honor's favorite subject is math and always puts her best effort forward into everything she does. Honor excels not only in soccer and lacrosse, but also in dance. She brightens every room she walks into with a truly contagious smile. Honor is the perfect amount of smart, silly, and funny that makes everyone around her happy.

Honor enjoys spending time with her proud grandparents, Nana and Chief, Papa and Granma, her aunts and uncles, and all of her cousins.

I look forward to watching Honor grow and mature into a fine independent young woman, and a shining light to our family and community. Happy Birthday, Honor.

RECOGNITION OF MARLENE ISBELL DEVINE

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Marlene Isbell Devine who retired from Allianz of America on April 10, 2015 after working for over 38 years at the firm and its antecedent companies, most notably Allianz Life, which is headquartered in my district in Golden Valley.

Marlene began her career in the typing and steno pool of North American Life Insurance and Casualty Company on August 16, 1976 and moved up in fast order to become the Executive Assistant to CEO Howard Barnhill. Her tenure with the company coincided with its purchase by the German Insurance giant Allianz AG in 1979. Marlene served four other company CEOs and at the time of her retirement she was the Personal Assistant to Allianz of America Chairman and Member of the Allianz SE Board of Management, Gary Bhojwani.

Office technology, fashion styles and even eating habits have changed dramatically since Marlene started in the mid-1970s, sometimes for the better and sometimes not. However, one thing that is constant is that every CEO and organization needs a person like Marlene Devine who can be counted on to keep things organized, communicate information, and serve as a friend and counsel to everyone around them. As we all know, today's work life can at times be all-consuming, and Marlene's greatest strength was her ability to make everyone feel special and appreciated. In doing so, she was mentor to hundreds of people within the company, many of whom rose to the highest executive positions within Allianz. Marlene's personal warmth, integrity, good judgment, dedication, and humor made her very valued and beloved.

Marlene is married to Dan Devine, and they reside in Savage, Minnesota. They have three grown children, Stephanie, Kyle, and Whitney; and two grandsons, Joshua Stewart and Hunter Johnson, who are all a source of pride and happiness. Marlene is an avid gardener, enjoys her cats and reading, and loves a good day on the river fishing with Dan. She and her twin sister Marilyn Wille are known for their long "Thelma and Louise" automobile excursions that have taken them all across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a period of time of fast movement where people change jobs and companies regularly during the course of their careers. However, as we all know from our own offices, institutional knowledge is essential, and those dedicated people who have it are the key to our success. Marlene Devine deserves our praise for an exemplary life that touched so many people. I offer my best wishes to her and Dan on the next chapter of their lives, and for many years of good health and happiness.

RECOGNIZING KAREN ERICKSON FOR HER OUTSTANDING COMMIT- MENT TO THE BUFFALO COMMU- NITY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor Mrs. Karen Erickson for her work in the South Buffalo community. Mrs. Erickson has dedicated her career to acting as a public servant as well as giving back to her native community.

Mrs. Erickson is a South Buffalo native who attended Mt. Mercy Academy in 1963 and re-

ceived her Associate Degree from Erie Community College and her Bachelor's Degree from Houghton College. It was during the Jack Donohue 5K Race that Mrs. Erickson began the tradition of serving hot dogs along with her sorority sisters, a tradition which has continued after the retirement of "Jack's 5K" into the Mount Mercy Alumnae Race.

Besides her contributions to Mount Mercy Academy Mrs. Erickson has also been the Athletic Director for Most Precious Blood School and the organizer of the George Leather, MPB Invitational Basketball Tournament for 25 years. She has also served on the Diocesan School Board, the School Board at St. Francis High School, Community Concern, and various organizations in the Town of Evans. She currently serves on the Board of the Business and Finance Academy at Lake Shore Central High School, Vice President of the Evans Democratic Club and serves on the Evans Economic Development Committee. Additionally she has, for the past five years, organized the Connors' 5K Wiener Run to benefit the Boys and Girls Club of Lake Shore. Finally Mrs. Erickson was the Deputy Supervisor in the Town of Evans for 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize Mrs. Karen Erickson. I ask that my colleagues join me congratulating Mrs. Erickson on an accomplished career, and to commend her for the exemplary work she has done to enrich the communities of Western New York.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF SHIRLEY JEANNE MOSCOV STARK

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Shirley Jeanne Moscov Stark. Mrs. Stark passed away May 4, 2015, and, during her nearly 85 years, she impacted the lives of everyone she touched.

Trailblazer is a word we hear often about those who pave the way for future generations. Rarely has that term been more fittingly used than now as we pay tribute to Shirley. Shirley Jeanne Moscov was born October 18, 1930, and raised in Canonsburg, PA, a small town outside of Pittsburgh. She was the daughter of Polish Jewish immigrants who first arrived in New York and eventually settled in Western Pennsylvania. Her parents ran one of the few grocery stores in town and lived above the store. As was true with so many immigrants of that era, they never took a vacation or attended family events together—the store had to be open to serve the community. This was the Great Depression; her parents would extend credit to their neighbors who couldn't afford to pay for needed food and supplies, and Shirley learned from a young age the value of charity and serving the needs of others.

Shirley was an exceptionally bright and curious child. She read every book in the local library and excelled at school. But in a small coal town, educational opportunities were scarce. Few boys went to college and even

fewer girls. In her early teens, one of her teachers recognized her abilities and potential and encouraged Shirley to apply to a very select program for gifted high school students offered by the University of Chicago. Shirley took the entrance exam and earned not only a perfect score, but admittance to the University. At the age of 15, Shirley boarded a train to Chicago to begin her studies. Two years later, at 17, she had earned a Bachelor's Degree. Shirley returned to Pennsylvania where she enrolled at the University of Pittsburgh earning a Masters Degree in Mathematics. She was recruited by Westinghouse and heralded by the press as "The World's Youngest Nuclear Physicist at 19." While working at Westinghouse, she continued her studies and received yet another Masters Degree in psychology. A few years later, she married Sidney Stark, Jr. and decided to postpone her professional career in favor of raising a family.

Parallel to Shirley's love of science was her passion in the fields of travel, music, art, and architecture. When her children, Seth and Sid, entered elementary school, she decided to pursue her passions and enrolled in graduate studies at the University of Pittsburgh Fine Arts Department. She spent summers and vacations in Europe expanding her knowledge and expertise. During her life she traveled to five continents and dozens of countries. Shirley was an inspiring teacher; she chaired the Art Department at Chatham College for seven years and taught various courses in Art and Architectural History at Carnegie Mellon University well into her later years. During this time, she also opened a small business, Travel Bound Books, and served as a consultant to specialized tours throughout Europe that focused on mankind's greatest artistic and architectural creations.

With all of these achievements, Shirley is best remembered as charming and vivacious. Her home was always full of laughter, music, loved ones, and of course, great food. New Year's Eve parties, Seders, crab and lobster feasts, and holiday dinners at the Stark house were legendary. Shirley was a loving and devoted daughter, wife, mother, grandmother, sister, aunt, and friend, and she made every person she met feel special and unique. Her sharp wit and sparkling spirit were infectious, and all who met her felt they were lucky and blessed to have known her.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the life of Shirley Jeanne Moscov Stark and in extending my deepest condolences to her family and friends. She will be greatly missed.

KILLUM PEST CONTROL, INC.

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate all members of the Killum Pest Control, Inc. team who were honored with the Winner of Distinction Award at the Better Business Bureau Awards for Excellence.

Killum Pest Control, Inc. is one of 314 companies recognized by the Better Business Bureau Awards of Excellence for their commitment and integrity. They have now been recognized twice for their achievements. We are extremely proud of the dedication of Killum Pest Control's employees and the leadership it provides in the small business community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Killum Pest Control, Inc. for earning this esteemed award.

HONORING RICHARD C. EHLKE

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, Jr.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent, Richard C. Ehlke, Senior Advisor to the Director and Senior Specialist, of the Congressional Research Service (CRS) of the Library of Congress. Mr. Ehlke retired on May 29, 2015 after a distinguished career of over four decades with CRS.

During his tenure, Mr. Ehlke served in many roles at CRS. He began his career as a legislative attorney with the American Law Division of CRS, and Members of Congress and staff actively sought his thoughtful, objective analyses of some of the most complex and nuanced legal issues facing the Congress. His highly regarded and much relied upon briefs often focused on potential points of friction between Congress and the Executive Branch. At the behest of his Congressional clients, he analyzed the legal intricacies of legislative vetoes, Congressional access to agency and presidential information, the interplay of the President's constitutional powers under the Appointments Clause and of Congress' legislative and advice and consent prerogatives, and the transparency in government provided for by the Freedom of Information Act. He was routinely called upon by Congressional offices to clarify the legal complexities arising out of the federal government's relationship with Native Americans.

Following his many years of providing direct legal counsel to Congress as a legislative attorney, Mr. Ehlke was promoted to serve as the head of CRS' American Law Division. In this role, he guided the work of a generation of Division attorneys and paralegal assistants, instilling in them the rigorous, careful legal research and analytical skills that had always been the hallmark of his own work. He was instrumental in establishing the Division's Law Recruit Program in 1988, which has attracted new hires, contributing to a vibrant and diverse workforce of legislative attorneys.

Following his tenure as head of the American Law Division, a succession of CRS Directors called upon Mr. Ehlke for his sage advice and leadership skills in the service of Congress in a number of critical roles. His accomplishments during this part of his career were significant. Mr. Ehlke played a leading role in the development of a new performance assessment system for CRS. He also advised the Director on the establishment of the position of Section Research Manager (SRM)

(first-line supervisors) in the Service and assisted with the recruitment, hiring, orientation, and performance expectations of the initial cohort of these SRMs. Additionally he oversaw a complete redesign of the CRS website and served as a member of the website governance board to streamline services for our Congressional offices. Given his long-term interest in ensuring CRS' objective of providing the best service to Congress, Mr. Ehlke assisted with the Congressionally mandated CRS customer satisfaction survey. And as the Senior Advisor to the Director and as a Senior Specialist, he advised on significant legal issues relating to ethics, media policy, CRS relations with the Library of Congress, speech or debate privilege, CRS reorganizations, and personnel actions.

Whatever his role, the result has always been the same—a highly competent, skillful performance for the benefit of Congress, its Members, and staff. CRS has been fortunate to have had such a person of high intellect dedicated to the institution's mission of providing objective, authoritative service to Congress in an unfailing patient and courteous manner for over forty years. We wish him the very best in his retirement, and thank him for his exceptional record of service to CRS and to the Congress of the United States.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 9, 2015, I missed several roll call votes due to undergoing a medical procedure in Oregon. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

Roll Call vote 309, On Passage of H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call vote 310, On Agreeing to the Blackburn Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call vote 311, On Agreeing to the Gosar #1 Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 312, On Agreeing to Gosar #2 Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 313, On Agreeing to Posey #1 Amendment, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 314, On Agreeing to Sessions #1 Amendment, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 315, On Agreeing to Sessions #2 Amendment, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 317, On Agreeing to Posey #2 Amendment, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 318, On Agreeing to Posey #3 Amendment, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 319, On Agreeing to Yoho Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Yes.

Roll Call 320, On Agreeing to Brooks Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Yes.

Roll Call 321, On Agreeing to Hultgren Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 322, On Agreeing to Meehan Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 323, On Agreeing to Garrett Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 324, On Agreeing to Ellison Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Aye.

Roll Call 325, On Agreeing to Emmer Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call Vote 326, On Agreeing to Peters Amendment, I would have voted Aye.

Roll Call Vote 327, On Agreeing to Issa Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 328, On Motion to Recommit with Instructions to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Aye.

Roll Call 329, On Passage of H.R. 2577 would have voted Nay.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF BEAU BIDEN

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in remembrance of a friend, a public servant, and a good man—Beau Biden. I joined the Biden family last weekend to mourn his loss, which is felt by all who knew him, and celebrate his life, which has left an indelible impact.

Beau was a gifted lawyer who was twice elected attorney general in the state of Delaware and served his country in the National Guard in Iraq. But more than that, he was a devoted son, a loving husband, and a caring father.

JOE and his boys lived through great personal tragedy with the loss of his wife, Neilia, and daughter, Naomi. They have an unbreakable bond. And they, along with the rest of the family, have found the greatest joy in spending time together. No one who has come in contact with the Biden family can miss the deep love and devotion they have for one another.

I had the privilege of getting to know Beau better during the Obama-Biden reelection campaign. We were together on several occasions, including in the immediate aftermath of the Biden-Ryan debate. A very proud son was beaming about his dad's stellar performance. In that moment, you could see Beau's competitive spirit fuse with his devotion to his dad.

I extend my deepest sympathies to my friends JOE and Jill, to Beau's wife, Hallie, and their two children, his siblings, Hunter and Ashley, and the entire Biden family. I hope that they can take comfort in the love they share and the knowledge that they do not walk alone in their grief. We have lost Beau far too soon, but his memory lives on until we meet again.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. PENNY REDDELL

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Penny Reddell upon her retirement

after 38 years of exemplary public service. She earned her first of many degrees at Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches. From there, she went onto the University of Texas at Tyler to obtain her master's degree before finally earning her doctorate from Baylor University.

Dr. Reddell began her education career as a teacher and has capably served in multiple capacities including diagnostician, assistant principal, principal, gifted and talented program consultant, and adjunct college professor. She is retiring from Lewisville ISD as the Associate Superintendent for Learning and Teaching, a position she has held for the last six years. Her areas of responsibilities have included: Strategic Design implementation, Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education, Early Childhood, Literacy Intervention, Program Evaluation, District Grant Writing, Gifted and Talented, Advanced Academics, Assessment and Accountability and Federal Programs, ESL, Dual Language, Bilingual, and World Languages. Dr. Reddell's leadership has had a positive and profound impact on all the programs that she has overseen.

As Dr. Reddell retires, her commitment and hard work on behalf of the students and faculty of Lewisville ISD will be greatly missed. After almost four decades as an educator and administrator, Dr. Reddell retires as a professional beloved by her colleagues and leaves an indelible mark to be emulated. It is a privilege to honor such an esteemed constituent in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING ANDREW McLEAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew McLean. Andrew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 362, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Andrew has earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and became a Brotherhood Member in the Order of the Arrow. Andrew has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Andrew completed a garden around a statue of Mary at Little Sisters of the Poor, an elder care facility in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Andrew McLean for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING CHABAD JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER OF PLACER COUNTY

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chabad Jewish Community Center of Placer County on the momentous occasion of completing its Community Torah.

Led by Rabbi Yossi Korik, Chabad Jewish Community Center opened in 2005 to educate and support the local Jewish community and inspire people from all walks of life.

As part of this effort, the Chabad of Placer County commissioned a professional scribe in Israel to write a Torah scroll in the traditional method, which dates back thousands of years.

The Torah contains the Five Books of Moses and is the most precious article in Jewish life. Its guidance provides a strong foundation for morals in today's global society.

In October of 2014, members of the Jewish community gathered with rabbis and public leaders in Placer County to witness the first letters of the Torah being inscribed. This weekend, many months after the project's inception, the same community will once again gather—this time to celebrate the scroll's completion.

This tremendous accomplishment will be celebrated on Sunday, June 14, 2015, with a festive parade. The Torah will travel down Douglas Boulevard under a Chuppah, led by a local marching band.

Mr. Speaker, George Washington stated in his Farewell Address: "of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports." We are fortunate to have the Chabad Jewish Community Center as a pillar of religious and moral teachings in the Fourth Congressional District of California, and I am honored to share in this occasion.

I thank members of Chabad for their continued positive impact on the Placer County community, and I am proud to stand with them in celebration.

RECOGNIZING LISA PURCELL FOR HER OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO THE BUFFALO COMMUNITY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor Mrs. Lisa Purcell for her work in the Buffalo community. Mrs. Purcell has dedicated her time to aiding various charity organizations in the Buffalo area.

As the founder of the Ryan Purcell Foundation, Mrs. Purcell has organized the annual Purcell Memorial 5K race. The Foundation is dedicated to her son Ryan Purcell who was killed in a hit and run accident in October of 2011. The Foundation is committed to hon-

oring the life and memory of Ryan Purcell and raises funds to give to scholarships to high school students in the Buffalo area.

Mrs. Purcell has also been a large supporter of the Mount Mercy Academy 5K race as well as their scholarship program. Mount Mercy Academy has been educating the young women of Western New York for over 110 years. Their Alumnae have grown to over 10,000 members, 70% of whom still live and work in Western New York. Mrs. Purcell is married to Dr. Peter Purcell D.D.S. and has five children as well as three grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize Mrs. Lisa Purcell. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Mrs. Purcell on an accomplished history of giving to charitable organizations, and to commend her for the exemplary work she has done to enrich the communities of Western New York.

CONNECTING HOUSTON AND TAIPEI

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a new connection between Taipei, Taiwan and Houston, Texas. Beginning on June 19th, 2015 a new direct flight will connect these cities and allow Houstonians to travel to Taiwan and Asia more easily. This new opportunity will also promote business and tourism, which means economic benefits for both Texas and Taiwan.

The United States and Taiwan already enjoy a robust economic partnership. Taiwan is our 10th largest trading partner. Our bilateral trade amounts to more than \$67 billion in 2014. I am confident this important relationship will continue to thrive and will continue to support our close friend and ally.

REUNIFICATION OF CYPRUS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Cyprus has made great strides in the past decade. It turns out that, just like the United States, Cyprus has a lot of natural gas. Let's hope they don't have as much bureaucracy to get through to export their gas as we do. But the country is held back because it is still divided by a foreign power. Turkey still has 30,000 troops in Cyprus. Erdogan thinks he is still in control. The beauty of democratic elections is that you can see what the people really want.

And faced with the choice between a candidate that wanted to keep Cyprus divided and one that wanted to reunify Cyprus, Turkish Cypriots chose reunification.

It is encouraging to hear that negotiations between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots are getting back on track. You know, I was a judge in my former life. I dealt a lot with one

word: justice. And as a judge I would never have allowed the kind of bullying that is seen by Turkey. The Turkish Cypriots should be able to negotiate on their own behalf. If they want peace, they should be able to get it. They don't need another foreign country like Turkey telling them what they can and cannot agree to. They do not want to be dependent on Turkey. They want to enjoy the economic freedom of the EU.

Reunification will require a lot of work, but ultimately it will only happen if the two sides talk to each other. This time next year I hope we can come together to celebrate the reunification of Cyprus and the end of over 40 years of Turkish occupation.

And that's just the way it is.

H.R. 1493, THE PROTECT AND PRESERVE INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY ACT

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit the thoughts of my friend, Matthew Polk, regarding the consideration of H.R. 1493, the Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act. Matthew Polk is deeply involved in the preservation of cultural heritage and I believe his comments are both insightful and valuable to the ongoing effort to preserve the cultural heritage of civilizations around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I first wish to thank Congressman Issa for his interest in this matter and the opportunity to provide a statement for the Congressional Record.

With regard to H.R. 1493, I applaud this bipartisan effort to protect Syrian cultural property as well as to coordinate our Government's enforcement efforts to protect international cultural property. I also applaud Mr. Chabot's and Mr. Engel's understanding that this bill is not meant to target the lawful trade in Syrian or other cultural goods and that it only authorizes import restrictions on artifacts illegally removed from Syria after the start of its civil war. Nonetheless, it must be emphasized that the burden remains on the Government to prove that the artifact in question is illicit. While protecting Syrian cultural artifacts from looting is important, it is also important that we stay true to our own values. Our tradition of due process requires that the Government meet its burden of proof before private property may be seized or forfeited. This legislation does not change the burden placed on the Government under the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act. Here, as under the CPIA, the Government must establish: (1) the item is of a type that appears on the designated list of Syrian artifacts that will be created; (2) the item was "first discovered" in Syria and is subject to Syrian export control; and (3) the item was illegally removed from Syria after the effective date of the restrictions, which in this case is March 15, 2011. The fact that an object's "country of origin" or manufacture may be "Syria" cannot constitute the sole basis for its seizure and forfeiture under either this legislation or the CPIA.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW S. POLK, JR.,
Board Member—The
Committee for Cul-

tural Property,
Former Trustee—The
Baltimore Museum
of Art, Member—The
Museum Trustees
Association, Mem-
ber—The Walters
Art Museum Collec-
tions Committee,
President—Historic
Textile Research
Foundation.

RECOGNIZING SOUTH KOREAN PRESIDENT PARK GEUN-HYE AND U.S.-KOREAN ALLIANCE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am disheartened to hear that South Korean President Park Geun-Hye's visit to Washington, D.C. was postponed due to the growing threat of the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus (MERS) outbreak in the Republic of Korea. I know this is a very difficult time for the South Korean people and would like to send my deepest sympathy to the victims of this deadly virus. I express my utmost confidence in President Park's ability to lead the people of her beautiful country out of this crisis.

As always, the success and future of the Peninsula remain a priority for me. As a Korean War veteran, I have a very personal tie to Korea and its people. Since returning home from my service in the Korean War over six decades ago, I have proudly witnessed South Korea's rise as a war-torn nation to becoming an international giant, which is a testament to the resilience and industriousness of the Korean people. All across America, Koreans have inspired us with their entrepreneurialism and perseverance toward strengthening the fabric of our nation.

I commend President Park and Ambassador Ahn Ho-Young for further strengthening U.S.-Korean ties. As you know, the relationship between our country and the Republic of Korea is deeply rooted in our unbreakable bloodshed alliance. As we celebrate the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Korea from Imperial Japan, I will continue working to help promote peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula—in hopes that the two Koreas will be reunified in my lifetime.

RETIREMENT OF DR. JAMES HADLEY BILLINGTON

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary leadership of Dr. James Hadley Billington, the 13th Librarian of Congress and renowned scholar of Russia. Following 28 years of tireless service, Dr. Billington an-

nounced that he will be retiring from his post as the Librarian of Congress. During his tenure, Dr. Billington made significant contributions by providing visionary leadership as he ushered the Library of Congress into the digital age.

Since being unanimously confirmed by the Senate in 1987, Dr. Billington has overseen the expansion of the Library's collection size. It has roughly doubled, from 85.5 million items in 1987 to more than 160 million items today. Dr. Billington dedicated much of his efforts to ensuring that our nations historic items and collections be made readily available to the American public. In his early years, at the dawn of the internet age, he worked to facilitate an innovative program for the Library of Congress known as the National Digital Library (NDL) Program, which ensured that American historical and cultural information was available online. As a result of his efforts, projects such as the NDL, Congress.gov, and numerous pieces of information from the U.S. Copyright Office have become frequently used in K-12 education systems across America.

In addition to efforts ensuring the spread of the richly diverse history of the United States, Dr. Billington is also responsible for the development of the World Digital Library. A project similar to the NDL, the World Digital Library compiles cultural materials from the 193 countries listed in the UNESCO into one database for public access. I can say without question that throughout his decades of service, Dr. Billington has been firmly dedicated to the spread of information.

Dr. Billington has been an outstanding leader and educator to both our nation and the world. I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors. I have no doubt that his contributions to our global society will have a significant impact on scholastic achievement for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the service and sacrifice of Dr. James Hadley Billington.

COBDEN HIGH SCHOOL CAPTURES STATE BASEBALL TITLE

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to Cobden High School for capturing the Illinois Class 1A state baseball title. The Appleknockers defeated Okawville Rockets 9 to 3 in Peoria.

Cobden made its third state tournament appearance and first since 1987, when it lost 12-1 in five innings to Columbia in the state title game.

CHRISTIAN PASTOR DUONG KIM KHAI JAILED IN VIETNAM

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since the early 1990's, Pastor Duong Kim Khai has

been detained or arrested thirteen times. The first time he was arrested he was just 14 years old. Usually, he is arrested for simply organizing Christian prayer sessions. Most recently, he was arrested in August 2010 for his efforts to advocate for religious freedom and social justice. The trumped up charge? Attempting to overthrow the government.

For this, he was sentenced to 2–8 years in prison and 3–5 years probation and house arrest.

Unfortunately, his wife, who was denied permission to visit him in prison, died before she could see him again. In 2011, the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention ruled that the Vietnam government's detention and conviction of Pastor Duong Kim Khai and six other activists were in violation of international law.

But the State Department refuses to include Vietnam as a Country of Particular Concern for religious freedom. The Pastor is not only a spiritual leader in his community but he also works to promote democracy and help victims of injustice. For example, he has served as an advocate for Vietnamese farmers whose land was confiscated by the government.

Pastor Duong Kim Khai's trial was a sham and imprisonment is unacceptable. Freedom to worship is a human right and the Vietnamese government should immediately release him. Until they do, the State Department should call it like it is and recognize Vietnam as a Country of Particular Concern.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF LARNELL SAWYER

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents, Larnell Sawyer, of Chino Valley, Arizona.

Larnell Sawyer recently received the Teacher of the Year award for outstanding work as a teacher at Lincoln Elementary. Lincoln is recognized as a haven for academic achievement and growth. Ms. Sawyer has played a crucial role in creating this reputation.

Larnell Sawyer has deep ties to Chino Valley. She grew up and attended school there from kindergarten through high school. She then moved to Tucson and attended the University of Arizona, where she received her Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education. After teaching 1st grade for a year in Tucson, she got married to her high school sweetheart and moved back to Prescott. After her own initial academic successes, Larnell was hired in Chino Valley to teach an English Language Development kindergarten class, which she taught for two years. Realizing that she wanted to expand her knowledge, Larnell started her Master's program at Northern Arizona University and received her advanced degree in Early Childhood Education. Afterwards, she continued to teach in Chino Valley for another two years and was ultimately hired at Lincoln Elementary in 2012, where she continues to roar with pride as a Lincoln Lion kindergarten teacher. When the dedicated Ms. Sawyer is not shaping the minds of her students, she is

spending quality time with her husband and two daughters.

Ms. Sawyer is a prime example of a great educator, and the positive influence that she has on her students will resonate for years to come.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 11, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 15

5 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To receive a closed briefing on lifting sanctions on Iran, focusing on practical implications.

S-116

JUNE 16

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jonathan Elkind, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (International Affairs), and Monica C. Regalbutto, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management).

SD-366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine health information technology, focusing on what providers and the Department of Health and Human Services can do to improve electronic health record user experience.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Federal real property reform, focusing on how cutting red tape and better management could achieve billions in savings.

SD-342

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Fiscal Year 2016 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill."

SD-138

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Fiscal Year 2016 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations."

SD-124

JUNE 17

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's final rule to regulate disposal of coal combustion residuals from electric utilities.

SD-406

10 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine CBO's analysis of the Federal government's deepening fiscal challenges.

SD-608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

SR-253

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on evaluating accreditation's role in ensuring quality.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine governing through goal setting, focusing on enhancing the economic and national security of America.

SD-342

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the economic exposure of Federal credit programs.

SH-216

2 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Carol Fortine Ochoa, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, General Services Administration.

SD-342

JUNE 18

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine the EPA's management of the renewable fuel standard program.

SD-342

JUNE 24

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine demanding results to end Native youth suicides.

SD-628

10 a.m.	JULY 9	lated legislation, including S. 854, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste.	
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources			SD-366
To hold hearings to examine the back-end of the nuclear fuel cycle and re-			

SENATE—Thursday, June 11, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, in this quiet moment, may a holy hush come over us, giving us a sense of our dependence on You. May our Senators not trust too much in their abilities to solve problems and meet challenges but continue to seek the eternal and transcendent resources You offer to people of faith.

Lord, give our lawmakers humble and contrite hearts, that they may be channels of light and truth. Uphold them with Your everlasting and uplifting arms. May they persevere with integrity so that they may be presented holy and unblameable in Your sight. Keep our Senators calm and filled with faith in spite of all they must face.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The majority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES BILLINGTON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have recently learned that Dr. James Billington, the Librarian of Congress, who has been with us for almost 30 years, will be retiring in January. He plans to spend more time with his wife of nearly 58 years, Marjorie. He wants to see more of his 4 children and 12 grandchildren. I am sure he would also like to catch up with his buddy who plays for the Grateful Dead or maybe just sit back with a box or two of the Mallomars he loves so much.

But I don't think Dr. Billington is ready to take his scholar's cap off quite yet, because he is preparing to do a little writing, too, about folks who played an important role in the history of—what else—the Library that means so much to him.

Dr. Billington has called the Library of Congress the “greatest collection of

knowledge and copyrighted creativity in human history,” and I know how proud he is of the many initiatives he has undertaken to expand its reach and its relevance.

I noted yesterday that we are unlikely to come across many guys who can say they have been a Princeton valedictorian, a Harvard professor, an expert on the Kremlin, a veteran, and a Rhodes Scholar. But that is our Librarian of Congress.

He speaks 7 languages, he has 42 honorary doctorates, and I am hoping he will soon be able to start catching a full 8 hours of sleep every night.

Dr. Billington has certainly earned it, and we wish him the very best in his retirement.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on a different matter, I think a lot of people were shocked to hear that the Obama administration was unable to prevent the information of 4 million Americans from being compromised by hackers.

Officials in the White House now owe it to every American to let Congress help them get out of the past and up to speed with the cyber security realities of the 21st century. That is just what the measure we will soon consider would help do.

It contains modern tools that cyber security experts tell us could help deter future attacks against both the public and the private sectors. The measure would also help get the word out faster about attacks as soon as they are detected, provide governments and businesses with knowledge they can use to erect stronger defenses, and help strike a critical balance between security and privacy in the process. The bill would do so, for instance, by mandating the creation of guidelines to limit the use, retention, and diffusion of consumers' personal information.

This is more than just a smart measure. It is a transparent one too. It has been carefully scrutinized by Senators from both parties. It has been endorsed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis by nearly every single Democrat and every single Republican on the Intelligence Committee, and it has been posted online and available for anyone to read for quite some time.

The need for this smart, bipartisan, transparent measure couldn't be clearer. We shouldn't wait for the administration to fumble away another 4 million Social Security numbers or personal addresses before we help them get modernized and up to speed.

That hasn't stopped some Democratic leaders from thinking they should try to score some political points by taking down a bipartisan measure to combat cyber attacks.

I hope they won't do that.

Most Americans would find it awfully cynical for Democratic leaders, in the wake of the administration's inability to stop such a massive cyber attack, to vote against the very same cyber security legislation their own party vetted and overwhelmingly endorsed in committee for the sake of scoring some kind of political point.

We have a smart, transparent, bipartisan, fully vetted measure before us that can help make our country safer. Senators in both parties have a chance to offer other amendments to the bill and amend it, too.

My hope now is that we can work together to help pass a measure that is in support of the American people and backed by a broad coalition of supporters—everyone from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the U.S. Telecom Association. The sooner we do, the sooner we can conference it with two similar White House-backed bills that passed the House, and the sooner we can finally get a good cyber security law on the books to help protect Americans.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, that brings me then to the larger debate the Senate is having this week. The bill the cyber measure has been offered to is the annual Defense authorization Act. It is a related issue. It is about protecting our country. It makes sense to consider these issues together.

Now, the Defense bill is another measure that should be sailing to passage with strong bipartisan support. It does so almost every year. But Democratic leaders now seem to have a different idea.

Here is a headline that just appeared in the Washington Post: “Democrats prepare for filibuster summer.”

“Democrats prepare for filibuster summer.” We can already feel Americans just tense up. They don't even like the sound of it. Who would?

Let me read just a few lines from that story: “After almost six months in the minority . . . Senate Democrats aren't afraid to be obstructionists, detailing a strategy of blocking appropriations bills and other Republican agenda items until they get what they want”—“until they get what they want.”

"Get ready for filibuster summer," the Post warned, because despite opening themselves "to charges of hypocrisy," Democrats have "decided to block all spending bills starting with the defense appropriations measure."

Putting the obvious hypocrisy aside, one thing is clear: The party leaders opposite seem to think this is all just a game.

Democratic leaders seem to think the pay raise for a soldier who gives everything to protect our country and who would give anything to provide for her kids isn't something she has earned, but something she can gamble with in a high-stakes game of "Shutdown Roulette."

Democratic leaders don't seem the least bit bothered by the dire national security implications of what they are doing. They have packed the car for their filibuster vacation, and they are ready to hit the road, whatever the consequences for our country. They are heading down this road at a time when "the United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of World War II."

Those are the words of Henry Kissinger. And he is right. From Beijing, Moscow, and the tribal areas of Pakistan, to Ramadi and Tehran, we see unrest and global threats that threaten American values and American interests.

And what do we see from Democratic leaders? A serious plan?

We hear the President telling us he still doesn't even have one when it comes to confronting one of our most serious challenges—ISIL.

This is 8 months after he announced his intention to confront this threat. This is 8 months after I and others called on the President to provide us with a comprehensive plan to defeat this menace. And it is 8 months since I pledged that Congress would work with the administration to ensure our forces have the resources they need to carry out their missions.

Republicans have kept up our end of the bargain, even if the President still doesn't have a serious plan.

The President asked us for \$612 billion in his budget request to Congress. That is what he asked for. So we worked across the aisle to craft a bipartisan Defense authorization bill at precisely that level. He asked. We delivered.

The House version of this bill already passed by a big bipartisan margin. The Senate version sailed out of the Armed Services Committee on a vote of 22 to 4. We were all set to pass the very type of bill President Obama indicated he wanted, but then Democratic leaders started listening to that little partisan pat on their shoulder: Why not take this opportunity to pump up that unrelated government spending we like so much? Just threaten to filibuster pay raises for the troops until they shower

more cash on the bureaucrats in Washington.

At a moment of grave and gathering threats, Democrats listened to that partisan voice—that partisan voice.

At a time when our military families need all the support they can get, Democratic leaders reverted to partisan form and are now threatening to blow up a bipartisan bill.

I would think this would be of some concern to commonsense Democrats. They have to be wondering if their leaders have totally lost it—completely lost it—with this filibuster summer and holding our military hostage.

We don't have to look too far to see the important role the military plays in each of our communities. I mentioned yesterday how important Fort Campbell is to Kentucky. Let me now tell my colleagues a little bit about Fort Knox.

Fort Knox hosts the Army's Human Resources Command. It is a hub for multiple major commands under the Training and Doctrine Command. Because of its vast array of excellent training grounds and exceptional training facilities, Fort Knox also recently began hosting thousands of cadets for extensive annual training under the Army Leader's Training Course. Not only has Fort Knox been leading the Army in energy independence by developing the capability to go off the grid entirely, but it also continues to make an exceptionally important contribution locally, as well.

Fort Knox's economic impact on Hardin County and the surrounding communities stands at over \$2 billion a year. My constituents in Elizabethtown and across the Commonwealth know how important Fort Knox is to our community and to our country. They also know that passing the bipartisan Defense bill before us would allow for a critical new medical facility to be built at Fort Knox. They don't want to see Democratic leaders hold that medical facility hostage for unrelated partisan reasons.

Kentuckians and Americans know that supporting our troops is never ever a waste of time. They know that ensuring the military has the tools it needs isn't a game. Here is something else so many of our constituents know: What America needs right now is not a summer of filibusters but a season of serious bipartisan solutions. That is what the Defense bill before us represents, and that is what this new Congress has been doing all year. We have gotten a lot done. There is a lot more we can do. And if rank-and-file Democrats reject their leader's partisan games in favor of keeping up the bipartisan work that got us to this point instead—on a bill they joined Republicans to pass in committee 22 to 4—then that is just the kind of productive summer we can keep working toward.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES BILLINGTON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I admire and appreciate very much my friend the Republican leader mentioning Dr. James Billington, a friend of mine.

I had a wonderful conversation with Dr. Billington yesterday. I wrote him a nice letter talking about what we have done together over these past three decades.

It seems only yesterday that I was chairman of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee and a new Senator here. One of the first attacks we got from Republicans at that time was to whack the Library of Congress. They even went after the magazines that were produced in braille. I can remember the debate we had about Playboy magazine. I don't know what they were trying to eliminate, but they tried. I don't know what they could do with the braille in a Playboy magazine. But we were able to turn that back.

I so appreciate this good man and what he has done. His academic record is terrific. As a person, he is the best. We have traveled parts of the world with him, together with Mark Hatfield, a Republican, who was one of the Republican leaders of the Senate, and I was a junior Senator at the time. We had a great trip. Prior to coming to the Library of Congress, Jim Billington was the acting leader of our country on the Soviet Union. He is a wonderful man, and I ask that my remarks indicate that I agree with every word the Republican leader said about Jim Billington.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend the Republican leader threw around words such as "cynicism" and "hypocrisy." This speech my friend gave—I would suggest he walk into his office, his little bathroom in there, and look into that mirror because over that mirror he should be able to see the words "hypocrisy" and "cynicism" because the speech he gave was fervent with hypocrisy and cynicism.

We have tried very hard since the first of the year to cooperate with the Republicans, and we have done it. On this bill which is before us now, the Defense authorization bill—it is a bill I will talk about a little later in more detail—this is a piece of legislation which the President said before it left the committee was going to be vetoed. He not only said it, he put it in writing. We cooperated. We allowed it to go on the floor without the normal filibuster and the motion to proceed that

I had to approach when I led the Senate as the majority leader hundreds of times—hundreds of times. So we have cooperated. We haven't filibustered getting on the bill, as I mentioned, and we have allowed amendments to get pending and get votes. That is something the Republicans would not let us do when this bill came up the last 2 years. It is a major bill.

The Republican leader said a couple years ago, and I quote, "The Defense authorization bill requires 4 or 5 weeks to debate." That is what he said.

So this work that he has done on this Defense authorization bill is just the height of hypocrisy and cynicism. He comes to the floor today and blames Barack Obama for the hacking that the Chinese did. He talks about what a great bill we have. He stuck on this bill the cyber security—for 5 years we tried to get up a cyber security bill. Every time we brought it up, it was stopped by the Republicans. Every time. I met in my office 5 years ago with five different committee chairs, and they moved forward to try to get a bill out. Every step of the way, my Republican friends blocked us. So talk about cynicism, hypocrisy.

On the Defense bill they talk about what a gift they gave to the President. They gave a gift to the President of \$39 billion more deficit spending. That is more deficit spending on the overseas contingency fund. They refused to allow that on virtually everything else.

My friend the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, in years past and, in fact, when this bill first came from the House, complained about this phony gimmick they were using, but now my friend, with whom I came to Congress 33 years ago, suddenly likes this bill. I don't know how he can do the backflip he did to come to this reasoning.

There is no better example of the dysfunction created by the Republican leader and his party than what we have seen not in the last 5½ months, the last 24 hours. Think about what he has done. We are on the Defense authorization bill that the President said out loud and in writing he is going to veto. Everyone knows that. Every Republican knows that. But the Republican leader is hell-bent on moving forward with this cynical ploy to pass a bill that is destined to be vetoed.

Yesterday, he even went further and intimated that Republicans love the defense of this country through our military and we don't. At that time, I said, and I repeat, every one of my Democratic Senators is a patriot. They believe in this country, and they support the military. So supporting the military isn't a lock that the Republicans have.

To make matters worse, the Republican leader is now using this bill which should be focused on funding our troops to pull these diverting, deceitful

plays on cyber security. On cyber security, with the Republican leader's blessing, Senators BURR and MCCAIN employed a rarely used device to get a cyber security amendment pending with no agreement, and then, before any action was taken, the Republican leader quickly filed cloture.

When the Senate considered the 2012 cyber security bill—and we tried so hard to get that out—Senator MCCONNELL complained about cloture being filed too quickly, which I did because they wouldn't let us move at all on the bill.

In 2012, Senator MCCONNELL said:

The few days the bill was on the floor, the majority limited its consideration to debate only and then . . . filed cloture. But, of course, that is kind of par for the course around here. . . . The notion that we should just roll over and wave through these bills without having a chance to improve them and that Democratic Senators would be willing to be rolled in such a way is ridiculous, especially on a bill of this significance.

Yet, here the Republican leader is doing just what he lambasted before. Now, that really is par for the course over these last 5 months.

For 6 years, in three different Congresses, virtually everything President Obama tried to do and we tried to do was filibustered. That is no secret. Hundreds of times—hundreds of times on motions to proceed, gobbling up 30 hours here, 2 days here. Hundreds of times.

So now what we find is something that to me is even more troubling. There have been press reports today that Republicans on the House side are involved in a vote-buying scheme on the trade bill by promising never to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. They are saying to these few Republicans: If you vote to allow us to go forward with this trade bill, we won't do anything on the Export-Import Bank. What a shame.

Let me get this straight. Republicans want to pass a trade bill that hurts American workers, and in order to buy votes to make that happen, they are going to kill 165,000 more jobs by letting Ex-Im Bank lapse. The number of Americans working today because of the Bank, as we speak today, is 165,000.

Another part of this cynical ploy unfolded here on the Senate floor. The Republican leader, who is intent on letting the Export-Import Bank lapse, allowed a token vote on the measure to try to appease the Bank's supporters. The Republican leader immediately walks out in the last 24 hours and files an amendment on Ex-Im Bank and within hours files a motion to table the amendment. Wow.

So we should not be easily fooled, and we are not. If the Bank expires, there is no telling how long it will take to renew it—if, in fact, it ever happens. None should be fooled by these sham votes. If we want to preserve the Bank, we should vote to extend it before it

expires on June 30 this year—in a couple weeks.

I am amazed it is even an issue. It wasn't that long ago that Republicans believed that this Bank was good for America. Republican Presidents believed in it—Reagan, Bush, and Bush.

I remember when the Republican leader was in favor of the Bank. In 1997, the Senator from Kentucky cosponsored legislation reauthorizing the Bank's charter. With Senator MCCONNELL's help, the Senate passed that bill unanimously. That is the way we used to do it because it was so good for America. Again, 4 years later, the Republican leader signed on to a letter encouraging George W. Bush to extend the Bank's charter, which, of course, he did. At that time, he and 29 other Republican Senators argued that allowing the Bank to lapse would be devastating to the economy and in particular our trade deficit. Now the senior Senator from Kentucky has turned a legislative backflip and today wants the Bank to disappear. Talk about hypocrisy. Talk about cynicism. Wow. As he continues to remind everyone, he sets the schedule around here. Yet, he cannot be bothered to schedule a vote on the Export-Import Bank before it lapses.

So what changed? Here is what changed. The Republican leader is not the only Republican performing a breath-taking about-face on this issue. The chairman of the banking committee supported the Export-Import Bank as recently as a year or two ago. In fact, the senior Senator from Alabama supported a 4-year renewal. If the Senator from Alabama had gotten his way, the Bank would still have a year left before the charter expired. But now the senior Senator from Alabama, speaking on the Bank's reauthorization, said, "I believe at the end of the day if it expires, we won't miss it." Tell that to 165,000 people who will lose their jobs. Just last night, the banking committee chairman tried to table an amendment reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank. That motion failed overwhelmingly and displayed that the Bank has a lot of support for reauthorization.

I don't mean to point a finger at just the Republican leader and the banking committee chairman. Many other Senate Republicans have flipped on this also and so quickly that I am sure their heads are spinning even as we speak.

To understand the Republican change of position, one need only look—where do we look? What do the Koch brothers want us to do? What do the Koch brothers want us to do? These Koch brothers are their billionaire benefactors. Charles and David Koch adamantly oppose the Export-Import Bank today but not yesterday. They were not always against the Bank.

Just like most other businesses in America, Koch Industries is always

looking for new markets for its goods. They should. That means the Koch brothers are all for exports. How could they not be? After all, the Koch brothers got into business by selling services to Joseph Stalin. That is where they got started—Joseph Stalin and his brutal Communist Soviet Union.

More recently, Koch Industries and its subsidiaries have used the Export-Import Bank to find an international marketplace for their goods. The Hill newspaper reports that Koch companies Georgia-Pacific, John Zink, Molex, and Koch Heat Transfer, among others, received over \$16 million in loans from the Bank. That is what the Bank is intended for. That \$16 million is to help sustain American jobs.

But it is stunningly hypocritical that the same Koch brothers are using the Bank for loans they could literally write a check for and that they are attacking as a corporate giveaway. This reminds me of the time the Kochs attacked ObamaCare as collectivism. They probably know a little bit about it. That is where their business started. The Kochs attacked ObamaCare as collectivism, while collecting health subsidies through the Affordable Care Act. Talk about cynicism. Talk about hypocrisy.

Now, after benefiting from the Export-Import Bank, the Koch brothers figure we have it all. Why should we try to help anybody else? We are multi-billionaires. That is an understatement. They are labeling it “corporate welfare” and “a handout” for big business. I wonder if Charles and David got whiplash from their extreme turnaround. The Kochs’ main political arm, Americans for Prosperity, is now leading an all-out assault on the Bank. It is going to great lengths to pressure Republicans to let the Bank’s charter lapse.

It is one thing for a couple of oil baron billionaires to oppose a program for their own financial purposes; it is an entirely different thing for governing Republicans in Congress to do their bidding. But obviously that is what is happening. Why else the turnaround? Republicans in Congress were for the Export-Import Bank until the Kochs were against it. Now Republicans are running for cover, waiting to find a way that they can try to rationalize not being for it, when they were for it before.

One conservative news outlet run by the Heritage Foundation went so far as to report that Republican Presidential hopefuls have to reject the Export-Import Bank if they want the Koch’s endorsement and financial backing. You cannot make up stuff better than this. The Daily Signal, for example, reports, “An endorsement would likely turn on a candidate’s approach to one or more issues of importance to the Koch brothers, beginning with their opposition to the Federal Export-Import Bank.”

It would be tragic if the Export-Import Bank was not reauthorized because Republicans with White House ambitions or Senators who are afraid they are going to get a primary here in the Senate are more interested in auditioning for the Koch brothers, as Presidential candidates are and Republican leaders in Congress do. They go meet with them a couple times a year to make sure they bow when they are supposed to and don’t crowd and make sure they are called upon when they are asked to.

The Republican leader and his colleagues have completely altered their position on a program that supports 165,000 American jobs, jobs here right in our country, many in their own States. Every State in the Union benefits. Republicans have changed their opinion on a bank that has returned \$7 billion to the Treasury, our Treasury. It is a flip that would make a trapeze artist cringe.

I say to my Republican friends: Just because the Koch brothers tell you to jump, do you have to say: Well, how high do you want me to jump? We do not have much time. The Export-Import Bank charter expires at the end of this month. Last night’s vote proves there is support in this Chamber to reauthorize this Bank. Sixty-five Senators voted in support of it last night. So I urge Senate Republicans to put aside their nonsensical backtracking on a program they themselves admitted was a job creator and understand where the real cynicism and hypocrisy lies in this Chamber.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Utah.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last month, the Senate passed the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, which renews trade promotion authority or TPA. Years of hard work and compromise enabled us to pass this bill with strong bipartisan support in the Senate. Now with the Senate having already acted, all of our eyes are turned to the House of Representatives, where I know the Speaker and the Republican leadership, not to mention the chair-

man of the House Ways and Means Committee, who is the coauthor of the bill, are working to move this important bill forward.

I want to take some time to address some of the concerns I have heard from our House colleagues and others about this bill and the concept of TPA, in general. For example, I know some have claimed that TPA cedes too much congressional authority to the executive branch. This is a particularly troublesome proposition for some of my Republican House colleagues who might be wary of granting new powers to the current occupant of the White House.

Now, let me be clear. I have spent as much time as anyone in Congress criticizing President Obama’s Executive overreach. I have come to the floor numerous times to catalog all the ways the current administration has overstepped its authority on issues ranging from health care to immigration, to labor policy. In fact, I was here just yesterday talking about efforts on the part of the administration to unilaterally undermine welfare reform.

So when people say they are worried about legislation that would take power from Congress and give it to this President, believe me, I understand. I would worry about that, too, but that is not what our TPA legislation does. Simply put, TPA is a compact between the House, the Senate, and the administration.

With TPA in place, the administration agrees to pursue negotiating objectives established by Congress and is required to consult with Congress on a regular basis during the whole negotiating process. In return, the House and Senate agree to vote on any trade agreement that meets those requirements under a specified timeline without amendments. The President does not have any new powers under this compact and Congress does not give up any powers.

In fact, the primary purpose of TPA is to enhance Congress’s role in the negotiating process. That is right. Despite some claims that TPA is an abrogation of congressional power, the opposite is actually true. Without TPA, the Members of Congress and their constituents have no strong voice on establishing our trade priorities. With TPA, Congress can define trade negotiating objectives and priorities.

Without TPA, the administration is under no formal obligation to provide Congress with meaningful information on the status of ongoing trade negotiations. With TPA, Congress can require the administration to provide frequent updates and consultations. For example, the Senate-passed TPA bill will ensure that any Member of Congress who wants access to the negotiating text, at any time during the negotiations, will get that access.

In addition, Members of Congress will, once again at any time, be able to

request and receive a briefing from the USTR, the U.S. Trade Representative, on the current status of ongoing trade negotiations. In other words, TPA gives Congress a much stronger say in the substance of our country's trade negotiations and provides mechanisms to hold the administration far more accountable.

Right now, the Obama administration is negotiating trade agreements with only ad hoc and informal direction from Congress. That will change once Congress renews TPA. Still, I know there are some who believe that by agreeing not to allow amendments or filibusters of trade agreements, Congress is giving up most of its power to influence trade agreements on the back end once an agreement is actually signed.

Again, let me be clear. Under TPA, Congress at all times—all times—maintains the ultimate authority over a trade agreement, the power to reject it entirely. TPA does not guarantee the passage of any trade agreement now or in the future, nor does it, as some have argued, reduce votes in Congress to a "rubberstamp" for the administration.

This is important, as there has been some confusion on this point. With the coming vote on TPA, the House of Representatives is not voting to approve any individual trade agreement. I know pundits and talking heads in the media have tried to conflate passage of TPA with Congress's approval of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, but in reality these are separate and distinct propositions.

Case in point: Over the last couple of years, I have been the most outspoken advocate in Congress in favor of renewing TPA. However, throughout that time, I have made it abundantly clear that my support for TPA does not guarantee any support for the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Indeed, I am fully prepared to vote against the TPP if the administration falls short on reaching high-priority negotiating objectives. Many on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle have informed them of some of these high-priority negotiating objectives.

But even if maintaining the power to accept or reject the trade agreement is not enough, the Senate-passed TPA bill contains procedures, including an all-new procedure that will enable Congress to strip procedural protections from any trade agreement if it determines there was inadequate consultation or that the negotiating objectives have not been met.

Additionally, under the bill, both the House and the Senate maintain their constitutional prerogative to change their respective rules to override TPA. So as you can see, the Congress has not given up any of its powers under TPA. In addition to preserving and enhancing Congress's role in trade policy, the Senate-passed TPA bill contains a

number of provisions that actually constrain the administration as it negotiates and implements new trade agreements.

For example, the bill ensures that implementing bills to trade agreements will include—and I am quoting the text of the bill here—"only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement" trade agreements. Additionally, the bill makes clear that any commitments made by the administration that are not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill for an agreement is introduced will not be considered as part of the agreement and will have no force of law.

Furthermore, the bill also ensures that trade agreements cannot be used to undermine U.S. sovereignty, another concern I have heard about TPA and one I wanted to make sure we were protecting against. The bill accomplishes this goal in four important ways; first, it makes clear that any provision of the trade agreement that is inconsistent with Federal or State law will have no effect; second, the bill states specifically that Federal and State laws will prevail in the event of a conflict with the trade agreement; third, it affirms that no trade agreement can prevent Congress or the States from changing their laws in the future; fourth, it confirms that the administration cannot unilaterally change U.S. law.

All of these provisions have been drafted with an eye toward maintaining the separation of powers and ensuring that no administration can use trade agreements to unilaterally write U.S. laws or policy. Now, we have all heard claims that the President intends to use trade agreements to change our immigration laws or enact strict climate change standards. TPA ensures that throughout the process of negotiating, finalizing, and approving a trade agreement, Congress stays in the driver's seat.

Finally, I want to address the concerns I have heard about the supposed secrecy surrounding the TPP agreement. Some of our House colleagues, as well as a number of people in the media, have decried the fact that details of the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, have not yet been made public. They have also argued that by renewing the TPA before the details of the deal are disclosed, Congress would be enabling further secrecy. Again, this reflects a simple misunderstanding of simple negotiation tactics.

The TPP is still being negotiated. As with any high-stakes negotiation, some level of confidentiality is a must if we are going to get the best deal possible with 11 other countries at the table.

In all sensitive negotiations, there is a time for disclosure and a time to hold your cards close to your chest. So I recognize that with trade negotiations,

our government is negotiating on behalf of the American people. We need to ensure that the maximum amount of transparency is possible.

Fortunately, the Senate-passed TPA bill strikes an appropriate balance to deal with these issues, providing unprecedented levels of transparency and oversight into the trade-negotiating process. Under our bill, the full text of a completed trade agreement must be made public at least 60 days before the President can even sign it—be made public at least 60 days before the President can even sign it. Talk about transparency—this is an all-new requirement, giving the American people new and unprecedented access and knowledge of all trade agreements well before they are even submitted to the Congress for approval.

After that 60-day period has expired and the President signs an agreement, he must submit to Congress the legal text of the trade agreement and a Statement of Administrative Action at least 30 days before formally submitting an implementing the bill. As I noted earlier, the bill includes all-new requirements giving Members of Congress access to text and information throughout the negotiating process.

Any Member of the House of Representatives that supports free trade who is concerned about the secrecy of current negotiations should be the first in line to support the Senate-passed TPA bill. Once again, any supporters of expanded U.S. exports who are also wary of executive overreach should be trumpeting their support for our bill.

The Senate TPA bill enhances Congress's role in trade negotiations. The Senate TPA bill maintains Congress's power to accept or reject any future trade agreement. The Senate TPA bill prevents the President from pursuing unilateral changes to U.S. law or policy. And the Senate TPA bill provides unprecedented levels of transparency and oversight into these trade agreements or into any trade agreements that may come forward, including TPP.

I am sure that some of the cynics out there have one more question: If TPA imposes all of these requirements and restrictions on the administration, why does the President want it so badly?

The answer to that question is simple. TPA is necessary in order for our negotiators to get a good deal. We know this is the case. Without TPA in place, our negotiating partners have no guarantees that the deal they sign will be one Congress will consider.

Without those guarantees, they are less likely to put their best offers on the table because they will have no assurance that our country can deliver on the deal or any deal they enter into with us. Make no mistake, we need to get good deals at the negotiating table.

More than 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of our country,

the United States. If our farmers, manufacturers, and entrepreneurs are going to compete on the world stage, they need access to these customers.

History has shown that high-standard free-trade agreements expand market access for U.S. exporters and reduce our trade deficits. Most importantly, they grow our economy, create good, high-paying jobs for workers here at home, and improve living standards for our citizens and for our trading partners. If the United States is going to advance its values and interests in the international marketplace, we need to be writing the rules and setting the standards. We cannot do that if we are sitting on the sidelines.

This is an important bill. I was very pleased to see it pass the Senate with bipartisan support.

I hope that in the coming days, we will see a similar result in the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

KING V. BURWELL

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we expect a ruling this month in the Supreme Court case of *King v. Burwell*, which will have such an impact on families all across America and on the affordability and availability of health insurance for them and for their families. This is an incredibly important issue.

As someone who was there in the Senate Finance Committee at virtually every meeting—and who helped write the tax credit section of the bill—I wish to remind my colleagues of what is at stake in this decision.

During the Finance Committee markups, I worked very hard to make sure the affordability tax credits, which provide tax cuts for millions of Americans, were meaningful in helping people buy health insurance through the marketplaces. It took a lot of work to get those tax credits written into the Affordable Care Act. In fact, as my colleagues know, certainly on this side of the aisle, I would go to every meeting with charts and graphs, looking at what people would have to pay under various levels of tax cuts and how to make sure it was affordable. The great news is that the majority of Americans today are able to purchase affordable health insurance for less than \$100 a month, and that was a lot of work to get done. That is really what is at stake right now.

Now, I know there are people who don't like the law that was written, but the legal argument being presented in the Supreme Court right now makes absolutely no sense. Folks on the Republican side of the aisle are asking the Supreme Court to raise the taxes of some 6.4 million Americans. We are talking about \$1.7 billion in tax in-

creases going to all these States in the red, including my own.

We have Members of the Senate cheering on a court that could rule that there would be a \$1.7 billion tax increase on their own constituents. Don't count me in as one of those who are cheering that on. I don't understand it.

These Members of Congress are effectively saying that people in Massachusetts, where there is a State exchange, can have a tax cut and the affordable coverage that comes with it, but people in Oklahoma can't have a tax cut. They are suggesting it is fine for people who live in the District of Columbia to get tax cuts to help pay for their insurance, but people in Louisiana cannot or that people in New York can have tax cuts to help pay for their insurance, but people in Texas cannot.

Now, to drive this point home, I wish to take a moment to look at how many people in each State are at risk of a tax increase based on the Supreme Court ruling, because this is very important to literally millions and millions of Americans.

In Alabama the Supreme Court could raise taxes through their decision on 132,253 people. Over 132,000 people will find out this month whether they get a tax increase as a result of the Supreme Court decision.

In Alaska, we see the possibility of 16,583 people in the Last Frontier State who would see an average of \$536 more in taxes as a result of the possible decision being urged on by Republicans in the House and Senate.

In Arizona, the Grand Canyon State, over 126,000 people—Americans—would see a tax increase. There would be \$20 million total in tax increases in Arizona, depending on how the Supreme Court rules.

Let's go on to what is called the Natural State, Arkansas, where 48,100 people will see an average increase of \$284 as a result of the Supreme Court decision if they rule against what we know was done correctly in terms of writing the Affordable Care Act.

Let's go on and look at Delaware, the First State, where 19,128 people would see their taxes go up—a tax increase in Delaware, depending on what the Supreme Court does later this month.

In Florida, the Sunshine State, it is over 1.3 million people—1,324,516 people—and we are looking at almost \$390 million in tax increases that would be coming from the State of Florida if the Supreme Court sides with Republicans and makes that decision that will increase people's taxes.

In Georgia, the Peach State, 412,385 Georgians will see a tax increase as a result of the Supreme Court if the Supreme Court does what the Republicans want to have done.

In Illinois, 232,371 people living in Illinois, next to Michigan, our great friends in Illinois—almost \$50 million

in tax increases in Illinois will happen beginning at the end of this month if the Supreme Court rules the way Republicans want them to rule.

In Indiana, also next to the great State of Michigan, 159,802 people living in Indiana, Hoosiers, will see their taxes go up if the Supreme Court rules against providing tax cuts.

In Iowa, the Hawkeye State, 34,172 Iowans will see their taxes go up. These are families. These are working families. These are families working hard, with one job, maybe two jobs, maybe three jobs. There probably are folks who are certainly included in this who lost the equity in their homes after what happened with the great recession and are trying to dig themselves out of the hole and are celebrating the fact that they can go to bed at night not having to worry if the kids get sick, if they can take them to the doctor. Most of them are able to buy health insurance for less than \$100 a month because of the tax cuts we passed in the Affordable Care Act.

In Kansas, the Sunflower State, 69,979 people—almost 70,000 people in Kansas—will see their taxes go up if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position on the Affordable Care Act.

In Louisiana, the Pelican State, 137,940 people who live in Louisiana—almost \$45 million would come out of this State in tax increases if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position regarding the Affordable Care Act.

In Maine there are 60,939 people who represent families—people who have families, who have children, spouses—who are now able to afford insurance, most of them for under \$100 a month, maybe for the first time ever because of the tax cuts, tax credits that are translated into tax cuts for people in the Affordable Care Act.

This one means the most to me, of course, and that is my home State of Michigan. There is no way, by the way, I would have ever voted to do this. The idea that we voted for something that would make all of this happen is pretty crazy. Obviously, that was not legislative intent. But in Michigan, 228,388 people in my State, men and women and their children, will, in fact, see a tax increase if the Supreme Court rules with the Republican position at the end of this month.

Missouri, the Show Me State: Well, I will tell you what they don't want to show are more tax increases—197,663 people in Missouri, and we are talking about \$55 million coming out of the State of Missouri. These are families who will pay more and, in many cases, not be able to afford health care anymore for their families. So they are going to pay more, and they are not going to have health care.

Mississippi, the Magnolia State: There are 75,613 people. That State will

see over \$26 million in total tax increases.

Montana, the Treasure State: 41,766 people in Montana. It is close to \$10 million in total that will come out of Montana, from Montana families, in tax increases, if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position in the House and the Senate and raises people's taxes.

Nebraska: 56,910 Nebraskans will see their taxes go up an average of \$257 each—almost \$15 million in total coming from Nebraska.

New Hampshire: The Supreme Court decision could raise taxes on almost 30,000 people—29,996 people—in New Hampshire who have health insurance now, most for under \$100 a month. They will probably lose their health care and the bonus is they will get a tax increase that will, in total, be almost \$8 million.

New Jersey, the Garden State: 172,345 people in New Jersey are all looking at about \$54 million in tax increases—this is New Jersey alone—who will get less health care and more taxes.

North Carolina, the Tar Heel State: 458,738 people. That is a lot of people in North Carolina—458,738 people—who today have the peace of mind of knowing if they get sick, they can go to a doctor, take their children to the doctor, they can prevent themselves from getting sick by having preventive care and cancer screenings and all those things we want for ourselves and our families. They will see their taxes go up if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position.

North Dakota: 14,115 individuals will see their taxes go up. We are looking at \$3.3 million in small States such as North Dakota where families will pay an increase in taxes.

Ohio: 161,011 people in Ohio. The Buckeye State—the great rivals of my State. There are 161,011 Ohioans who are looking at \$41 million in total tax increases. They are looking at less health care and more taxes if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position sometime between now and the end of the month.

The Sooner State of Oklahoma: 87,136 people living in Oklahoma. This is another State near and dear to me. This is where my mom grew up. She lived on a farm and actually picked cotton. I know how hard they work. So 87,136 people in Oklahoma will see over \$18 million come from this State. These are men and women who just want to make sure they have health care for their children so they can respond if somebody gets sick, if somebody has cancer, if somebody needs to have some health care help. They will see less health care and \$18 million more in tax increases if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position this month.

Pennsylvania, the Keystone State: 348,823 people. Again, a big State and a

lot of people in Pennsylvania—348,823 people. This State will see almost \$80 million in total tax increases. So less health care, more taxes, if the Supreme Court gets this wrong and sides with the Republican position.

South Carolina: 154,221 people in South Carolina will see their taxes go up, meaning about \$43 million in total if this decision goes against the American people.

South Dakota, the Mount Rushmore State: This is another small State, but every single person there who is getting health care today and is paying less for it—most folks under \$100 a month—is going to care about this. There are 16,811 people in South Dakota who will get tax increases and less health care if the Supreme Court makes the wrong decision, if the Supreme Court in this case sides with the Republican position.

Tennessee: 155,753 people in Tennessee will see their taxes go up, with a total of about \$34 million just from Tennessee alone.

Texas: And here we begin to see bigger numbers. Again, big State, big numbers—832,334 people in Texas, and we are talking about over \$205 million in increased costs, increased taxes on people who live in Texas who just want to be able to provide health care for themselves and their children. That is all. This is not some big frill we are talking about here. It is pretty basic. We cannot control whether we get sick. We are looking at 832,000-plus people who are holding their breath waiting to see what the Supreme Court is going to do and whether they are going to side with them or they are going to side with the Republican position.

Utah: 86,330 individuals in Utah who will see their taxes go up, all together about \$18 million.

Virginia: 285,938 people. Pretty close by in Virginia. Again, on average, they will see a \$258 increase in their taxes or a total of \$74 million from Virginia. This is just across the bridge here.

West Virginia, the Mountain State: We have 26,145 West Virginians who would all, in total, see over \$8 million coming out of the State of West Virginia if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position on the tax credits under health care.

Wisconsin: 166,142 people. This is another close neighbor of ours in Michigan. There are 166,000-plus people who will see over \$52 million coming right across Lake Michigan, as we look across at Wisconsin. So less health care and taxes go up if the Supreme Court gets this wrong and sides with the Republican position.

And finally, Wyoming: 16,937 individuals and over \$7 million coming from the State of Wyoming in total taxes if the Supreme Court gets this wrong.

Madam President, a central question for Justices to consider in *King v. Burwell* is legislative intent. That is a

question I am, frankly, very qualified to answer, given how engaged I was in crafting the Affordable Care Act and especially the tax cuts represented in the affordable tax credits. I was there. I can speak firsthand to what the intent was.

The core purpose of this law was to make sure health care coverage was affordable for every American. Pretty simple. And to achieve that, I fought very hard to make sure these tax credits would be available; that they would be enough to make the difference.

I pushed so hard for these tax cuts in the Finance Committee markup that Chairman Baucus ended up calling me "Senator Affordability" in the process. I knew we had to get that right for every American, including those in my State. The key to this Affordable Care Act is for individuals and small businesses to be able to pool their risk to help drive down the cost for everyone, and it is doing that.

So the law created the marketplaces where Americans could shop. We also wanted to give States the right to create a marketplace of their own, if that was their preference. Now, here is the important part. We didn't want States to feel like they were being forced to create a marketplace, so we gave them a choice: either a Federal marketplace or you could choose a State marketplace.

The Federal marketplace created healthcare.gov. With healthcare.gov, every American has an opportunity to go online to see if they qualify for these savings, driven by the tax credits created within the Affordable Care Act. The great news is that 6.4 million Americans are getting those tax cuts right now.

Now the Court is considering the ludicrous idea that Congress actually meant to make those tax credits available in States that created their own exchanges but only in those States; that somehow we were not trying to make sure everybody in the United States had access to affordable health care and lower taxes and to put that money toward providing health care—not every exchange, not every State, not every person buying health insurance, only Americans living in States with a State-created exchange. That is what they have to believe in order to take the position the Republicans are asking us to take.

I can't think of a single instance in the history of our country where Members of the U.S. Congress have voted to give tax cuts to people in one State and not to people in another State, particularly if it is their own State that is not getting the tax cut.

Senator Max Baucus from Montana was chair of the Finance Committee at that time. In Montana, there was no plan to set up a State health care exchange. It is totally absurd to suggest that Senator Baucus would help

write—would lead the writing of a health care bill with tax cuts for the people of other States and not his own State. Why would I, as a Senator from Michigan, push so hard for these tax credits in the Affordable Care Act that my own constituents wouldn't qualify for but people in other States would? That makes no sense whatsoever. The legislative intent here is crystal clear.

So we have this bizarre situation where colleagues across the aisle are asking the Court to strike down the tax cuts and raise taxes on millions of their own constituents.

My belief on this issue is the same as it was 5 years ago when I pushed the tax credits through the Finance Committee: The right to get those tax credits has nothing to do with where you live in the United States of America; it has to do with whether you need health care for yourself and your children. If you are an American, then you deserve the opportunity to receive these tax cuts that will make health care affordable for you and your family. Whether you get your plan through a State exchange or through the Federal Government, it doesn't matter. That was intent of the law when we wrote it; that is how the law has worked since the marketplace opened; and that is how it should continue into the future.

Finally, I want to make it absolutely clear that the bill authored by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON, is not a repeal-and-replace plan; it is a Trojan horse that would completely destroy the health care law that is currently providing medical care for over 16 million Americans in our country. Experts tell us it would lead to a death spiral, where rates would go up so high that only sick people would be willing to pay the premiums, making insurance completely unaffordable for American families. It would let your State decide what health benefits are essential to your family, meaning a family in Iowa could have completely different protections from someone living a few miles away in Minnesota. It puts an expiration date on the tax credits that make health coverage affordable. Conveniently enough, though, it extends the tax cuts until after the 2016 election. And there is the real danger that when the guarantee of these tax cuts expires in September 2017, they will not be renewed. By putting that expiration date after the election, it is clear that this bill's first priority isn't finding a way to make health care affordable; its priority is delaying a massive tax increase until after the election. The priority is to win an election first and dismantle affordable health care coverage second.

My hope and, frankly, my prayer is that the Court recognizes what I know to be true: that the language of this law is consistent with the original intent, which is clear from the very first words of the law, title I, page 1. Here is

what it says: "Quality, Affordable Health Care for All Americans"—not Americans in some States and not others, all Americans.

It is my deep hope that the Court ruling will allow us to lock in affordable health care coverage for good. Then we can move on and spend our time more productively, focusing on how to make a good law even better for families, communities, businesses, and providers. I hope that will be the opportunity we will have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Wyoming.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DOUGLAS J. KRAMER TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 145, and that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that following the disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The Senator from Wyoming.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the growing burden of Federal regulations and the need to rein in the creation of new rules and

the expansion of existing rules. The regulatory burden in 2014 is reported to be nearly \$2 trillion, and the Federal Register last year came out to nearly 78,000 pages of new rules and regulations. This chart shows that 78,000 pages of regulations is all too common, especially for this administration, where regulatory overreach has become normal, and the size of the Federal Register has topped 80,000 pages for 4 out of the 6 years of the President's time in office. With this administration, we are seeing a high-water mark of regulations that are drowning American families and businesses.

The flood of regulations has been getting bigger every year for the past 2½ decades under administrations from both parties. We can't afford to keep piling on these rules. The economic burden of Federal regulations is clear. One study estimated that the regulatory burden in the United States cost more than \$1.8 trillion in 2014 and was bigger than the GDP of India.

My second chart puts this in perspective: Only the 10 largest economies are bigger than the U.S. regulatory burden all by itself.

This burden is real. Some studies have estimated the regulatory drag on economic growth in the United States to be as high as 2 percent per year over the last 6½ decades. An annual report from the Competitive Enterprise Institute also noted that in 2014 regulations cost the average household nearly \$15,000. A study by the Small Business Administration found that regulations increase costs by more than \$10,000 per employee.

The fact that we cannot afford this burden is just as clear. Economic growth in the first quarter shrank by seven-tenths of 1 percent. If we get a growth of 1 percent, it increases the revenue, without raising taxes, to the United States by \$300 billion. That is according to the Congressional Budget Office. According to the President's budget person, it would increase it by \$400 billion. Imagine what a seventh-tenths loss costs us.

Complex regulations are costly and time-consuming, especially for small businesses. Small business owners and their employees have to take on dozens of different responsibilities to make their business work. They have to be compliance experts now, and that takes time and resources away that they need to put toward growing their business and succeeding. I have spoken to many businesses in Wyoming that have stopped measuring their permitting applications in pages because it is easier to measure them in feet.

Businesses are struggling in this regulatory environment because they can't make long-term plans for investments. They don't know what new regulation might come out next month that will change their entire business model. And the problem with complex

permitting and regulatory requirements is not just the cost that existing businesses have to bear; it also comes as a cost in businesses that don't even get started because the Federal Government has placed a mountain of paperwork between their idea and success.

The rush of regulations by this administration is clear. President Obama's administration has issued more than 80 regulations that have a price tag of more than \$100 million each. That is, at a minimum, \$80 billion in costs for this administration's rules.

But what is more disturbing is not just the willingness to churn out more redtape but to find new and creative ways to do it. Agencies are only supposed to create new rules when they have clear authority from Congress to do so and can demonstrate a real need for the regulations. However, we are seeing more and more examples of the administration finding new justifications and new interpretations of laws that Congress has passed in order to get around Congress.

President Obama said that because he is unable to rely on Congress to achieve his agenda, he intends to use Executive orders. We have seen that with the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Labor Relations Board, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is collecting everybody's data as we speak, the National Security Agency, and so many other Federal agencies that are willing to read new authorities into existing laws and grant themselves new powers that Congress never intended.

One place that is willing to force through an agenda regardless of congressional intent, the will of the people, or the Constitution, is in the energy sector. Energy is one of the main drivers of our economy. Yet, this administration is doing everything it can to wage a regulatory war on coal by releasing rules and regulations designed to make coal harder to produce and making energy more expensive to use in our Nation. Anyone who uses electricity should be concerned about this—oh yeah, that is everybody, isn't it?

I recently talked to some sisters who were driving from Arizona to Wyoming. They were running low on gas, so they stopped in Colorado to fill up. The power was out at the gas station, so they couldn't pump gas or get a snack or use the restroom. All of these things—the gas pump, the cash register, the restroom lights—depend on electricity. Think of all the things around you that depend on electricity. Almost everything we do depends on electricity. Yet, this administration seems to want to do anything it can to drive up the cost of electricity.

A few years ago, Senators on both sides of the aisle realized that coal is

one of our best sources of energy, the only stockpileable one, and rejected a cap-and-tax as an extremely expensive and bad idea—bipartisan. Now the administration is moving forward on a backdoor cap-and-tax proposal. They believe the best way to reach their goals of promoting alternative energy sources is to make the current sources more and more expensive to produce and to use. This hurts consumers, it hurts jobs, and it hurts our economy.

It is a simple fact: Make it more expensive to mine coal, and the coal industry will be less profitable. Make it more expensive to use coal to produce energy, and consumers will see a hit on their energy bills each and every month. Make it more difficult to turn a profit with coal, and coal workers will find themselves with fewer benefits, less job security, and a lot less employment, which costs the government more for unemployment.

This administration has made it clear that they do not care about these costs. The Small Business Advocate wrote EPA that their review panel on the Clean Power Plan was only checking the box and "is unlikely to succeed at identifying reasonable regulatory alternatives for small businesses." The incomplete information they provided "greatly limits [small entity representatives'] ability to propose potential regulatory flexibilities or discuss the costs and benefits of particular regulatory alternatives."

Rural electric cooperatives, transmission companies, and municipal utilities are going to bear the costs of these coal regulations. This is where our communities get their electricity, so those costs will likely be passed on to consumers. Businesses really have no other choice.

Several Members are pushing back on this regulatory overreach. For example, I am proud to cosponsor a bill Senator VITTER introduced earlier this week to protect small business from the onslaught of regulations. But the recent case of the Colowyo mine is a good example of how the administration does not care about a loss of jobs or costs to consumers and is a clear signal to Congress that we have to do more to oppose this.

Coal produced by this mine is responsible for employing over 200 people. The Craig Power Station in Senator GARDNER's State of Colorado sends power to a tristate cooperative which provides service in the West. If the cooperative goes offline, electricity prices for electric customers will rise. Why would it go offline? Because of a little vacation on the mine planned from 2007.

Senator GARDNER, will this affect your State's mine? But it also sets a wider precedent against our most dependable fuel source.

So what does taking this one mine offline—I know they are picking on a

small one. That is easier to do than pick on a big one. But what does it mean to your constituents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming through the Chair for bringing that point to our colleagues about what is happening in western Colorado and the Colowyo mine.

The Senator from Wyoming mentioned in his comments that sometimes the regulations from this administration can and should be measured in a matter of feet and not just pages because that is how many new regulations are being piled upon businesses in this country.

In the case of the Colowyo Mine, though, a 2007 permit is being brought into question by a Federal court that has given this mine 120 days—the Office of Surface Mining—to rectify a decision that was made back in 2007. This is a court case that was brought 8 years after the 2007 permit was granted.

If the 120 days go by and the court decides that the review was not complete by the Office of Surface Mining, it could result in a shutdown of the Colowyo Mine. As you mentioned, this will result in 220 layoffs. Communities in western Colorado of Craig and Meeker will be devastated.

This mine is responsible for about \$200 million in economic impact to Western Colorado. It pays almost \$10 million to the Federal Government in terms of taxes. It pays about \$1 million to the State of Colorado in terms of severance taxes. Think about the impact that losing 220 people would have on the Main Street of Craig, CO, and on the people of Meeker, CO. Think about the impacts this would have on families and the kids of the 220 employees who are being pulled out of school systems. Maybe \$100,000 or more of impact to schools that can barely afford the loss already. That is just to mention the direct impacts to those communities of this court decision, and, by the way, we only have about 85 or 86 days left to rectify this permit decision if the Department of the Interior decides they are not going to appeal this decision. You have about 80-some days to make this decision that could affect the lives of 220 people, that could affect \$200 million worth of economic activity.

You mentioned that this power is from an electric co-op. The Senator from Wyoming mentioned that this power is from an electricity co-op, a cooperative. There are no shareholders. There are no stockholders. There is no guaranteed income to Tri-State.

This is an organization that is a cooperative. It is designed to be owned by its members, those people who receive power through the cooperative. When we increase the cost of electricity by closing down a mine that feeds the Craig Power Station, in this case, you

are increasing the cost of that electricity. You are taking money out of the hands of members across the Tri-State region, whether that is in Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico or Nebraska. Those costs will get borne by the members of the cooperative.

One thing that we know as well is that Tri-State is one of those cooperatives that provide electricity to some of the poorest areas in Colorado. They are some of the areas that can least afford it. As a result of this decision, it will increase the cost of electricity, and those costs will be borne by those people who can least afford it—people on low income, people on fixed income, people in rural areas of our State who do not have as high an income as other areas in the State or country may have. This will have a significant economic impact.

In fact, the Senator from Wyoming may or may not know that a number of Members of Congress from the Colorado congressional delegation have written letters to the Department of the Interior urging them to appeal this decision as well as to put a stay on this decision, as we have 80-some days left and because 220 people, their lives, their livelihoods, their jobs are at stake, and these are small communities. They are communities that can be economically devastated with 220 job losses.

The Presiding Officer represents a State where there are many towns where five jobs are a really big deal, two jobs are a really big deal, one job is a really big deal. For a community that is the size of the town that I live in—3,000 people or so—to lose 220 jobs would be economic catastrophe.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Governor John Hickenlooper to the Honorable Sally Jewell, Secretary of the Interior, asking for an appeal of this decision. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Congressman ED PERLMUTTER to appeal this decision. In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter that I wrote, as well as Congressman SCOTT TIPTON wrote, asking and urging for an appeal of this decision.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Denver, CO, May 22, 2015.

Hon. SALLY JEWELL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY JEWELL: On May 8, 2015, a federal District Court judge in Denver issued a decision that could have significant impacts to communities in Moffat and Rio Blanco Counties, in northwest Colorado. That ruling found that the Interior Department's Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) failed to perform

adequate public notice and environmental analysis when approving a mining plan for the Colowyo Coal Mine pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. Colowyo employs 220 people, contributes over \$200 million to the regional economy, generates royalties and taxes estimated at \$12.0 million annually, and provides affordable and reliable electricity to Colorado and the Intermountain West.

The final judgment in the Colowyo case stated that the court will void OSMRE's approval of the mining plan if the agency does not, within 120 days, supplement the environmental analysis, provide public notice and an opportunity to comment, and render a new decision. Such a result would effectively shut down the Colowyo Coal Mine, result in layoffs for all 220 individuals, impact hundreds of other families and businesses in the region, and eliminate the principle source of coal for the Craig Station Power Plant.

We have expressed our concerns to OSMRE about these impacts and pledged to play whatever role we can to minimize them, including participation as a cooperating agency in OSMRE's supplemental environmental review. Given the importance of this mine to the economies of the region, we ask that you do everything possible to respond to the judge's order and remedy the situation as expeditiously as possible. If needed, we encourage OSMRE to petition the court for an extension of the time granted to complete the supplemental environmental review. In addition, we encourage you and OSMRE to appeal the decision if appropriate, given potential adverse impacts on mines in Colorado and other federal permitting decisions.

Thank you for your consideration. If we can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. HICKENLOOPER,
Governor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 2, 2015.

Hon. SALLY JEWELL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY JEWELL: I write regarding the recent federal District Court ruling affecting the Colowyo mine in Colorado. The ruling found the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) failed to fulfill the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act when approving the amended mining plan in 2007. The ruling gave OSMRE 120 days to re-examine the application and comply with the deficiencies identified by the Court.

I am concerned this ruling could have a damaging impact on communities in Moffat and Rio Blanco Counties. The mine supports more than 200 employees, over \$200 million in annual economic impact to the region, and is important to the steady supply of coal for Craig Station Power Plant which provides electricity to thousands of Coloradans. Quick resolution to this case is important so these workers and communities have the certainty they need.

I understand OSMRE is working with the State of Colorado pursuant to the Court's 120-day timeline to conduct additional public outreach and considerations in the environmental assessment. The Colowyo Coal Company also filed an appeal of the decision last week. While OSMRE must continue working to follow the Court's orders, I believe the Interior Department should also direct the

Justice Department to appeal the Court's decision.

Thank you for your consideration and your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,
ED PERLMUTTER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2015.

Hon. SALLY JEWELL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

SECRETARY JEWELL: On May 8, 2015, the Federal District Court for the District of Colorado issued an order determining that the Office of Surface Mining ("OSM") failed to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") in 2007, when it issued a mine plan approval for the Colowyo Coal Mine. The Court gave OSM 120 days to prepare a new analysis and issue a new decision. If OSM does not complete the process in 120 days, the Court stated that it would vacate the mine plan, effectively shutting down the Mine.

We write to urge you to take all necessary and appropriate action to ensure the continued operation of the Colowyo Coal Mine, which is a critical component of northwest Colorado's regional economy and has responsibly operated in the eight years since the mine plan approval was issued by your office. Coal produced by this mine, located in Moffat and Rio Blanco counties, is then used to generate power at the Craig station and is responsible for employing over 200 people with a payroll of around \$20 million dollars. Requested actions include urgently deploying sufficient personnel with the resources and expertise to complete the supplemental NEPA work within the 120 day window provided by the District Court.

Colowyo Coal Mine is a significant contributor to both of the counties' economies. The adverse effects of shutting down this mine go beyond the jobs at the mine that would be lost. We surely do not need to impress upon your office the potentially devastating impact of reducing operations at two of the counties' largest employers as well as one of the largest electricity providers in the western half of the state.

In addition, we strongly urge OSM to evaluate the propriety of an appeal. Without remarking on the reasoning of the Court contained within the decision itself, the result nonetheless creates adverse precedent with other suits pending, which would harm not only Colowyo and the town of Craig, but potentially numerous other mining operations and towns in other states as well. The federal government must vigorously defend the legality of its permitting actions, and leave policy debates over the role of coal to the legislative and rulemaking proceedings where those debates belong.

Respectfully,
CORY GARDNER,
U.S. Senator,
SCOTT TIPTON,
Member of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for his insights. This is the beginning of a process of eliminating coal mining in the United States. Here is a company that has their permit for 8 years for mining coal, and that permit took extensive permitting. Now what they are saying is that you have to take a look at

where the coal is burned to see what the impacts are. That has never been one of the requirements. Again, it is one of those increases in regulation that this administration is fond of. It is designed to put things out of business, to raise costs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article called "The Case For Legislative Impact Accounting Economics 21," which is part of the Manhattan Institute.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[June 9, 2015]

THE CASE FOR LEGISLATIVE IMPACT ACCOUNTING ECONOMICS 21 (PART OF THE MANHATTAN INSTITUTE)

(By Jason J. Fichtner, Patrick A. McLaughlin)

For the first time in six years, Congress finally passed a budget resolution. The federal budget process, when it works, permits Congress to monitor and fund programs based on their fiscal impact. Yet every Congressional budget masks the true economic costs of federal spending. Mandatory spending, which makes up the vast majority of federal spending and includes interest on the national debt, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, is not part of the annual budget process. Also excluded from the annual budget process are the costs of regulations. In fact, the vast majority of economic costs induced by federal actions remain off the books.

We propose reforming the legislative and regulatory processes to put these costs on the books. After all, proper budgeting is about making trade-offs between competing wants and limited resources, and it requires planning, setting priorities and making difficult decisions. But these decisions cannot be made without a more complete understanding of the direct and indirect costs of proposed legislation and spending bills, and their regulatory Progeny. Our proposal, called legislative impact accounting, would provide that information to Congress.

Estimates of the total cost of regulations vary widely, but by any account, they represent a significant cost to the economy. Government economists in the Office of Management and Budget tally up the direct compliance costs associated with rules created in the last decade that have an effect of more than \$100 million annually. OMB's most recent estimate was that annual costs fall between \$57 and \$84 billion. Conversely, economists John Dawson and John Seater estimated how the economy would look if federal regulations were held to 1949 levels—essentially asking the question: What if, instead of spending resources on regulatory compliance, businesses invested in research and development? The answer was shocking. In 2011, instead of \$15.1 trillion, annual GDP would have equaled \$54 trillion . . .

Our proposal, legislative impact accounting, would incorporate economic analyses of legislation and regulation into the budget process in two ways: First, when new legislation is proposed, an independent office—perhaps the Congressional Budget Office—would produce an estimate of the economic costs the legislation would create. Importantly, a legislative impact assessment would attempt to consider economic costs of proposed legislation, not just budgetary outlays. Examples of some of the effects that could be included as specific line items are: direct compliance costs, employment effects, technological

hindrances, trade distortions, and changes to the cumulative regulatory burden. This type of analysis is not unprecedented. The European Commission provides impact assessments on all legislation considered by the European Parliament.

Second, legislative impact accounting would require retrospective analyses of the economic effects of legislation, starting five years after the legislation passed. The idea is to learn what the real effects have been, and to then update the original estimates produced in the first stage. This would effectively create a much-needed feedback loop that communicates information about the economic effects of legislation back to Congress.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute.

McCain amendment No. 1456 (to amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.

Cornyn amendment No. 1486 (to amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Vitter amendment No. 1473 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units.

Markey amendment No. 1645 (to amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Reed (for Blumenthal) amendment No. 1564 (to amendment No. 1463), to increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

McCain (for Paul) modified amendment No. 1543 (to amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

Reed (for Durbin) modified amendment No. 1559 (to amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.

McCain (for Burr) modified amendment No. 1569 (to amendment No. 1463), to improve cy-

bersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats.

Feinstein (for McCain) amendment No. 1889 (to amendment No. 1463), to reaffirm the prohibition on torture.

Fischer/Booker amendment No. 1825 (to amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, as we return to the legislation, unfortunately we are still, apparently, unable to move forward with managers' packages and amendments and others. So I would like to apologize to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have pending amendments, who have parts of managers' packages, and who have invested so many hours of time and effort to this legislation, not to mention members of the committee who spent an inordinate amount of time putting together a Defense authorization bill that I think all of us on both sides, with the exception of four who voted against it, were proud of and a product that was accomplished in a bipartisan fashion.

I, again, want to thank my friend from Rhode Island for all of his hard work. But apparently right now we are still stuck in resistance. Rather than go through all of the reasons why, I hope we can have some serious negotiations in order for us to move forward and complete this legislation.

Meanwhile, the world moves on, and there are greater and greater challenges to our security. In fact, this morning the New York Times says: "Trainers Intended as Lift, but Quick Iraq Turnaround Is Unlikely." That is The New York Times.

The New York Times says:

Mr. Obama's plan does not call for small teams of American troops to accompany Iraqi fighters onto the battlefield, to call in airstrikes or advise on combat operations. Nor is it likely to significantly intensify an air campaign in which American warplanes have been able to locate and bomb their targets only about a quarter of the time.

"This alone is not going to do it," said Michele A. Flournoy, who was the senior policy official in the Pentagon during Mr. Obama's first term. "It is a great first step, but it should be the first in a series of steps."

One of the reasons I have that quote from Michele Flournoy is that it is not just former Bush administration officials. It is former Obama administration officials who all agree that what we are doing is without strategy and without prospect of success.

POLITICO article: "Obama's Iraq quagmire."

The President finds himself dragged back into a war he was elected to end.

When pressed on why the latest efforts do not include having American troops serve as spotters for airstrikes or sending Apache aircraft to back up the Iraqi troops, Deputy National Security Adviser Ben Rhodes told reporters the president "has been very clear he'll look at a range of different options."

That is encouraging that the President has been very clear. I love it. All these spokespeople use two sorts of fillers: One is “very clear” and the other is “quite frankly.”

Do you ever notice that? Isn't that interesting? Maybe we should take that out of their vocabulary—“very clear” and “frankly”—when they are neither clear nor frank.

But anyway, Mr. Rhodes said—he is really a very interesting guy: “The U.S. military cannot and should not do this simply for Iraqis, and, frankly, Iraqis want to be in the lead themselves.”

“The U.S. military cannot and should not do this simply for Iraqis.”

Does anyone in the world think that the United States of America would be engaged simply for Iraqis? Has Mr. Rhodes ever listened to Mr. Baghdadi and ISIS and their intentions to attack and destroy America as much as they possibly can?

POLITICO: “Trainers or advisors? White House and Pentagon don't agree.”

The White House says the new batch of troops deploying to Iraq are going to train Iraqi recruits to fight the Islamic State. The Pentagon says the 450 American personnel headed to Al-Taqqaddum Air Base are going over just as advisers.

The mixed signals come as President Barack Obama struggles to find a balance between achieving his goal of “degrading and ultimately destroying” the terrorist group known as the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant while avoiding restarting a war in Iraq that he has worked to end since he became President in 2009.

From The Wall Street Journal editorial this morning: “Obama's Latest Iraq Escalation.”

President Obama all but admitted on Wednesday that his strategy against the Islamic State is flailing by ordering an additional 450 U.S. military advisers to join the 3,500 already in Iraq. Alas, this looks like more of the half-hearted incrementalism that hasn't worked so far.

The fundamental problem with Mr. Obama's strategy is that he is so determined to show that the U.S. isn't returning to war in Iraq that he isn't doing enough to win the war we are fighting. In September he pledged to “degrade” and ultimately “destroy” ISIS—the kind of commitment a U.S. President must never make lightly. But his fitful bombing and timid special-forces campaign hasn't been able to stop the jihadist advances, much less drive it out of Iraq's western cities.

The longer ISIS stands up to a U.S. President pledging its destruction, the more of a magnet it becomes for young men willing to die for its perverted form of Islam.

Again, an article in the Wall Street Journal today: “To U.S. Allies, Al Qaeda Affiliate in Syria Becomes the Lesser Evil.”

This is what so many of us were so concerned about when we literally begged for help for the Free Syrian Army back as long ago as 3 years ago—that we would end up in a situation where we had the Faustian choice of Al

Qaeda, Bashar al-Assad versus Al Qaeda or Al Qaeda-affiliated organizations. That is a scenario that most of us said might happen, unless we supported the Free Syrian Army.

The Wall Street Journal says:

In the three-way war ravaging Syria, should the local Al Qaeda branch be seen as the lesser evil to be wooed rather than bombed?

This is increasingly the view of some of America's regional allies and even some Western officials.

Outnumbered and outgunned, the more secular, Western-backed rebels have found themselves fighting shoulder to shoulder with Nusra in key battlefields.

The list goes on and on.

Lebanon's Labor Minister, who is a prominent Lebanese Christian politician long opposed to Mr. Assad, said:

“This is great error—we refuse the choice between ISIS and Nusra. We want to choose between democracy and dictatorship, not between terrorism and terrorism. If the Syrians have to choose between ISIS, Nusra or Assad, they will choose Assad.”

That is exactly the situation that Assad has been hoping for.

The New York Times: “Russian Groups Crowdfund the War in Ukraine.”

The Novorossiia Humanitarian Battalion boasts on its website that it provided funds to buy a pair of binoculars used by rebels in eastern Ukraine to spot and destroy an armored vehicle. . . . It is unclear just how extensive the fundraising network is, or how much money flows through it, though the separatist groups identified by The Times claim in social media posts to have raised millions of dollars.

The New York Times, “Increasingly Frequent Call on Baltic Sea: ‘The Russian Navy Is Back.’”

The Wall Street Journal, “The New Cold War's Arctic Front: Putin is militarizing one of the world's coldest, most remote regions.”

The Washington Post:

The U.S. should send aid to democracy's front lines in Ukraine.

In the past several months, Ukraine's freely elected government has taken dramatic steps to reform its economy, fight corruption and rebuild democratic institutions. It has imposed painful austerity on average Ukrainians, stripped oligarchs of political and economic privileges and rewritten laws to encourage free enterprise and foreign investment. It has done all this even while fighting a low-grade war against Russia, which has deployed an estimated 10,000 troops to attack Ukraine and, with its local proxies, attacks Ukrainian forces on a near-daily basis. . . . What's missing is a decision by Mr. Obama to make the defense of Ukraine a priority. The president has ceded leadership on the issue to Germany and France and overridden those in his administration and Congress who support arms deliveries. . . . A stronger U.S. commitment to Ukraine will not guarantee its success. But Mr. Obama's lukewarm support risks a catastrophic failure for the cause of Western democracy.

I cannot emphasize enough to my colleagues that this is a critical and fundamental issue as to whether we

will provide defensive weapons to Ukraine, and I would remind my colleagues who don't want to send American troops anywhere that they are not asking for American troops. They are not asking for a single boot on the ground. Why in the world we can't provide them with defensive weapons is something I will never understand as long as I live.

The New York Times, “Hackers May Have Obtained Names of Chinese with Ties to U.S. Government.”

And, of course, we all know that in the last week some 4 million Americans, at least, have been hacked into and had some of their most sensitive information broken into, which is one of the arguments many of us had for consideration of the cyber bill on the floor of the Senate as part of the Defense bill. Obviously, we are in a cyber war. Obviously, it requires the involvement and engagement of the Department of Defense, along with our intelligence agencies, and that is why I am a bit taken aback by the vociferous opposition by my colleagues on that side of the aisle to addressing this issue since it is clearly part of the defense and security of this Nation.

I would like to mention—and I appreciate the indulgence of my friend from Rhode Island—the issue of Russian rocket engines. Less than 6 months after the prohibition was enacted in last year's NDAA, which would end the use of RD-180 on military space launches by 2019, the administration has stated they want access to 14 more Russian rocket engines. Agreeing to the administration's request endorses another 8 years of Russian rocket engines and over \$300 million for Vladimir Putin and his cronies.

We must not reward Vladimir Putin and the Russian military industrial complex. We cannot in good conscience agree to reward the Russian military industrial base with over \$300 million in rocket engines while they occupy Crimea, destabilize Ukraine, send weapons to Iran, and violate the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty.

The bill before us today would limit the use of Russian rocket engines and restates the committee's direction to end the use of Russian engines for national security space launches by 2019. There are some who want to continue our Nation's dependence on Russian rocket engines. The NDAA would put an end to this dependence and stop hundreds of millions of dollars from going to Vladimir Putin. We can meet our national security space needs without Russia, and we must lead by example by eliminating our dependence as quickly as possible and fostering competition.

I say to my colleagues, we have two launch providers, ULA and SpaceX. Regardless of the Russian RD-180, we will

be able to provide full redundant capabilities by 2017 with the Delta IV, Falcon 9, and Falcon Heavy. There will be no capability gap. The Atlas 5 is not going anywhere anytime soon. With the engines allowed under this amendment, ULA has enough Atlas 5s to get them through at least 2018, if not later.

As the New York Times editorial board stated last week:

When sanctions are necessary, the countries that impose them must be willing to pay a cost, too. After leaning on France to cancel the sale of two ships to Russia because of the invasion of Ukraine, the United States can hardly insist on continuing to buy national security hardware from one of Mr. Putin's cronies.

I have a Reuter's article from last year. "Comrade Capitalism: In murky Pentagon deal with Russia, big profit for a tiny Florida firm."

ULA's dealings with Russia are troubling and ethically questionable. A Reuters investigation this past November on the RD-180 raises troubling issues regarding the businesses and shell companies that facilitate the purchase of Russian rocket engines. The report describes a five-person company called RD AMROSS, a joint venture between Russian rocket engine manufacturer Energomash and Pratt and Whitney Rocketdyne that collects nearly \$93 million in cost markups.

The article uncovers that in the past, RD AMROSS was investigated by the Defense Contract Management Agency, which determined that in a previous contract, RD AMROSS had collected \$80 million in "unallowable excessive pass-through charges."

The article titled "Comrade Capitalism" also exposed the role senior Russian politicians and close friends of Vladimir Putin play in the in the Energomash management. The article states that according to a Russian audit of Energomash, the Russian rocket manufacturer had been operating at a loss because funds were "being captured by unnamed offshore intermediary companies."

Well, I just want to say there is no argument for the continued purchase of these rocket engines from the Russians—from Vladimir Putin and his cronies, one of whom was involved in the management and has been sanctioned by the United States of America.

I have confidence America is capable of building our own rocket engines, and I am confident we can do that in a reasonable period of time—like 1 to 2 years. For us to commit to the continued use of these rocket engines and making millions and millions of dollars, in this case \$300 million, for Vladimir Putin and his cronies is—the question has to be asked of individuals who want to continue the purchase of these rocket engines from this Russian shell company: Why do you want to help Vladimir Putin? Why do you want to help Vladimir Putin and his cronies by

giving them as much as \$300 million? That is a legitimate question.

If any of my colleagues who support this basically unlimited or continued purchase of rocket engines from Russia rather than having it terminated in a reasonable and very short time, the question has to be asked: Why are you helping Vladimir Putin? Why are you helping his cronies? That is a legitimate question, and if any of my colleagues try to force this continued and unnecessary purchase of Russian rocket engines, that question needs to be asked of them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473, AS MODIFIED

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 1473 be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 38, line 12, insert after "FIGHTER AIRCRAFT" the following: "AND ARMY COMBAT UNITS".

On page 43, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(e) MINIMUM NUMBER OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.—Section 3062 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) Effective October 1, 2015, the Secretary of the Army shall maintain the following:

"(A) A total number of brigade combat teams for the regular and reserve components of the Army of not fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

"(B) A total number of brigade combat teams for the Army National Guard of not fewer than 26 brigade combat teams.

"(2) In this subsection, the term 'brigade combat team' means any unit that consists of—

"(A) an arms branch maneuver brigade;

"(B) its assigned support units; and

"(C) its assigned fire teams".

(f) REDUCTION OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.—

(1) PRESERVATION OF TEAMS.—The Secretary of the Army shall give priority to maintaining 32 brigade combat teams for the Army as required by subsection (e)(1) of section 3062 of title 10 United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section), and shall carry out such priority as funding or appropriations become available to maintain such war fighting capability.

(2) REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (e)(1) of section 3062 of title 10 United States Code (as so amended), or paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary may, after October 1, 2015, reduce the number of brigade combat teams for the Army to fewer than 32 brigade combat teams upon the latest of the following:

(A) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report required by paragraph (3).

(B) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the reduction of Army brigade combat teams will not increase the operational risk of meeting the National Defense Strategy.

(C) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that funding or appropriations are not adequate to sustain 32 brigade combat teams for the regular Army.

(3) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(A) The rationale for any proposed reduction of the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as so amended), and an operational analysis of the total strength of the Army that demonstrates performance of the designated mission at an equal or greater level of effectiveness as the personnel of the Army so reduced.

(B) An assessment of the implications for the Army, the Army National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve of the force mix ratio of Army troop strengths and combat units after such reduction.

(C) Such other matters relating to the reduction of the total strength of the Army as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(g) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At least 90 days before the date on which the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, is reduced below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section), the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with (where applicable) the Director of the Army National Guard or Chief of the Army Reserve, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the reduction.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A list of each major combat unit of the Army that will remain after the reduction, organized by division and enumerated down to the brigade combat team-level or its equivalent, including for each such brigade combat team—

(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

(B) A list of each brigade combat team proposed for disestablishment, including for each such unit—

(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

(C) A list of each unit affected by a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B) and a description of how such unit is affected.

(D) For each military installation and unit listed under subparagraph (B)(ii), a description of changes, if any, to the designed operational capability (DOC) statement of the unit as a result of a proposed disestablishment.

(E) A description of any anticipated changes in manpower authorizations as a result of a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B).

(h) REPORT MANNING OF BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS AT ACHIEVEMENT OF ARMY ACTIVE

END-STRENGTH.—Upon the achievement of the end strength for active duty personnel of the Army specified in section 401(1), the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the current manning of each brigade combat team of the Army.

(i) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section should be construed to supersede Army manning of brigade combat teams at designated levels.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I discussed this amendment yesterday on the floor. It deals with brigade combat teams in the Army, making sure we don't cut through fat and into meat and bone with regard to that essential part of our force. I urge bipartisan support of this commonsense amendment.

There is already language in the underlying bill that takes similar action on the Air Force side and on the Navy side with regard to major, significant key units in those forces, and it is the same principle that would be applied to the Army's brigade combat teams.

This amendment is strongly supported by the national organizations built around both the Army National Guard and the Regular Army.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1564

Mr. REED. Madam President, I call for regular order with respect to amendment No. 1564.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1564, AS MODIFIED

Mr. REED. I have a modification to that amendment, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. INTEREST RATE LIMITATION ON DEBT ENTERED INTO DURING MILITARY SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 527) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “ON DEBT INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE” after “LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT ON DEBT INCURRED DURING SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE.—An obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year that is incurred by a servicemember, or the servicemember and the servicemember's spouse jointly, during military service to consolidate or refinance one or more student loans incurred by the servicemember before such military service shall not bear an interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent during the period of military service.”;

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by inserting “or (2)” after “paragraph (1)”; and

(5) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the interest rate limitation in subsection (a)” and inserting “an interest rate limitation in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AS OF DATE OF ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “in the case of an obligation or liability covered by subsection (a)(1), or as of the date the servicemember (or servicemember and spouse jointly) incurs the obligation or liability concerned under subsection (a)(2)”.

(c) STUDENT LOAN DEFINED.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) STUDENT LOAN.—The term ‘student loan’ means the following:

“(A) A Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

“(B) A private student loan as that term is defined in section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)).”.

SEC. 1086. TERMINATION OF RESIDENTIAL LEASES AFTER ASSIGNMENT OR RELOCATION TO QUARTERS OF UNITED STATES OR HOUSING FACILITY UNDER JURISDICTION OF UNIFORMED SERVICE.

(a) TERMINATION OF RESIDENTIAL LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 305 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 535) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) in the case of a lease described in subsection (b)(1) and subparagraph (C) of such subsection, the date the lessee is assigned to or otherwise relocates to quarters or a housing facility as described in such subparagraph.”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) the lease is executed by or on behalf of a person who thereafter and during the term of the lease is assigned to or otherwise relocates to quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code), including housing provided under the Military Housing Privatization Initiative.”.

(2) MANNER OF TERMINATION.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting “in the case of a lease described in subsection (b)(1) and subparagraph (A) or (B) of such subsection,” before “by delivery”; and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph (B):

“(B) in the case of a lease described in subsection (b)(1) and subparagraph (C) of such subsection, by delivery by the lessee of written notice of such termination, and a letter

from the servicemember's commanding officer indicating that the servicemember has been assigned to or is otherwise relocating to quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code), to the lessor (or the lessor's grantee), or to the lessor's agent (or the agent's grantee); and”.

(b) DEFINITION OF MILITARY ORDERS AND CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES FOR PURPOSES OF ACT.—

(1) TRANSFER OF DEFINITIONS.—Such Act is further amended by transferring paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 305(i) (50 U.S.C. App. 535(i)) to the end of section 101 (50 U.S.C. App. 511) and redesignating such paragraphs, as so transferred, as paragraphs (10) and (11).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such Act is further amended—

(A) in section 305 (50 U.S.C. App. 535), as amended by paragraph (1), by striking subsection (i); and

(B) in section 705 (50 U.S.C. App. 595), by striking “or naval” both places it appears.

SEC. 1087. PROTECTION OF SURVIVING SPOUSE WITH RESPECT TO MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 531 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 (50 U.S.C. App. 533) the following new section:

“SEC. 303A. PROTECTION OF SURVIVING SPOUSE WITH RESPECT TO MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), with respect to a servicemember who dies while in military service and who has a surviving spouse who is the servicemember's successor in interest to property covered under section 303(a), section 303 shall apply to the surviving spouse with respect to that property during the one-year period beginning on the date of such death in the same manner as if the servicemember had not died.

“(b) NOTICE REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be covered under this section with respect to property, a surviving spouse shall submit written notice that such surviving spouse is so covered to the mortgagee, trustee, or other creditor of the mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage with which the property is secured.

“(2) TIME.—Notice provided under paragraph (1) shall be provided with respect to a surviving spouse anytime during the one-year period beginning on the date of death of the servicemember with respect to whom the surviving spouse is to receive coverage under this section.

“(3) ADDRESS.—Notice provided under paragraph (1) with respect to property shall be provided via e-mail, facsimile, standard post, or express mail to facsimile numbers and addresses, as the case may be, designated by the servicer of the mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage with which the property is secured.

“(4) MANNER.—Notice provided under paragraph (1) shall be provided in writing by using a form designed under paragraph (5) or submitting a copy of a Department of Defense or Department of Veterans Affairs document evidencing the military service-related death of a spouse while in military service.

“(5) OFFICIAL FORMS.—The Secretary of Defense shall design and distribute an official Department of Defense form that can be used by an individual to give notice under paragraph (1).”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Section 303A of such Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to deaths that occur on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

“Sec. 303A. Protection of surviving spouse with respect to mortgage foreclosure.”.

SEC. 1088. MAKING PERMANENT EXTENDED PERIOD OF PROTECTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES RELATING TO MORTGAGES, MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE, AND EVICTION.

Section 710(d) of the Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-154) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (3).

SEC. 1089. INCREASE IN CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 801(b)(3) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 597(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$55,000” and inserting “\$110,000”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$110,000” and inserting “\$220,000”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) that occur on or after such date.

Mr. REED. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIPARTISAN SOLUTIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, this morning I heard the distinguished majority leader say it was a time for bipartisan solutions. He said: “What America needs right now is a season of serious bipartisan solutions.”

Democrats couldn't agree more. We have been asking for weeks for all parties to sit down and start talking about the budget—not at the eleventh hour, not when we are already at the edge of a cliff, but now.

From a substantive perspective, this only makes sense. Both parties hate the sequester. Both parties understand there is a smarter way to budget than senselessly acting as though we are hostage to these arbitrary, meat-cleaver cuts that were never intended to go into effect, whether on the defense side or on the nondefense side.

So, Mr. Majority Leader, let's sit down and start talking about some serious bipartisan solutions.

The majority leader makes it seem as though he has been negotiating and being fair. Every number in the Appropriations Committee had no consulta-

tion from the Democrats. They just chose the numbers. That is not bipartisan. They did not talk to the White House, which has veto power over every one of these. That is not bipartisan.

We all know that the only way we are going to get something done on the budget, on the spending bills is by sitting down together and talking. Why not sooner rather than later? Why not now rather than at the last minute?

There is a charade going on by my friends on the other side. They totally decide the appropriations numbers by themselves. They totally decide to use OCO for defense but they do nothing for the nondefense side. Then they say: Let's move forward with those bills.

That is not bipartisan. Have any Democrats been consulted? I ask the majority leader: Who has he consulted on the other side of the aisle about his numbers? Who has he consulted at the White House about his numbers? He knows he needs input from both to get anything done.

I think what the majority leader wants to do is play a game of chicken—wait until the end and then say: Do it our way. Well, that is not going to work.

Over the next month or two, the American people are going to see that we will not move forward on these proposals until—but certainly with great vigor when—there is a bipartisan discussion and agreement. We all know how this place works. The Senate and our system of government—both the executive and the Congress—are involved in doing the budget and doing the appropriations bills in particular. It works only when both parties come to agreement. When one party tries to shove things down the other party's throat, which, in all due respect, is what the majority leader is now doing, we end up with worries and sometimes the reality of a government shutdown. If the majority leader wants that, he should continue with this strategy, and any shutdown will be on his hands. We don't want that, the American people don't want that, and my guess is most of the Members on this side of the aisle don't want that. We want to come to an agreement.

All we want the majority leader to do is talk to us, not to decide in his office or maybe with the chair of the Appropriations Committee what all the numbers should be—how much to spend on defense, how much to spend on education, how much to spend on highways. Those are some of the most important decisions we make around here, and they will not be made without bipartisanship, sooner rather than later.

Mr. Majority Leader, like it or not, we have a Democratic President, and we have 46 Democratic votes in the Senate—enough to stop us from moving forward if we can't negotiate—like it or not, Mr. Majority Leader.

The path the majority leader is pursuing is a cul-de-sac that will either force us to sit down and negotiate later in the day or force a CR, which no one wants, or even if some of the people on that side of the aisle have their way, a government shutdown, as they did once before. None of those is a good solution. The best solution is for us to all sit down and talk. We should not keep kicking the can down the road. Yet, here we are.

In Roll Call this week: “McConnell Cool to Budget Summit.”

When he was asked: Is it time to start talking about the budget, he replied: No, of course not. Why? What is his logic? His logic is Democrats should just accept everything Republicans want.

That is not why we have two parties. That is not how the Senate works. That is not how democracy works. There is nothing left for Democrats to conclude other than that there is a yawning chasm between the Republican leader's stated intentions and his actions to date, because the current posture by the majority has been this: my way or shut down the government. Well, we have seen that before, it didn't work, and it is not going to work this time.

We are saying, let's negotiate and let's start those negotiations soon, before it is too late. If the Republican leader truly wants a season of bipartisan solutions, well, the winds are blowing in one direction. Sit down with Democrats and let's start negotiating a sensible budget, and let's start doing it now. We are ready to sit down this afternoon. We are ready to sit down at any moment that he gives us a signal. Let's get in the room and start the real work of finding bipartisan agreement on the budget, plain and simple.

One other thing, when the American people ask why Washington so gridlocked, just look at how the majority leader is handling one of the most important parts of what the government does, where the dollars go. There is gridlock when one side insists that it has to get all of its way and not sit down with the other side. That is the path at the moment that the majority leader is on. We hope he gets off of it. It is untenable. It won't work. It will lead to a bad solution.

Once again, I repeat: We are willing to sit down and start talking about the budget, talking about how much to spend on defense and transportation and education and medical research today. We are waiting, Mr. Majority Leader, for you to give us that ability, that signal, so we can actually enact a budget without acrimony and that will work for this great country of ours.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1569, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, earlier this year, the Senate Intelligence Committee reported the Cybersecurity

Information Sharing Act to the Senate floor. This bill is intended to facilitate sharing of cyber threat information between the private sector and the government. While this could be useful in protecting against cyber attacks, I am concerned that certain provisions in the Senate Intelligence Committee's bill would severely undermine Americans' privacy.

Senator BURR's bill would remove all existing legal restrictions to allow an unprecedented wave of information—including Americans' personal communications—to flow from the private sector into government databases without any meaningful controls or limitations. It would explicitly authorize the government to use this information to "prevent" crimes that have nothing to do with cybersecurity, such as firearms possession, arson, and robbery.

These problems are compounded by the fact that this bill requires all information provided to the government through the information-sharing regime to be immediately disseminated, which does not allow time for removal of unnecessary private information, to a number of Federal agencies—including the National Security Agency and others. We do not know whether this information would also be shared with the Drug Enforcement Administration, or the Internal Revenue Service, for example. We do know this would open a new flow of information to the Federal Government, without appropriate restrictions on how these agencies can store, query, or mine this information.

Congress should enact cybersecurity legislation to protect American businesses and the American people. But we need a cyber security bill, not a cyber surveillance bill.

There are also provisions in this bill that add entirely new exemptions to the Freedom of Information Act, FOIA. These provisions are completely unnecessary, and have the potential to greatly weaken government transparency.

Senator BURR's information sharing bill is major legislation that deserves full debate and a meaningful opportunity for Senators to offer amendments to improve the bill. It has had neither.

The bill was drafted behind closed doors. It has not been the subject of any open hearings or public debate. The text of the bill was only made public by the Intelligence Committee after it was reported to the Senate floor, and no other committee of jurisdiction—including the Judiciary Committee—was allowed to consider and improve the bill. I shared with Chairman GRASSLEY my concern that the Judiciary Committee should also consider this bill, and Chairman GRASSLEY assured me that there would be a "robust and open amendment process" if this bill were considered on the Senate floor. I expect that the Senate Homeland Security Committee received the same assurances.

Senator BURR's attempt to offer the Intelligence Committee's information sharing bill as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act runs directly counter to those assurances. This is not a sincere effort to consider and pass this bill under regular order. Instead, through a series of procedural maneuvers, Republican leadership is deliberately preventing any type of meaningful debate on this bill.

I agree that we must do more to protect our cyber security, but we should not rush to pass legislation that has significant privacy implications for millions of Americans. We must be thoughtful and responsible. Attempting to stifle meaningful debate and pass this bill as an amendment to the NDAA is the wrong answer. That is not how the Senate should operate. I urge Senators to vote no on cloture.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, Senator VITTER spoke about his amendment, No. 1473, to the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, which makes certain our U.S. Army is able to maintain the current number of brigade combat teams to prevent further reductions to the Army force structure.

I support Senator VITTER's amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same so that our military men and women are prepared to face our Nation's evolving national security threats.

Our Army and soldiers here at home and abroad need all the support we can give them. In the coming months, I look forward to welcoming home Major General Funk, who is currently serving in Iraq and leading the front against ISIS. We must remember that he and the soldiers he commands need our help and protection, just as they serve and protect us.

The across-the-board cuts called for in the Budget Control Act, including a reduced force structure, make no sense when our country continues to face global threats. The cuts fail to establish priorities and suggest that every program has equal value, which is not the case.

In my home State of Kansas, these reductions could have a significant impact on the Intellectual Center of the Army, Fort Leavenworth, and the Army's First Infantry Division, the Big Red One.

The Big Red One is just one of the many divisions across the country that could lose entire brigade combat teams, BCTs, degrading our Army's ability to meet current and emerging challenges such as Russian aggression, Ebola response operations, and taking on terrorist organizations like ISIS or Al Shabaab. I mention these specific examples because they are the most recent situations over the last 12 months that call on our Armed Forces to be ready and resilient.

Without arbitrary budget reductions, the Army would not intentionally choose to downsize the Army and let valuable soldiers go.

As the cochair for the Senate Defense Communities Caucus, we must consider our towns and citizens who overwhelmingly support our military. These reductions make no common sense for our communities and the soldiers and their families who call our towns home.

These reductions impact the morale of the men and women who serve our country, as well as their families, at a time when we need their commitment and readiness the most.

I urge my colleagues to support Senator VITTER's amendment. Maintaining our Nation's military forces must be our top priority. A capable and strong national defense is critical to the security of the United States and is our Federal Government's primary constitutional responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to join the bipartisan group of Armed Services Committee members who support a very important measure for our troops. Last month, we overwhelmingly voted in favor of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2016 that the Senate is considering today.

The defense of our Nation is a fundamental responsibility of the Federal Government, and the annual passage of the NDAA is an important step in making sure that our servicemembers have what they need to do their job and to succeed. These brave men and women selflessly sacrifice everything to keep us safe from the forces of darkness that wish to do us harm. We owe it to these men and women to wisely work together to make certain they have the necessary tools to accomplish their dangerous and demanding missions, and that is what we did in the Armed Services Committee just a few weeks ago.

Under the leadership of Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED, we reported a bill out of committee that not only supports our Armed Forces but makes a host of needed reforms as well, and we did this overwhelmingly by a bipartisan vote of 22 to 4.

I would like to cite a number of the bill provisions which make our Nation stronger and which I hope Congress and the President will enact into law.

Our bill cuts nearly \$10 billion in wasteful and duplicative spending, thereby freeing up additional funds to develop and procure weapons systems of the future, while also giving our troops in combat the tools they need today.

This bill also makes important reforms aimed at recruiting and retaining the All-Volunteer Force that has so consistently defended our country for over four decades.

The Armed Services Committee produced this legislation by using the limited and admittedly less than optimal funding tools at its disposal. For now, the hand we are dealt is limited by the Budget Control Act, which includes arbitrary spending caps and the threat of sequestration. So in our bill we are funding our Armed Forces using funds from the overseas contingency operations account. We are doing so at a level above that requested by the President for this account. OCO was included in the Budget Control Act because Members of the 112th Congress recognized the importance of funding our men and women who serve on the frontlines.

I believe that many Members of the Senate fervently hope that in the near future we will be able to fund our government in a fiscally sound manner, without the irrational budget caps and threat of sequestration that pervades all of Congress's budgetary deliberations.

I am willing to work with any of my colleagues on either side of the aisle to fix the Budget Control Act, but until that day comes, we need to use the funding options we have available to keep America safe. The legislation before us today does exactly that. We are following the rules that are in force today.

I am proud of my colleagues who serve with me on the Armed Services Committee for coming together to achieve a truly bipartisan, comprehensive bill. Our bill will support our troops and meet the demands of a military that needs to continue its dynamic evolution in the face of ever more sophisticated threats. And I am pleased that a number of provisions I offered are included in the final package we are debating today.

Now that we have completed our work in committee and Leader McCONNELL has brought our bill to the full Senate for debate, we must come together to pass the NDAA, as the Senate has done each year for more than five decades. It is no coincidence that the NDAA is the only legislation to achieve this track record; rather, it indicates the vital importance that generations of Senate Members have attached to it. The defense of our country is not a partisan issue.

The bipartisan NDAA sustains what our servicemembers need to succeed in a world that grows ever more dangerous. From the Russian aggression in Ukraine and mounting Chinese coercion in Asia to the ugly aggression of the self-proclaimed Islamic State in the Middle East, new threats continue to rise throughout the world. These threats are multifaceted, and our enemy's tactics ever-changing. We must make certain our Armed Forces can continue to face these challenges, and we must uphold our commitment to them.

I encourage my colleagues to pass the NDAA, and I encourage our President to work with Congress to keep Americans safe.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

ZIVOTOFSKY V. KERRY DECISION

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, earlier this week, the Supreme Court wrongly decided the case of *Zivotofsky v. Kerry*, an unprecedented decision which impairs Congress's role in foreign policy and which is an affront to our close ally Israel.

The *Zivotofsky* case concerned the executive branch's refusal to implement a 2002 law passed by Congress and signed by the President. The law required State Department officials to offer U.S. persons born in Jerusalem the option of listing Israel as their location of birth on passports and other consular documents. The State Department's practice had been to list the place of birth only as Jerusalem, reflecting the President's policy of not recognizing any national sovereign authority over the Holy City.

Despite the fact that a President signed the statute into law, the executive branch has fought tooth and nail for 13 years to free itself from what it viewed as the heavy burden of writing the word "Israel" on one line in a tiny number of U.S. passports, and it argued its case all the way to the Supreme Court.

In litigating the *Zivotofsky* case, it is no surprise that the President outlined a maximalist vision for his power to steer the Nation's foreign policy, leaving little room for the people's representatives in Congress. But it was a surprise that the Supreme Court acquiesced to the President's position.

Before Monday, in the entire 225-year history of our Nation, the Supreme Court had never sided with a President's blatant refusal to comply with a duly-passed statute affecting the conduct of foreign affairs. This is a remarkable and disturbing break with precedent and one made through a poorly reasoned judicial opinion. The Court announced that the President possesses an exclusive constitutional power to recognize other nations and that this power crowds out any attempt by Congress to legislate in this area, including on how locations of birth are characterized on passports.

But this conclusion suffers from a number of problems. The Court is supposed to only find a preclusive executive power where such a power is clearly committed to the executive branch in our Constitution. But nowhere in the text of the Constitution is there a reference to a recognition power, let alone an allocation of such a power to the President alone. The Court acknowledges this in its opinion, so it instead finds the recognition power em-

bedded in the constitutional provision stating that the President "shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers." But, as Alexander Hamilton wrote in *Federalist* 69, that provision was understood to be a matter of "dignity," not "authority" that would have "no consequence for the administration of government." In other words, that provision does not imbue the President with a power; it imposes an obligation on him, and a ceremonial one at that.

The provision furthermore appears in the section of the Constitution that imposes an array of obligations on the President, not the section investing him with any powers. Ironically, it appears right before the provision that obligates the President to "take care that the Laws be faithfully executed." I would assume the Framers believed that "the Laws" would include ones regarding passports.

I want to be very clear on this. The recognition power the Court identified is not enumerated in the text of the Constitution, and no one at the time of the founding believed it to be included. At the same time, the Constitution explicitly entrusts Congress with grave international responsibilities, including the power to declare war and raise and support armies. These powers place the legislative branch in a central role in the conduct of our Nation's foreign policy. The Supreme Court therefore stood on remarkably shaky ground when it announced a supposedly exclusive Presidential power—one that can nullify contrary congressional enactments. And it unwisely and indeterminately expanded the President's unchecked discretion in the conduct of foreign affairs. That is a potentially dangerous opening, particularly with the current President. President Obama has shown an unhealthy penchant for granting unilateral concessions to longtime enemies abroad. That tendency cannot and must not go unchecked.

Beyond the constitutional infirmities of the Court's opinion, I want to comment on the broader issue in the background of the *Zivotofsky* case.

The executive branch based its refusal to comply with the passport law on the fear that identifying a person born in Jerusalem as having been born in Israel would upend the peace process. The State Department declared that compliance with the law "would critically compromise" U.S. efforts to forge an agreement between Israel and the Palestinians, "significantly harm" our foreign policy, and "cause irreversible damage" to the role of the United States as an honest broker.

That is embarrassing hyperbole, and it is also complete nonsense. The role of an honest broker in negotiations is just that—to be honest. So let's be honest. Israel's seat of government is located in Jerusalem. Israel administers

the entire city. Over 500,000 Israelis live and work in Jerusalem. The reality is that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel, and any final agreement—whether or not it includes some sort of sharing arrangement—will not change that. The United States and the world should not deny that reality; they should accept it and then begin the hard work of helping the parties forge a lasting peace.

The role of an honest broker is to ground negotiations in truth. It is to quell unreasonable reactions and expectations. It is to strip away issues that are peripheral and focus on those that are essential.

That the President believes the designation of Jerusalem as a part of Israel on a passport can throw the entire prospect of peace into a tailspin says much about his confidence in his abilities as a mediator, and it perhaps also says much about the current political climate in the Middle East, where deepened divisions would render renewed talks at this point unproductive.

Ultimately, a resolution of the Israel-Palestinian dispute should be reached, but progress toward that resolution will not move forward if the Palestinians remain unreasonably sensitive to peripheral issues such as passports. It will not move forward if the President is afraid to speak the truth. It will not move forward if the United States Congress is restrained from adding a dose of reality to the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, we have 2 more weeks remaining before the scheduled district work period with regard to the Fourth of July. Then, when we come back from there, in the next work period there will be another deadline. The deadline I am referring to is the enactment of a 6-year transportation reauthorization bill.

We have been talking about finding a 6-year reauthorization solution now for over a year—well over a year. We have been working with short-term extensions. We had a 10-month extension that expired just recently. We did another 2-month extension with a commitment that our committees would work to come together, that Democrats and Republicans would work to

come together for a 6-year reauthorization of the transportation programs for this country.

My constituents are frustrated. I am frustrated. You see, I commute between Baltimore and Washington every day. This community or this area has the second worst traffic congestion in the country. We desperately need a more robust Federal partner in dealing with the transportation challenges of my State and of every State in this country. We need to move forward with transit projects. Every person we can get to use mass transit is one less car on the road.

It helps all of us. It helps our transportation infrastructure and the wear and tear. It helps our environment. We have bridges that literally must be replaced. In the southern part of my State, the Nice Bridge desperately needs to be replaced. That costs money. You need a Federal partner to do that. We have road maintenance and expansion issues in every State in this country.

We have safety concerns that are not being addressed today. I would like to take my colleagues to some of the overpasses in Baltimore that need to be upgraded for the purposes of safety. Route 1 through College Park desperately needs attention. In my State, there is Georgia Avenue and Randolph Road in Montgomery County and 301, a major artery on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, which need real serious safety upgrades that are important.

Each one of these is extremely expensive. I know that every Senator could list dozens of projects in their own State that need to move forward for safety reasons. Then there is the issue of jobs. We all know that without the predictability of a 6-year program, transportation construction is delayed. That costs us not only construction jobs—and there are literally millions of construction jobs that depend upon the Federal partnership in transportation—but the economic impact of a reauthorization of the surface transportation program. So many projects in Maryland are affected by this.

But let me talk about one part of Maryland that does not always get the same attention, and that is the western part of our State. It is not where the real population of Maryland is located. But the completion of the Appalachia Highway, the north-south highway, is critically important to the economic future of western Maryland—and I might tell you also Pennsylvania and West Virginia. We need to get that done.

Quite frankly, without a long-term reauthorization of the surface transportation program, I do not know if we will get that done. That means jobs. That means our economy. We know that we have to be more competitive as a country. We know we are involved in global competition. The countries that

we compete with are putting much more of their economy into transportation than we are into infrastructure. We must do a better job.

Well, the Federal partnership in constructing the roads, the bridges, and the transit systems is called MAP-21. It expires at the end of July—again. This is not the first time. We have not reauthorized the 6-year program for a long time. We need a 6-year program. Why? Because when you enter into a transportation project, it is more than just a 2-month commitment or a 10-month commitment. Our States cannot go into these multiyear projects unless they know they have a Federal partner. The only way they know they have a Federal partner is if we give them the certainty of a 6-year reauthorization bill.

So it is critically important. So what should we do? Starting now, the committees of jurisdiction need to have hearings and working sessions and report out legislation. That should be done now. There needs to be a commitment as to what schedule will be followed so we do not miss this deadline. That was the commitment that the leadership gave us—that we will get this done in this 2-month period.

Well, unless our committees are working to come together with legislation—in the Environment and Public Works Committee, which both the Presiding Officer and I serve on, we need to bring out a bill. We have done it before. The Senate Finance Committee, which I serve on, is responsible for the financial aspects on how we get together on that.

I am going to come back to that in one moment. Of course the banking committee is responsible for the transit section, as are other committees involved. But let me make an observation; that is, yes, we have to come out with a 6-year reauthorization. That is critical. We do not want any more short-term extensions. Secondly, it has to be a robust program.

We know that if we just reauthorize at the current level, it will be inadequate. We know that. We know that, each of us in talking to our State transportation agencies. They tell you they need a more robust Federal partnership and that the challenges today are more expensive. And we have delayed for so long that it is even more expensive. So we need to come to grips with a 6-year reauthorization but at a level that will allow for a stronger Federal partnership.

The President's number is \$478 billion over 6 years. I think that is a reasonable level. If we just have a level-funded adjusted-for-inflation program, it would be \$331 billion. I would hope that we would recognize that the additional \$147 billion the President is talking about over 6 years is a modest increase but an important increase to the Federal share to deal with our urgent

needs of safety, economic development, jobs, and competitiveness.

Now, here is the problem. As to the current revenues in the transportation trust fund, if we just use the \$331 billion, which is basically a freeze adjusted for inflation for the next 6 years, there is a \$97 billion gap. We do not have enough money projected in the transportation trust fund for a basically stand-still 6-year reauthorization. We are \$97 billion short.

So we need to come to grips as to how we are going to fill that void. I said I serve on the Senate Finance Committee. There are lots of revenues that go into the trust fund that we should look at adjusting. There are other ideas about how we can bring in transportation revenues. I hope we look at all of that. Then there has been the recommendation that has been done by both Democrats and Republicans. We have to find a way to bridge the gap here. It does not do any good if we just have one party that agrees on how to deal with this. We all have to deal with it.

It is incumbent upon the Republican leadership to get engaged in that debate—and the Democratic leadership. We have already said that we are open to the current revenues that go into the transportation trust fund. But there is one area that seems to be in agreement between Democrats and Republicans, and that is looking at international reform. We have all talked about the fact that we have a lot of earnings from our corporations—American corporations—that are trapped overseas because the companies have made a decision not to repatriate the money back into the United States because it would be subject to a higher U.S. corporate tax rate.

They do not want to pay that higher tax. That is a business decision made by U.S. businesses. Now, obviously, the way to solve that is to reform our business taxes here. Senator THUNE and I are cochairing a working group of the Senate Finance Committee to try to come to grips with that. It is going to be difficult for us to do that. You heard the numbers I have already given you.

But every 1-percent reduction in the corporate tax rate costs about \$100 billion over 10 years. If you include relief for those who pay the personal tax rates for their business income, it is probably closer to \$150 or \$160 billion to get a 1-percent reduction in the corporate tax rate. So that is going to be challenging.

In the meantime, there have been recommendations in order to unleash those funds: Why don't we find a charge that is less than the full corporate tax for those revenues that are returned to the United States? We have Democrats and Republicans working together on a bill, including the President, who has submitted that in his budget. He has submitted a toll charge

for the revenues that are trapped overseas that corporations would have to pay.

That toll charge would be at a 14-percent rate. Then he has projected a minimum tax on foreign earnings at 19 percent that would have to be paid with certain reforms on trying to move the United States more to a territorial corporate tax rate. I mention that because I think there is interest by both Democrats and Republicans to take a look at reforming the way we tax foreign income for American companies so that we can have greater economic activity here in the United States. These proposals generate a significant amount of revenue, both one-time-only and permanent revenue.

I mention that because we could take a look at the international tax reform proposals. Democrats and Republicans have both submitted proposals on this. That could help us get to a robust 6-year reauthorization of the surface transportation bill. We could get that. My reason for mentioning it right now is this: Let's talk about it. Let's have the Republicans come to the table and talk about it also. Let's not just wait these next 2 weeks, go into the work period, come back, and be faced with another deadline with no game plan on how we are going to resolve it and say: We have to pass another short-term extension so we can get together and talk about it.

Let's start talking about this now. I tell you that there are viable options. The one thing I found is that Democrats and Republicans agree that infrastructure is important and we have to have a stronger program in this country for infrastructure. I always enjoy hearing from Senator INHOFE, the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, a person with whom I came to the Congress. He says frequently that he may be a conservative but when it comes to infrastructure spending, it is important that we have a robust Federal program.

Under his leadership and under Senator BOXER's leadership, we have been able to bring out bills from the Environment and Public Works Committee to reauthorize a 6-year program. The challenge is this: Can we find the revenue? Of course, there we need to work together as Democrats and Republicans. So I come to the floor to urge my colleagues: Let's work together. That is what the American people expect us to do. They expect us to work together to solve the problem.

I don't think there is a Member of the Senate who would disagree that we should have a robust reauthorization of a 6-year transportation program for this country, that our States need it, that our country needs it, and that we need it for our economy. Let's put aside our own individual differences. Let's sit down and work out a bill. Let's start working it out now. Let's not wait until the next deadline.

I urge my colleagues to do this. That is what the American people want us to do. That is what we need to do to move this country forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I know we are on the national defense bill and, of course, national defense is ultimately about national security, and one of the concerns I have about national security and our national interests is the challenge of a nuclear-armed Iran.

I came to the floor last week to say that when it comes to dealing with Iran—as we count down to the deadline for an agreement—the truth is always elusive. I said then that international inspectors reported that Tehran's stockpile of nuclear fuel, rather than decreasing, actually increased by 20 percent.

Now, in the last days before the agreement deadline is reached, David Albright, a well-respected expert on Iran's nuclear program, in an article for the Institute for Science and International Security, says that the State Department's explanation of Iran's newly produced 3.5 percent enriched uranium falls short and that the State Department seemed to be making excuses for the fact that Iran has not reduced its enrichment level, which they agreed to do in the Joint Plan of Action. The fact is uranium enrichment, when taken to the maximum, can lead to bomb material. So reducing the enrichment level is critical, in terms of possible breakout time in Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon.

Albright says:

The core of the State Department's explanation in the last few days appears to be that Iran meets the conditions of the Joint Plan of Action once it feeds newly produced low enriched uranium hexafluoride gas into the uranium conversion plant at Esfahan. . . .

Now, to bring this down into lay terms, this conversion plant is there to take this enriched uranium—that if further enriched, can lead to bomb material—to transform the enriched uranium that can be prepared for potential nuclear material to an oxide form, and that is a form in which the bomb threat is dramatically reduced.

But the Esfahan plant didn't even become operational until the fall of 2014, a year after it was supposed to have opened, and—conveniently for the Iranians—it is having operational difficulties, making it highly unlikely Iran can convert the low-enriched uranium hexafluoride, which we are concerned

about, into enriched uranium dioxide used for making nuclear power reactor fuel.

Put simply, at the end of the day, once again Iran will not have lived up to what they agreed to.

Now, we knew from the beginning it was going to be a challenge. We knew it was going to be difficult for the Iranians to blend down their nuclear fuel, rather than to ship it out to another country, which so far they have refused to do. We knew it would be a concern if they weren't able to convert low-enriched uranium hexafluoride into the enriched uranium dioxide—the one in which, obviously, we have far less concerns. And, frankly, because that is obviously a problem, I am concerned, because as the Albright article states, “The amounts of LEU amount to about 4,000 kilograms of 3.5 LEU hexafluoride, enough to potentially make 2 to 3 nuclear weapons if further enriched to weapons-grade uranium.”

Two to three nuclear weapons if further enriched to nuclear-grade uranium. Now, I am concerned this is more blue smoke and mirrors that overlooked the real ambitions of an untrustworthy negotiating partner. I am concerned Iran is still saying it will not ship out excess low-enriched uranium but somehow blend it down and store it at the plant, which can't possibly blend down enough at this point to meet the requirements under the Joint Plan of Action.

I am concerned this is more of an issue than the administration is willing to concede, particularly if, at the end, there is no deal and we, through sanctions relief, paid them to convert and then they walk away with massive amounts of low-enriched uranium that can be fed into their centrifuges and be easily converted to highly enriched uranium and on to weapons-grade uranium.

According to David Albright:

Based on the IAEA's report—

That is the International Atomic Energy Administration's report to member states—

the problems in making enriched uranium oxide were apparent by the fall of 2014 . . . but the Administration decided not to make a major issue about the lack of oxide production.

The article goes on to say:

Concluding that Iran has met the Joint Plan of Action condition to convert to oxide newly-enriched up to 5 percent is incorrect.

And it further says:

In this case, the potential violation refers to Iran not producing the enriched oxide at the end of the initial six month period of the Joint Plan of Action and again after its first extension.

This is a continuing quote:

The choosing of a weaker condition which must be met cannot be a good precedent for interpreting more important provisions in a final deal. Moreover, it tends to confirm the view of critics that future violations of a

long-term deal will be downplayed for the sake of generating or maintaining support for the deal.

It says:

The administration relied on a technical remedy that Iran had not demonstrated it could carry out.

The article concludes:

The State Department has some explaining to do.

Now, the enrichment issue is one thing, but then there is the recently released U.N. Security Council report on a whole host of the existing Security Council resolutions and mandates as it relates to Iran, and there are other problems as well. They are well documented in this just recently released report; that Iran has continued to deny the legitimacy of Security Council resolutions not addressed in the Joint Plan of Action; that Iran's arms transfers have actively continued, raising concerns in particular in the region; that cases of noncompliance with the travel ban have also been observed; that Iran has continued certain nuclear activities, including enrichment and work at Arak; and that there is no progress by Iran in addressing possible military dimensions that had been agreed to be addressed by Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency. The most troubling relates to allegations of large-scale high-explosives experimentation at Parchin.

The report goes on to talk about Iran's missile technology. Here we have a sense from the U.N. Security Council's report where it speaks to Iran's missile capability. And I am using a map here that I give credit to the New York Times for to demonstrate what that means. Iran has two kinds of ballistic missiles capable of delivering a nuclear weapon, according to the report—the Ghadr missile, which is a variation of the liquid-fuel Shahab-3, with a range of about 1,600 kilometers, or 995 miles, and the other is the Sejil missile, with a range of about 2,000 kilometers, or about 1,250 miles. The first missile encompasses most of the gulf and certainly our ally, the State of Israel, as well as Afghanistan and Pakistan, not to mention Turkey, among others, and then the longer range missile actually goes as far as into Europe. And this is missile technology that is still in development. As the U.N. Security Council report points out, we can see the range of Iran's missiles and the potential military dimensions of its pursuits.

Then there is the issue of arms embargo violations and the transfer of conventional arms. For whatever reasons—and the report speculates that maybe member states, meaning member countries of the United Nations, don't want to upset the apple cart of the negotiations—there have been no reports—even in the midst of very clear violations taking place, and those have been largely reported—from member

states of the U.N. about the transfer of conventional arms by Iran. But the U.N. report nevertheless says that “the panel notes media reports pointing to continued military support and alleged arms transfers to Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Yemen, and to Hezbollah and Hamas.”

The report also says that a shipment of arms was confirmed by Massoud Barzani, president of Kurdistan's regional government, who said: “We asked for weapons and Iran was the first country to provide [them].” This is a clear violation if ever there were one.

According to the report, some member states informed the panel that Iran's nuclear procurement trends and circumvention techniques remain basically unchanged. In fact, Great Britain informed the U.N. panel that they are aware of an active Iranian nuclear procurement network associated with Iran's centrifuge technology company known as TESA and Kalay Electric Company, which are listed sanction entities under the U.N. Security Council resolutions.

The report further says that member states have reported on the methods Iran has used and continues to use to carry out financial transactions below the radar to conceal any connection to Iran. Some states that import oil, for example, have authorized their banks to receive payments into accounts belonging to the Central Bank of Iran. The funds were reportedly paid out against invoices for exports of goods to Iran although the goods were never exported, meaning money was taken out and ultimately made its way to Iran even though they were not for payment of anything because nothing was shipped.

The simple fact is—and there are many other examples in the U.N. Security Council report, to which I commend my colleagues' attention—we can't trust Iran to abide by its agreements or to abide by U.N. resolutions even when they are in the midst of negotiations, when you would think they would be behaving the best. One would think they would want to put their best foot forward. Why would we think we can trust them if they are violating U.N. Security Council resolutions? That is the world—not the United States, not even the P5+1, but the world—telling them they can't do these things or they violate an international order. So why would we think we could trust them not to enrich uranium, not to pursue a weapons program, and not to find any way possible to renege on any agreement they reach when they are violating existing Security Council resolutions?

As I have said, I will come to the floor to reiterate my skepticism that Iran will not do all it can to pursue their agenda. I believe, rather, they will try to find a way to pursue their

agenda, to play fast and loose with the truth, to hide the truth, to cover it up, and to buy time. Iran needs to be held responsible for its commitments—forget about its work; its commitments. There can be no slippage, no delays, no obfuscation. That is how they succeeded in the past in bringing themselves to be on the verge of becoming a threshold nuclear state.

So where do we go from here? It remains to be seen whether compliance with that which has already been agreed to by the Iranians—even at this early stage while the world is watching—can be realized or will it be explained away.

I intend to come to the floor again and again to hold Iran accountable for its actions and to keep a laser-like focus on the mullahs in Tehran. I fear that when that spotlight is off, when the press is gone, when the agreement is out of the headlines and the curtain closes on the P5+1 talks, Iran will pull back into the shadows. When that happens and if it goes wrong, what will we do then?

We haven't seen the final agreement, so we will have to wait to make a final judgment on it. But if the final agreement follows in the line of the framework agreement, then we will have a set of circumstances where we will not be solving the problem. I think some of the experts who were before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday in a briefing admitted to the fact—and one or two of them are proponents of an agreement—they said this does not solve the problem but only kicks the problem down the road.

Those are hard choices no matter what, but I would rather confront a country that is on the path to nuclear weapons before it gets it and when it is at its weakest point, not when it becomes a country at its stronger point, with far more resources, with sanctions that have largely dissipated. And even with snapback provisions—which I think we should have, but several years down the road when the world has now engaged Iran in doing business and Iran has risen in its economy—its economy has already stopped its free-fall just on the basis of expectations—and it decides possibly to break out 3 or 4 years down the road, putting all of those international sanctions back together, as someone who was the author of those sanctions here in the Congress, I can tell you that is going to take a lot more work. There is no instantaneous snapback: Oh, we will put the sanctions back and they will have effect immediately. You have to tell the world, you have to give them notice that, in fact, there are sanctions back in effect. You have to tell companies now doing business and give them time to disinvest from those businesses. By the time you add that, if experience is a good barometer, we gave at a minimum 6 months' lead time to tell the world this is going

to be a sanctionable activity, and by the time we actually pursued enforcement and implementation of those, it was far beyond—close to a year. Well, that happens to be the time we are actually vying for breakout time.

So I am going to continue to come to the floor to continue to shine a spotlight on the challenges we have with Iran and on the shortcomings of the interim agreement as we hope for a good final agreement. But I will use the refrain that the administration at one time used, which is that no agreement is better than a bad agreement, and that is what my concern is—that we are headed toward a bad agreement.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Arizona.

EARMARKS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a problem that, despite a congressional ban on the practice, continues to plague our budget. That problem is earmarks.

Back in 1986—just a little history lesson here—as Congress engaged in a last-minute scramble to fund the government, a Republican Congressman from Pennsylvania slipped an earmark into a massive spending bill. He turned a small exhibit of steam-powered trains, known as Steamtown USA, into a national park. Three decades, nearly \$100 million, and one congressional earmark ban later, that project continues to cost taxpayers millions of dollars annually. The bridge to nowhere, the North Carolina teapot museum, the indoor rainforest in Iowa, and, yes, Steamtown USA, are among the many egregious earmarks that led fed-up taxpayers to press for a ban on this kind of spending.

Like triceratops and velociraptors, earmarks that were declared extinct, fossilized relics of a bygone era, are somehow making a reappearance. What taxpayers and many in Congress didn't realize is that despite the successful ban on earmarks, we are still paying millions of dollars for the old ones. Through unexpended funds, carve-outs in the Tax Code, and grant awards, spending on past earmark projects and their recipients still roam the Federal budget landscape.

Today, I am releasing a report—“Jurassic Pork”—which will highlight the fossilized pork projects that are still embedded or buried deep in the Federal budget. It should serve as a reminder of the past scandals that brought about the extinction of earmarks and serve as a warning that the cost of earmarking often outlives the practice itself.

“Jurassic Pork” digs into just two dozen of the many earmarked projects and recipients of congressional bounty that continue to cost taxpayers millions of dollars.

Take for example the aptly named *VelociRFTA*, a bus rapid transit system in Colorado that covers the 40

miles between Aspen and Glenwood that began as an \$810,000 earmark. Since the earmark ban took place in 2010, thanks to continued Federal funding, this project—this vestige—has cost taxpayers \$36 million.

Also highlighted in the report is the American Ballet Theater, which supplemented a flow of Federal grant money with more than \$800,000 in earmarked funds from a Member of Congress who also happened to perform in one of the group's recent productions.

Then there are the 6,000 unspent highway earmarks representing \$5.9 billion that sit idle in the Department of Transportation account. These include pork projects such as the \$600,000 Upper Delaware Scenic Byway Visitor Center in Cocheton, NY. Unfortunately for taxpayers, the visitor center ended up being built in Narrowsburg. Because the location was specified as Cocheton, the money will likely continue to sit on the Federal Government's ledger.

Now, within these unspent transportation earmarks, there is a smaller group that is often referred to as “orphan” earmarks. These are earmarks that have had less than 10 percent of their expended—or their anticipated funds spent over 10 years. According to the Congressional Research Service, 70 earmarks worth more than \$120 million remain on the books, and in August 2015, more than 1,200 earmarks from the last major highway bill that was passed in 2005 will officially become orphan earmarks. These represent \$2 billion in yet-to-be-spent funds.

With the near bankrupt highway trust fund, Congress needs to find a way to permanently park these unspent funds. To that end, I have also introduced a Jurassic Pork Act, which will rescind funding for orphan earmarks and will return this money to the highway trust fund. We all know the highway trust fund could use it about now.

Now, like John Hammond, the billionaire CEO of the failed theme park in the first “Jurassic Park” film, not everyone in Congress is content to leave these as relics of the past. Not a year after the earmark ban was implemented in the Senate, the then-majority leader proclaimed: “I’ve done earmarks all my career, and I’m happy I’ve done earmarks all my career.”

Others from both sides of the aisle have argued that a return to earmarking would help to lard up or incentivize votes. But taxpayers don't exist for political horse trading or as a reward for powerful Members to dole out as tributes. Taxpayers need to remain vigilant against all this kind of parochial spending, and we cannot return to pork as we knew it.

The moratorium on earmarks in 2010 didn't put an end to these kind of shenanigans. But as readers of “Jurassic Pork” will see, the spending on their

legacy continues. Taxpayers have already seen the end of this movie. We don't need to be treated to a sequel.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LEE. I ask for regular order with respect to Vitter amendment No. 1473.

AMENDMENT NO. 1687 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1473, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LEE. I send a second-degree amendment, Lee amendment No. 1687, to the desk as a second-degree amendment to Vitter amendment No. 1473 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 1687 to amendment No. 1473, as modified.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the protection and recovery of the greater sage-grouse, the conservation of lesser prairie-chickens, and the removal of endangered species status for the American burying beetle)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROTECTION AND RECOVERY OF GREATER SAGE GROUSE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “Federal resource management plan” means—

(A) a land use plan prepared by the Bureau of Land Management for public lands pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712); or

(B) a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for National Forest System lands pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(2) The term “Greater Sage Grouse” means a sage grouse of the species *Centrocercus urophasianus*.

(3) The term “State management plan” means a State-approved plan for the protection and recovery of the Greater Sage Grouse.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is—

(1) to facilitate implementation of State management plans over a period of multiple, consecutive sage grouse life cycles; and

(2) to demonstrate the efficacy of the State management plans for the protection and recovery of the Greater Sage Grouse.

(c) ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973 FINDINGS.—

(1) DELAY REQUIRED.—Any finding by the Secretary of the Interior under clause (i),

(ii), or (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)) with respect to the Greater Sage Grouse made during the period beginning on September 30, 2015, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall have no force or effect in law or in equity, and the Secretary of the Interior may not make any such finding during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2025.

(2) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—The delay imposed by paragraph (1) is, and shall remain, effective without regard to any other statute, regulation, court order, legal settlement, or any other provision of law or in equity.

(3) EFFECT ON CONSERVATION STATUS.—Until the date specified in paragraph (1), the conservation status of the Greater Sage Grouse shall remain warranted for listing under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but precluded by higher-priority listing actions pursuant to clause (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)).

(d) COORDINATION OF FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND STATE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.—In order to foster coordination between a State management plan and Federal resource management plans that affect the Greater Sage Grouse, upon notification by the Governor of a State with a State management plan, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may not amend or otherwise modify any Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal lands in the State in a manner inconsistent with the State management plan for a period, to be specified by the Governor in the notification, of at least five years beginning on the date of the notification.

(2) RETROACTIVE EFFECT.—In the case of any State that provides notification under paragraph (1), if any amendment or modification of a Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal lands in the State was issued during the one-year period preceding the date of the notification and the amendment or modification altered management of the Greater Sage Grouse or its habitat, implementation and operation of the amendment or modification shall be stayed to the extent that the amendment or modification is inconsistent with the State management plan. The Federal resource management plan, as in effect immediately before the amendment or modification, shall apply instead with respect to management of the Greater Sage Grouse and its habitat, to the extent consistent with the State management plan.

(3) DETERMINATION OF INCONSISTENCY.—Any disagreement regarding whether an amendment or other modification of a Federal resource management plan is inconsistent with a State management plan shall be resolved by the Governor of the affected State.

(e) RELATION TO NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—With regard to any Federal action consistent with a State management plan, any findings, analyses, or conclusions regarding the Greater Sage Grouse or its habitat under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) shall not have a preclusive effect on the approval or implementation of the Federal action in that State.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter

through 2021, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the Secretaries' implementation and effectiveness of systems to monitor the status of Greater Sage Grouse on Federal lands under their jurisdiction.

(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation, this section, including determinations made under subsection (d)(3), shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. _____. IMPLEMENTATION OF LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN RANGE-WIDE CONSERVATION PLAN AND OTHER CONSERVATION MEASURES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CANDIDATE CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS.—The terms “Candidate Conservation Agreement” and “Candidate and Conservation Agreement With Assurances” have the meaning given those terms in—

(A) the announcement of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce entitled “Announcement of Final Policy for Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances” (64 Fed. Reg. 32726 (June 17, 1999)); and

(B) sections 17.22(d) and 17.32(d) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(2) RANGE-WIDE PLAN.—The term “Range-Wide Plan” means the Lesser Prairie-Chicken Range-Wide Conservation Plan of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, as endorsed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on October 23, 2013, and published for comment on January 29, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 4652).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) PROHIBITION ON TREATMENT AS THREATENED OR ENDANGERED SPECIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any prior action by the Secretary, the lesser prairie-chicken shall not be treated as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) before January 31, 2021.

(2) PROHIBITION ON PROPOSAL.—Effective beginning on January 31, 2021, the lesser prairie-chicken may not be treated as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) unless the Secretary publishes a determination, based on the totality of the scientific evidence, that conservation (as that term is used in that Act) under the Range-Wide Plan and the agreements, programs, and efforts referred to in subsection (c) have not achieved the conservation goals established by the Range-Wide Plan.

(c) MONITORING OF PROGRESS OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall monitor and annually submit to Congress a report on progress in conservation of the lesser prairie-chicken under the Range-Wide Plan and all related—

(1) Candidate Conservation Agreements and Candidate and Conservation Agreements With Assurances;

(2) other Federal conservation programs administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Department of Agriculture;

(3) State conservation programs; and

(4) private conservation efforts.

SEC. ____ . REMOVAL OF ENDANGERED SPECIES STATUS FOR AMERICAN BURYING BEETLE.

Notwithstanding the final rule of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the American Burying Beetle" (54 Fed. Reg. 29652 (July 13, 1989)), the American burying beetle shall not be listed as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MCCAIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am fully aware that we are not going to be able to get past a unanimous consent request, but I wanted to make sure the Chair knew and others know that we have an amendment that I will do the best I can to bring out.

It is an amendment that already has 21 cosponsors. There is a provision in the Senate bill that was put in by the Senate that is not in the House bill that has to do with commissaries. It is viewed upon as privatizing commissaries. It is not really that. It is an attempt to evaluate the idea of the commissaries being privatized by using five commissaries as test cells to see what kind of result we would get if we did privatize them.

What we are doing with my amendment is taking it back—taking that language out—in order to go ahead with an assessment before we do that. It wouldn't make sense to me that if we wanted to get this done, even if we felt very passionately about privatizing, that we would do it before we had an assessment. So the assessment would be first.

We had a lot of discussion about this in the Senate Armed Services Committee. As I said, we now have 21 cosponsors who would like to reverse this so we can do the assessment and then make the determination.

It is kind of interesting, even though most people say privatizing is not going to actually save or make any money, the amendment simply requires the assessment on privatizing before we make any significant changes to our servicemembers' privatized com-

missary benefits. This is something that is very popular among members of our service, wives, and husbands, when surveyed last year. Approximately, 95 percent of the servicemembers were using the commissaries to purchase household goods to achieve needed savings in their family budgets with a 91-percent satisfaction rate. We don't get 91 percent satisfaction rates around here very often. The language in this bill as it is now ignores the recommendations made by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission that we are all very familiar with. In the report released in January, it specifically stated, in recommendation No. 8, "to protect access and savings to DOD commissaries and exchanges." Well, that is exactly what we want to do.

I have a very impressive list, which I will not read, of 41 organizations and associations, including labor unions, the Gold Star Widows, American Veterans, and others, and I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING INHOFE/MIKULSKI AMENDMENT

1. National Military and Veterans Alliance
2. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations Teamsters
3. The Coalition to Save Our Military Shopping Benefits
4. National Guard Association of the United States
5. Military Officers Association of America
6. American Federation of Government Employees
7. Veterans of Foreign Wars
8. Armed Forces Marketing Council
9. American Logistics Association
10. American Military Retirees Association
11. American Military Society
12. American Retirees Association
13. Army and Navy Union
14. Gold Star Widows
15. International Brotherhood of Teamsters
16. Military Order of Foreign Wars
17. Military Order of the Purple Heart
18. National Association for Uniformed Services
19. National Defense Committee
20. Society of Military Widows
21. The Flag and General Officers Network
22. Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors
23. Uniformed Services Disabled Retirees
24. Vietnam Veterans of America
25. Fleet Reserve Association
26. National Military Family Association
27. Military Officers Association of America
28. The Retired Enlisted Association
29. Association of the United States Army
30. American Veterans
31. United States Army Warrant Officers Association
32. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America
33. Association of the United States Navy
34. Air Force Sergeants Association
35. Military Partners and Families Coalition
36. National Association for Uniformed Services

37. American Military Retirees Association
38. The American Military Partner Association

39. American Logistics Association
40. Reserve Officer Association
41. Air Force Association

Mr. INHOFE. I also have a synopsis of letters of support that is from six different organizations, including the Military Officers Association of America; the Armed Forces Marketing Council; the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO; the American Military Retirees Association; and saveourbenefit.org.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the synopsis of these six letters representing these organizations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA: "This amendment requires a study in lieu of the Senate Armed Service Committee (SASC) language that mandate a privatization pilot in at least five commissaries chosen from the commissary agency's largest U.S. markets. MOAA commends this approach. To conduct a privatization pilot without proper assessment could result in unintended consequences, putting this highly valued benefit at risk. The commissary is a vital part of military compensation providing a significant benefit to military families. The average family of four who shops exclusively at the commissary sees a savings of up to 30 percent."

ARMED FORCES MARKETING COUNCIL: "What is at stake for military families: Loss of up to 30% savings on a market basket of products for military families. That equates to over \$4000 per year for a family of four. Loss of jobs for military family members. Over 60 percent of DeCA employees are military related and their jobs are transferable, allowing them to retain their positions and seniority when the military provides permanent change of station orders. Families would be required to pay sales taxes on groceries. Loss of a cherished benefit that is enjoyed by 95% of the active force. Loss of traffic at commissaries will adversely impact sales in military exchanges by up to 40%. This will diminish the dividend that supports quality of life programs for military families."

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS: "The commissary system is a vital benefit to our nation's active military, their families, and veterans across the country. The system provides thousands of jobs for American Teamsters in the warehouse, shipping, and food distribution industries. Commissaries also provide a needed benefit for military spouses and family members, who make up nearly 30 percent of Department of Commissary employees."

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (AFL-CIO): "The Department of Defense's (DoD) commissaries and exchanges (Army and Air Force Exchange Service, AAFES) are an earned benefit treasured by military families and an important contributor to their quality of life. The modest cost of providing military families with inexpensive but essential goods and services is almost invisible in the Department's overall budget. Given that privatization of the commissaries has been repeatedly rejected by the executive and legislative branches and

that this option was explicitly not recommended by a recent commission which looked comprehensively at the commissaries, it makes no sense to begin to privatize the commissaries before understanding the impact on costs and services as well as morale and recruitment. Senator Inhofe's amendment would wisely direct DoD to study the impact of privatization, and the Government Accountability Office to review the DoD's finding, before the Department is directed to privatize the commissaries."

AMERICAN MILITARY RETIREES ASSOCIATION: "The American Military Retirees Association believes commissary and exchanges are a vital part of military pay and compensation. Ninety percent of the military community uses these benefits and consistently rank[s] them as a top compensation benefit, yielding returns that far outweigh taxpayer support. They also provide critical jobs for military families and veterans—over 60 percent of employees are military affiliated—and provide healthy living alternatives both stateside and overseas."

SAVEOURBENEFIT.ORG: "The Inhofe-Mikulski amendment offers a sensible, pragmatic and thoughtful approach to examining private operation of military commissaries. Senators Inhofe and Mikulski are right. Study before deciding to implement. Nearly 40 organizations—representing tens of millions of active duty, Guard and Reserve, retirees, military families, veterans and survivors—agree. The Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (MCRMC) surveyed the private sector and found no interest among major retailers to operate on military bases. The Commission, chartered by the Senate, found that commissaries were worth preserving and recommended changes to the current structure—not privatization."

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my intention, as soon as we get to the point where we can get into the queue and get unanimous consent to set the current business aside—it would be my intention to do that to consider this amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on amendment No. 1569 be moved to 3 p.m. today. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call up the following amendments: Ernst No. 1549, Gillibrand No. 1578, Whitehouse No. 1693, Fischer-Booker No. 1825, Collins No. 1660, Cardin No. 1468; that at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, June 16, the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Fischer-Booker No. 1825; Collins No. 1660; Cardin No. 1468; Gillibrand No. 1578; Ernst No. 1549; Whitehouse No. 1693; Durbin No. 1559, as modified; and Paul No. 1543; that there be no second-degree amendments in order to any of these amendments

prior to the votes, and that the Gillibrand, Ernst, Whitehouse, Durbin, and Paul amendments require a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption; also, that there be 2 minutes equally divided between the votes and that all votes after the first be 10 minutes in length.

I further ask that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the McCain substitute amendment No. 1463 occur at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, June 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I initially say to my impatient friend, he has to be patient and allow me to say a few words. During the short time we have been in the minority, we have behaved in a way that I think is proper for a responsible minority. For example, on this bill dealing with the authorization of our defense capacity in the United States, we have been very clear how we support the troops. But remember, we have this little difficult issue. The President of the United States has said he is going to veto this bill. So we have worked through all this with that in mind. Having said that, in spite of that, we did not ask for a cloture vote on the motion to proceed. When we were in the majority, having the minority not do that was a big day. It happened extremely rarely. We have been doing that consistently—with some exceptions but not many.

On this Defense bill, we have allowed amendments to become pending. There are a dozen or so pending right now. We have allowed the Senate to conduct votes. We have allowed managers' amendments to be cleared—lots of them. We have reacted in a responsible way. We have no regret for having done that.

The two managers were working together to get amendments pending in a mutually agreed-upon fashion when out of the blue, up comes this cyber security amendment. It was also done in a very unusual way where Senator BURR employed parliamentary devices to get the cyber security bill pending to where we are right now. We could have been playing around all week with our offering amendments, but I have always felt that it should be done extremely rarely, for the minority to do something like that. We could have done that.

If you look at the amendments that have been offered by us Democrats, they are all, with rare exception, dealing with the security of this Nation—not sage grouse, not all the other things the Republicans have brought up in this bill.

To say that the Ex-Im Bank and the cyber security amendments have impeded progress is a gross understatement. The cyber security bill is a major bill in its own way—a major bill. I can speak with some authority in this

regard. Five years ago, I got every committee chair who had jurisdiction over this subject and we met over a period of days to come up with a cyber security bill. We did that. Republicans stopped us. We kept getting a smaller group of people involved as we were narrowing the bill, and we actually were scheduled to finally have a vote on the cyber security bill. It wasn't as good as I thought we should have, but it was an important bill. And what happened on that? The chamber of commerce made a call to some of the Republican leaders in the Senate, and suddenly that bill was gone and we were voting on another ObamaCare amendment that, of course, went nowhere.

But we have tried cyber security.

The Intelligence Committee reported out this bill, and I appreciate that they did. It was on a bipartisan basis, but it also contains a lot of matter within the jurisdiction of other committees—for example, the Homeland Security Committee and the Judiciary Committee.

To her credit, the ranking member, Senator FEINSTEIN, recognized that and went to the Democrats and said: We will work with you and make sure the problems you have with this bill when it gets to the floor—we will work with you on this.

Senator FEINSTEIN is a person of her word. I know she will do that, and she will do that.

This morning, the Republican leader, who is on the floor, was saying that we just had an attack on 4 million people and that it is Obama's fault. I think that is stretching things a little bit, especially recognizing that I have only given a brief travel through the times we have tried to get up the cyber security legislation. We should take the time to do it right.

I have told the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and I have checked with our ranking member of the Finance Committee, who is extremely interested—and hasn't been for 10 minutes or 10 days or 10 months but 10 years—in privacy. He has been our leader on privacy on this side of the aisle, and he believes we could finish it, if we had a free shot at this cyber bill, in a couple of days—and I agree with him—at the most. So we are not trying to avoid cyber. I believe—we believe it is an important part of what we need to do. But we should take time to do it right. We should not be tacking this important piece of legislation onto a bill the President has already said he is going to veto just so the Republicans can blame Obama for vetoing this bill as well.

If the majority would withdraw their cyber amendment and agree to take it up after this bill, we could do it in a couple of days and then we could return to working on the Defense bill. But we cannot take up all these new amendments my friend the chairman of

the committee wants to set up votes on—we have the 9 he talks about, plus 6; that is 15—until we resolve this matter dealing with cyber security.

So without belaboring the point—and I appreciate my impatient friend being patient with me and listening to me go through all of this—I ask the majority leader or my friend the chairman of the Armed Services Committee if he would modify his consent request as follows.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to amendment No. 1569—that is cyber security—as modified, be withdrawn; that the pending amendment No. 1569—again, that is cyber security—as modified, be withdrawn; and that upon the disposition of H.R. 1735, the Defense authorization bill, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, S. 754. That is the bill which came out of the Intelligence Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am going to propose a modification of the consent request propounded by the Democratic leader: that following disposition of H.R. 2685, the Defense appropriations bill, the Senate turn to consideration of S. 754, the cyber security measure reported by the Senate Intelligence Committee. I further ask that there be 10 relevant amendments to be offered by each bill manager or designee, with 1 hour of debate followed by a vote on the amendments offered, with a 60-vote threshold on those amendments that are not germane to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to my friend's modification, I repeat, the cyber security bill is important and the Senate should turn to it, but putting it after the Defense appropriations bill is a false promise. It is a facade. I think it is very clear. I heard the Republican leader give a speech on the floor today that he knows, unless there are some changes made, we are not going to get on the Defense appropriations bill. So this is a false promise.

If we could do it in a more specific, determined time, that would be one thing, but the Republican leader obviously has no plan to complete the Defense appropriations bill if this is how we are proceeding; rather, they are proceeding ahead with his partisan budget plan—a plan the President said will not become law.

Until Republicans sit down to work out a bipartisan Senate budget, the Senate will not finish the Defense authorization bill. Once again, the right way to do this would be to consider the cyber security bill on its own merits after the Defense authorization bill is done. It would take 2 days.

So I ask the majority leader if he would modify his consent request to the following: that upon disposition of the Defense authorization bill, H.R. 1735, the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 28, S. 754, which is the cyber security bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will object, I will point out that the Defense appropriations bill was reported out of the Appropriations Committee today with only three members voting against it. There was a lot of discussion about the Democratic leader saying "We are not going to pass the bill," but when the votes were counted, only three members—all on the Democratic side but only three—voted against reporting the bill out of committee.

My good friend the Democratic leader and I have had this discussion back and forth, but one of the advantages of being in the majority is that we set the schedule, and we are going to do the Defense appropriations bill after we do the Defense authorization bill; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

Mr. REID. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Does the Senator from Arizona modify his request with the request of the Democratic leader?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, may I make a couple of comments real quick before the distinguished majority leader modifies his request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would remind my good friend from Nevada, the Democratic leader, for the last 2 years we took up the Defense authorization bill, and it was taken up so late there was not a single amendment—not a single, solitary amendment on the Defense authorization bill for the last 2 years. So I understand the Democratic leader's commitment to amendments. It is too bad that for 2 years we never had a single amendment to the Defense authorization bill.

As far as relevant amendments are concerned, one of the things about this body is that everybody has the right to propose an amendment until their amendments are not made germane. The three pending Democratic amendments we have now on the bill are not germane.

So all I can say is that I hope we can get a modification. I hope we can move forward.

I just wish to point out one more time what I know that my colleagues have heard over and over, and I will make it brief. Henry Kissinger testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the world has never been in

more crises. This world is at risk, and we have to—we have to protect the men and women who are serving in our security. I would argue that a national defense authorization act is probably more important now than it has been at any time in recent history.

I refuse to modify my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's original request?

Mr. REID. Which Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. REID. Yes, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on amendment No. 1569 be moved to 3 p.m. today and that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will be extremely brief. We can have a debate here. We can look at all the press clippings of both sides on what happened in the last 2 years on Defense authorization. We didn't get a bill. We got a bill, but it was done in secret by the managers of the two bills in the House and the Senate. The reason that happened—it wasn't our fault. They wouldn't let us on the bill—"they" meaning the Republicans. So we can debate that all we want. Those are the facts.

I do not object to my friend's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the McCain substitute amendment No. 1463.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the McCain amendment No. 1463 to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John McCain, Richard C. Shelby, Jeff Flake, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Jeff Sessions, Shelley Moore Capito, Lamar

Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Joni Ernst, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Kelly Ayotte, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk with respect to the underlying House bill, H.R. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John McCain, Richard C. Shelby, Jeff Flake, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Jeff Sessions, Shelley Moore Capito, Lamar Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Joni Ernst, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Kelly Ayotte, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 1569, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in just a moment, the Senate will consider an important cyber security measure. I urge every one of my colleagues to support it.

USA TODAY recently cited a cyber security expert who noted that this Senate legislation has the potential to greatly reduce the number of victims targeted by the kinds of hackers we have seen in recent years. It contains modern tools to help deter future attacks against both the government and the private sector, to provide them with knowledge to erect stronger defenses, and to get the word out faster about attacks when they are detected.

The top Democrat on the Intelligence Committee reminded us that the cyber security measure before us would also protect individual privacy and civil liberties. She has urged Congress to "act quickly" to deter a threat that is literally impossible to overstate.

The White House has also urged Congress to act.

The new Congress has been asked to act, and today we are, with a good, strong, transparent, bipartisan measure which has been thoroughly vetted by both parties in committee and which has been available for months—literally months—for anyone to read. It was endorsed by nearly every Democrat and every Republican on the Intelligence Committee, 14 to 1. It is also backed by a broad coalition of supporters, everyone from the Chamber of Commerce to the United States Telecom Association.

It is legislation that is all about protecting our country, which is why it makes perfect sense to consider it alongside defense legislation with the very same aim. Cyber security amendments can be offered, and the debate will continue.

So let's work together to advance this measure. There are now 4 million extra reasons for Congress to act quickly. The sooner we do, the sooner we can conference it with similar legislation that passed the House and get a good cyber security law enacted to help protect our country. The opportunity to begin doing that will come in a few moments with a vote for cloture on this bipartisan cyber security bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have on the Senate floor an authorization bill for about \$600 billion—Defense authorization for about \$600 billion. I can't imagine the procedural games, the chicanery involved in this. Why did we yesterday have on this bill something on Ex-Im Bank? Was it just to check it off so they could say we tried and Democrats wouldn't let us do it? Why would we have on this \$600 billion bill dealing with the security of this Nation something else that also deals with the security of this Nation and that deserves a separate piece of legislation so we can have amendments and talk about that? We have agreed to do it in a very short period of time.

There is no good reason for doing it this way. We should limit the matter at hand to the Defense authorization bill at some \$600 billion, and then we have agreed to go to cyber security. We are willing to do that. But I cannot imagine—I cannot imagine—why the Republican leader is doing this. It makes a mockery of the legislative process.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield to the ranking member of the committee for a question.

Mr. WYDEN. Leader, I strongly oppose cloture on this cyber measure and I want to ask the Senator a question.

I think we all understand how dangerous hackers are. They are increasingly sophisticated. The most dangerous hackers rarely use the same technique twice. I believe what the Senator is saying is we can't deal with this responsibly by stapling the cyber bill to something else. Is that one of the key reasons the leader is opposing this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, respectfully, I suggest we are on leader time now. My time is protected—or used to be—and the Senator asked me a question. I yielded to him for a question. He should have the right to answer the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. I will be very brief.

I oppose cloture on the cyber measure. I think what the leader is saying is that the cyber measure is so serious we shouldn't deal with it by stapling it to something else. It is so important we ought to have an opportunity over that 2-day period to deal with it separately; is that the leader's view?

Mr. REID. Without any question.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 1569, as modified, to the McCain amendment No. 1463 to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, David Perdue, Bob Corker, Michael B. Enzi, Susan M. Collins, Jeff Flake, Mike Rounds, Richard Burr, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Daniel Coats, John McCain, Deb Fischer, Tom Cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1569, as modified, offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, for the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURR, to the substitute amendment No. 1463, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Cassidy	Daines
Ayotte	Coats	Donnelly
Barrasso	Cochran	Enzi
Bennet	Collins	Ernst
Blunt	Corker	Fischer
Boozman	Cornyn	Flake
Burr	Cotton	Gardner
Capito	Crapo	Graham

Grassley	McCain	Scott
Hatch	McConnell	Sessions
Hoever	Moran	Shelby
Inhofe	Murkowski	Sullivan
Isakson	Nelson	Thune
Johnson	Perdue	Tillis
King	Portman	Toomey
Kirk	Risch	Vitter
Klobuchar	Roberts	Warner
Lankford	Rounds	Wicker
Manchin	Sasse	

NAYS—40

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Sanders
Boxer	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Lee	Shaheen
Cardin	Markey	Stabenow
Carper	McCaskill	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Mikulski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Paul	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Merkley
Leahy	Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 40.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WELCOMING VISITORS FROM WHEATON COLLEGE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, now that we concluded the vote, I would like to announce for the RECORD that I am privileged and honored to be able to host a number of people from my alma mater, Wheaton College. The board of trustees is holding a meeting here in Washington. They are visiting the Capitol and we are about to go on a tour.

I want to thank them for their service to our college and to America. They are spending a good amount of time here working through issues that are very important to the school. Wheaton College is an evangelical school that has been true to the faith in dealing with the challenges that exist today. I am pleased to be able to acknowledge that they are here visiting the Capitol, and enjoying the sites of Washington while making some tough decisions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

(The remarks of Mr. SANDERS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1564 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

FEDERAL VEHICLE REPAIR COST SAVINGS ACT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan legislation I introduced with

my colleague Senator LANKFORD, the Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act.

I am pleased the Senate is considering the first bill I introduced as a Senator, which was approved by the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on a unanimous vote earlier this year.

I appreciate Senator LANKFORD partnering with me to work on this legislation in committee and as it has moved to the Senate floor. I look forward to continuing to work with him as a member of the subcommittee he chairs, the Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management Subcommittee.

I also appreciate that my colleague from Michigan Representative HUIZENGA has introduced bipartisan companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

The Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act is a bipartisan, commonsense measure that will help save taxpayers money and promote conservation by encouraging Federal agencies to use remanufactured auto parts when they are maintaining their fleets of vehicles.

In addition to saving money, this legislation also supports remanufacturing suppliers and their employees in Michigan and across the country. Remanufactured parts are usually less expensive than similar parts and have been returned to same-as-new condition using a standardized industrial process.

The United States is the largest producer, consumer, and exporter of remanufactured goods. Remanufacturing of motor vehicle parts accounts for over 30,000 full-time U.S. jobs, and our country employs over 20,000 workers remanufacturing off-road equipment.

In addition to the cost savings using remanufactured parts, it also has significant environmental benefits. Remanufacturing saves energy by reusing raw materials such as iron, aluminum, and copper. On average, the remanufacturing process saves approximately 85 percent of the energy and material used to manufacture equivalent new products.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 565, the Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act, commonsense legislation that is good for taxpayers, our environment, and American manufacturers.

Mr. President, I also rise to support the bipartisan Ayotte-Peters amendment to authorize bilateral research and development with Israel on anti-tunnel capabilities.

I appreciate Senator AYOTTE's efforts to work together on this critical matter of national security. Israel remains our closest ally in the Middle East, and this amendment will further our shared cooperation to increase security for both Americans and Israelis.

Our ally Israel faces significant threats from underground tunnels built by terrorists intent on murdering innocent Israelis. Hamas and Hezbollah

threaten Israel with an extensive network of sophisticated tunnels which are used to smuggle weapons and carry out kidnappings and attacks against Israeli citizens.

These are not simple tunnels dug by hand with shovels. These tunnels cost millions of dollars and are built with thousands of tons of concrete. Often they are built using resources intended for humanitarian purposes in Gaza but are instead diverted to terrorist activity. They are constructed with machinery designed to avoid detection. In some cases, Hamas has filled the tunnels with provisions to last several months. The Israeli Defense Forces called the tunnels underneath Gaza an underground city of terror.

Bomb attacks from tunnels dug by terrorist organizations are a growing threat to forward deployed U.S. forces and our diplomatic personnel abroad. Terrorists carry out these attacks by digging tunnels underneath a target and detonating explosives.

Earlier this week, the publication Defense One reported that ISIS is also using tunnel bombs as a tactic, detonating at least 45 tunnel bombs in Iraq and Syria over the last 2 years.

We face threats from tunnels on American soil as well. Our own Border Patrol and law enforcement on the southern border are up against drug smugglers, human traffickers, and other global criminal organizations using tunnels to sneak drugs, weapons, and people across our border illegally.

I serve on the Homeland Security Committee and understand the threat our Border Patrol agents and law enforcement face from transnational criminal organizations using tunnels along our southern border. These criminals flow to the path of least resistance, and as our border security efforts address one threat, they seek other methods to avoid detection and continue their criminal activity.

When the U.S. Border Patrol blocked drug smugglers and human traffickers from utilizing existing drainage tunnels, the criminals began digging their own tunnels. We need to stay ahead of these threats, and that is why we must conduct critical research and development so we can detect and destroy these dangerous tunnels.

This amendment will authorize joint research and development with Israel on anti-tunnel capabilities. This joint approach will help us work together on research and development against this shared threat.

The amendment requires Israel to share in the cost of this research and provides a framework for sharing intellectual property developed together before action is carried out. This amendment will allow the Department of Defense to work with Israel to develop a capability that will be used to protect our homeland and our troops abroad as well as those of our ally.

This amendment will make clear that joint research and development on anti-tunnel capabilities can and should be part of our security cooperation with Israel. It will also send a strong message that the Senate recognizes the threat posed by tunnels intended for attacks against Israel, and this cooperation will help us secure our own borders as well.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Ayotte-Peters amendment No. 1628.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 1569, as modified, be withdrawn; that the next first-degree amendments in order to H.R. 1735, the Defense authorization bill, be the Gillibrand amendment No. 1578 and the Ernst amendment No. 1549; and that the Gillibrand and Ernst amendments be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1549 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I call up the Ernst amendment No. 1549.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for Mrs. ERNST, proposes an amendment numbered 1549 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for a temporary, emergency authorization of defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government)

At the end of section 1229, add the following:

(c) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to promote a stable and unified Iraq, including by directly providing the Kurdistan Regional Government military and security forces associated with the Government of Iraq with defense articles, defense services, and related training, on an emergency and temporary basis, to more effectively partner with the United States and other international coalition members to defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(d) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) MILITARY ASSISTANCE.—The President, in consultation with the Government of Iraq, is authorized to provide defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to Kurdistan Regional Government military

and security forces associated with the Government of Iraq for the purpose of supporting international coalition efforts against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and any successor group or associated forces.

(2) DEFENSE EXPORTS.—The President is authorized to issue licenses authorizing United States exporters to export defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government military and security forces described in paragraph (1). For purposes of processing applications for such export licenses, the President is authorized to accept End Use Certificates approved by the Kurdistan Regional Government.

(3) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance authorized under paragraph (1) and exports authorized under paragraph (2) may include anti-tank and anti-armor weapons, armored vehicles, long-range artillery, crew-served weapons and ammunition, secure command and communications equipment, body armor, helmets, logistics equipment, excess defense articles and other military assistance that the President determines to be appropriate.

(e) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—

(1) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Assistance authorized under subsection (b)(1) and licenses for exports authorized under subsection (d)(2) shall be provided pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), notwithstanding any requirement in such applicable provisions of law that a recipient of assistance of the type authorized under subsection (d)(1) shall be a country or international organization. In addition, any requirement in such provisions of law applicable to such countries or international organizations concerning the provision of end use retransfers and other assurance required for transfers of such assistance should be secured from the Kurdistan Regional Government.

(2) CONSTRUCTION AS PRECEDENT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as establishing a precedent for the future provision of assistance described in subsection (d) to organizations other than a country or international organization.

(f) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(A) A timeline for the provision of defense articles, defense services, and related training under the authority of subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2).

(B) A description of mechanisms and procedures for end-use monitoring of such defense articles, defense services, and related training.

(C) How such defense articles, defense services, and related training would contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States, as well as impact security in the region.

(2) UPDATES.—Not later than 180 days after the submission of the report required by paragraph (1), and every 180 days thereafter through the termination pursuant to subsection (i) of the authority in subsection (d), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report updating the previous report submitted under this subsection. In addition to any matters so updated, each report shall include a description of any delays, and the cir-

cumstances surrounding such delays, in the delivery of defense articles, defense services, and related training to the Kurdistan Regional Government pursuant to the authority in subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2).

(3) FORM.—Any report under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(4) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(g) NOTIFICATION.—The President should provide notification to the Government of Iraq, when practicable, not later than 15 days before providing defense articles, defense services, or related training to the Kurdistan Regional Government under the authority of subsection (d)(1) or (d)(2).

(h) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “defense article”, “defense service”, and “training” have the meanings given those terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

(i) TERMINATION.—The authority to provide defense articles, defense services, and related training under subsection (d)(1) and the authority to issue licenses for exports authorized under subsection (d)(2) shall terminate on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1578 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

(Purpose: To reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Mr. REED. I ask that the pending amendment be set aside and on behalf of Senator GILLIBRAND I call up amendment No. 1578.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for Mrs. GILLIBRAND, proposes an amendment numbered 1578 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of June 3, 2015, under “Text of Amendments.”)

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, as is obvious, we have an agreement to votes on both the Gillibrand and Ernst amendments. I would imagine it may require a recorded vote, but I am not positive. Then, we are planning on moving forward with additional amendments as agreed to by both sides and a managers’ package as well. That is our

intention. I am told that at some point there may be a cloture motion on the bill as well.

So I wish to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his continued cooperation, and hopefully we can get as many Members' amendments as possible up and voted on and finish the bill, at the soonest, next week.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I await the impressive and loquacious and convincing words of the Senator from Texas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Arizona, but if I am going to be as loquacious as he suggested, it may take me a little more than 10 minutes, so I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last few days, this Chamber has been discussing the Defense authorization bill, thus fulfilling one of our basic responsibilities as part of the Federal Government; that is, our national security, and in the process making sure our warfighters—the people who are on the cutting edge of the knife, so to speak, in terms of our national security—have the resources we are morally committed and duty-bound to provide them.

So when voting for the Defense authorization bill, we as legislators are fulfilling our responsibilities, just as those who wear the uniform are performing their duties—no more, no less—although I must say ours is a tad safer than they are experiencing, to be sure.

With so much at stake for the security of our country, the well-being of our folks in uniform as well as the families of those servicemembers hanging in the balance, as I mentioned yesterday, it is particularly disappointing that the Democratic leader has characterized the discussion of this bill as “a waste of time.” I really have to believe he would want to take those words back because it certainly is not a waste of time.

Unfortunately, it is becoming more and more evident that the threats of the Democratic leader and the President of the United States to stall Re-

publicans' efforts to get this bill passed quickly is just the first step to a larger political strategy. The reason I know that is not because it just occurred to me—an epiphany—it is because they said so in the pages of the Washington Post just yesterday.

The headline says it all: “Democrats prepare for filibuster summer.” That is the headline in the Washington Post yesterday.

The article goes on to say: “Democrats have decided to block all spending bills starting with the defense appropriations measure headed to the floor next week.”

So imagine my surprise when yesterday the Democratic leader came to the floor and accused Republicans of threatening to shut down the government, the same day his colleague, the senior Senator from New York, detailed their strategy to block all appropriations bills, in the Washington Post.

One thing we have to love about our friends across the aisle: They are not unclear, nor are they timid, about telling us what their plans are. Indeed, it is there for the world to read and for us to read.

But let me say it again. Hours after the Democratic leader laid out their plans to filibuster all government spending bills, their leader claimed Republicans were the ones threatening a shutdown.

This type of cynical political maneuvering is what the American people so soundly rejected in the last election on November 4. Stifling debate and shutting down the Senate are not what the American people sent us to do, and it is certainly not what my constituents expect me to do on their behalf.

Today, our colleagues across the aisle have now blocked an amendment that would provide for greater sharing of information to address the rampant and growing cyber threat this country faces. The sharing of cyber threat information will help us as a country deter future cyber attacks, and it helps both the public and the private sector to act in a more nimble way when attacks are detected. So the fact that seven Democrats joined virtually all Republicans to move forward with this bill, tells me the Democratic position is not monolithic. In other words, when the Democratic leader and the senior Senator from New York say it is our plan to shut down the Senate and not to cooperate to get the people's work done, not every Member of the Democratic minority are comfortable with that cynical strategy—and good for them.

The refusal to move forward with this legislation, particularly the cyber security part of this discussion, is just unconscionable.

Let me give my colleagues some other headlines. Just last week, there was a massive breach at the Office of Personnel Management. The sensitive

personal information of up to 4 million—4 million—current and former Federal employees may have been compromised. There are now reports that the stolen data includes login information and credentials that is actively being traded, bought, and sold online.

Now, we will await the details of the current investigation into this, but we know it has great potential to harm not only the privacy interests and the financial interests of the people affected but also our national security. We know there are state actors—notably China and Russia—who are, on a regular basis, engaged in cyber attacks against the United States in an effort to steal our intellectual property as well as in order to do intelligence operations using the Internet and using cyber space.

Now, in terms of the personal interests of these employees, it may expose them—many of whom may work with national security matters—to further targeting by hackers, identity thieves, and even foreign intelligence agents.

At the end of last month, it was reported that the data of more than 100,000 taxpayers was stolen at the IRS. Just so colleagues understand the reason for my concern, the former Acting Director of the CIA, on June 11, 2015, when asked about former Senator and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's decision to put all of her official emails at the Secretary of State's office on a private email server, Michael Morell said: “I think that foreign intelligence services, the good ones, have everything on any unclassified network that the government uses.”

So not only do they have it on unclassified networks such as the one Hillary Clinton maintained, but also if they are able to breach the security measures we have in place on government networks, they are happy to steal that for whatever their purpose may be, whether it is intelligence-gathering or whether it is economic harm that they can impose on American citizens by hacking their identity or stealing their bank accounts or what have you.

So we also have to be worried about the 100,000 people whose accounts were hacked at the IRS. The suggestion that was made by the IRS Commissioner at the Finance Committee recently is that these identity thieves steal this information so they can then file false tax returns and then claim the refunds or the other credit that those taxpayers would have otherwise been able to receive. Imagine when these 100,000 or so taxpayers go about the business of filing their own tax returns, only to find out that a cyber thief has stolen their identity and filed a tax return and taken their refund or their tax credit before they ever had a chance to do it.

At the IRS, we know the breach included access to past tax returns. As we all know, we have to put a lot of

sensitive information on tax returns. That is why they are not public information. But they also include sensitive information such as Social Security numbers, addresses, birth dates—all stolen and potentially in the hands of criminals.

The hypocrisy of the administration in this area is just breathtaking. It was just June 6—last Saturday—that Josh Earnest, the White House Press Secretary, chastised Congress, on behalf of the President of the United States, for not acting urgently enough on the issue of cyber security. Here is what Mr. Earnest said: “We need the United States Congress to come out of the Dark Ages and actually join us here in the 21st century to make sure that we have the kinds of defenses that are necessary to protect a modern computer system.”

That is what White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest said on June 6, 2015.

Then our colleagues on the Democratic side have the temerity to come here and block the very type of legislation that the White House has called for. How hypocritical can you get? How cynical can you get? Indeed, the Democratic leader then says, well, they are doing everything the way they should be doing it, and it is really a Republican conspiracy to shut down the government.

These are just the most recent examples of a threat that should be keeping us up at night—a threat that should cause us to quickly act to find solutions to the cyber security threat to the American people and to the United States Government and, yes, to our national security.

Some of our Democratic friends act as if the fact that we have decided to file an amendment to the Defense authorization bill, which represents an almost unanimous vote of the bipartisan vote of the Senate Intelligence Committee, was some sort of dirty trick—that we pulled a fast one on them. Well, this legislation has been out there for the world to see for quite a while now, and it was negotiated by the senior Senator from California, the ranking member on the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator BURR, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, and as I said, it only had one dissenting vote in the Senate Intelligence Committee. So to have the gall to come on the Senate floor and act as if this is some sort of pulling a fast one or some sort of trick is just disingenuous. I could probably think of some other words to describe it, too, but “disingenuous” will have to suffice for now.

To come out here and to block debate on a vote on a cyber security bill at a time when the news is chock-full of the nature of this threat and its intrusive invasion into the privacy of the American people and its danger to our na-

tional security is just flat out irresponsible. These are not threats we can afford to ignore.

And here is the coup de grace—the icing on the cake. Two months ago the Democratic leader came to the floor and said he was “committed” to getting cyber security legislation done, and that was before these most recent attacks. So for the Democratic leader to claim this morning that Senate Republicans were—these are his words—using “deceitful ploys” to ensure our Nation is safe from these threats is really beyond the pale.

In addition to the clear and undeniable urgency of the problem, I would like to also point out that this was the same language that was, as I said, passed out of the Intelligence Committee in March. So perhaps you can understand why I am so confused by our Democratic colleagues’ position and actually by the White House’s position.

The White House called for cyber security legislation. Cyber security legislation gets voted out of the Senate Intelligence Committee 14 to 1. The Democratic leader said we need to act on cyber security, and we try to act on cyber security legislation, only to be blocked by the Democratic leader. All I can see is the Democratic leader’s “commitment” to work on cyber legislation has given way to partisan gamesmanship by our Democratic colleagues who are promising “a filibuster summer.” Well, welcome to the filibuster summer.

But this is not what the American people deserve. This isn’t why they sent us here, and this is what they affirmatively rejected this last election. But somehow our Democratic colleagues just can’t stand it that we have actually turned things around and we have been able to make some slow, incremental progress. We passed the first budget since 2009. You know, that should be a scandal, but I guess it represents progress that we finally have been able to do it with the new majority starting in January. We have worked with the White House to pass trade promotion authority and some things that are tough and are controversial on both sides of the aisle. We have taken a number of positive steps on child trafficking and on a number of other topics. Now we are trying to do our most basic duty and deal with our Nation’s defense, and that includes protecting our Nation’s cyber security infrastructure while we fund our Armed Forces to make sure they have the resources to do what they volunteered to do so bravely on our behalf.

The men and women of this country and particularly the men and women who wear the uniform of the U.S. military deserve better. This National Defense Authorization Act, this basic bill to which the cyber security language was being offered, has strong bipar-

tisan support, and it passed out of the Armed Services Committee overwhelmingly. And do you know what? It even authorizes funding levels at the figure requested by the President of the United States. Yet our Senate Democratic colleagues are still dragging their feet, refusing to allow us to vote on amendments to this bill and defeating the very cyber security provision that the Democratic leader said we ought to get to and that Josh Earnest chastised Congress for not passing. Yet Members of his own political party—the President’s own political party—blocked that cyber security legislation.

So this bill should not be held hostage to political gamesmanship. The American people’s security and safety should not be held hostage to political gamesmanship, and the Senate, which used to be known as the world’s greatest deliberative body, should not be used just purely for partisan gain.

So I hope that the seven Democrats who actually voted to proceed on this cyber security bill will get some more allies. I can tell that not all of our friends across the aisle are comfortable with the Democratic leader’s direction to block this cyber security legislation, and perhaps over the weekend, some will have second thoughts. I hope as they have those second thoughts, they will focus on our collective duty to our troops and their families and to our duty as Members of the Senate to promote and protect the security of the American people.

So let’s get back to basics. Let’s do what the American people elected us to do by voting on a bipartisan bill that will protect our country and provide for our troops.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FERGUSON EFFECT

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, last month I was here on the Senate floor to address the topic of the riots in Baltimore and the unfortunate and completely misguided scapegoating of police officers that has been going on far too often in parts of our country today. So I rise again today on the same topic because in just the last month or so there have been some more very harmful developments in this area.

One of those developments is the dramatic decline in police arrests and a massive increase in violent crime and murders in the city of Baltimore. Now, some of my friends would say: Why is the Senator from Pennsylvania speaking out so often about these tragic circumstances that are happening in Baltimore? Well, first of all, as a U.S. Senator, I am concerned with what goes on

in our entire country, not just my State. Baltimore is a great American city that is going through a very difficult period, and we should all be concerned about it. Second of all, Baltimore is, of course, less than 100 miles away from Pennsylvania. Most importantly, what is happening in Baltimore is not happening only in Baltimore. The scapegoating of police and the rise of violent crime is happening in New York City and in other places as well. And, frankly, it is a threat to public safety and security in every city.

Some, including the police chief of St. Louis, MO, have described what has come to be known as the Ferguson effect. This can be traced back to the riots and lawlessness that followed the unfortunate death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO, last August. As you will remember, in the Ferguson case, Officer Darren Wilson acted in self-defense and shot and killed Brown when Brown attacked him while he was resisting arrest. In the weeks and months that followed the incident, and after Officer Wilson was cleared of wrongdoing, violent protests erupted. Protesters, police, and bystanders were injured. Buildings were burned to the ground. Property was destroyed. But instead of placing the onus on those who were actually causing the havoc, it was portrayed by many as if law enforcement was somehow responsible for the violence and unrest. Anti-law enforcement sentiments were even expressed by some of the local officials in Ferguson. This endorsement of violent protesters empowered those who wished to turn peaceful protests into violent riots, and it also left the police feeling powerless.

What has happened in Ferguson since is as tragic as it was predictable. The homicide rate in Ferguson increased 47 percent in the latter portion of 2014, and robberies in St. Louis County jumped by 82 percent. This really should be no surprise. This is what happens when a city puts these views of "police as the problem" into practice, such as when a city determines that police are the cause of the violence as opposed to the brave defense against it, when a city justifies lawlessness, stops law enforcement from doing its job, and allows law breakers to go unpunished. The results of those practices are that the innocent members of those very communities pay a horrible price.

These tragic circumstances are now playing out in the city of Baltimore. On April 18 of this year, many Baltimore residents began peaceful protests over the injury and eventual death of Mr. Freddie Gray while he was in police custody. As I mentioned in my speech about this last month, in my view, Freddie Gray's death absolutely calls out for justice and calls out for a thorough investigation, and the judicial process is now proceeding and playing out exactly as it should. But

what has happened in Baltimore since then is not about Freddie Gray.

A week after the Baltimore protests began, on April 25, they turned violent. Over the next 5 days rioters damaged 200 businesses. They set fire to a newly constructed senior center, burned down a CVS drugstore and cut the fire hose of the firemen who were trying to put out the flames, and set fire to 144 cars. And 130 law enforcement officers were injured, many seriously. The chaos was so extreme that the city had to impose a curfew for 5 days and had to call in 3,000 National Guard troops.

Now with all that mayhem, how did the public officials of Baltimore respond? On the first day of the violence, the mayor held a press conference in which she legitimized the violence. She said: "We also gave those who wish to destroy space to do that as well."

Seriously, space to destroy? Destroying other people's property, setting buildings and cars ablaze, attacking police officers? These are not legitimate acts, and no mayor should be accommodating those kinds of acts with "space." In fact, they are criminal. They are harmful. These are exactly the kinds of activities that a mayor should be all about stopping and preventing. But that is not all.

Next the Baltimore police were given a stand-down order, and they were forbidden from arresting the looters and the rioters. Then officials announced that half of all those arrested for the destruction and violence would be released without charges. Mobs would gather around police when they tried to enforce the law. All this is a clear illustration of the impact that the Ferguson effect is having on Baltimore.

Lawbreakers are in control, and the city's residents are at the mercy of the lawbreakers. Law enforcement has been limited because of a lack of support from the community and the civic and the political leaders.

Baltimore has seen the disastrous effects of this policy. The riots began to subside on April 30 when six police officers were arrested in the death of Mr. Gray, but the violence has continued. The month of May that just passed was Baltimore's deadliest month in over 40 years. There were 43 homicides in the month of May alone. Shootings have more than doubled compared to May of the previous year. These murders have nothing to do with anger over the death of Freddie Gray; they have everything to do with public policy that disparages police and turns a blind eye on criminal activity. You see, in Baltimore in the month of May, arrests were nearly 70 percent lower than the same month last year.

Some attempt to portray this whole crisis in racial terms, but tragically all too often the victims of this surge in violent crime are innocent African Americans who live in cities in which the police are no longer permitted to do their jobs.

Consider the case of an 8-year-old boy police found shot in the head on Thursday, May 28 at 8:20 a.m. He was lying dead beside his mother, who had also been fatally shot in the head.

Take the case of 23-year-old Charles Dobbins, who was killed on Monday, May 25. Charles' cousin reports that Charles was killed in a robbery. Charles worked at BWI. He worked transporting handicapped people to and from the terminals. He loved kids. When he graduated from high school, he worked for Baltimore city schools as a bus aid assisting disabled children.

Consider the case of 4-year-old Jacele Johnson. She was in a car with her teenage cousin when someone opened fire on the car, seriously wounding them both.

These are not just statistics; these are real people who are now lost to us. Their lives matter. That 8-year-old boy and his mother, 23-year-old Charles Dobbins, a little 4-year-old girl, Jacele Johnson, and her cousin—their lives matter.

The Ferguson effect, unfortunately, is not the only phenomenon that is at work here. Unfortunately, our President seems to have bought into the notion that the police are the problem and the solution is to deny them valuable tools.

This last month, the President announced extensive restrictions on when local police may access lifesaving Federal surplus equipment. The gear we are talking about is almost all purely defensive. It is riot helmets, riot shields, armored personnel transport vehicles. This is surplus gear. The Federal Government has already paid for it but has decided it has no use for it. It has long been the practice that this surplus protective gear has been made available to local police forces.

Why is this administration making it harder to send this purely defensive gear—gear that would otherwise go unused—to insufficiently protected police officers across the country? Why would the administration do that? Well, they released a report telling us why. Here is what they said in their own report. According to this report by the administration, the Federal equipment "could significantly undermine community trust" and that this concern outweighs the interest in "addressing law enforcement needs (that could not otherwise be fulfilled)." President Obama likewise opined that Federal equipment "can sometimes give people a feeling like there's an occupying force" and "can send the wrong message."

So this is the concern that justified keeping lifesaving gear from police officers. So, according to the administration, the need to save police officers' lives in the line of duty is something that should be weighed against and, in fact, sacrificed to the desire to prevent distrust or discomfort on the part of

others. How many police officers' lives are we going to sacrifice? One? Twenty? One-hundred? This is outrageous.

Each day across America, there are 780,000 law enforcement officers who put on a badge and uniform, and they answer the call of those in need no matter the danger. When others run away, they run to the problem. The rest of us in America rely on these law enforcement officers doing their job. The people who live in high-crime areas, often ethnic minorities living in high-poverty areas of our inner cities—these are the folks who most depend on those officers. When those officers are held back, we all pay a steep price, but the residents of those communities pay the steepest price.

I just hope we in the Federal Government will stop putting obstacles in the way of law enforcement and start supporting them. I hope we as a nation will stop scapegoating law enforcement and start thanking them. If we fail to reverse the Ferguson effect, what we will see is more violent crime and more suffering of our people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIPARTISANSHIP

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, over the past few years, bipartisanship has not always fared well in the Senate. We have been able to change the Chamber's culture for the better in 2015. Now that is in jeopardy once again.

In the first half of the year, we had a number of bipartisan accomplishments. It kicked off with the passage of the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act at the beginning of the year. The new law will provide the VA with the personnel, services, and proper tools to help veterans facing mental illness struggles, which is vital as it is estimated that 22 veterans commit suicide every day. The Clay Hunt act will help stop this tragic and unacceptable trend.

Then we were able to pass the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act in a unanimous fashion. This law will save lives. It will restore dignity to the victims of these heinous crimes, and it will help end modern-day slavery.

We followed that with legislation that will give Congress a voice in the President's negotiations with Iran over its illicit nuclear program. There was such a strong show of bipartisanship on this vote that it forced President Obama to drop his initial veto threat. Had we not maintained bipartisan

unity, there would be no review of the Iran deal. There would be nothing stopping President Obama from signing a bad agreement with Iran. It is because we stood together across party lines that the American people will now have a say in negotiations.

Before we adjourned for the Memorial Day work period, we approved granting the President trade promotion authority. We worked together to provide the President with the necessary tools to negotiate a fair trade deal while maintaining Congress's important role in the process.

I say all this to highlight what we can accomplish when we work together. Unfortunately, the minority leader seems intent on ending that streak.

We are in the midst of discussing another bill which should have substantial bipartisan support, the National Defense Authorization Act. Yet, Minority Leader REID has called this vital, traditionally bipartisan bill "a waste of time." This is a bill which, as the senior Senator from Arizona has noted, Congress has passed for 53 consecutive years, including those when the minority leader controlled the Senate schedule.

Far from a waste of time, the NDAA helps us modernize our military to face today's security challenges. We live in a dangerous world. We have to stay ahead of those who would seek to harm us, not fall behind them. This is no time to be dismissive of our national security needs.

It is also about the livelihood of over 1.4 million men and women on Active Duty and 718,000 civilian personnel. We are talking about the Nation's largest employer. The NDAA helps us ensure that we are doing everything we need to do to help them. So I think we can all agree there is much in this bill that needs to get done.

Unfortunately, the White House is taking what should be a bipartisan bill and using it to push for its own political end game to increase domestic spending. Worse yet, the President has somehow convinced Senate Democrats to go along with this misguided strategy.

Instead of approaching this in a bipartisan manner, the minority leader is forcing his caucus to carry water for President Obama, who has indicated he would veto the NDAA unless he gets the domestic spending increases he is demanding. That means the President stands ready to block the policy prescriptions and funding levels for the Department of Defense unless we give other agencies, such as the EPA, as they try their additional power grab through things like the Clean Water Act and extending that, and the IRS, as they waste money on bonuses for their employees—all of this is very dangerous.

There will be plenty of time to debate our domestic spending priorities

and allotments, but now is not the time. Let's get that bipartisan mentality back and finish the work that needs to be done to protect our Nation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, today, as I have for a number of weeks, I rise to speak about 11 North Dakotans who did not come home from the Vietnam war. Each of these men gave his life for our country.

Before I begin speaking about the 198 North Dakotans who died during Vietnam, I wish to thank my great friend, Bill Anderson of Rutland, ND. Bill is a marine, and he is a veteran of the Vietnam war.

Bill grew up in Rutland, attended the University of North Dakota, and then started law school at the University of Colorado. It was the late 1960s, and young men with college degrees were being drafted. So Bill left law school, enlisted in the Marine Corps, and was trained to be an officer. In 1970, he arrived in Vietnam and became the commander of the 2nd Platoon of Delta Company, 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment.

Bill's own written words about the impact the Vietnam war had on him strike me. He didn't choose to write about his blindness caused by the malaria vaccine that he took or his lymphoma caused by Agent Orange exposure. Instead, Bill focused on his experience in Vietnam and on the greatness of the 18- and 20-year-old Marines with whom he served. Bill writes:

I am proud, every day, of the Marines I served with in Vietnam. They did not shrink from danger. They did not flinch at combat. They did their duty with steadfast courage of United States Marines, and for that Americans can, and should, be proud and grateful.

I am grateful for Bill's service to our country. I am also proud of his service to my State. After his time in the Marines, Bill ran his family-owned insurance business. And then, when he was 40 years old and had lost most of his vision, he returned to law school. Since the 1980s, Bill has served many communities in southeastern North Dakota as a private practice lawyer. In fact, I can tell you this, as a lawyer myself: Bill Anderson is one of the most brilliant lawyers I have ever worked with. And since 2004, Bill has been a Sargent County Commissioner.

So thank you, Bill. I hope that you will have a great reunion later this month in Tennessee with the Marines of Company D.

Mr. President, I now wish to take a few moments to talk about the lives of those Vietnam veterans who did not come home.

ARLAN GABLE

Arlan Gable was from Rolette. He was born February 3, 1938. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Arlan was 29 years old when he died on June 10, 1967.

He was the youngest of 10 children and grew up on his parents' farm outside of Rolette. Arlan's niece, Sandi, remembers all the animals on the farm, and in particular, she remembers chasing his mother's geese.

Each of the five boys in the family served our country in the military. Right after graduating from high school, Arlan enlisted in the Army. He served in Korea and Germany, and he served two tours of duty in Vietnam. Arlan was killed while serving as the gunner on a tank when the tank hit a landmine. About 1 month before, Arlan had been home on leave. After his death, Arlan's mother's health deteriorated very rapidly.

MARK MANGIN

Mark Mangin, a native of Verono, was born April 29, 1949. He served in the Marine Corps' 3rd Marine Amphibious Force. On October 1, 1969, Mark died. He was only 20 years old.

He grew up on his parents' small farm and had one brother, Marvin. Marvin said that during high school Mark played basketball and loved fixing old cars. The brothers both worked for neighboring farmers. Before graduating, Mark enlisted to serve because he wanted to become a marine. He earned his GED while at basic training.

Mark sent letters home from Vietnam asking Marvin to take care of their mom and dad, and he wrote that he was an expert marksman and liked what he was doing. He included pictures of himself holding young Vietnamese children.

When he had less than 1 month left of his tour of duty in Vietnam, Mark was killed when someone near him tripped the wire of a boobytrap. His brother believes that with his mechanical abilities, he would have become a mechanic.

MICHAEL MEYHOFF

Michael Meyhoff was from Center and was born February 3, 1948. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Michael died January 4, 1968. He was 19 years old.

He grew up in a big family in a small house. Michael was the second of 11 children. Two of his brothers, Rick and Brent, also served in the Army.

While growing up, Michael enjoyed helping his grandparents on their family farm near Center, ND. Michael's

brother, Rick, says that Michael was a good athlete and was an explorer. He always had to see what was over the next hill. He especially loved fishing with his father and always looked forward to fishing trips as opportunities to explore and spend time with his family in the outdoors. Michael was very family-minded and was excellent at writing letters and responding to letters from his brothers, sisters, parents, and grandparents.

When he died, Michael's community was deeply affected. Now, 47 years after his death, his family and community still think about him or talk about him daily.

Michael's mother, Harriet, will turn 90 years old next month. She has told the family that when she dies, she wants to be buried with Michael's Purple Heart.

CHARLES PIPER, JR.

Charles Piper, Jr., was born November 21, 1937. He was from Durbin. He served in the Navy on the USS Robison as a master chief boiler technician. Charles was 34 years old when he died on August 30, 1972.

Charles and his sister Marion worked on nearby farms after their father died when they were children. Marion says that Charles was a good listener and was always a good mentor to her son. When Charles was 17 years old and had just graduated from Casselton High School, he enlisted in the Navy. He didn't like water, but his cousins serving in the Navy inspired him to join.

Charles made his Navy service a career. He had about a year left in the Navy before he planned to retire. His dream after retirement was to work for the game and fish department and to live with his wife Marie on their farm near Kalispell, MT.

THOMAS WELKER

Thomas Welker was born on February 23, 1938, and made his home in Minot with his wife Frances. He served in the Army 101st Airborne Division. His unit was called the Screaming Eagles. Thomas died on July 27, 1967. He was 29 years old.

Before going to Vietnam, the Army stationed Thomas, Frances, and their sons, John, Thomas, Rodney, and Dean, in several places in the United States. Thomas' older stepson, Rodney, said that Thomas loved to hunt and fish. He worked two jobs to support his family, working as a bartender on the base in the evenings.

In Vietnam, Thomas was killed when someone nearby stepped on a Bouncing Betty. The Army awarded him a Bronze Star Medal for his valor that day. Thomas is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

IRVIN KNIPPELBERG

Irvin Knippelberg was born in Turtle Lake on January 17, 1939. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. He was 27 years old when he died on May 19, 1966.

He was the youngest of five children. His two brothers served our country during the Korean war—Jack in the Army and Darold in the Navy.

Growing up on his family's farm near Turtle Lake, Irvin was the big little brother. He was 6 feet 4 inches tall, but he was the kid brother. His brother Darold is Irvin's only living sibling. Darold said that when the brothers played together boxing, Irvin's arms were so long that he could hit his brothers four times before they could ever get close to him. Darold remembers Irvin as a good-natured, loveable guy who everyone liked. Darold says he knows that Irvin's faith helped him along in life.

After high school, Irvin first enlisted in the Marine Corps. He later enlisted in the Army and spent time in Alaska and Japan before his tour of duty in Vietnam. He planned to make the Army his career. Irvin had only been in Vietnam about 1 month when he was shot and killed.

DELBERT AUSTIN OLSON

Delbert Austin Olson was from Casselton, and he was born on January 4, 1926. He served as a commander in the Navy. Delbert was 42 years old when he went missing on January 11, 1968.

Delbert was the youngest of four children who grew up on his family's farm. His brothers also served in the military—Charles in Korea and Harold in World War II. Delbert's family said that he loved flying and was committed to his Navy career. He was a phenomenal naval officer and pilot.

Delbert was 6 feet 4 inches tall, and his son, David, is 6 feet 6 inches tall. Delbert's brother, Charles, told David that he looks just like his dad, "Delly."

In 1968, Delbert and eight other Navy crewmen went missing when their aircraft crashed into a mountain in Laos. In the 1990s, investigation crews were finally able to search for the remains from the crash. All nine crewmen were identified and, in 2003, they were buried together in Arlington National Cemetery.

In addition to his siblings, Delbert is survived by his daughter Dana and his son David.

DONALD SOBY

Donald Soby was from Rugby. He was born on December 15, 1946. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division. Donald died on July 7, 1967. He was 20 years old.

Donald was the youngest of three children. His brother William also served in Vietnam in the Air Force.

Their sister Margaret said that Donald always lived for today. He was a good kid, but if he wanted to do something, he would go and do it that day because he may not get another chance. She remembers Donald's sense of humor and good-natured pranks.

Donald and his best friend, Terry, shared many adventures together, including taking Margaret's young son with them to a nearby town to attract girls and running into the game warden, who sent them home after discovering the ducks they were supposed to be hunting looked a lot more like pheasants.

Donald and his brother William both served in Vietnam at the same time. The brothers inquired about Donald's leaving Vietnam since they were both serving, but they were advised to wait until William's discharge. They were able to spend Christmas of 1966 together. That was the last time William saw Donald.

In May, Donald was wounded, and he died in July as a result of those wounds. The family is extremely grateful to Wanda Nielson of Rugby for coordinating efforts for the military to fly Donald's mother to the Philippines to be with Donald at the time of his death.

JOHN JOYCE

John Joyce, a Minot native, was born on November 15, 1944. He served in the Marine Corps, Kilo Company, 3rd Battalion, 26th Marines. John died on April 17, 1969. He was 24 years old.

John was one of four children and enjoyed playing sports in his free time. In addition to playing football, basketball, and track, John left a legacy of being an excellent baseball player. He played baseball for Minot State University and for Northern Arizona University. In 2001, he was inducted into the Minot Baseball Hall of Fame.

After college John became a teacher and coach for a year in Montana. He then enlisted in the Marines and served in Vietnam. One of John's best friends, Jan Olson, who taught with John and also served in Vietnam, said this about John: "Inch for inch, pound for pound, he was the toughest man I ever knew and he was also the nicest man."

About 6 weeks after his death, John was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for his heroic actions. His Bronze Star citation describes John putting himself in the line of fire while defending his platoon with a grenade launcher and then carrying a wounded companion to a covered position.

Ronald Jensen is a Marine who served under John in Vietnam. Ronald's 2003 book, titled "Tail End Charlie," describes John like this:

He was a great guy, no questions about it. He helped everybody, always in the front, and he saved me. He was most liked by his men. He saved a lot of lives over there.

WILLIAM "BILL" KRISTJANSON

William "Bill" Kristjanson was born October 13, 1943, and was from Inkster. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. His unit's nickname was the Black Scarves. Bill died on February 26, 1970. He was 26 years old. He was the only child born to Sig and Frances Kristjanson.

He attended elementary school in Conway and high school in Inkster. In 1967, Bill graduated from the University of North Dakota. He also attended the University of Michigan and the University of Oslo in Norway. Bill's pride and interest in his father's Icelandic heritage inspired him to tour Iceland after graduating from UND.

In 1968, Bill was drafted into the Army. In Vietnam, he was involved in both ground and air combat. About 5 months after arriving in Vietnam, Bill was promoted from private first class to sergeant on the battlefield.

On February 11, Bill was injured when the vehicle he was riding in overturned. About 2 weeks later, he died in a military hospital in Japan. The ten medals the Army awarded him, both before and after his death, demonstrate that Bill was a heroic soldier the Army valued greatly.

PATRICK MCCABE

Patrick McCabe was from Bismarck, and he was born on July 20, 1924. He served in the Army as a master sergeant. Patrick died May 6, 1968, at the age of 43.

He came from a family dedicated to serving our country. Four of the six boys in his family served in the military, and all three of Patrick's sons followed in his footsteps and joined the military. Two of his sons served in Vietnam after Patrick's death—Mark as a medic in the Marines and Scott as an Air Force pilot. Patrick's third son, David, served in the Air Force for over 20 years.

Patrick's daughter, Kathy, said that her dad was a good man who helped anyone who needed it. Her dad loved his country and felt like the Army was his family.

Patrick served in World War II and two tours of duty in Vietnam. He volunteered to return to Vietnam and died during his second tour of duty.

We tell these stories because we cannot ever forget that every life matters. I am always struck by imagining what these young men would have been had they been allowed to grow up, whom these young men could have been when they were grandfathers and whom they would have taken fishing or hunting or taught how to play football. But these lives were given in sacrifice to their country and in sacrifice so that all of us can live in freedom, and we must never forget, during this period of commemoration of the Vietnam war, those people who gave the ultimate sacrifice, those people who were killed in action in Vietnam.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alaska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act. I rise in support to move this bill forward and the amendments that many of us in this body want to have heard, debated, and voted on.

I also rise in opposition to obstruction—obstruction to this bill, obstruction to the key issues of national defense for our country. Make no mistake, there is obstruction going on, on the Senate floor right now, with regard to this important bill.

A little bit of background here: This bill, the NDAA, came out of the Senate Armed Services Committee after a lot of hard work, bipartisan work, by all the members of the committee. We worked together to include over 185 amendments. Almost all of these were bipartisan amendments.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked about voting against the bill because they did not like the way it was funded, even though our committee had nothing to do with the funding. But at the end of the day, after much debate in the committee, we worked and passed a strong, important, reform-oriented bipartisan NDAA by a vote of 22 to 4. That is bipartisan.

I thank the chairman of that committee Senator MCCAIN and the ranking member Senator REED on their great leadership in getting this committee to work so closely together to move the bill forward.

As part of the Armed Services Committee, just 2 weeks ago, I had the distinct honor of traveling with both of them to Vietnam and to Singapore for an important Defense Ministry conference. It was a huge honor for me as a new Member of the body to travel with JOHN MCCAIN and JACK REED—two veterans who have sacrificed a lot for their country—to Vietnam and other places. They did a fantastic job on this bill.

Then, this bill came to the floor and it all stopped. Everything came to a halt. There are over 500 amendments of Senators who want to move forward on a bipartisan basis to try to improve this bill. We have gotten to barely a trickle—barely a trickle—and nothing has happened. For 2 weeks we have been on this bill and nothing has happened after the great work we did in the Senate Armed Services Committee.

What is going on here? It is the same obstructionist playbook that my colleagues and particularly the minority leader used for the last few years, and the American people have rejected it. They rejected it last November, and they rejected it when they realized this

body had only 14 rollcall votes on amendments during the entire year of 2014. That is not how this body is supposed to work. Nobody on either side of the aisle wants this body to work that way. It is certainly not how it is supposed to work when it comes to the defense of our Nation and the critical bill to take care of our men and women in uniform. Yet, the minority leader said this bill is a waste of time. I will repeat that. The National Defense Authorization Act, one of the most important things we do in this body, is "a waste of time."

I understand that the parties have ideological differences, and that is certainly the way it should be. That is the way it has been since the founding of our great Nation. But if leaders on the other side of the aisle believe that protecting the country, taking care of the men and women in uniform, and keeping our promises to them is a waste of time, then we don't belong to different parties, we belong in different universes. In this world, in this universe, in the U.S. Senate, our most important job is to protect this country and to take care of the men and women who so courageously serve our country. It is not a waste of time to be doing that. It is the most important thing we were sent here to do.

We took an oath. We pledged to solemnly swear to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. That is what this bill does, and that is what we—Members on both sides—are trying to do in terms of improving it with amendments, but none of those are moving. None of those are moving, and that is a shame.

One of the things we tried to address in the bill is the serious threats and challenges our Nation faces.

At the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing we had several weeks ago, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said:

The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the second world war.

We know what they are—the growth and brutality of ISIS, a rising China, Iran on the verge of obtaining a nuclear weapon. The largest state sponsor of terrorism is possibly on the verge of gaining a nuclear weapon, and a resurgent Russia has invaded the sovereign territory of another country. It is the first time since World War II in the heart of Europe.

So at this time we not only have obstruction on the other side of the aisle from the leader there, the President of the United States is threatening to veto the NDAA. I am not sure they are reading about what is going on in the world. I am not sure they recognize the critical importance of this bill. And to threaten to veto this bill, and therefore what—we are going to stop? No. We are going to do our duty, and we will put

this on the President's desk, and we will see if he vetoes it when the United States faces this huge array of challenges.

Let me talk about one of those challenges for a few minutes. It is an important area. As a Senator from Alaska, it is certainly an important area for me. It is the Arctic and the increasing militarization of the Arctic by Russia.

Earlier this year, Russia began a 5-day Arctic war exercise that included 38,000 troops, 50 surface warships, in addition to submarines, and 110 aircraft in the Arctic. And the Russians are not being shy about their ambitions in the Arctic. President Putin has said he wants to build 13 new airfields and add four new Russian combat brigades in the Arctic. He is going to stand up a new Arctic command, and he is going to add several new icebreakers to their already robust fleet.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee talked about this. He talked about what the Russians are doing in the Arctic. There is no mystery here. As a matter of fact, today there was an outstanding article in the Wall Street Journal entitled "The New Cold War's Arctic Front," with the subtitle "Putin is militarizing one of the world's coldest, most remote regions." Well, in my State, this is home. America is an Arctic nation because of Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The Wall Street Journal, Jun. 9, 2015]

THE NEW COLD WAR'S ARCTIC FRONT

(By Sohrab Ahmari)

HELSINKI.—G-7 leaders gathering in Bavaria on Monday vowed to extend sanctions if Russia doesn't dial back its aggression against Ukraine. Previous sanctions haven't deterred Kremlin land-grabs, and the question now isn't if Russian President Vladimir Putin will strike again but whom he'll target next. Mr. Putin considers Europe's eastern periphery, stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, part of Russia's imperial inheritance.

Yet in recent years the Russian leader has also turned his attention northward, to the Arctic, militarizing one of the world's coldest, most remote regions. Here in Finland, one of eight Arctic states, the Russian menace next door looms large.

"That is a tough nut to crack, to know exactly what the Russians want," newly appointed Finnish Foreign Minister Timo Soini says. "But I'm sure they know. Because they are masters of chess, and if something is on the loose they will take it"—a variation on the old proverb that "a Cossack will take whatever is not fixed to the ground."

There is much that "is not fixed to the ground" already in the Arctic, and more every year. Climate change is transforming the High North. By 2030, the Northern Sea Route (NSR) from the Kara Strait to the Pacific will have nine weeks of open water, according to the U.S. Navy, up from two in

2012. The NSR is a 35% to 60% shorter passage between European ports and East Asia than the Suez or Panama routes, according to the Arctic Council. The Northwest Passage, which connects the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans via the Canadian Arctic Archipelago, will have five weeks of open water by 2030, up from zero in 2012. It represents a 25% shorter passage between Rotterdam and Seattle than non-Arctic routes, according to a NATO Parliamentary Assembly study published in March. As with other claims about the climate, these aren't universally accepted prognostications.

These changes have implications not just for trade but also for the ability to exploit the vast energy resources beneath the Arctic. Energy fields in the region have to date produced some 40 billion barrels of oil and 1,100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates the region also holds 13% of the world's undiscovered conventional oil, a third of the world's undiscovered conventional gas and a fifth of the world's undiscovered natural-gas liquids.

No wonder Moscow has been racing to reopen old Soviet bases on its territory across the Arctic and develop new ones. Mr. Putin wants by the end of 2015 to have 14 operational airfields in the Arctic, according to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and he has increased Russia's special-forces presence in the region by 30%.

"In the Arctic area they have twofold objectives," says a senior official at the Finnish Defense Ministry. "To secure the Northern Sea Route and [exploit] the energy-resources potential. And they are increasing their ability to surveil that part of the world, to refurbish their abilities for the air force and the Northern Fleet. They are exercising their ability to move their airborne troops from the central part of Russia to the north."

The Russian buildup in the region is made worse by the fact that Moscow makes no effort to be a good neighbor. The Kremlin's propensity for holding unannounced exercises in the region can only be a deliberate attempt to provoke. The senior official voices the concern that the Kremlin might use yet another such drill "as deployment for a real operation"—which is considerably less paranoid than it sounds given Mr. Putin's record.

Russian warplanes have violated Finnish airspace as recently as August, and pro-Kremlin media have also launched a systematic propaganda campaign against Finland. "They are writing things about us and our defense forces that are not from this world," says the senior official, such as the yarn that the Finnish government removes children from ethnic-Russian Finnish families for adoption by gay couples in the U.S.

Another Defense Ministry official says that he finds it hard to view as spontaneous "one of their pro-Putin demonstrations with crowds shouting 'Thank you, Putin! You gave us Crimea. Now give us Poland and Finland.'"

Despite such developments, the possibility of conflict here might seem distant for now. But it poses troubling questions about the West's readiness in the Arctic-security race. So far there has been plenty of Allied strategizing, including a 2013 White House paper on Arctic strategy heavy on climate-change alarmism but offering little by way of real mobilization. Russia still has the world's largest fleet of icebreakers, many of them nuclear-powered. Washington, by contrast, fields just one heavy icebreaker, the Coast Guard's aging Polar Star.

For the Finns, the Kremlin menace raises another touchy issue: their nonmembership in NATO. The April election that sent Mr. Soini to the Foreign Ministry and the centrist Juha Sipilä into the premiership relegated Alexander Stubb, an uncommonly pro-NATO Finnish prime minister, to the Finance Ministry in the new government. Mr. Soini, who leads the right-wing populist True Finns party, has denounced Mr. Stubb in the past as a “radical market liberal NATO hawk.” But now in government, Mr. Soini strikes more nuanced notes that belie his party’s anti-Atlanticist reputation.

“If we think that the paradigm [in the region] is going to be changed,” he says, “there is no hesitation that we will do it,” meaning join NATO. He adds: “Whatever the system or situation in Russia we have to cope, and we have some experience with them. And they also respect us. They know our history. . . . We want to be independent and free.”

Mr. SULLIVAN. The writer of this article talks about what is at stake and about what the Russians are doing in the Arctic.

Here is a map. It is a little small, but it shows Russia’s Arctic push and the dramatic increase of airbases, operational infrastructure all around the Arctic, and the different exercises. We know that it is an important place—transportation, natural resources. This is a critical area.

Our leaders are taking notice, our military leaders. ADM Bill Gortney with the U.S. Northern Command stated: “Russian heavy bombers flew more out-of-area patrols in 2014 than in any year since the Cold War.”

Secretary of Defense Carter just 2 months ago said: “The Arctic is going to be a major area of importance to the United States, both strategically and economically in the future—it’s fair to say that we’re late to the recognition of that.”

This is why the NDAA is so important. Congress heard this testimony. The Senate Armed Services Committee heard this testimony. We have been following what has been happening in the Arctic, and we have acted. The NDAA has provisions to start to address the challenges we see in the Arctic. It certainly is focused on making sure the Arctic remains a peaceful and stable place, but it also starts to focus the leadership of our military on the Arctic, and that is important.

There is language in the NDAA which was unanimously voted on in the committee—it is very bipartisan—that requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report that updates the U.S. military strategy in the Arctic and requires a military operations plan to be described for the protection and security of our interest in the Arctic. It lays out what the issues are, what the threats are, and what the Russians are doing in the Arctic.

President Putin is certainly going to be watching, and maybe he is taking notice that we are noticing, and that is one reason why this is an important bill.

As we can see here, today’s Wall Street Journal article talked about President Putin moving forward and possibly having the ability to send airborne troops and airborne brigades to the Arctic. Yet, right now, our own U.S. Army is thinking about removing the only airborne brigade in the Arctic. That is not good strategy.

That is why we need this bill. We need to set the direction in terms of strategy and to make sure we are not making strategic mistakes as the Russians move forward in the Arctic and we start looking at reducing our capabilities there. Weakness is provocative, and if anyone knows that, it is President Putin. We need to show strength, and that is why we need to pass this bill.

Finally, I want to talk briefly about an amendment I wanted to offer. I am still trying to get it offered as part of the NDAA. As I mentioned, there is a lineup of hundreds of amendments. Unfortunately, the leader on the other side of the aisle doesn’t want to move them. This is one of those amendments. It is a very bipartisan amendment. If it were allowed to come to the floor, it would probably pass overwhelmingly. It is a simple amendment. All it does is ask the President to follow the law when it comes to raising the pay of members of our military. It is a simple amendment.

The law States that our servicemembers are entitled to get a larger pay increase—not much, but when there is a pay increase, they should get a slightly larger pay increase than their civilian counterparts. That is the current law. My amendment expresses the sense of the Senate that when giving a pay increase to members of the Department of Defense, military and civilian, that the President simply needs to follow the law.

I want to emphasize something as somebody who has served in the military and is still serving in the Reserves. Our civilian DOD employees and members do a superb job. They are patriotic, they work hard, and they deeply respect the members of the military with whom they serve. I have seen this throughout my entire career.

The current law, however, recognizes the unique sacrifices our servicemembers make wearing the uniform of our country and mandates a half-a-percent greater pay increase when there is a pay increase for our men and women in uniform. Right now, the President is not abiding by that law. It is simple. He needs to do it. My amendment would request and focus on this issue, and I think we could probably get 100 Senators to vote for it.

What is the origin of this law and the intent behind it? It is simple. It recognizes the unique sacrifices our men and women in the military make. These sacrifices are well known to the American people. They include long hours

and serious, difficult separations from family. Of course, they include the risk of combat when our troops are deployed overseas in combat zones. It includes hardship to families. When our troops are deployed, they miss weddings, birthdays, first communions. It even takes training into account because the members of the military don’t work on a 9-to-5 basis.

I will give one example. I had the great opportunity to head out to the National Training Center in Fort Irwin, CA. It is one of the great training bases in our country—one of the great training places in the world. I was there to watch the training of the 1st Stryker Brigade, which is based in Fairbanks, AK. They were out there for a month deployment and training hard. They were not punching a clock 9 to 5; they were training around the clock every day.

I happened to be out there on Super Bowl Sunday. The vast majority of Americans were enjoying the Super Bowl, as they should have been. They were having fun, going to parties, watching the game, drinking Coke, Pepsi, and a little beer. But there were some Americans who were out in the middle of Fort Irwin in the desert training. They were not watching the Super Bowl; they were training to make sure that when their country next called them up, they would be ready to protect our Nation. That is the reason this law states that we treat our military members a little bit different than other members of the Department of Defense.

That is all my amendment would do, but unfortunately, this one, like dozens, if not hundreds, is not going to be heard—at least for the time being—because the minority leader on the other side is trying to bring back the way they used to run the Senate last year and the year before and the year before that.

We know. We heard the stories. Last year, again, there were 14 amendments that were brought to the floor for a rollcall vote in 2014. They essentially shut down the greatest deliberative body in the world. We have heard the stories of how the previous majority leader used his position to block consideration of amendments more than twice as often as the previous six majority leaders combined, and now we are doing it on a bill that relates to the national security of our Nation and the critical issue of taking care of the men and women in uniform.

I hope we can move through this. I hope we can get to regular order. I hope this body can take up amendments such as mine—commonsense, bipartisan amendments that are going to keep our Nation safer, take care of our troops and their families, and give the American people faith that we are doing the job they sent us here to do. That is my hope.

We are already doing it under the new majority leader. We voted on almost 200 amendments already this year, but right now we are stuck on one of the most important bills this body will consider for the entire year. It is a shame. We need to get unstuck.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECTION 3112 OF S. CON. RES. 11

Mr. HATCH. On March 27, 2015, the Senate functioned properly by adopting S. Con. Res. 11 on the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 2016.

Section 3112 of that budget resolution contains a specification of procedures governing cost estimates for what is defined to be “major legislation” as defined in section 3112(c)(1).

I wish to provide a few comments to clarify that section of the budget resolution, and I understand that my distinguished colleague from Oregon, Finance Committee Ranking Member WYDEN, also wishes to provide separate and related comments.

In setting out what is to be taken as “major legislation,” the budget resolution specifies that legislation may be designated to be “major” if the Senator or House Member who is chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation, or JCT, designates the legislation as such “for revenue legislation.” Of course, such language is entirely consistent with existing laws and practice, under which the responsibility and control over revenue estimates in the congressional budget process lies squarely with the chair and vice chair of the JCT.

The budget resolution also specifies that legislation may be designated to be “major” if the chair of the Committee on the Budget in the Senate or the House designates the legislation as such “for all direct spending and revenue legislation.” Of course, existing laws and practice assigns responsibility and control over spending estimates with the Budget Committees. However, the budget resolution includes “revenue legislation” as part of what the Budget Committee chairs may use for designating legislation as being “major.”

As I understand the intent of the language, when major legislation is to be considered, there can be cases in which the legislation may require estimates both from the JCT and from the Con-

gressional Budget Office, or CBO. In such cases, there is nothing to prohibit use of longstanding practice in which the Budget Committees consult with the chair and vice chair of the JCT to ensure that any necessary revenue estimates are arrived at by the JCT, for use in scoring major legislation. To be clear, however, nothing in the budget resolution should be taken to mean that the chairs of the Budget Committees have authority to interfere with the responsibility and control over revenue estimates in any part of the congressional budget process which, as I identified earlier, lies squarely with the chair and vice chair of the JCT.

It is my understanding that the budget resolution does not direct or allow for any possibility of such interference, and my purpose in the remarks I am making today is to make that understanding clear. As I have mentioned, longstanding practice has been that if a need arises for the CBO to obtain information on major legislation from the JCT in terms of revenue estimates or effects of legislative proposals on marginal effective tax rates, Budget Committee members can ensure that those estimates and effects are obtained by consulting with the chair and vice chair of the JCT. This longstanding practice ensures smooth processing of the JCT's workload, and prevents any direct control or intervention in JCT's workload from other committees with other jurisdictions.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I share the concern of my colleague, the Finance Committee chairman, and I support his interpretation of this provision. In accordance with longstanding historical practice, and because of important practical considerations, the chair and vice chair of the Joint Committee on Taxation should exercise principal control over the revenue estimating process, and section 3112 should not be interpreted to authorize the chairs of the Budget Committees to interfere with JCT's responsibility for and control over revenue estimates in any part of the congressional budget process.

However, I must note that on the broader point of dynamic estimates, I am opposed, and I was therefore opposed to section 3112 being included in the budget resolution and conference agreement to start with. Dynamic estimates rely on shaky math and convenient assumptions that reward advocates of tax cuts while punishing advocates of long-term investments in people and our Nation's infrastructure.

FAIR ELECTIONS NOW ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it was 8 years ago that I first introduced the Fair Elections Now Act. Former Senator Arlen Specter, our late colleague and former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, was my lead cosponsor. We

introduced the bill because we believed that America needs a system that rewards candidates with the best ideas and principles—not just the person who is the most talented in raising special interest money.

I noted that day that our democracy was in trouble because special interests and big-donor money were choking the system and preventing us from facing up to the big challenges of our time. Little did I know that almost a decade later, this problem would have grown much worse.

Through a series of recent cases—including the infamous Citizens United decision—the Supreme Court has allowed wealthy, well-connected campaign donors and special interests to unleash a deluge of cash in an effort to sway Federal, State, and local elections across our Nation. When it comes to understanding the influence of wealthy donors and special interests on Federal elections, the numbers speak for themselves.

In the 2012 election cycle, candidates for both the House and Senate raised the majority of their funds from large donations of \$1,000 or more. Forty percent of all contributions to Senate candidates came from donors who maxed out at the \$2,500 contribution limit, representing just 0.02 percent of the American population.

We saw this trend continue during the recent midterm elections. The 100 biggest donors gave a combined \$323 million during the 2014 election cycle through official campaign contributions and donations to national party committees, PACs, Super PACs, and 527 organizations. In contrast to those 100 donors, an estimated 4.75 million people gave a comparable amount of \$356 million through small-dollar donations of \$200 or less. Astonishing as these figures are, they don't include the \$173 million spent in the 2014 election cycle by tax-exempt “dark money” groups that are not required to publicly disclose their donors.

Deep-pocketed special interests are aiming to control the agenda in Congress. It is time to fight back and fundamentally reform the way we finance congressional elections. We need a system that allows candidates to focus on constituents instead of fundraising—a system that encourages ordinary Americans to make their voice heard with small, affordable donations to the candidate of their choice.

That is why I am once again introducing the Fair Elections Now Act. While this bill cannot solve all of the problems facing our Nation's campaign finance system, the Fair Elections Now Act will dramatically change the way campaigns are funded. This bill allows candidates to focus on the people they represent, regardless of whether those people have the wealth to attend a big money fundraiser or donate thousands of dollars.

I would like to thank Sens. BALDWIN, BOXER, BROWN, FRANKEN, GILLIBRAND, HEINRICH, KLOBUCHAR, LEAHY, MARKEY, MCCASKILL, MENENDEZ, MERKLEY, MURPHY, SANDERS, SHAHEEN, UDALL, and WARREN for cosponsoring the Fair Elections Now Act and joining me in this effort to reform our campaign finance system.

The Fair Elections Now Act will help restore public confidence in congressional elections by providing qualified candidates for Congress with grants, matching funds, and vouchers from the Fair Elections Fund to replace campaign fundraising that largely relies on lobbyists, wealthy donors, corporations, and other special interests. In return, participating candidates would agree to limit their campaign spending to amounts raised from small-dollar donors plus the amounts provided from the Fair Elections Fund.

The Fair Elections system would have three stages for Senate candidates. First, candidates would need to prove their viability by raising a minimum number and amount of small-dollar qualifying contributions from in-state donors. Qualified candidates would then be required to limit the amount raised from each donor to \$150 per election.

In the primary, participants would receive a base grant that would vary in amount based on the population of the State that the candidate seeks to represent. Participants would also receive a 6 to 1 match for small-dollar donations up to a defined matching cap. After reaching that cap, the candidate could raise an unlimited amount of \$150 contributions, as well as contributions from small-donor People PACs.

In the general election, qualified candidates would receive an additional grant, further small-dollar matching, and vouchers for purchasing television advertising. The candidate could continue to raise an unlimited amount of \$150 contributions, as well as contributions from small-donor People PACs.

Under the Fair Elections Now Act, candidates would have an incentive to seek small donations. And citizens would have an incentive to donate to the candidate of their choice, knowing that their small donation of \$150 would be converted to a \$900 donation through the 6 to 1 Fair Elections match.

Citizens would also be eligible for a modest, refundable tax credit. The Fair Elections Now Act establishes the "My Voice Tax Credit" to encourage individuals to make small donations to campaigns. Citizens could also make their voices heard by aggregating small contributions of \$150 or less into a type of small-donor political action committee, known as a "People PAC." People PACs would then be permitted to make campaign contributions to qualified Fair Elections candidates. Coupled with the Fair Elections public financ-

ing system, People PACs would elevate the views and interests of a diverse spectrum of Americans, rather than those of the traditional, wealthy donor class.

Our country is facing major challenges. We need to continue to create more jobs and restore economic security for the middle class. We need to build and sustain our transportation infrastructure. We need to fix our broken immigration system. We need to ensure that the right to vote is protected and preserved.

But with high-powered, special interest lobbyists fighting every proposal to make our country stronger, it is incredibly difficult for members of Congress to make progress on behalf of their constituents. This bill would dramatically reduce the influence of these special interests and wealthy donors, because Fair Elections candidates would not need their money to run campaigns. As a result, the bill would enhance the voice of average Americans. Let me be clear: the overwhelming majority of people serving in American politics are good, honest people, and I believe that most members of Congress are guided by the best of intentions. But we are nonetheless stuck in a terrible, corrupting system.

A recent poll found bipartisan concerns about our current system. According to the poll, more than four out of five Americans say money plays too great a role in political campaigns. Two-thirds say that the wealthy have more of a chance to influence the electoral process than other Americans. The perception is that politicians are corrupted by big money interests . . . and whether that is true or not, that perception and the loss of trust that goes with it make it very difficult for Congress to solve tough issues.

This problem—the perception of pervasive corruption—is undermining our democracy, and we must address it. Everyone is entitled to a seat at the table, but wealthy donors and big corporations shouldn't be able to buy every seat.

The Fair Elections Now Act will reform our campaign finance system so that members of Congress can focus on implementing policies in the best interest of the people who elected them—not just the wealthy donors and special interests that bankrolled their success. I urge my colleagues and the American people to support this important legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF LESTER CROWN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I recognize the 90th birthday of one of the outstanding business leaders of our time—Chicago businessman, Lester Crown.

Lester Crown was born on June 7, 1925, to Henry Crown, the son of Jewish

immigrants from Lithuania, and his wife, Rebecca Kranz. Like many other Illinoisans, Lester came from a family of Lithuanian immigrants with humble beginnings who moved to America to pursue a better life for their children.

Lester's father worked hard with his two brothers to build their family construction supplies company, the Material Service Corporation. As a young man, Lester worked with his father at the Material Service's quarry over the summers to lend a hand. Through the hard work and dedication of the entire Crown family, the Material Service Corporation became one of the most successful companies in America. Several years later, that family business merged with General Dynamics Corporation to become America's largest defense contractor.

From the start, Lester saw his father's work and learned what it took to be a successful businessman. He used his experience to excel and quickly became the president of Marblehead Lime and Royal Crown (RC) Cola. After years of managing companies, Lester took over as chair of General Dynamics and as the head of the family investment firm.

One of Lester's many talents has been his ability to recognize great potential. His eye for promising investments has led him to grace the Forbes 400 list every year since 1982. With a quick glance at his impressive list of investments we can easily see why—he is a major shareholder in Maytag, Hilton Hotels, Alltel, Aspen Skiing Company, New York's Rockefeller Center, the New York Yankees, and Illinois' very own Chicago Bulls.

But Lester is not just a successful businessman, he is also a dedicated philanthropist, husband, and father. He has channeled his successes to provide generous contributions to a wide array of local and national projects. His charitable footprint can be seen in landmarks such as the famous Crown Fountain in Millennium Park, the Lyric Opera of Chicago, Stroger Hospital, and in universities across the Nation.

Lester and his wife Renee have been happily married for more than 60 years and have seven children. Renee serves as a founding member and former president of the Women's Board of Northwestern University and a life director of the Multiple Sclerosis Society. She also serves on the board of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Chicago, the Field Museum, the Joffrey Ballet, and as an honorary chair of the Shoah Visual History Foundation.

Lester and Renee are an inspiration for many in their family who have become successful investors and philanthropists. Their son Jim is continuing the legacy started by Lester's father nearly a century ago by now serving as the lead director of General Dynamics. Together, the Crown family works with roughly 600 groups a year and donates

millions of dollars annually to support organizations that focus on education and community development.

In addition to the energy Lester has poured into his family and business life, he has been a pillar in the Jewish-American community in his support of Israel. Few can match his dedicated commitment to the survival and success of the nation of Israel.

While few share Lester's long list of business achievements, even fewer share his level of leadership and generosity. It is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 90th birthday of Lester Crown and to congratulate him on his legendary career and his many contributions to the city of Chicago, the Nation, and the world. I offer my best wishes as he continues to provide visionary leadership through his business endeavors and family philanthropy for years to come.

CONFIRMATION OF ERIC MILLER TO BE VERMONT'S U.S. ATTORNEY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last night, the Senate confirmed Eric Miller to be Vermont's 37th U.S. attorney. I am confident that he will do an outstanding job as the top Federal law enforcement officer in the State. Before recommending Eric to the President, I consulted prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, law enforcement officials, and civic leaders throughout Vermont. They were unanimous in their support for Eric. I was particularly impressed with his thoughtfulness, vision, and depth of experience. Eric Miller is one of Vermont's leading trial attorneys. He is well regarded by State and local law enforcement and leaders in Vermont's legal community.

Eric Miller has worked since 1999 in the Burlington office of the law firm Sheehey Furlong & Behm PC, serving as partner since 2002. He has litigated a range of complex issues in Federal civil and criminal cases, including trials and appeals. As an appointee to the Criminal Justice Act panel of the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont, Eric has also represented indigent defendants in serious felony cases involving narcotics, weapons, and immigration-related charges. He clerked for the Honorable Fred Parker on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in Burlington. He has a law degree from Yale University and an undergraduate degree from Duke University.

I thank Eric for his willingness to continue to serve Vermont and I congratulate him on his confirmation.

SENATE COMPETITIVE CAUCUS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, the hallmark of our Nation's economy has long been the ability of anyone with creativity, ambition, and a good work ethic to realize their dreams and move

America forward. From the lightbulb to the iPhone, the legacy of American invention has shone brightly throughout the world. Yet while our culture of innovation and entrepreneurial spirit remain strong, the policy framework that empowers that spirit to flourish is losing its competitive edge.

For years, enabling our Nation's innovative drive was an economic system unparalleled around the world—from competitive tax laws to public investments in research, infrastructure, and education. We have long understood something that many other countries haven't: for innovation and the entrepreneurial spirit to thrive, we need a strong, competitive economic ecosystem. There simply is no single silver bullet for economic growth.

While other nations catch up, our system is deteriorating in a number of ways. Federal investments in basic research and development are not keeping up with inflation and our tax code remains riddled with complexity, unable to spur growth and provide the certainty our businesses need. We also have to address the tough questions about how to fund our infrastructure, transportation, and education systems. In our dynamic market economy, the natural churn of businesses opening and closing keeps our Nation competitive, as long as we are creating more businesses than we are closing, of course. According to the Census Bureau, however, U.S. businesses are now failing faster than they are being created for the first time in 35 years—since the data began being recorded. Meanwhile, the 2014 Global Innovation Index saw the U.S. innovation ecosystem fall to 6th, while ranking 39th in ease of starting a business. These declines are coupled to a global R&D forecast that projects leading competitors—like China—will surpass the U.S. in total R&D investment by 2022.

Yet even with these challenges, we do retain a competitive edge. Americans' entrepreneurial drive still spurs our economy; manufacturing output continues to increase; our colleges and universities remain the envy of the world; innovations in the American energy industry have reduced our trade deficit and improved our energy security; and private sector R&D has rebounded after several years of stagnation.

We now find ourselves at a competitive inflection point. We can either do more to nurture and take advantage of our strengths—only some of which we have mentioned—or we can fall behind in the 21st century. In order to support our competitive strengths, Senator JERRY MORAN and I are launching the bipartisan Senate Competitiveness Caucus, a forum to bring together Democrats and Republicans to address the most pressing issues facing our economy.

Rather than focus on just one issue or one bill, we have built the caucus

with the understanding that it will take a whole range of policies working in concert to sustain our innovation ecosystem.

We will pursue ways to invest in our roads, bridges, ports, and highways so they meet the needs of a 21st century economy. We will work to make our tax code more competitive so the United States will remain the best country in which to do business and raise a family. We will seek to streamline regulations to protect consumers and make it easier to start and grow a business. We will look at our Federal budget and focus Federal resources on pro-growth policies that will create an environment for job creation now and into the future. We will work together to boost manufacturing because no country can support a strong middle class without a thriving manufacturing sector. That is just a start.

If the last century has taught us anything, it is that other countries will not slow down when it comes to chasing America's economic success. That means that even though the United States remains a world leader in innovation and competitiveness, it will only become more difficult to retain that position as the years go by. Members of the Competitiveness Caucus understand that we are now competing with every country, every government, every worker, and every business on the planet. Congress must come together to turn our economic challenges into opportunities for growth.

HEALTH INFORMATION EXCHANGE: A PATH TOWARDS IMPROVING THE QUALITY AND VALUE OF HEALTH CARE FOR PATIENTS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks at the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing earlier this week.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH INFORMATION EXCHANGE: A PATH TOWARDS IMPROVING THE QUALITY AND VALUE OF HEALTH CARE FOR PATIENTS

We're here today to outline our plans to conduct an intensive review of electronic health records.

There is a great deal of bipartisan interest in this on the committee. My staff and Sen. Murray's staff have been meeting with experts every day, the staff of each of our committee members have been meeting once a week, and Sen. Murray and myself have been speaking with the administration regularly as well.

The administration understands our level of interest and is working with us to improve these records.

Here's what we're talking about: The Meaningful Use Program began in 2009 to encourage the 491,000 physicians who serve Medicaid and Medicare patients and almost 4,500 hospitals who serve those patients to begin to adopt and use electronic health records systems.

Of those 491,000 physicians, 456,000 have received some sort of Medicare or Medicaid incentive payment from the Meaningful Use Program. All hospitals and most physicians that tried were able to meet the first stage requirements. For those who met the requirements, the government paid incentive payments in the form of higher Medicare reimbursements. It has so far paid out \$30 billion in incentive payments.

But the program's stage 2 requirements are so complex that only about 11 percent of eligible physicians have been able to comply so far, and just about 42 percent of eligible hospitals have been able to comply.

The next step in the program is penalties for doctors and hospitals that don't comply. This year, 257,000 physicians have already begun losing 1 percent of their Medicare reimbursements and 200 hospitals may be losing even more than that.

Our goal is to identify the 5 or 6 steps we can take to improve electronic health records—a technology that has great promise, but has, through bad policy and bad incentives, run off track.

To put it bluntly, physicians and doctors have said to me that they are literally “terrified” on the next implementation stage of electronic health records, called Meaningful Use Stage 3, because of its complexity and because of the fines that will be levied.

My goal is that before that phase is implemented, we can work with physicians and hospitals and the administration to get the system back on track and make it a tool that hospitals and physicians can look forward to using to help their patients instead of something they dread.

Today will mark the start of a series of hearings we will hold this summer to address various possible solutions.

Senator Murray and I are today announcing the next two hearings in the series, which will be chaired by different members of our committee to examine solutions to the problems we identify.

The first hearing is on the burden physicians face with these systems, and I have asked Senator Cassidy, who is a physician himself, to chair that hearing.

The second hearing is on the question of whether you and I control information about our health, and I have asked Senator Collins to chair that hearing.

On March 17, we held our first hearing to identify the problems with electronic health records, and the government's Meaningful Use Program.

At today's hearing, we will set the table for this series of hearings by discussing how we can solve those problems and improve electronic health records.

I was in Nashville at Vanderbilt University two weeks ago for a public workshop of the National Institutes of Health Precision Medicine Working Group, which is working out the details of the president's precision medicine initiative. That will involve creating a collection of 1 million sequenced genomes that researchers and scientists and doctors nationwide can consult in treating patients and curing diseases.

It's cutting edge medicine that has the potential to change the way we treat everything from diabetes to cancer.

But it will only work the way it's supposed to if electronic health records systems work the way they are supposed to.

Number one, electronic health records can help to assemble and understand the genomes of the one million individuals. And, second, if we want to make genetic information useful, being able to exchange informa-

tion will help doctors when they write a prescription for you.

So that's just one important medical breakthrough initiative that will rely on a big improvement to electronic health records.

This committee is interested not least because the government has invested \$30 billion to encourage doctors and hospitals to install these expensive systems.

The program has increased adoption. According to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), since 2009, the percentage of physicians with a basic electronic health record system has grown from 22 percent to 48 percent. And the percentage of hospitals with a basic records system has grown from 12 percent to 59 percent. But the program hasn't done enough to make the systems easy to use or interoperable—meaning able to communicate with one another—or really achieved much beyond adoption.

According to a Medical Economics survey nearly 70 percent of physicians say their electronic health record systems have not been worth it. They are spending more time taking notes than taking care of patients, and they are spending a lot of their own money on systems that have to comply with government requirements, not satisfying their own needs to serve patients with the latest in cutting edge medicine that could be accessed with the kind of technology Health IT is supposed to promise.

Or as the conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer, a doctor himself, wrote recently: “The EHR technology, being in its infancy, is hopelessly inefficient. Hospital physicians will tell you endless tales about the wastefulness of the data collection and how the lack of interoperability defeats the very purpose of data sharing.”

Today we have invited experts representing various perspectives:

Medical informatics, the profession focused on what information to use and how to use it to improve care; a records system vendor, one of the companies tasked with building the records systems; a health system chief information officer, the expert in charge of implementing Health IT for a hospital's many different types of care providers across many different types of care settings; and the perspective of the patient so that we can hear recommendations on how improvements in Health IT can improve the patient experience and patient involvement in their own care.

I am especially interested to hear from our witnesses their recommendations to improve the exchange of health information, which has been a glaring failure of the current state of electronic health records.

Patients will receive better care if we can improve the exchange of information so that a patient's health record can be accessed by physicians and pharmacists in an efficient and reliable way, the term industry experts use for this exchange of information is interoperability.

We're fortunate that a report was published May 28, 2015, by the American Medical Informatics Association offering immediate strategies to the challenges in electronic health records that I've been detailing. The report was written by a task force of experts from all aspects of Health IT: physicians, researchers, vendors, patient advocates, and others.

We know that improvements need to be made to these programs, and they need to be done quickly. One of the things I like about this report is that the recommendations are targeted for the next 6 to 12 months and could make improvements quickly.

The report makes recommendations in these five areas:

Simplify and speed documentation—that means using technology to help doctors spend less time taking notes and more time taking care of patients.

Refocus regulation—that means the government requirements should be clear, simple, and streamlined towards better patient care.

Increase transparency and streamline certification, such as using detailed tests for records systems to receive certification, so purchasers can easily judge performance and compare products.

Foster innovation—The brilliant minds working in Information Technology should be allowed to innovate new ideas, not just react to satisfying government ideas for Health IT. Standards are important, but they should support and enable innovations—not stifle them.

And “support person-centered care delivery”—Today, with a click of a mouse or a swipe on a smart phone, one can see the prices for airplane tickets from competing airlines or, mortgage rates from hundreds of banks. But, in health care, Information Technology has not made much difference to the patient experience. Patients still fill out paper forms with clipboards at every doctor appointment, call multiple offices to make appointments, and piece together their health information one doctor office and one hospital visit at a time. Electronic health records could change that experience for all of us so that when an individual visits a doctor, his care team can access his information no matter where the patient has been or which doctors he's seen in the past and deliver more accurate and higher quality care for the patient.

I look forward to hearing our witnesses' recommendations, their thoughts on this report, and also advice on how we can make improvements as quickly as possible.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Kiwanis International for its 100th anniversary celebration. Since its formation in 1915, Kiwanis has become a global service organization, supporting communities both in its Indianapolis headquarters and beyond.

Last year, I had the pleasure of meeting Stan Soderstrom, who serves as the executive director of Kiwanis International and oversees the organization's branches and clubs in 80 nations, from the Kiwanis Club of Pike Township in Indianapolis. With a hands-on approach and great leadership from folks like Stan, as well as previous leaders such as State Representative Christina Hale, Kiwanis clubs provide a place for fellowship, as well as personal and community growth. Kiwanis and its affiliates boast more than 600,000 members who raise more than \$100 million and contribute more than 18 million volunteer hours each year. Their impact is tremendous and felt globally.

In the State of Indiana, there are more than 190 Kiwanis clubs and more than 6,000 adult members participating in a wide variety of charitable efforts. Kiwanis has served the Indianapolis area by providing everything from playground projects to scholarship programs. Hoosier Kiwanis clubs have raised more than \$234,000 to benefit the Child Life program at Riley Hospital for Children and contributed more than \$1.1 million toward the Eliminate Project, which works with developing countries to help immunize millions of women in the fight against maternal and neonatal tetanus. These Hoosiers serve as an example of the hard work and service that make Indiana a great place to live. Each year, Kiwanis clubs in Indiana serve nearly 300,000 children and youths, raise more than \$1.1 million, and donate more than 50,000 volunteer hours of invaluable service. I commend the Indiana district Kiwanis leaders for these great accomplishments in doing good for Indiana communities and the world.

On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I congratulate and thank each and every member of Kiwanis International for helping Kiwanis evolve into the thriving and impactful organization that it is today. For a century, Kiwanians have faithfully served their local communities and communities around the world. I wish them continued growth and success for many more years to come.●

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS ROBOTICS TEAM

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, UNLV, robotics team on being selected as one of the top ten in the world by competing in the 2015 U.S. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency Robotics Challenge. The competition included a dozen teams from the United States, including the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Lockheed Martin. Eleven teams from Japan, Germany, Italy, South Korea, and Hong Kong also participated.

The competition was initially created in response to the humanitarian need after the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear reactor incident in 2011. The goal of the program remains to accelerate the development of advanced robots capable of entering areas too dangerous for humans and acting as first responders in the disaster zone. The robots chosen as finalists, including UNLV's Metal Rebel, competed in eight tasks related to disaster response, including climbing stairs, turning valves, tripping circuit breakers, walking among rubble, and driving alone. Metal Rebel took eighth place out of 23 teams, bringing in a score of 6 out of 8 and a

time of 57:41. This team of students and faculty stands as a tribute to what dedication and hard work can achieve. I am proud to call them fellow Nevadans.

The team of 15 UNLV engineering students was led by Paul Oh, Lincy professor of unmanned aerial systems and expert in robotics and autonomous systems for UNLV's Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering. Mr. Oh joined the competition to help UNLV and Nevada become a national leader in the autonomous systems industry. He was also the former program director for the National Science Foundation robotics. His work for this university and our State is greatly appreciated.

I am excited to see local students and faculty bringing recognition to both Nevada and to UNLV for their advancement in a global competition. These students should be proud to call themselves top contenders in this international competition. I ask my colleagues to join me and all Nevadans in congratulating UNLV for its success and honorable representation of Nevada.●

CONGRATULATING BECKY BOSSHART, MICHAEL PFURR, ROHAN DHARAN, MICHAEL MONCRIEFF, AND RYAN LARSEN

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize five of Nevada's brightest students—Becky Bosshart, Michael Pfurr, Rohan Dharan, Michael Moncrieff, and Ryan Larsen—on being selected as 2015 recipients of the Fulbright scholarship.

The Fulbright Scholar Program was developed shortly after World War II by former U.S. Senator James William Fulbright due to language barriers experienced by Americans and their allies during the war. Students selected for the program study and teach English abroad, building upon their language skills, as well as growing international good will. The scholarship is highly competitive, with thousands applying from colleges and universities across the country. I am proud to congratulate these five students on their achievement, as well as the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, UNLV, on receiving its largest amount of Fulbright scholarship selections in a single year in Rebel history. The students are shining examples of how hard work leads to success, and stand as role models for future Rebels.

The five students will teach English and expand upon their language skills in countries from Eastern Europe to Asia. Ms. Bosshart served in the Peace Corps in Chernivisti, Ukraine, and worked diligently to return to Eastern Europe. She will spend her time in Romania. Mr. LARSEN spent the last 6 years mentoring Fulbright scholarship applicants and will spend time in Japan. Mr. Moncrieff will complete his

Ph.D. while studying in Kistanje, Croatia. Mr. Dharan, a member of Teach for America, will expand upon his teaching experience in New Delhi, India. Finally, Mr. Pfurr will build upon his experience in Austria. I am proud to call these excellent students ambassadors for not only the United States, but also for Nevada, throughout their journeys.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these exceptional young Nevadans. These students worked hard for this incredible opportunity, and I wish them the best of luck in their future endeavors.●

CONGRATULATING WOODY OVERTON

● Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I congratulate my good friend Woody Overton on his retirement after 14 years as director of governmental affairs and community relations at JE Dunn Construction and his many years of leadership and service to Kansas City. Woody demonstrated exceptional professionalism, and I am pleased to recognize his outstanding career today.

Woody, a native of Trenton, MO, received his bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Missouri—Kansas City. He is a U.S. Army veteran and is deeply involved with nonprofit and civic organizations in the Kansas City area.

Woody served as assistant to former U.S. Senator Thomas Eagleton in charge of major projects and constituent services from 1977 to 1986. He learned from the best and embodied the lessons he learned from Senator Eagleton throughout his life and career. Each time you talk to Woody he will share a lesson he learned through an anecdote. That time in his life was the defining moment of his career, and his love of public service and community involvement came directly from his respect and admiration for his boss and friend, Senator Tom Eagleton.

In 1992, Woody ran the Clinton Presidential campaign in Missouri, helping President Clinton secure a must-win State by ten points. In 1993, Woody was appointed as the Regional Administrator of the General Services Administration's, GSA, Heartland Region which includes Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas. Woody served as its chief executive officer and regional liaison to other Federal agencies, State and local Governments. Woody's leadership and accomplishments in providing better customer service to Federal agencies earned him the GSA Administrator's "Exceptional Service Award" in May 2001.

Woody's ability to work with Democrats and Republicans to help Kansas City remain a Federal regional center during his tenure as head of Kansas City's GSA should be commended. He oversaw construction of several important Kansas City buildings including

the Federal courthouse, the Illus W. Davis Civic Mall, the FBI office, and the Agriculture Department complex and in Kansas City, Kansas another courthouse and the Environmental Protection Agency headquarters.

Woody is looking forward to spending more time with his family, and especially his grandchildren. I know they will enjoy the opportunity to spend more time with him.

It is my pleasure to honor Woody Overton today. He has touched the lives of many and immensely improved the Kansas City community.

I ask that the Senate join me in congratulating and honoring Glen W. "Woody" Overton.●

RECOGNIZING MAINSTREET SELF STORAGE

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses are able to recognize what their neighbors and communities need, and what is even more impressive is that they are able to meet those needs quickly and efficiently. This is especially important when a natural disaster strikes. That is why this week's Small Business of the Week is Mainstreet Self Storage of Shreveport, LA.

Northwest Louisiana is currently struggling with major flooding, which has driven families out of their homes and shut down small businesses. In response, Mainstreet Self Storage is doing its part to help those affected by offering free storage space for the next 3 months. Through this program, Mainstreet aims to provide folks a safe, secure space to store their belongings—truly a fine example of Louisiana's ingenuity and generosity.

In May of 2009, the Delaney family opened a facility offering storage and moving solutions for Shreveport-Bossier city residents. Mainstreet Self Storage's complex is comprised of climate-controlled units, nonclimate controlled-units, car garages, cover RV storage, and open or closed storage for boats and vehicles. Mainstreet's top-of-the-line security system and humidity-controlled units give clients a peace of mind in the stowing of their belongings. Shortly after opening, Mainstreet partnered with the U-Haul company in order to offer moving and transportation equipment to their customers. In the years since, Mainstreet Self Storage has become a Top 100 U-Haul Dealer and was recently named the eighth in the Nation for customer service.

Congratulations to MainStreet Storage for being selected as the Small Business of the Week. We appreciate and recognize your generosity and commitment to aiding your neighbors in Northwest Louisiana during these times of need.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting nominations which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:31 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2393. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of the 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 23. An act to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-62).

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1558. An original bill making appropriations for Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-63).

By Mrs. CAPITO, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2250. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-64).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 756. A bill to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1551. A bill to provide for certain requirements relating to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1552. A bill to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. COATS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SASSE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1553. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1554. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study with respect to stormwater runoff from oil and gas operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. REID, Mr. Kaine, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1555. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1556. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

S. 1558. An original bill making appropriations for Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1559. A bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1560. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide end-users with a reasonable amount of time to meet their margin requirements and to repeal certain indemnification requirements for regulatory authorities to obtain access to swap data required to be provided by swaps entities; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1561. A bill to clarify the definition of nonadmitted insurer under the Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1563. A bill to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to extend, enhance, and revise the provisions relating to collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children, to establish certain other protections for personal information of children and minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1564. A bill to require that employers provide not less than 10 days of paid vacation time to eligible employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1565. A bill to allow the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to provide greater protection to servicemembers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1566. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for coverage of oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the coverage provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1567. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a review of the characterization or terms of discharge from the Armed Forces of individuals with mental health disorders alleged to affect terms of

discharge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1568. A bill to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 1569. A bill to require a review of the adequacy of existing procedures to ensure at least one employee of the personal office of each Senator serving on a committee that requires access to top secret and sensitive compartmented information may obtain the security clearances necessary for the employee to have access to such information; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 1570. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce to establish public-private partnerships under the Market Development Cooperator Program of the International Trade Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 199. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding establishing a National Strategic Agenda; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 200. A resolution wishing His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama a happy 80th birthday on July 6, 2015, and recognizing the outstanding contributions His Holiness has made to the promotion of nonviolence, human rights, interfaith dialogue, environmental awareness, and democracy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 146

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 146, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes.

S. 280

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr.

WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 280, a bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to safeguard data stored abroad from improper government access, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, supra.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to enable hospital-based nursing programs that are affiliated with a hospital to maintain payments under the Medicare program to hospitals for the costs of such programs.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 1049

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to allow the financing by United States persons of sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1115

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1115, a bill to close out expired, empty grant accounts.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term "waters of the United States", and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SASSE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, *supra*.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from New Hamp-

shire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1178

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1178, a bill to prohibit implementation of a proposed rule relating to the definition of the term "waters of the United States" under the Clean Water Act, or any substantially similar rule, until a Supplemental Scientific Review Panel and Ephemeral and Intermittent Streams Advisory Committee produce certain reports, and for other purposes.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to exempt application of JSA attribution rule in case of existing agreements.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1476

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1476, a bill to require States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding shooting incidents involving law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1473 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1559

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1559 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1567

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1567 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1578

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1578 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1605

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1605 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1771

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1771 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1783

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1783 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for

military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1987

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1987 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1552. A bill to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1552

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Clean Water for Rural Communities Act”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to ensure a safe and adequate municipal, rural, and industrial water supply for the citizens of—

- (1) Dawson, Garfield, McCone, Prairie, Richland, Judith Basin, Wheatland, Golden Valley, Fergus, Yellowstone, and Musselshell Counties in the State of Montana; and
- (2) McKenzie County, North Dakota.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration.

(2) AUTHORITY.—The term “Authority” means—

(A) in the case of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System—

(i) the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority, which is a publicly owned nonprofit water authority formed in accordance with Mont. Code Ann. § 75–6–302 (2007); and

(ii) any nonprofit successor entity to the Authority described in clause (i); and

(B) in the case of the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System—

(i) the Central Montana Regional Water Authority, which is a publicly owned nonprofit water authority formed in accordance with Mont. Code Ann. § 75–6–302 (2007); and

(ii) any nonprofit successor entity to the Authority described in clause (i).

(3) DRY-REDWATER REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY SYSTEM.—The term “Dry-Redwater

Regional Water Authority System” means the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System authorized under section 4(a)(1) with a project service area that includes—

(A) Garfield and McCone Counties in the State;

(B) the area west of the Yellowstone River in Dawson and Richland Counties in the State;

(C) T. 15 N. (including the area north of the Township) in Prairie County in the State; and

(D) the portion of McKenzie County, North Dakota, that includes all land that is located west of the Yellowstone River in the State of North Dakota.

(4) INTEGRATED SYSTEM.—The term “integrated system” means the transmission system owned by the Western Area Power Administration Basin Electric Power District and the Heartland Consumers Power District.

(5) MUSSELHELL-JUDITH RURAL WATER SYSTEM.—The term “Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System” means the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System authorized under section 4(a)(2) with a project service area that includes—

(A) Judith Basin, Wheatland, Golden Valley, and Musselshell Counties in the State;

(B) the portion of Yellowstone County in the State within 2 miles of State Highway 3 and within 4 miles of the county line between Golden Valley and Yellowstone Counties in the State, inclusive of the Town of Broadview, Montana; and

(C) the portion of Fergus County in the State within 2 miles of US Highway 87 and within 4 miles of the county line between Fergus and Judith Basin Counties in the State, inclusive of the Town of Moore, Montana.

(6) NON-FEDERAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.—The term “non-Federal distribution system” means a non-Federal utility that provides electricity to the counties covered by the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System.

(7) PICK-SLOAN PROGRAM.—The term “Pick-Sloan program” means the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program (authorized by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the “Flood Control Act of 1944”) (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665)).

(8) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(9) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Montana.

(10) WATER SYSTEM.—The term “Water System” means—

(A) the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System; and

(B) the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System.

SEC. 4. DRY-REDWATER REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY SYSTEM AND MUSSELHELL-JUDITH RURAL WATER SYSTEM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may carry out—

(1) the project entitled the “Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System” in a manner that is substantially in accordance with the feasibility study entitled “Dry-Redwater Regional Water System Feasibility Study” (including revisions of the study), which received funding from the Bureau of Reclamation on September 1, 2010; and

(2) the project entitled the “Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System” in a manner that is substantially in accordance with the feasibility report entitled “Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System Feasibility Re-

port” (including any and all revisions of the report).

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the Authority to provide Federal assistance for the planning, design, and construction of the Water Systems.

(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the costs relating to the planning, design, and construction of the Water Systems shall not exceed—

(i) in the case of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System—

(I) 75 percent of the total cost of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System; or

(II) such other lesser amount as may be determined by the Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, in a feasibility report; or

(ii) in the case of the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System, 75 percent of the total cost of the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System.

(B) LIMITATION.—Amounts made available under subparagraph (A) shall not be returnable or reimbursable under the reclamation laws.

(2) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(A) GENERAL USES.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Water Systems may use Federal funds made available to carry out this section for—

(i) facilities relating to—

(I) water pumping;

(II) water treatment; and

(III) water storage;

(ii) transmission pipelines;

(iii) pumping stations;

(iv) appurtenant buildings, maintenance equipment, and access roads;

(v) any interconnection facility that connects a pipeline of the Water System to a pipeline of a public water system;

(vi) electrical power transmission and distribution facilities required for the operation and maintenance of the Water System;

(vii) any other facility or service required for the development of a rural water distribution system, as determined by the Secretary; and

(viii) any property or property right required for the construction or operation of a facility described in this subsection.

(B) ADDITIONAL USES.—In addition to the uses described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System may use Federal funds made available to carry out this section for—

(I) facilities relating to water intake; and

(II) distribution, pumping, and storage facilities that—

(aa) serve the needs of citizens who use public water systems;

(bb) are in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(cc) may be purchased, improved, and repaired in accordance with a cooperative agreement entered into by the Secretary under subsection (b); and

(ii) the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System may use Federal funds made available to carry out this section for—

(I) facilities relating to—

(aa) water supply wells; and

(bb) distribution pipelines; and

(II) control systems.

(C) LIMITATION.—Federal funds made available to carry out this section shall not be used for the operation, maintenance, or replacement of the Water Systems.

(D) TITLE.—Title to the Water Systems shall be held by the Authority.

SEC. 5. USE OF POWER FROM PICK-SLOAN PROGRAM BY THE DRY-REDWATER REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY SYSTEM.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that—

(1) McCone and Garfield Counties in the State were designated as impact counties during the period in which the Fort Peck Dam was constructed; and

(2) as a result of the designation, the Counties referred to in paragraph (1) were to receive impact mitigation benefits in accordance with the Pick-Sloan program.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF POWER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Administrator shall make available to the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System a quantity of power required, of up to 1½ megawatt capacity, to meet the pumping and incidental operation requirements of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System during the period beginning on May 1 and ending on October 31 of each year—

(A) from the water intake facilities; and

(B) through all pumping stations, water treatment facilities, reservoirs, storage tanks, and pipelines up to the point of delivery of water by the water supply system to all storage reservoirs and tanks and each entity that distributes water at retail to individual users.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—The Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System shall be eligible to receive power under paragraph (1) if the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System—

(A) operates on a not-for-profit basis; and

(B) is constructed pursuant to a cooperative agreement entered into by the Secretary under section 4(b).

(3) RATE.—The Administrator shall establish the cost of the power described in paragraph (1) at the firm power rate.

(4) ADDITIONAL POWER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If power, in addition to that made available to the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System under paragraph (1), is necessary to meet the pumping requirements of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority, the Administrator may purchase the necessary additional power at the best available rate.

(B) REIMBURSEMENT.—The cost of purchasing additional power shall be reimbursed to the Administrator by the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority.

(5) RESPONSIBILITY FOR POWER CHARGES.—The Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority shall be responsible for the payment of the power charge described in paragraph (4) and non-Federal delivery costs described in paragraph (6).

(6) TRANSMISSION ARRANGEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System shall be responsible for all non-Federal transmission and distribution system delivery and service arrangements.

(B) UPGRADES.—The Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System shall be responsible for funding any transmission upgrades, if required, to the integrated system necessary to deliver power to the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System.

SEC. 6. WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act—

(1) preempts or affects any State water law; or

(2) affects any authority of a State, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, to manage water resources within that State.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are nec-

essary to carry out the planning, design, and construction of the Water Systems, substantially in accordance with the cost estimate set forth in the applicable feasibility study or feasibility report described in section 4(a).

(b) COST INDEXING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) may be increased or decreased in accordance with ordinary fluctuations in development costs incurred after the applicable date specified in paragraph (2), as indicated by any available engineering cost indices applicable to construction activities that are similar to the construction of the Water Systems.

(2) APPLICABLE DATES.—The date referred to in paragraph (1) is—

(A) in the case of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System, January 1, 2008; and

(B) in the case of the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water Authority System, November 1, 2014.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1556. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I introduced the Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act, a bill that would enable faculty working less than full-time to participate in the Public Service Student Loan Forgiveness Program.

Contingent faculty members are like full-time instructors. They have advanced degrees. They teach classes and spend many hours outside the classroom preparing for class. They hold office hours, grade papers and give feedback to students. They provide advice and write letters of recommendation. Students rely on them. Since most adjuncts have advanced degrees and, as almost 75 percent of graduate degree recipients have an average of \$61,000 in student loans, they are also among the 40 million Americans with student debt.

The Public Service Loan Forgiveness program is meant to encourage graduates to go into public service by offering student loan forgiveness for eligible federal loans after 10 years of full-time work in government or the non-profit sector. Public service fields like nursing, military service, and public health qualify. Many education jobs qualify, including full-time work at public universities and part-time work at community colleges in high-needs subject areas or areas of shortage. But other faculty members, those who work part-time, are not eligible for loan forgiveness because the law requires an annual average of 30 hours per week to qualify for the program. For adjunct faculty working at several schools on a contingent basis, this requirement can be difficult or impossible to meet, even when they are putting in more than 30 hours of work each week.

The number of faculty hours given for each class is calculated differently at different schools. Some give one hour per hour in the classroom while others actually take into consideration the time required outside the classroom. So, even as these faculty members are working hard and as their options for tenured, full-time positions become slimmer, more of them are overworked and undervalued for their work in public service.

The Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2015 would solve this by amending the Higher Education Act to expand the definition of a “public service job” to include a part-time faculty member who teaches at least one course at an eligible institution of higher education. They would still have to meet all the other requirements to qualify for the program, including making 120 on-time payments while employed at a qualifying institution, and they could not be employed full-time elsewhere at the same time.

This bill would benefit someone like Alyson, an adjunct professor from Chicago, IL, who graduated with \$65,000 in student loan debt and, after 10 years of on-time payments, has over \$56,000 left. Like most adjuncts, Alyson strings together multiple teaching assignments along with part-time work to afford her monthly living expenses and minimum student loan payment. She comes from a family of educators and considers teaching her dream job. Alyson would like to participate in the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program. This bill would ensure that Alyson and many thousands like her, could obtain credit towards the Public Service Loan Program for loan payments she made while teaching, whether she was teaching one course or seven.

Unfortunately, for all their contributions to the college programs and the students they work with, adjunct faculty don't have the same employment benefits or job security as their colleagues. The number of classes they teach every semester varies. To make ends meet, these professors often end up teaching classes at more than one school in the same semester, getting paid about \$3,000 per class and making an average annual income that hovers around minimum wage. This also means that, in some parts of the country, they spend as much time commuting as they do teaching.

Nationally, over half of all higher education faculty work on a contingent basis, facing low pay with little or no benefits or job security. In the past, these were a minority of professors who were hired to teach an occasional class because they could bring experience to the classroom in a specific field or industry. Over time, as university budgets have tightened and it has gotten more expensive to hire full-time,

tenure track professors, higher education institutions have increasingly hired adjuncts.

From 1991 to 2011, the number of part-time faculty in the U.S. increased two and a half times from 291,000 to over 760,000. At the same time, the percentage of professors holding tenure-track positions has been steadily decreasing—from 45 percent of all instructors in 1975 to only 24 percent in 2011. The number of full-time instructors, tenured and non-tenured, now makes up only about 50 percent of professors on U.S. campuses. The other 50 percent of the 1.5 million faculty employees at public and non-profit colleges and universities in the U.S. work on a part-time, contingent basis.

Illinois colleges rely heavily on adjuncts. In 2012, 53 percent of all faculty at public and not-for-profit colleges and universities in the State, more than 30,400 faculty employees, worked on a part-time basis. This is a 52.6 percent increase in part-time faculty in Illinois compared to a 13 percent increase in full-time faculty since 2002.

Not surprisingly, in Illinois, 69 percent of all part-time faculty work in Chicago, where the cost of living is 16 percent higher than the U.S. average. Based on an average payment of \$3,000 per class an adjunct professor must teach between 17 and 30 classes a year to pay for rent and utilities in Chicago.

They would have to teach up to seven classes to afford groceries for a family of four and two to four classes per year just to cover student loan payments. Because they are part-time, they are not eligible for vacation time, paid sick days, or group health-care. So they would have to teach an additional two to three classes to afford family coverage from the lowest priced health insurance offered on Get Covered Illinois, the official health marketplace.

Even though these professors are working in a relatively low-paying field, teaching our students, their part-time status also means they aren't eligible for the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program.

This bill does not completely fix this growing reliance on part-time professors who are underpaid and undervalued. But it would ensure that members of the contingent faculty workforce are no longer excluded from the loan forgiveness program for public servants. I would like to thank my colleague, Senator AL FRANKEN from Minnesota for joining me in this effort. I hope my other colleagues will also join me to provide this benefit to faculty members who provide our students with a quality education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1556

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY.

Section 455(m)(3)(B)(ii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(m)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking "teaching as" and inserting the following: "teaching—

"(I) as";

(2) by striking ", foreign language faculty, and part-time faculty at community colleges, as determined by the Secretary." and inserting "and foreign language faculty), as determined by the Secretary; or"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(II) as a part-time faculty member or instructor who—

"(aa) teaches not less than 1 course at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a)), a postsecondary vocational institution (as defined in section 102(c)), or a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b)); and

"(bb) is not employed on a full-time basis by any other employer.".

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1557

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Servicemember Student Loan Affordability Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. INTEREST RATE LIMITATION ON DEBT ENTERED INTO DURING MILITARY SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 527) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "ON DEBT INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE" after "LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

"(2) LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT ON DEBT INCURRED DURING SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE.—An obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year that is incurred by a servicemember, or the servicemember and the servicemember's

spouse jointly, during military service to consolidate or refinance one or more student loans incurred by the servicemember before such military service shall not bear an interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent during the period of military service.";

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by inserting "or (2)" after "paragraph (1)"; and

(5) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking "paragraph (2)" and inserting "paragraph (3)".

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "the interest rate limitation in subsection (a)" and inserting "an interest rate limitation in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking "AS OF DATE OF ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY"; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "in the case of an obligation or liability covered by subsection (a)(1), or as of the date the servicemember (or servicemember and spouse jointly) incurs the obligation or liability concerned under subsection (a)(2)".

(c) STUDENT LOAN DEFINED.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) STUDENT LOAN.—The term 'student loan' means the following:

"(A) A Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

"(B) A private student loan as that term is defined in section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)).".

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1564. A bill to require that employers provide not less than 10 days of paid vacation time to eligible employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about family values. "Family values" is an expression that has been used for many years by my Republican colleagues. Generally speaking, what they mean by "family values" is opposition to a woman's right to choose, opposition to contraception, opposition to gay rights. I happen to strongly disagree with many of my Republican colleagues on those issues. Let me take the opportunity to briefly give a somewhat different perspective on family values—on real family values, on the values that really matter to millions of families in this country.

When a mother gives birth to a baby and is unable to spend time with that newborn child during the first weeks and months of that baby's life because she does not have the money to stay home and is forced to go back to work, which is the case for millions of mothers in this country, that is not a family value. Separating a mother from a newborn baby for economic reasons is not a family value. In fact, that is an attack on everything that a family is supposed to stand for.

When a wife is diagnosed with cancer and her husband cannot get time off of work to take care of her because he

does not have any family or medical leave time or sick leave time, that is not a family value. That is an attack on everything that a family is supposed to stand for.

When a husband, wife, and kids, during the course of an entire year, are unable to spend any time on a vacation, when they cannot get together in leisure activity, when they cannot relax and spend quality time with each other, that is not a family value.

Let us be very clear in understanding that, in fact, in terms of protecting the needs of our families, in terms of real family values, in many, many respects the United States of America lags behind virtually every other major country on earth.

When you look at other major countries, what you find is that the United States is the only advanced economy that does not guarantee its workers some form of paid family leave, some form of paid sick time, some form of paid vacation time. In other words, when it comes to basic workplace protections and family benefits, workers in every other major industrialized country in the world get a better deal than our workers here in the United States. That is wrong. That is a travesty, and that has got to change.

Last place is no place for America. It is time for us to join the rest of the industrialized world by showing the people of this country that we are not just a nation that talks about family values but that we are a nation that is prepared to live up to these ideals by making sure that workers in this country have access to paid family leave, paid sick time, and paid vacations, just like workers in virtually every other major country on earth.

Simply stated, it is unacceptable that millions of women in this country give birth and are forced back to work because they do not have the income to stay home with their newborn babies.

When we talk about family values, what is more important than for mothers and fathers to bond with their babies at a time when almost every psychologist will tell you those are the most important weeks and months of a human being's life? What kind of family value is it when you tell a woman who has just had a baby that she cannot spend time with her child because she has to go back to work? This is not a family value. That is an insult to every mother, every father, and every newborn child in this country, and we have to change that.

The reality is that the Family and Medical Leave Act that was signed into law in 1993 is totally inadequate. Today, nearly 8 out of 10 workers in this country who are eligible to take time off under this law cannot do so because they cannot afford to do so, according to the Department of Labor. Even worse, 40 percent of American workers are not even eligible to receive

this unpaid leave because they work for a company with fewer than 50 employees.

In my view, every worker in this country should be guaranteed at least 12 weeks of paid family and medical leave, and that is why I am a proud cosponsor of the FAMILY Act, introduced by KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND. The FAMILY Act would guarantee employees 12 weeks of paid family and medical leave to take care of a baby, to help a family member who is diagnosed with cancer or has some other serious medical condition or to take care of themselves if they become seriously ill. Just like Social Security retirement and disability, it is an insurance program that workers would pay into at a price of about one cup of coffee a week.

That is not all. We have to make certain that in this country workers have paid sick time. It is absurd that low-wage workers in McDonald's and Burger King and low-wage employees all over this country who get sick are forced to work because they cannot afford to take time off. Not only is this unfair to the workers, it is also a public health issue. I do not know about you, but I am not crazy about the idea of somebody who is sick coming to work and preparing the food that I eat in a restaurant.

That is why I am supporting the Healthy Families Act, introduced by Senator PATTY MURRAY, which guarantees 7 days of paid sick leave to American workers. This bill would benefit 43 million Americans who today do not have access to paid sick leave, and it would create a permanent floor in workplaces where employers already provide some paid sick leave.

Last but not least, when we talk about the disappearing American middle class, we are talking about millions of American workers working longer hours for lower wages. We are talking about Americans who are overworked, underpaid and, in many cases, living under enormous stress. In my State of Vermont, I see it every week I am home. You talk to people who work not one job but who are working two jobs or sometimes three jobs in order to cobble together some income and some health care.

Here is an amazing irony. Many of us can remember in school reading about workers protesting, taking to the streets 100 years ago, and they held up large banners. Do you know what those banners said 100 years ago? They said: We want a 40-hour workweek. A 40-hour workweek was the demand 100 years ago. Today, we still have not achieved that goal.

In fact, today 85 percent of men who are working and 66 percent of working women are working more than 40 hours a week. In fact, in America today—not widely known but true—our people are working the longest hours of any major country on Earth, because as real

wages go down, people have to work 50 hours or they have to work 60 hours. Husbands are working here, and wives are working there—all to cobble together some income in order to provide for the family.

Today Americans are working 137 hours a year more than workers in Japan—and the Japanese are very hard workers. We are working 260 hours more than the British and almost 500 hours a year more than French workers.

That is why I am introducing legislation today to require employers to provide at least 10 days of paid vacation to workers in this country. This is already done in almost every other major country on Earth. It is one more way to demonstrate our commitment to real family values. What we are saying is that if families are overworked and if husbands and wives do not even have the time to spend together with their kids, what family values are about is that at least for 2 weeks a year, people can come together under a relaxed environment and enjoy the family. That is a family value that I want to see happen in this country.

The time is long overdue for us to start talking about real family values, not about abortion, not about gay rights but the values the American people want to see inscribed in law to protect their families. Let us make sure every American worker is entitled to paid family and medical leave, paid sick time, and guaranteed at least some vacation time. Those are real family values. Let's go forward and make that happen.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1565. A bill to allow the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to provide greater protection to servicemembers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, along with Senators SCHUMER, MENENDEZ, WARNER, MERKLEY, WARREN, BLUMENTHAL, FRANKEN, DURBIN, KAINE, and HIRONO, I am introducing the Military Consumer Protection Act, which reinforces our commitment to consumer protections for servicemembers.

Our country has a strong tradition of ensuring that our servicemembers are protected while they sacrifice to keep our Nation safe. Building on such efforts, Congress passed the Soldiers' and Sailor's Civil Relief Act as World War II escalated to provide crucial financial protections for servicemembers to "enable such persons to devote their entire energy to the defense needs of the Nation." Now called the Servicemember Civil Relief Act, SCRA, this law includes such protections as prohibiting

the eviction of servicemembers and their dependents from rental or mortgaged properties and capping the interest at 6 percent on debts incurred prior to an individual entering active duty military service.

Despite the SCRA's importance, enforcement of this critical law has been found to be inconsistent and subject to the discretion of our financial regulators. Indeed, misinformation, lapses, and mistakes that the SCRA was intended to fix continue to persist. Moreover, according to a July 2012 report from the Government Accountability Office, "in 2010, examinations for SCRA compliance occurred in an estimated 26 percent of all [financial] institutions, compared with 2007 when about 4 percent of all institutions were reviewed for SCRA."

Without a change in the law, SCRA enforcement will continue to be subject to the changing priorities of the financial regulators. Simply put, prioritizing the consumer protection of our servicemembers should not be discretionary. It should be mandatory, and my legislation ensures that SCRA enforcement will be a permanent priority for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, which Congress created to enforce Federal consumer financial protection laws.

In 2010, as we were debating the creation of the CFPB, I led the bipartisan effort to ensure it would contain a key role in protecting servicemembers through the establishment of an Office of Servicemember Affairs. Since that time, the CFPB has coordinated with other enforcement agencies and regulators to help servicemembers recover millions in relief from unscrupulous actors in the financial marketplace. With this demonstrated record of success in protecting our servicemembers, the CFPB is an ideal focal point for enforcement of certain key SCRA provisions, such as the protections against default judgments and the maximum rate of interest on debts incurred before military service.

As we take steps to protect our servicemembers, we should do all we can to make sure there is a strong watchdog on the beat that can enforce the protections we have put in place. Our legislation is supported by the National Guard Association of the United States, the National Military Family Association, the Military Officers Association of America, Americans for Financial Reform, the Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Action, the National Consumer Law Center, and the U.S. Public Interest Research Group. I urge our colleagues to help honor our commitment to our Nation's servicemembers by joining us in this effort to improve the supervision and enforcement of the SCRA.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 199—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL STRATEGIC AGENDA

Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 199

Whereas the United States needs its leaders to pursue policies in the interest of the United States that are foremost national priorities;

Whereas the United States faces many fiscal and long-term policy challenges that not only threaten the opportunities, hopes, and aspirations of the citizens of the United States, but the overall ability of the United States to be a world leader in bringing peace and stability around the world;

Whereas the United States needs its leaders to unite behind common goals and concrete solutions to create the next generation of growth and opportunity;

Whereas a National Strategic Agenda can provide both a long-term vision and a priority list, oriented around common goals for the United States, both of which, as of May 2015, do not exist in the Federal Government;

Whereas adopting a National Strategic Agenda would bring a long-term vision to a policymaking process that has become too often dominated by short-term political considerations;

Whereas a National Strategic Agenda can provide a consistent framework and focus the attention of the Federal Government on the most urgent problems facing the United States;

Whereas millions of people in the United States are currently seeking employment opportunities to improve their lives and provide a better future for their children;

Whereas, as of May 2015, the Federal debt is higher as a percentage of gross domestic product than at any time since World War II and will be an unsustainable burden on future generations if left unaddressed;

Whereas the Social Security and Medicare benefits that millions of people in the United States have earned must be preserved and protected;

Whereas a fiscally responsible solution to secure Social Security and Medicare for future generations is needed now, as waiting longer will further jeopardize the ability to preserve and protect these programs;

Whereas the United States can become energy secure by pursuing an all-of-the-above energy plan that develops more affordable and sustainable domestic energy sources, increases energy efficiency, and builds a more reliable and resilient system for energy generation and transmission; and

Whereas the creation and implementation of a new National Strategic Agenda for the United States will require the participation of both the legislative and executive branch along with agreement by all parties to work together: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the 4 goals of the National Strategic Agenda are to—

(A) create 25,000,000 new jobs over the next 10 years;

(B) balance the Federal budget by 2030;

(C) secure Medicare and Social Security for the next 75 years; and

(D) make the United States energy secure by 2024;

(2) the Senate should strive to create, debate, and adopt policy solutions to achieve the 4 goals of the National Strategic Agenda to address the national interest and priorities represented by the agenda; and

(3) in achieving success toward the National Strategic Agenda, the goal of the Senate should be to reach solutions through—

(A) collaboration, not division;

(B) mutual respect, not partisan bickering; and

(C) a commitment to honor the public duty of the Senate to the United States as a body of representatives elected by people across the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 200—WISHING HIS HOLINESS THE 14TH DALAI LAMA A HAPPY 80TH BIRTHDAY ON JULY 6, 2015, AND RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS HIS HOLINESS HAS MADE TO THE PROMOTION OF NONVIOLENCE, HUMAN RIGHTS, INTERFAITH DIALOGUE, ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS, AND DEMOCRACY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 200

Whereas, for over 50 years, His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama has significantly advanced greater understanding, tolerance, harmony, and respect among the religious faiths of the world;

Whereas the Dalai Lama was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1989 in recognition of his efforts to seek a peaceful resolution to the situation in Tibet and to promote non-violent methods for resolving conflict;

Whereas the Dalai Lama was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 2007 in recognition of his many enduring and outstanding contributions to peace, nonviolence, human rights, and religious understanding;

Whereas the Dalai Lama has led the effort to preserve the rich and unique cultural, religious, historical, and linguistic heritage of the people of Tibet while working to safeguard other endangered cultures throughout the world;

Whereas the 14th Dalai Lama has devolved the traditional role of the Dalai Lama as the political head of the Tibetan government, and his own responsibilities within the Central Tibetan Administration, in favor of the democratically elected leadership of Tibetans in exile, while continuing to travel and speak as a spiritual leader for the people of Tibet;

Whereas the Dalai Lama, together with leading environmentalists, has been gravely concerned by the degraded state of the environment of Tibet and the consumption of the natural resources of Tibet, including freshwater, because the degradations have implications not only for the people of Tibet, but for the whole of Asia; and

Whereas the people of the United States, including Tibetan Americans, have come to regard the Dalai Lama as a leading figure of moral and religious authority: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends well-wishes to the Dalai Lama on his 80th birthday;

(2) recognizes the Dalai Lama for a lifelong commitment and outstanding contribution to the promotion of nonviolence, human rights, religious tolerance, environmental awareness, and democracy; and

(3) recognizes the Dalai Lama for using moral authority to promote the concept of universal responsibility as a guiding tenet for how human beings should treat one another and the planet that all human beings share.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1997. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1998. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1999. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2000. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2001. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2002. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2003. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2004. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2005. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1569 proposed by Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. McCAIN) to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2006. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2007. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2008. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2009. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2010. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2011. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WICKER, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2012. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2013. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2014. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2015. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1997. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. ASSESSMENT OF EFFECT OF BETTER BUYING POWER 3.0 INITIATIVE ON INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) **ASSESSMENT OF BETTER BUYING POWER 3.0.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the Better Buying Power 3.0 initiative and its management of independent research and development activities by contractors of the Department of Defense.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the implementation of Better Buying Power 3.0 and how it balances the need for management of reimbursement of Department contractor independent research and development costs with the need

to preserve the independence of a contractor to choose which technologies to pursue in its independent research and development program.

(2) An assessment of the costs, risks and benefits of proposed changes to the current guidelines of the Department for authorizing independent research and development by contractors and reimbursing such contractors for expenses relating to such independent research and development.

(3) Recommendations for legislative or administrative action to improve the ways in which the Department authorizes independent research and development by contractors of the Department and reimburses such contractors for expenses relating to such independent research and development.

SA 1998. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 475, beginning on line 17, strike “2035; and” and all that follows through “(E) Implications” on line 18 and insert the following: “2035;

(D) options to address ship classes that begin decommissioning prior to 2035, including Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers; and

(E) implications

SA 1999. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. RETENTION OF RECORDS OF REPRIMANDS AND ADMONISHMENTS RECEIVED BY EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 714. Record of reprimands and admonishments

“If any employee of the Department receives a reprimand or admonishment, the Secretary shall retain a copy of such reprimand or admonishment in the permanent record of the employee as long as the employee is employed by the Department.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“714. Record of reprimands and admonishments.”.

SA 2000. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1614. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION MODIFYING RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF ROCKET ENGINES FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION FOR THE EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report if the bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report—

(1) would not authorize appropriations for a fiscal year for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy; and

(2) would modify, amend, or supersede restrictions on the use of rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 2001. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. REVIEW OF CHARACTERIZATION OR TERMS OF DISCHARGE FROM THE ARMED FORCES OF INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL HEALTH DISORDERS ALLEGED TO AFFECT TERMS OF DISCHARGE.

Section 1553(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) In addition to the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2), in the case of a former member described in subparagraph (B), the board shall—

“(i) review medical evidence of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or a civilian health care provider that is presented by the former member; and

“(ii) review the case with a rebuttable presumption in favor of the former member that post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic

brain injury materially contributed to the circumstances resulting in the discharge of a lesser characterization.

“(B) A former member described in this subparagraph is a former member described in paragraph (1) or a former member whose application for relief is based in whole or in part on matters relating to post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury as supporting rationale or as justification for priority consideration whose post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury is related to combat or military sexual trauma, as determined by the Secretary concerned.”.

SA 2002. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1273 and insert the following:

SEC. 1273. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT ON QATAR FIGHTER AIRCRAFT CAPABILITY CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL SAFETY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States should consider, in a timely manner, the July 2013 Letter of Request from the Government of Qatar for fighter aircraft;

(2) the approval of such a sale, if found to be in the national interests of the United States, could contribute to the self-defense of Qatar, deter the regional ambitions of Iran, reassure partners and allies of the United States commitment to regional security, and enhance the strike capability of fighter aircraft of the Qatar air force;

(3) the ability of our regional partners to respond to threatening Iranian military actions in the Gulf, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching a ballistic missile attack, is a critical element of deterring Iranian aggression and to maintaining security and stability in the region;

(4) the maintenance by Israel of a Qualitative Military Edge (QME) is vital, and due diligence is essential in thoroughly evaluating the impact of such a sale as it relates to the military capabilities of Israel; and

(5) the Department of State should prioritize its consideration of whether to issue a Letter of Offer and Acceptance, to advance the sale of fighter aircraft to the Government of Qatar so that key decisions can be taken regarding the way forward for capabilities that are critical for security and stability in the Middle East.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the risks and benefits of the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar as described in subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the followings:

(A) A description of the assumptions regarding the increase to Qatar air force capabilities as a result of the sale.

(B) A description of the assumptions regarding items described in subparagraph (A)

as they may impact the preservation by Israel of a Qualitative Military Edge.

(C) An estimated timeline for final adjudication of the decision to approve the sale.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

(4) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 2003. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SBIR PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE FEE EXTENSION.

Section 9(mm)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(1)) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “for the 3 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection” and inserting “until September 30, 2017”.

SA 2004. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE AIR FORCE MINORITY LEADERS PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Air Force Minority Leaders Program facilitates the development of relationships between the Department of the Air Force and students, teachers, and professors from historically black colleges and universities and minority institutions (HBCU/MI) to contribute to the performance of research tasks for the Department.

(2) The Air Force Minority Leaders Program promotes valuable research for the Department, increases the pipeline of minority scientific talent for professions within the Air Force, and strengthens the scientific and educational infrastructure in the minority community.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate to encourage the Department of the

Air Force and the Air Force Research Laboratory to continue to invest in the Air Force Minority Leaders Program by devoting time, personnel, and resources to the Program in order to meet the critical objectives of the Department with respect to defense capabilities, science and technology, the future workforce, and other technical matters.

SA 2005. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1569 proposed by Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. MCCAIN) to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, strike line 9 and insert the following:

authority regarding a cybersecurity threat; and

(iii) communications between a Federal law enforcement entity and a private entity regarding a cybersecurity threat;

SA 2006. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON TRAVEL OF NEXT OF KIN TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DIGNIFIED TRANSFER OF REMAINS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WHO DIE OVERSEAS.

(a) REVIEW OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a review of the current policies of the Department of Defense on the travel for next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The review required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the changes to Department instructions and Federal regulations necessary to provide Government funded travel to the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurred in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(B) An action plan and timeline for making the changes described in subparagraph (A).

(b) MODIFICATION OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall take ap-

propriate actions to modify the policies of the Department in order to provide Government funded travel for the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurs in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary is not required to modify the policies of the Department as described in paragraph (1) if, by not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary certifies, in writing, to the congressional defense committees that such action is not in the best interest of the United States. The certification shall include the following:

(A) An assessment and reevaluation by the Secretary of the rationale for excluding the next of kin from Government funded travel if the death of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the Department overseas occurs in a non-combat area.

(B) Recommendations for alternative plans to ensure that the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas in a non-combat area may participate in the dignified transfer of the remains of the deceased at Dover Port Mortuary, including through the actions of appropriate non-governmental organizations.

SA 2007. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION.

(a) EXTENSION OF COMMISSION.—Section 679 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1795), as amended by section 1095(b)(6) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 880), is further amended by striking “not later than 35 months after the Commission establishment date” and inserting “on October 1, 2016”.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 680 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (126 Stat. 1795), as amended by section 1095(b)(7) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (127 Stat. 880), is further amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “Of the amounts”;

(2) in the third sentence, by striking “under this section” and inserting “under this subsection”;

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, \$1,800,000 shall be made available to the Commission to carry out its duties under this subtitle. Funds made available to the Commission under the preceding sentence shall remain available until expended.”.

SA 2008. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1645 and insert the following:

SEC. 1645. ISRAELI COOPERATIVE MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM CODEVELOPMENT AND POTENTIAL COPRODUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for Procurement, Defense-wide, and available for the Missile Defense Agency, \$150,000,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel to procure the David's Sling Weapon System and \$15,000,000 for the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program, including for co-production of parts and components in the United States by United States industry.

(b) DISBURSEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), following successful completion of milestones that inform production decisions and production readiness reviews in the research, development, and technology agreements for the David's Sling Weapon System and the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Development Program, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency may disburse amounts available pursuant to subsection (a) on the basis of what is mutually agreed to by the United States and Israel, on or after the date that the United States enters into a bilateral agreement with the Government of Israel that, as determined by the Director, accomplishes the following:

(A) Establishes the terms of co-production of parts and components of the respective systems—

(i) in a manner that will minimize non-recurring engineering and facilitization expenses; and

(ii) that ensures that an optimal production share is carried out by United States persons.

(B) Ensures that, in the case of coproduction of the David's Sling Weapon System, a study is jointly conducted by the Israel Missile Defense Organization and the Missile Defense Agency of the United States as follows:

(i) The purpose of the study shall be to determine the most effective and efficient ways to reach a target of 50 percent production in the United States by the end of the multi-year coproduction plan.

(ii) The study shall identify and assess, with respect to the process of moving production to the United States—

(I) the best opportunities for United States contractors;

(II) cost, schedule, and operational risks; and

(III) imports required.

(iii) The study shall be carried out so that the results will inform future negotiations on the amendments to the bilateral agreement with regard to United States work share.

(C) Establishes a plan for procurement, using amounts disbursed under this subsection and based on the Israeli requirement for the number of interceptors and batteries

of the respective systems that will be procured.

(D) Allows the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to establish technical milestones for co-production and procurement of the respective systems.

(E) Establishes joint approval processes for third party sales of such systems.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR LONG LEAD TIME AND CRITICAL ITEMS.—(A) The Director may make a disbursement under paragraph (1) before the date that the United States enters into a bilateral agreement described in such paragraph for long lead time and critical procurement items and activities, not to exceed \$90,000,000 for the David's Sling Weapon System and \$15,000,000 for the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program.

(B) Amounts disbursed under subparagraph (A) shall be considered amounts disbursed under a bilateral agreement described in paragraph (1).

SA 2009. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XIV, add the following:

SEC. 1409. ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS, WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS, FOR THE DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 1401 is hereby increased by \$322,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for working capital funds, Defense Commissary Agency, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

(b) OFFSET.—

(1) O&M, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 is hereby decreased by \$53,666,667, with the amount of the decrease to be applied to amounts available for operation and maintenance, Army, as specified in the funding table in section 4301 and achieved by limiting excessive and redundant purchases of spare parts.

(2) O&M, NAVY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 is hereby decreased by \$53,666,667, with the amount of the decrease to be applied to amounts available for operation and maintenance, Navy, as specified in the funding table in section 4301 and achieved by limiting excessive and redundant purchases of spare parts.

(3) O&M, AIR FORCE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 is hereby decreased by \$53,666,666, with the amount of the decrease to be applied to amounts available for operation and maintenance, Air Force, as specified in the funding table in section 4301 and achieved by limiting excessive and redundant purchases of spare parts.

(4) GENERALLY.—The aggregate amount available for fiscal year 2016 under this division due to foreign currency fluctuations is reduced from the aggregate amount other-

wise specified in the funding tables in division D by \$151,000,000.

SA 2010. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. REPORT ON DEFENSE CONTRACTING FRAUD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on defense contracting fraud.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A summary of fraud-related criminal convictions and civil judgments or settlements over the previous five fiscal years.

(2) A listing of contractors that within the previous five fiscal years performed contracts for the Department of Defense and were debarred or suspended from Federal contracting based on a criminal conviction for fraud.

(3) An assessment of the total value of Department of Defense contracts entered into during the previous five fiscal years with contractors that have been indicted for, settled charges of, been fined by any Federal department or agency for, or been convicted of fraud in connection with any contract or other transaction entered into with the Federal Government.

(4) Recommendations by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense or other appropriate Department of Defense official regarding how to penalize contractors repeatedly involved in fraud in connection with contracts or other transactions entered into with the Federal Government, including an update on implementation by the Department of any previous such recommendations.

SA 2011. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WICKER, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1272 and insert the following:

SEC. 1272. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ANTI-TUNNEL COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Tunnels can be used for criminal purposes, such as smuggling drugs, weapons, or humans, or for terrorist or military purposes, such as launching surprise attacks or detonating explosives underneath civilian or military infrastructure.

(2) Tunnels have been a growing threat on the southern border of the United States for years.

(3) In the conflict in Gaza in 2014, terrorists used tunnels to conduct attacks against Israel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to develop technology to detect and counter tunnels, and the best way to do this is to partner with other affected countries;

(2) the Administration should, on a joint basis with Israel, carry out research, development, test, and evaluation of anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel; and

(3) the Administration should use developed anti-tunnel capabilities to better protect the United States and deployed United States military personnel.

(c) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH ANTI-TUNNEL CAPABILITIES PROGRAM WITH ISRAEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, is authorized to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel. Such authority includes authority to construct facilities and install equipment necessary to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation so authorized. Any activities carried out pursuant to such authority shall be conducted in a manner that appropriately protects sensitive information and United States and Israel national security interests.

(2) REPORT.—The activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (d) may be carried out after the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth the following:

(A) A memorandum of agreement between the United States and Israel regarding sharing of research and development costs for the capabilities described in paragraph (1), and any supporting documents.

(B) A certification that the memorandum of agreement—

(i) requires sharing of costs of projects, including in-kind support, between the United States and Israel;

(ii) establishes a framework to negotiate the rights to any intellectual property developed under the memorandum of agreement; and

(iii) requires the United States Government to receive quarterly reports on expenditure of funds, if any, by the Government of Israel, including a description of what the funds have been used for, when funds were expended, and an identification of entities that expended the funds.

(d) ASSISTANCE IN CONNECTION WITH PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide procurement, maintenance, and sustainment assistance to Israel in support of the anti-tunnel capabilities research, development, test, and evaluation activities authorized in subsection (c)(1).

(2) **REPORT.**—Assistance may not be provided under paragraph (1) until 15 days after the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth a detailed description of the assistance to be provided.

(3) **MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.**—Assistance may not be provided under this subsection unless the Government of Israel contributes an amount not less than the amount of assistance to be so provided to the program, project, or activity for which the assistance is to be so provided.

(e) **QUARTERLY REPORTS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress on a quarterly basis a report that contains a copy of the most recent quarterly report provided by the Government of Israel to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(iii).

(f) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(g) **SUNSET.**—The authority in this section to carry out activities described in subsection (c), and to provide assistance described in subsection (d), shall expire on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2012. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. BORDER SECURITY ON FEDERAL LANDS ALONG THE SOUTHERN BORDER.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FEDERAL LANDS.**—The term “Federal lands” includes all land under the control of the Secretary concerned that is located—

(A) within 100 miles of the international border between the United States and Mexico; and

(B) within the Tucson and Yuma sectors of United States Border Patrol.

(2) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) **SUPPORT FOR BORDER SECURITY NEEDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To achieve border security on Federal lands—

(A) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned shall provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel with immediate access to Federal lands for border security activities, including—

(i) routine motorized patrols; and

(ii) the deployment of communications, surveillance, and detection equipment;

(B) the Secretary concerned may provide education and training to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel on the natural and cultural resources present on individual Federal land units; and

(C) the security activities described in subparagraph (A) shall be conducted, to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner that the Secretary of Homeland Security determines will best protect the natural and cultural resources on Federal lands.

(2) **INTERMINGLED STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any private or State-owned land within the boundaries of Federal lands.

(3) **SUNSET.**—The requirements under this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days before the date on which the requirements under subsection (b) are scheduled to terminate, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an analysis of the effectiveness of the actions taken pursuant to such subsection, including the impact of such actions on—

(A) border security activities; and

(B) the natural and cultural resources on impacted Federal lands;

(2) an assessment of the 2006 Memos of Understanding between the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior regarding access to Federal and Indian lands for border security activities, including—

(A) how such memoranda, as in force on the date of the enactment of this Act, impacted border security activities;

(B) the best way to improve such memoranda and their application;

(C) specific ways in which such memoranda could be used to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security receives timely access to Federal lands for critical border security activities; and

(D) the number of agency personnel required to effectively and efficiently execute such memoranda;

(3) a sector-by-sector analysis of the expected impact of applying the requirements under subsection (b) to the entire land border of the United States, including—

(A) an assessment of—

(i) how border security activities and natural, cultural, and historic resources on Federal and Indian lands would be impacted, including the potential impact on wildlife, including endangered species;

(ii) any actions the Department of Homeland Security would need to take to mitigate the impact of border security activities, including the estimated costs of such actions; and

(iii) whether lack of access hinders border security; and

(B) an examination of the impact of providing the Department of Homeland Security with increased access to Federal and Indian lands located within—

(i) 25 miles of the United States border;

(ii) 50 miles of the United States border, or

(iii) 100 miles of the United States border; and

(4) a sector-by-sector analysis of—

(A) the costs incurred by each Secretary concerned relating to managing and mitigating for illegal border activity on Federal lands, including the cost of restoring natural resources that were damaged by illegal border activity;

(B) the impact of illegal traffic on wildlife, including endangered species and critical habitat; and

(C) the impact of illegal traffic on natural, cultural, and historic resources on Federal lands.

SA 2013. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO USED POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO PURSUE A PROGRAM OF EDUCATION AT AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING THAT CLOSED WHILE PURSUING THE PROGRAM.

(a) **ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter II of chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3318 the following new section:

“§ 3318A. Assistance for individuals who pursue programs of education at institutions of higher learning that unexpectedly close

“(a) **COVERED INDIVIDUALS.**—(1) For purposes of this section, a covered individual is any individual who—

“(A)(i) pursued a program of education at an institution of higher learning with educational assistance under this chapter and stopped pursuing such program of education because the institution of higher learning closed before such individual could complete such program of education or because the individual anticipated that such institution of higher learning would close and withdrew from such program not more than 120 days before the date on which such institution of higher learning actually closed; and

“(ii) did not complete such program of education pursuant to a teach-out plan (as defined in section 487(f)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(f)(2))); or

“(B) pursued a program of education with educational assistance under this chapter at an institution of higher learning that the Secretary determines caused such harm to the individual as the Secretary determines equity requires that the individual receive relief under this section.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection and in the case of the closing of an institution of higher learning, the Secretary may increase the 120-day period specified in paragraph (1)(A)(i) if the Secretary determines that exceptional circumstances regarding such closing justify the increase.

“(b) **RESTORATION OF ENTITLEMENT TO EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary shall restore to each covered individual who used educational assistance under this chapter to pursue a program of education at an institution of higher learning—

“(1) as described in subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(1) such individual’s entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter in an amount equal to one month for each month of educational assistance used by the individual to pursue such program of education at such institution of higher learning; and

“(2) as described in subparagraph (B) of such subsection such individual’s entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter in such amount as the Secretary determines equity requires.

“(c) **RESTORATION OF ENTITLEMENT TO TUTORIAL ASSISTANCE.**—In the case of a covered individual described in subsection (a)(1) who received benefits under section 3314 of this title to correct a deficiency of the covered individual in a course that was part of the program of education pursued by the covered individual as described in such subsection, the Secretary shall—

“(1) in a case described in subparagraph (A) of such subsection, restore to such covered individual such covered individual’s entitlement to benefits under such section in an amount equal to the amount paid under such section for such correction; and

“(2) in a case described in subparagraph (B) of such subsection, restore to such covered individual such amount of such covered individual’s entitlement to benefits under such section as the Secretary determines equity requires.

“(d) **CONTINUED PAYMENT OF MONTHLY HOUSING STIPENDS.**—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), in the case of a covered individual described in subsection (a)(1) who in the case described in subparagraph (A) of such subsection was receiving a monthly housing stipend under this chapter while pursuing the program of education at the institution of higher learning that closed or who in a case described in subparagraph (B) of such subsection in which the covered individual was receiving a monthly housing stipend under this chapter while pursuing the program of education and stopped pursuing the program of education because of the harm caused by the institution of higher learning, the Secretary shall continue to pay to such covered individual such monthly housing stipend for the first month beginning after the covered individual stopped pursuing such program of education and for each month thereafter until the covered individual begins pursuing a program of education at a new institution of higher learning with educational assistance under this chapter.

“(2) No individual may receive more than three months of monthly stipend under this subsection.

“(e) **NATIONAL TESTS.**—In the case of a covered individual who pursued a program of education at an institution of higher education as described in subsection (a)(1) and received educational assistance under section 3315A of this title for a national test for admission to such program of education or institution of higher learning or for course credit at such institution of higher learning, the Secretary shall restore to such covered individual the months of entitlement charged such covered individual pursuant to subsection (c) of such section for such educational assistance.

“(f) **RELOCATION AND TRAVEL ASSISTANCE.**—A payment under section 3318 of this title for pursuit of a program of education at an institution of higher learning as described in subsection (a)(1) of this section shall not be considered a payment of additional assistance under section 3318 of this title for purposes of subsection (d) of such section.

“(g) **RECOVERY.**—In a case of a covered individual who pursued a program of education at an institution of higher learning as described in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall seek to recover from the institution of higher learning the value of—

“(1) the entitlement to educational assistance restored to the covered individual under subsections (b) and (e), if any;

“(2) the entitlement to tutorial assistance restored to the covered individual under subsection (c), if any;

“(3) the amount of monthly housing stipend paid to the covered individual under subsection (d)(1), if any; and

“(4) the additional assistance provided to the covered individual under section 3318 of this title for such pursuit, if any.

“(h) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘institution of higher learning’ has the meaning given that term in section 3452 of this title.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 33 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3318 the following new item:

“3318A. Assistance for individuals who pursue programs of education at institutions of higher learning that unexpectedly close.”.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in section 3318A of such title, as added by subsection (a)(1), or any other provision of law, shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from restoring entitlement or continuing payment under such section before promulgating regulations to carry out such section.

(c) **RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Section 3318A of such title, as added by subsection (a), shall apply as if it were enacted on the date of the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-252).

SA 2014. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FURTHER CUTS TO THE NUMBER OF BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS OF THE ARMY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) both the quantity and complexity of national security threats facing the United States have grown in recent years, particularly the threat posed by the terrorists of the self-declared Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and continuing aggression by the Russian Federation;

(2) the National Commission on the Future of the Army is currently assessing the appropriate force structure for the Army in light of these threats, and is required to report to Congress on that assessment by February 1, 2016; and

(3) in light of these growing threats and that assessment, the Department of Defense should not make further reductions in the number of brigade combat teams in the regular and reserve components of the Army, including the Army National Guard, which would be difficult and costly to reverse and would have an adverse impact on the ability of the Army to respond to global threats.

SA 2015. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr.

MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 832. APPLICABILITY OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 13673 “FAIR PAY AND SAFE WORKPLACES” TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—The Secretary of Defense shall limit the application of any acquisition regulations promulgated pursuant to Executive Order 13673 to contractors or subcontractors who have been suspended or debarred under the laws and regulations in effect on May 28, 2015, as a result of a Federal labor law violations covered by Executive Order 13673.

(b) **COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that Department of Defense contractors or subcontractors who are not described under subsection (a) are not compelled or required to comply with the conditions for contracting eligibility as stated in any acquisition regulations promulgated to implement Executive Order 13673.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on June 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Achieving the Promise of Health Information Technology: What Can Providers and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Do To Improve the Electronic Health Record User Experience?”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jamie Garden of the committee staff on (202) 224-1409.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on June 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Evaluating Accreditation’s Role in Ensuring Quality.”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jake Baker of the committee staff on (202) 224-0738.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 11, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 11, 2015, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Blowing the Whistle on Retaliation: Accounts of Current and Former Federal Agency Whistleblowers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 11, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ryan Nagle, my State director, be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO EXTEND THE AUTHORIZATION TO CARRY OUT THE REPLACEMENT OF THE EXISTING MEDICAL CENTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS IN DENVER, COLORADO

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1568, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1568) to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I thank Chairman ISAKSON of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for his tireless work on this legislation and Sen-

ator BLUMENTHAL as well as the cosponsor of this legislation tonight, Senator BENNET, my colleague from Colorado.

This gives us the breathing room we need to finish the job in Colorado. We have more work to do with the Veterans' Administration, but tonight we can begin the process of starting to finish this job.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1568) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1568

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED.

Section 2(a) of the Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act (Public Law 114-19) is amended—

- (1) by striking "in fiscal year 2015,"; and
- (2) by striking "\$900,000,000" and inserting "\$1,050,000,000".

SEC. 2. LIMITED, ONE-TIME AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER SPECIFIC AMOUNTS TO CARRY OUT MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT IN DENVER, COLORADO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the unobligated balances of amounts available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2015, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may transfer amounts from the appropriations accounts under the following headings, in the amounts and from the activities specified, to the appropriations account under the heading "Construction, Major Projects":

- (1) "Medical Services", \$6,494,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (2) "Medical Support and Compliance", \$1,611,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (3) "Medical Facilities", \$80,735,000 to be derived from amounts available for green energy projects of the Department and human capital investment plans.
- (4) "National Cemetery Administration", \$60,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (5) "General Administration", \$1,130,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Office of the Secretary.
- (6) "General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration", \$670,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (7) "Information Technology Systems", \$240,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (8) "Construction, Minor Projects", \$3,000,000 to be derived from amounts available for minor construction projects at the staff offices of the Department.

(b) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS AVAILABLE IN FUNDS.—

- (1) REVOLVING SUPPLY FUND.—Of the unobligated balances of amounts available in the revolving supply fund of the Department under section 8121 of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary may transfer \$20,030,000

to the appropriations account under the heading "Construction, Major Projects".

(2) FRANCHISE FUND.—Of the unobligated balances of amounts available in the Department of Veterans Affairs Franchise Fund established in title I of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104-204; 31 U.S.C. 501 note), the Secretary may transfer \$36,030,000 to the appropriations account under the heading "Construction, Major Projects".

(c) USE OF AMOUNTS AND AVAILABILITY.—The amounts transferred under subsections (a) and (b) shall—

- (1) be used only to carry out the major medical facility construction project in Denver, Colorado, specified in section 2 of the Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act (Public Law 114-19); and
- (2) remain available until September 30, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 95, H.R. 615.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 615) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

H.R. 615

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act" or the "DHS Interoperable Communications Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term "Department" means the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) the term "interoperable communications" has the meaning given that term in section 701(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3; and

(3) the term "Under Secretary for Management" means the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES IN RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT.

Section 701 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)(4), by inserting before the period at the end the following: "including policies and directives to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department"; and
- (2) by adding at the end the following:

"(d) INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'interoperable

communications' has the meaning given that term in section 7303(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (6 U.S.C. 194(g)).''

SEC. 4. STRATEGY.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a strategy, which shall be updated as necessary, for achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department, including for daily operations, planned events, and emergencies, with corresponding milestones, that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of interoperability gaps in radio communications among the components of the Department, as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Information on efforts and activities, including current and planned policies, directives, and training, of the Department since November 1, 2012 to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department, and planned efforts and activities of the Department to achieve and maintain such interoperable communications.

(3) An assessment of obstacles and challenges to achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department.

(4) Information on, and an assessment of, the adequacy of mechanisms available to the Under Secretary for Management to enforce and compel compliance with interoperable communications policies and directives of the Department.

(5) Guidance provided to the components of the Department to implement interoperable communications policies and directives of the Department.

(6) The total amount of funds expended by the Department since November 1, 2012 and projected future expenditures, to achieve interoperable communications, including on equipment, infrastructure, and maintenance.

(7) Dates upon which Department-wide interoperability is projected to be achieved for voice, data, and video communications, respectively, and interim milestones that correspond to the achievement of each such mode of communication.

(b) *SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL.*—Together with the strategy required under subsection (a), the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate information on—

(1) any intra-agency effort or task force that has been delegated certain responsibilities by the Under Secretary for Management relating to achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department by the dates referred to in subsection (a)(7); and

(2) who, within each such component, is responsible for implementing policies and directives issued by the Under Secretary for Management to so achieve and maintain such interoperable communications.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 100 days after the date on which the strategy required under section 4(a) is submitted, and every 2 years thereafter for 6 years, the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the status of efforts to implement the strategy required under section 4(a), including the following:

(1) Progress on each interim milestone referred to in section 4(a)(7) toward achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department.

(2) Information on any policies, directives, guidance, and training established by the Under Secretary for Management.

(3) An assessment of the level of compliance, adoption, and participation among the components of the Department with the policies, directives, guidance, and training established by the Under Secretary for Management to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components.

(4) Information on any additional resources or authorities needed by the Under Secretary for Management.

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY.

Sections 4 and 5 shall only apply with respect to the interoperable communications capabilities within the Department and components of the Department to communicate within the Department.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 615), as amended, was passed.

AUTHORIZING THE REPRINTING OF THE 25TH EDITION OF THE POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 54, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) authorizing the reprinting of the 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) was agreed to.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Georgia be authorized to

sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June 15, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to Executive Session to the en bloc consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 131 and 132; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2015

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 15; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1735; and, finally, the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to both H.R. 1735 and the McCain substitute 1463 be at 4 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:19 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 15, 2015, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, VICE STANLEY R. CHESLER, RETIRING.

ROBERT F. ROSSITER, JR., OF NEBRASKA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA, VICE JOSEPH F. BATAILLON, RETIRED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by
the Senate June 11, 2015:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DOUGLAS J. KRAMER, OF KANSAS, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 11, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 11, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

BUILDING A TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that after 55 months in control, my Republican friends have scheduled their first hearing on transportation and finance. This is a very important, very welcome development, as welcome as it is long overdue. I appreciate my friend, PAUL RYAN, the chairman of the committee, keeping his word that we would actually have a hearing.

Now, the question is whether this is going to be one that is more or less perfunctory, sort of a plain vanilla, or whether it is going to be the start of a critical dialogue involving not just ideologues, but the people who do more than just study the issue, hear from the vast army of people who plan, build, maintain, and use our transportation infrastructure. Theirs is a unique, shared, forceful vision. Congress should spend the time not just to listen to those stakeholders, but to un-

derstand how they got to where they are and what we need to do.

We shouldn't settle for half steps to just get past the next transportation deadline, which is looming next month, which would be the 34th short-term extension. Just as bad or worse, we would fail to give the country the bold transportation investment that is so sorely needed.

The next hearings are even more important following next Wednesday's effort. That is the time to actually follow regular order, to debate real options.

I have introduced a path. After 20 years of working on transportation funding, it is still the simplest, the best, and the most widely supported. It is the widest coalition, in fact, of any major issue confronting people on Capitol Hill. It includes the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, contractors, transit, local government, bicyclists, engineers. It includes the AAA, representing automobile users, and the American Trucking Association. They all support, for the first time in 22 years, raising the Federal gas tax.

We are in the problem we are in now because we are paying for 2015 transportation needs with 1993 dollars. It doesn't work.

My approach would not just raise the gas tax, index the gas tax, but work to abolish the gas tax because it is no longer a sustainable long-term solution. We can, in fact, replace it with a much more viable, effective, fair system based on road user charges, which we are experimenting with in Oregon, and States around the country are looking at.

In the meantime, we ought to step up and do our job on the gas tax. It is interesting that six red States have already raised the gas tax this year. If it was good enough for Eisenhower, if it was good enough for Ronald Reagan, who used his Thanksgiving Day speech in 1982 to summon Congress back to more than double the gas tax, which he and Tip O'Neill did, it ought to be good enough for us today.

Let's discuss, examine, and understand all the viable solutions, the health of our infrastructure, our economy, and the impacts on the people we serve.

Whatever solution we come up with must meet three tests: It must raise enough to do the job of giving America its first 6-year transportation bill since 1998; it must be dedicated to allow the certainty to be able to build a trans-

portation vision for the future; and it must be sustainable so that we don't end up back in the same place in a year or 2 or 4 or even 5.

My legislation would provide 210 additional billion dollars, enough for the transportation committee to fashion that vision for the future. It is ironclad dedicated over the next 6 years, but it is sustainable because, if Congress hasn't moved to abolish the gas tax by then, at least we don't fall off a cliff.

There was a time when America had the best infrastructure in the world. Sadly, that time has passed. There was a time when infrastructure used to be bipartisan. I am hopeful that if we step up to the plate, approach it in a bipartisan fashion, we can do the job so that we start repairing infrastructure that is now rated 25th or 27th in the world, and going down.

We no longer have the finest infrastructure, but we can be bipartisan and thoughtful. We can reverse this 20-year slide. We can put hundreds of thousands of people to work across America at family-wage jobs this year and rebuild and renew America so our families are safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

WE NEED THE RIGHT TRACK, NOT THE FAST TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, TPA, TPP, TTIP, WTO, GATT, fast track, to the American people, we have made the ability to understand trade relations with other nations nigh on impossible.

Politicians, pundits, and prophetic economists are issuing clarion calls to free trade. We all like free trade, but these same advocates insist that we do it fast, you know, put it on a fast track with "trade promotional authority." Listening to these experts, they insist that we cannot do trade without it. Never mind that for 160 years we negotiated without it under the guide of the Constitution and the watchful eye of the Representatives of the people.

Now, they want the negotiations to be secret: Don't worry. The trade agreements are complex. They will give us the final agreement, and we will have a little bit of time to look it over. Can't change it. Just look it over, and then you can have a simple up-or-down vote that could bind America to the terms of other nations.

"But it will create jobs?" they say, just like NAFTA, just like the world

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

trade agreement, just like CAFTA. We were reassured then that those would fix everything. We passed them. We are still waiting for those jobs.

Americans need to ask a few questions of us in this body before we commit to something that could have decades of impact.

The Pacific Partnership includes a transnational commission with a living agreement clause to change it. Why would we surrender congressional authority of a two-thirds vote to stand guard against something that could clearly damage our laws and Nation?

Why would we want to isolate China, possibly driving them toward Russia, and create cold war II. The Army Chief of Staff saw a need this week to ease tensions with China. Why would we want to increase them with anti-Chinese trade rhetoric? You think military spending is high now; try it in a cold war or worse. Let's trade with China instead, not make them our adversary.

Even a partial pruning of commercial links or even a gradual upsurge in Western protectionism toward China would have a profound impact on the world's well-being. Why would we pursue a path that most likely creates tension that could spill over in other areas with devastating consequences, sending ripples throughout the world?

The current President's talent for negotiation among nations should be measured by his foreign policy. Have we forgotten the line in the sand, the arming of al Qaeda and other nefarious Syrian rebels to fight Assad, only to watch them become ISIS, and then dismiss them as a JV team, only to see them tear through Iraq, which fell apart after we abandoned it, after we were assured that they could stand on their own if we left early? Now, there is no strategy to fix it. Then there is the Arab Spring, which has morphed into the potential for a nuclear winter with Iran. Let's not forget Crimea and Ukraine. I can go on.

The question is: Why are we? Like Lucy holding the football, we are told that the President needs the power to negotiate. If we just come and take a kick at it, all will be well.

Much is at stake. National security, American jobs, capital, manufacturing, pharmaceuticals, agricultural, and, contrary to economic theorists, even American law. One only has to look at the case of Australia's law that made generic packaging required on cigarettes. The law was challenged by a cigarette company who went treaty shopping by using its Hong Kong subsidiary and was able to interfere with Australia's law because of her treaty with Hong Kong.

Perhaps most concerning is all the anti-Chinese rhetoric. China is an enormous trading partner, a holder of large amounts of U.S. Treasury bonds that have kept interest rates low and our

purchasing power at the store high. They are not our enemy. Yet the rhetoric coming from the White House and the architects of the TPA bill seem set on anti-Chinese dictums to make their case.

We need China. China needs us. Let's establish some rules of the road as competitors rather than laying the track for the smashup derby. It will take time, it will be hard, but dialogue and diplomacy are better than tanks and Tomahawks. We can do this without turning it into a foreign policy disaster that gives the President and Congress a chance to make China our enemy.

We can engage without granting TPA, but we have to lead. TPA without leadership is less valuable than leadership without TPA. Among the proposed Pacific Partnership's 11 other nations, we already have high-standard, free trade agreements with seven of them. We do not have to subject ourselves to this multilateral trade treaty to work with them, and we certainly should not do it fast by granting TPA to a President that has exhibited poor leadership in foreign affairs.

We need the right track, not the fast track.

WORST TRADE AGREEMENT IN A 20-YEAR HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the House of Representatives will be asked to grease the skids for the last and worst trade agreement in a 20-year history of job-killing trade agreements. I say "last" because this is a new concept. It is a living trade agreement. Anybody can access to it in the future. All they have to do is say: We pretend—or will pretend—to follow the very weak rules of this trade agreement.

When the President began the negotiations, China was concerned because he talked about the pivot to Asia, confronting China. Now China is saying: Hey, we want in. This is great. We know how to game it. We can take away the last of your manufacturing, and we are not going to let it just go to Japan who is already in the agreement.

The worst, for many reasons, but among them is something called the investor-state dispute resolution process. What is that? It means there will be a special private court set up for corporations to challenge our domestic laws, any and all domestic laws, that they find to be trade restrictive.

Now, the President came to Oregon and said those of us who are critical of this are making things up because we said they can repeal otherwise. Now, the President danced on the head of a rhetorical pin there, a bit duplicitously. He is right. They can't

make us repeal our laws. We can pay to keep them.

Yes, you heard that right. We can pay to keep our laws that protect consumers, and we can pay to protect our laws that protect the environment or labor or Buy America or anything else. We can keep them if we want to pay.

Here are four examples:

Yesterday, the House of Representatives repealed requirements that meat, poultry be labeled as to country of origin. American consumers would kind of like to know. We have got enough problems in our own industry here. We would like to know if this stuff is coming overseas from someplace where maybe the sanitary conditions aren't quite so good. Well, we lost a trade dispute on that issue.

Now, we could keep the law if we wanted to pay billions of dollars or, no, a Republican rush to repeal the law. It makes a few giant agribusiness companies happy. Of course, it kind of sticks it to the domestic producers who know they are producing a good product. That is one loss.

Brazilian cotton, now, this is a funny one. We provide these bizarre subsidies through our foreign program, and one of them goes to cotton.

□ 1015

We were found to be subsidizing, therefore, putting Brazil at a disadvantage. For years, we paid Brazil \$147 million a year so we could keep subsidizing our cotton producers. Isn't that great?

Yeah, we kept our law; we just cost us \$147 million to subsidize the cotton producers. Last year, we got a settlement out of them. They are going to give us a 3-year grace. We gave them a one-time \$300 million penalty, and they won't challenge it again until 2018.

Now, Mexican trucks—personally involved in this one—they don't have meaningful driver's licenses; they don't have hours of service standards; they don't have drug testing; they don't have alcohol testing, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, so we didn't want them ranging around the United States of America. We passed a bill almost unanimously in the House to prevent that.

Mexico went to one of these secret tribunals; they won. The Obama administration caved under threats of billions of dollars of punitive tariffs against the U.S. to allow those Mexican trucks free and permanent access to the highways of the United States of America.

You are right, we can't. You are right, Mr. President—no, you are not right, Mr. President; actually, you are wrong on that one.

One last one, dolphin-safe tuna—now, we just wanted to say the Mexicans go out and slaughter dolphins to catch tuna. They cast the nets over the dolphins who swim on top of the tuna.

There are some people who thought: well, hey, it would be good marketing for StarKist and others if we had dolphin-safe tuna, where people don't slaughter dolphins to get the tuna.

Well, Mexico won a trade dispute saying: no, you can't do that, that is trade restricted; you can pay us not to slaughter dolphins, or we can slaughter dolphins, and you can't label those cans as dolphin-safe tuna.

Yeah, the President is sort of, kind of technically right. They can't force us to repeal our laws. They can just blackmail us to repeal our laws in secret tribunals.

Now, the ones I mentioned are under a state-to-state resolution. The TPP that this trade promotion authority facilitates allows corporations special standing to go to a special private secret tribunal, only available to corporations, to challenge our laws.

Just think of the mischief in the future. One will certainly be pharmaceuticals. Most certainly, they will challenge the requirement that we negotiate lower drug prices for our veterans and people on Medicaid, and they will win.

The President is right; we won't have to repeal the subsidies for those drugs or the reduced price. We can just pay the pharmaceutical industry tens of billions of dollars to keep providing affordable drugs to veterans and seniors.

This is a great day for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

WIMBERLEY, TEXAS, IS MAKING A COMEBACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, up until several weeks ago, my State of Texas experienced a drought so severe that water levels were reduced to historic lows while conservation efforts were set to all-time highs. Lakes and reservoirs were bone dry. Wildfires were a constant threat.

In a cruel twist of fate, Texas is now recovering from the worst flooding in recent memory. Rivers overflowed, and dams burst.

In Wimberley, Texas, a town about 40 miles southwest of the Texas capital, water rushed over the banks of the Blanco River with enough force to rip houses off their foundations and carry cars like they were toys. Loved ones were lost. Belongings and memories were washed away.

The last month has been marked by death, destruction, and disbelief. I have met with first responders, toured flood damage, and spoke to the National Guard and regional FEMA officers about response and recovery operations. My office established a response

center in town to help with the recovery process.

Although we are still in a period of mourning, the strong Texas spirit of resolve has proven more powerful than Mother Nature's fury. Just this week, a nearby newspaper ran the headline, "Hard hit by flood, Wimberley assures tourists: We're open for business." I personally might add "wide open for business."

Mr. Speaker, this is the Texas way; it is what we do. Today, just a few weeks since the rains eased and the floodwaters subsided, Wimberley is making a comeback. Nearly all of the businesses in downtown Wimberley have reopened.

Cathy Moreman, the executive director of the Wimberley Valley Chamber of Commerce, told my office they have had offers of help from around the country. Locals and visitors alike have come in and out and offered much in help from rescue to cleanup efforts. She said the outpouring of support has been astounding.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I mean when I cite the Texas spirit of resolve. We have and will continue to take care of each other, look out for our neighbors, and together push forward.

I assure you, we will rebound from this tragedy quickly and fully.

May God bless the residents of Wimberley, and may God bless all of Texas.

In God we trust.

KING KAMEHAMEHA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today, in my home State of Hawaii, we are celebrating King Kamehameha Day to honor the legacy of King Kamehameha I, who established the Kingdom of Hawaii in 1810.

King Kamehameha knew that for a nation to be vibrant, its citizens must feel safe and secure. He proclaimed the Kanawai Mamalahoe, the Law of the Splintered Paddle, as the law of the land. This law, still enshrined in the Hawaii State Constitution today, protects the unalienable rights of all men and women to be safe and secure in their home.

Kamehameha also knew that, to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of his people, it was imperative to create economic opportunities. He invested resources to maintain viable fish ponds and taro patches, protect freshwater streams, fertile soils, and forestlands; he built schools and trained an entire new generation of leaders.

As we observe Kamehameha Day, it is a true day of aloha for the people of Hawaii. Those who are visiting the Capitol this week may have seen the many fragrant and beautiful flower leis draped on the statue of King Kamehameha in Emancipation Hall.

All this week, in Hawaii, across the State, there will be further lei-draping ceremonies taking place to pay homage to the legacy of Hawaii's first King.

As legislators, we are called upon to embody the servant leadership and the humility of leaders like King Kamehameha I.

IRS RESPONSE LETTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the IRS response letter that was sent to me and 51 of my colleagues asking for an investigation of the Clinton Foundation's tax-exempt status.

Now, the IRS responded to us with a letter. It is dated May 21. What we received back, Mr. Speaker, from the IRS was simply a form letter. It was addressed, "Dear Sir or Madam," not even my name. The director of the Exempt Organizations Examinations didn't even take the time to sign the letter.

What we have is this: the IRS has so little respect for Members of Congress who are asking a question, who are seeking clarity on behalf of their constituents, that they respond to a congressional inquiry with a letter that is a form letter, not even signed. Well, you can imagine that we were a little bit surprised by this.

I think it is important to talk about why we were asking for clarity on the Clinton Foundation and their tax-exempt status. We all have 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organizations that do great work in our communities. Many of these organizations had come to us—their Member of Congress—and said: What do you know about how the Clinton Foundation works? What about these foreign donations that are coming into the Clinton Foundation?

We were continuing to look at this because when you go to charitynavigator.org, which many of our colleagues or our constituents would do, and you pull up, you enter in the search engine "the Bill, Hillary, and Chelsea Clinton Foundation," what comes up is this:

We don't evaluate Bill, Hillary, and Chelsea Clinton Foundation. Why not? We have determined that this charity's atypical business model cannot be accurately captured in our current rating methodology.

How interesting is that; how very interesting. The American people are wanting to know how this charity keeps a not-for-profit status and how they conduct business. It is appropriate that we write the IRS and ask for clarity on this situation, doing it on behalf of our constituents who are seeking answers to questions.

Now, I have to tell you, we know that there is no shortage of pens in the executive branch of this government. The

President has said he has got a pen and a phone and he will work around Congress if he needs to. We understand that.

We know they have pens over at the IRS. We know that they have just chosen to dismiss what we have asked for, which is clarity. We have a divided government; we have a system of checks and balances, and we do expect to have a response from the IRS that addresses the structure of this organization.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to follow this issue. We have found it quite amusing that this is how they would choose to address the inquiry and that this is the attitude that they are taking.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, TAX EXEMPT AND GOVERNMENT ENTITIES DIVISION,

May 21, 2015.

Hon. MARSHA BLACKBURN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR OR MADAM: Thank you for the information you submitted regarding The Bill, Hillary and Chelsea Clinton Foundation. The Internal Revenue Service has an ongoing examination program to ensure that exempt organizations comply with the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The information you submitted will be considered in this program.

Internal Revenue Code section 6103 protects the privacy of tax returns and tax return information of all taxpayers. Therefore, we cannot disclose the status of any investigation. If, at a later date, you have additional information that you believe is relevant to this matter, please attach a copy of this letter to the information and send it to the address shown above.

We appreciate your concern in bringing this matter to our attention. If you have additional questions, please call Customer Account Services.

Sincerely,

MARGARET VON LIENEN,
Director, Exempt Organizations:
Examinations.

CONGRESS MUST SUPPORT PROBLEM-SOLVERS OF TOMORROW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, recently, I visited Warrenton High School in a small coastal community in my district in beautiful northwest Oregon.

I met with students who were working on an underwater robotics team. These talented students are running simulation experiments in a pool in preparation for the Marine Advanced Technology Education competition.

This year, students were asked to maneuver their underwater robots to retrieve items like algae and sea urchins from the ocean floor. This hands-on learning fosters collaboration and creativity in students and helps them see the connections between what is in their textbook and how it translates to

practical work that can make a difference for our planet.

Perhaps more importantly, this kind of activity builds problem-solving skills and shows students that trial and error is a natural part of growth and discovery and learning.

After visiting the underwater robotics team, I joined students at their school's fish hatchery, where they raise salmon for release into local waterways. This program provides opportunities for students to develop skills in biology, water chemistry, engineering, and natural resources management and contributes to our ability to sustain an economically and culturally important fishery; importantly, it also gives them valuable skills and leadership in management.

In the United States, we face a growing shortage of innovative workers, people who are prepared to tackle the challenges of the future. This is an especially serious problem because we absolutely must grapple with one of the greatest environmental threats this Nation has faced, climate change.

Today, too many students, particularly young women and minorities, lack access and opportunities to engage in this hands-on kind of STEM learning occurring at Warrenton High School. Here in Congress, we must be doing more to foster and support students who have become the problem-solvers of tomorrow. Doing so makes economic sense and environmental sense.

We need smart, passionate students to help understand environmental challenges and changes, to develop the technology to address our growing impact on our planet, and to find more sustainable practices.

Oregon is home to some excellent research universities. The University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Oregon Health & Science University are all working on a wide range of research and development programs to help combat and adapt to climate change.

These universities are conducting the basic science we need to understand and anticipate changes and trends, as well as the applied science to help use existing information to develop practical tools and technologies to meet the challenges presented by climate change.

They model changes caused by sea level rise; they help shellfish hatcheries adapt to ocean acidification, or they develop new types of biofuel. This is exciting, important research; and we need smart, passionate young people to take up this mantle.

□ 1030

June is National Oceans Month. This month, we recognize the value of our oceans, lakes, and coastline, and we recommit to protecting these bodies of water.

I would also like to recommit to developing and investing in technologies to help stop and begin to repair the damage we have done to our oceans, our coasts, and our ecosystems. Improved and innovative technology development in areas such as renewable energy and water conservation have the power to make a real difference for our planet and for current and future generations, but we can't do it without people like smart, skilled students who will become the workers in the workforce of tomorrow.

Those students in Warrenton, Oregon, and others like them are our future leaders and problem-solvers. Let's help do all we can to make sure that they have the tools and the resources they need today as students and tomorrow as scientists, engineers, and innovators who can meet the complex challenges ahead and turn them into productive opportunities that will better their communities, their States, our country, and the world.

HIPAA CHANGES IN THE HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as part of my 3-year investigation into the Nation's mental health system, I have been meeting with families and caregivers of those with mental illness. Their number one concern is the HIPAA privacy rule. Since its inception in 2002, the rule has generated nearly 70,000 complaints.

Families are locked out from helping in treatment by Federal regulations that don't understand the complexity of treating a serious mental illness in someone who has other medical problems, like diabetes or lung disease or skin problems or other illnesses that require treatment. When you have those with the diminished capacity to follow through on their own care, should we just let them languish and suffer? Should we let their mental illness and poor medical care become what some consider to be a slow-motion suicide?

If a family member has a head injury or a stroke or Alzheimer's illness, a doctor would not hesitate to explain the medical concerns to a family member. A doctor would do this because the doctor recognizes the brain illness can make the individual unable to clearly understand the severity of his illness. According to the current HIPAA laws, when a child is in severe psychosis, the doctor is unable to tell the parents anything.

We must recognize that severe mental illness like schizophrenia, bipolar, and severe depression is brain disease—it is not an attitude. It is not something cured by pulling oneself up by

the bootstraps no more than dementia is cured by a different outlook on life or by a motivational poster. We cannot continue to make care the most difficult for those who have the most difficulty in caring for themselves. This has to change. There is merit to those 70,000 complaints, and we must address them compassionately.

The Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 2646, allows the doctor or mental health professional to provide the diagnosis, treatment plans, appointment scheduling, and prescriptions for an individual with a serious mental illness to a known caregiver. This change would apply to those who can benefit from care yet who are unable to follow through on their own self-directed care.

Put yourself in the shoes of a family member. Imagine yourself trying to help a parent or a sibling or a child, and a caseworker who doesn't even know your family member can't help you because he is bound from letting you—a loving and caring parent—help your son or daughter. The law puts you behind this heartless barrier where you have to passively watch your child wither away. But what parent would not run into a burning building or throw himself in front of a car to save his child? Yet, with our current HIPAA laws, you have to watch and suffer along with your child.

We have to change this, and H.R. 2646 does make this important change. My legislation does not allow for the sharing of psychotherapy notes or of personal conversations between a therapist and a patient. It is limited to the information that is essential to caring for someone with a serious mental illness to make sure he stays in care. Let's make it easier. Let's make it more compassionate for those who need help the most. I urge my colleagues to please support H.R. 2646 and to sign on as cosponsors.

GENESIS WITH REVELATIONS YET TO COME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is always a preeminent privilege to stand in the well of the House of Representatives to advocate on behalf of my constituents in the Ninth Congressional District of Texas, but it is also a greater honor to advocate on behalf of the American people. I contend that no one could have predicted that I would have had this great opportunity at my birth, and I am always grateful to have it, and I want people to know that I appreciate it greatly.

Mr. Speaker, last night, the House of Representatives passed a bipartisan piece of legislation, H. Res. 295. This is a resolution that would encourage law enforcement agencies to use body cam-

eras. It passed overwhelmingly, and I am here today to express my gratitude to the many Members who supported this piece of legislation.

I would like to start with the leadership. I am honored that the leadership supported it because, without the support of leadership, legislation does not come to the floor.

Mr. BOEHNER, I am grateful that you supported and allowed it to come to the floor.

Ms. PELOSI, I am grateful that you supported and allowed it to come to the floor.

Mr. HOYER, I am honored that we had the opportunity to visit with you about it as well as with other members of leadership, including Mr. BOEHNER, and that you allowed it to come to the floor.

I also want to mention the chair of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE. He allowed us to visit with him about this legislation. We are grateful that he participated in the process and allowed it to come to the floor.

I am also especially honored to mention Mr. CONYERS, the sage of the House of Representatives, the dean of the House of Representatives, and I am grateful that he has been understanding and has given us the opportunity to have this piece of legislation come to the floor in the form of a resolution.

There were Members who supported this, and they were cosponsors. I have to mention my very dear friend Mr. CLEAVER. I will say candidly that, without him, we wouldn't have been able to have succeeded. He has been a partner with me on this legislation, and we have worked through the entirety of the process.

I will mention Mr. TED POE from Texas. He and I were lawyers together, and we were judges together. He was the first person to actually sign onto the resolution, and that meant something to have his support.

Mr. POE, I am grateful that you signed on as the first original cosponsor, and my prayer is that this piece of legislation is something that you will be proud of in the years to come.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER signed onto it, Mr. LACY CLAY, Mr. YODER, and Ms. CLARKE—all persons who were original cosponsors of the legislation. I am grateful that they chose to allow their names to be associated with it, and I am grateful to all of the Members of the House of Representatives who voted for it, some 421 Members.

Let me now just focus on the legislation for just a moment and remind everybody that this, in a metaphorical sense, is not the end; it is the beginning. In a metaphorical sense, it is not the closing argument as we might have in a trial; it is the opening statement. As a Christian, in a metaphorical sense, this is Genesis; it is not Revelation. There are many other things to

come. In fact, we have a piece of legislation—the CAM TIP Act—that is currently pending before the House, and my hope is that we will get some additional cosponsors on that piece of legislation.

As for this piece of legislation, let me announce that what it does is to simply provide encouragement to law enforcement agencies to know that the consensus of the House of Representatives is that you have body cameras. We ask that you please consider the rationale for body cameras.

One, transparency. This means that there won't be disputes about what happened. With cameras, you can still have some disputes. This is not a panacea; it will not cure all that ails some of our concerns. Yet it does provide some empirical evidence, empirical evidence that we would not acquire otherwise because of the contentions that can be at odds with each other about facts. By the way, as a judge, I know that you can have persons with the best of intentions who can see the same facts and come away with different conclusions as to what occurred. This provides the additional transparency.

It also provides an opportunity for us to allow this evidence to go into court. It is not enough for the public to see what is going on. Those who serve as jurors will have an opportunity to see what happened and base their decisions on more than what one person says as opposed to what another person says.

I am proud to tell you that the piece of legislation will provide an opportunity for people to adjust their behavior. A wonderful thing can happen when cameras are on. People will know that they are being watched, and they can adjust their behavior.

I am so honored that the legislation has passed, and I am grateful for the opportunity to speak this morning. I thank those who were supportive of it. This is the genesis. The revelations are yet to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members.

IN SUPPORT OF CUBAN HISTORIAN GUSTAVO PEREZ SILVERIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to support Gustavo Perez Silverio, an historian in Cuba who has had to endure continued threats from Castro's state security forces.

This week, Castro's thugs threatened Gustavo Perez Silverio by telling him that he would be prosecuted for terrorist activities, but his only crime was to support activism and engagement in Cuban civil society. That is

not a crime. This is not the first time he has had to endure these dire threats.

While in the United States last year, Gustavo issued statements about the current difficult situation in Cuba for human rights, but when he returned to the island, he learned that he lost his job as a professor at the university where he was teaching. This is another attempt by the Castro regime to silence peaceful opposition leaders.

We cannot let this continue. What is happening to Gustavo happens to dozens of Cubans every day, innocent but brave dissidents who try to speak the truth about the human rights violations occurring in Cuba, violations that go unpunished due to the undeserved concessions given to the Castro brothers by this administration.

Let's stand with the oppressed, the brave dissidents like Gustavo Perez Silverio, and not stand with their oppressor, the Castro regime.

CLAUDIA PUIG

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to honor Claudia Puig, a leader in television and radio broadcasting, on her receipt of the Bill Brooks Award from the Florida Association of Broadcasters.

Claudia is a prominent figure in our south Florida community, and with over 25 years of experience, her opinion is trusted and credible. Claudia has been recognized by Radio Ink magazine as one of the 50 Most Influential Women in Radio and has been honored as Manager of the Year with the prestigious Medallas de Cortez Award in 2012. Claudia has served on many prestigious boards, including Florida International University's Board of Trustees, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the Orange Bowl Committee.

For those of us who know her, the Bill Brooks Award is a deserved honor and a testament to her hard work.

Congratulations, Claudia. I wish you many more years of continued success.

22ND ANNIVERSARY OF AMIGOS FOR KIDS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Amigos for Kids, an organization in my congressional district that works to mitigate the harmful effects of child abuse and neglect. It has now embarked on its 22nd year of service to families in my congressional district in south Florida.

As part of its mission, this noble organization, Amigos for Kids, administers an afterschool program at Jose Marti Park in Little Havana that provides kids with academic and extracurricular enrichment activities. Funded by the Children's Trust, Amigos for Kids also offers workshops to fortify the family bond. On June 20, Amigos for Kids will host its annual Miami Celebrity Domino Night. It is an event at which guests will enjoy live entertainment and culinary delights, which will benefit these kids.

I thank Amigos for Kids for its commitment to assisting the less fortunate,

and I encourage our community to get involved for the betterment of children and families. A united community can make a positive and lasting difference for all of us.

□ 1045

RAISING ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS IN JUNE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, June is Alzheimer's Awareness Month, and I rise today to shed light on one of the fastest growing and costliest epidemics facing our Nation. Having lost my mother due to complications of Alzheimer's, I am all too familiar with how it impacts not only the person, but the person's loved ones and the caregivers.

Over 5.3 million Americans are living with this disease, including half a million Floridians. The Alzheimer's Association projects that, within the next 10 years, every State will experience significant increases in the number of people living with Alzheimer's. That means skyrocketing healthcare costs for impacted families and across all levels of government.

Research is our best hope to save taxpayer dollars, and most importantly, to save lives. My thanks to all who are working every day toward curing Alzheimer's, a devastating disease. I also thank them for improving the patient's well-being and the caregiver's.

THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM AND POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased this morning to speak about a topic that I really believe there is a strong pathway forward. I have said often, as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, that as we look at the criminal justice system with a myriad of issues that have come to our attention from the American public, from asset forfeiture to mens rea to a number of issues dealing with police interaction with the community, this is a significant moment in America's history.

We are a nation of laws, and we pride ourselves with understanding the very words of the Declaration of Independence that clearly says that we all are created equal with certain inalienable rights of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The beginning words of the Constitution say that our Founding Fathers—although imperfect in many of the aspects of the Constitution based upon rights not given to women and rights not given to African Americans—did say that they formed this government to create a more perfect Union.

Now, in 2015, we have an opportunity, again, as I said, to assess the criminal justice system in many ways. Let me

cite for you some of the challenges that we face. For example, a 16-year-old in New York who was arrested for taking a knapsack—he shouldn't have taken a knapsack—was thrown into Rikers Island and had a \$3,000 bail, which he or his family could not pay. He stayed in isolation for 3 years. His case never came before the courts. The lawyers obviously were backlogged, whatever court-appointed lawyer he might have had. During that time, there was abuse, and this youngster suffered. At 19 going on 20, he was finally released, no action taken against him. Tragically, 2 weeks after he was released, this young man committed suicide.

We understand the brain does not mature to its fullest before the age of 24 or 25, and so when you are dealing with teenagers between 18 and 24, you are dealing with kids. You are dealing with individuals who have yet formulated their full judgment.

These incidents, along with the cases of Walter Scott and Freddie Gray, begin to have us question how we make better our law enforcement. As we mourn those who have fallen in duty—and we do, as I have over the years—I recognize that we must give skills training and give more resources for professional development and change the concept that we have forced our law enforcement to be in.

We have forced the concept of warrior versus guardian. Maybe that caused the incident of the gentleman who was in his doorstep in suburban Virginia, right outside of Washington, D.C. I think the case was 3 years ago where the gentleman came to the door. Of course he was having a disagreement with the officer who was at the door, but he wound up dead in his doorstep. Of course the family settled because there was, in essence, an inappropriate use of excessive force and it did not have to happen.

As we work in the Committee on the Judiciary and work with Members, I am looking forward to finding a significant moment. We will be introducing legislation dealing with police accountability—we hope it will draw a number of Members' bipartisan support—using this concept of guardian versus warrior, giving the amount of resources for training, but also giving the necessary equipment that will be helpful, new technology, and a criteria utilized by small departments that will allow them to get a rating of having a police force that meets certain standards to know how to deal with the elderly, to know how to deal with the physically and mentally disabled, how to deal with juveniles, how to deal with women. Certainly we know that bad actors and those who are tending to do us harm, we are ultimately concerned that we have very safe communities.

I hope that as we confront this that the sheer shrillness of dealing with

criminal justice will be put aside so that we can studiously get a bill to the President's desk, we can get a bill about youth offenders that I will introduce, a bill about building trust, which means that we don't force communities to use police officers as revenue gatherers, so it is not about how many we stop on the street or how many we give tickets to to provide money to the coffers of our local community. That puts the police sometimes in unnecessary confrontational roles when they could very well be engaging in warnings or other ways of dealing with the community. I would like to enhance PAL, the Police Athletic League, an excellent community-based approach to police and children getting to know each other. Many things can happen.

This is a significant moment that captures the constitutional premise that we want to create a more perfect Union.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, chained to a bed in a warehouse, branded like cattle, these are just some of the horrific stories that I have heard from young girls who suffered as victims of human trafficking in my home State of Texas.

Human trafficking is modern-day slavery. Sadly, according to the National Human Trafficking Resource Center, Texas has the second highest number of reported instances of human trafficking in the country. My hometown of Houston is the hub for domestic trafficking of minor children.

While this dastardly underground industry has been hidden for years in plain sight, the good news is there are efforts to fight this scourge of human trafficking throughout the Nation. Earlier this week Senator CORNYN and I had the opportunity to visit the Letot Center in Dallas, Texas, where we saw firsthand what can happen when government, law enforcement, nonprofits, concerned citizens, and religious groups join together in a community to restore the lives of human trafficking victims.

We were joined by advocates from the nonprofit New Friends New Life, an organization that provides job training, financial assistance, life skills coaching, and special programs to address the challenges of survivors and their families. With the addition of a brand-new all-female facility, the Letot Center and groups like New Friends New Life not only provide a safe home for trafficking victims, but help arm them with the resources to rebuild their lives.

One remarkable young lady that we met—I will call her Amanda because

that is her name—became a victim of human trafficking after she was kidnapped in Dallas at the age of 15. For 9 years she lived in slavery, in terror, as she was repeatedly sold every day for sex.

Through New Friends New Life's approach, one that addresses the physical, mental, and spiritual needs of victims, Amanda was rescued, and she and her daughter are now living proof that there is hope for trafficking survivors fighting abuse, addiction, and poverty. After talking to her and hearing her story and she making her story public, Mr. Speaker, she is a remarkable person—a survivor, a fighter against the scourge of slavery.

As a former judge, as you are, Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe in not only punishing people who commit crimes, but also helping victims rebuild their lives. As a father of 4, grandfather of 11, I call upon all other fathers in the United States to refuse to sit back while America's children are being sold in the marketplace of sex. We have a responsibility, not just as Members of the House or the Senate, but as fathers, to fight this scourge that is taking place in our country.

That is why, in the Senate, Senator CORNYN and, in the House, CAROLYN MALONEY and I authored the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act: to provide law enforcement with new tools to apprehend those who commit these crimes and to provide resources for restoration for the survivors.

It is very encouraging that the House of Representatives and the United States Senate recently passed the Victims of Trafficking Act. It passed the Senate 99-0. It passed the House overwhelmingly, with only three voting against it. That very seldom happens in my experience in Congress, where one piece of legislation is so overwhelmingly supported by both sides of the aisle and in both the Senate and the House. This bipartisan bill has been signed into law by the President now.

Under this legislation, a special fund will be created to help these victims like Amanda get the shelter and services they need and provide them a fresh start. The law also ensures those who have been sold into slavery are treated as victims and not treated as criminals. Moreover, the legislation will strengthen law enforcement to give them tools to take down all human traffickers and organized criminal networks supporting them. Finally, the law targets the buyers, those predators who purchase children in the marketplace. The days of boys being boys in this country are going to end, and the law and law enforcement and the long arm of the law will go after these buyers. Partnerships on the Federal, State, and local level will be instrumental in stopping these crimes and rescuing victims.

So we must do everything possible to support survivors like Amanda—to

break the cycle of sexual exploitation—overcome the pain of their experiences and help them to start a new life. We can achieve this if organizations like New Friends New Life and facilities like the Letot Center have the tools and resources they need to serve every victim. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act will help do this.

America must send the word that our children are not for sale, not in our town and not in our country.

And that is just the way it is.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

May all the Members have the vision of our Nation where respect and understanding are the marks of civility, and honor and integrity are the marks of one's character.

Give them the grace to see the best in those with whom they find disagreement and the courage to move together with them toward solutions that best serve our great Nation.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within these hallowed Halls be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S LEGACY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, President Obama admitted that he does not have a complete strategy to fight ISIL, which he belittled as junior varsity, putting American families at risk. The President should change course to prevent more failed foreign policies.

Under his watch, the victory he cited in Iraq has evolved into the beheading of Americans and mass murder of Muslims by ISIL/Daesh. Safe havens exist to murder Americans worldwide.

Under his watch, Syria crossed his red line when it used chemical weapons to kill opposition yet faced no consequences. Iran continues with nuclear weapons development, building intercontinental ballistic missiles to achieve their goal of death to Israel, death to America.

Under his watch, Putin's regime invaded Ukraine, leaving over 7,000 dead, and extremists threaten American allies from the Baltics to central and southeastern Europe.

Under his watch, murder and kidnappings have swept Libya, Nigeria, Yemen, and Kenya, which the President should address with peace through strength.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND DEADLINE

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind Republican colleagues it is time to get serious about our country's transportation needs. With another highway and transit trust fund deadline on the horizon, we can no longer keep our Nation stuck with small, short-term funding that fails to meet the challenges of our Nation's crumbling roads and bridges.

In the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex, a long-term, bipartisan fix will ensure that the Texas Department of Transportation, TxDOT, can continue its work on long-term projects like the horseshoe project near downtown Dallas and the expansion of I-35W in Fort Worth.

In addition, it would ensure that thousands of residents in north Texas can continue to utilize reliable public transit services like the T and DART.

Later this summer, the highway transit fund will expire in the middle of a very busy travel season while constituents like these are trying to come to Washington, D.C. It is time for the Republicans to put aside their rhetoric and make good on their word to the American people.

Don't keep folks stuck in traffic this summer. Let's pass a long-term highway bill.

CONGRATULATING WAYZATA'S TOP FINANCE STUDENTS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate two Wayzata High School students for doing so well in the National Securities Industry and Financial Market Association Foundation's student essay competition. Tyler Carlstrom, a sophomore, placed second in the InvestWrite essay competition, and senior Megan Plummer placed fifth.

The InvestWrite essay competition is a component of the stock market game that asks students around the country to analyze an investment scenario in 1,000 words or fewer. Tyler and Megan both used their analytical skills that they learned in their investments class at Wayzata High School, taught by their teacher, Candy Lee.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, I believe our youth need more opportunities to learn how to effectively manage money in order to plan and achieve their financial goals. Events like this certainly strongly encourage our students to learn the ins and outs of our financial and economic world views.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Tyler and Megan on their great opportunity and doing so well in this tough competition.

FAST TRACK

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my opposition to the fast-track legislation making its way through our House this week.

Let me be clear, I am pro-trade. I represent the Port of Los Angeles, and I understand the potential benefits of a good trade deal. But I am also pro-worker, pro-environment, pro-immigration reform, pro-human rights and pro-food safety.

These goals, I believe, would be undermined by this fast-track legislation that limits our President's ability to negotiate those critical issues. Moreover, if the President gets fast-track authority, then our only role as Members of Congress would be an up-or-down vote on the final deal, limited debate, no amendments.

We cannot afford another bad trade deal. NAFTA cost our Nation over 800,000 manufacturing jobs.

I do not want to vote against a trade deal. I want to shape a fair deal that does not hurt American workers. I want a deal I can vote for.

MAGNA CARTA: PRESERVING THE LEGACY OF FREEDOM

(Mr. BYRNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 800th anniversary of one of the world's most important documents, the Magna Carta.

On June 15, 1215, King John added his seal to the Magna Carta after it was drafted by barons in England who were tired of continued attacks on their freedoms and rights by a tyrannical king.

The Magna Carta, which is Latin for "the great charter," established the rule of law in England and served as an inspiration for the American revolution and the basis for the Declaration of Independence and our Bill of Rights.

As Thomas Paine said in 1776: "In free countries, the law ought to be king; and there ought to be no other."

Mr. Speaker, it seems that far too often our problem is we don't fully understand our history, and that is why we stray from it.

We are currently dealing with a President who has shown a willingness to change the laws through executive fiat. I believe it is vitally important that we remember the Magna Carta, which is based on the idea that no person, regardless of their position, will ever be above the law.

People from all over the world have fought for centuries in order to preserve and defend this basic principle, and that fight can never end. So on this 800th anniversary, I call on this body to remember the Magna Carta

and work every day to carry forward the torch of freedom.

HELPING CONSUMERS ACHIEVE CAR OWNERSHIP

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of cutting the bureaucratic red tape strangling our Nation's small businesses.

In 2013, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau implemented guidance that would prevent families and individuals from obtaining auto financing discounts. The CFPB issued this guidance without a public comment period for consumers, small businesses, or stakeholders.

This guidance not only affects the American auto industry and the hundreds of hard-working auto dealers in the Granite State; but it also affects Granite State families and individuals, for example, the young couple in Manchester struggling to afford a new minivan to accommodate their growing family or the startup logistics company in Conway wishing to add another truck to their fleet to grow their business.

The detrimental aspects of this onerous regulation are felt throughout our State and our Nation. That is why I introduced H.R. 1737, a bipartisan bill to rein in the CFPB's overreach and merely bring more transparency, accountability, and clarity to the formal rule-making process. It will reverse the CFPB's indirect auto financing guidance and allow the public's voice to be heard.

This bill has 49 Republican cosponsors and 40 Democrat cosponsors. I look forward to working with all those interested in continuing to reverse this rule.

TWO BROTHERS, ONE JOURNEY

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary 15-year-old named Hunter Gandee from Monroe County, Michigan.

Hunter's 8-year-old brother, Braden, has cerebral palsy and cannot walk on his own. Last week, Hunter carried Braden on his back for 57 miles to raise awareness for the disease. The 3-day journey took the Gandee family from Lambertville to the University of Michigan's Pediatric Rehabilitation Center in Ann Arbor, where Braden has upcoming surgery.

Along the way, there were hugs, cheers, and outpouring of support from communities across Michigan and the country. Two brothers, one journey, an inspiring story of love, courage, and

sacrifice—may we all learn from their example and do our part to make the world a better place.

God bless Hunter. God bless Braden.

THANKING EDIE LOWRY FOR HER SERVICE TO VETERANS

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my constituent and friend Edie Lowry for her service to our Nation's veterans as the founder and president of Honor Flight of Northeast Tennessee. Under Edie's direction, Honor Flight of Northeast Tennessee honors veterans by arranging trips and transporting former servicemen and -women to Washington, D.C., to visit their respective war memorials, all at no cost to the veterans.

Edie Lowry first became involved with the Honor Flight program in St. Joseph, Missouri, after reading about the program in a newspaper article. During an honor flight in 2008, she witnessed firsthand the impact the Honor Flight program has on veterans' lives.

After discovering in 2010 that Honor Flight did not exist in our area, Edie established a chapter in northeast Tennessee. Honor Flight of Northeast Tennessee has helped dozens of veterans visit their memorial and receive the honor and recognition they deserve.

I thank Edie Lowry, my friend, for her service to veterans in our community through Honor Flight of Northeast Tennessee.

RECOGNIZING JARED DER-YEGHIAYAN

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great achievement of a 10th District hero, Jared Der-Yeghiayan.

Working with the FBI and the DEA, Special Agent Der-Yeghiayan served as the lead special agent from the Department of Homeland Security to shut down the notorious black market Web site Silk Road.

For more than 2 years, Special Agent Der-Yeghiayan worked undercover to infiltrate the Silk Road network, an underground Web site used by thousands of drug dealers and criminals to facilitate drug sales and illegal activity around the globe.

His innovative cyber investigation led to thousands of drug seizures, dozens of arrests, and the successful conviction of the owner and operator of the Silk Road Web site. In helping bringing down this dark Web site, Jared Der-Yeghiayan has left his mark in making this country a safer and more secure place.

I am honored to have Jared as a constituent of Illinois' 10th District; I thank him for his service to this Nation, and I look forward to many more bright achievements in the future.

□ 1215

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this year's fiscal 2016 Defense Appropriations bill.

As we rapidly approach the final vote on this year's bill, I want to recognize the outstanding work that the Appropriations Committee has done in crafting this year's bill.

I am proud to represent the First Congressional District of Georgia, which is the proud home of Kings Bay Naval Submarine Base, Hunter Army Airfield, Moody Air Force Base, and Fort Stewart. These installations are the foundation of many critical missions that continue to support our troops abroad and our American citizens at home.

I am pleased and grateful that this year's appropriations bill supports the First District's important missions, and I commend the committee for its accomplishments, all while operating under budget.

Through this bill, the Georgia First's military installations and their personnel will continue receiving funding for critical missions that will ensure future success for our servicemen and -women. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING EDWARD JOSEPH OLENDER

(Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Army Sergeant Major Ed Olender, who passed away earlier this year at the age of 91.

For those who knew Ed, he was a humble and dedicated family man, neighbor, and friend. He was well-known around Tillson, New York, in having given his work in the post office, in his extensive volunteer service, in his service as a firefighter, and as a life member of the American Legion and the VFW. However, without knowing him well, you would never guess the rest of his life story.

Born in Dickinson, New York, in 1923, Ed joined the Army at the age of 17. He served in combat in the Pacific in World War II, including earning a Bronze Star for his actions in defending Hawaii during the attack on Pearl Harbor and earning a Purple Heart in Luzon. He also served in combat in

both Korea and Vietnam, earning a second Purple Heart and various other awards and commendations. He retired in 1974 as a command sergeant major. He earned the Silver Star and also earned the Combat Infantryman Badge three times.

Ed was predeceased by his wife of 53 years, June, and they had three children, two grandchildren, and three step-grandchildren.

I rise today to commemorate this great American hero—a humble but incredible example for all of us. May God bless Sergeant Major Olender and his entire family.

BRING OUR AMERICAN HEROES HOME

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I teamed up with Congressman GERRY CONNOLLY of Virginia to introduce a resolution to ensure that future trade partners with the United States are active in the recovery efforts of our POWs and MIAs.

Mr. Speaker, as the father of an injured Army soldier, I thank God every day that my son returned home safely, and it pains me to know that there are still brave men and women who have not been recovered. This bipartisan resolution makes it clear that we as Americans take the promises we make to our servicemembers and their families very seriously, and we are hopeful that future trade partners will become partners in our ongoing recovery efforts.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Defense, more than 80,000 American citizens who served in the Vietnam war, the Korean war, and World War II are still missing in action, and I will not rest until all of our men and women are returned home. These American heroes deserve no less.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H. Res. 56.

PERMISSION TO MODIFY ORDER OF HOUSE OF JUNE 10, 2015, REGARDING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1295, IRS BUREAUCRACY REDUCTION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of June 10, 2015, regarding consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 1295, be modified by striking “printed” and inserting “submitted for printing.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) kindly take the chair.

□ 1219

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. CURBELO of Florida (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

The Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016”.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

IRS BUREAUCRACY REDUCTION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of June 10, 2015, as modified by the order of the House of today, I call up the bill (H.R. 1295) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code, with the Senate amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. *Short title; table of contents.*

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. *Short title.*

Sec. 102. *Findings.*

Sec. 103. *Extension of African Growth and Opportunity Act.*

Sec. 104. *Modifications of rules of origin for duty-free treatment for articles of beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries under Generalized System of Preferences.*

Sec. 105. *Monitoring and review of eligibility under Generalized System of Preferences.*

Sec. 106. *Promotion of the role of women in social and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.*

Sec. 107. *Biennial AGOA utilization strategies.*

Sec. 108. *Deepening and expanding trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States.*

Sec. 109. *Agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.*

Sec. 110. *Reports.*

Sec. 111. *Technical amendments.*

Sec. 112. *Definitions.*

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Sec. 201. *Extension of Generalized System of Preferences.*

Sec. 202. *Authority to designate certain cotton articles as eligible articles only for least-developed beneficiary developing countries under Generalized System of Preferences.*

Sec. 203. *Application of competitive need limitation and waiver under Generalized System of Preferences with respect to articles of beneficiary developing countries exported to the United States during calendar year 2014.*

Sec. 204. *Travel goods.*

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Sec. 301. *Extension of preferential duty treatment program for Haiti.*

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

Sec. 401. *Tariff classification of recreational performance outerwear.*

Sec. 402. *Duty treatment of specialized athletic footwear.*

Sec. 403. *Effective date.*

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. *Report on contribution of trade preference programs to reducing poverty and eliminating hunger.*

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

Sec. 601. *Customs user fees.*

Sec. 602. *Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.*

Sec. 603. *Improved information reporting on unreported and underreported financial accounts.*

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of

trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost six-fold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(b) AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(g)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(2) EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “11 succeeding” and inserting “21 succeeding”; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(3) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “SEPTEMBER 30, 2015” and inserting “SEPTEMBER 30, 2025”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.”.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff treatment symbol “D” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol “A” or “A*” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “If the President” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described

in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”.

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

“(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

“(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

“(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

“(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

“(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

“(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

“(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

“(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

“(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

“(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.”.

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.”.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “for men and women” after “rights”.

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as “AGOA utilization strategies”);

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider requesting the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) CONTENTS.—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To

that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) PUBLICATION.—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest” and inserting “, through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have”; and

(B) by striking “and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States” and inserting “, complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) by inserting after “from those countries” the following: “, particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs,”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) COORDINATION.—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.”.

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) TERMINATION.—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “beneficiary sub-Saharan African country” means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) **SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “sub-Saharan African country” has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking “July 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013, and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1), shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) **REQUESTS.**—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) **PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.**—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **COVERED ARTICLE.**—The term “covered article” means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) **ENTER; ENTRY.**—The terms “enter” and “entry” include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of

the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.”.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “October 1” for “July 1” each place such date appears.

(b) **ARTICLE DESCRIBED.**—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. TRAVEL GOODS.

Section 503(b)(1)(E) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)(E)) is amended by striking “handbags, luggage, flat goods.”.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (cc) to read as follows:

“(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking “succeeding 11 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(II) by striking “December 19, 2018” and inserting “December 19, 2025”.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking “September 30, 2020” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 401. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) **AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.**—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking “For the purposes of subheadings” and all that follows through “6211.20.15” and inserting “For purposes of this chapter”;

(B) by striking “garments classifiable in those subheadings” and inserting “a garment”; and

(C) by striking “D 3600-81” and inserting “D 3779-81”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new notes:

“3. (a) For purposes of this chapter, the term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ means

trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants, and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with 5 or more of the following features:

“(i) Insulation for cold weather protection.

“(ii) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

“(iii) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

“(iv) Venting, not including grommet(s).

“(v) Articulated elbows or knees.

“(vi) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

“(vii) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

“(viii) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

“(ix) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

“(x) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

“(xi) Odor control technology.

The term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ does not include occupational outerwear.

“(b) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

“(i) The term ‘treated with plastics’ refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

“(ii) The term ‘sealed seams’ means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

“(iii) The term ‘critically sealed seams’ means—

“(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

“(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

“(iv) The term ‘insulation for cold weather protection’ means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

“(v) The term ‘venting’ refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

“(vi) The term ‘articulated elbows or knees’ refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or

knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

“(vii) The term ‘reinforcement’ refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

“(viii) The term ‘weatherproof closure’ means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

“(ix) The term ‘multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar’ means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar component, to allow volume adjustments around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

“(x) The terms ‘adjustable powder skirt’ and ‘inner protective skirt’ refer to a partial lower

inner lining with means of tightening around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

“(xi) The term ‘arm gusset’ means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

“(xii) The term ‘radial arm movement’ refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

“(xiii) The term ‘odor control technology’ means the incorporation into a fabric or garment of materials, including, but not limited to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

“(xiv) The term ‘occupational outerwear’ means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion,

or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

“(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as ‘recreational performance outerwear’.

“(d) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.”.

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
	6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.12.05

having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%	
	6201.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.13.05

having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				

6201.13.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6201.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6201.19.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%	
6201.91.10	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%	
6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6201.92.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	

6201.92.15	Other: Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 through 6201.93.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6201.93.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6201.93.20	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6201.93.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6201.93.30	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	
6201.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	”.

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
	6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6202.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6202.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6202.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
---	------------	--	------	--	-----	--

6202.19.10	Other:				
6202.19.90	Containing 70 percent or more by weight or silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%	
			8% (AU)		
			14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)		
6202.91.10	Other:				
	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%	
			8% (AU)		
			5.6% (OM)		
6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)		
			8% (AU)		
			14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, as the article description for subheading 6202.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
			8% (AU)		
6202.92.10	Other:				
	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	60%	
			3.9% (AU)		
6202.92.15	Other:				
	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	37.5%	
			5.5% (AU)		
6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)		
			8% (AU)	90%	”.

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 through 6202.93.50 and inserting the following, as the article description for subheading 6202.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
			8% (AU)		
	Other:				

6202.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6202.93.20	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6202.93.40	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
6202.93.45	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6202.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6202.99.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6203.41.10	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.8% (AU) 3% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, as the article description for subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
6203.42.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
6203.42.20	Other: Bib and brace overalls	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	”.

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 6203.43.05 having the same degree of indentation through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, as the article description for subheading 6203.43.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	
6203.43.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
6203.43.15	Other: Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.43.25	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.43.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6203.43.35	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%	
6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	”.

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.49 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.49 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.49 6203.49.05	Of other textile materials: Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	
	6203.49.10	Other: Of artificial fibers: Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%	
	6203.49.15	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6203.49.40 6203.49.80	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste Other	Free 2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	”.

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.10	Other: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	”.

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.62.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
	6204.62.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down Other:	Free		60%	

6204.62.20	Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6204.62.30	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%	
6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	”.

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 through 6204.63.35 and inserting the following, as the article description for subheading 6204.63.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	
6204.63.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
6204.63.12	Other: Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6204.63.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6204.63.30	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	”.

(24) By striking subheadings 6204.69 through 6204.69.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.69 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.69 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.69	Of other textile materials:							
	6204.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%		Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%			
		Other:							
		Of artificial fibers:							
	6204.69.10	Bib and brace overalls	13.6%		Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%			
		Trousers, breeches and shorts:			8% (AU)				
	6204.69.20	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%		Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%			
					8% (AU)				
	6204.69.25	Other	28.6%		Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%			
					8% (AU)				
		Of silk or silk waste:							
	6204.69.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.1%		Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%			
	6204.69.60	Other	7.1%		Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%			
					6.3% (AU)				
	6204.69.90	Other	2.8%		Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%			”.

(25) By striking subheadings 6210.40.30 and 6210.40.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.40.30 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.40.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%		Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%			
		Other:							
	6210.40.30	Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%		Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%			
	6210.40.50	Other	7.1%		Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%			”.

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.50.30 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%		Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%			
		Other:							

6210.50.30	Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	”.

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.32	Of cotton:				
6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.33	Of man-made fibers:				
6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	
6211.33.10	Other	16%	6.4% (OM) Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	”.

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.39.10	Other: Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%	
6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	4.8% (OM) Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.42	Of cotton:				
6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
			7.2% (AU)		

6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%	”.
------------	-------------	------	---	-----	----

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.43	Of man-made fibers:				
6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	
6211.43.10	Other	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	”.

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	
6211.49.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	”.

SEC. 402. DUTY TREATMENT OF SPECIALIZED ATHLETIC FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF SPECIALIZED ATHLETIC FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

“6. For the purposes of this chapter, the term ‘specialized athletic footwear’ includes footwear

(other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1 or Additional U.S. Note 2) that is designed to be worn chiefly for sports or athletic purposes, hiking shoes, trekking shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over \$24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.”.

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR SPECIALIZED ATHLETIC FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

6402.91.42	Specialized athletic footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	”.
------------	--	-----	---	-----	----

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new sub-

heading, with the article description for subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of in-

dentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

“ 6402.99.32	Specialized athletic footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P)	1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35% ”.
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----	---	---	--------

(c) **STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.**—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall—

(1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

SEC. 601. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “July 7, 2025”.

(b) **RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.**—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking “June 30, 2021” and inserting “June 30, 2025”.

SEC. 602. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 5.25 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 603. IMPROVED INFORMATION REPORTING ON UNREPORTED AND UNDER-REPORTED FINANCIAL ACCOUNTS.

(a) **ELIMINATION OF MINIMUM INTEREST REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6049(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking

“aggregating \$10 or more” each place it appears.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Subparagraph (C) of section 6049(d)(5) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “which involves the payment of \$10 or more of interest”, and

(B) by striking “IN THE CASE OF TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING \$10 OR MORE” in the heading.

(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns filed after December 31, 2015.

(b) **REPORTING OF NON-INTEREST BEARING DEPOSITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subpart B of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 6049 the following new section:

“SEC. 6049A. RETURNS REGARDING NON-INTEREST BEARING DEPOSITS.

“(a) **REQUIREMENT OF REPORTING.**—Every person who holds a reportable deposit during any calendar year shall make a return according to the forms or regulations prescribed by the Secretary, setting forth the name and address of the person for whom such deposit was held.

“(b) **REPORTABLE DEPOSIT.**—For purposes of this section—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘reportable deposit’ means—

“(A) any amount on deposit with—

“(i) a person carrying on a banking business,

“(ii) a mutual savings bank, a savings and loan association, a building and loan association, a cooperative bank, a homestead association, a credit union, an industrial loan association or bank, or any similar organization,

“(iii) a broker (as defined in section 6045(c)), or

“(iv) any other person provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary, or

“(B) to the extent provided by the Secretary in regulations, any amount held by an insurance company, an investment company (as defined in section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940), or held in other pooled funds or trusts.

“(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Such term shall not include—

“(A) any amount with respect to which a report is made under section 6049,

“(B) any amount on deposit with or held by a natural person,

“(C) except to the extent provided in regulations, any amount—

“(i) held with respect to a person described in section 6049(b)(4),

“(ii) with respect to which section 6049(b)(5) would apply if a payment were made with respect to such amount, or

“(iii) on deposit with or held by a person described in section 6049(b)(2)(C), or

“(D) any amount for which the Secretary determines there is already sufficient reporting.

“(c) **STATEMENTS TO BE FURNISHED TO PERSONS WITH RESPECT TO WHOM INFORMATION IS REQUIRED.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Every person required to make a return under subsection (a) shall furnish to each person whose name is required to be set forth in such return a written statement showing—

“(A) the name, address, and phone number of the information contact of the person required to make such return, and

“(B) the reportable account with respect to which such return was made.

“(2) **TIME AND FORM OF STATEMENT.**—The written statement under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be furnished at a time and in a manner similar to the time and manner that statements are required to be filed under section 6049(c)(2), and

“(B) shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe by regulations.

“(d) **PERSON.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘person’, when referring to the person for whom a deposit is held, includes any governmental unit and any agency or instrumentality thereof and any international organization and any agency or instrumentality thereof.”.

(2) **ASSESSABLE PENALTIES.**—

(A) **FAILURE TO FILE RETURN.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 6724(d)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “or” at the end of clause (xxiv), by striking “and” at the end of clause (xxv) and inserting “or”, and by inserting after clause (xxv) the following new clause:

“(xxvi) section 6049A(a) (relating to returns regarding non-interest bearing deposits), and”.

(B) **FAILURE TO FILE PAYEE STATEMENT.**—Paragraph (2) of section 6724(d) of such Code is amended by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (GG), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (HH) and inserting “, or”, and by inserting after subparagraph (HH) the following new subparagraph:

“(II) section 6049A(c) (relating to returns regarding non-interest bearing deposits).”.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of section for subpart B of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 6049 the following new item:

“Sec. 6049A. Returns regarding non-interest bearing deposits.”.

(4) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns filed after December 31, 2015.

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.”.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title of H.R. 1295 and concur in the Senate amendment to the text of H.R. 1295 with amendment No. 1 submitted for printing in the Congressional Record.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendments to the text is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Findings.

Sec. 103. Extension of African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Sec. 104. Modifications of rules of origin for duty-free treatment for articles of beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 105. Monitoring and review of eligibility under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 106. Promotion of the role of women in social and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 107. Biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

Sec. 108. Deepening and expanding trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States.

Sec. 109. Agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 110. Reports.

Sec. 111. Technical amendments.

Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Sec. 201. Extension of Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 202. Authority to designate certain cotton articles as eligible articles only for least-developed beneficiary developing countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 203. Application of competitive need limitation and waiver under Generalized System of Preferences with respect to articles of beneficiary developing countries exported to the United States during calendar year 2014.

Sec. 204. Eligibility of certain luggage and travel articles for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Sec. 301. Extension of preferential duty treatment program for Haiti.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

Sec. 401. Tariff classification of recreational performance outerwear.

Sec. 402. Duty treatment of protective active footwear.

Sec. 403. Effective date.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Report on contribution of trade preference programs to reducing poverty and eliminating hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

Sec. 601. Customs user fees.

Sec. 602. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

Sec. 603. Elimination of modification of the Medicare sequester for fiscal year 2024.

Sec. 604. Payee statement required to claim certain education tax benefits.

Sec. 605. Special rule for educational institutions unable to collect TINs of individuals with respect to higher education tuition and related expenses.

Sec. 606. Penalty for failure to file correct information returns and provide payee statements.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost six-fold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(b) **AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C.

3721(g)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(2) **EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.**—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “11 succeeding” and inserting “21 succeeding”; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(3) **EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.**—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “SEPTEMBER 30, 2015” and inserting “SEPTEMBER 30, 2025”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.”.

(b) **APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.**—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.**—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.”.

(c) **MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.**—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff treatment symbol “D” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol “A” or “A*” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) **CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.**—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking "If the President" and inserting the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President's intention to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation."

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

"(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President's intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation."

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

"(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

"(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

"(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

"(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

"(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

"(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this sub-

section, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

"(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

"(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

"(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

"(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

"(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

"(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015."

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ";" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting ";" and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa."

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting "for men and women" after "rights".

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as "AGOA utilization strategies");

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider requesting the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) CONTENTS.—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) PUBLICATION.—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa

and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest” and inserting “, through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have”; and

(B) by striking “and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States” and inserting “, complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) by inserting after “from those countries” the following: “, particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **COORDINATION.**—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.”.

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) **IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) **POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) **TERMINATION.**—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “beneficiary sub-Saharan African country” means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) **SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “sub-Saharan African country” has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking “July 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013, and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1),

shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) **REQUESTS.**—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) **PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.**—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **COVERED ARTICLE.**—The term “covered article” means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) **ENTER; ENTRY.**—The terms “enter” and “entry” include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.”.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “October 1” for “July 1” each place such date appears.

(b) **ARTICLE DESCRIBED.**—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (5)”;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking “Footwear” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (5), footwear”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or (E) of paragraph (1), the President may designate the following as eligible articles under subsection (a):

“(A) Articles classifiable under subheading 4202.11.00, 4202.12.40, 4202.21.60, 4202.21.90, 4202.22.15, 4202.22.45, 4202.31.60, 4202.32.40, 4202.32.80, 4202.92.15, 4202.92.20, 4202.92.45, or 4202.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

“(B) Articles classifiable under statistical reporting number 4202.12.2020, 4202.12.2050, 4202.12.8030, 4202.12.8070, 4202.22.8050, 4202.32.9550, 4202.32.9560, 4202.91.0030, 4202.91.0090, 4202.92.3020, 4202.92.3031, 4202.92.3091, 4202.92.9026, or 4202.92.9060 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as such statistical reporting numbers are in effect on the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (cc) to read as follows:

“(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking “succeeding 11 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”;

(II) by striking “December 19, 2018” and inserting “December 19, 2025”.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking “September 30, 2020” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 401. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking “For the purposes of subheadings” and all that follows through “6211.20.15” and inserting “For purposes of this chapter”;

(B) by striking “garments classifiable in those subheadings” and inserting “a garment”;

(C) by striking “D 3600-81” and inserting “D 3779-81”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new notes:

“3. (a) For purposes of this chapter, the term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ means trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants,

and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with 5 or more of the following features:

“(i) Insulation for cold weather protection.

“(ii) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

“(iii) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

“(iv) Venting, not including grommet(s).

“(v) Articulated elbows or knees.

“(vi) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

“(vii) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

“(viii) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

“(ix) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

“(x) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

“(xi) Odor control technology.

The term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ does not include occupational outerwear.

“(b) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

“(i) The term ‘treated with plastics’ refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

“(ii) The term ‘sealed seams’ means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

“(iii) The term ‘critically sealed seams’ means—

“(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

“(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

“(iv) The term ‘insulation for cold weather protection’ means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

“(v) The term ‘venting’ refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

“(vi) The term ‘articulated elbows or knees’ refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

“(vii) The term ‘reinforcement’ refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

“(viii) The term ‘weatherproof closure’ means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

“(ix) The term ‘multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar’ means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar component, to allow volume adjustments around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

“(x) The terms ‘adjustable powder skirt’ and ‘inner protective skirt’ refer to a partial lower inner lining with means of tightening around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

“(xi) The term ‘arm gusset’ means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

“(xii) The term ‘radial arm movement’ refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

“(xiii) The term ‘odor control technology’ means the incorporation into a fabric or garment of materials, including, but not limited to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

“(xiv) The term ‘occupational outerwear’ means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion, or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

“(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as ‘recreational performance outerwear’.

“(d) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.”

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:					
	6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%		
	6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	”.	

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%		
	6201.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%		
	6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.	

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%		
	6201.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%		
	6201.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%		
	6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.	

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%		
	6201.19.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%		
	6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.	

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%		
		Other:					

6201.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%	
6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	"

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6201.92.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6201.92.15	Other: Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	"

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 through 6201.93.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6201.93.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6201.93.20	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6201.93.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6201.93.30	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	"

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	
6201.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	

6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	”.
------------	-------------	------	---	-----	----

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6202.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6202.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6202.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6202.19.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6202.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6202.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 5.6% (OM)	58.5%	
	6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6202.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 through 6202.93.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6202.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.40	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.45	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6202.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.
	6202.99.10	Other:	Free		35%	
	6202.99.90	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the fol-

lowing, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for sub-

heading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:				”.
	6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
				8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)		
	6203.41.10	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)		
				6.8% (AU) 3% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.
				8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)		
	6203.42.10	Other:	Free		60%	
		Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down				
	6203.42.20	Other:	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
		Bib and brace overalls		8% (AU)		
	6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)		
				8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6203.43.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6203.43.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.
				8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)		
	6203.43.10	Other:	Free		60%	
		Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down				
	6203.43.15	Other:	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%	
		Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant		6.3% (AU)		
	6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	
				8% (AU)		
	6203.43.25	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	
				8% (AU)		

6203.43.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6203.43.35	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%	
6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	”.

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6203.49 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for sub-

heading 6203.49 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.49	Of other textile materials:				
6203.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	
6203.49.10	Other: Of artificial fibers: Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%	
6203.49.15	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6203.49.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6203.49.80	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	”.

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6204.61.10	Other: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%	
6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	”.

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6204.62.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
6204.62.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	

6204.62.20	Other: Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6204.62.30	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%	
6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.
			11.6% (KR)		

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 through 6204.63.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.63.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	
6204.63.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
6204.63.12	Other: Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6204.63.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6204.63.30	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.
			11.4% (KR)		

(24) By striking subheadings 6204.69 through 6204.69.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.69 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.69 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.69	Of other textile materials:				
6204.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6204.69.10	Other: Of artificial fibers: Bib and brace overalls	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6204.69.20	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6204.69.25	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	Of silk or silk waste:				

6204.69.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%	
6204.69.60	Other	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%	
6204.69.90	Other	2.8%	6.3% (AU) Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	"

(25) By striking subheadings 6210.40.30 and 6210.40.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6210.40.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6210.40.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.40.30	Other: Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.40.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	"

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6210.50.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.50.30	Other: Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	"

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in ef-

fect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.32	Of cotton:				
6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	"

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in ef-

fect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.33	Of man-made fibers:				
6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	
6211.33.10	Other	16%	6.4% (OM) Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	"

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6211.39.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	Other:				

6211.39.10	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM)	58.5%	
6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in effect

on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“ 6211.42	Of cotton:				
6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%	
6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%	”.

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in effect

on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“ 6211.43	Of man-made fibers:				
6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	
6211.43.10	Other	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	”.

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“ 6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	
6211.49.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	”.

SEC. 402. DUTY TREATMENT OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

“6. For the purposes of subheadings 6402.91.42 and 6402.99.32, the term ‘protective

active footwear’ means footwear (other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1) that is designed for outdoor activities, such as hiking shoes, trekking shoes, running shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over \$24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.”.

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

" 6402.91.42	Protective active footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	"
--------------	---	-----	---	-----	---

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new sub-

heading, with the article description for subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of

indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

" 6402.99.32	Protective active footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P) 1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35%	"
--------------	----------------------------------	-----	--	-----	---

(c) **STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.**—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall—

(1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

SEC. 601. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “July 7, 2025”.

(b) **RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.**—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking “June 30, 2021” and inserting “June 30, 2025”.

SEC. 602. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 5.25 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 603. ELIMINATION OF MODIFICATION OF THE MEDICARE SEQUESTER FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b), section 251A(6)(D)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a(6)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking “0.25 percent” and inserting “0.0 percent”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not take effect unless the Trade Act of 2015 is enacted and if the Trade Act of 2015 is enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, such amendment shall be executed as if this Act had been enacted after the date of the enactment of such other Act.

SEC. 604. PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIRED TO CLAIM CERTAIN EDUCATION TAX BENEFITS.

(a) **AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY CREDIT, HOPE SCHOLARSHIP CREDIT, AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 25A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) **PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no credit shall be allowed under this section unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.”.

(2) **STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.**—Section 25A(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a statement described in paragraph (8) and received by such individual shall be treated as received by the taxpayer.”.

(b) **DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.**—Section 222(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) **PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.**—“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.

“(B) **STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.**—The receipt of the statement referred to in subparagraph (A) by an individual described in subsection (c)(3) shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as received by the taxpayer.”.

(c) **INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED ON PAYEE STATEMENT.**—Section 6050S(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the information required by subsection (b)(2).”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. SPECIAL RULE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS UNABLE TO COLLECT TINS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) **SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.**—No penalty shall be imposed under section 6721 or 6722 solely by reason of failing to provide the TIN of an individual on a return or statement required by section 6050S(a)(1) if the eligible educational institution required to make such return contemporaneously makes a true and accurate certification under penalty of perjury (and in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary) that it has complied with standards promulgated by the Secretary for obtaining such individual’s TIN.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 606. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS AND PROVIDE PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6721(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”, and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(b) **REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.**—

(1) **CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.**—Section 6721(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”,

(B) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”, and

(C) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(2) **FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.**—Section 6721(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”,

(B) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$250”, and

(C) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(c) **LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.**—Section 6721(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”, and

(B) by striking "\$1,500,000" and inserting "\$3,000,000",

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking "\$75,000" and inserting "\$175,000", and

(B) by striking "\$250,000" and inserting "\$500,000", and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking "\$200,000" and inserting "\$500,000", and

(B) by striking "\$500,000" (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting "\$1,500,000".

(d) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6721(e) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking "\$250" in paragraph (2) and inserting "\$500", and

(2) by striking "\$1,500,000" in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting "\$3,000,000".

(e) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6722(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking "\$100" and inserting "\$250", and

(B) by striking "\$1,500,000" and inserting "\$3,000,000".

(2) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(A) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6722(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking "\$30" and inserting "\$50",

(ii) by striking "\$100" and inserting "\$250", and

(iii) by striking "\$250,000" and inserting "\$500,000".

(B) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6722(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking "\$60" and inserting "\$100",

(ii) by striking "\$100" (prior to amendment by clause (i)) and inserting "\$250", and

(iii) by striking "\$500,000" and inserting "\$1,500,000".

(3) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6722(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "\$500,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000", and

(ii) by striking "\$1,500,000" and inserting "\$3,000,000",

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking "\$75,000" and inserting "\$175,000", and

(ii) by striking "\$250,000" and inserting "\$500,000", and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking "\$200,000" and inserting "\$500,000", and

(ii) by striking "\$500,000" (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting "\$1,500,000".

(4) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6722(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking "\$250" in paragraph (2) and inserting "\$500", and

(B) by striking "\$1,500,000" in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting "\$3,000,000".

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to returns and statements required to be filed after December 31, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 10, 2015, as modified by the order of the House of today, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the Trade Preferences Extension Act. This bill will strengthen America by promoting free enterprise all around the world. First, we extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act for 10 years. AGOA allows African countries to sell their goods in America duty free. This program is a very essential program. It strengthens ties between our countries because when America grows, they grow too.

I also want to thank Congressman RANGEL for his work on this. He is the champion of AGOA. He is one of the primary authors of AGOA, and he is the person who has done so much work throughout his career—having been chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, a leader in the committee—to help forge better ties between the nations of Africa and our country and to help the rising tide lift all of the boats, so I want to thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Second, we renew the Generalized System of Preferences through December 2017. GSP lowers duties on thousands of products around the developing world. We make a few changes in the bill, and I want to articulate those changes.

We make eligible for GSP things like purses, briefcases, and backpacks, but only after they receive extensive review and only if they are found to be nonimport sensitive. This is a trade bill, so there are lots of things like this in trade bills.

The purpose of all of this is to give American consumers access to better products at better prices, to help grow the economies of America and the countries we are trading with in the developing world.

We create a new tariff line for recreational performance outerwear, outerwear that is not made here, but that we buy that is needlessly more expensive for consumers. We lower duties on things like hiking and running shoes.

I also want to thank Congressman BLUMENAUER and Congressman

REICHERT for their work on performance outerwear and footwear. I also want to thank Congressman SMITH and Congressman CRENSHAW from Florida for their work on luggage. All of these programs have strong bipartisan support and say to the developing world: free enterprise, free enterprise is the way to go. That is the key to success. That is the key to upward mobility.

Third, we extend the HOPE and the HELP programs for products in Haiti for 10 years. These programs build up Haiti through trade and investment. That is the best kind of foreign aid and support you can have: more economic growth, more trade, more investment. They can create more opportunity and bring our countries closer together. That is why it is critical that we continue these programs.

Finally, I would like to say a word about the offsets in this bill. This bill will eliminate the Medicare sequester extension that was in the TAA bill, and in exchange it will set up stronger tax compliance laws. We have reached a bipartisan compromise here. This fixes the concerns that Members on both sides of the aisle, particularly on the Republican side, the Doctors Caucus as we call it, had about the Medicare sequester, and it removes the Medicare sequester.

These are commonsense programs that are fully paid for. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the legislation. It passed with a huge bipartisan margin over in the Senate, and I hope and expect that it will do so, as well, here.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this is more than just a trade bill. I want to thank Chairman RYAN for making certain that this did not come anywhere near the controversies that surround us in the trade area, which he could have done; but he made certain that this extension of AGOA, the support for Haiti, and also the GSP would not be surrounded with controversy but would move seamlessly.

I want to thank, also, ED ROYCE of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for being so cooperative in each stage of the way. It is a moving period for me because there hasn't been this type of cooperation between the House and the Senate or Republicans and Democrats in a long time, and it feels extremely good. I want to thank you for this and to realize that it is not just African countries, it is expansion of what I think our great country is all about, that it is not really just to exercise the economic power that we have, but to explore the potential that other countries have, especially in Africa that has been bypassed for so many, many decades.

I want to thank JIM McDERMOTT, who was one of the original authors;

Phil Crane, who was the chairman of the committee; and, of course, then-Speaker Gingrich, who was the first witness that we had for this bill. With roots like that, it probably carried over so that we can have this extension so that investors and importers of Africa and the African people themselves will be able to have a better idea of not where they are today, but where they can go with the cooperation of developing countries so that we will have the true meaning of peace, and that is through prosperity.

As far as Haiti is concerned, again, we have found throughout the world a general compassion for all of the things that we would want for other people that we enjoy ourselves, and by extending this through 2025, it gives them a better handle on what they can do in the future.

GSP has been with us since the 1970s, and we hope that developing countries can graduate into being full-fledged partners.

Again, as I said earlier, there has been no one like Dr. JIM McDERMOTT, who brought his experiences from the Peace Corps, having served in these countries and feeling in the marrow of his bones what we had to do. I have already given my appreciation, but he just walked in at the right time, as he usually does, and I would like to thank him publicly once again.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Senate AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015.

Today is a proud day for those of us who are deeply concerned about doing what we can to promote growth in developing countries. We are preparing to vote on a bipartisan bill that would extend preferences not only for African countries, but for Haiti, and developing countries more generally. I want to thank Chairman RYAN for working so closely with us on this bill, which has been a high priority for me this Congress.

AGOA

Let me talk about AGOA first. There is widespread enthusiasm about Africa these days. We know it's a continent that's poised for explosive growth. I am hopeful that growth will materialize. And that our program, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, will help fuel that growth.

In this country, our philosophy of trade and development has been to give poor countries a leg up on access to our market. That creates an incentive for importers to source from those countries, and it also builds relationships among our countries.

Some advanced economies have taken a different approach. They've forced developing countries, especially in Africa, to agree to sub-standard trade agreements instead of one-way preferences. One of the participants in the AGOA Forum last summer told us privately how much he appreciates the fact that the United States doesn't take that approach—that we don't view Africa as a continent full of natural resources to be exploited, but rather that it's our responsibility as a wealthy nation to provide a path for poor countries to develop.

We have seen countries participate in our preference programs, and then come to us asking to do free trade agreements. That's what happened with CAFTA/DR a decade ago. We are more than willing to do that—When they're ready and willing. And I think in the next 10 years, we're going to see quite a few countries in sub-Saharan Africa decide that entering into a two-way trade agreement with the United States is something they want to do, something they think will benefit them as well as us. The bill we're considering today pushes USTR to figure out a way to make that happen, without forcing anybody into doing a deal with us.

I'm excited to see where sub-Saharan Africa is headed, and for our country to do its part to help move those countries up the path of development.

But we should be clear—I we also benefit from this program, even if the preferences don't go both ways. Our businesses are able to source inputs from African countries without paying duty, and that in turn makes us more competitive, whether it's selling the finished product domestically, or exporting it to a third country.

I want to thank Congresswoman KAREN BASS for her tireless work to make this renewal happen. She is an advocate not just for Africa, but for policies that will promote real change in Africa. I know in the coming months we will be looking at ways to improve trade capacity building in Africa, and I am committed to working with her and our colleagues on Foreign Affairs to find a way to get that done.

HAITI

We're also extending the Haiti programs through 2025. Some provisions in the Haiti program begin to expire this year. We know from our own conversations with the administration that the Haitians, perhaps more than any other country, need a long-term extension of the program in order to attract investment. We hear that some factories in Haiti are at capacity—which is wonderful—but that for Haitian-owned businesses to be able to attract the capital to expand, the preferences have to be extended across a longer horizon so that investors will feel satisfied that they can recoup their investment. By extending preferences through 2025, we do that. We must recognize my friend, Senator BILL NELSON, who has been a champion for the people of Haiti and has been instrumental in crafting these provisions and getting them done.

GSP

Finally, we renew the Generalized System of Preferences, which expired almost two years ago. GSP has been the foundation of our trade and development program since 1975. This program provides preferences to a wide range of countries, across the development spectrum.

We've been fortunate to see countries become more and more developed, to the point where we are able to graduate them from the program and let them compete without needing the duty-free preference. I think it's unfortunate that we can't extend the program for a longer period of time, but the fact is, the program is so successful that finding offsets to pay for it has been a challenge. But it is my hope that GSP does not lapse again, and that next time, we're able to renew it ahead of time.

One thing I need to mention is the Senate inclusion of a provision that authorizes the President to review whether some goods should be made eligible for duty-free treatment under GSP. This is known as "GSP Update." We know that some domestic groups feel that some of those items are sensitive and should not be designated duty-free. So while we are supporting the inclusion of GSP Update in this bill, if and when the time comes to consider these goods for GSP, we urge the President to take into account the concerns that have been raised. I'll provide the clerk with a list of the items that domestic groups have flagged, so that it can be entered into the record.

OUTDOOR ACT

We are also including provisions that will allow us to keep track of imports of recreational clothing. These aren't preferences, but the Senate included them, and we have House Members who support the provision.

My colleagues who have advocated for this bill have noted that we need to do more to promote enjoyment of the great outdoors, and their goal is, eventually, to see if it's possible to remove duties on at least some of these goods.

But to enjoy the great outdoors, there must be great outdoors to enjoy, not just here, but around the world. My friend Mr. DOGGETT has for many years advocated including a criterion in GSP that would require beneficiaries to take steps to protect the environment. If there is an effort to make any of these goods duty-free at some point in the future, it would be my hope that those efforts would be paired with the kind of GSP criterion Mr. DOGGETT has advocated.

CONCLUSION

Looking at the bigger picture, there is so much support for these programs that a similar bill passed almost unanimously in the Senate last month. And I imagine the same will happen here today. I look forward to a time when we won't need preference packages at all, when the poorest of nations will have reached a level of development and productive capacity that they can compete with any other country. We are not there, but programs like the ones we're extending today will help them get there.

Supplemental Rangel Statement on HR 1295—Potentially Sensitive Items for GSP, by Harmonized Tariff Schedule Number

4202.12.40
4202.12.60
4202.12.80
4202.22.40
4202.22.45
4202.22.60
4202.22.80
4202.32.40
4202.32.80
4202.32.95
4202.92.08
4202.92.15
4202.92.20
4202.92.30
4202.92.90

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will just add a couple responses before I yield to the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee.

I appreciate the gentleman's kind words. This is a bipartisan bill, and

there is a time sensitivity here. It is very important, particularly for African nations in AGOA, that this gets done very quickly so that the proper signals are sent to the investors, to the factories, to the employers so that people can keep their jobs. That is one of the many reasons why we wanted to honor the commitment with the gentlewoman from California, with the gentleman from New York, to keep this distinct and separate and to get it moving through. So it is our intention that this gets moved through here, and then it is off and done.

I just want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their indulgence. This is one of those kind of rare, these days, moments of bipartisan support where this is good, and this is something that we should all be pleased that we are seeing done. It elevates our principles. It forges our ties with other countries. And in the time sensitive nature of this, I am glad that we could come together and get this done like we are.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my congratulations to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. RYAN, for the bipartisan nature of the work on this bill. Without his leadership, it wouldn't have happened. I also appreciate the leadership of the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee, Mr. RANGEL, who has been an advocate for this for a long, long time; Ranking Member LEVIN; the gentleman from Washington State, as it has been pointed out, and his leadership as well; the gentlewoman from California; Chairman ROYCE from California; as well as Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, who has been a strong advocate of getting this done, and getting this done quickly, as the chairman said. The entire process of developing a long-term extension and enhancement of AGOA reflects the strong bipartisan commitment that has always surrounded this issue and the bipartisan commitment of our chairman.

AGOA has been a clear success of economic development and in national security terms as well. In the last 15 years since it was enacted, it has become the cornerstone of our relationship with Africa. Since AGOA was enacted, trade has tripled and investment has grown almost sixfold. By one estimate, AGOA supports well over a million direct and indirect jobs in sub-Saharan Africa and about 100,000 jobs in the United States of America. We know the countries that participate in AGOA have higher average incomes per person and higher good governance scores, including on the rule of law and political stability criteria, than sub-Saharan African countries that do not participate in the program.

The bill we are considering today will extend AGOA for 10 years, the longest extension that Congress has ever considered for this program. It also strengthens the program by simplifying certain rules of origin, encouraging greater regional integration, building additional flexibility, improving certainty and predictability, and expanding transparency and participation in the AGOA review process.

For all its successes, we have also heard concerns about conditions in sub-Saharan Africa, including very significant concerns in South Africa, on issues that affect the agriculture industry, like in my State, poultry and pork. We have worked to correct that. The bill provides new mechanisms for addressing these concerns, including a petition process and an out-of-cycle review.

The bill also renews the General System of Preferences program through 2017 and provides retroactive relief to eligible products that were imported during the GSP's lapse. GSP promotes economic development by providing duty-free treatment for approximately 5,000 nonsensitive products from 126 developing countries. Employers in my district use this so they can grow their business and create more American jobs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill ensures that Haiti will continue to benefit from the HELP and HOPE programs by extending those preferences through 2025. This will encourage continued investment in Haiti and support its economic development and recovery efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), one of the authors of the original AGOA, and the people in South Africa as well as the United States are deeply indebted.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here today and to congratulate CHARLIE.

Most people don't remember 1995. That is when we did a bill called NAFTA, and tucked away in NAFTA was the beginning, the seeds of this particular bill. It didn't pass until 2000 when Newt Gingrich was Speaker. Newt Gingrich ought to get at least a little bit of an acknowledgment for his part in all of this.

Our goal then was to set up a proposal in trade that would allow for sustainable development in Africa. The last 15 years we have really achieved that goal, and that is why we are reauthorizing it today. This 10-year extension gives businesses an opportunity to actually plan.

What we have done over the last few years have been very short extensions, which has been very hard for the business community to make plans when they don't know whether it is going to be here at the next session.

One company in particular came in and told me that they want to create a vertically integrated process for producing clothing in Africa, everything from growing the seeds to spinning the yarn to producing the fabric. Now, this will require a major investment on their part. This long-term renewal of AGOA will provide that business with the certainty needed to make investments. When they go to the bank, the question is: How long is this actually going to last? They now can say "10 years" when they go to get the money to do this.

Once again, I am very proud and pleased to have been a part of this, and I think it shows that we can work together on things like trade.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), a distinguished Member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1245

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I thank the Chairman for yielding and for working to bring these issues to the floor.

This bill includes a number of critical reauthorizations, including AGOA, the Generalized System of Preferences, and trade with Haiti. It is an important first step as we address trade today and tomorrow.

I also want to thank the chairman for working with me and a number of other Members to ensure the inclusion of provisions in this bill to modernize the treatment of travel goods, performance outerwear, and footwear.

The GSP UPDATE Act, included in this bill, would allow the International Trade Commission to consider whether travel goods such as suitcases and backpacks are import sensitive. If, and only if, the ITC determines they are not, they would become eligible for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences.

Such a determination would be constructive for us, as well as our trade partners. This would mean increasing stability and economic growth in the developing world. It would also mean greater opportunities for retailers and consumers here in our country as we expand the availability of products.

Again, I thank the chairman for this provision's inclusion, and I urge passage.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, after 45 years in the House, I would be less than honest to say that there is certain legislation that I have concern with in terms of what happens after I leave this Congress, but I am so pleased to say that the gentlewoman from California has taken this little baby and nursed it to make certain that she would be the mother of the extension and that it will continue to grow.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. I rise today in support of H.R. 1891, the AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015.

I am delighted to be here to speak in favor of an extraordinarily important bill, of which AGOA is part, and to be joined by my distinguished colleague, Ranking Member RANGEL. I do have to say that it is quite appropriate that we are voting on this bill today, as it is Mr. RANGEL's birthday. As one of the original authors of AGOA, we extend this birthday present to him because I know that it will pass with bipartisan support.

I also want to acknowledge the work of one of the other original authors, Mr. McDERMOTT, for the longtime support of the nations in Africa and to acknowledge several Ambassadors that are here in the gallery from Lesotho, South Africa; Niger; and Gabon.

I also want to thank the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RYAN. I appreciate his timing. He made a commitment as soon as he took over as chair. He received numerous delegations from the continent. He made that commitment. He followed through on it, in particular, the timing, because it was so important that the chair and ranking member and chair of the subcommittee, Mr. TIBERI, that we did this soon so that we didn't wait until AGOA was near expiration.

We did that a couple of years ago with third-country fabric, and we found that many jobs on the continent were lost. I want to thank him for his leadership and following through.

The importance of reauthorizing AGOA—and by doing so, strengthening trade and investment between the United States and the nations of Africa—is clear. Since its enactment in 2001, AGOA has helped to significantly increase African exports to the United States and led to jobs both on the African Continent and here at home.

AGOA has generated approximately 100,000 jobs in the U.S. and 350,000 direct jobs and 1 million indirect jobs in Sub-Saharan Africa. A byproduct of this trade is the increase of U.S. exports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. BASS. Over the past decade, numerous countries on the continent of Africa have consistently been cited by international financial institutions as the fastest growing economies in the world.

Without question, I am pleased to have been part of this important process. I also look forward to continuing my work with my fellow Members of Congress and the administration in strengthening trade and investment relations between our country and home to the world's fastest growing economies and newest and most dynamic trade and investment frontier, Africa.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), one of

our newer Members who has taken a particular interest in the issue of trade. It matters greatly to the jobs in his district in Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the legislation that I am holding in my hand right now, the trade promotion authority bill.

Tomorrow, the House will be voting on the passage of TPA, which is a vital step in ensuring America's future success as a nation. Whenever I get asked why—Why is it important? Why is American trade important?—I say it is not just important to Minnesota, it is important to the entire country, but I will use my State as the starter.

The State of Minnesota is still home to 18 Fortune 500 companies, and the two main drivers of our private economy—our success—are agriculture and manufacturing.

American trade is important. It is important to ensure that our superior workforce, our quality companies and products, have full and fair access to other markets around the world.

Let me be clear, TPA is not a trade deal in itself; rather, TPA is legislation that authorizes the President to enter into an agreement only after Congress and the American people have given their approval.

It contains 150 objectives that Congress mandates the U.S. Trade Representative must adhere to during negotiations. It has a provision that allows the House to withdraw TPA at any time during its 6-year authorization, effectively stopping any bad agreement in its tracks. It requires that any deal must be public for a minimum of 60 days before any vote or considerations taken by Congress.

I want to thank Chairmen RYAN and TIBERI for their work on this important legislation. It is time for America to lead again, which is why I urge my colleagues to support the passage of trade promotion authority.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee that brought this matter of luggage to our attention in the first place.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I rise in support of passage of H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act, and I want to thank Chairman RYAN and Chairman TIBERI for their hard work and dedication in getting this important piece of legislation to the floor.

This bill contains many beneficial trade programs that have furthered our Nation's foreign policy and national security goals. Specifically, this bill renews the Generalized System of Preferences program and includes legislation that I authored, along with Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, on a commonsense

and helpful update to the GSP program.

The GSP program helps many designated beneficiary developing countries around the world. Stable countries with employed and productive citizens lead to a safe global environment that deters wars, terrorist groups, and violent uprisings and further allows our allies to develop their own economies, health care, and educational systems.

The GSP UPDATE, which would add travel goods to the list of items eligible for review, would specifically benefit our ally the Philippines, which has suffered multiple devastating weather events. It will also help Cambodia, one of the poorest countries in the world.

Goods are not eligible for the GSP program if they are "import sensitive" or compete with U.S. goods. This is decided by the International Trade Commission. Therefore, having travel and luggage items placed on the GSP-eligible list does not automatically give them preferential trade status.

The overall GSP program is a win-win for the U.S. and our allies around the world. Through this program, we are able to help countries develop their economies with little cost to the United States Government.

I want to thank Chairman RYAN for all of his hard work. I urge passage of this bill, the Trade Preferences Extension Act.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), one of the House's most active supporters of free trade and fair trade and who has made an outstanding contribution to this legislation.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. It is a bill that came out of the Senate 99-1, with wide bipartisan support; and why not? It has worked well for us in the past. It will work well for us in the future.

This is our opportunity to meaningfully engage the African nations when it comes to trade preferences to make sure that we maintain a healthy and strong relationship with a vibrant and growing area of the world, along with some other developing nations, and Haiti, for instance, that Mr. RANGEL has been particularly focused on, too. I would encourage my colleagues to support it.

This also fixes a problem that we have had in regard to the trade agenda that we are trying to move forward on this week. There was some concern about how the Trade Adjustment Assistance bill was going to be paid for, what offsets were being used. That now is being fixed in this bill as well through a bipartisan agreement.

I commend the chair of the Ways and Means committee and the Republican leadership for their willingness to compromise on this issue, to make sure

that this does not become a hurdle or a roadblock to advancing our trade agenda as a nation. So that is in the bill. I think Members of Congress need confidence that that offset has been fixed and paid for.

It is my understanding that the Senate plans on moving quickly, expeditiously, in order to take up this amended version and pass it on their side, so no Member should be under any illusion that there is a problem for the pay-for right now with Trade Adjustment Assistance.

Overall, the basis of this bill is something that has worked and benefited us in the past. It is the reason why there was overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate. We should have overwhelming bipartisan support on the floor of the House today.

I commend the leadership of the committee, Ranking Member RANGEL and the work that he has put in, and I encourage a "yes" vote on this underlying legislation.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to take this time to thank the chairman for changing the pay-for for the TAA. I just wondered, after that very difficult and complex negotiation, why in the world they would tie that up with TPA. That means that those votes now, it is my understanding, procedurally, it would be one vote, and you won't have a chance to vote for TPA and TAA separately.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Could you rephrase the question? I didn't catch it all.

Mr. RANGEL. It is my understanding that the TAA complex pay-for has been taken care of under your leadership under the bill that is before us. My question was: Why in the world would you tie that up with TPA?

When you accomplish one problem, it seems like you complicated that by not allowing the House to have two separate votes on two entirely separate issues.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The bills came over from the other body together—both policies, TAA and TPA, in the same bill; that is why these are not separate bills, but they are separate votes.

As the gentleman knows from his years of experience here, we can always choose to divide the question on a particular bill. We have chosen to divide the question on that forthcoming bill between TPA and TAA.

The issue before us right here is not just preferences, which is important for all the reasons we specified, but it also

fixes the pay-for problem that, on both sides of the aisle, Members had concerns with.

The bill coming over from the Senate has both issues together. We are simply dividing the question and having votes on each policy separately.

Mr. RANGEL. Reclaiming my time, I am glad to hear that.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), and I thank him publicly for the great work that he has put into this issue, as well as all the important issues.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and his leadership. It was my intention to engage in a colloquy with the chairman in a few minutes, but I wanted to make a couple of observations, if I could, about the subject at hand.

As Mr. RANGEL knows from his years of effort, one of our responsibilities in terms of promoting free and fair trade is to be able to focus attention on some of the poorest countries around the world.

□ 1300

I appreciate your work, what the committee is doing—in the past and moving forward—to be able to deal with some of the anomalies where some of the worst, heaviest tariff burdens are on some of the poorest of countries, and our being able to extend to less-developed countries opportunities to earn their own way, to have some modicum of tariff relief, to be able to promote their indigenous activities.

Trade is cheaper than aid, and it helps them strengthen their economies, strengthen their societies, and I really appreciate tireless efforts to extend those opportunities to others.

I think we have got a long way to go in terms of being able to deal with some of the poorest of countries. We have got trade promotion authority we may be talking about with a dozen countries. But there are other poor countries around the world that we need to work with to be able to pull into opportunities for them to grow their economies, for them to be able to trade with us, to be able to strengthen civil society, and partnerships.

So I wanted to thank you for your years of effort in this. I wanted to express my appreciation for the underlying bill.

I look forward to chatting a little further with the chairman when one of our partners surfaces.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), my friend and distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, one of the most knowledgeable persons in the House on the issue of trade.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. RANGEL.

I stand in support of this bipartisan legislation, which passed the Senate by

a vote of 99–1. It includes preferences that are critical to so many economies in the developing world: the African Growth and Opportunity Act, or AGOA, a core of close economic partnerships between the United States and a host of African nations; the Generalized System of Preferences, tariff preferences which help developing countries compete and build their economies worldwide; the Haiti HOPE and HELP programs, which provide duty-free treatment for certain Haitians to help Haitians build a 21st century economy.

And I know that my constituents have been calling for the passage of these provisions for many, many months.

As I have traveled to many affected nations, they too have experienced and expressed the serious and dire consequences that they could suffer without these benefits.

This is not just about helping other nations. The fact is, right here in the United States, exports grow as a result of increased trade with these nations that results from extending preferences in trade and investment flows—critical to my district and districts all across the United States. It is critically important.

And I compliment, also, Chairman RYAN, for putting this together in a way that we can pass it in a bipartisan way, because this is an important aspect of also making sure that we are secure because, as we help these nations on their feet and put them in part of the global economy, we are making sure that we are giving hope and opportunity to all.

So I heartily support, and ask everyone to support this bipartisan bill, which passed, again, 99–1 in the Senate. Collectively, we are going to make this place a better place.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. MEEKS, the gentleman who just left. He has been a great leader on this issue, on trade.

Let me explain to those who are watching who aren't steeped in the intricacies of the trade law: what this bill is, the bill with respect to Haiti, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, GSP, it is trade, not aid. It is combining the need in America for high-quality, lower-cost goods that are not made in America with the need for economic growth and jobs in developing countries. It is a win-win.

Take Africa, for example. People are getting opportunity. People are getting jobs. People are getting out of poverty, and they are making products that Americans need, that Americans don't make right here. And we are getting high-quality, lower-priced products as a result of it.

So that means, for the hard-working taxpayer in Wisconsin, for the hard-working taxpayer in New York and throughout America, they are stretching their dollar more. That means their paycheck goes farther. That means that they are buying shoes for their kids or blankets at home or towels, or luggage. They can buy more of it. It doesn't cost as much.

That means their take-home pay can go to that and even more things because it gives them more take-home pay. That is why it is good for us.

And why it is good for people in the developing world is it is helping them build an economy. It is helping them attract manufacturers and exporters who create jobs and opportunity.

So, as a component of our foreign policy, it is so important. You have heard it a million times: we believe in trade, not aid. You teach a man how to fish instead of feeding him a fish. We all know the parables we can get into. That is what this is.

This says, let's work together to grow your economy, to be independent, to be self-sufficient, to help people get more opportunity to pull themselves out of poverty. That is in the interest of the human person involved, but it is also in the interest of our countries, so that we can help the developing world get into the First World, so that we can help the developing world raise their living standards.

And by the way, just from a brass tacks, material standpoint, having the developing world grow, having people enter the middle class in other countries means more customers for our products. It means more trade for us.

But, from an international standpoint, from a foreign policy standpoint, it means these countries are more secure. They are more safe. They are more prosperous. And they enter the world from a developing nation to the developed world. That is good for everybody. That is good for all.

That is why this is one of the more important components of our foreign policy as a country and our economic policy, in general.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). The gentleman from New York has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. And I just want to take a moment to recognize the chairman, the ranking member, the subcommittee chairman and ranking member, for their work on this critical legislation.

South Florida, where I hail from, is home to thousands of Haitian Ameri-

cans, and I know that they will soon be expressing their gratitude to this House, to this Congress, for passing this important bipartisan legislation.

This legislation is going to provide opportunity, hope for the people of the continent of Africa, but also for the people of Haiti. And in south Florida, we have a very special bond with Haiti. We know how much that country needs American involvement, opportunity.

And the relatives of so many Haitians who live in south Florida will be beaming with pride and gratitude when they get the news that this House has passed this critical legislation.

As Chairman RYAN says, this is not just trade legislation. This is foreign policy. This is foreign aid, but the aid that really helps people prosper, the aid that allows companies, governments to provide opportunity for their citizens.

This will also provide opportunity for our citizens. The more markets that we help create for our products, American businesses and American families will thrive.

For a long time, people have been complaining that the economic recovery has been weak; that it has left the people at the bottom behind. This is our opportunity to change that, to create more markets for American exports, to give people hope and opportunity, so that the United States can continue being that country, Mr. Speaker, where anyone who comes and wants to succeed and wants to work hard will have that opportunity. This is how we do it, and we also do it by working together.

All of us in this House want to strengthen Medicare, and today we have taken another important step toward strengthening Medicare. How? By working together. This is exactly what the American people sent us here to do.

For too long, Members of this House have refused to cooperate, have refused to find common ground. Well, we are doing that today, and I am so proud to be able to come to the floor of the House to congratulate our leaders for their fine work, and to offer my strong support of this important bipartisan legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

This is a really important bipartisan bill. I want to thank Mr. RANGEL for his work and, of course, Chairman RYAN.

This bill is important because it is part of our soft power. This is about how America exerts soft power in these

regions. It is about helping to build trade capacity in the long run to get us to expanded commercial relations in areas of need.

This bill encourages the adoption and implementation of WTO agreements, including the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement, which eliminates red tape at the border, something that we have worked very hard to do and something that will benefit American companies in the long run, as well as our trading partners.

This encourages the development by AGOA beneficiaries of utilizing strategies to improve the effectiveness and use of the program to make this program more effective. It commits the United States to working with AGOA beneficiaries to develop and implement these kinds of strategies. It outlines a path for deepening and expanding trade and investment ties, all good for American national security, good for the American economy, good for job creation.

The Generalized System of Preferences program—extends this program until December 31, 2017. It provides retroactive relief to eligible products that were imported during the lapse of the program, and it implements U.S.-WTO commitments by making duty-free certain cotton articles eligible from least-developed beneficiary developing countries. All good policy.

With regard to Haiti—and my colleague spoke earlier about this—this extends the HOPE and HELP programs for products from Haiti until September 30, 2025; encourages foreign investment and job creation by extending trade preferences to reinvigorate the apparel industry and attract new and expanded foreign direct investment; and reaffirms U.S. foreign policy and national security interests by promoting trade and long-term investments in Haiti, as it does with the other countries in Africa through the AGOA program.

We also correct the program that we had earlier dealing with the Medicare sequester, supplementing the entire package with a different pay-for. I think that is more acceptable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BOUSTANY. So this is really about achieving America's goals. This is about improving our economy. It is about growing jobs. It is about economic connectedness. It is about helping countries that have struggled and building newer relations and stronger commercial relationships with those countries.

This, ultimately, is about doing what America does best and extending our values worldwide.

I urge the support of this bill. It is a good bill. A lot of thought went into it on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the chairman's courtesy, as I have appreciated the opportunity to be working with you on the package that is coming forward. I know we are not quite there yet. I look forward to continuing this effort.

But I would like to engage in an issue that is critical to Mr. REICHERT, my colleague from the Northwest, to our consumers, and to important jobs in our district.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the innovative footwear industry must face an unreasonable reality at our borders. Two identical looking running shoes are imported. One must pay a significantly higher tariff for a single reason: it contains a waterproof liner. Waterproof means a lot in the Pacific Northwest, for Mr. REICHERT and I.

This bill puts an end to an outmoded tariff code that charges extremely high tariffs for no good reason.

□ 1315

I appreciate the chairman and the staff working with my team, with Mr. REICHERT to try to get this right for tariff relief for outdoor enthusiasts and business around the country, but there is another issue at work here.

Mr. REICHERT and I have been lead sponsors of the U.S. OUTDOOR Act that defines and creates tariff classification unique and specific to recreational performance outerwear and eliminates import duties on those apparel products. The Preference bill achieves one of these goals of the OUTDOOR Act by creating new definitions and tariff classifications for recreational performance outerwear.

Again, I appreciate your efforts, Mr. Chairman, and those of your staff to include the provision. It provides recognition that these are distinct, unique products that will help the industry better track the imports of recreational performance outerwear and sets the stage for tariff relief.

However, due to a drafting error, I understand that the duty rates assigned are incorrect and, in most cases, will raise the tariffs on those products and, as a result, on small- and medium-sized outdoor businesses, if they are not corrected. In addition, I understand the agreed-to language on the definitions of recreational performance outerwear and the list of tariff lines should be included.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a commitment from you and your staff to apply the correct duty rates and make the necessary changes to the definition in the conference report on the Customs reauthorization bill. I further understand that there is a very tight window here that we both

know to get this done. The new classifications will come into effect in 15 days, after the Preference bill is signed into law.

I would appreciate your acknowledgement that I understand the commitment correctly and that we will be able to get it done within this timeframe.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, first, I wanted to just note for the record that the footwear provision lowers duty on outdoor activity shoes, athletic footwear, such as gym shoes, just to make sure we can clarify that.

I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and also the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), who is involved in this issue, for their leadership on recreational performance outerwear and footwear.

The provisions we included in this bill will lower costs for American consumers. It will expand opportunities for U.S. businesses in these key product areas. I share both your interest in ensuring that the recreational performance outerwear provisions in this bill do, in fact, achieve their intended results in a revenue-neutral fashion. We have already been working with you on these provisions, and we commit to continue to do so in the conference discussions on the Customs Trade Facilitation and Enforcement Act. So I want to commit to you to making a good-faith effort to work through these highly technical provisions and to do it in a very quick timeframe.

We anticipate a very quick and relatively brief conference so that we can get these issues resolved in a very quick and timely fashion.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate that very much. And I hope that there is one area that we might be able to engage in some activity in the future.

According to a 2007 report by the ITC, there is no commercially viable production of recreational performance outerwear in the United States, yet these products still face tariffs averaging 14 percent, and some go up to almost 30 percent. So I look forward to continuing to work with you to achieve the next goal of the OUTDOOR Act, which would be duty elimination.

As was discussed before, there is no viable domestic production, very high rates. There are not many opportunities to pursue tariff relief anymore because we have been moving in that direction, and I think that is important. But I look forward to working with you to find the appropriate offset, to deal with revenue neutrality, and enact tariff relief on those products as soon as we can.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his interest. I share his interest, and I appreciate his indulgence.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, once again, I want to thank Chairman RYAN. He epitomizes what can happen when we find a cause that is good for our country and good for the rest of the world.

I thank Speaker BOEHNER, who allowed this meaningful leadership agreement to move forward; Congressman NUNES, who enthusiastically supported the extension of AGOA; my dear and long-time friend from Utah, Senator HATCH, who managed to keep the bill as clean as possible during this journey with the other house; Senator BILL NELSON, who is a longtime friend and supporter of the extension of the trade agreement that we have with Haiti; and also the African Diplomatic Corps. They certainly did gain the confidence of Republicans and Democrats as they shared their problems and their ability to overcome some of the objections that Members had.

But most of all, and I know that Chairman RYAN joins me in thanking the staff on both sides of the aisle. We can come up with the great ideas, as we normally do, but it takes the staff to put them in the position and put the legislation in place so that we can move forward with it. So on behalf of the chairman and all of the Members that have played a part in the historic extension of this legislation, I want to thank the staff members that made it possible to bring us to this point that we can pass this important piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from New York. This is an issue that he has been passionate about for a long time that he, along with other leaders here, championed.

I, too, want to thank the staff for working very well with each other on this issue. We know that this is a win-win.

To our colleagues who haven't been paying attention to this, this bill makes a big difference. It makes a big difference. It makes a big difference for our constituents, for consumers at home, and it makes a big difference for people who are aspiring to live a dream, who are aspiring to get themselves out of poverty, who are aspiring to make a good life for themselves and their children.

This is something that we should all be proud of, and I am very pleased that we have the kind of bipartisan coalition that we have on this issue. So that is why I urge a "yes" vote.

I am also pleased we were able to fix the other issues, such as sequester, in this bill. And I think, for all of those reasons, we should vote “yes” on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Trade Preferences Extension Act, which will extend important trade preferences to our partners around the world.

First, this bill extends the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) until September 2025. This will expand preferences and reduce trade barriers with African countries and foster U.S. investment in the region. It will also help to promote social and economic development and empower farmers and women through sustainable agriculture assistance.

The bill also retroactively renews and updates the General System of Preferences (GSP), which reduces trade barriers by allowing various products from developing countries to enter into the U.S. duty-free. This program expired in July 2013 and I am glad to see that it has finally been renewed.

It also extends trade preferences with Haiti and ensures that we continue to assist Haiti's recovery and support its economy. In addition, the bill will also help outerwear and footwear imports by reducing duty rates and creating a new category of product that will include protective active footwear.

I am also pleased that it strikes the Medicare pay-for found in the Trade Adjustment Assistance package and replaces it with a different offset that I helped identify. In addition, I am pleased that this bill will support community banks by reducing burdensome reporting requirements. These measures represent a significant effort to reduce trade barriers and support our partners around the world and I urge a YES vote. I hope that the Senate will pass this legislation expeditiously and send it to the President's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 10, 2015, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 32, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—397

Abraham	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Adams	Beyer	F.
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Brady (PA)
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)
Allen	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Brown (FL)
Ashford	Black	Brownley (CA)
Barletta	Blackburn	Buchanan
Barr	Blum	Bucshon
Barton	Blumenauer	Burgess
Bass	Bonamici	Bustos
Beatty	Bost	Butterfield
Becerra	Boustany	Byrne
Benishkek		Calvert

Capps	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Capuano	Grayson	Marino
Cardenas	Green, Al	Matsui
Carney	Green, Gene	McCarthy
Carson (IN)	Griffith	McCauley
Carter (GA)	Grijalva	McClintock
Carter (TX)	Grothman	McCollum
Cartwright	Guinta	McDermott
Castor (FL)	Guthrie	McGovern
Castro (TX)	Gutiérrez	McHenry
Chabot	Hahn	McKinley
Chaffetz	Hanna	McMorris
Chu, Judy	Hardy	Rodgers
Ciilline	Harper	McNerney
Clark (MA)	Harris	McSally
Clarke (NY)	Hartzer	Meadows
Clay	Hastings	Meenan
Cleaver	Heck (NV)	Meeks
Clyburn	Heck (WA)	Meng
Coffman	Hensarling	Messer
Cohen	Herrera Beutler	Mica
Cole	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (FL)
Collins (GA)	Higgins	Miller (MI)
Collins (NY)	Hill	Moolenaar
Comstock	Himes	Moore
Conaway	Hinojosa	Moulton
Connolly	Holding	Mullin
Cook	Honda	Mulvaney
Cooper	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Costa	Hudson	Murphy (PA)
Costello (PA)	Huelskamp	Nadler
Courtney	Huffman	Napolitano
Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Neal
Crawford	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Crenshaw	Hurd (TX)	Newhouse
Crowley	Hurt (VA)	Noem
Cuellar	Israel	Nolan
Culberson	Issa	Norcross
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Nunes
Curbelo (FL)	Jeffries	O'Rourke
Davis (CA)	Jenkins (KS)	Olson
Davis, Danny	Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
DeFazio	Johnson (OH)	Pascarella
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen
Delaney	Johnson, Sam	Payne
DeLauro	Jolly	Pearce
DelBene	Joyce	Pelosi
Denham	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Dent	Katko	Perry
DeSantis	Keating	Peters
DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Pittenger
Deutch	Kelly (PA)	Pitts
Diaz-Balart	Kennedy	Pocan
Dingell	Kildee	Poliquin
Doggett	Kilmer	Polis
Dold	Kind	Pompeo
Donovan	King (IA)	Price (NC)
Doyle, Michael	King (NY)	Price, Tom
F.	Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley
Duckworth	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
Edwards	Kline	Ratcliffe
Ellison	Knight	Reed
Ellmers (NC)	Kuster	Reichert
Emmer (MN)	LaMalfa	Renacci
Engel	Lamborn	Ribble
Eshoo	Lance	Rice (NY)
Esty	Langevin	Rice (SC)
Farenthold	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Farr	Larson (CT)	Rigell
Fattah	Latta	Roby
Fincher	Lawrence	Roe (TN)
Fitzpatrick	Lee	Rogers (AL)
Fleischmann	Levin	Rogers (KY)
Fleming	Lewis	Rokita
Flores	Lieu, Ted	Rooney (FL)
Forbes	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Roskam
Foster	Loeb sack	Ross
Fox	Lofgren	Rothfus
Frankel (FL)	Long	Rouzer
Franks (AZ)	Love	Roybal-Allard
Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal	Royce
Fudge	Lowe	Ruiz
Gabbard	Lucas	Ruppersberger
Gallego	Luetkemeyer	Rush
Garamendi	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)
Gibbs	(NM)	Ryan (WI)
Gibson	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda
Gohmert	(NM)	T.
Goodlatte	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Graham	MacArthur	Sanford
Granger	Maloney,	Sarbanes
Graves (GA)	Carolyn	Scalise
Graves (LA)	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky

Schiff	Takai	Walters, Mimi
Schrader	Takano	Walz
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Schultz
Scott, David	Thornberry	Waters, Maxine
Sensenbrenner	Tiberi	Watson Coleman
Serrano	Tipton	Webster (FL)
Sessions	Titus	Welch
Sewell (AL)	Tonko	Wenstrup
Sherman	Torres	Westerman
Shimkus	Trott	Whitfield
Shuster	Tsongas	Williams
Simpson	Turner	Wilson (FL)
Sinema	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Sires	Valadao	Wittman
Slaughter	Van Hollen	Womack
Smith (MO)	Vargas	Woodall
Smith (NE)	Veasey	Yarmuth
Smith (NJ)	Vela	Yoder
Smith (TX)	Velázquez	Young (AK)
Smith (WA)	Visclosky	Young (IA)
Speier	Wagner	Young (IN)
Stefanik	Walberg	Zeldin
Stewart	Walden	Zinke
Stivers	Walker	
Swalwell (CA)	Walorski	

NAYS—32

Amash	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Babin	Jones	Posey
Brat	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Labrador	Russell
Brooks (AL)	Loudermilk	Salmon
Buck	Lummis	Schweikert
Duffy	Massie	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Nugent	Westmoreland
Garrett	Palmer	Yoho
Gosar	Peterson	

NOT VOTING—4

Clawson (FL)	Gowdy
Conyers	Thompson (CA)

□ 1355

Messrs. BRAT, MOONEY of West Virginia, BROOKS of Alabama, PETERSON, SCHWEIKERT, ROHRBACHER, WEBER of Texas, YOHO, and POE of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. KING of New York, GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER, LIPINSKI, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, RUSH, YOUNG of Alaska, and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 1295, I mistakenly voted “no.” I would like to vote “yes” on rollcall 345, the Motion to Concur in the Senate amendments with a House amendment to H.R. 1295.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1357

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill had been read through page 163, line 2.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

Amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment by Mr. SABLAN of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 231, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

AYES—196

Adams	Benishek	Boyle, Brendan
Amash	Beyer	F.
Ashford	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Bass	Brooks (AL)	Brooks (MN)
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Becerra	Bonamici	Buck

Burgess	Honda	Perlmutter
Butterfield	Huelskamp	Perry
Capps	Huffman	Peterson
Capuano	Hurt (VA)	Pingree
Cárdenas	Israel	Pocan
Carney	Issa	Polis
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Posey
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clark (MA)	Jones	Ribble
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Clay	Keating	Richmond
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Rigell
Clyburn	Kennedy	Rohrabacher
Cohen	Kildee	Rokita
Connolly	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Kuster	Rush
Cooper	Labrador	Ryan (OH)
Courtney	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	T.
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Sanford
DeFazio	Lee	Sarbanes
DeGette	Levin	Schakowsky
Delaney	Lewis	Schiff
DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
DeBene	Lipinski	Schweikert
DesSaulnier	Loeback	Scott (VA)
DesJarlais	Lofgren	Scott, David
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sensenbrenner
Dingell	Lowe	Serrano
Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Sires
F.	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	(NM)	Speier
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Swalwell (CA)
Edwards	Maloney,	Takai
Ellison	Carolyn	Takano
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Esty	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Farr	Matsui	Titus
Fattah	McCollum	Tonko
Foster	McDermott	Torres
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Tsongas
Fudge	McNerney	Van Hollen
Gallego	Meeks	Vargas
Garamendi	Miller (FL)	Veasey
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Vela
Grayson	Moulton	Velázquez
Green, Al	Mulvaney	Visclosky
Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)	Walz
Griffith	Nadler	Wasserman
Grijalva	Napolitano	Schultz
Gutiérrez	Neal	Waters, Maxine
Hahn	Nolan	Watson Coleman
Hastings	Nugent	Welch
Heck (WA)	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
Herrera Beutler	Pallone	Yarmuth
Higgins	Pascrell	Yoho
Himes	Payne	
Hinojosa	Pelosi	

NOES—231

Abraham	Chabot	Fincher
Aderholt	Chaffetz	Fitzpatrick
Aguilar	Coffman	Fleischmann
Allen	Cole	Fleming
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Flores
Babin	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Barletta	Comstock	Fortenberry
Barr	Conaway	Foxx
Barton	Cook	Franks (AZ)
Bera	Costa	Frelinghuysen
Bilirakis	Costello (PA)	Gabbard
Bishop (MI)	Cramer	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Crawford	Gibson
Black	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Blackburn	Cuellar	Goodlatte
Bost	Culberson	Gosar
Boustany	Curbelo (FL)	Graham
Brady (TX)	Davis (CA)	Granger
Brat	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Bridenstine	Denham	Graves (LA)
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Graves (MO)
Brown (FL)	DeSantis	Grothman
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Guinta
Bucshon	Dold	Guthrie
Bustos	Donovan	Hanna
Byrne	Duffy	Hardy
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Carson (IN)	Ellmers (NC)	Hartzler
Carter (GA)	Emmer (MN)	Heck (NV)
Carter (TX)	Engel	Hensarling
Cartwright	Farenthold	Hice, Jody B.

Hill	Meadows	Scott, Austin
Holding	Meehan	Sessions
Hoyer	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Hudson	Messer	Shimkus
Huizenga (MI)	Mica	Shuster
Hultgren	Moolenaar	Simpson
Hunter	Mullin	Sinema
Hurd (TX)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (MO)
Jenkins (KS)	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
Jenkins (WV)	Newhouse	Smith (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Stefanik
Johnson, Sam	Norcross	Stewart
Jolly	Nunes	Olson
Jordan	Palazzo	Palmer
Joyce	Palmer	Paulsen
Katko	Kelly (MS)	Pearce
Kelly (PA)	Kind	Peters
Kline	King (IA)	Pittenger
King (NY)	King (NY)	Pitts
Kinzinger (IL)	Kirkpatrick	Poe (TX)
Kirkpatrick	Kline	Poliquin
Knight	Knight	Pompeo
LaMalfa	LaMalfa	Price, Tom
Lamborn	Lamborn	Ratcliffe
Lance	Lance	Reed
Latta	Latta	Reichert
LoBiondo	LoBiondo	Renacci
Long	Long	Rice (SC)
Loudermilk	Loudermilk	Roby
Love	Love	Roe (TN)
Lucas	Lucas	Rogers (AL)
Luetkemeyer	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)
Lynch	Lynch	Rooney (FL)
MacArthur	MacArthur	Ros-Lehtinen
Marchant	Marchant	Roskam
Marino	Marino	Ross
McCarthy	McCarthy	Rothfus
McCaul	McCaul	Rouzer
McClintock	McClintock	Royce
McHenry	McHenry	Ruiz
McKinley	McKinley	Ruppersberger
McMorris	McMorris	Russell
Rodgers	Rodgers	Ryan (WI)
McSally	McSally	Salmon
		Scalise

NOT VOTING—6

Clawson (FL)	Harris	Moore
Gowdy	Mooney (WV)	Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1400

Mr. STEWART changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. MULVANEY changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 270, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

AYES—157

Adams
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallo
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al

Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Slaught
Speier
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
DeSaulnier
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—270

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert

Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)

Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling

Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally

Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)

Salmon
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Clawson (FL)
Davis, Rodney

Deutch
Ellison

Gowdy
Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1403

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 347,
had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 165, noes 264,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

AYES—165

Adams
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo

Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Slaught
Speier
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
DeSaulnier
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—264

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck

Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson

Curbelo (FL)
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett

Gibbs Lucas
 Gibson Luetkemeyer
 Gohmert Lujan Grisham
 Goodlatte (NM)
 Gosar Lummis
 Graham MacArthur
 Granger Maloney, Sean
 Graves (GA) Marchant
 Graves (LA) Marino
 Graves (MO) McCarthy
 Green, Gene McCaul
 Grothman McClintock
 Guinta McHenry
 Guthrie McKinley
 Hanna McMorris
 Hardy Rodgers
 Harper McSally
 Harris Meadows
 Hartzler Meehan
 Heck (NV) Messer
 Hensarling Mica
 Herrera Beutler Miller (FL)
 Hice, Jody B. Miller (MI)
 Hill Moolenaar
 Holding Mooney (WV)
 Hoyer Moulton
 Hudson Mullin
 Huelskamp Murphy (PA)
 Huizenga (MI) Neugebauer
 Hultgren Newhouse
 Hunter Noem
 Hurd (TX) Norcross
 Hurt (VA) Nugent
 Issa Nunes
 Jenkins (KS) Olson
 Jenkins (WV) Palazzo
 Johnson (OH) Palmer
 Johnson, Sam Paulsen
 Jolly Pearce
 Jordan Perry
 Joyce Peters
 Katko Peterson
 Kelly (MS) Pittenger
 Kelly (PA) Pitts
 Kind Poe (TX)
 King (IA) Poliquin
 King (NY) Pompeo
 Kinzinger (IL) Price, Tom
 Kirkpatrick Ratcliffe
 Kline Reed
 Knight Reichert
 Labrador Renacci
 LaMalfa Rice (SC)
 Lamborn Rigell
 Lance Roby
 Latta Roe (TN)
 Lipinski Rogers (AL)
 LoBiondo Rogers (KY)
 Loeb sack Rokita
 Long Rooney (FL)
 Loudermilk Ros-Lehtinen
 Love Roskam

NOT VOTING—4

Clawson (FL) Gowdy
 Davis, Rodney Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1407

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from the Northern Mariana
 Islands (Mr. SABLAN) on which further
 proceedings were postponed and on
 which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 173, noes 256,
 not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

AYES—173

Adams Frankel (FL)
 Aguilar Fudge
 Amash Gallego
 Ashford Gohmert
 Bass Grayson
 Becerra Green, Al
 Beyer Grijalva
 Bishop (UT) Gutierrez
 Blumenauer Hahn
 Bonamici Heck (WA)
 Boyle, Brendan Higgins
 F. Himes
 Brady (PA) Hinojosa
 Brownley (CA) Honda
 Butterfield Huffman
 Capps Jackson Lee
 Capuano Jeffries
 Cárdenas Johnson (GA)
 Carney Johnson, E. B.
 Carson (IN) Jones
 Cartwright Kaptur
 Castor (FL) Keating
 Castro (TX) Kelly (IL)
 Chu, Judy Kennedy
 Cicilline Kildee
 Clark (MA) Kirkpatrick
 Clarke (NY) Kuster
 Clay Langevin
 Cleaver Larsen (WA)
 Clyburn Larson (CT)
 Cohen Lawrence
 Connolly Lee
 Conyers Levin
 Costa Lewis
 Courtney Lieu, Ted
 Crowley Lipinski
 Cuellar Lofgren
 Cummings Lowenthal
 Davis, Danny Lowey
 DeFazio Lujan Grisham
 DeGette (NM)
 Delaney Luján, Ben Ray
 DeLauro (NM)
 DelBene Lynch
 DeSaulnier Maloney,
 Deutch Carolyn
 Dingell Massie
 Doggett Matsui
 Doyle, Michael McCollum
 F. McDermott
 Duckworth McGovern
 Edwards McNerney
 Ellison Meeks
 Engel Meng
 Eshoo Moore
 Esty Moulton
 Farr Murphy (FL)
 Fattah Nadler
 Foster Napolitano

NOES—256

Abraham Brooks (IN)
 Aderholt Brown (FL)
 Allen Buchanan
 Amodei Buck
 Babin Bucshon
 Barletta Burgess
 Barr Bustos
 Barton Calvert
 Benishek Carter (GA)
 Bera Carter (TX)
 Bilirakis Chabot
 Bishop (GA) Chaffetz
 Bishop (MI) Coffman
 Black Cole
 Blackburn Collins (GA)
 Blum Collins (NY)
 Bost Comstock
 Boustany Conaway
 Brady (TX) Cook
 Brat Cooper
 Bridenstine Costello (PA)
 Brooks (AL) Cramer

Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foss
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gabbard
 Garamendi
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Graham
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hanna
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Hill
 Holding
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Israel
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 MacArthur
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Peters
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Ruppersberger
 Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Vargus
 Vela
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walkerski
 Walters, Mimi
 Walz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

Byrne Gowdy
 Clawson (FL) Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1410

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 81, noes 347, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—81

Adams	Harris	Perry
Babin	Holding	Pingree
Barletta	Honda	Poliquin
Benishek	Hudson	Polis
Bilirakis	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Bost	Hurd (TX)	Price (NC)
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rangel
Burgess	Jones	Ratcliffe
Butterfield	Jordan	Rokita
Carson (IN)	King (IA)	Ross
Cartwright	Labrador	Rouzer
Davis, Rodney	Lawrence	Ruiz
DeFazio	Long	Ruppersberger
DeSantis	Loudermilk	Salmon
Duncan (SC)	Lujan Grisham	Sánchez, Linda
Emmer (MN)	(NM)	T.
Fleming	Luján, Ben Ray	Schiff
Fox	(NM)	Sensenbrenner
Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Sinema
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (PA)
Galleo	Massie	Titus
Gohmert	McSally	Wagner
Gosar	Messer	Walker
Graham	Mooney (WV)	Watson Coleman
Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)	Weber (TX)
Griffith	Newhouse	Webster (FL)
Grijalva	Norcross	Westmoreland
Grothman	Pallone	Wilson (FL)

NOES—347

Abraham	Clarke (NY)	Esty
Aderholt	Clay	Farenthold
Aguilar	Cleaver	Farr
Allen	Clyburn	Fattah
Amash	Coffman	Fincher
Amodei	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Ashford	Cole	Fleischmann
Barr	Collins (GA)	Flores
Barton	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Bass	Comstock	Fortenberry
Beatty	Conaway	Foster
Becerra	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Bera	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Beyer	Cook	Gabbard
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Garamendi
Bishop (MI)	Costa	Garrett
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Gibbs
Black	Courtney	Gibson
Blackburn	Cramer	Goodlatte
Blum	Crawford	Granger
Blumenauer	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Bonamici	Crowley	Graves (LA)
Boustany	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Boyle, Brendan	Culberson	Grayson
F.	Cummings	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Curbelo (FL)	Guinta
Brady (TX)	Davis (CA)	Guthrie
Brat	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Bridenstine	DeGette	Hanna
Brooks (IN)	Delaney	Hardy
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Harper
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Hartzler
Buchanan	Denham	Hastings
Buck	Dent	Heck (NV)
Bucshon	DeSaulnier	Heck (WA)
Bustos	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Byrne	Deutch	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	Diaz-Balart	Hice, Jody B.
Capps	Dingell	Higgins
Capuano	Doggett	Hill
Cárdenas	Dold	Himes
Carney	Donovan	Hinojosa
Carter (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Hoyer
Carter (TX)	F.	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Huizenga (MI)
Castro (TX)	Duffy	Hultgren
Chabot	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Chaffetz	Edwards	Hurt (VA)
Chu, Judy	Ellmers (NC)	Israel
Cicilline	Engel	Issa
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Jackson Lee

Jeffries	Miller (FL)	Scott, David
Jenkins (WV)	Miller (MI)	Serrano
Johnson (GA)	Moolenaar	Sessions
Johnson (OH)	Moore	Sewell (AL)
Johnson, E. B.	Moulton	Sherman
Johnson, Sam	Mullin	Shimkus
Jolly	Mulvaney	Shuster
Joyce	Murphy (PA)	Simpson
Kaptur	Nadler	Sires
Katko	Napolitano	Slaughter
Keating	Neal	Smith (MO)
Kelly (IL)	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
Kelly (MS)	Noem	Smith (NJ)
Kelly (PA)	Nolan	Smith (TX)
Kennedy	Nugent	Smith (WA)
Kildee	Nunes	Speier
Kilmer	O'Rourke	Stefanik
Kind	Olson	Stewart
King (NY)	Palazzo	Stivers
Kinzinger (IL)	Palmer	Stutzman
Kirkpatrick	Pascrell	Swalwell (CA)
Kline	Paulsen	Takai
Knight	Payne	Takano
Kuster	Pearce	Thompson (MS)
LaMalfa	Pelosi	Thornberry
Lamborn	Pelosi	Tiberi
Lance	Perlmutter	Tipton
Langevin	Peters	Tonko
Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Torres
Larson (CT)	Pittenger	Trotter
Latta	Pitts	Poe (TX)
Lee	Pocan	Posey
Levin	Poe (TX)	Price, Tom
Lewis	Reed	Quigley
Lieu, Ted	Reichart	Valadao
Lipinski	Renacci	Van Hollen
LoBiondo	Ribble	Vargas
Loeb	Rice (NY)	Veasey
Loeb	Rice (SC)	Vela
Lofgren	Richmond	Velázquez
Love	Rigell	Visclosky
Lowenthal	Roby	Walberg
Lowe	Roe (TN)	Walden
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Walters, Mimi
Lynch	Rohrabacher	Walz
MacArthur	Rooney (FL)	Wasserman
Maloney	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
Carolyn	Rothfus	Waters, Maxine
Marchant	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Marino	Royce	Roskam
Matsui	Rush	Westerman
McCarthy	Russell	Whitfield
McCaul	Ryan (OH)	Williams
McCollum	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Sanchez, Loretta	Wittman
McDermott	Sanford	Womack
McGovern	Sarbanes	Woodall
McHenry	Scalise	Yarmuth
McKinley	Schakowsky	Yoder
McMorris	Schneider	Yoho
Rodgers	Schweikert	Young (AK)
McNerney	Scott (VA)	Young (IA)
Meadows	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)
Meehan		Zeldin
Meeks		Zinke
Meng		
Mica		

NOT VOTING—5

Clawson (FL)	Gowdy	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Gutiérrez	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1414

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF

GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 265, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

AYES—165

Adams	Garrett	Nolan
Amash	Gibson	Norcross
Bass	Gosar	Pallone
Beatty	Grayson	Pascrell
Becerra	Grijalva	Payne
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hahn	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Harris	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Honda	Quigley
Capps	Hoyer	Rangel
Capuano	Huelskamp	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Israel	Richmond
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rohrabacher
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Jenkins (KS)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Jordan	Salmon
Cicilline	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	T.
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kildee	Sanford
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kuster	Schroder
Conyers	Labrador	Schweikert
Crowley	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
DeFazio	Lee	Sherman
DeGette	Levin	Sires
Delaney	Lewis	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Lofgren	Takai
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Takano
Deutch	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Titus
Doggett	(NM)	Tonko
Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
F.	(NM)	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Massie	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Veasey
Edwards	McDermott	Velázquez
Ellison	McGovern	Visclosky
Engel	McNerney	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meeks	Schultz
Esty	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Mooney (WV)	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Mulvaney	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Nadler	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Napolitano	Young (IA)
Galleo	Neal	

NOES—265

Abraham	Bost	Chaffetz
Aderholt	Boustany	Cleaver
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Coffman
Allen	F.	Cole
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Ashford	Brat	Collins (NY)
Babin	Bridenstine	Comstock
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Barton	Buchanan	Cooper
Benishek	Buck	Costa
Bera	Bucshon	Costello (PA)
Bilirakis	Burgess	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Bustos	Cramer
Bishop (MI)	Byrne	Crawford
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Crenshaw
Black	Carter (GA)	Cuellar
Blackburn	Carter (TX)	Culberson
Blum	Chabot	Curbelo (FL)

Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)

King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)

Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—3

Clawson (FL) Gowdy Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1417

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vail by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 51, noes 378,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—51

Barletta
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Collins (GA)
Cramer
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Fleming
Gallego
Garrett
Loudermilk
Lummis
Massie
McClintock
Meadows
Mica

Harris
Hice, Jody B.
Huelskamp
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lipinski
Long
Garrett
Lumms
Massie
McClintock
Meadows
Mica

Nugent
Pearce
Perry
Polis
Posey
Price, Tom
Reichert
Rokita
Salmon
Sanford
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Young (IA)

NOES—378

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bencher
Benish
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Black
Williams
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline

Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold

Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee

Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaull
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar

Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader

Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

Clawson (FL) Hill
Gowdy Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1421

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 352
Gosar No. 2 DoD App's I was detained in a
constituent meeting. Had I been present, I
would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF
GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 262, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

AYES—166

Adams	Fox	Murphy (FL)
Amash	Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Ashford	Fudge	Napolitano
Bass	Gabbard	Neal
Beatty	Gallego	Nolan
Becerra	Garrett	Norcross
Bera	Gibson	O'Rourke
Beyer	Grayson	Pallone
Bishop (UT)	Green, Al	Payne
Blum	Griffith	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Perry
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Peterson
F.	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Quigley
Capps	Huelskamp	Rangel
Capuano	Hunter	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Israel	Richmond
Carney	Issa	Rohrabacher
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Jeffries	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Cicilline	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	T.
Clay	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kind	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kuster	Schiff
Connolly	Labrador	Schweikert
Conyers	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lee	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sires
DeFazio	Lewis	Slaughter
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Delaney	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lowey	Speier
DelBene	Lujan Grisham	Takai
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Takano
Deutch	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Carolyn	Tonko
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Duckworth	McClintock	Van Hollen
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Vargas
Edwards	McDermott	Veasey
Ellison	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Eshoo	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Farr	Meng	Welch
Fattah	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Moulton	Young (IA)

NOES—262

Abraham	Babin	Billirakis
Aderholt	Barletta	Bishop (GA)
Aguilar	Barr	Bishop (MI)
Allen	Barton	Black
Amodei	Benishek	Blackburn

Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Pompeo
Boustany	Hill	Posey
Brady (TX)	Himes	Price, Tom
Brat	Holding	Ratcliffe
Bridenstine	Hudson	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Huffman	Reichert
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Buchanan	Hultgren	Ribble
Buck	Hurd (TX)	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Hurt (VA)	Rigell
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Roby
Bustos	Jenkins (WV)	Roe (TN)
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Jolly	Rokita
Carter (TX)	Jones	Rooney (FL)
Castor (FL)	Joyce	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Katko	Roskam
Chaffetz	Keating	Ross
Coffman	Kelly (MS)	Rothfus
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Royce
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Russell
Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Kirkpatrick	Salmon
Cook	Kline	Sanford
Cooper	Knight	Scalise
Costa	LaMalfa	Schrader
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Courtney	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Latta	Sessions
Crawford	Lawrence	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Shuster
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Simpson
Culberson	Loeb sack	Sinema
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Smith (MO)
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Denham	Love	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Lowenthal	Smith (TX)
DeSantis	Lucas	Stefanik
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Diaz-Balart	Luján, Ben Ray	Stivers
Dold	(NM)	Stutzman
Donovan	Lummis	Swalwell (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Thompson (PA)
F.	MacArthur	Thornberry
Duffy	Marchant	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Tipton
Elmiers (NC)	Massie	Titus
Emmer (MN)	Matsui	Torres
Esty	McCarthy	Trotter
Farenthold	McCaul	Turner
Fincher	McHenry	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Valadao
Fleischmann	McMorris	Vela
Fleming	Rodgers	Visclosky
Flores	McSally	Wagner
Forbes	Meadows	Walberg
Fortenberry	Meehan	Walden
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Walker
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Walorski
Garamendi	Miller (FL)	Walters, Mimi
Gibbs	Miller (MI)	Walz
Gohmert	Mooleenaar	Wasserman
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Schultz
Gosar	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Graham	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Westerman
Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Westmoreland
Graves (MO)	Noem	Whitfield
Green, Gene	Nugent	Williams
Grothman	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Guinta	Olson	Wittman
Guthrie	Palazzo	Womack
Hahn	Palmer	Woodall
Hanna	Pascarella	Yarmuth
Hardy	Paulsen	Yoder
Harper	Pearce	Yoho
Harris	Peters	Young (AK)
Hartzler	Pittenger	Young (IN)
Heck (NV)	Pitts	Zeldin
Hensarling	Poe (TX)	Zinke
Herrera Beutler	Poliquin	

NOT VOTING—5

Clawson (FL)	Jordan	Thompson (CA)
Gowdy	Scott, David	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1424

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 242, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

AYES—187

Adams	Fitzpatrick	Meeks
Aguilar	Foster	Meng
Ashford	Frankel (FL)	Moore
Bass	Fudge	Moulton
Beatty	Gabbard	Murphy (FL)
Becerra	Gallego	Nadler
Bera	Garamendi	Napolitano
Beyer	Graham	Neal
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	Nolan
Blumenauer	Green, Al	Norcross
Bonamici	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Boyle, Brendan	Grijalva	Pallone
F.	Gutiérrez	Pascarella
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Payne
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Pelosi
Brownley (CA)	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Bustos	Higgins	Peters
Butterfield	Himes	Peterson
Capps	Hinojosa	Pingree
Capuano	Honda	Pocan
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Polis
Carney	Huffman	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Israel	Quigley
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Castor (TX)	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Castro (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Kaptur	Ruiz
Clark (MA)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Clay	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kilmer	T.
Cohen	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kuster	Schakowsky
Cooper	Langevin	Schiff
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Lawrence	Scott, David
Cummings	Lee	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Sherman
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
DeGette	Lipinski	Sires
Delaney	Loeb sack	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Lowenthal	Speier
DeSaulnier	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Takai
Dingell	(NM)	Takano
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Titus
F.	Lynch	Tonko
Duckworth	Maloney,	Torres
Edwards	Carolyn	Tsongas
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Engel	Matsui	Vargas
Eshoo	McCollum	Veasey
Esty	McDermott	Vela
Farr	McGovern	Velázquez
Fattah	McNerney	Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1427

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF
MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 133, noes 297,
not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

AYES—133

NOES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith

Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen

Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Cramer
Crawford
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith

Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marino
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palmer

Pearce
Perry
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rokita
Rothfus
Rouzer
Salmon
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

NOES—297

Adams
Agullar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)

Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon

Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda

Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCormack
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarella
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson

Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—3

Clawson (FL)
Gowdy
Thompson (CA)

NOT VOTING—4

Clawson (FL)
Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1431

Ms. PELOSI and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 255, noes 174, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

AYES—255

Adams	Conyers	Green, Al
Aguilar	Courtney	Green, Gene
Amash	Cramer	Griffith
Amodei	Crowley	Grijalva
Ashford	Cuellar	Grothman
Babin	Cummings	Guinta
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Bass	Davis (CA)	Gutiérrez
Beatty	DeFazio	Hahn
Becerra	DeGette	Harris
Beyer	DeLauro	Heck (WA)
Bilirakis	DelBene	Hensarling
Bishop (GA)	DeSantis	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	DeSaulnier	Hice, Jody B.
Black	DesJarlais	Higgins
Blackburn	Deutch	Hinojosa
Blum	Dingell	Honda
Blumenauer	Doggett	Hoyer
Bonamici	Doyle, Michael	Hudson
Boyle, Brendan	F.	Huelskamp
F.	Duffy	Huffman
Brady (PA)	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Brat	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Bridenstine	Edwards	Hurt (VA)
Brooks (AL)	Ellison	Issa
Buchanan	Emmer (MN)	Jackson Lee
Buck	Engel	Jeffries
Burgess	Eshoo	Jenkins (KS)
Bustos	Esty	Jenkins (WV)
Butterfield	Farenthold	Johnson (GA)
Byrne	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Capps	Fattah	Jones
Capuano	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Cárdenas	Fleischmann	Kelly (IL)
Carter (GA)	Fleming	Kelly (MS)
Cartwright	Fortenberry	Kildee
Castro (TX)	Fox	Kilmer
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Kind
Chu, Judy	Fudge	Kirkpatrick
Cicilline	Gabbard	Kuster
Clark (MA)	Gallagher	Labrador
Clarke (NY)	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Clay	Gibson	Lamborn
Cleaver	Gohmert	Lance
Clyburn	Gosar	Larsen (WA)
Cohen	Graves (GA)	Larson (CT)
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Latta
Connolly	Grayson	Lawrence

Levin	O'Rourke	Scott (VA)
Lewis	Olson	Scott, David
Lieu, Ted	Pallone	Sensenbrenner
Loeb	Payne	Serrano
Lofgren	Pelosi	Sessions
Loudermilk	Perlmutter	Sires
Love	Perry	Slaughter
Lowenthal	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Lowe	Pingree	Smith (TX)
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Pocan	Smith (WA)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Poe (TX)	Stutzman
Lynch	Polis	Takai
Maloney, Carolyn	Posey	Takano
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Massie	Price, Tom	Thompson (PA)
Matsui	Rangel	Tipton
McClintock	Ratcliffe	Titus
McCollum	Renacci	Tonko
McDermott	Ribble	Tsongas
McGovern	Rice (SC)	Van Hollen
McNerney	Richmond	Vargas
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Veasey
Meeks	Rohrabacher	Vela
Meng	Rokita	Velázquez
Messer	Ross	Wagner
Mica	Rothfus	Walberg
Mooney (WV)	Roybal-Allard	Walker
Moore	Ruiz	Walz
Mulvaney	Rush	Waters, Maxine
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Watson Coleman
Napolitano	Salmon	Weber (TX)
Neal	Sánchez, Linda T.	Welch
Neugebauer	Sanchez, Loretta	Williams
Nolan	Sanford	Wilson (FL)
Norcross	Sarbanes	Yarmuth
Nugent	Schakowsky	Yoder
	Schrader	Yoho
	Schweikert	Young (AK)
		Young (IA)

NOES—174

Graves (MO)	Nunes
Hanna	Palazzo
Hardy	Palmer
Harper	Pascarella
Hartzer	Paulsen
Hastings	Pearce
Heck (NV)	Peters
Hill	Pittenger
Himes	Pitts
Holding	Poliquin
Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Hurd (TX)	Quigley
Israel	Reed
Johnson (OH)	Reichert
Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Jolly	Rigell
Joyce	Roby
Katko	Rogers (AL)
Keating	Rogers (KY)
Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Kennedy	Ros-Lehtinen
King (IA)	Roskam
King (NY)	Rouzer
Kinzing (IL)	Royce
Kline	Ruppersberger
Knight	Russell
Langevin	Ryan (WI)
Lee	Scalise
Lipinski	Schiff
LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Long	Sewell (AL)
Lucas	Sherman
Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
Lummis	Shuster
MacArthur	Simpson
Marchant	Sinema
Marino	Smith (MO)
McCarthy	Smith (NE)
McCaul	Speier
McHenry	Stefanik
McKinley	Stewart
McMorris	Stivers
Rodgers	Swalwell (CA)
McSally	Thornberry
Meehan	Tiberi
Miller (FL)	Torres
Miller (MI)	Trott
Moolenaar	Turner
Moulton	Upton
Mullin	Valadao
Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Murphy (PA)	Walden
Newhouse	Walorski
Noem	Walters, Mimi

Wasserman	Westmoreland	Woodall
Schultz	Whitfield	Young (IN)
Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Zeldin
Wenstrup	Wittman	Zinke
Westerman	Womack	

NOT VOTING—4

Clawson (FL)	Kaptur
Gowdy	Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1435

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 303, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MOULTON. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Moulton moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2685 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the “Operation and Maintenance, Army” account, on page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

In the "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" account, on page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)".

In the "Defense Health Program" account, on page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

In the "Defense Health Program" account, on page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount relating to research, development, test and evaluation, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

In the "Defense Health Program" account, on page 36, line 20, after the dollar amount relating to the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is simple. First, it will add \$2 million to the Army Threat Integration Center to protect our troops and their families from terrorist attacks.

ISIS, al Qaeda, and other terrorist groups are directly threatening Americans, our troops, and our allies abroad every single day. In fact, a group related to ISIS recently posted the photos and addresses of about 100 hundred U.S. troops online so that, in their words, "our brothers residing in America can deal with you."

Our military families have also been threatened with attacks. We can't stand idly by; we must act, and this additional funding will help.

The amendment also adds \$2 million for the Yellow Ribbon reintegration program to help Active Duty and National Guard troops. As a veteran myself, I know just how difficult the reintegration process can be. In fact, I am in regular contact with many of the marines from my platoon, and we talk about this every day.

These men and women have put their lives on the line for our country and our freedom. We owe it to them to provide them with the resources they need both on and off the battlefield.

Lastly, this amendment adds \$5 million for Joint Warfighter Medical Research, which provides the latest cutting-edge techniques to save injured troops on the battlefield.

The men and women who fight on our behalf should know that we have their backs at the most difficult times.

These initiatives are fully paid for with a reasonable and commonsense reduction in funding for Defense Media Activity, which provides magazines and movies for our military.

I ask my colleagues: Is it more important to fund the fight against ISIS or to fund government-sponsored Scooby Doo? After all, if the troops really want to watch it, they can get their cartoons on their smartphones anyway.

Rarely in this Chamber do we have a choice that is so clear. Let's take a small step to improve this bill for our military families and for our troops.

I urge Members to vote "yes" on this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Before speaking on the motion to recommit, Mr. VISCLOSKEY and I would like to thank our consummate professional staff that put this bill together for all of us, headed up by our clerk, Rob Blair; Tim Prince; Paul Terry; Walter Hearne; B.G. Wright; Brooke Boyer; Adrienne Ramsey; Megan Milam; Collin Lee; Cornell Teague; and Sherry Young; of my staff, Nancy Fox, Steve Wilson, and Katie Hazlett; minority clerks Becky Leggieri and Taunja Berquam; and from Mr. VISCLOSKEY's staff, Joe DeVooght.

Mr. Chairman, over the years, Members of Congress have agreed that the Defense Appropriations bill is no place for partisan politics. Our national security is far too important.

This week, the leadership of the other party has decided to throw that tradition out the window, and their timing couldn't be more unfortunate.

As we gather here this afternoon, over 200,000 men and women in uniform do the hard work of freedom across the globe—in Afghanistan, Iraq, the Sinai, Eastern Europe, along the DMZ, and other faraway places. These members of our Armed Forces and their comrades who serve here at home and their families all deserve our admiration and untiring gratitude.

This bipartisan bill before you delivers for them. I urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit and "yes" on final passage of this bipartisan bill that recognizes and honors their service.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 240, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

AYES—186

Adams	Fudge	Neal
Aguilar	Gabbard	Nolan
Ashford	Gallego	Norcross
Bass	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Beatty	Graham	Pallone
Becerra	Grayson	Pascrell
Bera	Green, Al	Payne
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Peters
Bonamici	Hahn	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hinojosa	Quigley
Butterfield	Honda	Rangel
Capps	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Huffman	Richmond
Cárdenas	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jackson Lee	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kuster	Scott, David
Cohen	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cooper	Lawrence	Sinema
Costa	Lee	Sires
Courtney	Levin	Slaughter
Crowley	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Cummings	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Takai
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Takano
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lowe y	Titus
Delaney	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Tonko
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Torres
DelBene	Lynch	Tsongas
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Deutch	Carolyn	Vargas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doggett	Matsui	Vela
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Velázquez
Duckworth	McDermott	Visclosky
Edwards	McGovern	Walz
Ellison	McNerney	Wasserman
Engel	Meeks	Schultz
Eshoo	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Esty	Moore	Watson Coleman
Farr	Moulton	Welch
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Nadler	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	

NOES—240

Abraham	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Aderholt	Burgess	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Byrne	Dold
Amash	Calvert	Donovan
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Babin	Carter (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Barletta	Chabot	Ellmers (NC)
Barr	Chaffetz	Emmer (MN)
Barton	Coffman	Farenthold
Benishek	Cole	Fincher
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (MI)	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Comstock	Fleming
Black	Conaway	Flores
Blackburn	Cook	Forbes
Blum	Costello (PA)	Fortenberry
Bost	Cramer	Fox
Boustany	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Brat	Culberson	Garrett
Bridenstine	Curbelo (FL)	Gibbs
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Gibson
Brooks (IN)	Denham	Gohmert
Buchanan	Dent	Goodlatte
Buck	DeSantis	Gosar

Granger	Massie	Rouzer	Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Pitts	Butterfield	Hahn	Pascarell
Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Royce	Black	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)	Capps	Hastings	Payne
Graves (LA)	McCaul	Russell	Blackburn	Hice, Jody B.	Poliquin	Capuano	Higgins	Pelosi
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Ryan (WI)	Blum	Hill	Pompeo	Cárdenas	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Griffith	McHenry	Salmon	Bost	Himes	Posey	Carney	Honda	Pingree
Guinta	McKinley	Sanford	Boustany	Holding	Price, Tom	Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Pocan
Guthrie	McMorris	Scalise	Brady (TX)	Hudson	Ratcliffe	Cartwright	Huffman	Polis
Hanna	Rodgers	Schweikert	Brat	Huelskamp	Reed	Castor (FL)	Israel	Price (NC)
Hardy	McSally	Scott, Austin	Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert	Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Harper	Meadows	Sensenbrenner	Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Renacci	Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Rangel
Harris	Meehan	Sessions	Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Ribble	Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Hartzler	Messer	Shimkus	Brownley (CA)	Hurd (TX)	Rice (NY)	Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Heck (NV)	Mica	Shuster	Buchanan	Hurt (VA)	Rice (SC)	Clarke (NY)	Jones	Rush
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Simpson	Buck	Issa	Rigell	Clay	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda T.
Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Smith (MO)	Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Roby	Cleaver	Keating	
Hill	Moolenaar	Smith (NE)	Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Roe (TN)	Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Holding	Mooney (WV)	Smith (NJ)	Bustos	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Cohen	Kennedy	Sanford
Hudson	Mullin	Smith (TX)	Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)	Connolly	Kildee	Sarbanes
Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Stefanik	Calvert	Jolly	Rohrabacher	Conyers	Kind	Schakowsky
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Stewart	Carter (GA)	Jordan	Rokita	Crowley	Labrador	Schiff
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Stivers	Carter (TX)	Joyce	Rooney (FL)	Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Hunter	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)	Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Hurd (TX)	Noem		Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Roskam	Davis, Danny	Lee	Serrano
Hurt (VA)	Nugent		Cole	Kilmer	Ross	DeFazio	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Issa	Nunes	Thornberry	Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Rothfus	DeGette	Lewis	Sherman
Jenkins (KS)	Olson	Tiberi	Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Rouzer	DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Sires
Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo	Tipton	Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)	Royce	DelBene	Loebach	Slaughter
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Trott	Conaway	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz	DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Turner	Cook	Kline	Ruppersberger	Deutch	Lowenthal	Speier
Jolly	Pearce	Upton	Cooper	Knight	Russell	Dingell	Lowe	Swalwell (CA)
Jones	Perry	Valadao	Costa	Kuster	Ryan (OH)	Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Jordan	Pittenger	Wagner	Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Ryan (WI)	Doyle, Michael F.	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Joyce	Pitts	Walberg	Courtney	Lamborn	Salmon	Duncan (TN)	Lynch	Titus
Katko	Poe (TX)	Walden	Cramer	Lance	Scalise	Edwards	Maloney, Carolyn	Tonko
Kelly (MS)	Poliquin	Walker	Crawford	Langevin	Schweikert	Ellison	Matsui	Torres
Kelly (PA)	Pompeo	Walorski	Crenshaw	Larson (CT)	Scott, Austin	Engel	McCollum	Tsongas
King (IA)	Posey	Cuellar	Latta	Latta	Scott, David	Eshoo	McDermott	Van Hollen
King (NY)	Price, Tom	Weber (TX)	Lipinski	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner	Farr	McGovern	Vargas
Kinzing (IL)	Ratcliffe	Webster (FL)	LoBiondo	LoBiondo	Sessions	Fattah	Meeks	Velázquez
Kline	Reed	Wenstrup	Davis, Rodney	Long	Shimkus	Frankel (FL)	Meng	Visclosky
Knight	Reichert	Westerman	Delaney	Loudermilk	Shuster	Fudge	Moore	Wasserman
Labrador	Renacci	Westmoreland	Denham	Love	Simpson	Galleo	Moulton	Schultz
LaMalfa	Ribble	Whitfield	Dent	Lucas	Sinema	Garamendi	Nadler	Waters, Maxine
Lamborn	Rice (SC)	Williams	DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)	Grayson	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Lance	Rigell	Wilson (SC)	DesJarlais	Lujan Grisham	Smith (NE)	Green, Al	Neal	Welch
Latta	Roby	Wittman	Diaz-Balart	(NM)	Smith (NJ)	Grijalva	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
LoBiondo	Roe (TN)	Womack	Dold	Lummis	Smith (TX)	Gutiérrez	Pallone	Yarmuth
Long	Rogers (AL)	Woodall	Donovan	MacArthur	Stefanik			
Loudermilk	Rogers (KY)	Yoder	Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Stewart			
Love	Rohrabacher	Yoho	Duffy	Marchant	Stivers	Clawson (FL)	Gowdy	Katko
Lucas	Rokita	Young (AK)	Duncan (SC)	Marino	Stutzman	Coffman	Grothman	Thompson (CA)
Luetkemeyer	Rooney (FL)	Young (IA)	Elmiers (NC)	Massie	Takai			
Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IN)	Emmer (MN)	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)			
MacArthur	Roskam	Zeldin	Esty	McCaul	Thornberry			
Marchant	Ross	Zinke	Farenthold	McClintock	Tiberi			
Marino	Rothfus		Fincher	McHenry	Tipton			
			Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Trott			
			Fleischmann	McMorris	Turner			
			Fleming	Rodgers	Upton			
			Flores	McNerney	Valadao			
			Forbes	McSally	Veasey			
			Fortenberry	Meadows	Vela			
			Foster	Meehan	Wagner			
			Fox	Messer	Walberg			
			Franks (AZ)	Mica	Walden			
			Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Walker			
			Gabbard	Miller (MI)	Walorski			
			Garrett	Moolenaar	Walorski, Mimi			
			Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Walz			
			Gibson	Mullin	Weber (TX)			
			Gohmert	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)			
			Goodlatte	Murphy (FL)	Wenstrup			
			Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Westerman			
			Graham	Neugebauer	Westmoreland			
			Granger	Newhouse	Whitfield			
			Graves (GA)	Noem	Williams			
			Graves (LA)	Nolan	Wilson (SC)			
			Graves (MO)	Norcross	Wittman			
			Green, Gene	Nugent	Womack			
			Griffith	Nunes	Woodall			
			Guinta	Olson	Yoder			
			Guthrie	Palazzo	Yoho			
			Hanna	Palmer	Young (AK)			
			Hardy	Paulsen	Young (IA)			
			Harper	Pearce	Young (IN)			
			Harris	Perry	Zeldin			
			Hartzler	Peters	Zinke			
			Heck (NV)	Peterson				
			Heck (VA)	Pittenger				

NOT VOTING—7

Clawson (FL) Grothman Thompson (CA)
Duffy Hice, Jody B.
Gowdy Kaptur

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1451

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 149, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

YEAS—278

Abraham Ashford Benishek
Aderholt Babin Bera
Aguilar Barletta Bilirakis
Allen Barr Bishop (GA)
Amodei Barton Bishop (MI)

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty

NAYS—149

Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Clawson (FL) Gowdy Katko
Coffman Grothman Thompson (CA)

□ 1459

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 358, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on passage of H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, I would have voted “yes” had I been present for the final roll (Roll no. 358).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 11, 2015 at 11:26 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 253.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1314, ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 644, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 305

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The question of adoption of the motion shall be divided as follows: first, concurring in section 212 of the Senate amendment; second, concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment; and third, concurring in the matter preceding title II of the Senate amendment. The portion of the divided question on concurring in section 212 of the Senate amendment shall be considered as adopted. The Chair shall first put the question on the portion of the divided question on concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment. If any portion of the divided question fails of adoption, then the House shall be considered to have made no disposition of the Senate amendment.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House: (1) concur in the Senate amendment to the title; and (2) concur in the Senate amendment to the text with the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution modified by the amendment printed in part B of that report. The Senate amendments and the motion

shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question. If the motion is adopted, then it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 644 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very dear friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of Ronald Reagan Republican free trade principles and in support of trade promotion authority, which is known as TPA.

Since the days of President Ronald Reagan, Republicans have supported free trade because we know that when America competes, America wins. TPA is a vital piece of our free trade agenda because it creates the process that we need to secure trade agreements that grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and lower prices for American consumers.

For America to continue to determine the rules of the global economy, we need to lead by crafting free trade agreements, and thus, the House is here today to provide to the President the parameters under which he or she should negotiate a trade promotion authority.

Free trade means more good-paying American jobs. Free trade means that American workers make American products at American businesses to be sold all across the globe. More than 38 million American jobs are tied to trade, and these jobs pay well. In fact, trade-related jobs, on average, pay 18 percent more than jobs that are not trade related.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is here today with Ronald Reagan watching from Heaven down on us, to say that we are continuing what he really began, and that is a process of American exceptionalism around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary time.

Mr. Speaker, shortly after midnight Tuesday night, the Rules Committee learned we would consider the Senate's package of three sweeping trade bills. We convened mere hours later and considered hundreds of pages of new text rewriting our trade laws and the rules of the House.

Part of that package includes what is called fast track, a procedure that has outlived its purpose and circumvents congressional authority because it does not allow for committee debate or for the Members to be able to amend it or change it, just to vote up or down—at least that is what happened over here in the House.

It silences the debates of the Members of the Chamber, and by doing that, the Americans who send us here don't have a voice. We are being asked to push this Trans-Pacific Partnership through by using fast track, and what is more, we are being asked to push fast track through with a closed rule.

Now, we have been very concerned about what is in this fast track. As you know, we really aren't allowed to know. We are only allowed to vote up or down on the trade bill itself, once fast track is passed.

I realized how awful it was for us here; if we wanted to go see it, we had to take someone with us with a security clearance, but we would not be allowed to talk about it.

I learned of something this morning that is even worse, an article of The New York Times about the Australian Government and the members of Parliament there who say that, if they go down and read the trade bill, they have to sign an oath that they will not speak of it for 4 years.

Now, that asks the question: Who runs these democracies, the Representatives of the people of the United States or the corporate giants who write the trade bills that we are not able to see?

It is pretty clear who runs it here because, from what we have heard, that was leaked out through WikiLeaks, is that major parts of this bill have been negotiated by Big Pharma, the pharmaceutical industries of America, and the financial system. Neither one of those have shown any aptitude to try to put the members of the public first.

Australia is so concerned about the fact that pharma is asking for 12 more years' extension on their patents that they are very much afraid it will destroy their healthcare system.

More and more people are finding out simply by the leaks of what is in this bill, and so far, according to the polls, nobody much likes it.

Instead of the weeks that we could have had a transparent debate about a bill we had seen and a bill that we

know, all we do is roll what happened in the Rules Committee yesterday. Yesterday, no Member of the Rules Committee or any Member of the House who came before it was allowed to have amendments approved.

Now, the Senate did; the Senate allowed amendments to change the bills considerably, but not us. Amendments were offered in the Rules Committee to provide for transparency so that we will know what these things are all about.

To change the investor's state, what we need to really bear down on—and the Australians are also aware of—is that disputes from any of the 12 countries in this trade agreement, if they do not approve of or believe they are losing money because of our Clean Air Act or our Clean Water Act, they can go to the three-person tribunal of corporate lawyers and act against us.

We know that that is a concern in this Congress because just yesterday, they voted away the country of origin labeling because they were concerned about the WTO.

As I pointed out, we had those amendments. We also had one amendment on currency manipulation, which is a major concern. We lose lots of jobs and lots of money because of currency manipulation, and we simply allow it to happen.

We will not do anything—everybody says, if that should be in this bill at all, that the President would veto it—so the American public, once again, those of us standing here trying to take care of them, are not going to be able to do it because we only know by word of mouth or what we have been able to read in the newspapers what is in there.

Let me tell you what is in the rule. That is a very important piece. Most of the discussion in the House has been around what we call the pay-for part of the trade bill, which is called trade adjustment allowance. That is supposed to take care of all the people who are laid off, who lose their jobs. The fact that we have asked for such a large number indicates to me that they expect an awful lot of jobs lost in this country.

So how the TAA was paid for, as it came from the Senate, was with a \$700 million cut in Medicare. NANCY PELOSI has driven mightily, along with JOHN BOEHNER, to change those cuts that will be paid for with the TAA.

I need to make it very clear, and I want everybody to understand that the bill we voted on this morning, the African growth bill, which contains the new pay-fors other than Medicare, are not valid until after the Senate acts on that bill. If tomorrow on the floor, the trade adjustment allowance and the fast track authority pass, they will go to the Senate, with the pay-fors coming from Medicare.

I think it is very important that we make that point because many of the

people that serve with us here are confused about exactly where that is coming from.

Let me repeat that. The pay-fors that substitute from the use of Medicare to pay for trade adjustment allowance will not be valid until after there is Senate action, if or when that takes place.

We were told that the Speaker said over in the Senate that he would do this under unanimous consent, but we have also been told that unanimous consent will not be given.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the advocates of the fast track and TPP are telling us that this is going to be a wonderful trade deal.

We know that it is not going to create jobs because none of them have. Those of us in upstate New York, after NAFTA, we were told we were going to get at least 250,000 new jobs; instead, as the Speaker probably knows, we lost a great deal.

If we, as Members of Congress, wanted to view the deal, we could not talk about it; and that, by itself, should be enough to have us not do it.

□ 1515

In a seminal sociological and political discussion of our early American democracy, "Democracy in America," Alexis de Tocqueville said of our Nation in 1835: "The surface of American society is covered with a layer of democratic paint. But from time to time, one can see the old aristocratic colors breaking through."

This is one of those times, Mr. Speaker, because this bill, this trade bill that affects every person in the United States—and will for maybe a generation to come—is not being written by the Members of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, but in a closed, backroom deal and, as we are told, by major corporations in the United States to benefit themselves. That certainly appears to be what we are going to get.

By giving away the role of Congress in setting the trade policies, we give away our ability to safeguard America's jobs and, most importantly again, as I pointed out, the American laws meant to protect the citizens we represent, such as the Clean Water Act. I have never seen in my years of Congress a trade bill come out of this Congress that benefited either the American manufacturer or the American worker. This one is the same.

Any lawmaker thinking about voting for another job-killing trade agreement should take a serious look at NAFTA and at our growing trade deficit with South Korea and think about whether they want to be responsible for shipping their constituents' jobs overseas.

Now, we know this bill has been modeled after the failed policies that have shuttered store windows and closed factories all across the Nation. That is the

legacy, ladies and gentlemen, of free trade. What we ought to demand in our trading bills is fair trade. America should not be the supplier of jobs to bolster the rest of world and improve their economies at the cost of ours.

From food safety, clean air, and labor standards to environmental protections, this trade deal would impact every facet of our daily lives. Ninety percent of the seafood now that is consumed by Americans is imported. Less than 3 percent of it is inspected. Tons of it have been sent back just from that small amount being inspected.

We will not be able to interfere with them coming in here under the investor-state dispute settlement or under this free trade act.

I urge my colleague to vote "no" on the rule and carefully, carefully consider the trade package before us.

I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman originally, I believe, is from Kentucky, and she will recognize when I tell this awesome story about how important a free trade agreement is.

A couple of years ago, we did a free trade agreement with the country of Korea. Within a year, Mr. Speaker, as a result of that trade agreement, the number one selling car in Korea came from Georgetown, Kentucky. It is a Toyota Camry made in the United States. The Koreans love it, a Kentucky-made product.

Mr. Speaker, if we didn't have a free trade agreement with Korea, the people in Georgetown, Kentucky, couldn't claim to be the number one car in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the young gentleman from Auburn, Washington (Mr. REICHERT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today in support of today's rule, which will allow us to proceed in consideration of trade promotion authority, trade adjustment assistance, and customs legislation.

Passage of trade promotion authority is absolutely critical to our economic growth and global leadership. Without TPA, we will not be able to bring home the benefits of a high-standard trade agreement.

Now, what are the benefits of high-standard trade agreements? Job creation, selling American products across this globe to 96 percent of the market, which exists outside of this country. Selling American, that is what we want to do.

And, by the way, we not only create jobs, but we create jobs that are higher paid wages, which we are all trying to struggle with across this country in raising the minimum wage. We can do that in this trade adjustment and trade promotion authority.

This is counter to exactly what communities across the Nation need right

now: more opportunities, more good paying jobs; and that leads to a promising future for our families, for our children, to better-paying, high-tech jobs and manufacturing jobs across this country.

I am proud to be the House sponsor of legislation to renew trade adjustment assistance because I understand the necessity of TAA.

Now, not only is this a great trade initiative here, but we are also taking into consideration, as we move ahead in this global economy, that there may be people who do have opportunities to look at other jobs; and this TAA bill provides training and education for people to have and gain better jobs, higher paying jobs. So I would encourage my colleagues to vote for this rule in support of TPA, TAA, and the customs legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute because I do so appreciate my friend, Mr. SESSIONS, giving us a good Kentucky story. I need to change that story just a little bit. That factory has been in Georgetown for at least three decades. It is Toyota, which is Japanese.

All of South Korea has only 26 car dealers in the country that will sell an American car. Of course, we buy Japanese cars that are made here, but they don't buy ours in Japan. I think about 2 years ago we had only sold 8,000 American cars in Japan for that entire year, and I would imagine we sell that many Japanese cars in the United States on a daily basis.

So I appreciate the story. Georgetown, I know, would love to be mentioned, but we have got to get it right.

Now I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because America's middle class and our workers have been under economic attack. I rise to voice my opposition to the very restrictive process being used to shove these job outsourcing trade deals through Congress.

The Republican leadership has denied our House any amendment, even on currency manipulation, on legislation that is sure to impact every single American, turning our oversight role into little more than a rubberstamp. This makes a mockery of the House's clear, constitutional authority on trade and commerce.

Worse still, this limitation is being pursued because Republican leaders simply do not want to go to conference with the Senate. This belies every American, every Member their right to be represented and have a voice in this process.

Hundreds, however, of multinational corporations and lobbyists, the 1 percent, helped to write, amend, and draft the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, line by line.

But today, years into the process and with negotiation in the final stages,

Members of Congress were only recently given our first access. To read it, you have to go to a secure room, deep in the Visitor Center. We are supervised. Any notes we take are confiscated, and we can't discuss what we find with anyone unless they have top secret clearance.

The trade deal is a secret deal because they want to fast-track it through Congress, hoping Congress really won't understand what is in it. And I find it hard to imagine a more dangerous or irresponsible approach than fast-tracking another trade deal through Congress.

TPA, the authority to fast track, is a gateway to the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Both will further harm workers and communities to a faster global race to the bottom, with more outsourcing of jobs, more lower wages, more dropping benefits, more lower standards for worker safety, compensation, and environment. We have seen that since NAFTA passed 30 years ago.

For decades, I have fought against destructive trade deals that were brought down on our Nation's workers and communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. KAPTUR. Over this period of time, every time one of these so-called free trade deals is signed, America moves into deeper and deeper trade deficit, deeper and deeper red ink, as more of our jobs get shipped abroad.

I remember standing at the corner of Ohio and Michigan Avenues in Matamoros, Mexico, and looking at the TRICO windshield factory that was moved from the State of New York down there, and Parker Seals. It almost seemed like a movie set but for one thing, it was real.

Last year alone, our trade deficit cost us 20 percent of our GDP. Is anybody here paying attention or are we all a part of the 1 percent and forget about the 99 percent who have had to bear the brunt of this terrible, terrible outsourcing of jobs?

Average American wages across my region have dropped by \$7,000. This trade deficit didn't happen by accident. Some people got filthy rich off of it.

This is a time for America to say, "No more. No more. We are going to do it right. We are going to create trade deals that create jobs in our country, create a stronger middle class, raise wages, improve the environment, here and abroad. No more taking it out of the hide of America's workers."

We are here because we stand on their shoulders. Vote "no" on this rule and "no" on TAA and "no" on TPP.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, I love the fervency of our colleagues who come down here and argue Japan is the problem. You can't talk about the trade agreement that we

have with Korea where it works—Japan, Japan, Japan.

Well, good gosh, this is about getting a trade deal with what is called TPP, of which Japan would be included. This is a deal where my colleagues come down and don't like our trade deficits, but the bottom line is that the United States has a trade surplus with its 20 free trade partners.

So we are trying to take people from nontrade agreement, where we run a deficit and they close their market, to a trade deal where we run a surplus where people want to buy American-made products. If they will listen, we have got a good deal for them today. And one of those good deals, Mr. Speaker, is agriculture, so that our men and women engaged in agriculture can sell their products around the world.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Midland, Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, and I especially want to commend Chairman RYAN and his colleagues on Ways and Means for their hard work in bringing us the underlying legislation.

Everyone in the room knows that America's farmers and ranchers are the most productive in the world. They have continuously proven their ability to meet rapidly growing and ever-changing demands here at home, and their reach stretches well beyond the shores of America. In fact, exports now account for almost one-third of total U.S. farm income. In the case of commodities like cotton, tree nuts, rice, and wheat, over one-half the total production is exported.

In 2014 alone, U.S. agricultural exports set a record \$152.5 billion, highlighting the growing demand for quality food and fiber around the world. As was noted in a recent hearing before the House Agriculture Committee, the United States exported almost as much beef, pork, and poultry to the 20 nations with which we have trade agreements as they did the other 170-plus nations in the world.

Beyond the obvious benefits to producers, trade also helps support almost 1 million American jobs in production agriculture and in related sectors like food processing and transportation. As a result, it is crucial not only to American agriculture, but to the U.S. economy as a whole, to maintain and increase access to the world's 7 billion consumers, 95 percent of whom live outside the shores of the United States. To obtain that access, it is imperative that we work to reduce and eliminate international barriers to trade so that our farmers and ranchers can compete on a level playing field in the global market.

With negotiations in the World Trade Organization languishing for the last 14

years, regional free trade agreements represent our best opportunity for expanding trade opportunities for U.S. agricultural. History has shown that trade promotion authority in one form or another has been vital in completing and implementing past agreements. In fact, Congress has granted TPA to every President since 1974, and the 114th Congress should be no exception.

TPA will provide our negotiators with the credibility necessary to conclude the most effective trade agreements possible by making it clear to the rest of the world that Congress and this administration are serious about this endeavor.

The legislation before us today empowers Congress to move the aggressive trade agenda. It includes the strongest measures, to date, for ensuring that this President sticks to the negotiating objectives laid down by Congress, including the unicameral ability to turn TPA off on an individual agreement. At the end of the day, it is Congress that will decide the fate of each agreement.

In conclusion, I am a strong proponent of free trade and the benefits it provides our Nation's producers and consumers. However, if we are not going to continue to expand American markets, other countries, often with lower standards, will step up to the plate and fill that demand. Markets are not won or regained easily after they have been lost, and billions around the globe still want America's quality food and fiber.

□ 1530

We can win over new markets, boost our economy, and meet these global demands first and foremost by showing that we are, in fact, a strong and reliable trading partner. We can make that happen by passing this rule and the underlying TPA agreement.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her tremendous leadership on so many issues.

I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. Our country has already lost too many good-paying American jobs because of past trade deals. We should be clear about what this rule would do. This rule is really a vote to extended Medicare sequestration and provides for no amendments in the fast track bill, Trade Adjustment Assistance, and the customs bill.

We have seen what happens when bad trade deals are passed without congressional oversight: American jobs shift overseas—many come from communities of color; dangerous food makes its way to our meals; human rights are violated; labor standards are ignored; and the effects of climate change get worse.

The American people do deserve better. The American people deserve a trade policy that creates American jobs and an open process for passing trade deals that gives them a strong voice.

Passing this rule and passing fast track does neither. This is a bad deal for American workers. It is bad for American jobs. It needs to go back to the drawing board, a drawing board that is public and that gives the American people a voice in trade policy, not just big corporations and hedge fund managers.

Between 2001 and 2011, the growing trade deficit with China cost more than 2.7 million jobs. Nearly 1 million of these jobs, mind you, came from communities of color. After these workers lost their jobs, their situation went from bad to worse.

These workers saw their wages fall nearly 30 percent—or more than \$10,000 a year. The total economic cost of this job loss to these communities is more than \$10 billion. Now, that is \$10 billion each and every year.

We cannot allow another bad trade deal to shift millions more of American jobs overseas. We cannot allow another bad trade deal to strip billions from struggling communities. We cannot allow this rule or a flawed TAA or fast track to pass.

Make no mistake, I support trade. I have the honor of representing the Port of Oakland, and I understand the critical role that trade plays in the economy in my district in California and also in our country.

However, let me just say, trade only grows our economy. This bill is not fair; it is not open, and it is not transparent.

I have the honor of representing the Port of Oakland and I understand the critical role that trade plays in the economy of my district, California and our country.

However, trade only grows our economy when it's fair, open, transparent and creates jobs.

This bill—Fast Track—is not fair.

It's not open—

And it's not transparent.

So once again, I urge a "NO" vote on this Rule, a "NO" on the flawed TAA, and a "NO" on Fast Track.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Good gosh, Mr. Speaker, I was afraid she was in reference to ObamaCare, which is why we are losing American jobs all across this country.

The bottom line is that, where there is trade with other countries and we have a trade deal, America wins, and we get more jobs. As an example, 3 million jobs in the Lone Star State of Texas are related to trade, and jobs are growing nearly twice as fast as nontrade jobs. This is what is happening. It is the vibrancy of America.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Har-

rison Township, Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), chairman of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of this rule.

I come from southeast Michigan, which, of course, is the heart of American manufacturing. Michigan manufacturers, especially the Big Three domestic auto companies, have all had concerns for years about the unfair competitive disadvantage that they face by nations that manipulate their currency such as Japan, South Korea, and China.

It was very important to me that, as Congress moves forward with legislation to give trade promotion authority to this President and others, that the package must also include strong, new tools allowing America to fight back against those nations that unfairly manipulate their currency and those that harm American manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very thankful that Chairman RYAN and House leadership agreed to work with us to craft an approach which I believe is a strong step forward. For decades, administrations of both parties have refused to identify foreign currency manipulators or to take any action to stop it.

The manager's amendment, put forward by Chairman RYAN, that we worked with him to develop, gets very, very tough on currency manipulators. For the first time ever, Mr. Speaker, it puts in place a three-part test to define currency manipulation with specific guidance requiring nations that manipulate their currency to be named publicly.

Also, for the first time, the focus will be shifted from reporting and monitoring to actionable items and to steps that will show the impact of currency manipulation on the American economy, as well, Mr. Speaker, as requiring remedial action to be taken.

These tough steps will impact every Nation that we trade with, not just those that might be included in the TPP, but every Nation that we trade with, including South Korea and China, as I mentioned, Japan.

Certainly, while these are steps in the right direction, more needs to be done; absolutely, more needs to be done. Here in Congress, every Member of Congress continues to reserve the right to oppose any TPP agreement that does not meet the needs of the American economy and the American manufacturing industry.

With these changes that I have outlined here that are going to be in the manager's amendment, I support—and I am proud to support—this trade package that will provide an opportunity to drive our economy forward.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I worked for a while as an ironworker at the Quincy shipyard in Quincy, Massachusetts. I was a welder.

Unfortunately, because of bad trade policy, that shipyard closed down, and thousands of workers were laid off. Later on, I also worked at the General Motors facility in Framingham, Massachusetts, and the company decided to close that plant down, while they opened three new ones in Mexico. I have seen what lousy trade policy can do.

The fundamental problem with our trade policy is that it is negotiated in secret by multinational corporations who are basically hiring foreign labor at very low wages, move the jobs overseas, and then export the products back into the United States.

If you look at some of the minimum wages for the countries that we are dealing with in this trade agreement for Malaysia and Vietnam, it is less than \$1 an hour for the minimum wage in those countries, and they maintain those low wages so that they can attract business. It is a race to the bottom.

I do want to say that, as part of my job with the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I have had a chance to go to South Korea and Japan to see how our trade agreements have been working out there.

I was in South Korea for several days, and just on my own, with my staff, I looked for an American car for several days. We were in traffic a lot. South Korea is a booming industrial country, major highways. I saw hundreds of thousands of cars.

I saw two—two—United States cars. One was the one I was driving in from the Embassy, and the second car was my security detail behind me. Those were the only two U.S. cars, only two U.S. cars.

Our trade with Japan—I was in Japan as well. You need a detective to find a U.S. car in Japan. That is the plain and simple fact. They import \$1 billion worth of U.S.-manufactured products in auto and the air industry; we import \$25 billion.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts just to ask one simple question: What was that trade deal that you were talking about?

Mr. LYNCH. The Korea-U.S. trade agreement.

Mr. SESSIONS. Two years ago?

Mr. LYNCH. Two years ago.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thought you said you lost your job?

Mr. LYNCH. What is that? No, no, no. The job I lost—you were talking to

people—the job I lost, 2,700 workers lost at the GM plant, those plants were reopened in Mexico.

Mr. SESSIONS. When was that? What trade deal?

Mr. LYNCH. That was right after NAFTA. That was another bad trade agreement.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, we gave you a good job, and you came to Congress.

I think the gentleman makes a point that I would like to make, and that is we need a trade deal with Japan to level the playing field, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), who sits on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairmen RYAN, SESSIONS, and TIBERI for their tireless effort to move us closer to realizing trade deals that will unlock new markets and bolster our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both the rule in front of us today and the trade promotion authority legislation we will consider tomorrow.

The benefits of increased free and fair trade are well established and undeniable. For companies in my State, the pending trade deals would remove tariff barriers and unlock doors for businesses such as Morris & Associates, who export the world's best poultry chilling equipment; or a company like Cummins Engine in my State to export U.S.-made engines; and to allow countless farms in my district and State to export hogs, chickens, tobacco, and sweet potatoes all across the globe. This means increased productivity, which means better wages and more jobs.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, TPA is about empowering Congress, making sure that this body and the people's elected representatives keep tight reins on this President.

Now, I am certainly no supporter of the President's laundry list of unconstitutional actions from immigration, to his administration's unilateral attempts to salvage the sinking ship that is ObamaCare, which is why TPA is needed.

The President is going to negotiate trade deals whether or not we pass TPA. Why wouldn't we want to make this President's negotiators more accountable, the deals themselves more transparent, and make our oversight more effective?

Now, here is how it works. If the President disregards the parameters Congress sets out or fails to consult Members at every step, Congress can turn off TPA. If the President comes back with a bad trade deal, Congress can vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, we need TPA to not only get the best deals possible, but also need this authority to check the President.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support TPA.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the land of cars, Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the rule we are considering today represents everything for me that is wrong with politics. We are currently debating the most important package of trade legislation in a generation; yet, despite how critical this issue is to American jobs, this rule does not allow any amendments.

Currency manipulation, the mother of all trade barriers, has cost this country as many as 5 million jobs. A bipartisan group of 20 Members—10 Republicans, 10 Democrats—proposed an amendment to address this, and it is vital that Congress debate and vote on how to address currency manipulation as we set U.S. trade policy for the next decade.

With nothing but the deepest of respect for the chair of the Rules Committee, I want to give you the facts about the Korean free trade agreement. The reality is that after it passed, we increased exports to Korea from 14,000 to 34,000.

By comparison, Korea exported 800,000 to the U.S. before the trade agreement and now exports 1.3 million. We increased our exports to Korea by 20,000, and they have increased their exports to this country by 461,000.

Toyota made more money last year in currency manipulation in this country than Ford Motor Company did in its worldwide operations.

The American people deserve a full and open debate on trade policy, not procedural gimmicks and political games that shut out amendments and avoid the tough questions.

Let's defeat this rule and have a real debate on the issues that the working men and women of this country have sent us here to consider and that are so critical to the livelihood and the backbone of this American economy. American jobs are at stake.

□ 1545

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Sunnyside, Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a farmer and a rancher and a freshman Member on the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank the chairman for yielding his time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the rule and the underlying trade promotion authority granted by H.R. 1314.

As a member of the Rules Committee, I can affirm that the committee heard and seriously considered many amendments and concerns from both Democratic and Republican Members late into the night. This rule has

been very fair, deliberative, and interested parties have been given ample opportunity to weigh in on it and on the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as you just heard, I come from the State of Washington, which is the most trade-benefited State in the country. If my colleagues want to see the benefit trade brings and the jobs it creates, they only have to look at my State. We export coffee, aircraft, footwear, software—you name it. We also have an enormous agriculture industry. In Washington, we export fully 30 percent of the apples we grow, more than 85 percent of the wheat, 75 percent of the hops. Right now, consumers around the world are enjoying a brand new crop of fresh Washington State cherries, but the trade success story I want to share with you today is about potatoes.

Prior to the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement that the Congress passed and the President signed in 2011, we shipped \$53 million worth of french fries to South Korea. After that agreement was passed, that value rose to \$83 million—a 57 percent increase in just 2 years—largely attributed to the trade barriers that were lowered. For the record, that potato industry supports fully 24,000 jobs in my State. Those are good-paying jobs which are all supported by trade.

Trade promotion authority is about creating a fair playing field for American producers so we can create more jobs here at home. Most people may not know this, but, right now, American wines face 50 percent tariffs in Japan. Chilean and Argentinean wines face no tariffs at all. Our beef faces a 38 percent tariff—our oranges, a 16 percent tariff. TPA will instruct our negotiators to work on lowering these barriers to U.S. products.

Mr. Speaker, Americans produce some of the finest products in the world, and if given the chance to compete fairly, I believe they can. I have no doubt that we can outperform almost any competitor in the world, but we can't continue to allow other countries to stack the deck against us, which is happening right now. By granting the President the power to negotiate a treaty and by Congress telling him what priorities must be negotiated, we can create a fair playing field and create those jobs we need here at home.

I understand there are concerns about the privacy surrounding the TPP deal. I share those concerns, which is why I have personally gone and reviewed the text of this deal three times now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. The reason this vote on TPA is so important is that it will make the deal public. It will give

the American people at least 2 months and as much as 5 months to review any negotiated deal. That is months to tell their Members of Congress whether they should support the deal or not. Without voting on TPA, there is no review period. The deal can stay a secret.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and the underlying bill are critical to our economy. Without TPA, our country will be left disadvantaged against other countries, and we will be left to trade with one arm tied behind our back. With it, we can open new opportunities for our businesses. They can grow and create more jobs, and we can ensure that the American economy remains the most competitive, strongest economy in the world for decades to come.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today is filled with plenty of procedural gimmicks but with no opportunities to actually improve the underlying bills.

These bills fail to have enforceable environmental negotiating objectives; they fail to address currency manipulation adequately; and they fail to recognize climate change and its connection to trade. I had proposed amendments to address these issues, which were, unfortunately, not made in order.

Since NAFTA and other subsequent deals, millions of United States manufacturing jobs—one in four, in fact—have been lost, and when manufacturing workers lose their jobs due to trade, the story doesn't get much better: three in five of them take cuts if they find a new job. This is a bad deal for those who lose their jobs due to trade, of course, but it is also bad for all Americans, and it is one reason wages have stagnated for the last two decades. We cannot afford to fast-track another NAFTA on steroids.

On top of that, according to the Department of Labor, four TPP negotiating partners are using forced labor or child labor in violation of international standards. Are these the types of countries to which we want to give fast-tracked trade privileges? Plenty of multinational corporations will benefit from TPP, from increased drug prices to access to cheaper labor, when American jobs are offshored. That much is clear. Yet it is not clear how the average American worker—the people of New York's Capital Region that I represent and the people who sent all of us to be their voices in Washington—would benefit.

Let's end this foolishness and take up bills that actually help our working families by passing a minimum wage, by requiring paid family leave, by investing in STEM education and research, and by rebuilding our infrastructure.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule, to defeat this inadequate trade

adjustment assistance and to defeat fast track. My message: Hands off the American worker. Hands off the American worker's children. Hands off the American Dream.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a very savvy member of our trade team and a gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of trade agreements being carried out all over the world today, and the United States—our country—is sitting on the sidelines. Ninety-five percent of the market is closed off in many respects because we don't have trade agreements; we don't have the market opening. We are an open economy. They are sending stuff here, but we don't have the opportunity to sell there. That is a problem.

Let's talk about what trade promotion authority really is. At a very basic level, it is the catalyst for American economic engagement around the world. It is the catalyst for American leadership. I, for one—and, I think, for most of my friends here on this side of the aisle—am not ready to just step back and relinquish American leadership to others. That is just unacceptable. Trade promotion authority gets us started.

We are on the verge of negotiating two very important trade agreements with growing areas around the world—the Asia-Pacific region and the European Union. This represents the lion's share of gross domestic product growth around the world. Why would we want to lock ourselves out of these markets? It is absolutely ridiculous. It is absurd. We want the American worker to have access to those markets. I want mothers around the world to buy goods off the shelves that read, "Made in America." Those markets are closed. Let's open them. Let's get trade promotion authority in place.

What is it?

It is not the trade agreement, itself. It is the process by which we get the strongest and highest quality trade agreement for American workers that would be most beneficial to our country. It is the whole way we are going to achieve growth in this economy. We can't do it to the extent we need to without this. It puts Congress in the driver's seat, providing over 150 negotiating priorities that we set, not the administration. We set these as we negotiate with foreign countries. If we fail to pass this, the President negotiates on his own priorities, not on the priorities of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Trade promotion authority gives more transparency to

the whole process. Right now, we don't have the kind of transparency that is necessary. TPA, trade promotion authority, is public. That is public. That is the process. It is very public. Go to congress.gov. Anybody can read the legislation. It is public. Plus, passing TPA will require that the final trade agreement—those negotiations aren't done yet, but once they are concluded, the President has to make it public for 60 days in order for anybody and everybody to read it. That is transparency.

If we fail to pass this, we are giving up American leadership. We are basically throwing the American worker under the bus. We need growth. We need American leadership, and trade promotion authority is the catalyst for providing that leadership. Trade promotion authority is necessary for Congress to provide the proper checks and balances on the administration. I don't want the administration negotiating without our having a robust consultative role in this, and that is what TPA does.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support this underlying legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the only way to get better trade agreements is to reject this fast-track bill and develop a better alternative that reflects our values and the realities of the 21st century.

As one who has supported legislation for more trade with most of the countries that are TPP agreement countries, I would like to support more trade today, but, as happened in the Ways and Means Committee, this rule shuts out every single attempt of Democrats to strengthen and improve this bill.

These Fast Trackers—they say they want free trade. Well how about trade that is free of secrecy and connivance? How about trade that is free of deals that jeopardize our the health and safety such as the food that we eat as American families? How about trade that is free of corporate panels that will be able to award taxpayer dollars to foreign corporations with more rights than American businesses, instead of relying on our system of justice?

I think we have to look at the trade agreements we have had in the past—the free trade agreements—and realize that, for too many American workers, they haven't been free. They have come at a tremendous cost. This trade agreement has been shrouded in secrecy in order to assure there is not a full and fair debate or a discussion of the failures of the USTR.

The USTR, as of right now, has not shared with this Congress a single document to show how Vietnam, instead of being the great human rights abuser

it is today, will begin to show even the slightest measure of decency to its workers. The USTR has ignored the record of sex trafficking and human trafficking in Malaysia. One of the worst and in a category by itself with North Korea—and a handful of others—in human trafficking. And they are being rewarded in this deal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Too often, the USTR simply does not believe in law enforcement. It wouldn't enforce the law in Guatemala and Honduras under prior labor agreements. In Peru, it ignored the audit responsibility that it had.

We can do better than this. We can do better than some kind of Christmas wish list of multiple objectives that this President doesn't have to follow. And indeed, this Christmas wish list is being proposed for the next President, who has not even been elected—an open-ended ability to have more trade agreements that come at the cost of too many families. We can do better.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I just love our friends who come up to the podium and talk about jobs; yet it is this administration and the Democrat policies that have taken American jobs, including ObamaCare, climate change, and all of the other rules and regulations—175,000 pages of rules and regulations—and have inhibited growth and job development in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), one of the most exciting new, young Members of Congress.

□ 1600

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this. We have a duty here to legislate based on truth and not on fiction. Let's establish the facts. First of all, if you want really strong trade agreements, then you have to be in a position to negotiate those because, I will tell you, my friends, if we are not at the table, we are on the menu.

As we talk about growing the economy and growing jobs and making sure that America is secure going into the future, and if you are worried about having an agreement that doesn't meet the demands that the American people are asking for, trade promotion authority is the only thing that gives us the ability to drive strong trade agreements to make sure that every single American is taken care of.

Now, this TPA does not give President Obama any new power, none whatsoever. For those of us who don't trust the President's judgment, then TPA is absolutely necessary. It is not an option. We look at things and we talk about the people's House and what the responsibility of the people's House is and how would the people's House move forward.

This puts us in the driver's seat. This allows this Congress, the people's House, to set the parameters of any future trade agreements. It does not negotiate them; it enforces them. So if you are worried about a strong trade agreement, then make sure that we give ourselves the power to actually set the parameters of the way a trade agreement should look.

It is time to get rid of all this bogeyman talk about what is going on. I have got to tell you, if you want the United States of America to dominate a global economy and not just participate in a global economy, then you have to have trade promotion authority. My lifetime has been spent negotiating. When you sit down at the table to actually negotiate something, the question that always came up to me: Was there anybody else other than yourself that would be responsible for making the decision? Without that decision, without that clarity, we can't draw on strong trade agreements. TPA is the only thing that gives us that. If you want to strengthen our country, if you want to grow our economy, if you want to create new jobs for America, then we need strong trade agreements.

Now, fast track, anything but fast track. Smart track, safe track, sure track, and something that gets America's economy back on track—absolutely. Vote for TPA. Vote for American jobs. Vote for the United States of America to drive the global economy and continue to write the rules and not China.

If you really are concerned about American jobs, and if you are really concerned about America's role in the world, then don't put us behind; put us in front. Let America, with the strongest economy, drive the trade agreements. TPA gives us that, gives us the ability to grow an American economy, grow American jobs, and make America more safe and secure. And it gives our partners around the world the certainty that America has not walked away from the table; America will continue to be your strongest partner and your strongest ally to build a stronger and more safe world.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this rule covers three bills. It covers TAA and TPA. I asked Rules to place in order a substitute bill on TPA that would have helped a full discussion of this vital issue affecting 40 percent of global GDP. Under the rule before us, if a majority does not vote for TAA, there will not be a vote on TPA tomorrow. This will give the House another opportunity to improve TPA and TAA, of which I am an author. TAA should not be a bargaining chip for a flawed TPA bill.

The third bill, Customs, weakens the TPA bill on human trafficking, prohibits any provision in TPP relating to climate, likewise as to immigration, and strikes out the Schumer provision on currency manipulation. The manager's amendment on currency is more rhetorical language without any teeth. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Genoa Township, Ohio (Mr. TIBERI). He is one of our three captains that has driven this entire thing in addition to Chairman PAUL RYAN and myself. He has done an outstanding job.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership. Texas is lucky to have him.

Ladies and gentlemen, today and tomorrow, we are not voting on a trade agreement. We are not voting on a trade agreement. In fact, we are voting on a bill called TPA, which is this. It is public. We can all read it. Our constituents can read it. We are not voting on anything today or tomorrow that we can't read, that is secret.

A lot of confusion out there. Here is what TPA is, and you have heard it before. It is a process. It is a process where Congress inserts itself to what the executive branch already can do, which is negotiate a trade agreement. But it is a process that, quite frankly, empowers the Congress. It tells the President, as the lead negotiator, this is what we would like him to do, and we are going to hold our authority, and we are going to say whatever the President negotiates, we are going to either approve it or not.

But you know what? By passing TPA, we are going to require that, whatever is negotiated, the public is given 60 days to review, which doesn't have to be done unless TPA is passed.

Mr. Chairman, I didn't have 6 hours to review ObamaCare—not 6 hours. My constituents will have 60 days before the President can sign any deal he negotiates. That is what TPA does. It inserts Congress. It inserts the American people into any trade agreement the President—this one or the next—negotiates. It empowers the people to review that process, to review that agreement—no secrecy.

This is what we are voting on tomorrow, ladies and gentlemen, TPA. Please go to congress.gov to look at it. Another day, maybe tomorrow, we will talk a little bit about what trade has done, not done, what it has done for American consumers and American employees and American businesses.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). The gentleman from New York has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me take 30 seconds and say, that is really great, go ahead and read the TPA, but it is

the bill we are worried about, the TPP. We have to have an armed guard, practically, to go look at that.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there really is quite a lot on the line here, despite what some speakers would submit, which is, oh, you know, this is just the TPA; it is not a big thing. No, this is a huge thing.

As a matter of fact, this particular rule we are voting on right now does three important things. One is that it has the pay-for for the trade adjustment assistance that includes cuts to Medicare. No matter how you slice it, if you vote for this rule, you are voting to cut Medicare. Then what it does, it sets up a vote for the trade adjustment assistance and trade promotion authority.

The fact is, if you go home and you try to explain to Americans, "Oh, I didn't vote to cut Medicare," the fact is you will not be able to honestly say that. You might be able to say, "Well, I did, but then they fixed it." You might be able to say, "Well, yeah, I cut Medicare, but then later on we passed a thing and maybe MITCH MCCONNELL won't try to change it later." You can say anything you want, but the maneuverings on this floor and in this body to get us to where we are have not changed one solid fact, which is that we are voting to cut Medicare.

Now, there are all kinds of cute procedural maneuverings and different kinds of rules we are invoking, but you cannot escape the essential fact: the cut to Medicare is not going to be cut and excised out of this. If you vote for the rule, you voted to cut Medicare. Our seniors have taken enough on the chin. Do not put their livelihood at risk.

Now, let me also say that this TAA is not supported by the AFL-CIO. Trade adjustment assistance is to help workers who are displaced by bad trade deals. Wouldn't you think that the president of the AFL-CIO would say, "Yeah, well, we definitely would want TAA"? And he usually almost always does, but not this time because he knows what all of us should know, which is this trade adjustment authority is cutting Medicare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ELLISON. This trade adjustment authority is paid for by Medicare. It continues to be underfunded. Trade adjustment authority is underfunded. It is like if you kick somebody off their job because of a bad trade deal and then you tell them, "We are going to help you adjust to it." Well, you know what? At least we should fund it properly. Given the billions of dollars that

will be made by this trade deal by multinational corporations, doesn't it make sense that we should at least try to fully fund trade adjustment authority, trade adjustment assistance? But we don't.

Then the fact is that it excludes public sector workers. Public sector workers are negatively impacted by bad trade deals, just like all other workers. Why wouldn't we include them in it? They are not included in it.

So this TAA, this trade adjustment assistance, package is insufficient. We must vote it down. I urge a "no" vote. I just want to let Members know, when you walk into that senior center and Mrs. McGillicuddy asks you, "Did you vote to cut Medicare?" I hope you can answer truthfully you did not vote to cut Medicare. Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's bad trade bills have gutted our manufacturing economy, transformed our stature on the global stage, and taken millions of jobs from American workers. Heavens to Betsy, let's not do it again. We need to demand a trade deal that will let us sell American-made goods to every customer in the world, and we need a trade bill that is negotiated through a transparent and open process that doesn't mortgage our patents, our innovation, and our future.

Let me echo what Congressman ELLISON just said. This rule, this vote right now that we are about to take, codifies, it ensures, that this money for the trade adjustment assistance will come from Medicare. That is what will go to the President. If you vote for this, you are voting for Medicare to be used in that way.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I support TPA because it provides an unprecedented level of transparency. Let me be clear. A vote for TPA is a vote for jobs. It is a vote so that we can grow our economy. It is not a vote for a secret document. It is a vote to set up a process that ensures the American people understand exactly what any trade deal is before Congress votes on it. We will have 60 days to do that. TPA requires that the President make public the text of a complicated trade agreement for at least 60 days, and we are going to do just that.

Over the last few months, I have worked with Chairman PAUL RYAN and Chairman PAT TIBERI and other Members of Congress to strengthen TPA so that the President cannot hijack free trade agreements. I think it is obvious here: no one in this body really trusts the President of the United States to

go and negotiate something that we would be in favor of. That is why we are making this trade TPA, so that we are following our agenda, one that we know that we have heard of. We have heard the concerns of the American people regarding immigration, climate change, currency, American sovereignty, and I think we have addressed all of these.

My constituents are just like me. They want to know that we are going to support jobs. But we do not trust the President, and that is why we are doing this deal today. This grants no new authority to the President of the United States.

Just the other day, I began working further after the Senate passed their TPA bill, and I worked with Congressman STEVE KING of Iowa to ensure that the trade agreements do not require changes to U.S. immigration laws or to obligate the United States to gain access or to extend access to visas.

We had an excellent idea, also, that we took from Senator TED CRUZ from Texas. We just strengthened it and made it more straightforward, and it is in this deal that we do.

This trade package also includes language that would prohibit the administration from attaching any climate change commitments to a trading agreement.

□ 1615

We have also worked to guarantee that American sovereignty is upheld. TPA reflects what the Constitution requires, and that is that Congress maintain authority over any changes to U.S. law and our constitutional rights to approve any trade agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule. I look forward to the debate that will follow. I urge my colleagues to listen to every single bit of this, and they will understand why a vote for TPA and this rule is the right thing to do.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule to consider the Senate amendment to H.R. 644, Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

I strongly support legislation to update the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) as it exists today. That said, I must voice my great dismay with the inclusion of H.R. 878, the "United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act," in a vehicle that circumvents regular order and is under threat of veto.

Enactment of CBP authorization legislation could help clarify and enhance Congressional intent for this critical agency as well as the oversight of its activities. In the previous Congress, the Committee on Homeland Security marked up and reported such legislation, which was subsequently considered and passed by the House. Because authorizing such a large and important agency requires a thoughtful and thorough approach, H.R. 878

should have gone through regular order this Congress.

There are 10 new Members of Congress serving on the Committee on Homeland Security this Congress. Upending regular order, as the House Leadership is doing, effectively prevents my Committee and its newest members from applying the knowledge we acquired through oversight about CBP programs and activities to improving the legislation before us today.

Moreover, the text of the legislation in which these important provisions are included was just made available at midnight on Wednesday, and we are now considering it under a rule that does not allow for amendments. By limiting the ability of my Members to weigh in on the CBP Authorization provisions, even if only on the House floor, we are denied the opportunity to address changes that the Ways and Means Committee made to the text.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support authorizing U.S. Customs and Border Protection but am deeply disappointed that the fate of this non-controversial legislation, which was overwhelmingly approved by the 113th Congress on suspension, is now tied to controversial measures that the President may well veto. This, Mr. Speaker, is no way to legislate.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 212, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

YEAS—217

Abraham	Chaffetz	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Coffman	Ellmers (NC)
Allen	Cole	Emmer (MN)
Babin	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Fincher
Barr	Comstock	Fitzpatrick
Barton	Conaway	Fleischmann
Benishek	Connolly	Flores
Bilirakis	Cook	Forbes
Bishop (MI)	Cooper	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Fox
Black	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Blackburn	Crawford	Gibbs
Blumenauer	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Boehner	Cuellar	Granger
Bost	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Boustany	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (LA)
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Brooks (IN)	Delaney	Grothman
Buchanan	Denham	Guinta
Bucshon	Dent	Guthrie
Burgess	DeSantis	Hanna
Byrne	DesJarlais	Hardy
Calvert	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Carter (GA)	Dold	Hartzler
Carter (TX)	Donovan	Heck (NV)
Chabot	Duffy	Hensarling

Herrera Beutler	McMorris	Sanford
Hill	Rodgers	Scalise
Holding	McSally	Scott, Austin
Hudson	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
Huelskamp	Messer	Sessions
Huizenga (MI)	Mica	Shimkus
Hultgren	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Hunter	Miller (MI)	Simpson
Hurd (TX)	Moolenaar	Smith (MO)
Hurt (VA)	Mullin	Smith (NE)
Issa	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins (KS)	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Jenkins (WV)	Newhouse	Stefanik
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Stewart
Johnson, E. B.	Nugent	Stivers
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Jolly	Olson	Thornberry
Joyce	Palazzo	Tiberi
Katko	Paulsen	Tipton
Kelly (MS)	Pittenger	Trott
Kelly (PA)	Pitts	Turner
Kind	Poe (TX)	Upton
King (IA)	Poliquin	Valadao
King (NY)	Pompeo	Wagner
Kinzinger (IL)	Price, Tom	Walberg
Kline	Ratcliffe	Walden
Knight	Reed	Walker
LaMalfa	Reichert	Walorski
Lamborn	Renacci	Walters, Mimi
Lance	Ribble	Weber (TX)
Larsen (WA)	Rice (SC)	Wenstrup
Latta	Rigell	Westerman
LoBiondo	Roby	Westmoreland
Long	Roe (TN)	Whitfield
Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Williams
Love	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Womack
MacArthur	Rooney (FL)	Woodall
Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoder
Marino	Roskam	Young (AK)
McCarthy	Ross	Young (IA)
McCaul	Rouzer	Young (IN)
McClintock	Royce	Zeldin
McHenry	Russell	Zinke
McKinley	Ryan (WI)	

NAYS—212

Adams	DeGette	Israel
Aguilar	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Amash	DelBene	Jeffries
Ashford	DeSaulnier	Johnson (GA)
Bass	Deutch	Jones
Beatty	Dingell	Jordan
Becerra	Doggett	Kaptur
Bera	Doyle, Michael	Keating
Beyer	F.	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Duckworth	Kennedy
Blum	Duncan (SC)	Kildee
Bonamici	Edwards	Kilmer
Boyle, Brendan	Ellison	Kirkpatrick
F.	Engel	Kuster
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Labrador
Brat	Esty	Langevin
Bridenstine	Farr	Larson (CT)
Brooks (AL)	Fattah	Lawrence
Brown (FL)	Fleming	Lee
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Levin
Buck	Frankel (FL)	Lewis
Bustos	Franks (AZ)	Lieu, Ted
Butterfield	Fudge	Lipinski
Capps	Gabbard	Loehsack
Capuano	Gallego	Lofgren
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Carney	Garrett	Lowe
Carson (IN)	Gibson	Lujan Grisham
Cartwright	Gohmert	(NM)
Castor (FL)	Gosar	Lujan, Ben Ray
Castro (TX)	Graham	(NM)
Chu, Judy	Grayson	Lummis
Cicilline	Green, Al	Lynch
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	Maloney,
Clarke (NY)	Griffith	Carolyn
Clay	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Cleaver	Gutiérrez	Massie
Clyburn	Hahn	Matsui
Cohen	Harris	McCollum
Conyers	Hastings	McDermott
Costa	Heck (WA)	McGovern
Courtney	Hice, Jody B.	McNerny
Crowley	Higgins	Meadows
Cummings	Hinojosa	Meeks
Davis (CA)	Honda	Meng
Davis, Danny	Hoyer	Mooney (WV)
DeFazio	Huffman	Moore

Moulton	Rice (NY)	Speier	Conyers	Kelly (PA)	Price (NC)	Jenkins (KS)	Napolitano	Schakowsky
Mulvaney	Richmond	Stutzman	Cook	Kennedy	Quigley	Jenkins (WV)	Neal	Schiff
Murphy (FL)	Rothfus	Swalwell (CA)	Cooper	Kildee	Rangel	Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Schrader
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Takai	Courtney	King (IA)	Reichert	Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Napolitano	Ruiz	Takano	Cramer	King (NY)	Ribble	Jones	Norcross	Sherman
Neal	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Crawford	Kline	Roby	Jordan	Nugent	Sinema
Nolan	Rush	Titus	Crenshaw	Knight	Roe (TN)	Joyce	Palazzo	Sires
Norcross	Ryan (OH)	Tonko	Crowley	Kuster	Rogers (KY)	Kelly (IL)	Pallone	Slaughter
O'Rourke	Salmon	Torres	Cuellar	Labrador	Rokita	Kilmer	Paulsen	Smith (MO)
Pallone	Sánchez, Linda	Tsongas	Culberson	LaMalfa	Rooney (FL)	Kind	Payne	Stivers
Palmer	T.	Van Hollen	Cummings	Lamborn	Roskam	Kinzinger (IL)	Peters	Swalwell (CA)
Pascrell	Sanchez, Loretta	Vargas	Curbelo (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Ross	Kirkpatrick	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Payne	Sarbanes	Veasey	Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Rothfus	Lance	Pittenger	Thompson (PA)
Pearce	Schakowsky	Vela	Davis, Danny	Latta	Royce	Langevin	Poe (TX)	Tipton
Pelosi	Schiff	Velázquez	DeLauro	Lawrence	Ruiz	Lee	Poliquin	Tsongas
Perlmutter	Schrader	Visclosky	DelBene	Lipinski	Ruppersberger	Levin	Price, Tom	Turner
Perry	Schweikert	Walz	Dent	Loeb	Russell	Lewis	Ratcliffe	Valadao
Peters	Scott (VA)	Wasserman	DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Ryan (WI)	Lieu, Ted	Reed	Vargas
Peterson	Scott, David	Schultz	DesJarlais	Long	Salmon	LoBiondo	Renacci	Veasey
Pingree	Serrano	Waters, Maxine	Deutch	Loudermilk	Sanford	Love	Rice (NY)	Vela
Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Watson Coleman	Dingell	Lowenthal	Scalise	Lynch	Rice (SC)	Velázquez
Polis	Sherman	Webster (FL)	Doggett	Lowe	MacArthur	MacArthur	Richmond	Visclosky
Posey	Sinema	Welch	Donovan	Lucas	Schweikert	Maloney, Sean	Rigell	Walberg
Price (NC)	Sires	Wilson (FL)	Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Scott (VA)	Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Walden
Quigley	Slaughter	Yarmuth	Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Scott, Austin	Matsui	Rohrabacher	Walker
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Yoho	Emmer (MN)	(NM)	Scott, David	McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Watson Coleman
			Engel	Luján, Ben Ray	Sensenbrenner	McGovern	Rouzer	Weber (TX)
			Eshoo	(NM)	Serrano	Messer	Roybal-Allard	Wenstrup
			Esty	Lummis	Sessions	Miller (FL)	Rush	Wilson (FL)
			Farr	Maloney,	Shimkus	Moore	Sánchez, Linda	Wittman
			Fattah	Carolyn	Shuster	Mulvaney	T.	Woodall
			Fincher	Marino	Simpson	Murphy (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Yoder
			Fleischmann	Massie	Smith (NE)	Murphy (PA)	Sarbanes	Yoho
			Fortenberry	McCarthy	Smith (NJ)			
			Franks (AZ)	McCaul	Smith (TX)			
			Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Smith (WA)			
			Gabbard	McCollum	Speier			
			Gallego	McHenry	Stefanik			
			Goodlatte	McKinley	Stewart			
			Graham	McMorris	Stutzman			
			Granger	Rodgers	Takai			
			Grayson	McNerney	Takano			
			Grothman	McSally	Thornberry			
			Guthrie	Meadows	Tiberi			
			Hahn	Meehan	Titus			
			Hardy	Meng	Trott			
			Harper	Mica	Upton			
			Harris	Miller (MI)	Van Hollen			
			Hartzler	Moolenaar	Wagner			
			Heck (WA)	Mooney (WV)	Walorski			
			Hensarling	Moulton	Walters, Mimi			
			Higgins	Mullin	Wasserman			
			Hill	Nadler	Schultz			
			Himes	Newhouse	Waters, Maxine			
			Hinojosa	Noem	Webster (FL)			
			Hoyer	Nunes	Welch			
			Huelskamp	O'Rourke	Westerman			
			Huffman	Olson	Westmoreland			
			Hultgren	Palmer	Whitfield			
			Hurd (TX)	Pascrell	Williams			
			Hurt (VA)	Pelosi	Wilson (SC)			
			Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Womack			
			Johnson, Sam	Perry	Yarmuth			
			Jolly	Pingree	Young (IA)			
			Kaptur	Pocan	Young (IN)			
			Katko	Polis	Zeldin			
			Keating	Pompeo	Zinke			
			Kelly (MS)	Posey				

NOT VOTING—5

Amodei	Gowdy	Thompson (CA)
Clawson (FL)	Himes	

□ 1650

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. WALORSKI, Messrs. WITTMAN, BLUMENAUER, DELANEY, and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 172, answered “present” 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

AYES—239

Abraham	Bonamici	Carney
Adams	Boustany	Carson (IN)
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Carter (TX)
Allen	Brat	Cartwright
Barletta	Bridenstine	Castro (TX)
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Chabot
Becerra	Brooks (IN)	Chu, Judy
Bilirakis	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Bishop (GA)	Buchanan	Clay
Bishop (UT)	Bustos	Cleaver
Black	Butterfield	Cohen
Blackburn	Byrne	Cole
Blum	Calvert	Comstock
Blumenauer	Capps	Conaway

NOES—172

Aguilar	Coffman	Gibbs
Amash	Connolly	Gibson
Babin	Costa	Gosar
Barr	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Beatty	Davis, Rodney	Graves (LA)
Benishek	DeFazio	Graves (MO)
Bera	DeGette	Green, Al
Beyer	Delaney	Green, Gene
Bishop (MI)	Denham	Griffith
Bost	DeSantis	Guinta
Boyle, Brendan	Diaz-Balart	Gutiérrez
F.	Dold	Hanna
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Hastings
Brownley (CA)	Duffy	Heck (NV)
Buck	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Bushon	Ellison	Hice, Jody B.
Burgess	Farenthold	Holding
Capuano	Fitzpatrick	Honda
Cardenas	Fleming	Hudson
Cárdena	Flores	Huizenga (MI)
Castor (FL)	Forbes	Hunter
Chaffetz	Foxe	Israel
Clark (MA)	Fudge	Issa
Clarke (NY)	Garamendi	Jackson Lee
Clyburn	Garrett	Jeffries

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—21

Amodei	Ellmers (NC)	Ryan (OH)
Ashford	Foster	Thompson (CA)
Bass	Frankel (FL)	Tonko
Clawson (FL)	Gowdy	Torres
Collins (GA)	Grijalva	Walz
Collins (NY)	Meeks	Young (AK)
Doyle, Michael	Pearce	
F.	Pitts	

□ 1657

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1700

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY AND FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT PARTNERSHIP

(Mr. CURBELO of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CURBELLO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the newly announced partnership with Florida International University, a nationally respected institution of higher learning in my district, and Florida Power and Light.

FIU and FPL are working toward providing cleaner energy solutions to south Florida, something I wholeheartedly support. The project involves the installation of more than 5,700 solar panels on 23 canopy-like structures that will be constructed over the next few months in FIU's engineering center parking lot. Engineering students at FIU will directly monitor the amount of energy generated from these solar panels and the effects they have on the electricity grid that provides power for south Florida.

It was recently announced that FPL, which already is the largest generator of solar energy in Florida, is expected

to triple its presence in the business by 2016. Such an undertaking is only possible with talented and capable students, and I am glad to see FPL is helping to train a new generation of engineers that will create fresh solutions for our energy needs.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate FIU and FPL on their partnership and wish them success. I look forward to visiting the campus soon and seeing the progress being made.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this year's Defense Appropriations bill relies on adding an additional \$38 billion into the overseas contingency operations account, the OCO account. This budgeting gimmick is an end around to sequestration. It avoids the hard work that is required to reach a budget agreement and repeal sequestration once and for all. OCO funds are supposed to be used for war operations, and their use in the legislation misleads the American people.

The sequester cuts continue to have devastating impact on our schools, our Nation's infrastructure, and our investments in scientific research. Now is the time to fix this sequester, not deceive the American people about defense spending.

Our servicemembers and their families deserve to know their future more than just 1 year at a time. As a nation, we need to base our military strategy on an appropriate, long-term defense spending plan, not a budgetary gimmick.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for this legislation because we cannot leave our troops who are currently in harm's way without funding. As the appropriations process moves forward, I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to provide our military with the long-term support it needs and the American people with the transparency that they deserve.

IN MEMORY OF LOWELL ROBINSON

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in fond memory of a friend from Nevada County, Lowell Robinson, who is a community icon who passed away just recently at age 86.

Born in Nevada City in April 1929, his entrepreneurial career started in 1949 when he designed equipment for a local sawmill. A few years later, he began the logging business known as Robin-

son & Sons. In 1971, he helped establish Robinson Enterprises, which includes gold mining, road construction, logging, and petroleum distribution and sales.

Mr. Robinson was an active supporter, in many ways, of the Nevada County community. Indeed, he was a very kind gentleman, liked by everybody, and his legacy will be felt for many, many years in the work he did for helping United Way, FFA, 4-H, Boy Scouts. Just about anything worth doing, he was involved with in Nevada County, including my own personal travels.

This little old Indian Springs school still stands where he attended and his family owns. I hope some day they can renovate it in his honor.

So I join the community of Nevada County in mourning this loss, a great friend, a personal friend of mine who was always a kindhearted person whom you just got along great with. Our condolences go out to Wanda and his whole family.

ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY IS A SERIOUS MISCALCULATION

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have generally admired President Obama's bold foreign policy decisions. However, the administration's latest announcement to send an additional 450 U.S. military advisers to Iraq and to arm the Sunni tribes, the Shia forces, and the Kurdish Peshmerga, alike, is a grave misjudgment.

Arming the Sunni tribes could undermine Iraqi Prime Minister Abadi and the central government the U.S. is trying desperately to prop up. Sunni assistance may, in turn, push Iran to more aggressively arm their Shia militias in Iraq.

Worse still, arming the Shia fighters will further inflame Iraq's deep sectarian divide, which ISIS has exploited so skillfully. The Kurdish Peshmerga is perhaps the only reliable and ready force deserving of U.S. military assistance, but no amount of heavy weaponry will defeat ISIS without a concerted political settlement both in Baghdad and Damascus.

All of this comes just days after President Obama has said, yet again, we do not have a complete strategy to defeat ISIS in Iraq or Syria.

The U.S. has few palpable options when it comes to untangling the region's current chaos. However, the administration's current strategy "to arm everyone and let God sort them out" is a serious miscalculation.

FAST TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to address the issues that we will be voting on tomorrow: trade adjustment assistance and the trade promotion authority, or fast track.

I know that a number of my colleagues are within the sound of my voice, and I hope that if they share my views on these issues they will come down to the floor and invite me to yield them time. Until then, I am going to first focus on the trade adjustment assistance bill that will be before us tomorrow.

There are so many reasons to vote against trade adjustment assistance in this form, even if it was a freestanding bill. First, it is inadequate. It has got roughly \$450 million, and there is no assurance that that money will be available next year or the year after that.

We know that the majority of this House is actually opposed to funding this program at all. They are doing it in an effort to pass fast track. Once fast track is passed, every effort will be made on this floor to cut this program to zero. Bait and switch, you have been warned.

Second, this amount of money, who is supposed to be eligible? The proponents of fast track have said, well, we have expanded those who are eligible, not just those who lose their jobs because of the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal we are planning, not just those who lost their job because of NAFTA, but everybody who has lost their job because of globalization in any of its forms. Well, that is also a bait and switch.

They are able to tell tens of millions of Americans you are going to be eligible for this program, but the program has only \$450 million in it nationwide. So it is like you win because we give you a lottery ticket, and then we determine whether you will be one of the very small percentage of those who have lost their job due to globalization who benefit from the program.

This program is inadequate. It also explicitly contains language excluding any public sector employee from a benefit. Imagine that great unfairness. If you are at a public university and somehow grading of tests is offshored, you can't benefit. But if you are at a private university, same job, same offshoring, whether it be a call center or any of the other services that can be offshored in today's modern age, you could possibly—you are probably not going to get anything—but you can, at least, apply for a benefit.

The exclusion of the public sector may have made sense 40 or 50 years ago when only manufacturing jobs were subject to foreign competition. Today, anything that is done on the Internet,

anything that is done on the phone, anything that is part of the information economy is a job that can be taken offshore. It is going to be very difficult for Members of this House to explain that they voted for a program that slapped in the face those who lose their jobs because it is a public sector job.

The biggest problem with TAA is that it cuts Medicare two different ways. One way we are told is an acceptable way to cut Medicare, and the other we are told isn't going to really happen. It is actually two cuts to Medicare.

The first that they say they have ironed out is the \$700 million cut to Medicare that will, under the rule just passed in this House by a small majority, graft itself onto the Trade Adjustment Assistance bill if that bill unfortunately passes. So you will be in a position to explain why you voted for a bill, knowing full well that as soon as it passed, a \$700 million cut to Medicare was grafted on it and that the President would have on his desk and intended to sign a bill that cut Medicare by \$700 million.

Now, you can present a complicated chart showing how you voted for Trade Adjustment Assistance but you didn't vote for the rule, and the cut for Medicare was supposed to be undone by the other bill that you voted for before you voted against it. And if you are able to make that explanation, more power to you.

But if you are a Democrat, you will be in a particularly weak position to make that explanation, because the AFL-CIO issued a letter today that said a vote for Trade Adjustment Assistance in this form with this rule in this "here you see it, now you don't; we will take it away, don't worry about it" Medicare cut is a cut to Medicare. So you are going to be explaining why your opponent's attack on you is unfair when you are a Democrat and you say it is unfair, but the AFL-CIO says it is not only fair, it is absolutely true. A special problem for Democrats. Republicans will not have the difficulty in explaining why they disagree with the AFL-CIO.

Then there is a Medicare cut that is supposed to become law. This is the dialysis cut, and here is the thinking: Medicare will be more efficient in dealing with dialysis. We pass a statute that allows them to make use of clinics instead of hospitals. So through new procedures and new technology, Medicare will save roughly \$250 million.

Okay. Does Medicare keep that savings? No. It is used to buy votes for fast track.

Now, how is Medicare going to be sustained if every time new technology allows Medicare to save money, we take the savings and use it for something else, but every time new technology creates new medical costs, new

things for Medicare to pay for, well, Medicare has to pay for them?

If we establish a principle that every new technology that saves Medicare money is money to be spent on something else and every change in medical technology that increases Medicare's cost has to come out of Medicare, Medicare will be bankrupt and will go bankrupt more quickly as we change medicine.

□ 1715

That cut is supposed to become law if you vote for TAA, but TAA is on this floor for only one reason. It is a way to put a bandaid on a giant decapitation of the American middle class, a tiny program designed to facilitate the passage of a trade bill which will govern 40 percent of the world's GDP.

Don't be in enabler. Do not go back home and say you opposed fast track, but that you voted for the bill that will enable fast track. If you are against fast track, then you have got to vote "no" on TAA.

Well, what about fast track? What about this new Asia deal that is being negotiated? In the past, the proponents of these trade deals have come forward and said that they were going to reduce our trade deficit and create more jobs than will be lost.

For this deal, they don't even make that assertion. Their bait and switch is to say it will create some jobs in exports, but they are so arithmetically challenged, they don't then subtract out the jobs that will be lost to imports.

The fact is that time and again the proponents of our current trade policy have wildly misestimated the job effect of each action. For example, on this floor, we were told that the trade agreement with South Korea would reduce our trade deficit. That deficit has skyrocketed. We were told that permanent most favored nation status for China would increase our trade deficit by only \$1 billion. The proponents were off by 30,000 percent.

Now, they don't even say that we are going to get more jobs than we will lose; they simply say the jobs we lose don't count because that involves subtraction. The fact is that this is bad for the American middle class, as has our policy over the years.

Since NAFTA, we have hollowed out the middle class; we have hollowed out American manufacturing. Since NAFTA, we have had a stagnation of wages in this country. Now, as we begin to recover from the catastrophe of 2008, now, as there begins to be the possibility that employers are going to have to pay more in wages to compete for employees, we have a giant trade deal that guarantees that wages will decline or stagnate for another decade or longer.

The economics are against the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the fast track

that is designed to carry it, so there is a shift. The argument now is, well, it may be bad for our economy, but it is a great anti-China alliance, great geopolitics, disguised as a bad trade deal.

I have been on the Foreign Affairs Committee for 19 years. I am the ranking member on the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee. I am here to tell you this deal is not only bad economic policy; it is bad geopolitics as well.

Let's look at how China benefits from this deal. First and foremost, we are told that this deal is going to set the terms of trade in Asia. Then you go to the basement, and you look at this deal, and, as reported in the press, there is a statement that there will not be anything in this trade deal about currency manipulation.

China, if this deal goes forward, wins without even having to sign it. China gets a new approach to world trade, which is currency manipulation, go to it, it will be applauded, it will not be counted; but China gets something even more. Go deeper into the basement and look at the rule of origin provisions. Now, what are these rules of origin provisions?

You would think that under this deal, goods made in Vietnam, goods made in Japan, goods made in the other countries that are part of the deal come into our country duty free, that this deal benefits goods made in Japan, Vietnam, et cetera, but only to the countries that sign the deal.

Then you get down to the details, and you see that goods that are 50 or 60 percent made outside the countries that are parties to this deal, goods that are 50 or 60 percent made in China, are eligible to be fast-tracked into the United States with no tariffs and no limits, and goods where the manufacturer admits that it is 50 or 60 percent made in China may actually be 70 or 80 percent made in China.

Goods that are chiefly Chinese-made get the benefit of this agreement, with China not even having to sign it. Our trade deficit will balloon not only from goods that are really made in Japan and really made in Vietnam—and those are the two countries added to the free trade regime by this agreement; we already have free trade agreements with the others that are part of these Trans-Pacific Partnership; those are the two main countries—not only goods made in those countries, but goods that are just kind of polished in Vietnam, finished in Japan, but made in China.

We are told that this is part of some clever system to contain China when in reality, we established the international principle, the currency manipulation, the number one tactic of China to run up the largest trade deficit in history. We have the largest trade deficit; they have the largest trade surplus in history. That becomes the norm.

Then second, goods chiefly made in China, finished in Japan, get duty free into the United States.

But finally, think of what an insult it is to our men and women in uniform to be told that our allies in Asia are so disdainful of our help as they fight China over the islets that are in question, that we have to give away our jobs and enter into a bad trade deal just to have the honor of deploying our troops and our Navy to defend the islets claimed by Korea, Japan, and Vietnam.

You would think that the willingness of America to put its blood and treasure on the line to defend not only our allies, but even Vietnam, would be enough, not that we would be told that in order to have that honor, we have to enter into this trade agreement.

Finally—and, Mr. Speaker, I will end with this, there is the issue of admitting Vietnam into this deal. We are told that the purpose of this deal, the upside, is that we get free access to Vietnam's markets, free access to their markets. The only problem is Vietnam doesn't have freedom and it does not have markets.

This deal is great for Nike. They can manufacture shoes in Vietnam and pay 30–40 cents an hour. They can then add a few jobs in Oregon as they hire the marketing skill necessary to push off the shelves the last remnant of American-made shoes.

They can add some jobs in Oregon where they can find the tax lawyers to make sure that they don't pay any U.S. taxes on the enormous profit that you can get by making a shoe for 40 cents an hour and selling it for \$140. A few jobs, which will lead to pushing off the shelves all the American-made shoes. That is what we get on the import side.

The jobs we get are tax lawyers making sure that the importers don't pay any taxes. By the way, it has already been revealed that Nike will save several hundred million dollars in taxes on this, chiefly tariffs.

What access do we get for our exporters? Well, right now, Vietnam does have some tariffs. The tariffs go to the government. The entity paying the tariff is whoever is doing the exporting. Those importers are all owned and con-

trolled—or at least controlled—by the government.

Right now, if Vietnam imports anything from the United States, the Vietnamese Government pays itself a tariff. If this deal goes forward, that tariff will be lower, so they will pay themselves less. Paying themselves money is an irrelevancy.

We don't have access to the Vietnamese market just because Vietnamese Government-controlled or Vietnamese Government-owned enterprises will be paying a smaller tariff to the Vietnamese Government of which they are part to begin with.

Tariffs are not the limit on what we export to Vietnam. Vietnam makes a political decision, a nationwide economic planning decision which products to import to the United States. They are importing what they choose to import; they are not importing what they choose not to import, and they are going to keep doing it.

To assume that just because lowering tariffs means you sell more goods in the United States, means lowering tariffs, means you sell more goods in Vietnam, we are required to imagine that the Vietnamese economy, a communist economy, is just like ours. That is an absurd assumption.

The Vietnamese centrally planned economy will or will not import from the United States whatever they choose to. Their published tariffs are an irrelevancy. Their promise to change those tariffs is a promise to change an irrelevancy. We are a nation of free markets. When we change our public tariffs, that opens up our markets to all the tennis shoes that can be made for 40 cents an hour.

This is a terrible deal for the American people. It is part of a continued policy of what they call free trade. What America needs is fair trade. What America needs is to say that those who want access to the U.S. market must be willing to buy U.S. goods and services. What America needs is an understanding that we need results-oriented trade agreements.

We are in the deepest hole ever. We are the largest debtor nation in the world. We have the largest trade deficit in the world. We would expect that the

dollar will crash not this decade, but next decade. The first thing you do when you are in a hole that deep is to stop digging.

The first step is to stop this fast track. Then the next step is to deploy our trade negotiators with the power to say—the issue isn't whether we are going to lower our tariffs; we are a sovereign nation; we can increase our tariffs—if you want access to the U.S. market, everything is on the table, and a fair, balanced trade result is the requirement, if you want access to the one thing that the entire world wants, and that is access to the U.S. market.

I see no one seeking time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 11, 2015.

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO TRADE LEGISLATION

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates of the Fiscal Year 2016 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, S. Con. Res. 11, pursuant to section 4506 of such concurrent resolution. These revisions are designated for the following trade legislation: H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, and H.R. 1314, the Trade Act of 2015. Corresponding tables are attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of budgetary enforcement. These revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as the aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted.

Sincerely,
TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

TABLE 1—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES
BUDGET AGGREGATES
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year	
	2016	2016–2025
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,039,215	¹
Outlays	3,091,442	¹
Revenues	2,676,733	32,237,371
Adjustment for the amendment to the Senate amendment to HR 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015		
Budget Authority	20	¹
Outlays	20	¹
Revenues	–9	–1
Adjustment for HR 1314, the Trade Act of 2015		
Budget Authority	445	¹
Outlays	175	¹
Revenues	–42	–86

TABLE 1—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES—Continued

BUDGET AGGREGATES
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year	
	2016	2016–2025
Adjustment for the amendment to Senate amendment to HR 1295, the Trade Preference Extension Act of 2015		
Budget Authority	0	1
Outlays	0	1
Revenues	– 724	– 5,237
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,039,680	1
Outlays	3,091,637	1
Revenues	2,675,958	32,232,047

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2017–2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

House Committee on Ways and Means	2016		2016–2025 total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation:	962,805	962,080	13,224,077	13,222,960
Adjustment for the amendment to the Senate amendment to HR 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015	20	20	– 4	– 4
Adjustment for HR 1314, the Trade Act of 2015	445	175	– 174	– 174
Adjustment for the amendment to Senate amendment to HR 1295, the Trade Preference Extension Act of 2015	0	0	– 5,940	– 5,940
Revised Allocation:	963,270	962,275	13,217,959	13,216,842

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 12, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1803. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Institution Stockholder Voting Procedures (RIN: 3052-AC85) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1804. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Office of Policy and Program Development, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Descriptive Designation for Needle- or Blade-Tenderized (Mechanically Tenderized) Beef Products [Docket No.: FSIS-2008-0017] (RIN: 0583-AD45) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1805. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Financial Stability Oversight Council's 2015 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 112(a)(2)(N) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1806. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 15, 25, 27, 74, 78, 80, 87, 90, 97, and 101 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Implementation of the Final Acts of the World Radiocommunication Conference (Geneva, 2007)(WRC-

07), Other Allocation Issues, and Related Rule Updates [ET Docket No.: 12-338] (Proceeding Terminated) [ET Docket No.: 15-99] [IB Docket No.: 06-123] received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1807. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Natural Gas Act Pipeline Maps [Docket No.: RM14-21-000; Order No.: 801] received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1808. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cuban Assets Control Regulations; Terrorism List Governments Sanctions Regulations received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1809. A letter from the General Counsel, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting the Conference's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1810. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, during the period from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Pub. L. 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1811. A letter from the Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, and the Semiannual Management Report for the period ending March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of Pub. L. 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1812. A letter from the Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to Congress, of

the Office of Inspector General, for the period ending March 31, 2015, pursuant to Pub. L. 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1813. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, for the period of October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Pub. L. 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1814. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2015 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting [Docket No.: 14129999-5432-02] (RIN: 0648-BE74) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1815. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North and South Atlantic 2015 Commercial Swordfish Quotas [Docket No.: 150116050-5375-02] (RIN: 0648-XD726) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1816. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Aleutian Islands Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD920) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1817. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 140918791-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-XD908) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1818. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacktip Sharks, Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks, and Hammerhead Sharks in the Gulf of Mexico Region [Docket No.: 140429387-4971-02] (RIN: 0648-XD911) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1819. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gray Triggerfish [Docket No.: 120815345-3525-02] (RIN: 0648-XD901) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1820. A letter from the Controller, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution's Audited Financial Statements for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1102, Pub. L. 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices; with an amendment (Rept. 114-147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1615. A bill to direct the Chief FOIA Officer of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in the implementation of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1637. A bill to require annual reports on the activities and accomplishments of federally funded research and development centers within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2728. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 2729. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce to establish public-private partnerships under the Market Development Cooperator Program of the International Trade Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2730. A bill to establish the National Prostate Cancer Council for improved screening, early detection, assessment, and monitoring of prostate cancer, and to direct the development and implementation of a national strategic plan to expedite advancement of diagnostic tools and the transfer of such tools to patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KATKO, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2731. A bill to amend section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide increased accountability of nonprofit athletic associations and to establish a commission to identify and examine issues of national concern related to the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. ESTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 2732. A bill to provide for a grant program for handgun licensing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself and Mr. HARDY):

H.R. 2733. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2734. A bill to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to extend, enhance, and revise the provisions relating to collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children, to establish certain other protections for personal information of children and minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 2735. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require establishment of objective numerical recovery goals for removal of species from lists of endangered species and threatened species under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2736. A bill to provide for a Youth Mental Health Research Network; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TAKAI, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2737. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 2738. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to encourage and facilitate efforts by States and other transportation rights-of-way managers to adopt integrated vegetation management practices, including enhancing plantings of native forbs and grasses that provide habitats and forage for Monarch butterflies, native bees, and other native pollinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DENT, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 2739. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for coverage of oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the coverage provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BEYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BERA, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr.

LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PALONE, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BASS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SIREN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HIMES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 2740. A bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2741. A bill to provide a short-term disability insurance program for Federal employees for disabilities that are not work-related, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2742. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that military working dogs be retired in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2743. A bill to reauthorize the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. SABLON, and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 2744. A bill to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr.

HINOJOSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GALLEGGO, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 309. A resolution recognizing June 19, 2015, as this year's observance of the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 2730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 2732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 2733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 2735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I, section 8, clause 3, that grants Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 2736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the United States Congress shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes".

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 2738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 2739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This states that, "Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TURNER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SALMON, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 21: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 207: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 320: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 465: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 472: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 511: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 539: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 563: Mr. DONOVAN.
 H.R. 592: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 628: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 662: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 680: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 690: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 692: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 702: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 711: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 766: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 823: Mr. JEFFRIES.
 H.R. 825: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 845: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 850: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 879: Mr. PITTENGER and Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 881: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 918: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 921: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 923: Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 952: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 985: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. DUFFY.
 H.R. 986: Mr. TURNER and Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 999: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1192: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1197: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1202: Ms. BORDALLO and Mrs. TORRES.
 H.R. 1209: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FARR, and Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 1247: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 1301: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 1310: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1312: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 1321: Mr. HONDA, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1344: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1388: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 1411: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 1413: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. MENG, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. DONOVAN.
 H.R. 1462: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1475: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 1490: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 1500: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 1545: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1553: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1610: Mr. FLORES, Mr. BRUCE WESTERMAN, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 1624: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 1632: Mrs. TORRES.
 H.R. 1650: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1670: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1683: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 1684: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 1692: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 1742: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H.R. 1767: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 1768: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 1832: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1854: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1919: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 1941: Mr. KLINE and Ms. GRAHAM.
 H.R. 1942: Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 1950: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 1974: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 1977: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1994: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 2017: Mr. BARTON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BARR, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 2043: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 2050: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 2076: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 2128: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 2132: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 2193: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2216: Mr. POCAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2218: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 2233: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 2236: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 2295: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 2296: Mr. PETERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 2300: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 2311: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 2342: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2397: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 2400: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2403: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2404: Ms. MOORE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 2406: Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 2450: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2494: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2518: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 2523: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 2530: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. ESTY.
 H.R. 2545: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2555: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 2571: Mr. RUSH, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SALMON.
 H.R. 2590: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2627: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 2646: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 2647: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 2650: Mr. WOODALL.
 H.R. 2675: Mr. POSEY and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2689: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 2692: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 2694: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GALLEG0.
 H.R. 2698: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2716: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. PITTENGER.
 H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. GALLEG0.
 H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. WALZ, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. PITTENGER.
 H. Res. 12: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. COHEN.
 H. Res. 28: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
 H. Res. 54: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
 H. Res. 210: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H. Res. 214: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. NOLAN.
 H. Res. 232: Mr. COHEN.
 H. Res. 294: Mr. HONDA.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,
 12. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners, relative to Resolution No. R-455-15, urging Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 47, or similar legislation, supporting the establishment of a Presidential Youth Council; and urging President Obama's administration to establish a Presidential Youth Council; which was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: Mr. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 31: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. 2. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a flash-bang grenade under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: Mr. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 32: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE 2015 ARMED FORCES ENLISTEES FROM FREDERICKSBURG, VA

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 105 Fredericksburg, Virginia area high school seniors who plan to enlist in the United States Armed Forces after graduation. These students have excelled in their academic and extracurricular activities, and I offer my sincere congratulations upon their high school graduation.

I commend these student leaders for their selflessness and courageous decision to serve their country as members of the Armed Forces:

Amaya, Alexis Perez; Anderson, Jamie; Bates, Devon; Black, Sean; Bloesch, Charles; Coleman, Jaylan; Courtney, James; Cunningham, Christopher; Denise, Sean; Dixon, Tyler; Harcrow, Derek; Hardy, Diamond; Hughes, Hayden; Jenkins, Hunter; Lawrence, Darell; Lintz, Christopher; Lloyd, Katelyn; McHugh, Michael; Minaya, Jonathan; O'Carroll, Alexander; Pladson, Tyler; Post, Seth; Prouty, Justin; Raftery, Sean; Rivas, Michael; Shannon, Danielle; Smith, Jared; Smith, Justin; Steele, Brian; Stemen, Austein; Thomas, Sabre; Thornton, Destiny; Toussaint, Jamel; Wilson, Ashley; Yingling, Christopher.

Allen, Joshua; Bass, Elijah; Beard, Justin; Becerra, Luis; Bentz, Asher; Carter, Brandon; Clatterbuck, Zachary; Deleon, Elias; Dirisio, Daniel; Farr, Austin; Freeborn, Harley; Heath, Christopher; Holland, Elizabeth; Humberger, Jacob; Jenkins, Adam; Johnson, Nathaniel; Keirn, Ryan; Lewellyn, Benjamin; Mason, Garrett; McNair, Nicholas; Medinafranco, Tomas; Meyers, Tyler; Morris, Austin; Peck, Joshua; Perkins, Andrew; Phoebus, Scott; Pins, Jonathon; Principe, Leilani; Rigopoulos, Nicholas; Robleroyoc, Gerardo; Seggelink, Jacob; Shingler, Jonathan; Smith, David; Snider, James; Thome, Dominic; Torres, Everett; Vitale, Logan; Woodall, Mason.

Archer, Robert; Archie, Torrance; Belcher, Joshua; Dale, John Barron; Dillahunt, Zakiya; Duff, Cody; Flecker, Arthur; Gines, Dwayne; Glass, Samuel; Leach, Hunter; Moss, Shaygne; Norris, Seth; Smith, Jamie Le Ann; Tillmon, Sarah; Tran, Robinson; Truffer, Steven; Warren, Adam; Waters, Deja; Williams, Aaron.

Berry, Katie; Christensen-Dinwiddie, Joseph; Eldridge, Amber; Edivan, Joseph; Gilbert, Ryan; Harris, Brian; Kenly, Logan; Nordgren, Tycho; Rousseau, Teagan; Smith, Kayla; Szczepanski, Brittany; Valvo, Anthony; Wilkins, Kendrick.

These students will be honored by the Greater Fredericksburg Chapter of Our Community Salutes at their 4th Annual Military En-

listee Recognition Ceremony on Saturday, June 20, 2015 at the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, VA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these young men and women and their families for their dedication to serving this great Nation. We owe them and the many Americans who have served and will serve a debt of gratitude.

HONORING GRAHAM BOONE

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Graham Boone who has achieved the Eagle Scout award, a Boy Scout's highest honor. This recognition is well deserved and represents this young man's commitment to public service.

Achieving the status of Eagle Scout is a huge accomplishment, and I commend Mr. Boone for being a positive role model to young people across our great state and the nation through his commitment to community service.

Once again, congratulations to this young man for his outstanding accomplishment. I am very proud of him and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF
BENJAMIN BLYTHEWOOD III

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fine man and a friend, Benjamin Blythewood III. Ben passed away on Monday, June 1, 2015, at the age of 48.

Ben led an exemplary life that was dedicated to serving his community. As mayor of Woodville for six and a half years, a reliable member of our local Lion's Club, as well as that of countless other community organizations, Ben lived an inspiring life that was focused on helping and caring for others. Ben was also a proud Christian and a faithful member of the First Baptist Church of Woodville.

My prayers and condolences go out to Ben's loving wife, Amy, his son Benjamin and his daughter Bryanna. Ben will be sorely missed in our community, but his passion and legacy will certainly live on.

HONORING MR. NICK GWIAZDOWSKI FOR HIS OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT DURING THE 2014-15 NCAA DIVISION I WRESTLING SEASON

HON. DAVID ROUZER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, as a North Carolina State University alumnus, it is my pleasure to rise today to congratulate Nick Gwiazdowski on his 2015 NCAA Division I Individual National Championship. He defended his 2014 National Championship and is the first Wolfpack wrestler to win back-to-back titles.

Mr. Gwiazdowski has quickly established himself as one of the most successful student-athletes in NC State history. His perfect 2014-15 season, 35-0, has led to a 55-match winning streak, the longest in the nation entering next season. He is a three-time All-American and two-time ACC Wrestler of the Year.

Entering his senior year, Mr. Gwiazdowski holds a 77-2 record with the Pack and is on pace to set the NC State record for win-loss percentage. More importantly, Mr. Gwiazdowski is the H.C. Kennett Award Winner, presented annually to NC State's top student-athlete and was named to the 2015 All-ACC Academic Team.

Congratulations again, Nick. Wolfpack fans everywhere are proud of you and look forward to your continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT
OF FAYE PERKINS

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the coaching career of Faye Perkins, UW-River Falls Falcon softball coach. After 22 seasons, Coach Perkins retired at the end of the 2015 spring season.

During her tenure at UW-River Falls, Coach Perkins received numerous awards and accolades. She won more games than any other head coach in the history of UW-River Falls. Under her leadership, the UW-River Falls Falcons won Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (WIAC) Championships in 1993, 1994 and a Playoff Championship in 1993, 1994 and 2012. The 2012 team had a school record 34 wins and finished just one win away from reaching the NCAA Division III final eight Championship series. She was named the WIAC Coach of the Year in 1996 and had over 500 total career wins.

Faye was raised in Cresco, Iowa. She is a proponent of Title IX and has spoken on the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

benefits she experienced from this landmark legislation. While in high school, she petitioned to have a girls' basketball team for the first time. She went to Iowa State University, where she received a Bachelor of Science in Physical Education and a Master of Science in Exercise Physiology. While in college, she earned nine athletic letters as a member of the softball, basketball and track & field programs. In 2004, Faye was inducted into the Iowa State University Athletic Hall of Fame. She completed her Ph.D. in Health Education from the University of Utah.

While she is proud of the records established by the UW-River Falls Softball program, she is most proud of working with the students. Dedicated, passionate and supportive are just three of many adjectives used to describe Coach Perkins. In addition to coaching, Faye Perkins was the interim dean from 2007–2011 for the UW-River Falls College of Education and Professional Studies.

She has a passion not only for coaching and teaching, but also of traveling. Faye, her husband Joe, and their sons, Paul and Bobby, have enjoyed traveling the world. She has had the opportunity to teach in China and Scotland. She will continue teaching at UW-River Falls where she will remain the chair of the Health and Human Performance Department.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
REVEREND DR. RICHARD LIN

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of my constituent Anita Lin's loving father Reverend Dr. Richard Lin. Anita currently presides as the director emeritus of Ballet Western Reserve in Youngstown, Ohio and was appointed by the White House in 2014 to serve as a member of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts' advisory committee. Her dear father Dr. Lin passed away peacefully on May 21 in Santa Rosa, California. Dr. Lin was highly regarded within the community for his devotion to the performing arts and the teaching of music.

Born in Hunan Province, China in 1925 to humble beginnings, Richard Lin immigrated to the United States in 1952. Richard was very successful in his schooling having studied voice at the National Conservatory of Music in Shanghai before earning an undergraduate degree from the National Conservatory of Music in Paris. After performing in concert tours nationally and internationally, Richard went on to teach at the Oklahoma Baptist University for twelve years as a professor of music and chairman of the voice department before co-founding the Chinese Christian Church Music Institute for Worship. In addition, Dr. Lin was a senior professor of church music at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary where he touched the lives of thousands of church musicians. His achievements in teaching were recognized by the Association of Voice Teachers and American Choral Directors Association.

Dr. Lin is survived by his loving wife, Julia See Ying Lam Lin, with whom he shared sixty-five wonderful years. He also leaves behind his four children, eight grandchildren, and a great-granddaughter. I am deeply saddened by the passing of Reverend Dr. Richard Lin and I would like to extend my deepest condolences to his entire family. He was a great man whose legacy will continue to live on, and he will be missed.

CONGRATULATING THE AL WEST
COLLISION CENTER OF ROLLA

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Al West Collision Center of Rolla on their grand opening and ribbon cutting that took place on June 1st. Not only did they host a successful event kicking off the start of their business, but were able to raise money for local charities in the process.

Over 100 people gathered at the Al West Collision Center to celebrate their grand opening. The cornerstone of the event was a raffle to win a Dodge Challenger, with one hundred percent of the profit going to two local charities. The first charity the raffle benefited is the Association of United States Army Wounded Warriors which supports wounded and severely disabled Army veterans and their families in the Rolla area. The second charity, the Greater Rolla Area Charitable Enterprise, assists needy families in a variety of ways from providing them with food to even helping pay the bills. I'm proud of Missouri small businesses who give back to their community such as the Al West Collision Center.

For the money that was raised for local charities through their raffle, and to celebrate their recent grand opening, it is my pleasure to recognize the Al West Collision Center of Rolla before the House of Representatives and wish them the best of luck in their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 2015, I was unavoidably detained during a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on the following Roll Call votes: #309, on final passage of the Commodity End-User Relief Act and #329, on final passage of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016.

HONORING MS. ANNETTE GUMM

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ms. Annette Gumm, who, after years of service to Palm Beach County, is leaving the area. I speak for the citizens of Palm Beach County when I say that she will be greatly missed.

Ms. Gumm's public service in Florida began when she moved to Gleneagles in 1986 following an early retirement. She quickly became involved in her new community by volunteering with Plumosa Elementary School and Delray Community Hospital. In 1992, she was asked to join the campaign of Burt Aaronson; and, following his victory, she served as the Commissioner's administrative aide for several years.

Ms. Gumm also joined the Atlantic Democratic Club and was pivotal in transforming the organization into the United South County Democratic Club (USCDC). She has held several positions in USCDC, including Treasurer, Vice President, and President.

The amount of time and effort Ms. Gumm has expended for the betterment of her community is truly admirable and exhibits a level of passion worthy of recognition. It is with great pleasure that I honor, my dear friend, Annette Gumm.

IN HONOR OF REV. DR. BRITT
ARMANDO STARGHILL

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Rev. Dr. Britt Armando Starghill, a man who inspired South Jersey through his words and his selfless actions. Motivating youths to pursue academic careers and serving his church for 19 years, Armando was undoubtedly a champion for Camden, NJ and he will truly be missed by all.

Over the course of his career at Kaighn Avenue Baptist Church, Rev. Starghill's visionary leadership transformed practical ministry and his community. By connecting the church with area youths he was able to serve as a vital mentor to the community through services like hosting the Baccalaureate mass. He dedicated his entire life to serving others. Encouraging young adults in the city of Camden to attend college, Armando viewed education as the ultimate liberator for Camden's youth.

Rev. Starghill began preaching at the age of 13 and dedicated his entire life to service. After graduating from Virginia Union University, he went on to earn his doctorate from Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School, Rochester, NY. He then pursued a religious career and answered the call to serve wherever that led him. A social justice advocate, Rev. Starghill began a non-profit community development corporation to improve the socioeconomic environment for Camden's citizens.

By working on the Nehemiah Project, the Reverend attempted to combine a spiritual belonging in the Baptist Church with a sense of responsibility and pride in Camden's revitalization efforts.

Rev. Starghill was also a devoted husband and father. He was also revered by his parents, who are still living in Detroit, and he will be sorely missed by his sisters, brothers, and a host of other relatives.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Starghill was an incredible man, devoted to his family and dedicated to his community. He leaves behind a great legacy and I join the Camden community and the entire state of New Jersey in honoring the achievements and the life of this extraordinary man.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,768,664,619.57. We've added \$7,525,891,615,706.49 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

SPRINGSPIRIT BASEBALL

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I spent a recent hot, sunny day in my district visiting a real life "Field of Dreams." SpringSpirit Baseball near Houston, Texas in Spring Branch is providing opportunities for youth to realize their dreams through sports and mentoring.

SpringSpirit's mission is to provide safe pathways for youth to realize life opportunities through sports, education, and mentoring programs based on Christian principles. They create positive mentoring relationships between the education system and families through baseball, softball, soccer, and community programs.

It is a place that values integrity, patience, perseverance and respect for the individual.

SpringSpirit provides programs combined with the teaching of the gospel designed to grow the mind, body and soul, and they have a first-class sports training and education complex in the heart of the North Spring Branch community. They pair compassionate and caring mentors with local youth, and find life opportunities that can help participants contribute to their community and society and act as stewards for others.

Recently, I toured the facility with Executive Director John Meredith, Coach Ben Vigil and a man I like to call the "Mayor" of Spring Branch, Mr. Victor Alvarez.

I cannot express how impressed I was not only with the facility, but the passion each of these men brings to SpringSpirit Baseball. SpringSpirit grew from humble beginnings at the local Boys and Girls Club to a more than three acre state-of-the-art facility.

SpringSpirit was founded by Kenny Baldwin who after playing college baseball at Rice University and professional baseball spent many successful years in the oil and gas industry. He credits his success to strong coaches, loving mentors and faith leaders and wanted to create these same opportunities and relationships for underserved youth.

Fostering partnerships with the Cal Ripken, Sr. Foundation, Camp Ozark, Chapelwood United Methodist Church, Cornerstone Family Ministries, Baseball USA and Boys and Girls Club of Greater Houston among others, SpringSpirit can offer afterschool programs, summer camps, and baseball and soccer tournaments.

Among SpringSpirit's biggest fans are baseball greats Lance Berkman and Andy Pettitte. Berkman and Pettitte support SpringSpirit by serving as chairs of their annual fundraiser and if you drop by SpringSpirit at just the right time . . . you might be able to catch Lance mentoring some of the kids!

Kenny, John, and the entire staff at SpringSpirit Baseball should be commended for their selfless service to the community.

Their vision to build a superb facility, offer it to the youth of Spring Branch, and lead by example truly enriches our community and our city.

And that's just the way it is.

IN SUPPORT OF REAUTHORIZING THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for the House to bring H.R. 1031, the Promoting U.S. Jobs Through Exports Act for an immediate vote. This critical legislation would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, our nation's official export credit agency for the next seven years.

Currently, the Ex-Im Bank's charter will expire at the end of this month if immediate action is not taken. If Congress fails to do its job, hundreds of thousands of American jobs, including over 10,000 jobs in my district in Houston and Harris County, Texas may be lost to China, Japan, and other foreign competitors if we force Ex-Im to close its doors.

The Export-Import Bank, created 80 years ago during the depths of the Great Depression, has been authorized 16 times by Congress with overwhelming bipartisan majorities and has broad support from industry and labor for the very simple fact that it works.

In the past six years, Ex-Im has supported more than 1.3 million jobs and has returned over \$2 billion in deficit-reducing profits to the U.S. Treasury while providing over \$27 billion in export credit last year alone.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when foreign competition is becoming more fierce than ever be-

fore, with nations like China using any means necessary to win contracts in overseas markets, Congress must do everything in its power to support American small businesses and working families, including the immediate, long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

HONORING MR. LARRY FLYNN

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Larry Flynn for his contributions to the aerospace industry, General Dynamics and Gulfstream Aerospace, the largest private employer in the First District of Georgia.

Mr. Flynn's career spans 33 years, beginning in 1982 when he joined what was then known as Combs Gates and served as executive vice president and general manager. He later served as regional vice president for Signature Flight Support. His experience in managing aircraft service facilities led to his position as vice president, Location Based Services, for Stevens Aviation, where he was responsible for managing six service facilities and overseeing service on various models of corporate jets.

Mr. Flynn joined Gulfstream in 1995 as vice president and served in several key positions to include president of Product Support and senior vice president of Sales and Marketing. He became Gulfstream's president in 2011, and also served as a vice president of General Dynamics. During Mr. Flynn's tenure as president, Gulfstream achieved several significant milestones, including a seven-year, \$500 million Savannah facility expansion; the entry into service of the G280, the market-changing G650 and its extended-range variant, the G650ER; the unveiling of the G500; the announcement of the G600; the opening of the Beijing service center and the expansions of Gulfstream service centers in Brazil; London; Westfield, Massachusetts; and Brunswick, Georgia.

Mr. Flynn served on the Board of Directors of the General Aviation Manufacturers Association as chairman of the Communications Committee. He also served on the Board of Governors of The Wings Club. After earning a bachelor's degree in business administration from the University of Kansas, he completed a master's degree in manpower management from the same university.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join Mr. Flynn's colleagues, family and friends in celebrating his many years of hard work and dedication to the aerospace industry and the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed roll call votes 319,

320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329. If present, I would have voted "no" on roll call 319, "no" on roll call 320, "no" on roll call 321, "no" on roll call 322, "no" on roll call 323, "yea" on roll call 324, "no" on roll call 325, "yea" on roll call 326, "no" on roll call 327, "yea" on roll call 328, and "no" on roll call 329.

CELEBRATING D.C. FLAG DAY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating D.C. Flag Day, Sunday, June 14, 2015, which will be celebrated beginning this Saturday. All are invited to the fourth annual D.C. Flag Day Festival in Dupont Circle, celebrating the determination of the people of the District of Columbia to continue to fight for equal rights and statehood under the American flag. D.C. residents have struggled for equal rights since the city became the nation's capital in 1801. Although the city did not achieve home rule until 1973, D.C. finally got its own flag in 1938, when Congress commissioned a competition, and native Washingtonian Charles Dunn designed the current flag from the coat of arms of George Washington.

Thanks to the D.C. Flag Festival organizers, the event showcases everything that makes D.C. unique—our diverse communities, music, arts, food, and our D.C. flag—all of which will be on display for enjoyment and entertainment. However, on D.C. Flag Day, residents will rally not only for the American flag but also their flag, to show pride in their city and demand statehood. Residents began to celebrate D.C. Flag Day in 2011, and June 14 continues to serve as an important day to mark the quest for freedom and equal rights for the citizens of hometown Washington, D.C. D.C. Flag Day coincides with national Flag Day, which has been a national holiday since 1886, and inspired the organizers of D.C. Flag Day to celebrate the event locally in the District of Columbia.

At this weekend's D.C. Flag Day, we celebrate the District's own flag as well as the American flag. As residents show pride for our country and their hometown, they also continue to fight for the equal treatment the flag symbolizes. The American flag, our national symbol of patriotism and love of country, emboldens our continuous battle for self-government, voting rights, and statehood for the more than 650,000 taxpaying American citizens who live here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing D.C. Flag Day, its two-day celebration on June 13 and 14, and the organizers of the D.C. Flag Day celebration for their exemplary efforts to ensure equal rights for the citizens of the District of Columbia by creating pride in the city and promoting the city's rich cultural heritage.

COMMEMORATING THE 71ST ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY AND REMEMBERING THE MEMBERS OF THE GREATEST GENERATION WHO SAVED FREEDOM IN THE WORLD

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in humble gratitude to commemorate the 71st anniversary of D-Day, the Allied Forces' audacious amphibious landing at Normandy, France, on June 6, 1944.

"Operation Overlord," as D-Day was formally known, was the largest single amphibious assault in the history of warfare.

The success of D-Day, which was far from certain at the outset, led to the liberation of Western Europe, signaled the death knell of the German Wehrmacht, and paved the way to unconditional victory by the Allied Forces over the evils of Nazism, fascism, and Japanese imperialism.

It is no exaggeration to say that D-Day changed the course of human history.

The aim of the meticulously planned D-Day operation was to open a second front in the European war theater from which the Allied Forces could attack the German army and push east to capture Berlin.

With the Russian Army advancing from the east, coupled with the southern front opened by the Allied invasion of Italy from North Africa in 1942, the opening of a western front would set in motion the pincer movement that would catch the German Army in a trap from which there would be no escape.

The formidable German Army expected that the Allied Forces would try to launch an invasion from the western beaches of France, they just did not know when or where.

So in anticipation of an Allied invasion, the Nazis constructed the infamous Atlantic Wall, an extensive system of coastal fortifications built along the western coast of Europe and Scandinavia.

Under the direction of Field Marshal Rommel, the Atlantic Wall was reinforced by the addition of concrete pillboxes built along the beaches to house machine guns, antitank guns and light artillery.

Mines and antitank obstacles were planted on the beaches themselves and underwater obstacles and mines were placed in waters just off shore.

By the time of the D-Day landing, the Nazis had laid almost six million mines in northern France.

And awaiting Allied soldiers who made their way onto and away from the beaches were gun emplacements and minefields extended inland.

"War is hell," said General William Tecumseh Sherman during the Civil War.

And that is an apt description of what awaited the brave Allied warriors who set sail from England to the beaches of Normandy in the early morning of June 6, 1944, at the beginning of what has rightly been called "The Longest Day."

But they were buoyed in their resolve by the millions of prayers from Americans and others

back home, of all races, religions, and creeds, invoking the Lord's blessing, mercy, and grace.

With the outcome in doubt, President Franklin Roosevelt asked the nation to join him in this solemn prayer:

Almighty God: Our sons, pride of our nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity.

Lead them straight and true; give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness in their faith.

They will need Thy blessings.

For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace.

They fight not for the lust of conquest.

They fight to end conquest.

They fight to liberate.

They fight to let justice arise, and tolerance and goodwill among all Thy people.

They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home.

The prayers were needed because the cost of D-Day was high; U.S. casualties on D-Day totaled more than 2,499 dead, 3,184 wounded, 1,928 missing, and 26 captured.

Our British and Canadian allies suffered terrible losses on D-Day as well: approximately 2,700 for the British and 946 for the Canadians. German casualties are estimated at 4,000 to 9,000.

In total, the number of combatants killed, wounded or missing in the Battle of Normandy for both sides exceeded 425,000, not including the estimated 15,000 to 20,000 French civilians killed.

But the operation was a success.

More than 156,000 troops or paratroopers came ashore on D-Day, 73,000 from the U.S., 83,000 from Great Britain and Canada.

By the end of June 11, D-Day+5, 326,547 troops, 54,186 vehicles and 104,428 tons of supplies had come ashore.

And with them the seeds for the victory in Europe that would come less than a year later, on May 8, 1945, with the fall of Berlin and the unconditional surrender of the Nazis.

On the eve of the Normandy invasion, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces, addressed the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the Allied Expeditionary Forces and said to them that they were about to embark upon a "Great Crusade," and that the "eyes of the world" were upon you.

He told them that their task would not be easy because the "enemy is well trained, well equipped and battle-hardened. He will fight savagely."

But, General Eisenhower said, "this is the year 1944. The tide has turned. The free men of the world are marching together to victory."

And march to victory they did, fully justifying General Eisenhower's "confidence in their courage, devotion to duty, and skill in battle."

Because of the heroism of these men who willingly risked their lives to be the tip of the spear of liberty, the war was won and a world was saved for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, D-Day was, and remains, a day like no other in the history of man's sojourn on earth.

We remember Gettysburg.

There, President Lincoln paid tribute to those "who gave their lives so that the nation might live."

And it is equally fitting and proper that we remember D-Day.

And that we continue to honor those who risked all and gave all so that the world could remain free.

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. ROSE
OF LIMA CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 125th anniversary of St. Rose of Lima Catholic Church located in DeSoto, Missouri. St. Rose has been home to many life changing events for its parishioners and became a city landmark.

St. Rose Church was dedicated on June 21, 1885 in honor of St. Rose of Lima. Starting with just a few worshippers, it today has grown to over 550 registered and active families from the area who attend its services. Having hosted countless baptisms, weddings, and confirmations, St. Rose has long been a place for parishioners to celebrate life and their commitment to God. The church's stone walls, soaring tower, and beautiful stained-glass windows will continue to keep watch over the city of DeSoto and its people for years to come.

For the special place it holds in the hearts and lives of many in the community, as well as its place as a landmark in the city of DeSoto, it is my pleasure to recognize the 125th anniversary of St. Rose Church before the House of Representatives.

HONORING SUE DEWINE

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary accomplishments and career of Sue DeWine, President of Hanover College, located in Indiana's 6th District.

After more than 40 years in education, Sue became the first female President of Hanover College in 2007. During her tenure, overall enrollment at the college increased by 20% and campus diversity grew from 9% to 15%, where it currently stands. In addition to many other achievements, President DeWine made it possible for faculty and student representatives to serve on the Board of Trustees at the college. It's a move that helped solidify her reputation as leader who listened to and advocated for her students and faculty.

President DeWine will be retiring in the coming weeks, and she will be missed by all those whom worked with her. Her leadership touched the lives of thousands and her commitment to Hanover's students and faculty will never be forgotten. I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in thanking her for her long career and distinguished service.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF
JOÃO BOSCO MOTA AMARAL

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues Mr. NUNES and Mr. VALADAO to recognize the career of a distinguished Portuguese politician, and an old friend, João Bosco Mota Amaral. Mota Amaral, former President of the Autonomous Regional Government of the Azores, has devoted his life to serving the Azores and the Portuguese people. He deserves to be commended for his tireless work and service towards the advancement of Azorean and Portuguese interests.

Mota Amaral was born on April 15, 1943 in Ponta Delgada on the island of São Miguel in the Azores. He was a very diligent and studious individual, and graduated from the University of Lisbon in 1965 with a law degree. He also completed, with distinction, the Complementary Course of Political and Economic Sciences at the University of Lisbon in 1966, defending his thesis on the topic "Civil Liability of Public Administration."

Mota Amaral practiced law in Lisbon in the late 1960's, where he specialized in administrative and tax issues. He was then elected as Deputy to the National Assembly in 1969 and he championed issues important to the Azores. Following the Carnation Revolution of April 25, 1974, in which the authoritarian Estado Novo regime was overthrown, Mota Amaral emerged as a new political leader. He helped establish the Popular Democratic Party (PPD) later named the Social Democratic Party (PSD) in the Azores.

Shortly after the creation of the PPD, the question of autonomy for the Azores was outlined in the Party's principles. On November 8, 1974 Mota Amaral presented the Politico-Administrative Statute of the Autonomous Region of the Azores, lobbying for the archipelago to become an autonomous region within the context of the Portuguese Republic and governed by a Regional Assembly with elected members. This dream would come to fruition on April 2, 1976 when the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic was approved and the Azores achieved political autonomy.

Mota Amaral was elected to Parliament in 1976, but suspended the mandate in order to serve as the first President of the Government of the Azores. He subsequently won four more regional elections and served until 1995. Between 1995 and 2002, Mota Amaral served as the Vice-President of the National Assembly. In 2002, he was elected President of the National Assembly, a position he held until 2005.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that Mr. NUNES, Mr. VALADAO and I ask our colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize and honor the accomplishments of a great servant to the Azores and Portugal. João Bosco Mota Amaral has truly left a mark on the Azorean and Portuguese communities here in the U.S. and around the world, and we owe him our thanks and praise for advancing Azorean and Portuguese interests.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on several roll call votes and I would like to state my intentions on the following:

1. Roll Call No. 298—McClintock (R-CA), yes
2. Roll Call No. 299—Walberg (R-MI), yes
3. Roll Call No. 308—Esty (D-CT), no
4. Roll Call No. 301—Cartwright (D-PA), no
5. Roll Call No. 302—Garrett (R-NJ), yes
6. Roll Call No. 303—Brooks #1 (R-AL), yes
7. Roll Call No. 304—Brooks #2 (R-AL), yes
8. Roll Call No. 305—Capps (D-CA), no
9. Roll Call No. 307—Stivers (R-OH), yes

CONGRATULATING SHIRLEY
MAGAÑA ON A DISTINGUISHED
CAREER AND WELL-DESERVED
RETIREMENT

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Shirley Magaña on her retirement from Guthrie Corning Hospital.

Ms. Magaña has served as President and Chief Operating Officer of Corning Hospital since 2008. She has more than 35 years of experience in patient care and hospital operations.

Corning Hospital has blossomed under Ms. Magaña's leadership. During her tenure the hospital has expanded its operations and capabilities, allowing it to effectively serve the needs of our region. Ms. Magaña was instrumental in the building of a new 232,000 square foot facility; her fundraising efforts resulted in over \$5 million for the construction of the new hospital. This new state-of-the-art facility features a cancer treatment center and allows the hospital to provide lifesaving services and resources.

Ms. Magaña has worked tirelessly to better our local community. She is a member of the Corning Rotary Club and Corning Area Chamber of Commerce. She also serves as Co-Chair of the Fit & Strong Together Committee at Corning Hospital.

Throughout her distinguished career, Shirley Magaña has consistently provided exceptional medical care to those in need. She has positively impacted our local healthcare profession, and our neighbors are safer and healthier because of her years of dedicated service. I commend Ms. Magaña on a successful career and I wish her the very best in her well-deserved retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that yesterday, June 10, 2015, I incorrectly cast my vote in favor of the Country of Origin Labeling Act (H.R. 2393), Roll Call No. 333. I intended to vote "NO" on this legislation.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MISSOURI VETERANS HOME OF CAPE GIRARDEAU

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Missouri Veterans Home of Cape Girardeau. For the past 25 years, the administration and staff of the home have made the care of our nation's heroes their number one priority.

The Missouri Veterans Home of Cape Girardeau serves as a prominent asset to the well being of our veterans by providing them with medical care, counseling services, and documentation assistance they need and deserve. I am very proud of their service to the community of Cape Girardeau and the surrounding area.

For their tireless effort and devotion to serving our veterans in Missouri, it is my pleasure to recognize the 25th Anniversary of the Missouri Veterans Home of Cape Girardeau.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call number 326 I am recorded as a Nay. I would like to reflect my intention was to vote Yea.

RECOGNIZING THE QUAD COUNTY URBAN LEAGUE AND THE STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN TOMORROW'S SCIENTISTS, TECHNICIANS, AND MANAGERS AND PROJECT READY

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Quad County Urban League and the students participating in two of its important programs: Tomorrow's Scientists, Technicians, and Managers, and Project Ready.

For over twenty years, the Quad County Urban League has sponsored Tomorrow's Scientists, Technicians, and Managers in an effort to inspire young minority students to pursue their goals. Over 1,800 students have benefited from the tutoring, workshops, college visits, and guest speakers provided by the program. Students who have completed the program maintain excellent grade point averages, receive thousands of dollars in scholarships, and contribute countless hours giving back to their community.

More recently, the Quad County Urban League has introduced Project Ready, a program with the goal of familiarizing minority students and their families with the college decision making process. By introducing concepts like college admissions and financial aid early on, Project Ready prepares a path for strong academic students to pursue post-secondary STEM Education.

Congratulations to the Quad County Urban League and the students who have participated in these rigorous programs. Real differences are being made in our communities because of programs like Tomorrow's Scientists, Technicians, and Managers, and Project Ready.

RECOGNIZING THE PUERTO RICAN FAMILY INSTITUTE

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an organization that has evolved into an important anchor in both New York City and in Puerto Rico. The Puerto Rican Family Institute (PRFI) provides a wide range of critical social and health services, strengthening our neighborhoods.

For some of our youngest neighbors, PRFI operates 35 Head Start centers located in Brooklyn, the Bronx and San Juan, Puerto Rico. 1,396 children benefit from this initiative, which provides pre-school children of low-income families a comprehensive child development program to meet their educational, emotional, social, health and nutritional needs. In addition, the Institute operates four full-day Universal Pre-K classrooms serving over 60 children in Brooklyn and the Bronx.

On the other end of the age spectrum, PRFI is equally committed to caring for the seniors in our community. The Life Line Center for Latino Seniors is based at the Brooklyn Mental Health Clinic, and offers seniors counseling, assistance with obtaining financial entitlements, referrals for medical services, food stamp assistance, as well as group and peer support.

Mental health services are also part of PRFI's portfolio. The Children's Intensive Case Management Program targets assistance to emotionally disturbed children in need of clinical case management and supervision. In addition PRFI runs a center helping emotionally disturbed adolescents, and provides adult supportive services to homeless mentally ill individuals. 1,128 clients benefit from this service, making it the largest in our state.

Housing assistance is made available to developmentally disabled individuals through PRFI's quality community based residential services, which aims to provide skills that will enable program beneficiaries to live as independently as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on. From health services, to nutritional programs, PRFI helps meet the needs of ten thousand families and children residing in New York and Puerto Rico. The assistance offered extends well beyond the Latino community reaching individuals of all backgrounds. What all of PRFI's programs have in common is that they provide a helping hand to some of our most vulnerable neighbors. Whether it is the senior citizen struggling to get by on a fixed income, a low-income family endeavoring to raise children or a developmentally disabled person wanting to lead a richer life, PRFI harnesses the strengths of our community to assist them.

BULK DATA COLLECTION TRAMPLES OUR RIGHTS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the unrestricted and unconstitutional bulk data collection program started by the NSA represents the worst of the Washington Machine.

A recent poll shows that a majority of Americans agree.

The government should not have the authority to collect information without first obtaining a warrant. Period.

Our Founders feared a government powerful enough to commit unreasonable searches and seizures, so they crafted the Fourth Amendment to protect our right to privacy.

Though technology has evolved and continues to do so, the Constitution remains the same.

Gone are the days where Americans use their cellphones exclusively for phone calls and text messages.

Many people also use their phones for daily activities from tracking their steps to logging their finances or inputting what they ate that day.

The Fourth Amendment protects our phone conversations, our emails, our texts, our Internet history, our bank statements and more.

The NSA bulk-collection program tramples our rights.

Recently, the 2nd U.S. Court of Appeals deemed this bulk collection of data illegal.

Now, some members of Congress are trying to pass a law that allows this illegal surveillance to continue, and I will not stand for it.

The House of Representatives recently passed the USA Freedom Act, which makes some steps to limit data collection under Section 215 of the Patriot Act; however, the bill does nothing to limit government spying under Section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act.

Contrary to claims that the House bill would "end bulk surveillance," the truth is it would not.

The NSA uses Section 702 as a means to gather not only data, but actual content of

communications—content of your phone calls, texts and emails. Section 702 is more intrusive than Section 215.

In the course of this collection, the content of American citizens, many of whom have done nothing wrong or illegal, is also collected.

Current law allows law enforcement to then search through this data for information and they can do so without a warrant.

Reverse-targeting of American citizens is inconsistent with the Constitution and must stop now.

Opponents of civil liberties will argue that these mass invasions of privacy will make us safer.

Americans should not have to give up their constitutional rights for national security.

Casting too wide of a collection net for intelligence can be a distraction from the analysis necessary to stop plots and—to counter terrorism.

Let's be clear: The NSA should keep close watch on suspected terrorists to keep our country safe.

But before invading the privacy of American citizens, a warrant must and can be obtained in a timely manner.

Programs that permit due process and are held accountable by an open court will serve as a just way to collect intelligence.

The sacrifice of our personal liberty for security is and will forever be a false choice.

I have introduced several pieces of legislation that would restrain the federal government: This legislation includes H.R. 2233, the End Warrantless Surveillance of Americans Act. H.R. 2233 would prohibit warrantless searches of government databases for information that pertains to U.S. citizens. It would also forbid government agencies from mandating or requesting "back doors" into commercial products that can be used for surveillance.

This legislation mirrors an amendment that was offered to the USA Freedom Act, which was backed by a broad bipartisan coalition, including members of Congress and outside groups across the political spectrum.

The fight for NSA reform is ongoing, and I will continue to stand up and defend the Bill of Rights.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING TIM SBRANTI ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize a great teacher, mentor, and friend, Tim Sbranti, as he retires after 17 years of public school teaching.

Since 1978, Tim has been a resident of our shared hometown, Dublin, California. Tim's service to Dublin started early, serving as student body president at Dublin High School and on the Parks and Community Service Commission.

After graduating from California State University, Sacramento, Tim returned to his

hometown to teach and coach at his high school alma mater. I was fortunate enough to have Tim as my economics teacher, mock trial advisor, and tennis coach. As an educator, Tim encouraged me and countless other young people to help our community and go into public service. Over the past 17 years, few people have shaped the lives and inspired more youth in Dublin than Tim Sbranti.

Tim's advocacy for public education reached beyond Dublin. He worked as the chair of the California Teachers Association's Political Involvement Committee and led Californians Dedicated to Education. Beyond education, Tim has committed himself to working in all areas to better our local community. I was honored to serve with Tim when he and I were members of the Dublin City Council. Tim served on the City Council from 2002 to 2006, and as Dublin's mayor, from 2008 and 2014.

While always putting his hometown first, Tim has also been active in advancing opportunity in the greater Tri-Valley area. Tim has served as a board member of the Tri-Valley Housing and Opportunity Center, Dublin Historical Preservation Association, and Las Positas College Foundation. And, he is a past president of the Dublin Lions Club.

I am honored today to have the opportunity to publicly recognize Tim's many years of teaching and contributions to our shared hometown and the Tri-Valley.

HONORING BURNEY STARKS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize a leader in Tucson's community who dedicated his life to serve others.

Mr. Starks was a 1969 graduate of Pueblo High School, a proud Pueblo Warrior. In 1974 he graduated with honors from the University of Arizona where he also played football for the Wildcats. He then earned a Master's degree from Troy University. He was also known for his skills as an actor and singer. He appeared onstage in productions such as "Driving Miss Daisy" and "Look Ma, We're Dancing," as well as many others. Mr. Starks also sang with the True Devotion Motown Revue.

Mr. Starks was a U.S. Army veteran. He went on active duty as an Army officer and had tours of duty in Georgia, Indiana, Missouri and South Korea. Following his initial active duty tour he returned to Tucson where he hosted a TV talk show called "Looking Black" and worked for Tucson Unified School District. He returned to active duty in 1981 and retired from the military service in 1996 at the rank of Major. After leaving active duty he worked for the Tucson Urban League and returned to Tucson Unified School District. Mr. Burney Starks was known as the long time educator at Pueblo High School, a school counselor specializing in dropout prevention. He instilled in the minds of those who didn't believe in themselves that they could accomplish anything they set their minds to, that nothing was out of reach as long as they wanted it enough and were willing to work towards it. Mr. Starks

was also known for the many community activities he was a part of and in some cases was the driving force for. Burney served on the boards of the Tucson Arizona Boys Chorus, the Dunbar Coalition, the America Israel Friendship League, the Southern Arizona Academic Decathlon, the Pueblo Warrior Alumni Foundation and as President of the Board of the Tucson Juneteenth Festival Committee. He also served as Lieutenant Governor for Kiwanis International where he had been a member for 35 years; He was past commander in the Military Order of the World Wars and past president in the Reserve Officers Association.

He is survived by his wife Ruth M. Starks, 5 children Benjamin S., Burnes O. III, Elizabeth M., Bryan M., and Rebekah R.

Burney has 9 siblings: Gary E., Daryl D., Terry L., Charles G., Donna R., Harry J., Jacqueline B., Larry D., and Timothy B.

Burney Starks has left a legacy which he will be remembered for and honored for years to come.

IN HONOR OF ELIJAH "SONNY" SINGLETON, JR.

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincere condolences and to honor the memory of Elijah "Sonny" Singleton, Jr., for his achievements, contributions, and service to his community as a loving father and pillar of civic engagement.

Elijah Singleton spent his life serving his community as a teamster, putting the needs of others before his own. Elijah was also active as a member of his local union, imparting the importance of citizenship to his children at an early age. He taught them the value of a day's work and to appreciate life's gifts and opportunities.

His monumental example was the inspiration for his son, Troy, who now serves in the New Jersey General Assembly. Pursuing a life of service and following the lessons of his father, Troy once remarked that his father never looked for short cuts because true success only comes as a result of hard work and diligence.

Mr. Speaker, Elijah Singleton's dedication to family, community, and public service was evident. As a family man, he constantly surrounded himself with those he cared for, and no one worked harder or loved more passionately than Elijah. He is survived by two devoted sons, Troy and Derrick, and six adoring grandchildren. I join the South Jersey community and the State of New Jersey in honoring the life and accomplishments of this great man.

HONORING FRANK NASH

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Frank Nash from Ironton, Missouri for his academic success and service to our community.

Frank has set a wonderful example of hard work and a dedication to serve others. Now an Eagle Scout, Frank has earned nine Eagle Palms since he started as a Tiger Cub with the Boy Scouts. For his Eagle Scout project, Frank built tables and chairs for senior adults at his church to use. He also built a flower box to decorate the First Baptist Church of Pilot Knob's sign.

He is the salutatorian of his graduating class and has already earned more than 40 college credits through his high school's advanced placement program. He will be attending the University of Missouri-Kansas City in the fall where he is interested in studying neurology.

On April 1, Frank was notified that he was the sole recipient of the National Eagle Scout Association's \$25,000 United Health Foundation college scholarship. This scholarship, which receives more than 5,000 applications each year, is awarded to a student who plans to pursue a career in healthcare and is willing to reinvest their skills in an under-served community. Frank has also received scholarships from the Hagan Foundation and the Elks National Foundation. It comes as no surprise that his hard work, both in the community and the classroom, have paid off.

Frank is a role model for all Missouri students and it is my pleasure to recognize his efforts and accomplishments before the House of Representatives.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF MASTER SERGEANT
TAUTALAGIA "TUNI" SOTOA
NUMERA

**HON. AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN
RADEWAGEN**

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Master Sergeant Tantalagia Sotoa Numera, or known to his family and friends simply as "Tuni", who passed away on June 1 at the age of 86.

Tuni was born on February 27, 1929, in Pago Pago, American Samoa to parents, Tauga and Siao Numera. Following his childhood on the islands, and at the young age of 23, Tuni enthusiastically fulfilled his childhood dream of serving in our nation's armed forces and joined the U.S. Marine Corps.

During Tuni's 27 years of service in the Marine Corps, he would fight in two wars and serve 8 total combat tours. Tuni saw his first action in Korea, but it wouldn't be his last . . . not by a long shot.

Master Sergeant Numera served 7 combat tours in the jungles of Vietnam. During his first

tour in Vietnam, Tuni was wounded in combat for which he received the Purple Heart. While this would be more than enough sacrifice to one's nation for even the toughest and most patriotic of soldiers, it wasn't for Tuni. He would return to those jungles where he was initially wounded, 6 more times. When once asked by a friend "why did you serve 7 tours in Vietnam?" he replied . . . "I was looking for the guy that shot me during my first tour." This is a perfect example of just how much of a true Leatherneck he was.

Master Sergeant Numera was awarded numerous decorations during his career in the Marines, including: the Navy & Marine Corps Medal, the Bronze Star, and of course the Purple Heart, with a Gold Star, which is the equivalent of two Purple Hearts.

Known for his irresistible smile and grand sense of humor, Tuni was always at the center of whatever was going on and always had a kind word or helping hand to those who needed it.

Tuni also enjoyed a number of recreational activities, including fishing, bowling, playing poker, watching westerns, and TV shows like Walker Texas Ranger.

Perhaps the only things that Tuni loved more than his country were his faith in God and his beautiful family. Tuni is survived by his wife, Eleanor; children, Zina, Trinidad, Cynthia, Anthony, Jeffrey, Michael, Elena, and Christina; "adopted sons," Vincent, and Mike; 26 grandchildren, and 15 great-grandchildren. This man was obviously very loved by all who knew him and we all mourn their loss.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to join me recognizing the lifelong service and dedication to our nation that was exemplified by Master Sergeant Numera and honor him by continuing to uphold those values that we cherish as Americans and for which Tuni dedicated his life.

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Immigrant Heritage Month and salute the contributions of immigrants to the never ending glory and story of America.

I stand in solidarity with our immigrant soldiers who have fought to defend and extend our freedoms from the shores of the Atlantic to the Pacific, in the deserts of Africa and the jungles of Asia, to the seas of the Persian Gulf.

I stand in solidarity with our immigrant innovators and entrepreneurs who make up over 40 percent of the CEO of the Fortune 500 companies, which employ over 3 million of our fellow citizens.

And I stand in solidarity with the children of our immigrants who will be an integral part of our nation's future achievements.

This is why I have consistently introduced legislation such as H.R. 1525, "Save America Comprehensive Immigration Act of 2013," which sets forth a comprehensive and humane solution to immigrant reform.

This legislation works to secure our borders and brings close to 12 million illegal immigrants out of the shadows of society through earned access to legalization.

Our country has made progress because of the work and determination of immigrants and we owe it to them and ourselves to maintain a system that allows immigrants to prosper within our borders through approved legal processes.

In 1884 a Serbian immigrant name Nikola Tesla worked with American innovator Thomas Edison and would later contribute to the development of the alternating-current electrical system.

A son of an immigrant slave, Benjamin Banneker would grow up to be a scientist, surveyor, and author; these pioneers of their fields have helped advance the American economy through innovation.

We are a more prosperous nation because of the contributions from immigrants who helped build this country, but we have not done enough.

President Obama has used his executive powers to provide more resources for border security, modernizing the legal immigration system for workers, employers, and students, and focusing enforcement on the real threats to security.

Although more remains to be done to realize the full promise of the America dream for many immigrants, we continue to fight for those who are already contributing members of their communities to ensure there is a safe and legal path to the ultimate goal of full citizenship.

The unity of families is an essential American value and should be one of the fundamentals of immigration reform, along with increasing the diversity of immigration from parts of the world that have been historically underrepresented such as the Caribbean, Africa, and Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, my district is home to the most racially and ethnically diverse metropolitan area in the nation, and as a result I celebrate our immigrant leaders such as Texas Representative Hubert Vo, born in South Vietnam, graduate of the University of Houston, and now public servant for the people of District 149.

I celebrate Joseph Pulitzer a Hungarian immigrant soldier who served in the Civil War under the Union Army whose contributions would leave a legacy of literary excellence; Hakeem Olajuwon a Nigerian native and celebrated athlete of Houston who led the Houston Rockets to the NBA championship in 1994 and 1995, and the countless others who have made significant impacts that have advanced our nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to acknowledge the achievements of just a few of the countless Americans who have braved the seas and sands to build a new life in America and enrich the cultural tapestry of the greatest nation on earth.

I recognize that our nation would not enjoy the freedoms we have today without the dedication and hard work of our immigrant ancestors and we owe it to them to work on a more comprehensive immigration reform.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SHORT-TERM DISABILITY INSURANCE ACT OF 2015

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Federal Employee Short-Term Disability Insurance Act of 2015, which will help provide financial relief for federal employees who have a short-term injury or disability, become pregnant, or develop a pregnancy-related illness. This bill will offer federal employees short-term disability insurance at no cost to the federal government. Employees will be responsible for 100 percent of the premiums, and will be able to receive disability insurance benefits for up to one year that would replace a portion of their lost income due to a non-work related injury, illness, or pregnancy. These benefits will be particularly beneficial to ensure that our federal employees, who do not yet enjoy paid maternity leave, are able to utilize the 12 weeks of unpaid maternity leave permitted by federal law while continuing to pay their bills, buy groceries, and make their mortgage, car, and other loan payments without having to deplete their retirement or other savings accounts. Too many federal employees do not take advantage of federal unpaid maternity leave because they have no way to replace the lost income.

I decided to investigate how we could provide short-term disability insurance for federal employees after learning that many of them al-

ready buy short-term disability insurance as individuals in the private market at high individual rates. Although federal employees have good health insurance, federal health benefits do not replace lost income if employees are unable to work. Moreover, while federal employees may have available sick or annual leave days, they may not have enough such days to pay the bills if they have to be out of work for an extended period. Although there are long-term disability options for federal employees who become permanently disabled, federal employees do not qualify for such benefits until they have worked for the federal government for at least 18 months. My bill does no more than put federal employees in the same position as their private-sector counterparts, who have access to disability insurance through an employer at group rates. This bill will not allow participating insurance companies to exclude persons based on pre-existing conditions. Because of the federal government's purchasing power, this bill will provide these benefits at a more competitive rate than is available if an employee sought such insurance as an individual.

According to the Social Security Administration, a 20-year-old worker has a one in four chance of becoming disabled by retirement age. The majority of disabilities are not caused by major accidents, but by conditions or illnesses, such as cancer or back injuries, according to the Council for Disability Awareness. There is every reason to allow our federal employees to take advantage of the federal government's group rates to obtain the most reasonable price if they choose to purchase short-term disability coverage on their own at no cost to the federal government.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

YUCAIPA HIGH SCHOOL WOMEN
SOFTBALL TEAM CIF SOUTHERN
SELECT DIVISION II CHAMPIONS

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the Yucaipa High School Women's Softball team for ending their season as California Interscholastic Federation Southern Section Division II champions. The team has been named the 2015 Cal-Hi Sports State Team of the Year.

The Thunderbirds have had a rewarding season with an incredible 31 wins. Last Friday, the ladies scored another victory when they beat the undefeated Mission Viejo high school at the final game in Irving, California. With dedication and commitment, the team, along with their head coach David Kivett, earned the title after an entire season of hard work.

In closing, I'd like to joyously congratulate the players: Alexis Avalos, Kaitlyn Alvarado, Annie Bakenhus, Brooke Bolinger, Brooke Brady, Skyler Burke, Keely Clark, Mallorie Cross, Jordan Green, Jordan Herron, Jazzy Lopez, Kayla Martin, Megan Martin, Kelly Martinez, Madyson Marvuli, Blayne Nelson, and Kora Shoemaker.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, June 12, 2015*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask today that You bless the Members of this assembly to be the best and most faithful servants of the people they serve. Purify their intentions that they will say what they believe and act consistently with their words.

Help them, indeed help us all, to be honest with themselves so that they will not only be concerned with how their words and deeds are weighed by others, but also with how their words and deeds affect the lives of those in need and those who look to them for support, help, strength, and leadership.

May all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. CON. RES. 54. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of the 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 615. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1568. An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

REMEMBERING STATE REPRESENTATIVE JOHN BUCKNER

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great public servant to the State of Colorado, State Representative John Buckner of Aurora, Colorado, who recently passed away.

I have had the honor of knowing John Buckner for the last 30 years. We first met in 1985 when we were both members of the first Leadership Aurora class sponsored by the Aurora Chamber of Commerce.

At that time, I was a small-business owner and John Buckner was an educator with the Cherry Creek School sys-

tem. I found John Buckner to always be soft-spoken, warm, and passionate about his dedicated leadership in public education.

State Representative John Buckner had that same passion in representing his constituents in the Colorado General Assembly, and his loss will be felt by our entire community.

FAST TRACK

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the simple truth is these trade agreements are destroying our middle class. They are causing millions of Americans in mining and manufacturing to lose their jobs, millions of others to lose wages and benefits. It now takes two or three jobs to earn the same kind of income that one used to be able to earn from one job before these trade agreements.

The fact is, over the last century, we built the strongest middle class in the history of this world with living wages and benefits and protections for health and safety and the environment; but with the emergence of these trade agreements, we are asking Americans to compete with countries who have little or none of these benefits. To compete, Americans would have to give up on all this progress, give up on the American Dream. That is what this is all about.

I have reviewed the TPP documents and, make no mistake about it, this is a race to the bottom. The time has come for Congress to say "no" to these agreements. The time has come to put an end to them. They have been negotiated in secret for the benefit of a few and kept from the public for the benefit of the few at the top of our economic ladder.

The fact is it is destroying the American Dream—the American economy, the middle class, and, with that, the American Dream.

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETICS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the National Collegiate Athletic Accountability Act introduced by my

friend and Penn State fellow alumnus, Congressman CHARLIE DENT.

Mr. Speaker, there is no secret that for years the NCAA has failed when it comes to following their own rules. It has certainly failed when it comes to unduly exerting their perceived powers over college athletics.

The bipartisan National Collegiate Athletics Accountability Act will ensure that the NCAA is held to the highest standard possible by providing much-needed accountability and reforms. The NCAA Act would prohibit universities from receiving title IV funds if they participate in athletic associations that do not implement and enforce specific rules related to student athletes' health, safety, education, and due process protections.

For far too long, we have seen the NCAA fail to protect the well-being of our student athletes, and this bipartisan legislation is a huge step in the right direction to help fix that.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bipartisan measure.

STOP TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE AND SAVE AMERICA'S ECONOMY

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, how many times will Congress pretend to be fooled by yet another job-killing trade agreement.

First, there was NAFTA. They told us it would create hundreds of thousands of jobs. Unfortunately, they neglected to say they would be south of the border, and they would be at the expense of American workers.

Then there was the WTO. We are going to level the playing field—yeah, it is at bargain-basement prices—and compete with Chinese workers at 25 cents an hour and unfair trade practices.

Now, the Obama administration has a new paradigm—Korea. "This is the model for the future. It is going to be great." We are already running larger trade deficits with Korea. We have already lost 50,000 jobs.

Now, the last, biggest, worst trade agreement—the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Ironically, a key vote will be over something called trade adjustment assistance. That is right; it is critical. We have to have that because hundreds of thousands or millions of Americans are going to lose their jobs, so we need to retrain them for McDonald's or other high-level jobs. Secondly, of course, the trade adjustment assistance is funded by cutting Medicare.

So this is the critical vote. Ironically, this is it. They have got the votes from corporate America and the Obama administration to jam this thing through unless we kill trade ad-

justment assistance. We can stop it here today and save America's economy.

BRINGING MILITARY WORKING DOGS HOME

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, the actions of the brave men and women in the military sacrifice so much for our country. Many of these soldiers on the front lines are aided by military working dogs who perform countless, dangerous actions on the battlefield. So it is easy to understand why there is a special bond that is formed between servicemembers and their military service dogs.

Currently, the Department of Defense is not required to bring these dogs home after they are retired, and this means veterans are often forced to spend their own money to transport them back to the United States for adoption. That is why I have introduced bipartisan legislation with my colleague, Congresswoman KYRSTEN SINEMA, that would fix this problem by ensuring that military working dogs are returned to the United States for adoption.

Mr. Speaker, there is a waiting list of over 1,200 people looking to adopt these canines, and ensuring that our troops and veterans can easily adopt these dogs honors their service and their partnership.

HONORING CHARLES "BOB" PROVINE, JR., ON HIS 95TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the service of Charles "Bob" Provine, Jr., on his 95th birthday today.

Originally born in Redwood City, California, Bob's family moved to the town of Antioch when he was 1 year old, initially living in a tent. After working with the U.S. Army as a civilian firefighter during his junior year in high school, he enlisted in the United States Army during the Second World War, serving with the 376th Infantry Regiment, 94th Division. During this time, Bob saw combat action in Germany and served in the occupation of Czechoslovakia and Germany, finally coming home to Antioch.

After serving our great Nation at war, Bob served his community in peace as a volunteer firefighter and, for many years, as a volunteer at the public library. Bob saw Antioch grow from 35,000 to over 100,000 people.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Bob Provine for his service to

his community and to our great Nation.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IN NEPAL

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to not only the human toll incurred by Nepal's earthquakes in April, but also atrocious exploitation occurring in the aftermath.

Recent news reports have revealed that criminal groups, some masquerading as relief workers, are luring young girls and boys across borders into brothels in India into forced prostitution or into forced labor. Some traffickers have put a price on these young ones' lives, offering \$500 per child.

It is truly sickening that these criminals are using the chaos and insecurity following an earthquake that claimed 8,000 lives to steal many more vulnerable lives. The United Nations and some NGOs estimate between 12,000 and 15,000 girls are trafficked from Nepal alone.

As a member of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, I have introduced legislation targeting the demand for sex trafficking. Those who sell and purchase these young lives must be brought to justice, and government must take action. Nepal's most vulnerable cannot and should not be forgotten.

HIGH-SPEED RAIL AND JOB TRAINING

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the importance of investing in our Nation's infrastructure. This is all about the future economy of this Nation and jobs, jobs, and jobs.

Today, we are living off the investments that our parents and our grandparents made generations ago. Let me give you an example of what we are trying to do in California.

A high-speed rail project is a great example of how you invest in the future. This project in California will create 20,000 jobs annually for the next 5 years, a fact important not only to California, but my district, which is economically challenged.

Workforce investment boards in my district and throughout the valley have dedicated resources to making sure that the local workforce is ready to build. Apprenticeship programs like these connect disadvantaged workers with good-paying jobs and boost the valley's economy.

The California high-speed rail project, which combines Federal,

State, and private sector investments, will ensure that our State transportation infrastructure is fit for the 21st century.

Here in our Nation's Capital, we need to provide the long-term funding for infrastructure across the Nation. That is what we need to do: to invest in our water projects and invest in our transportation projects. That is what we need for jobs in the 21st century.

ARMY'S 240TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Sunday marks the 240th birthday of the United States Army. Established on June 14, 1775, as the Continental Army, the U.S. Army faithfully protects American families.

I am grateful to represent Fort Jackson, the largest initial-entry training facility in the U.S. Army. Last month, I attended Fort Jackson's change of command, where I was honored to recognize Major General Bradley Becker and Brigadier General Roger Cloutier for their leadership and dedicated service.

As the son of an Army Air Corps Flying Tiger of the 14th Air Force and as the father of three sons currently serving in the South Carolina Army National Guard and myself as a veteran of the Army Reserve in the South Carolina Army National Guard, I am grateful to know firsthand of the competence and patriotism of our servicemembers.

Twenty-five years ago today, I visited the Berlin Wall and was denied entry into East Germany at the Brandenburger Gate. Now, more countries than ever live in freedom and democracy than in the history of the world due to the success of the U.S. military.

Today is the anniversary of President Ronald Reagan's proclamation, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall" in 1987, proving peace through strength.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

God bless the U.S. Army.

VOTE DOWN FAST TRACK

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today this Congress can be fast-tracked or it can take the right track. We can seek strong, new trade agreements that benefit American families, or we can continue to backtrack with the failed policies of the past.

In the Ways and Means Committee, in the Rules Committee, every attempt to make constructive improvements in

this fast-track bill have been side-tracked.

First, we ask that the foreign corporations not be given more rights than American corporations and taxpayer funds awarded by some private tribunal.

Second, we ask that the Administration, if it is such a good trade deal, that they be open with it. Tell us at least as much as the Vietnamese Politburo learned.

Third, I ask that they at least meet the environmental standards of the last Bush administration.

In each case, those amendments and all other constructive improvements were rejected.

Today, let's not backtrack. Let's not fast-track. Let's vote down this bill and have an opportunity to create a 21st century trade policy that meets the needs of our families and businesses.

□ 0915

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 305, I call up the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Trade Act of 2015".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Trade negotiating objectives.

Sec. 103. Trade agreements authority.

Sec. 104. Congressional oversight, consultations, and access to information.

Sec. 105. Notice, consultations, and reports.

Sec. 106. Implementation of trade agreements.

Sec. 107. Treatment of certain trade agreements for which negotiations have already begun.

Sec. 108. Sovereignty.

Sec. 109. Interests of small businesses.

Sec. 110. Conforming amendments; application of certain provisions.

Sec. 111. Definitions.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Application of provisions relating to trade adjustment assistance.

Sec. 203. Extension of trade adjustment assistance program.

Sec. 204. Performance measurement and reporting.

Sec. 205. Applicability of trade adjustment assistance provisions.

Sec. 206. Sunset provisions.

Sec. 207. Extension and modification of Health Coverage Tax Credit.

Sec. 208. Customs user fees.

Sec. 209. Child tax credit not refundable for taxpayers electing to exclude foreign earned income from tax.

Sec. 210. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

Sec. 211. Coverage and payment for renal dialysis services for individuals with acute kidney injury.

Sec. 212. Modification of the Medicare sequester for fiscal year 2024.

TITLE I—TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015".

SEC. 102. TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

(a) *OVERALL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.*—The overall trade negotiating objectives of the United States for agreements subject to the provisions of section 103 are—

(1) to obtain more open, equitable, and reciprocal market access;

(2) to obtain the reduction or elimination of barriers and distortions that are directly related to trade and investment and that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade;

(3) to further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines and procedures, including dispute settlement;

(4) to foster economic growth, raise living standards, enhance the competitiveness of the United States, promote full employment in the United States, and enhance the global economy;

(5) to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive and to seek to protect and preserve the environment and enhance the international means of doing so, while optimizing the use of the world's resources;

(6) to promote respect for worker rights and the rights of children consistent with core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 111(7)) and an understanding of the relationship between trade and worker rights;

(7) to seek provisions in trade agreements under which parties to those agreements ensure that they do not weaken or reduce the protections afforded in domestic environmental and labor laws as an encouragement for trade;

(8) to ensure that trade agreements afford small businesses equal access to international markets, equitable trade benefits, and expanded export market opportunities, and provide for the reduction or elimination of trade and investment barriers that disproportionately impact small businesses;

(9) to promote universal ratification and full compliance with ILO Convention No. 182 Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor;

(10) to ensure that trade agreements reflect and facilitate the increasingly interrelated, multi-sectoral nature of trade and investment activity;

(11) to recognize the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce;

(12) to take into account other legitimate United States domestic objectives, including, but not limited to, the protection of legitimate health or safety, essential security, and consumer interests and the law and regulations related thereto; and

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

(b) **PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.**—

(1) **TRADE IN GOODS.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade in goods are—

(A) to expand competitive market opportunities for exports of goods from the United States and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through the utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating tariff and nontariff barriers and policies and practices of foreign governments directly related to trade that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade; and

(B) to obtain reciprocal tariff and nontariff barrier elimination agreements, including with respect to those tariff categories covered in section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(2) **TRADE IN SERVICES.**—(A) The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding trade in services is to expand competitive market opportunities for United States services and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating barriers to international trade in services, such as regulatory and other barriers that deny national treatment and market access or unreasonably restrict the establishment or operations of service suppliers.

(B) Recognizing that expansion of trade in services generates benefits for all sectors of the economy and facilitates trade, the objective described in subparagraph (A) should be pursued through all means, including through a plurilateral agreement with those countries willing and able to undertake high standard services commitments for both existing and new services.

(3) **TRADE IN AGRICULTURE.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to agriculture is to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of agricultural commodities in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in bulk, specialty crop, and value added commodities by—

(A) securing more open and equitable market access through robust rules on sanitary and phytosanitary measures that—

(i) encourage the adoption of international standards and require a science-based justification be provided for a sanitary or phytosanitary measure if the measure is more restrictive than the applicable international standard;

(ii) improve regulatory coherence, promote the use of systems-based approaches, and appropriately recognize the equivalence of health and safety protection systems of exporting countries;

(iii) require that measures are transparently developed and implemented, are based on risk assessments that take into account relevant international guidelines and scientific data, and are not more restrictive on trade than necessary to meet the intended purpose; and

(iv) improve import check processes, including testing methodologies and procedures, and certification requirements, while recognizing that countries may put in place measures to protect human, animal, or plant life or health in a manner consistent with their international obligations, including the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (referred to in section 101(d)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(3)));

(B) reducing or eliminating, by a date certain, tariffs or other charges that decrease market opportunities for United States exports—

(i) giving priority to those products that are subject to significantly higher tariffs or subsidy regimes of major producing countries; and

(ii) providing reasonable adjustment periods for United States import sensitive products, in close consultation with Congress on such products before initiating tariff reduction negotiations;

(C) reducing tariffs to levels that are the same as or lower than those in the United States;

(D) reducing or eliminating subsidies that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or unfairly distort agriculture markets to the detriment of the United States;

(E) allowing the preservation of programs that support family farms and rural communities but do not distort trade;

(F) developing disciplines for domestic support programs, so that production that is in excess of domestic food security needs is sold at world prices;

(G) eliminating government policies that create price depressing surpluses;

(H) eliminating state trading enterprises whenever possible;

(I) developing, strengthening, and clarifying rules to eliminate practices that unfairly decrease United States market access opportunities or distort agricultural markets to the detriment of the United States, and ensuring that such rules are subject to efficient, timely, and effective dispute settlement, including—

(i) unfair or trade distorting activities of state trading enterprises and other administrative mechanisms, with emphasis on requiring price transparency in the operation of state trading enterprises and such other mechanisms in order to end cross subsidization, price discrimination, and price undercutting;

(ii) unjustified trade restrictions or commercial requirements, such as labeling, that affect new technologies, including biotechnology;

(iii) unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including restrictions not based on scientific principles in contravention of obligations in the Uruguay Round Agreements or bilateral or regional trade agreements;

(iv) other unjustified technical barriers to trade; and

(v) restrictive rules in the administration of tariff rate quotas;

(J) eliminating practices that adversely affect trade in perishable or cyclical products, while improving import relief mechanisms to recognize the unique characteristics of perishable and cyclical agriculture;

(K) ensuring that import relief mechanisms for perishable and cyclical agriculture are as accessible and timely to growers in the United States as those mechanisms that are used by other countries;

(L) taking into account whether a party to the negotiations has failed to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or has circumvented obligations under those agreements;

(M) taking into account whether a product is subject to market distortions by reason of a failure of a major producing country to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or by the circumvention by that country of its obligations under those agreements;

(N) otherwise ensuring that countries that accede to the World Trade Organization have made meaningful market liberalization commitments in agriculture;

(O) taking into account the impact that agreements covering agriculture to which the United States is a party have on the United States agricultural industry;

(P) maintaining bona fide food assistance programs, market development programs, and export credit programs;

(Q) seeking to secure the broadest market access possible in multilateral, regional, and bilateral negotiations, recognizing the effect that si-

multaneous sets of negotiations may have on United States import sensitive commodities (including those subject to tariff rate quotas);

(R) seeking to develop an international consensus on the treatment of seasonal or perishable agricultural products in investigations relating to dumping and safeguards and in any other relevant area;

(S) seeking to establish the common base year for calculating the Aggregated Measurement of Support (as defined in the Agreement on Agriculture) as the end of each country's Uruguay Round implementation period, as reported in each country's Uruguay Round market access schedule;

(T) ensuring transparency in the administration of tariff rate quotas through multilateral, plurilateral, and bilateral negotiations; and

(U) eliminating and preventing the undermining of market access for United States products through improper use of a country's system for protecting or recognizing geographical indications, including failing to ensure transparency and procedural fairness and protecting generic terms.

(4) **FOREIGN INVESTMENT.**—Recognizing that United States law on the whole provides a high level of protection for investment, consistent with or greater than the level required by international law, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding foreign investment are to reduce or eliminate artificial or trade distorting barriers to foreign investment, while ensuring that foreign investors in the United States are not accorded greater substantive rights with respect to investment protections than United States investors in the United States, and to secure for investors important rights comparable to those that would be available under United States legal principles and practice, by—

(A) reducing or eliminating exceptions to the principle of national treatment;

(B) freeing the transfer of funds relating to investments;

(C) reducing or eliminating performance requirements, forced technology transfers, and other unreasonable barriers to the establishment and operation of investments;

(D) seeking to establish standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation, consistent with United States legal principles and practice;

(E) seeking to establish standards for fair and equitable treatment, consistent with United States legal principles and practice, including the principle of due process;

(F) providing meaningful procedures for resolving investment disputes;

(G) seeking to improve mechanisms used to resolve disputes between an investor and a government through—

(i) mechanisms to eliminate frivolous claims and to deter the filing of frivolous claims;

(ii) procedures to ensure the efficient selection of arbitrators and the expeditious disposition of claims;

(iii) procedures to enhance opportunities for public input into the formulation of government positions; and

(iv) providing for an appellate body or similar mechanism to provide coherence to the interpretations of investment provisions in trade agreements; and

(H) ensuring the fullest measure of transparency in the dispute settlement mechanism, to the extent consistent with the need to protect information that is classified or business confidential, by—

(i) ensuring that all requests for dispute settlement are promptly made public;

(ii) ensuring that—

(I) all proceedings, submissions, findings, and decisions are promptly made public; and

(II) all hearings are open to the public; and
 (iii) establishing a mechanism for acceptance of *amicus curiae* submissions from businesses, unions, and nongovernmental organizations.

(5) **INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade-related intellectual property are—

(A) to further promote adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights, including through—

(i) ensuring accelerated and full implementation of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(15)), particularly with respect to meeting enforcement obligations under that agreement; and

(II) ensuring that the provisions of any trade agreement governing intellectual property rights that is entered into by the United States reflect a standard of protection similar to that found in United States law;

(ii) providing strong protection for new and emerging technologies and new methods of transmitting and distributing products embodying intellectual property, including in a manner that facilitates legitimate digital trade;

(iii) preventing or eliminating discrimination with respect to matters affecting the availability, acquisition, scope, maintenance, use, and enforcement of intellectual property rights;

(iv) ensuring that standards of protection and enforcement keep pace with technological developments, and in particular ensuring that rightholders have the legal and technological means to control the use of their works through the Internet and other global communication media, and to prevent the unauthorized use of their works;

(v) providing strong enforcement of intellectual property rights, including through accessible, expeditious, and effective civil, administrative, and criminal enforcement mechanisms; and

(vi) preventing or eliminating government involvement in the violation of intellectual property rights, including cyber theft and piracy;

(B) to secure fair, equitable, and nondiscriminatory market access opportunities for United States persons that rely upon intellectual property protection; and

(C) to respect the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, adopted by the World Trade Organization at the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar on November 14, 2001, and to ensure that trade agreements foster innovation and promote access to medicines.

(6) **DIGITAL TRADE IN GOODS AND SERVICES AND CROSS-BORDER DATA FLOWS.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to digital trade in goods and services, as well as cross-border data flows, are—

(A) to ensure that current obligations, rules, disciplines, and commitments under the World Trade Organization and bilateral and regional trade agreements apply to digital trade in goods and services and to cross-border data flows;

(B) to ensure that—

(i) electronically delivered goods and services receive no less favorable treatment under trade rules and commitments than like products delivered in physical form; and

(ii) the classification of such goods and services ensures the most liberal trade treatment possible, fully encompassing both existing and new trade;

(C) to ensure that governments refrain from implementing trade-related measures that impede digital trade in goods and services, restrict cross-border data flows, or require local storage or processing of data;

(D) with respect to subparagraphs (A) through (C), where legitimate policy objectives

require domestic regulations that affect digital trade in goods and services or cross-border data flows, to obtain commitments that any such regulations are the least restrictive on trade, non-discriminatory, and transparent, and promote an open market environment; and

(E) to extend the moratorium of the World Trade Organization on duties on electronic transmissions.

(7) **REGULATORY PRACTICES.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the use of government regulation or other practices to reduce market access for United States goods, services, and investments are—

(A) to achieve increased transparency and opportunity for the participation of affected parties in the development of regulations;

(B) to require that proposed regulations be based on sound science, cost benefit analysis, risk assessment, or other objective evidence;

(C) to establish consultative mechanisms and seek other commitments, as appropriate, to improve regulatory practices and promote increased regulatory coherence, including through—

(i) transparency in developing guidelines, rules, regulations, and laws for government procurement and other regulatory regimes;

(ii) the elimination of redundancies in testing and certification;

(iii) early consultations on significant regulations;

(iv) the use of impact assessments;

(v) the periodic review of existing regulatory measures; and

(vi) the application of good regulatory practices;

(D) to seek greater openness, transparency, and convergence of standards development processes, and enhance cooperation on standards issues globally;

(E) to promote regulatory compatibility through harmonization, equivalence, or mutual recognition of different regulations and standards and to encourage the use of international and interoperable standards, as appropriate;

(F) to achieve the elimination of government measures such as price controls and reference pricing which deny full market access for United States products;

(G) to ensure that government regulatory reimbursement regimes are transparent, provide procedural fairness, are nondiscriminatory, and provide full market access for United States products; and

(H) to ensure that foreign governments—

(i) demonstrate that the collection of undisclosed proprietary information is limited to that necessary to satisfy a legitimate and justifiable regulatory interest; and

(ii) protect such information against disclosure, except in exceptional circumstances to protect the public, or where such information is effectively protected against unfair competition.

(8) **STATE-OWNED AND STATE-CONTROLLED ENTERPRISES.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding competition by state-owned and state-controlled enterprises is to seek commitments that—

(A) eliminate or prevent trade distortions and unfair competition favoring state-owned and state-controlled enterprises to the extent of their engagement in commercial activity, and

(B) ensure that such engagement is based solely on commercial considerations, in particular through disciplines that eliminate or prevent discrimination and market-distorting subsidies and that promote transparency.

(9) **LOCALIZATION BARRIERS TO TRADE.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to localization barriers is to eliminate and prevent measures that require United States producers and service providers to

locate facilities, intellectual property, or other assets in a country as a market access or investment condition, including indigenous innovation measures.

(10) **LABOR AND THE ENVIRONMENT.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to labor and the environment are—

(A) to ensure that a party to a trade agreement with the United States—

(i) adopts and maintains measures implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)) and its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(6)),

(ii) does not waive or otherwise derogate from, or offer to waive or otherwise derogate from—

(I) its statutes or regulations implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)), in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, where the waiver or derogation would be inconsistent with one or more such standards, or

(II) its environmental laws in a manner that weakens or reduces the protections afforded in those laws and in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, except as provided in its law and provided not inconsistent with its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(6)) or other provisions of the trade agreement specifically agreed upon, and

(iii) does not fail to effectively enforce its environmental or labor laws, through a sustained or recurring course of action or inaction, in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party after entry into force of a trade agreement between those countries;

(B) to recognize that—

(i) with respect to environment, parties to a trade agreement retain the right to exercise prosecutorial discretion and to make decisions regarding the allocation of enforcement resources with respect to other environmental laws determined to have higher priorities, and a party is effectively enforcing its laws if a course of action or inaction reflects a reasonable, bona fide exercise of such discretion, or results from a reasonable, bona fide decision regarding the allocation of resources; and

(ii) with respect to labor, decisions regarding the distribution of enforcement resources are not a reason for not complying with a party's labor obligations; a party to a trade agreement retains the right to reasonable exercise of discretion and to make bona fide decisions regarding the allocation of resources between labor enforcement activities among core labor standards, provided the exercise of such discretion and such decisions are not inconsistent with its obligations;

(C) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to promote respect for core labor standards (as defined in section 111(7));

(D) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to protect the environment through the promotion of sustainable development;

(E) to reduce or eliminate government practices or policies that unduly threaten sustainable development;

(F) to seek market access, through the elimination of tariffs and nontariff barriers, for United States environmental technologies, goods, and services;

(G) to ensure that labor, environmental, health, or safety policies and practices of the parties to trade agreements with the United States do not arbitrarily or unjustifiably discriminate against United States exports or serve as disguised barriers to trade;

(H) to ensure that enforceable labor and environment obligations are subject to the same dispute settlement and remedies as other enforceable obligations under the agreement; and

(I) to ensure that a trade agreement is not construed to empower a party's authorities to undertake labor or environmental law enforcement activities in the territory of the United States.

(11) CURRENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to currency practices is that parties to a trade agreement with the United States avoid manipulating exchange rates in order to prevent effective balance of payments adjustment or to gain an unfair competitive advantage over other parties to the agreement, such as through cooperative mechanisms, enforceable rules, reporting, monitoring, transparency, or other means, as appropriate.

(12) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

(13) WTO AND MULTILATERAL TRADE AGREEMENTS.—Recognizing that the World Trade Organization is the foundation of the global trading system, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the World Trade Organization, the Uruguay Round Agreements, and other multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements are—

(A) to achieve full implementation and extend the coverage of the World Trade Organization and multilateral and plurilateral agreements to products, sectors, and conditions of trade not adequately covered;

(B) to expand country participation in and enhancement of the Information Technology Agreement, the Government Procurement Agreement, and other plurilateral trade agreements of the World Trade Organization;

(C) to expand competitive market opportunities for United States exports and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, through the negotiation of new WTO multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements, such as an agreement on trade facilitation;

(D) to ensure that regional trade agreements to which the United States is not a party fully achieve the high standards of, and comply with, WTO disciplines, including Article XXIV of GATT 1994, Article V and V bis of the General Agreement on Trade in Services, and the Enabling Clause, including through meaningful WTO review of such regional trade agreements;

(E) to enhance compliance by WTO members with their obligations as WTO members through active participation in the bodies of the World Trade Organization by the United States and all other WTO members, including in the trade policy review mechanism and the committee system of the World Trade Organization, and by working to increase the effectiveness of such bodies; and

(F) to encourage greater cooperation between the World Trade Organization and other international organizations.

(14) TRADE INSTITUTION TRANSPARENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to transparency is to obtain wider and broader application of the principle

of transparency in the World Trade Organization, entities established under bilateral and regional trade agreements, and other international trade fora through seeking—

(A) timely public access to information regarding trade issues and the activities of such institutions;

(B) openness by ensuring public access to appropriate meetings, proceedings, and submissions, including with regard to trade and investment dispute settlement; and

(C) public access to all notifications and supporting documentation submitted by WTO members.

(15) ANTI-CORRUPTION.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the use of money or other things of value to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any improper advantage in a manner affecting trade are—

(A) to obtain high standards and effective domestic enforcement mechanisms applicable to persons from all countries participating in the applicable trade agreement that prohibit such attempts to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any such improper advantage;

(B) to ensure that such standards level the playing field for United States persons in international trade and investment; and

(C) to seek commitments to work jointly to encourage and support anti-corruption and anti-bribery initiatives in international trade fora, including through the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, done at Paris December 17, 1997 (commonly known as the “OECD Anti-Bribery Convention”).

(16) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT AND ENFORCEMENT.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to dispute settlement and enforcement of trade agreements are—

(A) to seek provisions in trade agreements providing for resolution of disputes between governments under those trade agreements in an effective, timely, transparent, equitable, and reasoned manner, requiring determinations based on facts and the principles of the agreements, with the goal of increasing compliance with the agreements;

(B) to seek to strengthen the capacity of the Trade Policy Review Mechanism of the World Trade Organization to review compliance with commitments;

(C) to seek adherence by panels convened under the Dispute Settlement Understanding and by the Appellate Body to—

(i) the mandate of those panels and the Appellate Body to apply the WTO Agreement as written, without adding to or diminishing rights and obligations under the Agreement; and

(ii) the standard of review applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreement involved in the dispute, including greater deference, where appropriate, to the fact finding and technical expertise of national investigating authorities;

(D) to seek provisions encouraging the early identification and settlement of disputes through consultation;

(E) to seek provisions to encourage the provision of trade-expanding compensation if a party to a dispute under the agreement does not come into compliance with its obligations under the agreement;

(F) to seek provisions to impose a penalty upon a party to a dispute under the agreement that—

(i) encourages compliance with the obligations of the agreement;

(ii) is appropriate to the parties, nature, subject matter, and scope of the violation; and

(iii) has the aim of not adversely affecting parties or interests not party to the dispute while maintaining the effectiveness of the enforcement mechanism; and

(G) to seek provisions that treat United States principal negotiating objectives equally with respect to—

(i) the ability to resort to dispute settlement under the applicable agreement;

(ii) the availability of equivalent dispute settlement procedures; and

(iii) the availability of equivalent remedies.

(17) TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws are—

(A) to preserve the ability of the United States to enforce rigorously its trade laws, including the antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard laws, and avoid agreements that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies, or that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international safeguard provisions, in order to ensure that United States workers, agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions; and

(B) to address and remedy market distortions that lead to dumping and subsidization, including overcapacity, cartelization, and market access barriers.

(18) BORDER TAXES.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding border taxes is to obtain a revision of the rules of the World Trade Organization with respect to the treatment of border adjustments for internal taxes to redress the disadvantage to countries relying primarily on direct taxes for revenue rather than indirect taxes.

(19) TEXTILE NEGOTIATIONS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in textiles and apparel articles are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of textiles and apparel in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in textiles and apparel.

(20) COMMERCIAL PARTNERSHIPS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an agreement that is proposed to be entered into with the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership countries and to which section 103(b) will apply, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding commercial partnerships are the following:

(i) To discourage actions by potential trading partners that directly or indirectly prejudice or otherwise discourage commercial activity solely between the United States and Israel.

(ii) To discourage politically motivated actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel and to seek the elimination of politically motivated nontariff barriers on Israeli goods, services, or other commerce imposed on the State of Israel.

(iii) To seek the elimination of state-sponsored unsanctioned foreign boycotts against Israel or compliance with the Arab League Boycott of Israel by prospective trading partners.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term “actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel” means actions by states, non-member states of the United Nations, international organizations, or affiliated agencies of international organizations that are politically motivated and are intended to penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or in Israeli-controlled territories.

(21) GOOD GOVERNANCE, TRANSPARENCY, THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF LEGAL REGIMES, AND THE RULE OF LAW OF TRADING PARTNERS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United

States with respect to ensuring implementation of trade commitments and obligations by strengthening good governance, transparency, the effective operation of legal regimes and the rule of law of trading partners of the United States is through capacity building and other appropriate means, which are important parts of the broader effort to create more open democratic societies and to promote respect for internationally recognized human rights.

(c) **CAPACITY BUILDING AND OTHER PRIORITIES.**—In order to address and maintain United States competitiveness in the global economy, the President shall—

(1) direct the heads of relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to work to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to carry out obligations under trade agreements by consulting with any country seeking a trade agreement with the United States concerning that country's laws relating to customs and trade facilitation, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical barriers to trade, intellectual property rights, labor, and the environment; and

(B) to provide technical assistance to that country if needed;

(2) seek to establish consultative mechanisms among parties to trade agreements to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environment and human health based on sound science;

(3) promote consideration of multilateral environmental agreements and consult with parties to such agreements regarding the consistency of any such agreement that includes trade measures with existing environmental exceptions under Article XX of GATT 1994; and

(4) submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate an annual report on capacity-building activities undertaken in connection with trade agreements negotiated or being negotiated pursuant to this title.

SEC. 103. TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY.

(a) **AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF BARRIERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Whenever the President determines that one or more existing duties or other import restrictions of any foreign country or the United States are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President—

(A) may enter into trade agreements with foreign countries before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c); and

(B) may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), proclaim—

(i) such modification or continuance of any existing duty,

(ii) such continuance of existing duty free or excise treatment, or

(iii) such additional duties, as the President determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any such trade agreement.

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) **NOTIFICATION.**—The President shall notify Congress of the President's intention to enter into an agreement under this subsection.

(3) **LIMITATIONS.**—No proclamation may be made under paragraph (1) that—

(A) reduces any rate of duty (other than a rate of duty that does not exceed 5 percent ad

valorem on the date of the enactment of this Act) to a rate of duty which is less than 50 percent of the rate of such duty that applies on such date of enactment;

(B) reduces the rate of duty below that applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreements or a successor agreement, on any import sensitive agricultural product; or

(C) increases any rate of duty above the rate that applied on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) **AGGREGATE REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.**—

(A) **AGGREGATE REDUCTION.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty on any article which is in effect on any day pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the aggregate reduction which would have been in effect on such day if—

(i) a reduction of 3 percent ad valorem or a reduction of $\frac{1}{10}$ of the total reduction, whichever is greater, had taken effect on the effective date of the first reduction proclaimed under paragraph (1) to carry out such agreement with respect to such article; and

(ii) a reduction equal to the amount applicable under clause (i) had taken effect at 1-year intervals after the effective date of such first reduction.

(B) **EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.**—No staging is required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a duty reduction that is proclaimed under paragraph (1) for an article of a kind that is not produced in the United States. The United States International Trade Commission shall advise the President of the identity of articles that may be exempted from staging under this subparagraph.

(5) **ROUNDING.**—If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of reductions under paragraph (4), the President may round an annual reduction by an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between the reduction without regard to this paragraph and the next lower whole number; or

(B) $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent ad valorem.

(6) **OTHER LIMITATIONS.**—A rate of duty reduction that may not be proclaimed by reason of paragraph (3) may take effect only if a provision authorizing such reduction is included within an implementing bill provided for under section 106 and that bill is enacted into law.

(7) **OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.**—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B), (3)(A), (3)(C), and (4) through (6), and subject to the consultation and layover requirements of section 115 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3524), the President may proclaim the modification of any duty or staged rate reduction of any duty set forth in Schedule XX, as defined in section 2(5) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(5)), if the United States agrees to such modification or staged rate reduction in a negotiation for the reciprocal elimination or harmonization of duties under the auspices of the World Trade Organization.

(8) **AUTHORITY UNDER URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT NOT AFFECTED.**—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority provided to the President under section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(b) **AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF AND NON-TARIFF BARRIERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—(A) Whenever the President determines that—

(i) 1 or more existing duties or any other import restriction of any foreign country or the United States or any other barrier to, or other distortion of, international trade unduly burdens or restricts the foreign trade of the United States or adversely affects the United States economy, or

(ii) the imposition of any such barrier or distortion is likely to result in such a burden, restriction, or effect,

and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President may enter into a trade agreement described in subparagraph (B) during the period described in subparagraph (C).

(B) The President may enter into a trade agreement under subparagraph (A) with foreign countries providing for—

(i) the reduction or elimination of a duty, restriction, barrier, or other distortion described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the prohibition of, or limitation on the imposition of, such barrier or other distortion.

(C) The President may enter into a trade agreement under this paragraph before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c).

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) **CONDITIONS.**—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(3) **BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.**—(A) The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (in this title referred to as "trade authorities procedures") apply to a bill of either House of Congress which contains provisions described in subparagraph (B) to the same extent as such section 151 applies to implementing bills under that section. A bill to which this paragraph applies shall hereafter in this title be referred to as an "implementing bill".

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) if changes in existing laws or new statutory authority are required to implement such trade agreement or agreements, only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement or agreements, either repealing or amending existing laws or providing new statutory authority.

(c) **EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL PROCESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in section 106(b)—

(A) the trade authorities procedures apply to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) before July 1, 2018; and

(B) the trade authorities procedures shall be extended to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) after June 30, 2018, and before July 1, 2021, if (and only if)—

(i) the President requests such extension under paragraph (2); and

(ii) neither House of Congress adopts an extension disapproval resolution under paragraph (5) before July 1, 2018.

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.**—

If the President is of the opinion that the trade authorities procedures should be extended to implementing bills described in paragraph (1)(B), the President shall submit to Congress, not later than April 1, 2018, a written report that contains a request for such extension, together with—

(A) a description of all trade agreements that have been negotiated under subsection (b) and the anticipated schedule for submitting such agreements to Congress for approval;

(B) a description of the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title, and a statement that such progress justifies the continuation of negotiations; and

(C) a statement of the reasons why the extension is needed to complete the negotiations.

(3) OTHER REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(A) REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The President shall promptly inform the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The Advisory Committee shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains—

(i) its views regarding the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(ii) a statement of its views, and the reasons therefor, regarding whether the extension requested under paragraph (2) should be approved or disapproved.

(B) REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The President shall promptly inform the United States International Trade Commission of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The International Trade Commission shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains a review and analysis of the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements implemented between the date of the enactment of this Act and the date on which the President decides to seek an extension requested under paragraph (2).

(4) STATUS OF REPORTS.—The reports submitted to Congress under paragraphs (2) and (3), or any portion of such reports, may be classified to the extent the President determines appropriate.

(5) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTIONS.—(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term “extension disapproval resolution” means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the _____ disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 103(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, of the trade authorities procedures under that Act to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) of that Act after June 30, 2018.”, with the blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress.

(B) Extension disapproval resolutions—

(i) may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of such House; and

(ii) shall be referred, in the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules.

(C) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to extension disapproval resolutions.

(D) It is not in order for—

(i) the House of Representatives to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules;

(ii) the Senate to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance; or

(iii) either House of Congress to consider an extension disapproval resolution after June 30, 2018.

(d) COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.—In order to contribute to the continued economic

expansion of the United States, the President shall commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers affecting any industry, product, or service sector, and expand existing sectoral agreements to countries that are not parties to those agreements, in cases where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. Such sectors include agriculture, commercial services, intellectual property rights, industrial and capital goods, government procurement, information technology products, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, civil aircraft, and infrastructure products. In so doing, the President shall take into account all of the negotiating objectives set forth in section 102.

SEC. 104. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) CONSULTATIONS WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—

(1) CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) meet upon request with any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement;

(B) upon request of any Member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(D) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(E) with regard to any negotiations and agreement relating to agricultural trade, also consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initiating an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(2) CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO FORCE.—Prior to exchanging notes providing for the entry into force of a trade agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis with Members of Congress and committees as specified in paragraph (1), and keep them fully apprised of the measures a trading partner has taken to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date that the agreement enters into force.

(3) ENHANCED COORDINATION WITH CONGRESS.—

(A) WRITTEN GUIDELINES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with Con-

gress, including coordination with designated congressional advisers under subsection (b), regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall enhance coordination with Congress through procedures to ensure—

(i) timely briefings upon request of any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress conducted under this title, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement; and

(ii) the sharing of detailed and timely information with Members of Congress, and their staff with proper security clearances as appropriate, regarding those negotiations and pertinent documents related to those negotiations (including classified information), and with committee staff with proper security clearances as would be appropriate in the light of the responsibilities of that committee over the trade agreements programs affected by those negotiations.

(C) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(b) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—

(A) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In each Congress, any Member of the House of Representatives may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consulting with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(B) SENATE.—In each Congress, any Member of the Senate may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(2) CONSULTATIONS WITH DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initiating an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations designated under paragraph (1).

(3) ACCREDITATION.—Each Member of Congress designated as a congressional adviser under paragraph (1) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiating sessions relating to trade agreements.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY GROUPS ON NEGOTIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—By not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 30 days after the convening of each Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall convene the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall convene the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations (in this subsection referred to collectively as the “congressional advisory groups”).

(2) MEMBERS AND FUNCTIONS.—

(A) MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the House of Representatives:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the House of Representatives that would have, under the Rules of the House of Representatives, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(B) MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the Senate:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the Senate that would have, under the Rules of the Senate, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(C) ACCREDITATION.—Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in negotiations for any trade agreement to which this title applies. Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in the negotiations by reason of which the member is in one of the congressional advisory groups.

(D) CONSULTATION AND ADVICE.—The congressional advisory groups shall consult with and provide advice to the Trade Representative regarding the formulation of specific objectives, negotiating strategies and positions, the development of the applicable trade agreement, and compliance and enforcement of the negotiated commitments under the trade agreement.

(E) CHAIR.—The House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(F) COORDINATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES.—Members of any committee represented on one of the congressional advisory groups may submit comments to the member of the appropriate congressional advisory group from that committee regarding any matter related to a negotiation for any trade agreement to which this title applies.

(3) GUIDELINES.—

(A) PURPOSE AND REVISION.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines to facilitate the useful and timely exchange of information between the Trade Rep-

resentative and the congressional advisory groups; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall provide for, among other things—

(i) detailed briefings on a fixed timetable to be specified in the guidelines of the congressional advisory groups regarding negotiating objectives and positions and the status of the applicable negotiations, beginning as soon as practicable after the congressional advisory groups are convened, with more frequent briefings as trade negotiations enter the final stage;

(ii) access by members of the congressional advisory groups, and staff with proper security clearances, to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(iii) the closest practicable coordination between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups at all critical periods during the negotiations, including at negotiation sites;

(iv) after the applicable trade agreement is concluded, consultation regarding ongoing compliance and enforcement of negotiated commitments under the trade agreement; and

(v) the timeframe for submitting the report required under section 105(d)(3).

(4) REQUEST FOR MEETING.—Upon the request of a majority of either of the congressional advisory groups, the President shall meet with that congressional advisory group before initiating negotiations with respect to a trade agreement, or at any other time concerning the negotiations.

(d) CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on public access to information regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) PURPOSES.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) facilitate transparency;

(B) encourage public participation; and

(C) promote collaboration in the negotiation process.

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include procedures that—

(A) provide for rapid disclosure of information in forms that the public can readily find and use; and

(B) provide frequent opportunities for public input through Federal Register requests for comment and other means.

(4) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(e) CONSULTATIONS WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with advisory committees established pursuant to section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155)

regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall enhance coordination with advisory committees described in that paragraph through procedures to ensure—

(A) timely briefings of advisory committees and regular opportunities for advisory committees to provide input throughout the negotiation process on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas represented by those committees; and

(B) the sharing of detailed and timely information with each member of an advisory committee regarding negotiations and pertinent documents related to the negotiation (including classified information) on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas the member represents, and with a designee with proper security clearances of each such member as appropriate.

(3) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF TRANSPARENCY OFFICER IN THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—Section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) There shall be in the Office one Chief Transparency Officer. The Chief Transparency Officer shall consult with Congress on transparency policy, coordinate transparency in trade negotiations, engage and assist the public, and advise the United States Trade Representative on transparency policy.”.

SEC. 105. NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS.

(a) NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS BEFORE NEGOTIATION.—

(1) NOTICE.—The President, with respect to any agreement that is subject to the provisions of section 103(b), shall—

(A) provide, at least 90 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, written notice to Congress of the President's intention to enter into the negotiations with that country and set forth in the notice the date on which the President intends to initiate those negotiations, the specific United States objectives for the negotiations with that country, and whether the President intends to seek an agreement, or changes to an existing agreement;

(B) before and after submission of the notice, consult regarding the negotiations with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, such other committees of the House and Senate as the President deems appropriate, and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c);

(C) upon the request of a majority of the members of either the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c), meet with the requesting congressional advisory group before initiating the negotiations or at any other time concerning the negotiations; and

(D) after consulting with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance, and at least 30 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and regularly update thereafter, a detailed and

comprehensive summary of the specific objectives with respect to the negotiations, and a description of how the agreement, if successfully concluded, will further those objectives and benefit the United States.

(2) **NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURE.**—

(A) **ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATIONS FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT.**—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to the subject matter under section 102(b)(3)(B) with any country, the President shall—

(i) assess whether United States tariffs on agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country;

(ii) consider whether the tariff levels bound and applied throughout the world with respect to imports from the United States are higher than United States tariffs and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(iii) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(B) **SPECIAL CONSULTATIONS ON IMPORT SENSITIVE PRODUCTS.**—(i) Before initiating negotiations with regard to agriculture and, with respect to agreements described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 107(a), as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(I) identify those agricultural products subject to tariff rate quotas on the date of enactment of this Act, and agricultural products subject to tariff reductions by the United States as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, for which the rate of duty was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate which was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994;

(II) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning—

(aa) whether any further tariff reductions on the products identified under subclause (I) should be appropriate, taking into account the impact of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned;

(bb) whether the products so identified face unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including those not based on scientific principles in contravention of the Uruguay Round Agreements; and

(cc) whether the countries participating in the negotiations maintain export subsidies or other programs, policies, or practices that distort world trade in such products and the impact of such programs, policies, and practices on United States producers of the products;

(III) request that the International Trade Commission prepare an assessment of the probable economic effects of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned and on the United States economy as a whole; and

(IV) upon complying with subclauses (I), (II), and (III), notify the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate of those products identified under subclause (I) for which the Trade Representative intends to seek

tariff liberalization in the negotiations and the reasons for seeking such tariff liberalization.

(ii) If, after negotiations described in clause (i) are commenced—

(I) the United States Trade Representative identifies any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) for tariff reductions which were not the subject of a notification under clause (i)(IV), or

(II) any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) is the subject of a request for tariff reductions by a party to the negotiations, the Trade Representative shall, as soon as practicable, notify the committees referred to in clause (i)(IV) of those products and the reasons for seeking such tariff reductions.

(3) **NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING THE FISHING INDUSTRY.**—Before initiating, or continuing, negotiations that directly relate to fish or shellfish trade with any country, the President shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and shall keep the Committees apprised of the negotiations on an ongoing and timely basis.

(4) **NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING TEXTILES.**—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to textiles and apparel products with any country, the President shall—

(A) assess whether United States tariffs on textile and apparel products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(B) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(5) **ADHERENCE TO EXISTING INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT AGREEMENT OBLIGATIONS.**—In determining whether to enter into negotiations with a particular country, the President shall take into account the extent to which that country has implemented, or has accelerated the implementation of, its international trade and investment commitments to the United States, including pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(b) **CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS BEFORE ENTRY INTO AGREEMENT.**—

(I) **CONSULTATION.**—Before entering into any trade agreement under section 103(b), the President shall consult with—

(A) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(B) each other committee of the House and the Senate, and each joint committee of Congress, which has jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters which would be affected by the trade agreement; and

(C) the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

(2) **SCOPE.**—The consultation described in paragraph (1) shall include consultation with respect to—

(A) the nature of the agreement;

(B) how and to what extent the agreement will achieve the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(C) the implementation of the agreement under section 106, including the general effect of the agreement on existing laws.

(3) **REPORT REGARDING UNITED STATES TRADE REMEDY LAWS.**—

(A) **CHANGES IN CERTAIN TRADE LAWS.**—The President, not less than 180 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate—

(i) the range of proposals advanced in the negotiations with respect to that agreement, that may be in the final agreement, and that could require amendments to title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or to chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.); and

(ii) how these proposals relate to the objectives described in section 102(b)(16).

(B) **RESOLUTIONS.**—(i) At any time after the transmission of the report under subparagraph (A), if a resolution is introduced with respect to that report in either House of Congress, the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) shall apply to that resolution if—

(I) no other resolution with respect to that report has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to those procedures; and

(II) no procedural disapproval resolution under section 106(b) introduced with respect to a trade agreement entered into pursuant to the negotiations to which the report under subparagraph (A) relates has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be.

(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term “resolution” means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the _____ finds that the proposed changes to United States trade remedy laws contained in the report of the President transmitted to Congress on _____ under section 105(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 with respect to _____, are inconsistent with the negotiating objectives described in section 102(b)(16) of that Act.”, with the first blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress, the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date of the report, and the third blank space being filled with the name of the country or countries involved.

(iii) Resolutions in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee.

(iv) Resolutions in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(v) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(vi) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(vii) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) shall apply to resolutions.

(4) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS.**—The report required under section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(e)(1)) regarding any trade agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 shall be provided

to the President, Congress, and the United States Trade Representative not later than 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 103(a)(2) or 106(a)(1)(A) of the intention of the President to enter into the agreement.

(c) **INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO COMMISSION.**—The President, not later than 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall provide the International Trade Commission (referred to in this subsection as the “Commission”) with the details of the agreement as it exists at that time and request the Commission to prepare and submit an assessment of the agreement as described in paragraph (2). Between the time the President makes the request under this paragraph and the time the Commission submits the assessment, the President shall keep the Commission current with respect to the details of the agreement.

(2) **ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 105 calendar days after the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report assessing the likely impact of the agreement on the United States economy as a whole and on specific industry sectors, including the impact the agreement will have on the gross domestic product, exports and imports, aggregate employment and employment opportunities, the production, employment, and competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the agreement, and the interests of United States consumers.

(3) **REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE.**—In preparing the assessment under paragraph (2), the Commission shall review available economic assessments regarding the agreement, including literature regarding any substantially equivalent proposed agreement, and shall provide in its assessment a description of the analyses used and conclusions drawn in such literature, and a discussion of areas of consensus and divergence between the various analyses and conclusions, including those of the Commission regarding the agreement.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The President shall make each assessment under paragraph (2) available to the public.

(d) **REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES WITH AGREEMENT.**—

(1) **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.**—The President shall—

(A) conduct environmental reviews of future trade and investment agreements, consistent with Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169), dated November 16, 1999, and its relevant guidelines; and

(B) submit a report on those reviews and on the content and operation of consultative mechanisms established pursuant to section 102(c) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(2) **EMPLOYMENT IMPACT REVIEWS AND REPORTS.**—The President shall—

(A) review the impact of future trade agreements on United States employment, including labor markets, modeled after Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169) to the extent appropriate in establishing procedures and criteria; and

(B) submit a report on such reviews to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(3) **REPORT ON LABOR RIGHTS.**—The President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on a timeframe determined in accordance with section 104(c)(3)(B)(v)—

(A) a meaningful labor rights report of the country, or countries, with respect to which the President is negotiating; and

(B) a description of any provisions that would require changes to the labor laws and labor practices of the United States.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The President shall make all reports required under this subsection available to the public.

(e) **IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—At the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E), the President shall also submit to Congress a plan for implementing and enforcing the agreement.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The implementation and enforcement plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) **BORDER PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.**—A description of additional personnel required at border entry points, including a list of additional customs and agricultural inspectors.

(B) **AGENCY STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.**—A description of additional personnel required by Federal agencies responsible for monitoring and implementing the trade agreement, including personnel required by the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture (including additional personnel required to implement sanitary and phytosanitary measures in order to obtain market access for United States exports), the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of the Treasury, and such other agencies as may be necessary.

(C) **CUSTOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS.**—A description of the additional equipment and facilities needed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(D) **IMPACT ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**—A description of the impact the trade agreement will have on State and local governments as a result of increases in trade.

(E) **COST ANALYSIS.**—An analysis of the costs associated with each of the items listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(3) **BUDGET SUBMISSION.**—The President shall include a request for the resources necessary to support the plan required by paragraph (1) in the first budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, after the date of the submission of the plan.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The President shall make the plan required under this subsection available to the public.

(f) **OTHER REPORTS.**—

(1) **REPORT ON PENALTIES.**—Not later than one year after the imposition by the United States of a penalty or remedy permitted by a trade agreement to which this title applies, the President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the penalty or remedy applied under United States law in enforcing United States rights under the trade agreement, which shall address whether the penalty or remedy was effective in changing the behavior of the targeted party and whether the penalty or remedy had any adverse impact on parties or interests not party to the dispute.

(2) **REPORT ON IMPACT OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 5 years thereafter, the United States Inter-

national Trade Commission shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements with respect to which Congress has enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures since January 1, 1984.

(3) **ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS AND REPORTS.**—(A) The United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate after acceptance of a petition for review or taking an enforcement action in regard to an obligation under a trade agreement, including a labor or environmental obligation. During such consultations, the United States Trade Representative shall describe the matter, including the basis for such action and the application of any relevant legal obligations.

(B) As part of the report required pursuant to section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2213), the President shall report annually to Congress on enforcement actions taken pursuant to a trade agreement to which the United States is a party, as well as on any public reports issued by Federal agencies on enforcement matters relating to a trade agreement.

(g) **ADDITIONAL COORDINATION WITH MEMBERS.**—Any Member of the House of Representatives may submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and any Member of the Senate may submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate the views of that Member on any matter relevant to a proposed trade agreement, and the relevant Committee shall receive those views for consideration.

SEC. 106. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **NOTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.**—Any agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

(A) the President, at least 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into the trade agreement, notifies the House of Representatives and the Senate of the President's intention to enter into the agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register;

(B) the President, at least 60 days before the day on which the President enters into the agreement, publishes the text of the agreement on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative;

(C) within 60 days after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement;

(D) the President, at least 30 days before submitting to Congress the materials under subparagraph (E), submits to Congress—

(i) a draft statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement; and

(ii) a copy of the final legal text of the agreement;

(E) after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft of an implementing bill described in section 103(b)(3);

(ii) a statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the trade agreement; and

(iii) the supporting information described in paragraph (2)(A);

(F) the implementing bill is enacted into law; and

(G) the President, not later than 30 days before the date on which the agreement enters into force with respect to a party to the agreement, submits written notice to Congress that the President has determined that the party has taken measures necessary to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date on which the agreement enters into force.

(2) SUPPORTING INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The supporting information required under paragraph (1)(E)(iii) consists of—

(i) an explanation as to how the implementing bill and proposed administrative action will change or affect existing law; and

(ii) a statement—

(I) asserting that the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(II) setting forth the reasons of the President regarding—

(aa) how and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, and objectives referred to in subclause (I);

(bb) whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated;

(cc) how the agreement serves the interests of United States commerce; and

(dd) how the implementing bill meets the standards set forth in section 103(b)(3).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the supporting information described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(3) RECIPROCAL BENEFITS.—In order to ensure that a foreign country that is not a party to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) does not receive benefits under the agreement unless the country is also subject to the obligations under the agreement, the implementing bill submitted with respect to the agreement shall provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement apply only to the parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement. The implementing bill may also provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement do not apply uniformly to all parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(4) DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.—Any agreement or other understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacts an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and

(B) is not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill with respect to that agreement is introduced in either House of Congress, shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force and effect under United States law or in any dispute settlement body.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) FOR LACK OF NOTICE OR CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) if during the 60-day period beginning on the date that one House of Congress agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution for lack of notice or consultations with respect to such trade agreement or agreements, the other House separately agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.

(B) PROCEDURAL DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION.—

(i) For purposes of this paragraph, the term

“procedural disapproval resolution” means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.”, with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements with respect to which the President is considered to have failed or refused to notify or consult.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i) and paragraphs (3)(C) and (4)(C), the President has “failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015” on negotiations with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements if—

(I) the President has failed or refused to consult (as the case may be) in accordance with sections 104 and 105 and this section with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(II) guidelines under section 104 have not been developed or met with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(III) the President has not met with the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations pursuant to a request made under section 104(c)(4) with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements; or

(IV) the agreement or agreements fail to make progress in achieving the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title.

(2) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERING RESOLUTIONS.—(A) Procedural disapproval resolutions—

(i) in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee; and

(ii) in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(B) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to a procedural disapproval resolution introduced with respect to a trade agreement if no other procedural disapproval resolution with respect to that trade agreement has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, and if no resolution described in clause (ii) of section 105(b)(3)(B) with respect to that trade agreement has been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) of such section.

(C) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(D) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(3) CONSIDERATION IN SENATE OF CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION TO REMOVE TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(A) REPORTING OF RESOLUTION.—If, when the Committee on Finance of the Senate meets on whether to report an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b), the committee fails to favorably report the bill, the committee shall report a resolution described in subparagraph (C).

(B) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the Senate to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A) if the Committee on Finance reports a resolution described in subparagraph (C) and such resolution is agreed to by the Senate.

(C) RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A resolution described in this subparagraph is a resolution of the Senate originating from the Committee on Finance the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply in the Senate to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.”, with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A).

(D) PROCEDURES.—If the Senate does not agree to a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to a resolution described in subparagraph (C), the resolution shall be committed to the Committee on Finance.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF A CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION.—

(A) QUALIFICATIONS FOR REPORTING RESOLUTION.—If—

(i) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives reports an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b) with other than a favorable recommendation; and

(ii) a Member of the House of Representatives has introduced a consultation and compliance resolution on the legislative day following the filing of a report to accompany the implementing bill with other than a favorable recommendation, then the Committee on Ways and Means shall consider a consultation and compliance resolution pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF A QUALIFYING RESOLUTION.—(i) Not later than the fourth legislative day after the date of introduction of the resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means shall meet to consider a resolution meeting the qualifications set forth in subparagraph (A).

(ii) After consideration of one such resolution by the Committee on Ways and Means, this subparagraph shall not apply to any other such resolution.

(iii) If the Committee on Ways and Means has not reported the resolution by the sixth legislative day after the date of its introduction, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

(C) CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A consultation and compliance resolution—

(i) is a resolution of the House of Representatives, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that

Act shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.", with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

(D) **APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.**—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or agreements which are the object of a consultation and compliance resolution if such resolution is adopted by the House.

(5) **FOR FAILURE TO MEET OTHER REQUIREMENTS.**—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the United States Trade Representative, shall transmit to Congress a report setting forth the strategy of the executive branch to address concerns of Congress regarding whether dispute settlement panels and the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization have added to obligations, or diminished rights, of the United States, as described in section 102(b)(15)(C). Trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill with respect to an agreement negotiated under the auspices of the World Trade Organization unless the Secretary of Commerce has issued such report by the deadline specified in this paragraph.

(6) **LIMITATIONS ON PROCEDURES WITH RESPECT TO AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country to which the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking are applicable and the government of which does not fully comply with such standards and is not making significant efforts to bring the country into compliance (commonly referred to as a "tier 3" country), as determined in the most recent annual report on trafficking in persons submitted under section 110(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)).

(B) **MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term "minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking" means the standards set forth in section 108 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106).

(C) **RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.**—Subsection (b) of this section, section 103(c), and section 105(b)(3) are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with the full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as any other rule of that House.

SEC. 107. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRADE AGREEMENTS FOR WHICH NEGOTIATIONS HAVE ALREADY BEGUN.

(a) **CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.**—Notwithstanding the prenegotiation notification and consultation requirement described in section 105(a), if an agreement to which section 103(b) applies—

(1) is entered into under the auspices of the World Trade Organization,

(2) is entered into with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries with respect to which notifications have been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act,

(3) is entered into with the European Union,

(4) is an agreement with respect to international trade in services entered into with WTO members with respect to which a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(5) is an agreement with respect to environmental goods entered into with WTO members with respect to which a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, and results from negotiations that were commenced before the date of the enactment of this Act, subsection (b) shall apply.

(b) **TREATMENT OF AGREEMENTS.**—In the case of any agreement to which subsection (a) applies, the applicability of the trade authorities procedures to implementing bills shall be determined without regard to the requirements of section 105(a) (relating only to notice prior to initiating negotiations), and any resolution under paragraph (1)(B), (3)(C), or (4)(C) of section 106(b) shall not be in order on the basis of a failure or refusal to comply with the provisions of section 105(a), if (and only if) the President, as soon as feasible after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) notifies Congress of the negotiations described in subsection (a), the specific United States objectives in the negotiations, and whether the President is seeking a new agreement or changes to an existing agreement; and

(2) before and after submission of the notice, consults regarding the negotiations with the committees referred to in section 105(a)(1)(B) and the House and Senate Advisory Groups on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

SEC. 108. SOVEREIGNTY.

(a) **UNITED STATES LAW TO PREVAIL IN EVENT OF CONFLICT.**—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b), nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, that is inconsistent with any law of the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States shall have effect.

(b) **AMENDMENTS OR MODIFICATIONS OF UNITED STATES LAW.**—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall prevent the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States from amending or modifying any law of the United States, that State, or that locality (as the case may be).

(c) **DISPUTE SETTLEMENT REPORTS.**—Reports, including findings and recommendations, issued by dispute settlement panels convened pursuant to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall have no binding effect on the law of the United States, the Government of the United States, or the law or government of any State or locality of the United States.

SEC. 109. INTERESTS OF SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Trade Representative should facilitate participation by small businesses in the trade negotiation process; and

(2) the functions of the Office of the United States Trade Representative relating to small businesses should continue to be reflected in the title of the Assistant United States Trade Representative assigned the responsibility for small businesses.

(b) **CONSIDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS INTERESTS.**—The Assistant United States Trade Representative for Small Business, Market Access,

and Industrial Competitiveness shall be responsible for ensuring that the interests of small businesses are considered in all trade negotiations in accordance with the objective described in section 102(a)(8).

SEC. 110. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS; APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.

(a) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **ADVICE FROM UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—Section 131 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2151) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking "section 2103(a) or (b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" and inserting "subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015"; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking "section 2103(b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" and inserting "section 103(b) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015";

(B) in subsection (b), by striking "section 2103(a)(3)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" and inserting "section 103(a)(4)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015"; and

(C) in subsection (c), by striking "section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" and inserting "section 103(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015".

(2) **HEARINGS.**—Section 132 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2152) is amended by striking "section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" and inserting "section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015".

(3) **PUBLIC HEARINGS.**—Section 133(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2153(a)) is amended by striking "section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" and inserting "section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015".

(4) **PREREQUISITES FOR OFFERS.**—Section 134 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2154) is amended by striking "section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" each place it appears and inserting "section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015".

(5) **INFORMATION AND ADVICE FROM PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS.**—Section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking "section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" and inserting "section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015"; and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking "section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" each place it appears and inserting "section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015"; and

(II) by striking "not later than the date on which the President notifies the Congress under section 2105(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" and inserting "not later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 106(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015"; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking "section 2102 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002" and inserting "section 102 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015".

(6) **PROCEDURES RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING BILLS.**—Section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(7) **TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS TO CONGRESS.**—Section 162(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2212(a)) is amended by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(b) **APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.**—For purposes of applying sections 125, 126, and 127 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2135, 2136, and 2137)—

(1) any trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as an agreement entered into under section 101 or 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2111 or 2112), as appropriate; and

(2) any proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as a proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2112).

SEC. 111. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **AGREEMENT ON AGRICULTURE.**—The term “Agreement on Agriculture” means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(2) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(2)).

(2) **AGREEMENT ON SAFEGUARDS.**—The term “Agreement on Safeguards” means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(13) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(13)).

(3) **AGREEMENT ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES.**—The term “Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures” means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(12)).

(4) **ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT.**—The term “Antidumping Agreement” means the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 referred to in section 101(d)(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(7)).

(5) **APPELLATE BODY.**—The term “Appellate Body” means the Appellate Body established under Article 17.1 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(6) **COMMON MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “common multilateral environmental agreement” means any agreement specified in subparagraph (B) or included under subparagraph (C) to which both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations are full parties, including any current or future mutually agreed upon protocols, amendments, annexes, or adjustments to such an agreement.

(B) **AGREEMENTS SPECIFIED.**—The agreements specified in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, done at Washington March 3, 1973 (27 UST 1087; TIAS 8249).

(ii) The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, done at Montreal September 16, 1987.

(iii) The Protocol of 1978 Relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, done at London February 17, 1978.

(iv) The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, done at Ramsar February 2, 1971 (TIAS 11084).

(v) The Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, done at Canberra May 20, 1980 (33 UST 3476).

(vi) The International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, done at Washington December 2, 1946 (62 Stat. 1716).

(vii) The Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, done at Washington May 31, 1949 (1 UST 230).

(C) **ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS.**—Both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations may agree to include any other multilateral environmental or conservation agreement to which they are full parties as a common multilateral environmental agreement under this paragraph.

(7) **CORE LABOR STANDARDS.**—The term “core labor standards” means—

(A) freedom of association;

(B) the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;

(C) the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor;

(D) the effective abolition of child labor and a prohibition on the worst forms of child labor; and

(E) the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

(8) **DISPUTE SETTLEMENT UNDERSTANDING.**—The term “Dispute Settlement Understanding” means the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(16)).

(9) **ENABLING CLAUSE.**—The term “Enabling Clause” means the Decision on Differential and More Favourable Treatment, Reciprocity and Fuller Participation of Developing Countries (L/4903), adopted November 28, 1979, under GATT 1947 (as defined in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501)).

(10) **ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.**—The term “environmental laws”, with respect to the laws of the United States, means environmental statutes and regulations enforceable by action of the Federal Government.

(11) **GATT 1994.**—The term “GATT 1994” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

(12) **GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TRADE IN SERVICES.**—The term “General Agreement on Trade in Services” means the General Agreement on Trade in Services (referred to in section 101(d)(14) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(14))).

(13) **GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT AGREEMENT.**—The term “Government Procurement Agreement” means the Agreement on Government Procurement referred to in section 101(d)(17) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(17)).

(14) **ILO.**—The term “ILO” means the International Labor Organization.

(15) **IMPORT SENSITIVE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT.**—The term “import sensitive agricultural product” means an agricultural product—

(A) with respect to which, as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, the rate of duty was the subject of tariff reductions by the United States and, pursuant to such Agreements, was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate that was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994; or

(B) which was subject to a tariff rate quota on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(16) **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGREEMENT.**—The term “Information Technology Agreement” means the Ministerial Declaration on Trade in Information Technology Products of the World Trade Organization, agreed to at Singapore December 13, 1996.

(17) **INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED CORE LABOR STANDARDS.**—The term “internationally recognized core labor standards” means the core labor standards only as stated in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-Up (1998).

(18) **LABOR LAWS.**—The term “labor laws” means the statutes and regulations, or provisions thereof, of a party to the negotiations that are directly related to core labor standards as well as other labor protections for children and minors and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health, and for the United States, includes Federal statutes and regulations addressing those standards, protections, or conditions, but does not include State or local labor laws.

(19) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of the United States; and

(C) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of a foreign country and is controlled by entities described in subparagraph (B) or United States citizens, or both.

(20) **URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS.**—The term “Uruguay Round Agreements” has the meaning given that term in section 2(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(7)).

(21) **WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION; WTO.**—The terms “World Trade Organization” and “WTO” mean the organization established pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(22) **WTO AGREEMENT.**—The term “WTO Agreement” means the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization entered into on April 15, 1994.

(23) **WTO MEMBER.**—The term “WTO member” has the meaning given that term in section 2(10) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(10)).

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) **REPEAL OF SNAPBACK.**—Section 233 of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–40; 125 Stat. 416) is repealed.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.**—Except as otherwise provided in this title, the provisions of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on December 31, 2013, and as amended by this title, shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to petitions for certification filed under chapter 2, 3, or 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after such date of enactment.

(c) **REFERENCES.**—Except as otherwise provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of any such chapter, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

SEC. 203. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **EXTENSION OF TERMINATION PROVISIONS.**—Section 285 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C.

2271 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” each place it appears and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(b) **TRAINING FUNDS.**—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “shall not exceed” and all that follows and inserting “shall not exceed \$450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021”.

(c) **REEMPLOYMENT TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.**—Section 246(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2318(b)(1)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(d) **AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.**—Section 245(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2317(a)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(2) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.**—Section 255(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2345(a)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2012 and 2013” and all that follows through “December 31, 2013” and inserting “fiscal years 2015 through 2021”.

(3) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS.**—Section 298(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401g(a)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2012 and 2013” and all that follows through “December 31, 2013” and inserting “fiscal years 2015 through 2021”.

SEC. 204. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND REPORTING.

(a) **PERFORMANCE MEASURES.**—Section 239(j) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2311(j)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “DATA REPORTING” and inserting “PERFORMANCE MEASURES”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “a quarterly” and inserting “an annual”; and

(ii) by striking “data” and inserting “measures”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “core” and inserting “primary”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “that promote efficiency and effectiveness” after “assistance program”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “CORE INDICATORS DESCRIBED” and inserting “INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) **PRIMARY INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE DESCRIBED.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The primary indicators of performance referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall consist of—

“(I) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who are in unsubsidized employment during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program;

“(II) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program and who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth calendar quarter after exit from the program;

“(III) the median earnings of workers described in subclause (I);

“(IV) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, subject to clause (ii), obtain a recognized postsecondary credential or a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, during participation in the program or within one year after exit from the program; and

“(V) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjust-

ment assistance program who, during a year while receiving such benefits, are in an education or training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential or employment and who are achieving measurable gains in skills toward such a credential or employment.

“(ii) **INDICATOR RELATING TO CREDENTIAL.**—For purposes of clause (i)(IV), a worker who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who obtained a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent shall be included in the percentage counted for purposes of that clause only if the worker, in addition to obtaining such a diploma or its recognized equivalent, has obtained or retained employment or is in an education or training program leading to a recognized postsecondary credential within one year after exit from the program.”;

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “DATA” and inserting “MEASURES”;

(B) by striking “quarterly” and inserting “annual”; and

(C) by striking “data” and inserting “measures”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **ACCESSIBILITY OF STATE PERFORMANCE REPORTS.**—The Secretary shall, on an annual basis, make available (including by electronic means), in an easily understandable format, the reports of cooperating States or cooperating State agencies required by paragraph (1) and the information contained in those reports.”.

(b) **COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF DATA.**—Section 249B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2323) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “enrolled in” and inserting “who received”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “complete” and inserting “exited”; and

(II) by striking “who were enrolled in” and inserting “, including who received”;

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “complete” and inserting “exited”;

(iv) in subparagraph (F), by striking “complete” and inserting “exit”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) The average cost per worker of receiving training approved under section 236.

“(H) The percentage of workers who received training approved under section 236 and obtained unsubsidized employment in a field related to that training.”; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking “quarterly” each place it appears and inserting “annual”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) The median earnings of workers described in section 239(j)(2)(A)(i)(III) during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program, expressed as a percentage of the median earnings of such workers before the calendar quarter in which such workers began receiving benefits under this chapter.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) the reports required under section 239(j);”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “a quarterly” and inserting “an annual”.

(c) **RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL DEFINED.**—Section 247 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2319) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(19) The term ‘recognized postsecondary credential’ means a credential consisting of an industry-recognized certificate or certification, a certificate of completion of an apprenticeship, a license recognized by a State or the Federal Government, or an associate or baccalaureate degree.”.

SEC. 205. APPLICABILITY OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.**—

(1) **PETITIONS FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014, AND BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—

(A) **CERTIFICATIONS OF WORKERS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—

(i) **CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.**—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) **RECONSIDERATION OF DENIALS OF CERTIFICATIONS.**—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall—

(I) reconsider that determination; and

(II) if the group of workers meets the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(iii) **PETITION DESCRIBED.**—A petition described in this clause is a petition for a certification of eligibility for a group of workers filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) **ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), a worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be eligible, on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to receive benefits only under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) **COMPUTATION OF MAXIMUM BENEFITS.**—Benefits received by a worker described in clause (i) under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be included in any determination of the maximum benefits for which the worker is eligible under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **PETITIONS FILED BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2014.**—A worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or before December 31, 2013, shall continue to be eligible to apply for and receive benefits under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of such Act, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

(3) **QUALIFYING SEPARATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PETITIONS FILED WITHIN 90 DAYS OF DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—Section 223(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be applied and administered by substituting “before January 1, 2014” for “more than one year before the date of the petition on which such certification was granted” for purposes of determining whether a worker is eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to

a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and on or before the date that is 90 days after such date of enactment.

(b) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.**—

(1) **CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—

(A) **CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.**—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(B) **RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF CERTAIN PETITIONS.**—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall—

(i) reconsider that determination; and
(ii) if the firm meets the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(C) **PETITION DESCRIBED.**—A petition described in this subparagraph is a petition for a certification of eligibility filed by a firm or its representative under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS THAT DID NOT SUBMIT PETITIONS BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 2014, AND DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Commerce shall certify a firm described in subparagraph (B) as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, if the firm or its representative files a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 not later than 90 days after such date of enactment.

(B) **FIRM DESCRIBED.**—A firm described in this subparagraph is a firm that the Secretary determines would have been certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance if—

(i) the firm or its representative had filed a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on a date during the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) the provisions of chapter 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, had been in effect on that date during the period described in clause (i).

SEC. 206. SUNSET PROVISIONS.

(a) **APPLICATION OF PRIOR LAW.**—Subject to subsection (b), beginning on July 1, 2021, the provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.), as in effect on January 1, 2014, shall be in effect and apply, except that in applying and administering such chapters—

(1) paragraph (1) of section 231(c) of that Act shall be applied and administered as if subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of that paragraph were not in effect;

(2) section 233 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a)—
(i) in paragraph (2), by substituting “104-week period” for “104-week period” and all that follows through “130-week period”; and
(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by substituting “65” for “52”; and

(II) by substituting “78-week period” for “52-week period” each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (g) as if it read as follows:

“(g) **PAYMENT OF TRADE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES TO COMPLETE TRAINING.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in order to assist an adversely affected worker to complete training approved for the worker under section 236 that leads to the completion of a degree or industry-recognized credential, payments may be made as trade readjustment allowances for not more than 13 weeks within such period of eligibility as the Secretary may prescribe to account for a break in training or for justifiable cause that follows the last week for which the worker is otherwise entitled to a trade readjustment allowance under this chapter if—

“(1) payment of the trade readjustment allowance for not more than 13 weeks is necessary for the worker to complete the training;

“(2) the worker participates in training in each such week; and

“(3) the worker—

“(A) has substantially met the performance benchmarks established as part of the training approved for the worker;

“(B) is expected to continue to make progress toward the completion of the training; and

“(C) will complete the training during that period of eligibility.”;

(3) section 245(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “December 31, 2007”;;

(4) section 246(b)(1) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “the date that is 5 years” and all that follows through “State”;

(5) section 256(b) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021” for “each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and \$4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning on October 1, 2007”;;

(6) section 298(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021” for “each of the fiscal years” and all that follows through “October 1, 2007”; and

(7) section 285 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a), by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “December 31, 2007” each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (b) as if it read as follows:

“(b) **OTHER ASSISTANCE.**—

“(1) **ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 3 after June 30, 2022.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 3 pursuant to a petition filed under section 251 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

“(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

“(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.

“(2) **FARMERS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 6 after June 30, 2022.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 6 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

“(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

“(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.”.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply on and after July 1, 2021, with respect to—

(1) workers certified as eligible for trade adjustment assistance benefits under chapter 2 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 221 of that Act before July 1, 2021;

(2) firms certified as eligible for technical assistance or grants under chapter 3 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 251 of that Act before July 1, 2021; and

(3) agricultural commodity producers certified as eligible for technical or financial assistance under chapter 6 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 292 of that Act before July 1, 2021.

SEC. 207. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF HEALTH COVERAGE TAX CREDIT.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 35(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “before January 1, 2014” and inserting “before January 1, 2020”.

(b) **COORDINATION WITH CREDIT FOR COVERAGE UNDER A QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN.**—Subsection (g) of section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (13), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraphs:

“(11) **ELECTION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—This section shall not apply to any taxpayer for any eligible coverage month unless such taxpayer elects the application of this section for such month.

“(B) **TIMING AND APPLICABILITY OF ELECTION.**—Except as the Secretary may provide—

“(i) an election to have this section apply for any eligible coverage month in a taxable year shall be made not later than the due date (including extensions) for the return of tax for the taxable year, and

“(ii) any election for this section to apply for an eligible coverage month shall apply for all subsequent eligible coverage months in the taxable year and, once made, shall be irrevocable with respect to such months.

“(12) **COORDINATION WITH PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An eligible coverage month to which the election under paragraph (11) applies shall not be treated as a coverage month (as defined in section 36B(c)(2)) for purposes of section 36B with respect to the taxpayer.

“(B) **COORDINATION WITH ADVANCE PAYMENTS OF PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.**—In the case of a taxpayer who makes the election under paragraph (11) with respect to any eligible coverage month in a taxable year or on behalf of whom any advance payment is made under section 7527 with respect to any month in such taxable year—

“(i) the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year shall be increased by the excess, if any, of—

“(I) the sum of any advance payments made on behalf of the taxpayer under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and section 7527 for months during such taxable year, over

“(II) the sum of the credits allowed under this section (determined without regard to paragraph (1)) and section 36B (determined without regard to subsection (f)(1) thereof) for such taxable year, and

“(ii) section 36B(f)(2) shall not apply with respect to such taxpayer for such taxable year, except that if such taxpayer received any advance payments under section 7527 for any month in such taxable year and is later allowed a credit under section 36B for such taxable year, then section 36B(f)(2)(B) shall be applied by substituting the amount determined under clause (i)

for the amount determined under section 36B(f)(2)(A)."

(c) EXTENSION OF ADVANCE PAYMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (a) of section 7527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "August 1, 2003" and inserting "the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015".

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Paragraph (1) of section 7527(e) of such Code is amended by striking "occurring" and all that follows and inserting "occurring—

"(A) after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015, and

"(B) prior to the first month for which an advance payment is made on behalf of such individual under subsection (a)."

(d) **INDIVIDUAL INSURANCE TREATED AS QUALIFIED HEALTH INSURANCE WITHOUT REGARD TO ENROLLMENT DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "insurance if the eligible individual" and all that follows through "For purposes of" and inserting "insurance. For purposes of".

(2) **SPECIAL RULE.**—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of such Code, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by striking "insurance." and inserting "insurance (other than coverage enrolled in through an Exchange established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act)."

(e) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (m) of section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ", 35(g)(11)" after "30D(e)(4)".

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) **PLANS AVAILABLE ON INDIVIDUAL MARKET FOR USE OF TAX CREDIT.**—The amendment made by subsection (d)(2) shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(3) **TRANSITION RULE.**—Notwithstanding section 35(g)(11)(B)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this title), an election to apply section 35 of such Code to an eligible coverage month (as defined in section 35(b) of such Code) (and not to claim the credit under section 36B of such Code with respect to such month) in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2013, and before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) may be made at any time on or after such date of enactment and before the expiration of the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 6511(a) with respect to such taxable year; and

(B) may be made on an amended return.

(g) **AGENCY OUTREACH.**—As soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Health and Human Services, and Labor (or such Secretaries' delegates) and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (or the Director's delegate) shall carry out programs of public outreach, including on the Internet, to inform potential eligible individuals (as defined in section 35(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of the extension of the credit under section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the availability of the election to claim such credit retroactively for coverage months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 208. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking "September 30, 2024" and inserting "September 30, 2025"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) Fees may be charged under paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) during the period beginning on July 29, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025."

(b) **RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.**—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) **FURTHER ADDITIONAL PERIOD.**—For the period beginning on July 15, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

"(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting '0.3464' for '0.21'; and

"(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting '0.3464' for '0.21'."

SEC. 209. CHILD TAX CREDIT NOT REFUNDABLE FOR TAXPAYERS ELECTING TO EXCLUDE FOREIGN EARNED INCOME FROM TAX.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) **EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYERS EXCLUDING FOREIGN EARNED INCOME.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer elects to exclude any amount from gross income under section 911 for such taxable year."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 210. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 2.75 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 211. COVERAGE AND PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.

(a) **COVERAGE.**—Section 1861(s)(2)(F) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)(F)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: ", including such renal dialysis services furnished on or after January 1, 2017, by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under section 1881(b)(14) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in section 1834(r)(2))."

(b) **PAYMENT.**—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(r) **PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.**—

"(1) **PAYMENT RATE.**—In the case of renal dialysis services (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1881(b)(14)) furnished under this part by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under such section during a year (beginning with 2017) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in paragraph (2)), the amount of payment under this part for such services shall be the base rate for renal dialysis services determined for such year under such

section, as adjusted by any applicable geographic adjustment factor applied under subparagraph (D)(iv)(II) of such section and may be adjusted by the Secretary (on a budget neutral basis for payments under this paragraph) by any other adjustment factor under subparagraph (D) of such section.

"(2) **INDIVIDUAL WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term 'individual with acute kidney injury' means an individual who has acute loss of renal function and does not receive renal dialysis services for which payment is made under section 1881(b)(14)."

SEC. 212. MODIFICATION OF THE MEDICARE SEQUESTER FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.

Section 251A(6)(D)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a(6)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking "0.0 percent" and inserting "0.25 percent".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 305, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1314, the Trade Act of 2015, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as may I consume.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is really pretty simple: Is America going to shape the global economy or is it going to shape us? Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers, they don't live in this country. They live in other countries. So if we want to create more jobs in America, we have got to make more things here in America and sell them over there. In fact, one out of every five jobs in America already today depends on trade, and you know what, that is a good thing because these jobs pay more. They pay on average 18 percent more. But while the world is moving full steam ahead we have been standing still, Mr. Speaker.

We haven't completed a trade agreement in years. Today, there are 262 free trade agreements in place across the world. We are a party to 14. Since 2007, when the last version of trade promotion authority expired, there have

been 100 trade agreements negotiated and signed. The U.S. is a party to none of those. China is negotiating seven agreements right now, including one with 16 countries.

In the global economy, if you are standing still, you are falling behind because all these other countries are negotiating agreements without us. What that basically means is other countries are lowering their trade barriers between those countries. As a result of them lowering their trade barriers, making their products more affordable, getting more market share, they are putting up barriers against our products, making it harder for us to get access to those markets.

Big companies can set up a factory in another country, make something there, and sell it there. Getting trade agreements means removing those barriers so we keep those factories here, so all businesses, big and small, can make things in America, grow things in America, and sell them overseas.

Let me just give you an example. Since the year 2000 there have been 48 trade agreements in East Asia alone. America has been a party to only two of them, and as a result of that, our share of their imports fell by 42 percent.

The rules of the global economy are being written right now, Mr. Speaker. That is not the question. The question is: Are we going to write the rules of the global economy with our allies or are we going to let other countries write the rules, such as China? This is why H.R. 1314, the Trade Act, would establish TPA, or trade promotion authority.

Now, there has been a lot of confusion about this bill, a lot of honest confusion and sometimes a lot of intentional confusion. Let me say really clearly what this bill is.

TPA is not a trade deal. TPA is not a trade agreement. TPA is a process for negotiating a trade agreement. Congress is not considering a trade agreement today. There is no secret agreement that nobody has read that is being voted on today. All we are voting on today is a process by which Congress considers trade agreements. The earliest we would do so would be in the fall, at the earliest. Why should we care about this process? Because a good process gets us a good result.

This TPA will give us the leverage that we, in Congress, need to get a fair deal for the American worker because when other countries know that the deal that they agreed to is a deal Congress will vote on they will give us their best offers. Countries aren't going to give us a good agreement if they have to negotiate with 535 people.

Here is how it works. Congress says to the President, when you submit a trade agreement, we will give you an up-or-down vote on three conditions. First, you have got to pursue specific

negotiating objectives, 150 of them. Here is what we want to see in a trade agreement and here is what cannot be in a trade agreement.

Second, you have got to keep us informed. You have got to regularly consult with Congress. Congress must have access to all of the negotiating texts. Right now, it is whatever the administration chooses to give us. They control it. They decide on their terms. With TPA, Congress says no, no, no; we, in Congress, get access to these negotiating documents while it is being negotiated. We, in Congress, are accredited to go to the negotiations if we want to, and with the Zinke protocol, which we added to this, if we ourselves can't make it, we will send representatives for ourselves to these negotiations.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, transparency. In the old days, they used to call this thing fast track. President goes out and gets an agreement and then wham, whizzes it through, has Congress vote on it, it is in law, everybody's wondering what the heck just happened, what is in this thing. Not again. No more.

When an agreement is reached, when America gets an agreement with other countries, before the President can even sign off on it, we make it public for 60 days, up on the Internet, everybody can read it for themselves and see what it is. That is in this law. Never done that before. And then the President can sign it, but when he signs it, it doesn't go into effect. When he signs it, it just means he sends it to Congress, and then Congress considers it. Congress considers it and Congress determines whether it is going to happen or not. It is a bill like any other bill. Congress has to pass it. They have to affirmatively pass it for it to go into effect, and if the House of Representatives doesn't like the trade agreement and they vote it down with a simple majority vote, it doesn't happen. That is what this bill does. We have the final say.

I understand a lot of our Members, especially on our side of the aisle, they don't trust this administration. Join the club. Neither do I. That is precisely why I support this bill. TPA puts Congress in the driver's seat.

Mr. Speaker, the world is watching this. The world is watching whether or not—and they are trying to make a decision—is America still America or is America in retreat? Our allies want our leadership. Our adversaries are measuring how much we stack up. Our enemies would love for us to retreat. The world is watching as to whether or not America is going to lead in the world, whether America in the dawn of the 21st century is going to take command of writing the rules of the global economy or cede that command to other countries.

If we establish TPA, we are saying, on a bipartisan basis, we want America

to lead; we believe in our country; we believe in our workers; we believe in our economy; we want to open up markets so that we can use American ingenuity and American workers to create American jobs. So we can sell our goods and our services and our products overseas so we can create more good-paying jobs right here at home. That is what this is about. It is about getting us on the playing field.

There have been 100 trade agreements negotiated, signed since 2007 when TPA last expired. We are a party to zero of those. The rest of the world is moving around. The rest of the world is getting better deals. The rest of the world is freezing us out. We have got to get back in this game and lead this game and define this game.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: I am writing regarding H.R. 1890, the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, as amended, which the Committee on Ways and Means reported on April 23, 2015.

The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. The Committee on the Budget did not take any action on H.R. 1890 prior to being discharged. By foregoing consideration of H.R. 1890, as amended, the Committee on the Budget does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that the Committee may address any remaining issues that fall within its jurisdiction. The Committee on the Budget also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support of any such request.

We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to working with you as this bill moves through the Congress.

Sincerely,
TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 18, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Cannon
House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Rules Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1890, the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, and your willingness to forego consideration by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Budget has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of the bill and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your committee in the event

of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 24, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: On April 23, 2015, the Committee on Ways and Means ordered reported H.R. 1890, the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015. As you know, the Committee on Rules was granted a referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over rules and joint rules of the House. The Committee has exclusive jurisdiction over several provisions related to expedited procedures for consideration of legislation in the House.

We appreciate your recognition of the Committee's jurisdiction over these provisions and your assurances that we will be able to make any necessary changes during any House-Senate conference. Because of your commitment to consult with my committee regarding these matters going forward, I will agree to waive consideration of the bill. By agreeing to waive consideration of the bill, the Rules Committee does not waive its jurisdiction. In addition, the Committee on Rules reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Rules for conferees on this measure or related legislation.

I also request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during its consideration on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 24, 2015.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
*Chairman, Committee on Rules, Washington,
DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Rules Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1890, the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, and your willingness to forego consideration by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Rules has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of the bill and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the committee report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: I write in regard to H.R. 1892, Trade Adjustment Assistance Act (TAA), and for other purposes of 2015, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on April 23, 2015. As you are aware, the bill also was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 1892 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 1892 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1892 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding your Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1892, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act of 2015, ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on April 23, 2015. I appreciate your decision to facilitate prompt consideration of the bill by the full House. I understand that by foregoing a mark-up of the bill, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its interest in the provisions within its jurisdiction or the right to seek conferees.

Per your request, I will include a copy of our exchange of letters with respect to H.R. 1892 in the Congressional Record during House consideration of this bill. We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to working with you as this bill moves through the Congress.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,
*Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Cannon
House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding your Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1892, the Trade Ad-

justment Assistance Act of 2015, ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on April 23, 2015. I appreciate your decision to facilitate prompt consideration of the bill by the full House. I understand that by foregoing a mark-up of the bill, the Committee on the Budget is not waiving its interest in the provisions within its jurisdiction or the right to seek conferees.

Per your request, I will include a copy of our exchange of letters with respect to H.R. 1892 in the Congressional Record during House consideration of this bill. We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to working with you as this bill moves through the Congress.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: I am writing regarding H.R. 1892, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act of 2015, as amended, which the Committee on Ways and Means ordered reported without recommendation on April 23, 2015.

The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. In order to expedite House consideration of H.R. 1892, as amended, the Committee on the Budget will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1892, as amended, the Committee on the Budget does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that the Committee may address any remaining issues that fall within its jurisdiction. The Committee on the Budget also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support of any such request.

We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to working with you as this bill moves through the Congress.

Sincerely,

TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have worked in all my years here to expand trade in ways that spread its benefits to the many, not just to the few. CHARLIE RANGEL and I led the fight to include strong and enforceable labor and environmental positions and to strike the right balance between innovation and access to medicines in the historic May 10 agreement of 2007.

The trouble with this TPA is that it means no meaningful provisions whatsoever in TPP on currency manipulation, which has destroyed millions of middle class American jobs and allows investors to challenge American health and environmental regulations and others, not through the American legal system but through unregulated arbitration panels.

□ 0930

It is about a TPP going in the wrong direction in access to medicines and, in some important ways, on environmental protections; and it is about countries like Mexico that deny their workers basic labor rights to gain an uncompetitive advantage over our companies and workers. It is about Vietnam and Malaysia, which stand in clear violation of the May 10 provisions on international workers' rights, with no plan we know of to change that, far from a progressive trade agreement. On this and every other area of the TPP, there are only vague negotiating objectives left to be determined whether they were met by those who did the negotiating. I just want to say these negotiating objectives are so vague that they are meaningless, and to hold them up as something that holds USTR to action is simply a mirage.

Instead of passing this bill, which gives a blank check to the administration to finish up TPP negotiations where they are now and leaves Congress with only an up-or-down vote at the end, we should be using our leverage to impact the negotiations. This bill does not do that.

We in Congress, despite all of the rhetoric, will be in the back seat, not in the falsely claimed driver's seat. That is what this is all about, not protectionism versus free trade, not reflective opposition as is sometimes claimed to expanded trade. I have worked for expanded trade. It is quite the opposite. I want a TPP that is worthy of broad bipartisan support.

As to TAA and proponents of TPA, they are the ones who have linked the two together in a single bill. TAA should not be a bargaining chip to get a deeply flawed TPA across the finish line, and that is how this has been set up. This TPA should stand on its own feet. Even in its best form, TAA was a modest program, and I was one of the authors supporting it, but this TAA bill includes a number of shortcomings compared to the high watermark of the program.

Despite the fact that the need in this country is growing and trade is expanding, the truth of the matter is we need to do far more to train and educate our workers and to invest in our future in order to compete in a global economy.

A "no" vote will give us another opportunity to improve TAA and TPA and to achieve our ultimate goal for which I and others have been working for months and months and months and months, and that is the goal: a strong TPP agreement that can gain broad, bipartisan support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 21½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman

from Michigan has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, some have called Trade Adjustment Assistance "burial insurance" since it delivers limited help after a job is dead and buried.

At a time when Fast Trackers are claiming that they will include over half of the world's economy, we need a TAA that is funded for more workers at risk of job loss. Unfortunately, this particular TAA proposal is really short for "Taking Away Assistance."

It includes substantially less funding than the Administration has said was essential to protecting those who lose their jobs through expanded trade. Further, this TAA fails to restore coverage to thousands whose jobs may be exported.

In a very contrived process this morning, designed to obscure what is really happening and to remove accountability from Members of this House, desperate Fast Trackers and fast talkers have split up the Senate bill into two pieces—two votes—before they put it back together in exactly the same form it was when it first got to the House. And along the way, they have a self-executing rule so that it appears that Members are not voting to do what they are doing.

The first vote we take today at the end of this debate is on TAA. Vote "no." Your vote of "no" offers an opportunity to achieve both better Trade Adjustment Assistance and better trade legislation, and your vote "no" will also ensure that you are not on record as voting to send a bill to the President, which is exactly what will happen if you vote "yes," that cuts Medicare by \$700 billion.

Reject this bill, and develop a better alternative that reflects our values and 21st century economic realities. What really needs "adjusting" here today is the no compromise, no amendment attitude on trade. This vote wouldn't be so close if this process had not been so closed.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, the former chairman of the Trade Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, and a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, this is a time when everybody in this body needs to step back and really realize what we are here to do today. This is an historic moment. We will either move forward with our allies, with our partners—with our trading partners—or we will move back. TPA is just one step. It is a step that we must have in

order to pass additional trade agreements that we have been doing throughout our history.

If you look at where we are today, this is about trade promotion authority. People will have plenty of time to look at whatever trade agreements come down the pipeline over the next 5 years. That is what this debate is about. Why do we need trade agreements? We need to reduce tariffs on products that are made in the United States so that we have a better opportunity to export them overseas.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement has geopolitical concerns also. If we look down the road at the first trade agreement that is supposed to come up, it is supposed to be the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Today, if you look at what our partners and allies in Asia are dealing with, it is a behemoth in China, and China doesn't want to play by the rules. They have consistently avoided playing by the rules, which is putting our allies and our trading partners at risk, which is why we need to come together and pass an agreement.

If you pass the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement and the EU agreement, you have two-thirds of the world's economy under one set of rules. That is what this is really about. If we pass trade promotion authority, we move to the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and we move to the European Union agreement. Then we get two-thirds of the world's economy under the same set of rules.

I hope that my colleagues will step back and just stop all of the rhetoric on both sides of the aisle. On one side, we have people who are clearly representing the labor unions. On the other side, we have people who don't want to give the President a victory.

Today, Mr. Speaker, is a time when we need to step back and do the right thing for the right reasons for the American people.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) be permitted to control the time on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), a member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation before us today, trade promotion authority as well as Trade Adjustment Assistance.

What we are debating and what we have to decide today is whether to grant this President, this administration, the same type of trade negotiating authority that every President

since FDR, minus Richard Nixon, has enjoyed.

As a Democrat who has supported this administration, I wonder why we would not at least have a modicum of trust in this President going out and trying to get the best trade deal that he can. We will have an opportunity later to analyze any agreement that is reached to make sure it makes sense for our constituents, for our States, and, ultimately, for our country.

Let's be clear here. We are already trading with these nations: Vietnam, Brunei, Malaysia. The question moving forward now is what the rules of trade are going to be. That is why we need to be at the table, negotiating those rules, elevating standards.

Now, we are going to be negotiating core labor, environmental, and human rights standards in the body of the agreement, fully enforceable like any other provision in it, which is something that we have lacked in past trade agreements.

When President Obama first ran for election, he was hoping for an opportunity to go back and amend NAFTA because he felt, as I did, that there were deficiencies in that agreement. This is the opportunity to go back and amend the problems that NAFTA created, the lack of core labor or environmental standards, especially as it related to Mexico.

We need to be clear that this is an opportunity to move forward, getting the rules of trade and the standards elevated up to where we are so that we have a level playing field for our workers, our farmers, our businesses to compete.

Otherwise, the alternative is a race to the bottom with no rules at all or, possibly, with China's rules. That, ultimately, is the choice we face here today: to move forward with this authority, to move forward with these trade agreements, elevating standards to where we are, or to end up in a global trading system with no rules or with China's rules. That would be a race to the bottom, and we will not be able to compete very effectively in it.

I encourage my colleagues to support the passage today so we can start leveling the playing field for our workers at home.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and a great partner in trying to open up and break down barriers around the world.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 1314, the Trade Act of 2015, and H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act.

With 96 percent of the world's customers living outside of the United States, it remains vital for Congress to facilitate free trade agreements

through the passage of trade promotion authority. Absent TPA, America will continue to sit on the sidelines while the rest of the world negotiates free trade agreements and opens additional markets.

In my home State of Indiana, we have the largest number of manufacturers per capita in the United States. In the Hoosier State, exporting manufacturing goods supports 22 percent of our manufacturing jobs, 1 out of every 5. Our Hoosier farmers export over \$3.6 billion across our 5 largest agricultural export sectors.

At the end of the day, trade equals jobs. Congress must pass TPA to empower our negotiators to receive the best deal possible for American families and job creators.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TIBERI. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to work with Chairman RYAN to ensure that the House was able to include language within this act to ensure that no future free trade agreement can include language for backdoor cap-and-trade agreements.

We included language that would prevent this as it would negatively impact States like Indiana, which is the second largest user of coal in the United States. I look forward to voting in support of this vital piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion to concur is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 44 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1055

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed earlier today, 39 minutes of debate remained on the bill.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 21 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), one of our leaders here in the Congress on free trade.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for yielding and for his good work.

Mr. Speaker, trade means prosperity. In any trade, both sides go away with something of greater value to themselves, or the trade wouldn't take place. More markets for American products means more jobs and higher wages for American workers. More products entering our economy means more consumer choices and lower prices.

Trade agreements make trade possible, but the authority to effectively negotiate trade agreements lapsed years ago, handicapping America ever since. This is not some new power; it just restores the same negotiating process that has served us well since the 1930s.

A lot of people confuse the TPA with the TPP. That is a trade agreement that hasn't even been finalized. If it is finalized, this bill assures that it has to meet 150 congressionally mandated conditions and be available for every American to read for at least 60 days before Congress votes to approve or reject it.

TPA tells world markets America is back.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a member of our committee, the most distinguished Member from Georgia—or I should say the very distinguished Member.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and my ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the fast track amendment.

Over 20 years ago, I stood on this very House floor in opposition to NAFTA. I felt strongly then, as I do now, that these agreements are about more than trade. They are reflections of our values. Let me be clear, I am for trade. Since NAFTA, I have opposed some agreements and supported others, but I am not for trade at any price or at any cost.

Those of us on the Ways and Means Committee tried time and time again to make this legislation better, but mine and every single other Democratic amendment was rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I visited Vietnam, and I know that there is much work to be

done. There is no freedom to organize, and freedom of speech is limited.

The people of Georgia are calling and writing my office in waves. For over 20 years, they have felt the hardship of unfair trade. Textile and automobile factories disappeared from metro Atlanta. Good jobs were shipped to Bangladesh, to China, to Mexico. Americans should not have to compete with starvation wages and environmental destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about you, but as Joshua of old said, as for me and my house, I am going to cast my lot with the working people of America.

Today, we have an opportunity to do what is right and what is just.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. LEWIS. We can develop smart trade policies which reflect our values. Labor, human rights, and trade have always been connected. This is not new. This little planet is not ours to waste, but to use what we need and leave this little planet a little greener and a little more peaceful for generations yet unborn.

This Congress must be a headlight and not a taillight, or history will not be kind to us.

I urge each and every Member of this Congress to do what is right. Stand up for the working people of our country.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a leader on trade, a member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of trade with other countries. The benefits of trade are huge and enormous for our economy.

If you take all the trade agreements that we have with other countries around the world and you add them together, we have a trade surplus. If you take the nontrade agreements with the countries we don't have trade agreements with, we have a deficit. These agreements help us; they benefit us.

There is no doubt that the U.S. has been on the sidelines in recent years. This gets us back in the game, making us create a healthier economy here at home, changing and making sure that our status as a global leader will be right back on top, higher-paying jobs, better-paying jobs. This is an opportunity also to make sure the United States is setting the rules for our economy, for the world economy, instead of China.

Mr. Speaker, if you are for these things, you should be for this legislation. Trade promotion authority allows these agreements to move forward with congressional oversight.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise in strong opposition to the trade bill before us, and I am also in opposition to using 1 cent of Medicare money for anything other than paying for health care for senior citizens.

I am not antitrade; I believe in trade, and I want a trade bill, but I want a trade bill that creates jobs and economic opportunity for the communities that I represent. I want a trade bill that creates fair wages and opportunities for employment.

I don't want a bill that continues to help the rich get richer and the poor get poorer and the middle class get squeezed into oblivion, and I don't want a fast track. As a matter of fact, the jobs in economic development have left the communities I represent fast enough. They don't need our help, and they don't need to be gone. We need jobs in America.

I am going to vote against this. If I do and if it is the wrong vote, I am going to be voting with the people that I represent, the people who sent me here, the people who have said "represent us." They want a "no" vote. I vote "no" because I represent them.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), a leader on trade, a member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Trade Act of 2015.

We have the opportunity to remove major trade barriers which make it harder to sell U.S. products to consumers in other countries.

To grow our economy, we must expand our access to the 96 percent of consumers outside the United States. Nebraska's producers—farmers, ranchers, and others—want to serve new markets, and this bill is an important step forward.

A number of concerns have been raised, and I want to clarify a couple of points. Many Nebraskans are concerned about the President's actions on a number of issues. To address these concerns, we need to actually pass this bill and establish more than 150 congressional parameters that the President will be required to follow as trade negotiations take place.

Some might be concerned that no one is allowed to read proposed trade agreements. We must pass this bill, actually, to ensure that every Member of this body has full access to negotiating text and any final agreement is publicly posted online for 60 days before the President can sign it.

This bill also ensures we have an up-or-down vote on any trade agreement and contains new provisions allowing us to block agreements if the executive branch does not follow our rules.

This bill is important; it is an important step for opportunity and growth, and I ask for a "yea" vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another valued member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Democrats just left a very powerful presentation from the President of the United States to our Members, who simply ask that our Members play it straight: vote for things they believe in.

For instance, 125 Democrats voted for Trade Adjustment Assistance to help workers displaced because of things in the global economy. We have a provision before us today that is actually stronger than what 125 of us voted for before; yet there are some that are thinking, well, they may not vote for it.

I have had ads run against me for cutting Medicare; yet I am going to ask to enter into the RECORD a letter from the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, American Health Care Association, and the National Association for Home Care & Hospice that point out there were no cuts to Medicare because of the changes that we are involved with making.

Now, this is part of the problem we are having dealing with how to consider trade promotion authority. This is something that all of us should embrace. It sets the rules for the administration to negotiate and how we will evaluate it.

It will guarantee, as my friend from Nebraska just pointed out, everybody in America will have almost 5 full months to look at it before it is ever voted on. It contains the strongest environmental and labor provisions of any trade provisions in history.

That is what people talked to me about when they wanted NAFTA fixed. Trade promotion authority that we have here will do it. It is very important. I have not stopped working to improve this package. I have got things I want to change, work with the Senate, work in conference committee.

If we ever get an agreement, then I will evaluate the TPP based on what is in it, not speculation, innuendo, and reckless charges.

JUNE 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of our members, who include a broad spectrum of Medicare providers, we are writing to share with you our appreciation for addressing the cuts to Medicare that had been included in trade legislation but will now be removed. We support the provisions in H.R. 1295, the "Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015," that remove this Medicare cut.

This week, the House is considering several trade bills. Section 603 of H.R. 1295, which was passed by the House earlier today, would eliminate the Medicare sequester extension for the last six months in 2024, which would have cut \$700 million from Medicare according to Congressional Budget Office estimates. This provision also would have resulted in a net effect of increasing the sequester in 2024 beyond the 2 percent in the Budget Control Act. With the protection of Section 603, coupled with expeditious passage by the Senate of H.R. 1295 as amended, we would no longer view a vote in favor of the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) legislation as a vote to cut Medicare.

Hospitals, physicians, nursing homes and home health and hospice providers have already absorbed hundreds of billions of dollars in cuts to the Medicare program in recent years. We believe that it is an unwise precedent to use Medicare cuts to pay for non-Medicare related legislation. We are grateful this is addressed favorably in Section 603.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN HOSPITAL
ASSOCIATION;
AMERICAN MEDICAL
ASSOCIATION;
AMERICAN HEALTH CARE
ASSOCIATION;
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR
HOME CARE & HOSPICE.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a new member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we want to make sure that we are moving forward and providing American leadership when it comes to trade.

My friend from Oregon here just articulately noted some of the reasons why this needs to move forward. Literally one in three manufacturing jobs relies upon exports; 95 percent of the world's consumers are outside of the United States.

I want to make sure that we have got good, high-paying jobs right here at home. The way to do that is to be able to make sure that we are deciding what are the rules of the road when it comes to trade.

The rules of the 21st century in the global economy are being written today, and the question is: Will the United States of America be there to be able to write these rules, to be part of the process? If we don't, certainly China and others will, putting the United States and our businesses, our workers, at an enormous disadvantage.

We want trade deals that are enforceable, accountable, and have high standards. This is about creating good, high-paying American jobs. This is what we all want. Frankly, we have got an opportunity to move forward.

The 10th Congressional District is the 4th largest manufacturing district in the nation, with over 107,000 manufacturing employees.

1 in 3 manufacturing jobs rely on exports.

New opportunities for America's small businesses.

97% of U.S. companies that export are small and medium-sized businesses.

The actual vote on any final trade agreement is months away. I want to clear up confusion, because there are efforts by critics of trade to distort what TPA is.

This is merely a vote on the process associated with moving forward on trade agreements—this is not the vote on any actual trade deal. That vote would not occur for months.

TPA explicitly prevents the enactment of any trade deal without separate, subsequent approval by Congress. Nothing will be enacted without an additional up-or-down vote in Congress.

TPA ensures that the American people will have an opportunity to read the actual text of any preliminary agreement that the President intends to enter into.

Specifically, the President must publish the text online at least 60 days prior to signing off on anything. And even after that, Congress still gets an up-or-down vote on approval or rejection. So, there is unprecedented transparency here.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what an innuendo is. It is saying that the jobs that we lose are going to be replaced by just as good or better jobs.

Well, here is the record. Remember, you are giving assistance to workers who already lost their jobs. Wouldn't it make sense logically to try to save the jobs in the first place? Or do we believe, as President Bush said in February of 2004 in his economic report: Hey, if they make it cheaper overseas, we have got to do something else? That is a way out. That is innuendo.

If you want to talk about inequality, the jobs we are losing in manufacturing are paying over \$600 a week, and the jobs that are being replaced pay \$330. Who are we kidding here? Get to the facts. Get to the facts.

Past trade deals have hurt the American worker. By the way, you placed this thing—those who are proponents of this legislation—that we are against trade. Nothing could be further from the truth. We want fair deals that help our workers. That is what this is all about.

In my town, a textile business lost everything 40–50 years ago; 25,000–30,000 people were employed with that textile industry. We sat here in the Congress of the United States and watched these people lose their jobs. You are sure as heck they want the retail jobs. Do you know what they paid?

Fast track and the underlying Trans-Pacific Partnership will continue the trend of corporations offshoring American jobs, driving down wages; and now, we are going to be competing with the Vietnamese who pay maybe 60 cents an hour. That is the level.

Everybody can't be like us. We understand that. We are not against trade. We want it to be fair, and we want the American worker to be protected. That is what this is all about.

We had our fears confirmed when the President told us that China wanted to join the TPP. That is the icing on the cake, making a bad deal even worse.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to remind my friend that globalization occurred long before any trade agreement. My dad lost his job, his steelworker job, years before NAFTA. In fact, we have a trade surplus, Mr. Speaker.

We have a trade surplus with the 20 countries that we have a trade agreement with, a deficit with the countries that we don't.

It is now my privilege to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Trade Act of 2015.

Ninety-five percent of the world's market is outside the United States, and selling our goods to these markets is critical to America's future prosperity. One in five of American jobs are directly tied to trade. If we can't knock down the tariffs that are placed on American goods around the world, the world is going to buy these goods elsewhere. Simply put, a strong trade agenda is essential to America's national security and the economic opportunity of hard-working taxpayers.

If you want a strong trade agreement with better protections for U.S. workers, you want trade promotion authority. TPA allows Congress to hold the administration accountable and gives Congress the chance to vote down a bad deal. Without it, we are negotiating from a disadvantage. If we are not setting the rules on global trade, China will.

Mr. Speaker, trade promotion authority means stronger, better trade agreements. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it because what is happening right now is, if we don't have an increasingly aggressive China in there setting the rules, the trade agreements give us the chances on things like labor, things like the environment, things like a fair and open Internet. Those are the kinds of things that are going to create future jobs and keep the world safer and better.

I urge my colleagues to support this.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ), another valued member of our committee.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this misguided TPA bill. Many of my colleagues have highlighted the reasons to oppose the bill, but I want to focus on two specific fundamental issues, labor and civil rights.

There is nothing in this that requires countries to bring their labor laws and

regulations into compliance before this deal takes effect. How can we have an agreement that doesn't require everybody to play by the same rules? That is just ridiculous.

We need trade agreements that prohibit signatory countries from murdering, jailing, torturing, or firing citizens for doing such outlandish things as trying to unionize and bargain for safer working conditions.

Enforceable labor provisions tell trading partners that we mean business on labor rights before letting their goods into the U.S. Trade agreements should not continue a race to the bottom for workers. We should be setting the standards.

I am frustrated that TPP negotiations are nearly complete and we are just now giving the administration their marching orders, but here we are, and those marching orders should be clear, especially on labor rights.

Additionally, in the Ways and Means markup for this legislation, I offered a commonsense amendment to address the issue of countries whose laws call for imprisonment, torture, and even death for the supposed crime of one's sexual orientation.

□ 1115

I was baffled to watch every single Republican member on the committee vote to say that it is perfectly acceptable to do business with countries that have these laws. Perhaps it was naive of me to think that we could at least have one bright-line rule for the most basic of human rights—not to be put to death based on a person's actual or perceived sexual orientation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. U.S. market access shouldn't be a free pass. If you want to do business with the U.S., we shouldn't tolerate such barbaric behavior.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I now have the privilege to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and an important voice on trade.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank Chairman TIBERI.

Mr. Speaker, one of two things is going to happen: we are either going to lean forward and claim the best days of America, which are ahead of us, or we are going to recede from those. The choice is here and the choice is today, and I urge us to move forward because I truly believe, if we pursue an aggressive trade agenda and if the United States leads on that trade agenda, I think good things are going to happen.

There is another part of this story, Mr. Speaker, as we have an oppor-

tunity to make history today as well. Included in the TPA is bipartisan legislation that I authored to shield Israel from being the victim of the insidious boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement that is brewing within Europe. This would be the first time in nearly four decades that Congress has taken action to combat boycotts against Israel.

Just last week, we saw a telecom giant, Orange, which is a company partially owned by the French Government, recede back from doing business in Israel and so forth based on BDS pressure. The language I offered that was unanimously adopted is simple: If you want to trade with the United States, you can't boycott Israel.

I want to thank Chairman RYAN and Chairman TIBERI for their leadership and Representative VARGAS and Senators PORTMAN and CARDIN for working with me on these important issues.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to stand as tall and as boldly as I can for the American worker. Almost 10 million Americans are unemployed; middle class income wages have been stagnant for decades; almost every low-wage job that could have moved overseas has moved overseas. We have to do something different—something smart, honest, brave, bold, and based on the almost unanimous consensus of American economists.

We need to tear down the trade barriers of other countries so that they will buy our goods and services. We need to establish much stronger labor and environmental laws overseas. We need to bring the rule of law to those countries so that investors will build new plants and equipment, and we need much stronger intellectual property protections around the world. We have to take globalization head on. We cannot isolate ourselves. No economy can grow from within. We tried protectionism, and we got the Great Recession.

Mr. Speaker, I stand for the American worker, and I support the Obama administration's commitment to free trade and to lifting the American middle class.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a leader on trade, a leader on the Trade Subcommittee, a past chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, and a leader on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank Chairman TIBERI for his leadership on trade and American success.

Mr. Speaker, who has the power? This is the question. When your family or your business wants to buy a product, who decides what you can buy and at what price? Is it you, or is it special interests or union bosses or the govern-

ment? If you build a better product or come up with a new idea, who has the power to decide where you can sell it around the world? Is it you, or is it special interests and government and, again, the union?

American trade is about giving you the power and you the freedom to buy and sell and compete around the world with as little government interference as possible. It is not enough to just buy American. We want to sell our American products around the world. When we do, we win. When we say to countries, "You are selling into the U.S., and we insist we sell into your country," we win and we create jobs. When we don't, America grows weaker, and our foreign competitors grow stronger. Our manufacturers and our farmers and our local businesses get priced out and shut down.

American trade is about our jobs and our prosperity. This bill sets the rules for trade so that, with these agreements, everyone benefits; everyone plays by the rules; everyone has the same opportunity. I am voting "yes" for more American jobs and more American economic opportunity and for less government control of our trade.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a longtime veteran of this Congress.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank our distinguished ranking member, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this limited fast-track trade debate.

Proponents of TPA are trying to lure votes for this Pacific deal by cynically adding \$700 million to trade adjustment assistance to take care of millions more people who are going to lose their jobs as billions and billions more of our productive wealth is outsourced to other countries. What a fig leaf. It is too little for the damage about to be done.

The eyes of working families in communities across our country are focused on Congress today, hoping we will finally stand up and do what is right for America. This latest job outsourcing trade deal serves only the 1 percent, rewarding the few at the expense of the many. It is a great deal for Wall Street, and it is a great deal for transnational corporations. But for Main Street, a shrinking middle class, and millions more of our workers, it is another punch to the gut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this week's scenario reminds me of the NAFTA fight. To pick up wavering Members back then, a deal was cut even to protect the corn broom industry, but in this deal, we don't protect people. In this deal, there is no

protection against human trafficking. That has been stripped out. So we have protections for corn brooms but not for people.

In return for securing votes for narrow interests to gain a majority for passage, a few thousand people may benefit handsomely from these little provisions, but America won't. We will continue to rack up massive trade and job deficits as world markets remain closed to us, as they have for four decades. State-run enterprises will continue to eat more of our lunch. And for America's working class, millions more of whom will be left out in the cold, the TPP will be a truly pathetic package. I urge "no," "no," "no" votes this afternoon. Stand up for America's workers for a change.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have great respect for my colleague from Ohio, but let me just give you a few facts.

Of the 20 countries with which we have trade agreements, we have a trade surplus. With the countries with which we don't, we have a trade deficit. It speaks for itself. In Ohio, 89 percent of our exporters are small- and medium-sized companies with fewer than 500 people. With respect to TAA, I must say that most of these trading dollars are spent at community colleges, at technical colleges, and they use that money to train workers and to upgrade skills for a 21st century economy.

I wish my dad, who had lost his manufacturing job way before NAFTA and who had lost his steelworker job way before any bilateral trade agreement for globalization, had had TAA to help him get a new job.

As the President said, in reality, a vote against this TAA bill will be a vote to actually cut funding for community college. As the President said yesterday, a "no" vote could potentially kill TAA forever.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. REICHERT), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and Trade Subcommittee and a leader on trade issues.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, Americans find themselves asking this question over and over again: Are things ever going to get better for America? The only answer has to be "yes." Today, we begin that process. Today, it is time for action. Today, we vote on trade legislation that is absolutely critical for America's future. Today, we send a message to the world—across this globe—a strong message that we are America, that we are strong, that we are free, and that we are united.

A "yes" vote today on TPA and TAA is a vote for a healthy economy. It is a vote for creating jobs. It is a vote for higher wages. It is a vote for selling

America. That is the message we are going to send across this globe today. America is back, and we are going to be strong in this world economy.

Hard-working taxpayers deserve a government that gives the citizens of this country freedom, choice, and control to pursue their futures. Every American deserves this—to build one's own business, to hire employees, to seek promotions, and to provide for one's family. Mr. Speaker, it is what real leaders will deliver today.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD).

Mr. ASHFORD. I thank the ranking member.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a vote for the ages. My constituents in Nebraska are asking me: "BRAD, can we govern? Can we come together? Can we move this country forward?" What we do here today will determine how we do move forward as a nation. What kind of country do we leave our children?

In my view, Mr. Speaker, we are at our best when we reach for the Moon. This, in my view, is one of those moments. This is a vote for better jobs, a stronger economy for American workers and for American exceptionalism. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a vote for the ages. Please support TAA and TPP and TPA to make life better for all Americans.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a leader on trade, a leader on the Ways and Means Committee, and a leader for Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, after 1945, the U.S. set up a global trading system, and countries around the world are taking advantage of it. The world is not sitting still. Hundreds of trade agreements exist, but we only have 20 with which we have a trade surplus, and we are sitting on the sidelines, standing still. It is just unacceptable.

American leadership is needed. If we are going to grow this economy, if we are going to create good-paying jobs for workers and farmers, we need to open markets, as 95 percent of the markets are outside the U.S. Let's open those markets. Let's be fair to our American workers and farmers. Let's give them market access. TPA is the catalyst to opening those markets and for growth.

The world is crying for American leadership. I am afraid American prestige is on the line right now. It is waning. Countries around the world are watching us to see how we vote on this today. We have the opportunity to show that America will lead the global trading system we created. I think, if we don't do this, we have dealt a serious blow to American leadership. It is a catalyst for American leadership. Let's pass TPA.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, would you tell us how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of yielding 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, time and again, we are promised trade deals create opportunity. Time and again, instead, they send jobs abroad. In the first 7 years of NAFTA, New York City's textile and apparel industry shed 7,900 jobs. In total, fast-track trade policies have cost the U.S. more than 1 million jobs. New York lost more than 374,000 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA and the World Trade Organization agreements.

Why would the Trans-Pacific Partnership be different? If that deal is approved, the U.S. will lose more than 130,000 jobs to just 2 of the 12 TPP members—Japan and Vietnam. New York already ran a \$47 billion trade deficit last year. This agreement will make the situation worse.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 20 seconds.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. When I go home to New York, I don't hear people telling me we need to rush into another trade deal. The only people pushing fast track are lobbyists and big corporations. They are not whom I represent. I would rather stand with New York's working families who oppose fast track. Vote "no."

□ 1130

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), a leader on the Committee on Ways and Means, a leader on trade.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, South Dakota tells the true story of what the benefits of trade can bring. When we have a trade agreement with another country, we sell 11½ times more goods to that country than if there were no agreement in place.

Trade has been and continues to be an important part of the American economy, but we cannot afford to fall behind. We have to continue to expand opportunities to export American-made products to these countries, but first we have to set the rules of the road.

The Constitution allows the President to negotiate trade agreements, but only Congress can approve or disapprove them. What we are voting on today ensures that Congress sets the priorities and the rules that the President has to follow. It allows an open and transparent process where the public can view any potential trade deal

for 60 days before it is sent to Congress. If the President doesn't follow our rules, we can take TPA away; or if we don't like future trade deals, we can simply vote them down. But we need to assert the power of Congress in the process and ensure that the public gets to weigh in down the road. That is what we are doing here today.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. America is counting on it.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Over the past 2 years, I have been a part of efforts, good-faith efforts, to write the strongest possible fast-track bill. But the process the legislation has gone through recently, with Ways and Means Democrats denied every opportunity to improve the legislation in committee, while Republicans were accommodated in the Customs bill with anti-immigrant, anti-environmental provisions, has moved the bill in precisely the wrong direction from what might have gained my support. Therefore, I plan to vote against TPA today.

But I strongly oppose the devious and reckless efforts to bring down TPA by trying to defeat the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act. TAA is a good bill which reflects longstanding Democratic priorities, and the objectionable Medicare offset that it contained has been removed. TAA has been critically important in North Carolina. I refuse to put displaced workers at risk for the sake of a political tactic.

I urge my colleagues, play it straight. Support TAA whether or not you support TPA.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), a new member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of TPA because trade is too important to southeast and southern Missouri to leave in the hands of this President or any President. TPA would bring more transparency and involvement to the negotiation process and gives Congress more authority over the President.

Without TPA, the President can keep Congress and the public in the dark on trade negotiations. Without TPA, the President alone sets the negotiating objectives; without TPA, Members of Congress are not entitled to read the text of negotiating documents during the process; and without TPA, the President does not have to publish updated summaries of trade bills during the negotiations.

However, with TPA, Members of Congress can be involved in the negotiation process to get the best deal for our folks back home. With TPA, for the first time ever, all bills negotiated would have to be public for 60 days be-

fore Congress votes on them; with TPA, Congress directs the negotiating objectives for trade bills; and with TPA, Members of Congress will have open access to the text anytime they want.

Mr. Speaker, we need TPA so that American trade deals can be transparent, effective, and enforceable.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this bill have not played it straight as far as legislative procedure. They took a Senate bill that should be a "yes" or "no" vote on this floor and split it up into two or three pieces. It is one package. If you are against fast track, vote "no" on TAA.

It is not the opponents who came up with this crazy procedure. If they had played it straight, we could play it straight. But now we are in a position to use the legislative tactics afforded by this House, pursuant to a rule that is complicated beyond belief, to sink this whole package by voting "no" on TAA. Vote "no" on Trade Adjustment Assistance because, if that happens, Republican leadership has said we go home.

What is the good of having a little bit of trade adjustment assistance if we lose millions of jobs because we put them on a fast track to Asia? Take Nancy Reagan seriously; when it comes to all three votes today, just vote "no."

Mr. TIBERI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy once said: "The U.S. did not rise to greatness waiting for others to lead. Economic isolation and political leadership are wholly incompatible."

This is the moment for the United States to lead. I am voting "yes" on the trade bills that we have today. Trade is good for the United States: 95 percent of all consumers are outside the United States. Trade is good for Texas: last year we had over \$289 billion of goods exported from Texas; 1.1 million jobs were created in Texas; millions of other jobs were created in the United States.

Now, who are those small companies? Who are those companies exporting? Ninety-three percent of those companies in Texas are small- and medium-sized, so therefore this is how we create good jobs here in the United States.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's support fair trade. Again, I ask you to support the trade bill today.

Mr. TIBERI. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time do I have remaining, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUNO).

Ms. DELAUNO. Mr. Speaker, the debate today is about one issue; it comes down to one question: Do we support hard-working Americans or do we abandon them? A vote for these bills is a vote against jobs, and it is a vote against wages.

The Trade Adjustment Assistance bill is underfunded. It excludes teachers, police officers, firefighters, and farmers who are hurt when production jobs are shipped abroad, go overseas. If we want to protect working families, we must stop fast-tracking bad trade deals.

Fast track denies public scrutiny, it denies debate in this House, and it relinquishes our congressional authority and does not allow us to amend a piece of legislation that will have such an effect on people's lives in this country.

Why is this trade agreement in so much difficulty? Why? Because this is the first time that a majority of the Congress is starting to say: We need to prioritize what is happening to the hard-working men and women in our country. What is happening to their lives? What is their struggle?

This trade agreement is only going to hurt their ability to have a job and to increase their wages. If we want to change that, then our job today is to vote down this bill.

Say "no" to Trade Adjustment Assistance and say "no" to fast track.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, I just want to point out the record here. No public service worker has ever been certified for TAA under the 2009 stimulus TAA that was passed. I will also reiterate a statement from the White House with respect to TAA, Mr. Speaker:

If you're a Member of Congress and you vote against TAA this week, you are signing the death certificate for this assistance.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak in favor of this important legislation for jobs, our economy, transparency, and accountability.

Free trade is critical for my constituents in central and eastern Kentucky. More than half a million Kentucky jobs are related to international trade, and expanding trade agreements will provide even more opportunities for job growth. Our State has a diverse economy that is synonymous with certain products, including coal, bourbon, and thoroughbred racehorses. We are a powerhouse of manufacturing, producing vehicles such as the Toyota Camry and even aerospace technology, which is the State's leading export category.

To continue the growth in these signature industries, we need to establish

fair and strong rules that hold other nations accountable for their unfair trade practices. We need to tear down barriers that block Kentucky goods from foreign markets.

What does free trade mean for Kentucky? In 2013, 2 years after our last free trade agreement was completed, the car of the year in South Korea was the Toyota Camry, manufactured in my district in Kentucky.

Let's be clear: The President already has the authority under the Constitution to negotiate trade agreements, but by passing TPA, we will ensure that Congress has the input into the final product and that America will shape the rules of global trade, not China.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in an auto town, where almost everyone had a family member who worked in the industry, but today there are no cars made there anymore. To me, trade deals should be about whether or not we will fight for American jobs and American workers' wages. Bad trade deals cost us both. Unless we have a say, unless the American people have a say, this trade deal will do exactly the same and cost us more jobs.

I have read the text, and I know where we are at with it as of now. I would like to see a deal that has better real protective teeth for labor and environmental law, strong protections for American sovereignty, and better protections for food safety and more. Bottom line: I want a trade deal that protects American jobs and lifts our wages right here at home.

If we vote for TPA, we will have no ability to make it better. For this trade deal or any other trade deal in the next 6 years under any President, if we want the American people to have a voice, a real voice, we must retain our authority to impact trade deals and vote against TPA in all votes that affect it today.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, let me set the record straight. All three bills that we are voting on today can be read. This is TPA. This is the bill that will hold the President accountable—this President, the next President. This is the bill that tells the administration what we expect. This is the bill that Congress inserts itself into to the President's negotiating.

Listen, ladies and gentlemen, the world is trading. The world is globalized. The world was globalized long before America decided to pass NAFTA—long before. And, in fact, NAFTA, in 1993, the year before NAFTA took effect, the U.S. had a steel trade deficit of 3 million net tons with Canada and Mexico. In 2014, the

most recent year for which data is available, the U.S. had a steel trade surplus of 1.2 million net tons with Canada and Mexico. NAFTA has benefited the entire North American steel industry. Total U.S.-Canada steel trade has increased 99 percent from 1993 to 2014. Total U.S.-Mexico steel trade has increased 352 percent between 1993 and 2014. That is why the steel industry in America supports this bill along with the enforcement that we are going to debate in a little bit.

In Ohio, Honda of America is a net exporter—is a net exporter. This is about jobs. This is about allowing those people, those workers, some of my constituents at East Liberty or in Marysville, to build more cars in Ohio, to send them overseas. The only way we do that is to break down barriers—more jobs.

Listen, I get job loss. My dad lost his job of 25 years. Ladies and gentlemen, we need to pass TPA to increase the number of jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today's vote on the trade package that includes trade adjustment assistance and trade promotion authority, also known as fast track, represents a flawed and hurried process to expedite the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement that is almost at the finish line. We should not vote for a TPA that fails to include strong and enforceable negotiating objectives on currency manipulation, labor rights and does not address the investor state dispute settlement system, which could see corporations challenge government regulations in secret tribunals that leave taxpayers on the hook for the bill.

I also strongly oppose using trade adjustment assistance as a bargaining chip to help pass a flawed TPA. I support providing assistance to workers displaced by trade but this bill should stand on its own merits and be improved on behalf of all workers before it is rushed through for a final vote. We must go back to strengthen TAA and TPA before moving forward on any future trade agreement that will have wide-ranging consequences for America's working class.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1314, which allows for fast track Trade Promotion Authority (TPA) for trade agreements entered into prior to July 1, 2021, including the prospective Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (T-TIP). Past trade agreements have outsourced American jobs and caused irreparable harm to our domestic manufacturing base. I believe that TPP, T-TIP, and other potential future agreements will be no different.

Throughout my career, I have voted against unfair trade agreements. I voted against the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which was sold on the promise of creating 200,000 American jobs. After enactment, the Economic Policy Institute (EPI) estimates that America lost 682,900 jobs, primarily in the manufacturing sector. I voted against the Korea Free Trade Agreement, which was sold on the promise of creating

70,000 American jobs. After enactment, again the EPI estimates that America lost 60,000 jobs. The future trade agreements we are discussing today are being sold on the promise of creating more American jobs. That argument may continue to work for some. But I am not buying it.

There has been a bipartisan failure, administration after administration, to address the effects of unfair trade on domestic manufacturers. Democrat and Republican administrations have been wrong to support irresponsible trade agreements in the past that have exacerbated the problems faced by American workers. President Obama is wrong in this instance. Congress should instead support trade agreements that substantially improve our existing trade laws and enhance our ability to enforce them in a timely fashion. We should only support trade agreements that include strong enforcement procedures, address currency manipulation, provide environmental protections, and protect American manufacturers from competing unfairly with exploited foreign workers. It is wrong to expect American workers to compete against state-owned enterprises that have unlimited government resources and violate our free market trade laws.

American manufacturing and the steel industry are struggling every day to keep their footing in the fight against unfair trade. Earlier this year, I co-chaired a Congressional Steel Caucus hearing where industry and labor representatives unanimously agreed that America's steel sector is being systematically targeted by trading partners that use the U.S. market as their dumping ground.

Just this month, six American steel producers, including two producers with facilities in my district, filed anti-dumping and countervailing duty petitions against foreign countries engaged in illegal trade practices. While I am pleased that American steel producers are taking action to hold these countries accountable, I am concerned that this case will not stop the ongoing trend of countries dumping their products into U.S. markets. I have frequently testified in front of the International Trade Commission (ITC), and was pleased that in 2009 the ITC ruled against China in an Oil Country Tubular Goods case. However, last year I testified again in a similar case involving these same products. After duties were imposed on China in 2009, other countries, such as Vietnam, Thailand, Turkey, and South Korea, started dumping the same product on our shores. This is a dangerous trend and Congress and the Administration must stop such practices from continuing.

I am encouraged that the House has taken some action to address unfair trade practices by including provisions in the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 that would strengthen our antidumping and countervailing duty laws. But while these provisions are a step in the right direction, they are not enough.

TPA does not include strong, enforceable currency reforms, and instead allows the Administration, without any clear guidelines, to determine how best to address currency manipulators. TPA does nothing to ensure that strong environmental protections will be included in future trade agreements. TPA does

not crack down on worker exploitation or lay out a roadmap to ensure countries included in future trade agreements are in compliance with international labor and human rights standards. Such economic inhibitors should be rejected. Instead, we should focus on investing in and encouraging vigorous domestic manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, steel is the economic backbone of the First Congressional District of Indiana, the foundation of our manufacturing base, and an essential element of our national defense. I am proud to represent the workers who make this steel every single day. Today, I ask that my colleagues stand up for American workers and oppose H.R. 1314.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Trade Act of 2015 (H.R. 1314), which would “fast-track” trade agreements, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), by allowing them to pass Congress by a straight up or down vote without any possibility of amendment.

Ever since NAFTA in 1993, these so-called free trade agreements have all been sold to the American people on the same propaganda; that they will boost exports and increase jobs. Yet the results have always been the same. Although we might increase exports somewhat, one of our biggest exports has been American jobs. Any claims to the contrary are not worth the paper they are written on.

For starters, these are not really free trade agreements. A true free trade agreement would consist of no more than a few pages simply listing the dates on which tariffs for various commodities would be eliminated. In fact, these agreements consist of thousands of pages of negotiated provisions, which history demonstrates have benefited multi-national companies while destroying millions of American jobs and depressing American wage levels. Without adequate labor, environmental and human rights standards, our trading partners can and do pay their workers 30 cents per hour, make their goods cheaper by dumping waste products in the river, and murder workers who try to join a union. No wonder factories in the United States close and move abroad. No wonder our balance of trade becomes calamitous.

We are always told that the next trade agreement will have better protections, but that has never been the case. None of the so-called protections have been enforceable or enforced. So it is particularly troubling that the text of the TPP is still classified. Members of Congress can look at it, but cannot take notes, cannot make copies, and cannot talk about what they have seen. What are they afraid people might discover? If it is true that the TPP includes enforceable provisions related to labor and environmental standards, why not make it public? Why not share what is supposedly so critical in this trade agreement with the American people?

The fact that the TPP is secret is obnoxious. Most of what we know about it has come from leaks that indicate that the TPP, just like its predecessors, will simply help multi-national corporations and further impoverish the lower and middle classes here at home.

For example, the TPP includes a chapter on Investment-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS)

that would allow multi-national corporations to sue state and local governments, or the Federal government, in private tribunals by alleging that American laws or regulations limit their profits. Companies like Phillip Morris could sue for compensation for loss of sales because of cigarette labeling laws. Companies could sue to void enforcement of minimum wage, or factory, safety or consumer laws.

According to the USTR, the TPP will also include new rules to “ensure fair competition between state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and private companies.” This could lead to privatization of a variety of public services. And just this week, the House voted to repeal our Country of Origin Labeling law after the WTO ruled that it discriminated against Canada and Mexico, raising even more questions about the consequences of these trade agreements on the sovereignty of our nation.

These questions are only the tip of the iceberg, and highlight the need for an open and honest review of the TPP rather than blindly facilitating its passage. The Constitution grants Congress the power to regulate foreign commerce. We must not cede that authority to the Executive Branch and abdicate our responsibility to protect the public interest. If the TPP is as beneficial as its supporters have claimed, it should be able to withstand scrutiny in the light of day and a full debate in Congress.

But we don't have to rely on leaks about the TPP to justify voting against the bills on the floor today. A host of provisions that have been added to the Trade Enforcement bill (H.R. 644) in order to gain support for this bill are egregious, such as prohibiting negotiations to address climate change, weakening language to combat human trafficking, and removing language to address currency manipulation.

This bill is dangerous and destructive. I urge my colleagues to vote No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion to concur is postponed.

□ 1145

AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2015

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 305, I call up the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, with the Senate amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.
(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 101. Improving partnership programs.

Sec. 102. Report on effectiveness of trade enforcement activities.

Sec. 103. Priorities and performance standards for customs modernization, trade facilitation, and trade enforcement functions and programs.

Sec. 104. Educational seminars to improve efforts to classify and appraise imported articles, to improve trade enforcement efforts, and to otherwise facilitate legitimate international trade.

Sec. 105. Joint strategic plan.

Sec. 106. Automated Commercial Environment.

Sec. 107. International Trade Data System.

Sec. 108. Consultations with respect to mutual recognition arrangements.

Sec. 109. Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee.

Sec. 110. Centers of Excellence and Expertise.

Sec. 111. Commercial Targeting Division and National Targeting and Analysis Groups.

Sec. 112. Report on oversight of revenue protection and enforcement measures.

Sec. 113. Report on security and revenue measures with respect to merchandise transported in bond.

Sec. 114. Importer of record program.

Sec. 115. Establishment of new importer program.

TITLE II—IMPORT HEALTH AND SAFETY

Sec. 201. Interagency import safety working group.

Sec. 202. Joint import safety rapid response plan.

Sec. 203. Training.

TITLE III—IMPORT-RELATED PROTECTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

Sec. 301. Definition of intellectual property rights.

Sec. 302. Exchange of information related to trade enforcement.

Sec. 303. Seizure of circumvention devices.

Sec. 304. Enforcement by U.S. Customs and Border Protection of works for which copyright registration is pending.

Sec. 305. National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center.

Sec. 306. Joint strategic plan for the enforcement of intellectual property rights.

Sec. 307. Personnel dedicated to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.

Sec. 308. Training with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.

Sec. 309. International cooperation and information sharing.

Sec. 310. Report on intellectual property rights enforcement.

Sec. 311. Information for travelers regarding violations of intellectual property rights.

TITLE IV—EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Procedures for investigating claims of evasion of antidumping and countervailing duty orders.

Sec. 403. Annual report on prevention and investigation of evasion of antidumping and countervailing duty orders.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

Sec. 501. Consequences of failure to cooperate with a request for information in a proceeding.

Sec. 502. Definition of material injury.
 Sec. 503. Particular market situation.
 Sec. 504. Distortion of prices or costs.
 Sec. 505. Reduction in burden on Department of Commerce by reducing the number of voluntary respondents.

Sec. 506. Application to Canada and Mexico.

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL TRADE ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION

Subtitle A—Trade Enforcement

Sec. 601. Trade enforcement priorities.
 Sec. 602. Exercise of WTO authorization to suspend concessions or other obligations under trade agreements.
 Sec. 603. Trade monitoring.
 Sec. 604. Establishment of Interagency Trade Enforcement Center.
 Sec. 605. Establishment of Chief Manufacturing Negotiator.
 Sec. 606. Enforcement under title III of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to certain acts, policies, and practices relating to the environment.
 Sec. 607. Trade Enforcement Trust Fund.
 Sec. 608. Honey transshipment.
 Sec. 609. Inclusion of interest in certain distributions of antidumping duties and countervailing duties.
 Sec. 610. Illicitly imported, exported, or trafficked cultural property, archaeological or ethnological materials, and fish, wildlife, and plants.

Subtitle B—Intellectual Property Rights Protection

Sec. 611. Establishment of Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator.
 Sec. 612. Measures relating to countries that deny adequate protection for intellectual property rights.

TITLE VII—CURRENCY MANIPULATION

Subtitle A—Investigation of Currency Undervaluation

Sec. 701. Short title.
 Sec. 702. Investigation or review of currency undervaluation under countervailing duty law.
 Sec. 703. Benefit calculation methodology with respect to currency undervaluation.
 Sec. 704. Modification of definition of specificity with respect to export subsidy.
 Sec. 705. Application to Canada and Mexico.
 Sec. 706. Effective date.

Subtitle B—Engagement on Currency Exchange Rate and Economic Policies

Sec. 711. Enhancement of engagement on currency exchange rate and economic policies with certain major trading partners of the United States.
 Sec. 712. Advisory Committee on International Exchange Rate Policy.

TITLE VIII—PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS

Sec. 801. Short title.
 Sec. 802. Sense of Congress on the need for a miscellaneous tariff bill.
 Sec. 803. Process for consideration of duty suspensions and reductions.
 Sec. 804. Report on effects of duty suspensions and reductions on United States economy.
 Sec. 805. Judicial review precluded.
 Sec. 806. Definitions.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 901. De minimis value.
 Sec. 902. Consultation on trade and customs revenue functions.
 Sec. 903. Penalties for customs brokers.

Sec. 904. Amendments to chapter 98 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

Sec. 905. Exemption from duty of residue of bulk cargo contained in instruments of international traffic previously exported from the United States.

Sec. 906. Drawback and refunds.

Sec. 907. Inclusion of certain information in submission of nomination for appointment as Deputy United States Trade Representative.

Sec. 908. Biennial reports regarding competitiveness issues facing the United States economy and competitive conditions for certain key United States industries.

Sec. 909. Report on certain U.S. Customs and Border Protection agreements.

Sec. 910. Charter flights.

Sec. 911. Amendment to Tariff Act of 1930 to require country of origin marking of certain castings.

Sec. 912. Elimination of consumptive demand exception to prohibition on importation of goods made with convict labor, forced labor, or indentured labor; report.

Sec. 913. Improved collection and use of labor market information.

Sec. 914. Statements of policy with respect to Israel.

TITLE X—OFFSETS

Sec. 1001. Revocation or denial of passport in case of certain unpaid taxes.

Sec. 1002. Customs user fees.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **AUTOMATED COMMERCIAL ENVIRONMENT.**—The term “Automated Commercial Environment” means the Automated Commercial Environment computer system authorized under section 13031(f)(4) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)).

(2) **COMMISSIONER.**—The term “Commissioner” means the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(3) **CUSTOMS AND TRADE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—The term “customs and trade laws of the United States” includes the following:

(A) The Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1202 et seq.).

(B) Section 249 of the Revised Statutes (19 U.S.C. 3).

(C) Section 2 of the Act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1453, chapter 251; 19 U.S.C. 6).

(D) The Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2071 et seq.).

(E) Section 13031 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c).

(F) Section 251 of the Revised Statutes (19 U.S.C. 66).

(G) Section 1 of the Act of June 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 817, chapter 617; 19 U.S.C. 68).

(H) The Foreign Trade Zones Act (19 U.S.C. 81a et seq.).

(I) Section 1 of the Act of March 2, 1911 (36 Stat. 965, chapter 191; 19 U.S.C. 198).

(J) The Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2102 et seq.).

(K) The Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

(L) The North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.).

(M) The Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

(N) The Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(O) The Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

(P) The African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.).

(Q) The Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-570; 100 Stat. 3207-79).

(R) The Customs and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-382; 104 Stat. 629).

(S) The Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-410; 92 Stat. 888).

(T) The Trade Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-210; 116 Stat. 933).

(U) The Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.).

(V) The Act of March 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 374, chapter 266; 19 U.S.C. 2077 et seq.).

(W) The Act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1263, chapter 566).

(X) Any other provision of law implementing a trade agreement.

(Y) Any other provision of law vesting customs revenue functions in the Secretary of the Treasury.

(Z) Any other provision of law relating to trade facilitation or trade enforcement that is administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection on behalf of any Federal agency that is required to participate in the International Trade Data System.

(AA) Any other provision of customs or trade law administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(4) **PRIVATE SECTOR ENTITY.**—The term “private sector entity” means—

(A) an importer;

(B) an exporter;

(C) a forwarder;

(D) an air, sea, or land carrier or shipper;

(E) a contract logistics provider;

(F) a customs broker; or

(G) any other person (other than an employee of a government) affected by the implementation of the customs and trade laws of the United States.

(5) **TRADE ENFORCEMENT.**—The term “trade enforcement” means the enforcement of the customs and trade laws of the United States.

(6) **TRADE FACILITATION.**—The term “trade facilitation” refers to policies and activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to facilitating the movement of merchandise into and out of the United States in a manner that complies with the customs and trade laws of the United States.

TITLE I—TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 101. IMPROVING PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to advance the security, trade enforcement, and trade facilitation missions of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the Commissioner shall ensure that partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection established before the date of the enactment of this Act, such as the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism established under subtitle B of title II of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 961 et seq.), and partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection established after such date of enactment, provide trade benefits to private sector entities that meet the requirements for participation in those programs established by the Commissioner under this section.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—In developing and operating partnership programs under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall—

(1) consult with private sector entities, the public, and other Federal agencies when appropriate, to ensure that participants in those programs receive commercially significant and measurable trade benefits, including providing preclearance of merchandise for qualified persons that demonstrate the highest levels of compliance with the customs and trade laws of the

United States, regulations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and other requirements the Commissioner determines to be necessary;

(2) ensure an integrated and transparent system of trade benefits and compliance requirements for all partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(3) consider consolidating partnership programs in situations in which doing so would support the objectives of such programs, increase participation in such programs, enhance the trade benefits provided to participants in such programs, and enhance the allocation of the resources of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(4) coordinate with the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and other Federal agencies with authority to detain and release merchandise entering the United States—

(A) to ensure coordination in the release of such merchandise through the Automated Commercial Environment, or its predecessor, and the International Trade Data System;

(B) to ensure that the partnership programs of those agencies are compatible with the partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(C) to develop criteria for authorizing the release, on an expedited basis, of merchandise for which documentation is required from one or more of those agencies to clear or license the merchandise for entry into the United States; and

(D) to create pathways, within and among the appropriate Federal agencies, for qualified persons that demonstrate the highest levels of compliance to receive immediate clearance absent information that a transaction may pose a national security or compliance threat; and

(5) ensure that trade benefits are provided to participants in partnership programs.

(c) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and December 31 of each year thereafter, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) identifies each partnership program referred to in subsection (a);

(2) for each such program, identifies—

(A) the requirements for participants in the program;

(B) the commercially significant and measurable trade benefits provided to participants in the program;

(C) the number of participants in the program; and

(D) in the case of a program that provides for participation at multiple tiers, the number of participants at each such tier;

(3) identifies the number of participants enrolled in more than one such partnership program;

(4) assesses the effectiveness of each such partnership program in advancing the security, trade enforcement, and trade facilitation missions of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, based on historical developments, the level of participation in the program, and the evolution of benefits provided to participants in the program;

(5) summarizes the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to work with other Federal agencies with authority to detain and release merchandise entering the United States to ensure that partnership programs of those agencies are compatible with partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(6) summarizes criteria developed with those agencies for authorizing the release, on an expedited basis, of merchandise for which documentation is required from one or more of those

agencies to clear or license the merchandise for entry into the United States;

(7) summarizes the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to work with private sector entities and the public to develop and improve partnership programs referred to in subsection (a);

(8) describes measures taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to make private sector entities aware of the trade benefits available to participants in such programs; and

(9) summarizes the plans, targets, and goals of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to such programs for the 2 years following the submission of the report.

SEC. 102. REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the effectiveness of trade enforcement activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the use of resources, results of audits and verifications, targeting, organization, and training of personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(2) a description of trade enforcement activities to address undervaluation, transshipment, legitimacy of entities making entry, protection of revenues, fraud prevention and detection, and penalties, including intentional misclassification, inadequate bonding, and other misrepresentations; and

(3) a description of trade enforcement activities with respect to the priority trade issues described in paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), as added by section 111(a) of this Act, including—

(A) methodologies used in such enforcement activities, such as targeting;

(B) recommendations for improving such enforcement activities; and

(C) a description of the implementation of previous recommendations for improving such enforcement activities.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 103. PRIORITIES AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR CUSTOMS MODERNIZATION, TRADE FACILITATION, AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS.

(a) **PRIORITIES AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commissioner, in consultation with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, shall establish priorities and performance standards to measure the development and levels of achievement of the customs modernization, trade facilitation, and trade enforcement functions and programs described in subsection (b).

(2) **MINIMUM PRIORITIES AND STANDARDS.**—Such priorities and performance standards shall, at a minimum, include priorities and standards relating to efficiency, outcome, output, and other types of applicable measures.

(b) **FUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS DESCRIBED.**—The functions and programs referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The Automated Commercial Environment.

(2) Each of the priority trade issues described in paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), as added by section 111(a) of this Act.

(3) The Centers of Excellence and Expertise described in section 110 of this Act.

(4) Drawback for exported merchandise under section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313), as amended by section 906 of this Act.

(5) Transactions relating to imported merchandise in bond.

(6) Collection of countervailing duties assessed under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and antidumping duties assessed under subtitle B of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673 et seq.).

(7) The expedited clearance of cargo.

(8) The issuance of regulations and rulings.

(9) The issuance of Regulatory Audit Reports.

(c) **CONSULTATIONS AND NOTIFICATION.**—

(1) **CONSULTATIONS.**—The consultations required by subsection (a)(1) shall occur, at a minimum, on an annual basis.

(2) **NOTIFICATION.**—The Commissioner shall notify the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of any changes to the priorities referred to in subsection (a) not later than 30 days before such changes are to take effect.

SEC. 104. EDUCATIONAL SEMINARS TO IMPROVE EFFORTS TO CLASSIFY AND APPRAISE IMPORTED ARTICLES, TO IMPROVE TRADE ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS, AND TO OTHERWISE FACILITATE LEGITIMATE INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Commissioner and the Director shall establish and carry out on a fiscal year basis educational seminars to—

(A) improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel to classify and appraise articles imported into the United States in accordance with the customs and trade laws of the United States;

(B) improve the trade enforcement efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

(C) otherwise improve the ability and effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel to facilitate legitimate international trade.

(b) **CONTENT.**—

(1) **CLASSIFYING AND APPRAISING IMPORTED ARTICLES.**—In carrying out subsection (a)(1)(A), the Commissioner, the Director, and interested parties in the private sector selected under subsection (c) shall provide instruction and related instructional materials at each educational seminar under this section to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and, as appropriate, to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel on the following:

(A) Conducting a physical inspection of an article imported into the United States, including testing of samples of the article, to determine if the article is mislabeled in the manifest or other accompanying documentation.

(B) Reviewing the manifest and other accompanying documentation of an article imported into the United States to determine if the country of origin of the article listed in the manifest or other accompanying documentation is accurate.

(C) Customs valuation.

(D) Industry supply chains and other related matters as determined to be appropriate by the Commissioner.

(2) **TRADE ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS.**—In carrying out subsection (a)(1)(B), the Commissioner, the Director, and interested parties in the private sector selected under subsection (c) shall provide instruction and related instructional materials at each educational seminar under this section to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and, as appropriate, to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel to identify opportunities to enhance enforcement of the following:

(A) Collection of countervailing duties assessed under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and antidumping duties assessed under subtitle B of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673 et seq.).

(B) Addressing evasion of duties on imports of textiles.

(C) Protection of intellectual property rights.

(D) Enforcement of child labor laws.

(3) APPROVAL OF COMMISSIONER AND DIRECTOR.—The instruction and related instructional materials at each educational seminar under this section shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioner and the Director.

(c) SELECTION PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall establish a process to solicit, evaluate, and select interested parties in the private sector for purposes of assisting in providing instruction and related instructional materials described in subsection (b) at each educational seminar under this section.

(2) CRITERIA.—The Commissioner shall evaluate and select interested parties in the private sector under the process established under paragraph (1) based on—

(A) availability and usefulness;

(B) the volume, value, and incidence of mislabeling or misidentification of origin of imported articles; and

(C) other appropriate criteria established by the Commissioner.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Commissioner and the Director shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the process established under paragraph (1) and the criteria established under paragraph (2).

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall give due consideration to carrying out an educational seminar under this section in whole or in part to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel to enforce a countervailing or antidumping duty order issued under section 706 or 736 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671e or 1673e) upon the request of a petitioner in an action underlying such countervailing or antidumping duty order.

(2) INTERESTED PARTY.—A petitioner described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as an interested party in the private sector for purposes of the requirements of this section.

(e) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—The Commissioner and the Director shall establish performance standards to measure the development and level of achievement of educational seminars under this section.

(f) REPORTING.—Beginning September 30, 2016, the Commissioner and the Director shall submit to the Committee of Finance of the Senate and the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives an annual report on the effectiveness of educational seminars under this section.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(2) UNITED STATES.—The term “United States” means the customs territory of the United States, as defined in General Note 2 to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(3) U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION PERSONNEL.—The term “U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel” means import specialists, auditors, and other appropriate employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(4) U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.—The term “U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel” means Homeland Security Investigations Directorate personnel and other appropriate employees of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 105. JOINT STRATEGIC PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall jointly develop and submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, a joint strategic plan.

(b) CONTENTS.—The joint strategic plan required under this section shall be comprised of a comprehensive multi-year plan for trade enforcement and trade facilitation, and shall include—

(1) a summary of actions taken during the 2-year period preceding the submission of the plan to improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation, including a description and analysis of specific performance measures to evaluate the progress of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement in meeting each such responsibility;

(2) a statement of objectives and plans for further improving trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(3) a specific identification of the priority trade issues described in paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), as added by section 111(a) of this Act, that can be addressed in order to enhance trade enforcement and trade facilitation, and a description of strategies and plans for addressing each such issue, including—

(A) a description of the targeting methodologies used for enforcement activities with respect to each such issue;

(B) recommendations for improving such enforcement activities; and

(C) a description of the implementation of previous recommendations for improving such enforcement activities;

(4) a description of efforts made to improve consultation and coordination among and within Federal agencies, and in particular between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, regarding trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(5) a description of the training that has occurred to date within U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation, including training under section 104 of this Act;

(6) a description of efforts to work with the World Customs Organization and other international organizations, in consultation with other Federal agencies as appropriate, with respect to enhancing trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(7) a description of U.S. Customs and Border Protection organizational benchmarks for optimizing staffing and wait times at ports of entry;

(8) a specific identification of any domestic or international best practices that may further improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(9) any legislative recommendations to further improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation; and

(10) a description of efforts made to improve consultation and coordination with the private sector to enhance trade enforcement and trade facilitation.

(c) CONSULTATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In developing the joint strategic plan required under this section, the Commissioner and the Director shall consult with—

(A) appropriate officials from the relevant Federal agencies, including—

(i) the Department of the Treasury;

(ii) the Department of Agriculture;

(iii) the Department of Commerce;

(iv) the Department of Justice;

(v) the Department of the Interior;

(vi) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(vii) the Food and Drug Administration;

(viii) the Consumer Product Safety Commission; and

(ix) the Office of the United States Trade Representative; and

(B) the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established by section 109 of this Act.

(2) OTHER CONSULTATIONS.—In developing the joint strategic plan required under this section, the Commissioner and the Director shall seek to consult with—

(A) appropriate officials from relevant foreign law enforcement agencies and international organizations, including the World Customs Organization; and

(B) interested parties in the private sector.

(d) FORM OF PLAN.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 106. AUTOMATED COMMERCIAL ENVIRONMENT.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 13031(f)(4)(B) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking “2003 through 2005” and inserting “2016 through 2018”;;

(2) by striking “such amounts as are available in that Account” and inserting “not less than \$153,736,000”; and

(3) by striking “for the development” and inserting “to complete the development and implementation”.

(b) REPORT.—Section 311(b)(3) of the Customs Border Security Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 2075 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report detailing—

“(i) U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s incorporation of all core trade processing capabilities, including cargo release, entry summary, cargo manifest, cargo financial data, and export data elements into the Automated Commercial Environment computer system authorized under section 13031(f)(4) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)) not later than September 30, 2016, to conform with the admissibility criteria of agencies participating in the International Trade Data System identified pursuant to section 411(d)(4)(A)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930;

“(ii) U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s remaining priorities for processing entry summary data elements, cargo manifest data elements, cargo financial data elements, and export elements in the Automated Commercial Environment computer system, and the objectives and plans for implementing these remaining priorities;

“(iii) the components of the National Customs Automation Program specified in subsection (a)(2) of section 411 of the Tariff Act of 1930 that have not been implemented; and

“(iv) any additional components of the National Customs Automation Program initiated by the Commissioner to complete the development, establishment, and implementation of the Automated Commercial Environment computer system.

“(B) UPDATE OF REPORTS.—Not later than September 30, 2017, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives an updated report addressing each of the matters referred to in subparagraph (A), and—

“(i) evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the Automated Commercial Environment computer system; and

“(ii) detailing the percentage of trade processed in the Automated Commercial Environment every month since September 30, 2016.”.

(c) **GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report—

(1) assessing the progress of other Federal agencies in accessing and utilizing the Automated Commercial Environment; and

(2) assessing the potential cost savings to the United States Government and importers and exporters and the potential benefits to enforcement of the customs and trade laws of the United States if the elements identified in clauses (i) through (iv) of section 311(b)(3)(A) of the Customs Border Security Act of 2002, as amended by subsection (b) of this section, are implemented.

SEC. 107. INTERNATIONAL TRADE DATA SYSTEM.

(a) **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE.**—Section 411(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1411(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (5) through (8), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall work with the head of each agency participating in the ITDS and the Interagency Steering Committee to ensure that each agency—

“(i) develops and maintains the necessary information technology infrastructure to support the operation of the ITDS and to submit all data to the ITDS electronically;

“(ii) enters into a memorandum of understanding, or takes such other action as is necessary, to provide for the information sharing between the agency and U.S. Customs and Border Protection necessary for the operation and maintenance of the ITDS;

“(iii) not later than June 30, 2016, identifies and transmits to the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection the admissibility criteria and data elements required by the agency to authorize the release of cargo by U.S. Customs and Border Protection for incorporation into the operational functionality of the Automated Commercial Environment computer system authorized under section 1303(f)(4) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)); and

“(iv) not later than December 31, 2016, utilizes the ITDS as the primary means of receiving from users the standard set of data and other relevant documentation, exclusive of applications for permits, licenses, or certifications required for the release of imported cargo and clearance of cargo for export.

“(B) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require any action to be taken that would compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation or national security.”; and

(3) in paragraph (8), as redesignated, by striking “section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note)” and inserting “section 109 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 108. CONSULTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO MUTUAL RECOGNITION ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) **CONSULTATIONS.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to any proposed mu-

tual recognition arrangement or similar agreement between the United States and a foreign government providing for mutual recognition of supply chain security programs and customs revenue functions, shall consult—

(1) not later than 30 days before initiating negotiations to enter into any such arrangement or similar agreement, with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

(2) not later than 30 days before entering into any such arrangement or similar agreement, with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(b) **NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVE.**—It shall be a negotiating objective of the United States in any negotiation for a mutual recognition arrangement with a foreign country on partnership programs, such as the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism established under subtitle B of title II of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 961 et seq.), to seek to ensure the compatibility of the partnership programs of that country with the partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to enhance trade facilitation and trade enforcement.

SEC. 109. COMMERCIAL CUSTOMS OPERATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly establish a Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the “Advisory Committee”).

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Advisory Committee shall be comprised of—

(A) 20 individuals appointed under paragraph (2);

(B) the Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy of the Department of the Treasury and the Commissioner, who shall jointly co-chair meetings of the Advisory Committee; and

(C) the Assistant Secretary for Policy and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the Department of Homeland Security, who shall serve as deputy co-chairs of meetings of the Advisory Committee.

(2) **APPOINTMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly appoint 20 individuals from the private sector to the Advisory Committee.

(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In making appointments under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall appoint members—

(i) to ensure that the membership of the Advisory Committee is representative of the individuals and firms affected by the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

(ii) without regard to political affiliation.

(C) **TERMS.**—Each individual appointed to the Advisory Committee under this paragraph shall be appointed for a term of not more than 3 years, and may be reappointed to subsequent terms, but may not serve more than 2 terms sequentially.

(3) **TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP.**—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security may transfer members serving on the Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations of the United States Customs Service established under section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to the Advisory Committee established under subsection (a).

(c) **DUTIES.**—The Advisory Committee established under subsection (a) shall—

(1) advise the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security on all matters involving the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including advising with respect to significant changes that are proposed with respect to regulations, policies, or practices of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(2) provide recommendations to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security on improvements to the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(3) collaborate in developing the agenda for Advisory Committee meetings; and

(4) perform such other functions relating to the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection as prescribed by law or as the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security jointly direct.

(d) **MEETINGS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security, or at the call of not less than two-thirds of the membership of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee shall meet at least 4 times each calendar year.

(2) **OPEN MEETINGS.**—Notwithstanding section 10(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), the Advisory Committee meetings shall be open to the public unless the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that the meeting will include matters the disclosure of which would compromise the development of policies, priorities, or negotiating objectives or positions that could impact the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection or the operations or investigations of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(e) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2016, and annually thereafter, the Advisory Committee shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) describes the activities of the Advisory Committee during the preceding fiscal year; and

(2) sets forth any recommendations of the Advisory Committee regarding the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—Section 14(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.; relating to the termination of advisory committees) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

(g) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective on the date on which the Advisory Committee is established under subsection (a), section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) is repealed.

(2) **REFERENCE.**—Any reference in law to the Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations of the United States Customs Service established under section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) made on or after the date on which the Advisory Committee is established under subsection (a), shall be deemed a reference to the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established under subsection (a).

SEC. 110. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AND EXPERTISE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commissioner shall, in consultation with the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established by section 109 of this Act, develop and implement Centers of Excellence and Expertise throughout U.S. Customs and Border Protection that—

(1) enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States by consistently enforcing the

laws and regulations of the United States at all ports of entry of the United States and by facilitating the flow of legitimate trade through increasing industry-based knowledge;

(2) improve enforcement efforts, including enforcement of priority trade issues described in subparagraph (B)(ii) of section 2(d)(3) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), as added by section 111(a) of this Act, in specific industry sectors through the application of targeting information from the Commercial Targeting Division established under subparagraph (A) of such section 2(d)(3) and from other means of verification;

(3) build upon the expertise of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in particular industry operations, supply chains, and compliance requirements;

(4) promote the uniform implementation at each port of entry of the United States of policies and regulations relating to imports;

(5) centralize the trade enforcement and trade facilitation efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(6) formalize an account-based approach to apply, as the Commissioner determines appropriate, to the importation of merchandise into the United States;

(7) foster partnerships through the expansion of trade programs and other trusted partner programs;

(8) develop applicable performance measurements to meet internal efficiency and effectiveness goals; and

(9) whenever feasible, facilitate a more efficient flow of information between Federal agencies.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report describing—

(1) the scope, functions, and structure of each Center of Excellence and Expertise developed and implemented under subsection (a);

(2) the effectiveness of each such Center of Excellence and Expertise in improving enforcement efforts, including enforcement of priority trade issues, and facilitating legitimate trade;

(3) the quantitative and qualitative benefits of each such Center of Excellence and Expertise to the trade community, including through fostering partnerships through the expansion of trade programs such as the Importer Self Assessment program and other trusted partner programs;

(4) all applicable performance measurements with respect to each such Center of Excellence and Expertise, including performance measures with respect to meeting internal efficiency and effectiveness goals;

(5) the performance of each such Center of Excellence and Expertise in increasing the accuracy and completeness of data with respect to international trade and facilitating a more efficient flow of information between Federal agencies; and

(6) any planned changes in the number, scope, functions or any other aspect of the Centers of Excellence and Expertise developed and implemented under subsection (a).

SEC. 111. COMMERCIAL TARGETING DIVISION AND NATIONAL TARGETING AND ANALYSIS GROUPS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **COMMERCIAL TARGETING DIVISION AND NATIONAL TARGETING AND ANALYSIS GROUPS.**—

“(A) **ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMERCIAL TARGETING DIVISION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish and maintain within the

Office of International Trade a Commercial Targeting Division.

“(ii) **COMPOSITION.**—The Commercial Targeting Division shall be composed of—

“(I) headquarters personnel led by an Executive Director, who shall report to the Assistant Commissioner for Trade; and

“(II) individual National Targeting and Analysis Groups, each led by a Director who shall report to the Executive Director of the Commercial Targeting Division.

“(iii) **DUTIES.**—The Commercial Targeting Division shall be dedicated—

“(I) to the development and conduct of commercial risk assessment targeting with respect to cargo destined for the United States in accordance with subparagraph (C); and

“(II) to issuing Trade Alerts described in subparagraph (D).

“(B) **NATIONAL TARGETING AND ANALYSIS GROUPS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A National Targeting and Analysis Group referred to in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) shall, at a minimum, be established for each priority trade issue described in clause (ii).

“(ii) **PRIORITY TRADE ISSUES.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—The priority trade issues described in this clause are the following:

“(aa) Agriculture programs.

“(bb) Antidumping and countervailing duties.

“(cc) Import safety.

“(dd) Intellectual property rights.

“(ee) Revenue.

“(ff) Textiles and wearing apparel.

“(gg) Trade agreements and preference programs.

“(II) **MODIFICATION.**—The Commissioner is authorized to establish new priority trade issues and eliminate, consolidate, or otherwise modify the priority trade issues described in this paragraph if the Commissioner—

“(aa) determines it necessary and appropriate to do so;

“(bb) submits to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a summary of proposals to consolidate, eliminate, or otherwise modify existing priority trade issues not later than 60 days before such changes are to take effect; and

“(cc) submits to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a summary of proposals to establish new priority trade issues not later than 30 days after such changes are to take effect.

“(iii) **DUTIES.**—The duties of each National Targeting and Analysis Group shall include—

“(I) directing the trade enforcement and compliance assessment activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection that relate to the Group's priority trade issue;

“(II) facilitating, promoting, and coordinating cooperation and the exchange of information between U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and other relevant Federal departments and agencies regarding the Group's priority trade issue; and

“(III) serving as the primary liaison between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the public regarding United States Government activities regarding the Group's priority trade issue, including—

“(aa) providing for receipt and transmission to the appropriate U.S. Customs and Border Protection office of allegations from interested parties in the private sector of violations of customs and trade laws of the United States of merchandise relating to the priority trade issue;

“(bb) obtaining information from the appropriate U.S. Customs and Border Protection office on the status of any activities resulting from

the submission of any such allegation, including any decision not to pursue the allegation, and providing any such information to each interested party in the private sector that submitted the allegation every 90 days after the allegation was received by U.S. Customs and Border Protection unless providing such information would compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation; and

“(cc) notifying on a timely basis each interested party in the private sector that submitted such allegation of any civil or criminal actions taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or other Federal department or agency resulting from the allegation.

“(C) **COMMERCIAL RISK ASSESSMENT TARGETING.**—In carrying out its duties with respect to commercial risk assessment targeting, the Commercial Targeting Division shall—

“(i) establish targeted risk assessment methodologies and standards—

“(I) for evaluating the risk that cargo destined for the United States may violate the customs and trade laws of the United States, particularly those laws applicable to merchandise subject to the priority trade issues described in subparagraph (B)(ii); and

“(II) for issuing, as appropriate, Trade Alerts described in subparagraph (D); and

“(ii) to the extent practicable and otherwise authorized by law, use, to administer the methodologies and standards established under clause (i)—

“(I) publicly available information;

“(II) information available from the Automated Commercial System, the Automated Commercial Environment computer system, the Automated Targeting System, the Automated Export System, the International Trade Data System, the TECS (formerly known as the ‘Treasury Enforcement Communications System’), the case management system of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and any successor systems; and

“(III) information made available to the Commercial Targeting Division, including information provided by private sector entities.

“(D) **TRADE ALERTS.**—

“(i) **ISSUANCE.**—Based upon the application of the targeted risk assessment methodologies and standards established under subparagraph (C), the Executive Director of the Commercial Targeting Division and the Directors of the National Targeting and Analysis Groups may issue Trade Alerts to directors of United States ports of entry directing further inspection, or physical examination or testing, of specific merchandise to ensure compliance with all applicable customs and trade laws and regulations administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(ii) **DETERMINATIONS NOT TO IMPLEMENT TRADE ALERTS.**—The director of a United States port of entry may determine not to conduct further inspections, or physical examination or testing, pursuant to a Trade Alert issued under clause (i) if the director—

“(I) finds that such a determination is justified by security interests; and

“(II) notifies the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations and the Assistant Commissioner of International Trade of U.S. Customs and Border Protection of the determination and the reasons for the determination not later than 48 hours after making the determination.

“(iii) **SUMMARY OF DETERMINATIONS NOT TO IMPLEMENT.**—The Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall—

“(I) compile an annual public summary of all determinations by directors of United States ports of entry under clause (ii) and the reasons for those determinations;

“(II) conduct an evaluation of the utilization of Trade Alerts issued under clause (i); and

“(III) submit the summary to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives not later than December 31 of each year.

“(iv) **INSPECTION DEFINED.**—In this subparagraph, the term ‘inspection’ means the comprehensive evaluation process used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, other than physical examination or testing, to permit the entry of merchandise into the United States, or the clearance of merchandise for transportation in bond through the United States, for purposes of—

“(I) assessing duties;
“(II) identifying restricted or prohibited items;
and

“(III) ensuring compliance with all applicable customs and trade laws and regulations administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.”.

(b) **USE OF TRADE DATA FOR COMMERCIAL ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES.**—Section 343(a)(3)(F) of the Trade Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(F) The information collected pursuant to the regulations shall be used exclusively for ensuring cargo safety and security, preventing smuggling, and commercial risk assessment targeting, and shall not be used for any commercial enforcement purposes, including for determining merchandise entry. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, nothing in this section shall be treated as amending, repealing, or otherwise modifying title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930 or regulations prescribed thereunder.”.

SEC. 112. REPORT ON OVERSIGHT OF REVENUE PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 31, 2016, and not later than March 31 of each second year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report assessing, with respect to the period covered by the report, as specified in subsection (b), the following:

(1) The effectiveness of the measures taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to protection of revenue, including—

(A) the collection of countervailing duties assessed under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and antidumping duties assessed under subtitle B of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673 et seq.);

(B) the assessment, collection, and mitigation of commercial fines and penalties;

(C) the use of bonds, including continuous and single transaction bonds, to secure that revenue; and

(D) the adequacy of the policies of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to the monitoring and tracking of merchandise transported in bond and collecting duties, as appropriate.

(2) The effectiveness of actions taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to measure accountability and performance with respect to protection of revenue.

(3) The number and outcome of investigations instituted by U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to the underpayment of duties.

(4) The effectiveness of training with respect to the collection of duties provided for personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(b) **PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT.**—Each report required by subsection (a) shall cover the period of 2 fiscal years ending on September 30 of the calendar year preceding the submission of the report.

SEC. 113. REPORT ON SECURITY AND REVENUE MEASURES WITH RESPECT TO MERCHANDISE TRANSPORTED IN BOND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than December 31 of 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Secretary of Home-

land Security and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on efforts undertaken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to ensure the secure transportation of merchandise in bond through the United States and the collection of revenue owed upon the entry of such merchandise into the United States for consumption.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report required by subsection (a) shall include, for the fiscal year preceding the submission of the report, information on—

(1) the overall number of entries of merchandise for transportation in bond through the United States;

(2) the ports at which merchandise arrives in the United States for transportation in bond and at which records of the arrival of such merchandise are generated;

(3) the average time taken to reconcile such records with the records at the final destination of the merchandise in the United States to demonstrate that the merchandise reaches its final destination or is reexported;

(4) the average time taken to transport merchandise in bond from the port at which the merchandise arrives in the United States to its final destination in the United States;

(5) the total amount of duties, taxes, and fees owed with respect to shipments of merchandise transported in bond and the total amount of such duties, taxes, and fees paid;

(6) the total number of notifications by carriers of merchandise being transported in bond that the destination of the merchandise has changed; and

(7) the number of entries that remain unreconciled.

SEC. 114. IMPORTER OF RECORD PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish an importer of record program to assign and maintain importer of record numbers.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that, as part of the importer of record program, U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(1) develops criteria that importers must meet in order to obtain an importer of record number, including—

(A) criteria to ensure sufficient information is collected to allow U.S. Customs and Border Protection to verify the existence of the importer requesting the importer of record number;

(B) criteria to ensure sufficient information is collected to allow U.S. Customs and Border Protection to identify linkages or other affiliations between importers that are requesting or have been assigned importer of record numbers; and

(C) criteria to ensure sufficient information is collected to allow U.S. Customs and Border Protection to identify changes in address and corporate structure of importers;

(2) provides a process by which importers are assigned importer of record numbers;

(3) maintains a centralized database of importer of record numbers, including a history of importer of record numbers associated with each importer, and the information described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1);

(4) evaluates and maintains the accuracy of the database if such information changes; and

(5) takes measures to ensure that duplicate importer of record numbers are not issued.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the importer of record program established under subsection (a).

(d) **NUMBER DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “number”, with respect to an importer of record, means a filing identification number described in section 24.5 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation) that fully supports the requirements of subsection (b) with respect to the collection and maintenance of information.

SEC. 115. ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW IMPORTER PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall establish a new importer program that directs U.S. Customs and Border Protection to adjust bond amounts for new importers based on the level of risk assessed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection for protection of revenue of the Federal Government.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Commissioner shall ensure that, as part of the new importer program established under subsection (a), U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(1) develops risk-based criteria for determining which importers are considered to be new importers for the purposes of this subsection;

(2) develops risk assessment guidelines for new importers to determine if and to what extent—

(A) to adjust bond amounts of imported products of new importers; and

(B) to increase screening of imported products of new importers;

(3) develops procedures to ensure increased oversight of imported products of new importers relating to the enforcement of the priority trade issues described in paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), as added by section 111(a) of this Act;

(4) develops procedures to ensure increased oversight of imported products of new importers by Centers of Excellence and Expertise established under section 110 of this Act; and

(5) establishes a centralized database of new importers to ensure accuracy of information that is required to be provided by new importers to U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

TITLE II—IMPORT HEALTH AND SAFETY

SEC. 201. INTERAGENCY IMPORT SAFETY WORKING GROUP.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an interagency Import Safety Working Group.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The interagency Import Safety Working Group shall consist of the following officials or their designees:

(1) The Secretary of Homeland Security, who shall serve as the Chair.

(2) The Secretary of Health and Human Services, who shall serve as the Vice Chair.

(3) The Secretary of the Treasury.

(4) The Secretary of Commerce.

(5) The Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) The United States Trade Representative.

(7) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(8) The Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

(9) The Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(10) The Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

(11) The Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(12) The head of any other Federal agency designated by the President to participate in the interagency Import Safety Working Group, as appropriate.

(c) **DUTIES.**—The duties of the interagency Import Safety Working Group shall include—

(1) consulting on the development of the joint import safety rapid response plan required by section 202 of this Act;

(2) periodically evaluating the adequacy of the plans, practices, and resources of the Federal Government dedicated to ensuring the safety of merchandise imported in the United States

and the expeditious entry of such merchandise, including—

(A) minimizing the duplication of efforts among agencies the heads of which are members of the interagency Import Safety Working Group and ensuring the compatibility of the policies and regulations of those agencies; and

(B) recommending additional administrative actions, as appropriate, designed to ensure the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise and considering the impact of those actions on private sector entities;

(3) reviewing the engagement and cooperation of foreign governments and foreign manufacturers in facilitating the inspection and certification, as appropriate, of such merchandise to be imported into the United States and the facilities producing such merchandise to ensure the safety of the merchandise and the expeditious entry of the merchandise into the United States;

(4) identifying best practices, in consultation with private sector entities as appropriate, to assist United States importers in taking all appropriate steps to ensure the safety of merchandise imported into the United States, including with respect to—

(A) the inspection of manufacturing facilities in foreign countries;

(B) the inspection of merchandise destined for the United States before exportation from a foreign country or before distribution in the United States; and

(C) the protection of the international supply chain (as defined in section 2 of the Security and Accountability For Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 901));

(5) identifying best practices to assist Federal, State, and local governments and agencies, and port authorities, to improve communication and coordination among such agencies and authorities with respect to ensuring the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise; and

(6) otherwise identifying appropriate steps to increase the accountability of United States importers and the engagement of foreign government agencies with respect to ensuring the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise.

SEC. 202. JOINT IMPORT SAFETY RAPID RESPONSE PLAN.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the interagency Import Safety Working Group, shall develop a plan (to be known as the “joint import safety rapid response plan”) that sets forth protocols and defines practices for U.S. Customs and Border Protection to use—

(1) in taking action in response to, and coordinating Federal responses to, an incident in which cargo destined for or merchandise entering the United States has been identified as posing a threat to the health or safety of consumers in the United States; and

(2) in recovering from or mitigating the effects of actions and responses to an incident described in paragraph (1).

(b) *CONTENTS.*—The joint import safety rapid response plan shall address—

(1) the statutory and regulatory authorities and responsibilities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other Federal agencies in responding to an incident described in subsection (a)(1);

(2) the protocols and practices to be used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection when taking action in response to, and coordinating Federal responses to, such an incident;

(3) the measures to be taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other Federal agen-

cies in recovering from or mitigating the effects of actions taken in response to such an incident after the incident to ensure the resumption of the entry of merchandise into the United States; and

(4) exercises that U.S. Customs and Border Protection may conduct in conjunction with Federal, State, and local agencies, and private sector entities, to simulate responses to such an incident.

(c) *UPDATES OF PLAN.*—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall review and update the joint import safety rapid response plan, as appropriate, after conducting exercises under subsection (d).

(d) *IMPORT HEALTH AND SAFETY EXERCISES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Commissioner shall periodically engage in the exercises referred to in subsection (b)(4), in conjunction with Federal, State, and local agencies and private sector entities, as appropriate, to test and evaluate the protocols and practices identified in the joint import safety rapid response plan at United States ports of entry.

(2) *REQUIREMENTS FOR EXERCISES.*—In conducting exercises under paragraph (1), the Secretary and the Commissioner shall—

(A) make allowance for the resources, needs, and constraints of United States ports of entry of different sizes in representative geographic locations across the United States;

(B) base evaluations on current risk assessments of merchandise entering the United States at representative United States ports of entry located across the United States;

(C) ensure that such exercises are conducted in a manner consistent with the National Incident Management System, the National Response Plan, the National Infrastructure Protection Plan, the National Preparedness Guidelines, the Maritime Transportation System Security Plan, and other such national initiatives of the Department of Homeland Security, as appropriate; and

(D) develop metrics with respect to the resumption of the entry of merchandise into the United States after an incident described in subsection (a)(1).

(3) *REQUIREMENTS FOR TESTING AND EVALUATION.*—The Secretary and the Commissioner shall ensure that the testing and evaluation carried out in conducting exercises under paragraph (1)—

(A) are performed using clear and objective performance measures; and

(B) result in the identification of specific recommendations or best practices for responding to an incident described in subsection (a)(1).

(4) *DISSEMINATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND BEST PRACTICES.*—The Secretary and the Commissioner shall—

(A) share the recommendations or best practices identified under paragraph (3)(B) among the members of the interagency Import Safety Working Group and with, as appropriate—

(i) State, local, and tribal governments;

(ii) foreign governments; and

(iii) private sector entities; and

(B) use such recommendations and best practices to update the joint import safety rapid response plan.

SEC. 203. TRAINING.

The Commissioner shall ensure that personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection assigned to United States ports of entry are trained to effectively administer the provisions of this title and to otherwise assist in ensuring the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise.

TITLE III—IMPORT-RELATED PROTECTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

SEC. 301. DEFINITION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

In this title, the term “intellectual property rights” refers to copyrights, trademarks, and

other forms of intellectual property rights that are enforced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 302. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION RELATED TO TRADE ENFORCEMENT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by inserting after section 628 (19 U.S.C. 1628) the following new section:

“SEC. 628A. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION RELATED TO TRADE ENFORCEMENT.

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to subsections (c) and (d), if the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection suspects that merchandise is being imported into the United States in violation of section 526 of this Act or section 602, 1201(a)(2), or 1201(b)(1) of title 17, United States Code, and determines that the examination or testing of the merchandise by a person described in subsection (b) would assist the Commissioner in determining if the merchandise is being imported in violation of that section, the Commissioner, to permit the person to conduct the examination and testing—

“(1) shall provide to the person information that appears on the merchandise and its packaging and labels, including unredacted images of the merchandise and its packaging and labels; and

“(2) may, subject to any applicable bonding requirements, provide to the person unredacted samples of the merchandise.

“(b) *PERSON DESCRIBED.*—A person described in this subsection is—

“(1) in the case of merchandise suspected of being imported in violation of section 526, the owner of the trademark suspected of being copied or simulated by the merchandise;

“(2) in the case of merchandise suspected of being imported in violation of section 602 of title 17, United States Code, the owner of the copyright suspected of being infringed by the merchandise;

“(3) in the case of merchandise suspected of being primarily designed or produced for the purpose of circumventing a technological measure that effectively controls access to a work protected under that title, and being imported in violation of section 1201(a)(2) of that title, the owner of a copyright in the work; and

“(4) in the case of merchandise suspected of being primarily designed or produced for the purpose of circumventing protection afforded by a technological measure that effectively protects a right of an owner of a copyright in a work or a portion of a work, and being imported in violation of section 1201(b)(1) of that title, the owner of the copyright.

“(c) *LIMITATION.*—Subsection (a) applies only with respect to merchandise suspected of infringing a trademark or copyright that is recorded with U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(d) *EXCEPTION.*—The Commissioner may not provide under subsection (a) information, photographs, or samples to a person described in subsection (b) if providing such information, photographs, or samples would compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation or national security.”.

(b) *TERMINATION OF PREVIOUS AUTHORITY.*—Notwithstanding paragraph (2) of section 818(g) of Public Law 112–81 (125 Stat. 1496), paragraph (1) of that section shall have no force or effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 303. SEIZURE OF CIRCUMVENTION DEVICES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 596(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1595a(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “or”;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) U.S. Customs and Border Protection determines it is a technology, product, service, device, component, or part thereof the importation

of which is prohibited under subsection (a)(2) or (b)(1) of section 1201 of title 17, United States Code.”.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF PERSONS INJURED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 30 business days after seizing merchandise pursuant to subparagraph (G) of section 596(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by subsection (a), the Commissioner shall provide to any person identified under paragraph (2) information regarding the merchandise seized that is equivalent to information provided to copyright owners under regulations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for merchandise seized for violation of the copyright laws.

(2) PERSONS TO BE PROVIDED INFORMATION.—Any person injured by the violation of (a)(2) or (b)(1) of section 1201 of title 17, United States Code, that resulted in the seizure of the merchandise shall be provided information under paragraph (1), if that person is included on a list maintained by the Commissioner that is revised annually through publication in the Federal Register.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations establishing procedures that implement this subsection.

SEC. 304. ENFORCEMENT BY U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OF WORKS FOR WHICH COPYRIGHT REGISTRATION IS PENDING.

Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall authorize a process pursuant to which the Commissioner shall enforce a copyright for which the owner has submitted an application for registration under title 17, United States Code, with the United States Copyright Office, to the same extent and in the same manner as if the copyright were registered with the Copyright Office, including by sharing information, images, and samples of merchandise suspected of infringing the copyright under section 628A of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 302.

SEC. 305. NATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS COORDINATION CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) establish within U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement a National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center; and

(2) appoint an Assistant Director to head the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center.

(b) DUTIES.—The Assistant Director of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center shall—

(1) coordinate the investigation of sources of merchandise that infringe intellectual property rights to identify organizations and individuals that produce, smuggle, or distribute such merchandise;

(2) conduct and coordinate training with other domestic and international law enforcement agencies on investigative best practices—

(A) to develop and expand the capability of such agencies to enforce intellectual property rights; and

(B) to develop metrics to assess whether the training improved enforcement of intellectual property rights;

(3) coordinate, with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, activities conducted by the United States to prevent the importation or exportation of merchandise that infringes intellectual property rights;

(4) support the international interdiction of merchandise destined for the United States that infringes intellectual property rights;

(5) collect and integrate information regarding infringement of intellectual property rights from

domestic and international law enforcement agencies and other non-Federal sources;

(6) develop a means to receive and organize information regarding infringement of intellectual property rights from such agencies and other sources;

(7) disseminate information regarding infringement of intellectual property rights to other Federal agencies, as appropriate;

(8) develop and implement risk-based alert systems, in coordination with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, to improve the targeting of persons that repeatedly infringe intellectual property rights;

(9) coordinate with the offices of United States attorneys in order to develop expertise in, and assist with the investigation and prosecution of, crimes relating to the infringement of intellectual property rights; and

(10) carry out such other duties as the Secretary of Homeland Security may assign.

(c) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—In carrying out the duties described in subsection (b), the Assistant Director of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center shall coordinate with—

(1) U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(2) the Food and Drug Administration;

(3) the Department of Justice;

(4) the Department of Commerce, including the United States Patent and Trademark Office;

(5) the United States Postal Inspection Service;

(6) the Office of the United States Trade Representative;

(7) any Federal, State, local, or international law enforcement agencies that the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement considers appropriate; and

(8) any other entities that the Director considers appropriate.

(d) PRIVATE SECTOR OUTREACH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Director of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center shall work with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other Federal agencies to conduct outreach to private sector entities in order to determine trends in and methods of infringing intellectual property rights.

(2) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Assistant Director shall share information and best practices with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights with private sector entities, as appropriate, in order to coordinate public and private sector efforts to combat the infringement of intellectual property rights.

SEC. 306. JOINT STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall include in the joint strategic plan required by section 105 of this Act—

(1) a description of the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to enforce intellectual property rights;

(2) a list of the 10 United States ports of entry at which U.S. Customs and Border Protection has seized the most merchandise, both by volume and by value, that infringes intellectual property rights during the most recent 2-year period for which data are available; and

(3) a recommendation for the optimal allocation of personnel, resources, and technology to ensure that U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement are adequately enforcing intellectual property rights.

SEC. 307. PERSONNEL DEDICATED TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) PERSONNEL OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.—The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforce-

ment shall ensure that sufficient personnel are assigned throughout U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, respectively, who have responsibility for preventing the importation into the United States of merchandise that infringes intellectual property rights.

(b) STAFFING OF NATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS COORDINATION CENTER.—The Commissioner shall—

(1) assign not fewer than 3 full-time employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center established under section 305 of this Act; and

(2) ensure that sufficient personnel are assigned to United States ports of entry to carry out the directives of the Center.

SEC. 308. TRAINING WITH RESPECT TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) TRAINING.—The Commissioner shall ensure that officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection are trained to effectively detect and identify merchandise destined for the United States that infringes intellectual property rights, including through the use of technologies identified under subsection (c).

(b) CONSULTATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR.—The Commissioner shall consult with private sector entities to better identify opportunities for collaboration between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and such entities with respect to training for officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in enforcing intellectual property rights.

(c) IDENTIFICATION OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES.—In consultation with private sector entities, the Commissioner shall identify—

(1) technologies with the cost-effective capability to detect and identify merchandise at United States ports of entry that infringes intellectual property rights; and

(2) cost-effective programs for training officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to use such technologies.

(d) DONATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY.—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall prescribe regulations to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection to receive donations of hardware, software, equipment, and similar technologies, and to accept training and other support services, from private sector entities, for the purpose of enforcing intellectual property rights.

SEC. 309. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) COOPERATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall coordinate with the competent law enforcement and customs authorities of foreign countries, including by sharing information relevant to enforcement actions, to enhance the efforts of the United States and such authorities to enforce intellectual property rights.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide technical assistance to competent law enforcement and customs authorities of foreign countries to enhance the ability of such authorities to enforce intellectual property rights.

(c) INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION.—The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall lead interagency efforts to collaborate with law enforcement and customs authorities of foreign countries to enforce intellectual property rights.

SEC. 310. REPORT ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT.

Not later than June 30, 2016, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall jointly submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways

and Means of the House of Representatives a report that contains the following:

(1) With respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights, the following:

(A) The number of referrals from U.S. Customs and Border Protection to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement relating to infringement of intellectual property rights during the preceding year.

(B) The number of investigations relating to the infringement of intellectual property rights referred by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to a United States attorney for prosecution and the United States attorneys to which those investigations were referred.

(C) The number of such investigations accepted by each such United States attorney and the status or outcome of each such investigation.

(D) The number of such investigations that resulted in the imposition of civil or criminal penalties.

(E) A description of the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to improve the success rates of investigations and prosecutions relating to the infringement of intellectual property rights.

(2) An estimate of the average time required by the Office of International Trade of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to respond to a request from port personnel for advice with respect to whether merchandise detained by U.S. Customs and Border Protection infringed intellectual property rights, distinguished by types of intellectual property rights infringed.

(3) A summary of the outreach efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement with respect to—

(A) the interdiction and investigation of, and the sharing of information between those agencies and other Federal agencies to prevent the infringement of intellectual property rights;

(B) collaboration with private sector entities—

- (i) to identify trends in the infringement of, and technologies that infringe, intellectual property rights;
- (ii) to identify opportunities for enhanced training of officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and
- (iii) to develop best practices to enforce intellectual property rights; and

(C) coordination with foreign governments and international organizations with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.

(4) A summary of the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to address the challenges with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights presented by Internet commerce and the transit of small packages and an identification of the volume, value, and type of merchandise seized for infringing intellectual property rights as a result of such efforts.

(5) A summary of training relating to the enforcement of intellectual property rights conducted under section 308 of this Act and expenditures for such training.

SEC. 311. INFORMATION FOR TRAVELERS REGARDING VIOLATIONS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop and carry out an educational campaign to inform travelers entering or leaving the United States about the legal, economic, and public health and safety implications of acquiring merchandise that infringes intellectual property rights outside the United States and importing such merchandise into the United States in violation of United States law.

(b) **DECLARATION FORMS.**—The Commissioner shall ensure that all versions of Declaration Form 6059B of U.S. Customs and Border Protec-

tion, or a successor form, including any electronic equivalent of Declaration Form 6059B or a successor form, printed or displayed on or after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act include a written warning to inform travelers arriving in the United States that importation of merchandise into the United States that infringes intellectual property rights may subject travelers to civil or criminal penalties and may pose serious risks to safety or health.

TITLE IV—EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Enforcing Orders and Reducing Customs Evasion Act of 2015”.

SEC. 402. PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATING CLAIMS OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by inserting after section 516A (19 U.S.C. 1516a) the following:

“SEC. 517. PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATING CLAIMS OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.**—The term ‘administering authority’ has the meaning given that term in section 771(1).

“(2) **COMMISSIONER.**—The term ‘Commissioner’ means the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection, acting pursuant to the delegation by the Secretary of the Treasury of the authority of the Secretary with respect to customs revenue functions (as defined in section 415 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 215)).

“(3) **COVERED MERCHANDISE.**—The term ‘covered merchandise’ means merchandise that is subject to—

“(A) an antidumping duty order issued under section 736;

“(B) a finding issued under the Antidumping Act, 1921; or

“(C) a countervailing duty order issued under section 706.

“(4) **ENTER; ENTRY.**—The terms ‘enter’ and ‘entry’ refer to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse for consumption, of merchandise in the customs territory of the United States.

“(5) **EVASION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘evasion’ refers to entering covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of any document or electronically transmitted data or information, written or oral statement, or act that is material and false, or any omission that is material, and that results in any cash deposit or other security or any amount of applicable antidumping or countervailing duties being reduced or not being applied with respect to the merchandise.

“(B) **EXCEPTION FOR CLERICAL ERROR.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term ‘evasion’ does not include entering covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of—

“(I) a document or electronically transmitted data or information, written or oral statement, or act that is false as a result of a clerical error; or

“(II) an omission that results from a clerical error.

“(ii) **PATTERNS OF NEGLIGENT CONDUCT.**—If the Commissioner determines that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of a clerical error referred to in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) and that the clerical error is part of a pattern of negligent conduct on the part of that

person, the Commissioner may determine, notwithstanding clause (i), that the person has entered such covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

“(iii) **ELECTRONIC REPETITION OF ERRORS.**—For purposes of clause (ii), the mere nonintentional repetition by an electronic system of an initial clerical error does not constitute a pattern of negligent conduct.

“(iv) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—A determination by the Commissioner that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of a clerical error referred to in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) rather than through evasion shall not be construed to excuse that person from the payment of any duties applicable to the merchandise.

“(6) **INTERESTED PARTY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘interested party’ means—

“(i) a manufacturer, producer, or wholesaler in the United States of a domestic like product;

“(ii) a certified union or recognized union or group of workers that is representative of an industry engaged in the manufacture, production, or wholesale in the United States of a domestic like product;

“(iii) a trade or business association a majority of whose members manufacture, produce, or wholesale a domestic like product in the United States;

“(iv) an association, a majority of whose members is composed of interested parties described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) with respect to a domestic like product; and

“(v) if the covered merchandise is a processed agricultural product, as defined in section 771(4)(E), a coalition or trade association that is representative of either—

“(I) processors;

“(II) processors and producers; or

“(III) processors and growers,

but this clause shall cease to have effect if the United States Trade Representative notifies the administering authority and the Commission that the application of this clause is inconsistent with the international obligations of the United States.

“(B) **DOMESTIC LIKE PRODUCT.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘domestic like product’ means a product that is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, covered merchandise.

“(b) **INVESTIGATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 10 business days after receiving an allegation described in paragraph (2) or a referral described in paragraph (3), the Commissioner shall initiate an investigation if the Commissioner determines that the information provided in the allegation or the referral, as the case may be, reasonably suggests that covered merchandise has been entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

“(2) **ALLEGATION DESCRIBED.**—An allegation described in this paragraph is an allegation that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion that is—

“(A) filed with the Commissioner by an interested party; and

“(B) accompanied by information reasonably available to the party that filed the allegation.

“(3) **REFERRAL DESCRIBED.**—A referral described in this paragraph is information submitted to the Commissioner by any other Federal agency, including the Department of Commerce or the United States International Trade Commission, that reasonably suggests that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

“(4) **CONSOLIDATION OF ALLEGATIONS AND REFERRALS.**—

“(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The Commissioner may consolidate multiple allegations described in paragraph (2) and referrals described in paragraph (3) into a single investigation if the Commissioner determines it is appropriate to do so.

“(B) *EFFECT ON TIMING REQUIREMENTS.*—If the Commissioner consolidates multiple allegations or referrals into a single investigation under subparagraph (A), the date on which the Commissioner receives the first such allegation or referral shall be used for purposes of the requirement under paragraph (1) with respect to the timing of the initiation of the investigation.

“(5) *INFORMATION-SHARING TO PROTECT HEALTH AND SAFETY.*—If, during the course of conducting an investigation under paragraph (1) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner has reason to suspect that such covered merchandise may pose a health or safety risk to consumers, the Commissioner shall provide, as appropriate, information to the appropriate Federal agencies for purposes of mitigating the risk.

“(6) *TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ADVICE.*—

“(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Upon request, the Commissioner shall provide technical assistance and advice to eligible small businesses to enable such businesses to prepare and submit allegations described in paragraph (2), except that the Commissioner may deny assistance if the Commissioner concludes that the allegation, if submitted, would not lead to the initiation of an investigation under this subsection or any other action to address the allegation.

“(B) *ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS DEFINED.*—

“(i) *IN GENERAL.*—In this paragraph, the term ‘eligible small business’ means any business concern that the Commissioner determines, due to its small size, has neither adequate internal resources nor the financial ability to obtain qualified outside assistance in preparing and filing allegations described in paragraph (2).

“(ii) *NON-REVIEWABILITY.*—The determination of the Commissioner regarding whether a business concern is an eligible small business for purposes of this paragraph is not reviewable by any other agency or by any court.

“(c) *DETERMINATIONS.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 270 calendar days after the date on which the Commissioner initiates an investigation under subsection (b) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner shall make a determination, based on substantial evidence, with respect to whether such covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

“(2) *AUTHORITY TO COLLECT AND VERIFY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.*—In making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner may collect such additional information as is necessary to make the determination through such methods as the Commissioner considers appropriate, including by—

“(A) issuing a questionnaire with respect to such covered merchandise to—

“(i) an interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise;

“(ii) a person alleged to have entered such covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion;

“(iii) a person that is a foreign producer or exporter of such covered merchandise; or

“(iv) the government of a country from which such covered merchandise was exported; and

“(B) conducting verifications, including on-site verifications, of any relevant information.

“(3) *ADVERSE INFERENCE.*—If the Commissioner finds that a party or person described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of paragraph (2)(A) has

failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of the party or person’s ability to comply with a request for information, the Commissioner may, in making a determination under paragraph (1), use an inference that is adverse to the interests of that party or person in selecting from among the facts otherwise available to make the determination.

“(4) *NOTIFICATION.*—Not later than 5 business days after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner—

“(A) shall provide to each interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise a notification of the determination and may, in addition, include an explanation of the basis for the determination; and

“(B) may provide to importers, in such manner as the Commissioner determines appropriate, information discovered in the investigation that the Commissioner determines will help educate importers with respect to importing merchandise into the customs territory of the United States in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

“(d) *EFFECT OF DETERMINATIONS.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—If the Commissioner makes a determination under subsection (c) that covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, the Commissioner shall—

“(A)(i) suspend the liquidation of unliquidated entries of such covered merchandise that are subject to the determination and that enter on or after the date of the initiation of the investigation under subsection (b) with respect to such covered merchandise and on or before the date of the determination; or

“(ii) if the Commissioner has already suspended the liquidation of such entries pursuant to subsection (e)(1), continue to suspend the liquidation of such entries;

“(B) pursuant to the Commissioner’s authority under section 504(b)—

“(i) extend the period for liquidating unliquidated entries of such covered merchandise that are subject to the determination and that entered before the date of the initiation of the investigation; or

“(ii) if the Commissioner has already extended the period for liquidating such entries pursuant to subsection (e)(1), continue to extend the period for liquidating such entries;

“(C) notify the administering authority of the determination and request that the administering authority—

“(i) identify the applicable antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rates for entries described in subparagraphs (A) and (B); or

“(ii) if no such assessment rate for such an entry is available at the time, identify the applicable cash deposit rate to be applied to the entry, with the applicable antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rate to be provided as soon as that rate becomes available;

“(D) require the posting of cash deposits and assess duties on entries described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) in accordance with the instructions received from the administering authority under paragraph (2); and

“(E) take such additional enforcement measures as the Commissioner determines appropriate, such as—

“(i) initiating proceedings under section 592 or 596;

“(ii) implementing, in consultation with the relevant Federal agencies, rule sets or modifications to rules sets for identifying, particularly through the Automated Targeting System and the Automated Commercial Environment authorized under section 13031(f) of the Consoli-

dated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)), importers, other parties, and merchandise that may be associated with evasion;

“(iii) requiring, with respect to merchandise for which the importer has repeatedly provided incomplete or erroneous entry summary information in connection with determinations of evasion, the importer to deposit estimated duties at the time of entry; and

“(iv) referring the record in whole or in part to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement for civil or criminal investigation.

“(2) *COOPERATION OF ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.*—

“(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Upon receiving a notification from the Commissioner under paragraph (1)(C), the administering authority shall promptly provide to the Commissioner the applicable cash deposit rates and antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rates and any necessary liquidation instructions.

“(B) *SPECIAL RULE FOR CASES IN WHICH THE PRODUCER OR EXPORTER IS UNKNOWN.*—If the Commissioner and the administering authority are unable to determine the producer or exporter of the merchandise with respect to which a notification is made under paragraph (1)(C), the administering authority shall identify, as the applicable cash deposit rate or antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rate, the cash deposit or duty (as the case may be) in the highest amount applicable to any producer or exporter, including the ‘all-others’ rate of the merchandise subject to an antidumping order or countervailing duty order under section 736 or 706, respectively, or a finding issued under the Antidumping Act, 1921, or any administrative review conducted under section 751.

“(e) *INTERIM MEASURES.*—Not later than 90 calendar days after initiating an investigation under subsection (b) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner shall decide based on the investigation if there is a reasonable suspicion that such covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion and, if the Commissioner decides there is such a reasonable suspicion, the Commissioner shall—

“(1) suspend the liquidation of each unliquidated entry of such covered merchandise that entered on or after the date of the initiation of the investigation;

“(2) pursuant to the Commissioner’s authority under section 504(b), extend the period for liquidating each unliquidated entry of such covered merchandise that entered before the date of the initiation of the investigation; and

“(3) pursuant to the Commissioner’s authority under section 623, take such additional measures as the Commissioner determines necessary to protect the revenue of the United States, including requiring a single transaction bond or additional security or the posting of a cash deposit with respect to such covered merchandise.

“(f) *ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 30 business days after the Commissioner makes a determination under subsection (c) with respect to whether covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, a person determined to have entered such covered merchandise through evasion or an interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise may file an appeal with the Commissioner for de novo review of the determination.

“(2) *TIMELINE FOR REVIEW.*—Not later than 60 business days after an appeal of a determination is filed under paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall complete the review of the determination.

“(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 business days after the Commissioner completes a review under subsection (f) of a determination under subsection (c) with respect to whether covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, a person determined to have entered such covered merchandise through evasion or an interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise may commence a civil action in the United States Court of International Trade by filing concurrently a summons and complaint contesting any factual findings or legal conclusions upon which the determination is based.

“(2) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In a civil action under this subsection, the court shall hold unlawful any determination, finding, or conclusion found to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.

“(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO OTHER CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS.—No determination under subsection (c) or action taken by the Commissioner pursuant to this section shall be construed to limit the authority to carry out, or the scope of, any other proceeding or investigation pursuant to any other provision of Federal or State law, including sections 592 and 596.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1581(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or 517” after “516A”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to implement the amendments made by this section.

(e) APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

SEC. 403. ANNUAL REPORT ON PREVENTION AND INVESTIGATION OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 15 of each calendar year that begins on or after the date that is 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the efforts being taken to prevent and investigate the entry of covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) for the calendar year preceding the submission of the report—

(A) a summary of the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and investigate the entry of covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion;

(B) the number of allegations of evasion received under subsection (b) of section 517 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 402 of this Act, and the number of such allegations resulting in investigations by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or any other agency;

(C) a summary of investigations initiated under subsection (b) of such section 517, including—

(i) the number and nature of the investigations initiated, conducted, and completed; and

(ii) the resolution of each completed investigation;

(D) the number of investigations initiated under that subsection not completed during the time provided for making determinations under subsection (c) of such section 517 and an explanation for why the investigations could not be completed on time;

(E) the amount of additional duties that were determined to be owed as a result of such investigations, the amount of such duties that were collected, and, for any such duties not collected, a description of the reasons those duties were not collected;

(F) with respect to each such investigation that led to the imposition of a penalty, the amount of the penalty;

(G) an identification of the countries of origin of covered merchandise determined under subsection (c) of such section 517 to be entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion;

(H) the amount of antidumping and countervailing duties collected as a result of any investigations or other actions by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or any other agency;

(I) a description of the allocation of personnel and other resources of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to prevent and investigate evasion, including any assessments conducted regarding the allocation of such personnel and resources; and

(J) a description of training conducted to increase expertise and effectiveness in the prevention and investigation of evasion; and

(2) a description of processes and procedures of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and investigate evasion, including—

(A) the specific guidelines, policies, and practices used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to ensure that allegations of evasion are promptly evaluated and acted upon in a timely manner;

(B) an evaluation of the efficacy of those guidelines, policies, and practices;

(C) an identification of any changes since the last report required by this section, if any, that have materially improved or reduced the effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in preventing and investigating evasion;

(D) a description of the development and implementation of policies for the application of single entry and continuous bonds for entries of covered merchandise to sufficiently protect the collection of antidumping and countervailing duties commensurate with the level of risk of not collecting those duties;

(E) a description of the processes and procedures for increased cooperation and information sharing with the Department of Commerce, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and any other relevant Federal agencies to prevent and investigate evasion; and

(F) an identification of any recommended policy changes for other Federal agencies or legislative changes to improve the effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in preventing and investigating evasion.

(c) PUBLIC SUMMARY.—The Commissioner shall make available to the public a summary of the report required by subsection (a) that includes, at a minimum—

(1) a description of the type of merchandise with respect to which investigations were initiated under subsection (b) of section 517 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 402 of this Act;

(2) the amount of additional duties determined to be owed as a result of such investigations and the amount of such duties that were collected;

(3) an identification of the countries of origin of covered merchandise determined under subsection (c) of such section 517 to be entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion; and

(4) a description of the types of measures used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and investigate evasion.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “covered merchandise” and “evasion” have the meanings given those terms in section 517(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 402 of this Act.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

SEC. 501. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO COOPERATE WITH A REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IN A PROCEEDING.

Section 776 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(B) by striking “ADVERSE INFERENCES.—If” and inserting the following: “ADVERSE INFERENCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If”;

(C) by striking “under this title, may use” and inserting the following: “under this title—“(A) may use”; and

(D) by striking “facts otherwise available. Such adverse inference may include” and inserting the following: “facts otherwise available; and

“(B) is not required to determine, or make any adjustments to, a countervailable subsidy rate or weighted average dumping margin based on any assumptions about information the interested party would have provided if the interested party had complied with the request for information.

“(2) POTENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR ADVERSE INFERENCES.—An adverse inference under paragraph (1)(A) may include”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—When the” and inserting the following: “CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The administrative authority and the Commission shall not be required to corroborate any dumping margin or countervailing duty applied in a separate segment of the same proceeding.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SUBSIDY RATES AND DUMPING MARGINS IN ADVERSE INFERENCE DETERMINATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority uses an inference that is adverse to the interests of a party under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority may—

“(A) in the case of a countervailing duty proceeding—

“(i) use a countervailable subsidy rate applied for the same or similar program in a countervailing duty proceeding involving the same country, or

“(ii) if there is no same or similar program, use a countervailable subsidy rate for a subsidy program from a proceeding that the administering authority considers reasonable to use, and

“(B) in the case of an antidumping duty proceeding, use any dumping margin from any segment of the proceeding under the applicable antidumping order.

“(2) DISCRETION TO APPLY HIGHEST RATE.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the administering

authority may apply any of the countervailable subsidy rates or dumping margins specified under that paragraph, including the highest such rate or margin, based on the evaluation by the administering authority of the situation that resulted in the administering authority using an adverse inference in selecting among the facts otherwise available.

“(3) NO OBLIGATION TO MAKE CERTAIN ESTIMATES OR ADDRESS CERTAIN CLAIMS.—If the administering authority uses an adverse inference under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority is not required, for purposes of subsection (c) or for any other purpose—

“(A) to estimate what the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin would have been if the interested party found to have failed to cooperate under subsection (b)(1) had cooperated, or

“(B) to demonstrate that the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin used by the administering authority reflects an alleged commercial reality of the interested party.”.

SEC. 502. DEFINITION OF MATERIAL INJURY.

(a) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES.—Section 771(7) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(J) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY.—The Commission shall not determine that there is no material injury or threat of material injury to an industry in the United States merely because that industry is profitable or because the performance of that industry has recently improved.”.

(b) EVALUATION OF IMPACT ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IN DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL INJURY.—Subclause (I) of section 771(7)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(I) actual and potential decline in output, sales, market share, gross profits, operating profits, net profits, ability to service debt, productivity, return on investments, return on assets, and utilization of capacity.”.

(c) CAPTIVE PRODUCTION.—Section 771(7)(C)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking the comma and inserting “, and”;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking “, and” and inserting a comma; and

(3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 503. PARTICULAR MARKET SITUATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF ORDINARY COURSE OF TRADE.—Section 771(15) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(15)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) Situations in which the administering authority determines that the particular market situation prevents a proper comparison with the export price or constructed export price.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF NORMAL VALUE.—Section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking “in such other country.”.

(c) DEFINITION OF CONSTRUCTED VALUE.—Section 773(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “business” and inserting “trade”; and

(2) By striking the flush text at the end and inserting the following:

“For purposes of paragraph (1), if a particular market situation exists such that the cost of materials and fabrication or other processing of any kind does not accurately reflect the cost of production in the ordinary course of trade, the administering authority may use another calculation methodology under this subtitle or any other calculation methodology. For purposes of paragraph (1), the cost of materials shall be determined without regard to any internal tax in the exporting country imposed on such materials

or their disposition that is remitted or refunded upon exportation of the subject merchandise produced from such materials.”.

SEC. 504. DISTORTION OF PRICES OR COSTS.

(a) INVESTIGATION OF BELOW-COST SALES.—Section 773(b)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE OR SUSPECT.—

“(i) REVIEW.—In a review conducted under section 751 involving a specific exporter, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that are less than the cost of production of the product if the administering authority disregarded some or all of the exporter’s sales pursuant to paragraph (1) in the investigation or, if a review has been completed, in the most recently completed review.

“(ii) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—In an investigation initiated under section 732 or a review conducted under section 751, the administering authority shall request information necessary to calculate the constructed value and cost of production under subsections (e) and (f) to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that represent less than the cost of production of the product.”.

(b) PRICES AND COSTS IN NONMARKET ECONOMIES.—Section 773(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) DISCRETION TO DISREGARD CERTAIN PRICE OR COST VALUES.—In valuing the factors of production under paragraph (1) for the subject merchandise, the administering authority may disregard price or cost values without further investigation if the administering authority has determined that broadly available export subsidies existed or particular instances of subsidization occurred with respect to those price or cost values or if those price or cost values were subject to an antidumping order.”.

SEC. 505. REDUCTION IN BURDEN ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF VOLUNTARY RESPONDENTS.

Section 782(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677m(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and by moving such clauses, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking “INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—In” and inserting the following: “INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In”;

(4) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (3), by amending subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), to read as follows:

“(B) the number of exporters or producers subject to the investigation or review is not so large that any additional individual examination of such exporters or producers would be unduly burdensome to the administering authority and inhibit the timely completion of the investigation or review.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DETERMINATION OF UNDULY BURDENSOME.—In determining if an individual examination under paragraph (1)(B) would be unduly burdensome, the administering authority may consider the following:

“(A) The complexity of the issues or information presented in the proceeding, including questionnaires and any responses thereto.

“(B) Any prior experience of the administering authority in the same or similar proceeding.

“(C) The total number of investigations under subtitle A or B and reviews under section 751 being conducted by the administering authority as of the date of the determination.

“(D) Such other factors relating to the timely completion of each such investigation and review as the administering authority considers appropriate.”.

SEC. 506. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL TRADE ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION

Subtitle A—Trade Enforcement

SEC. 601. TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 310 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2420) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 310. TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.

“(a) TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORT.—

“(1) TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES CONSULTATIONS.—Not later than May 31 of each calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, the United States Trade Representative (in this section referred to as the ‘Trade Representative’) shall consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives with respect to the prioritization of acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments that raise concerns with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, or otherwise create or maintain barriers to United States goods, services, or investment.

“(2) IDENTIFICATION OF TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.—In identifying acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments as trade enforcement priorities under this subsection, the United States Trade Representative shall focus on those acts, policies, and practices the elimination of which is likely to have the most significant potential to increase United States economic growth, and take into account all relevant factors, including—

“(A) the economic significance of any potential inconsistency between an obligation assumed by a foreign government pursuant to a trade agreement to which both the foreign government and the United States are parties and the acts, policies, or practices of that government;

“(B) the impact of the acts, policies, or practices of a foreign government on maintaining and creating United States jobs and productive capacity;

“(C) the major barriers and trade distorting practices described in the most recent National Trade Estimate required under section 181(b);

“(D) the major barriers and trade distorting practices described in other relevant reports addressing international trade and investment barriers prepared by a Federal agency or congressional commission during the 12 months preceding the date of the most recent report under paragraph (3);

“(E) a foreign government’s compliance with its obligations under any trade agreements to which both the foreign government and the United States are parties;

“(F) the implications of a foreign government’s procurement plans and policies; and

“(G) the international competitive position and export potential of United States products and services.

“(3) REPORT ON TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES AND ACTIONS TAKEN TO ADDRESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 31 of each calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, the Trade Representative shall report to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments identified as trade enforcement priorities based on the consultations under paragraph (1) and the criteria set forth in paragraph (2).

“(B) REPORT IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—The Trade Representative shall include, when reporting under subparagraph (A) in any calendar year after the calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, a description of actions taken to address any acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments identified as trade enforcement priorities under this subsection in the calendar year preceding that report and, as relevant, any year before that calendar year.

“(b) SEMIANNUAL ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the same time as the reporting under subsection (a)(3), and not later than January 31 of each following year, the Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives with respect to the identification, prioritization, investigation, and resolution of acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments of concern with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, or that otherwise create or maintain trade barriers.

“(2) ACTS, POLICIES, OR PRACTICES OF CONCERN.—The semiannual enforcement consultations required by paragraph (1) shall address acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments that raise concerns with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, or otherwise create or maintain trade barriers, including—

“(A) engagement with relevant trading partners;

“(B) strategies for addressing such concerns;

“(C) availability and deployment of resources to be used in the investigation or resolution of such concerns;

“(D) the merits of any potential dispute resolution proceeding under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party relating to such concerns; and

“(E) any other aspects of such concerns.

“(3) ACTIVE INVESTIGATIONS.—The semiannual enforcement consultations required by paragraph (1) shall address acts, policies, or practices that the Trade Representative is actively investigating with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, including—

“(A) strategies for addressing concerns raised by such acts, policies, or practices;

“(B) any relevant timeline with respect to investigation of such acts, policies, or practices;

“(C) the merits of any potential dispute resolution proceeding under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party with respect to such acts, policies, or practices;

“(D) barriers to the advancement of the investigation of such acts, policies, or practices; and

“(E) any other matters relating to the investigation of such acts, policies, or practices.

“(4) ONGOING ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—The semiannual enforcement consultations required

by paragraph (1) shall address all ongoing enforcement actions taken by or against the United States with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, including—

“(A) any relevant timeline with respect to such actions;

“(B) the merits of such actions;

“(C) any prospective implementation actions;

“(D) potential implications for any law or regulation of the United States;

“(E) potential implications for United States stakeholders, domestic competitors, and exporters; and

“(F) other issues relating to such actions.

“(5) ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES.—The semiannual enforcement consultations required by paragraph (1) shall address the availability and deployment of enforcement resources, resource constraints on monitoring and enforcement activities, and strategies to address those constraints, including the use of available resources of other Federal agencies to enhance monitoring and enforcement capabilities.

“(c) INVESTIGATION AND RESOLUTION.—In the case of any acts, policies, or practices of a foreign government identified as a trade enforcement priority under subsection (a), the Trade Representative shall, not later than the date of the first semiannual enforcement consultations held under subsection (b) after the identification of the priority, take appropriate action to address that priority, including—

“(1) engagement with the foreign government to resolve concerns raised by such acts, policies, or practices;

“(2) initiation of an investigation under section 302(b)(1) with respect to such acts, policies, or practices;

“(3) initiation of negotiations for a bilateral agreement that provides for resolution of concerns raised by such acts, policies, or practices; or

“(4) initiation of dispute settlement proceedings under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party with respect to such acts, policies, or practices.

“(d) ENFORCEMENT NOTIFICATIONS AND CONSULTATION.—

“(1) INITIATION OF ENFORCEMENT ACTION.—The Trade Representative shall notify and consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in advance of initiation of any formal trade dispute by or against the United States taken in regard to an obligation under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party. With respect to a formal trade dispute against the United States, if advance notification and consultation are not possible, the Trade Representative shall notify and consult at the earliest practicable opportunity after initiation of the dispute.

“(2) CIRCULATION OF REPORTS.—The Trade Representative shall notify and consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in advance of the announced or anticipated circulation of any report of a dispute settlement panel or the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization or of a dispute settlement panel under any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party with respect to a formal trade dispute by or against the United States.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) WTO.—The term ‘WTO’ means the World Trade Organization.

“(2) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term ‘WTO Agreement’ has the meaning given that term in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)).

“(3) WTO AGREEMENTS.—The term ‘WTO Agreements’ means the WTO Agreement and agreements annexed to that Agreement.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by striking the item relating to section 310 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 310. Trade enforcement priorities.”.

SEC. 602. EXERCISE OF WTO AUTHORIZATION TO SUSPEND CONCESSIONS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS UNDER TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 306 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2416) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) EXERCISE OF WTO AUTHORIZATION TO SUSPEND CONCESSIONS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS.—If—

“(1) action has terminated pursuant to section 307(c),

“(2) the petitioner or any representative of the domestic industry that would benefit from reinstatement of action has submitted to the Trade Representative a written request for reinstatement of action, and

“(3) the Trade Representative has completed the requirements of subsection (d) and section 307(c)(3),

the Trade Representative may at any time determine to take action under section 301(c) to exercise an authorization to suspend concessions or other obligations under Article 22 of the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(16))).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 1 of title III of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 301(c)(1) (19 U.S.C. 2411(c)(1)), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or section 306(c)” after “subsection (a) or (b)”;.

(2) in section 306(b) (19 U.S.C. 2416(b)), in the subsection heading, by striking “FURTHER ACTION” and inserting “ACTION ON THE BASIS OF MONITORING”;

(3) in section 306(d) (19 U.S.C. 2416(d)), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by inserting “or (c)” after “subsection (b)”; and

(4) in section 307(c)(3) (19 U.S.C. 2417(c)(3)), by inserting “or if a request is submitted to the Trade Representative under 306(c)(2) to reinstate action,” after “under section 301.”.

SEC. 603. TRADE MONITORING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 205. TRADE MONITORING.

“(a) MONITORING TOOL FOR IMPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the United States International Trade Commission shall make available on a website of the Commission an import monitoring tool to allow the public access to data on the volume and value of goods imported into the United States for the purpose of assessing whether such data has changed with respect to such goods over a period of time.

“(2) DATA DESCRIBED.—For purposes of the monitoring tool under paragraph (1), the Commission shall use data compiled by the Department of Commerce and such other government data as the Commission considers appropriate.

“(3) PERIODS OF TIME.—The Commission shall ensure that data accessed through the monitoring tool under paragraph (1) includes data for the most recent quarter for which such data are available and previous quarters as the Commission considers practicable.

“(b) MONITORING REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and not less frequently than quarterly thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce shall publish on a website of the Department of Commerce, and notify the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of the availability of, a monitoring report on changes in the volume and value of trade with respect to imports and exports of goods categorized based on the 6-digit subheading number of the goods under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States during the most recent quarter for which such data are available and previous quarters as the Secretary considers practicable.

“(2) REQUESTS FOR COMMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall solicit through the Federal Register public comment on the monitoring reports described in paragraph (1).

“(c) SUNSET.—The requirements under this section terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this section.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 204 the following:

“Sec. 205. Trade monitoring.”.

SEC. 604. ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERAGENCY TRADE ENFORCEMENT CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title I of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 142. INTERAGENCY TRADE ENFORCEMENT CENTER.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER.—There is established in the Office of the United States Trade Representative an Interagency Trade Enforcement Center (in this section referred to as the ‘Center’).

“(b) FUNCTIONS OF CENTER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall—

“(A) serve as the primary forum within the Federal Government for the Office of the United States Trade Representative and other agencies to coordinate the enforcement of United States trade rights under international trade agreements and the enforcement of United States trade remedy laws;

“(B) coordinate among the Office of the United States Trade Representative and other agencies with responsibilities relating to trade the exchange of information related to potential violations of international trade agreements by foreign trading partners of the United States; and

“(C) conduct outreach to United States workers, businesses, and other interested persons to foster greater participation in the identification and reduction or elimination of foreign trade barriers and unfair foreign trade practices.

“(2) COORDINATION OF TRADE ENFORCEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall coordinate matters relating to the enforcement of United States trade rights under international trade agreements and the enforcement of United States trade remedy laws among the Office of the United States Trade Representative and the following agencies:

“(i) The Department of State.

“(ii) The Department of the Treasury.

“(iii) The Department of Justice.

“(iv) The Department of Agriculture.

“(v) The Department of Commerce.

“(vi) The Department of Homeland Security.

“(vii) Such other agencies as the President, or the United States Trade Representative, may designate.

“(B) CONSULTATIONS ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.—In matters relating to the enforcement of United States trade rights involv-

ing intellectual property rights, the Center shall consult with the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator appointed pursuant to section 301 of the Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 8111).

“(c) PERSONNEL.—

“(1) DIRECTOR.—The head of the Center shall be the Director, who shall—

“(A) be appointed by the United States Trade Representative from among full-time senior-level officials of the Office of the United States Trade Representative; and

“(B) report to the Trade Representative.

“(2) DEPUTY DIRECTOR.—There shall be in the Center a Deputy Director, who shall—

“(A) be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce from among full-time senior-level officials of the Department of Commerce and detailed to the Center; and

“(B) report directly to the Director.

“(3) ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES.—The agencies specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) may, in consultation with the Director, detail or assign their employees to the Center without reimbursement to support the functions of the Center.

“(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Funding and administrative support for the Center shall be provided by the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

“(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the actions taken by the Center in the preceding year with respect to the enforcement of United States trade rights under international trade agreements and the enforcement of United States trade remedy laws.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) UNITED STATES TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—The term ‘United States trade remedy laws’ means the following:

“(A) Chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).

“(B) Chapter 1 of title III of that Act (19 U.S.C. 2411 et seq.).

“(C) Sections 406 and 421 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 2436 and 2451).

“(D) Sections 332 and 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332 and 1337).

“(E) Investigations initiated by the administering authority (as defined in section 771 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1677)) under title VII of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.).

“(F) Section 281 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3571).

“(2) UNITED STATES TRADE RIGHTS.—The term ‘United States trade rights’ means any right, benefit, or advantage to which the United States is entitled under an international trade agreement and that could be effectuated through the use of a dispute settlement proceeding.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 141 the following:

“Sec. 142. Interagency Trade Enforcement Center.”.

SEC. 605. ESTABLISHMENT OF CHIEF MANUFACTURING NEGOTIATOR.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—Section 141(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) There shall be in the Office 3 Deputy United States Trade Representatives, one Chief Agricultural Negotiator, and one Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, who shall all be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. As an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, any nomination of a Deputy United States Trade Represent-

ative, the Chief Agricultural Negotiator, or the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, and referred to a committee, shall be referred to the Committee on Finance. Each Deputy United States Trade Representative, the Chief Agricultural Negotiator, and the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator shall hold office at the pleasure of the President and shall have the rank of Ambassador.”.

(b) FUNCTIONS OF POSITION.—Section 141(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(c)) is amended—

(1) by moving paragraph (5) 2 ems to the left; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(6)(A) The principal function of the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator shall be to conduct trade negotiations and to enforce trade agreements relating to United States manufacturing products and services. The Chief Manufacturing Negotiator shall be a vigorous advocate on behalf of United States manufacturing interests and shall perform such other functions as the United States Trade Representative may direct.

“(B) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, and annually thereafter, the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the actions taken by the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator in the preceding year.”.

(c) COMPENSATION.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “Chief Agricultural Negotiator.” and inserting the following:

“Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.

“Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.”.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 141(e) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “5314” and inserting “5315”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “the maximum rate of pay for grade GS-18, as provided in section 5332” and inserting “the maximum rate of pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule in section 5315”.

SEC. 606. ENFORCEMENT UNDER TITLE III OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ACTS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES RELATING TO THE ENVIRONMENT.

Section 301(d)(3)(B) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411(d)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (iii)(V), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) constitutes a persistent pattern of conduct by the government of the foreign country under which that government—

“(I) fails to effectively enforce the environmental laws of the foreign country,

“(II) waives or otherwise derogates from the environmental laws of the foreign country or weakens the protections afforded by such laws,

“(III) fails to provide for judicial or administrative proceedings giving access to remedies for violations of the environmental laws of the foreign country,

“(IV) fails to provide appropriate and effective sanctions or remedies for violations of the environmental laws of the foreign country, or

“(V) fails to effectively enforce environmental commitments under agreements to which the foreign country and the United States are a party.”.

SEC. 607. TRADE ENFORCEMENT TRUST FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund

to be known as the Trade Enforcement Trust Fund (in this section referred to as the "Trust Fund"), consisting of amounts transferred to the Trust Fund under subsection (b) and any amounts that may be credited to the Trust Fund under subsection (c).

(b) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Trust Fund, from the general fund of the Treasury, for each fiscal year that begins on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, an amount equal to \$15,000,000 (or a lesser amount as required pursuant to paragraph (2)) of the antidumping duties and countervailing duties received in the Treasury for such fiscal year.

(2) LIMITATION.—The total amount in the Trust Fund at any time may not exceed \$30,000,000.

(3) FREQUENCY OF TRANSFERS; ADJUSTMENTS.—

(A) FREQUENCY OF TRANSFERS.—The Secretary shall transfer amounts required to be transferred to the Trust Fund under paragraph (1) not less frequently than quarterly from the general fund of the Treasury to the Trust Fund on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary.

(B) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall make proper adjustments in amounts subsequently transferred to the Trust Fund to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred to the Trust Fund.

(c) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—The Secretary shall invest such portion of the Trust Fund as is not required to meet current withdrawals in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

(2) INTEREST AND PROCEEDS.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in Trust Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Trust Fund.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS FROM TRUST FUND.—

(1) ENFORCEMENT.—The United States Trade Representative may use the amounts in the Trust fund to carry out any of the following:

(A) To seek to enforce the provisions of and commitments and obligations under the WTO Agreements and free trade agreements to which the United States is a party and resolve any actions by foreign countries that are inconsistent with those provisions, commitments, and obligations.

(B) To monitor the implementation by foreign countries of the provisions of and commitments and obligations under free trade agreements to which the United States is a party for purposes of systematically assessing, identifying, investigating, or initiating steps to address inconsistencies with those provisions, commitments, and obligations.

(C) To thoroughly investigate and respond to petitions under section 302 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2412) requesting that action be taken under section 301 of such Act (19 U.S.C. 2411).

(2) IMPLEMENTATION ASSISTANCE AND CAPACITY BUILDING.—The United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the Secretary of Labor, and such heads of other Federal agencies as the President considers appropriate may use the amounts in the Trust Fund to carry out any of the following:

(A) To ensure capacity-building efforts undertaken by the United States pursuant to any free trade agreement to which the United States is a party prioritize and give special attention to the timely, consistent, and robust implementation of the intellectual property, labor, and environmental commitments and obligations of any party to that free trade agreement.

(B) To ensure capacity-building efforts undertaken by the United States pursuant to any such free trade agreement are self-sustaining and promote local ownership.

(C) To ensure capacity-building efforts undertaken by the United States pursuant to any such free trade agreement include performance indicators against which the progress and obstacles for the implementation of commitments and obligations described in subparagraph (A) can be identified and assessed within a meaningful time frame.

(D) To monitor and evaluate the capacity-building efforts of the United States under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C).

(3) LIMITATION.—Amounts made available in the Trust Fund may not be used for negotiations for any free trade agreement to be entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the entry into force of any free trade agreement entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the Secretary of Labor, and any other head of a Federal agency who has used amounts in the Trust Fund in connection with that agreement, shall each submit to Congress a report on the actions taken by that official under subsection (d) in connection with that agreement.

(f) COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study that includes the following:

(A) A comprehensive analysis of the trade enforcement expenditures of each Federal agency with responsibilities relating to trade that specifies, with respect to each such Federal agency—

(i) the amounts appropriated for trade enforcement; and

(ii) the number of full-time employees carrying out activities relating to trade enforcement.

(B) Recommendations on the additional employees and resources that each such Federal agency may need to effectively enforce the free trade agreements to which the United States is a party.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ANTIDUMPING DUTY.—The term "antidumping duty" means an antidumping duty imposed under section 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673).

(2) COUNTERVAILING DUTY.—The term "countervailing duty" means a countervailing duty imposed under section 701 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671).

(3) WTO.—The term "WTO" means the World Trade Organization.

(4) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term "WTO Agreement" has the meaning given that term in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)).

(5) WTO AGREEMENTS.—The term "WTO Agreements" means the WTO Agreement and agreements annexed to that Agreement.

SEC. 608. HONEY TRANSHIPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall direct appropriate personnel and resources of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to address concerns that honey is being imported into the United States in violation of the customs and trade laws of the United States.

(b) COUNTRY OF ORIGIN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall compile a database of the individual characteristics of honey produced in foreign countries to facilitate the verification of country of origin markings of imported honey.

(2) ENGAGEMENT WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.—The Commissioner shall seek to engage the customs agencies of foreign governments for assistance in compiling the database described in paragraph (1).

(3) CONSULTATION WITH INDUSTRY.—In compiling the database described in paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall consult with entities in the honey industry regarding the development of industry standards for honey identification.

(4) CONSULTATION WITH FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.—In compiling the database described in paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall consult with the Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) describes and assesses the limitations in the existing analysis capabilities of laboratories with respect to determining the country of origin of honey samples or the percentage of honey contained in a sample; and

(2) includes any recommendations of the Commissioner for improving such capabilities.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Commissioner of Food and Drugs should promptly establish a national standard of identity for honey for the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection to use to ensure that imports of honey are—

(1) classified accurately for purposes of assessing duties; and

(2) denied entry into the United States if such imports pose a threat to the health or safety of consumers in the United States.

SEC. 609. INCLUSION OF INTEREST IN CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS OF ANTIDUMPING DUTIES AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall deposit all interest described in subsection (c) into the special account established under section 754(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675c(e)) (repealed by subtitle F of title VII of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-171; 120 Stat. 154)) for inclusion in distributions described in subsection (b) made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) DISTRIBUTIONS DESCRIBED.—Distributions described in this subsection are distributions of antidumping duties and countervailing duties assessed on or after October 1, 2000, that are made under section 754 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675c) (repealed by subtitle F of title VII of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-171; 120 Stat. 154)), with respect to entries of merchandise—

(1) made on or before September 30, 2007; and

(2) that were, in accordance with section 822 of the Claims Resolution Act of 2010 (19 U.S.C. 1675c note), unliquidated, not in litigation, and not under an order of liquidation from the Department of Commerce on December 8, 2010.

(c) INTEREST DESCRIBED.—

(1) INTEREST REALIZED.—Interest described in this subsection is interest earned on antidumping duties or countervailing duties distributed as described in subsection (b) that is realized through application of a payment received on or after October 1, 2014, by U.S. Customs and Border Protection under, or in connection with—

(A) a customs bond pursuant to a court order or judgment entered as a result of a civil action filed by the Federal Government against the surety from which the payment was obtained for the purpose of collecting duties or interest owed with respect to an entry; or

(B) a settlement for any such bond if the settlement was executed after the Federal Government filed a civil action described in subparagraph (A).

(2) **TYPES OF INTEREST.**—Interest described in paragraph (1) includes the following:

(A) Interest accrued under section 778 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677g).

(B) Interest accrued under section 505(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1505(d)).

(C) Equitable interest under common law or interest under section 963 of the Revised Statutes (19 U.S.C. 580) awarded by a court against a surety under its bond for late payment of antidumping duties, countervailing duties, or interest described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ANTIDUMPING DUTIES.**—The term “antidumping duties” means antidumping duties imposed under section 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673) or under the Antidumping Act, 1921 (title II of the Act of May 27, 1921; 42 Stat. 11, chapter 14).

(2) **COUNTERVAILING DUTIES.**—The term “countervailing duties” means countervailing duties imposed under section 701 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671).

SEC. 610. ILLICITLY IMPORTED, EXPORTED, OR TRAFFICKED CULTURAL PROPERTY, ARCHAEOLOGICAL OR ETHNOLOGICAL MATERIALS, AND FISH, WILDLIFE, AND PLANTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall ensure that appropriate personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as the case may be, are trained in the detection, identification, detention, seizure, and forfeiture of cultural property, archaeological or ethnological materials, and fish, wildlife, and plants, the importation, exportation, or trafficking of which violates the laws of the United States.

(b) **TRAINING.**—The Commissioner and the Director are authorized to accept training and other support services from experts outside of the Federal Government with respect to the detection, identification, detention, seizure, and forfeiture of cultural property, archaeological or ethnological materials, or fish, wildlife, and plants described in subsection (a).

Subtitle B—Intellectual Property Rights Protection

SEC. 611. ESTABLISHMENT OF CHIEF INNOVATION AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 141 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), as amended by section 605(a) of this Act—

(A) by striking “and one Chief Manufacturing Negotiator” and inserting “one Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, and one Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator”;

(B) by striking “or the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator” and inserting “the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, or the Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator”;

(C) by striking “and the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator” and inserting “the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, and the Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator”;

(2) in subsection (c), as amended by section 605(b) of this Act, by adding at the end the following:

“(7) The principal functions of the Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator shall be to conduct trade negotiations and to enforce trade agreements relating to United States intellectual property and to take appropriate actions to address acts, policies, and practices of foreign governments that have a significant adverse impact on the value of United States innovation. The Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator shall be a vigorous advocate on behalf of United States innovation and intellectual property interests. The Chief Inno-

vation and Intellectual Property Negotiator shall perform such other functions as the United States Trade Representative may direct.”.

(b) **COMPENSATION.**—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 605(c) of this Act, is further amended by inserting after “Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.” the following:

“Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.”.

(c) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than one year after the appointment of the first Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended by subsection (a), and annually thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report describing in detail—

(1) enforcement actions taken by the Trade Representative during the year preceding the submission of the report to ensure the protection of United States innovation and intellectual property interests; and

(2) other actions taken by the Trade Representative to advance United States innovation and intellectual property interests.

SEC. 612. MEASURES RELATING TO COUNTRIES THAT DENY ADEQUATE PROTECTION FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) **INCLUSION OF COUNTRIES THAT DENY ADEQUATE PROTECTION OF TRADE SECRETS.**—Section 182(d)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242(d)(2)) is amended by inserting “, trade secrets,” after “copyrights”.

(b) **SPECIAL RULES FOR COUNTRIES ON THE PRIORITY WATCH LIST OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 182 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242) is amended by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

“(g) **SPECIAL RULES FOR FOREIGN COUNTRIES ON THE PRIORITY WATCH LIST.**—

“(1) **ACTION PLANS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Trade Representative submits the National Trade Estimate under section 181(b), the Trade Representative shall develop an action plan described in subparagraph (C) with respect to each foreign country described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) **FOREIGN COUNTRY DESCRIBED.**—The Trade Representative shall develop an action plan pursuant to subparagraph (A) with respect to each foreign country that—

“(i) the Trade Representative has identified for placement on the priority watch list; and

“(ii) has remained on such list for at least 1 year.

“(C) **ACTION PLAN DESCRIBED.**—An action plan developed pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall contain the benchmarks described in subparagraph (D) and be designed to assist the foreign country—

“(i) to achieve—

“(I) adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights; and

“(II) fair and equitable market access for United States persons that rely upon intellectual property protection; or

“(ii) to make significant progress toward achieving the goals described in clause (i).

“(D) **BENCHMARKS DESCRIBED.**—The benchmarks contained in an action plan developed pursuant to subparagraph (A) are such legislative, institutional, enforcement, or other actions as the Trade Representative determines to be necessary for the foreign country to achieve the goals described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (C).

“(2) **FAILURE TO MEET ACTION PLAN BENCHMARKS.**—If, 1 year after the date on which an

action plan is developed under paragraph (1)(A), the President, in consultation with the Trade Representative, determines that the foreign country to which the action plan applies has not substantially complied with the benchmarks described in paragraph (1)(D), the President may take appropriate action with respect to the foreign country.

“(3) **PRIORITY WATCH LIST DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘priority watch list’ means the priority watch list established by the Trade Representative.

“(h) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Trade Representative submits the National Trade Estimate under section 181(b), the Trade Representative shall transmit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on actions taken under this section during the 12 months preceding such report, and the reasons for such actions, including—

“(1) any foreign countries identified under subsection (a);

“(2) a description of progress made in achieving improved intellectual property protection and market access for persons relying on intellectual property rights; and

“(3) a description of the action plans developed under subsection (g) and any actions taken by foreign countries under such plans.”.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the United States Trade Representative such sums as may be necessary to provide assistance to any developing country to which an action plan applies under section 182(g) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended by paragraph (1), to facilitate the efforts of the developing country to comply with the benchmarks contained in the action plan. Such assistance may include capacity building, activities designed to increase awareness of intellectual property rights, and training for officials responsible for enforcing intellectual property rights in the developing country.

(B) **DEVELOPING COUNTRY DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term “developing country” means a country classified by the World Bank as having a low-income or lower-middle-income economy.

(3) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting the authority of the President or the United States Trade Representative to develop action plans other than action plans described in section 182(g) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended by paragraph (1), or to take any action otherwise authorized by law in response to the failure of a foreign country to provide adequate and effective protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights.

TITLE VII—CURRENCY MANIPULATION

Subtitle A—Investigation of Currency Undervaluation

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Currency Undervaluation Investigation Act”.

SEC. 702. INVESTIGATION OR REVIEW OF CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION UNDER COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAW.

Subsection (c) of section 702 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671a(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) **CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION.**—For purposes of a countervailing duty investigation under this subtitle in which the determinations under clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A) are affirmative, or a review under subtitle C with respect to a countervailing duty order, the administering authority shall initiate an investigation to determine whether currency undervaluation by the government of a country or

any public entity within the territory of a country is providing, directly or indirectly, a countervailable subsidy, if—

“(A) a petition filed by an interested party (described in subparagraph (C), (D), (E), (F), or (G) of section 771(9)) alleges the elements necessary for the imposition of the duty imposed by section 701(a); and

“(B) the petition is accompanied by information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting those allegations.”.

SEC. 703. BENEFIT CALCULATION METHODOLOGY WITH RESPECT TO CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION.

Section 771 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(37) CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION BENEFIT.—

“(A) CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION BENEFIT.—For purposes of a countervailing duty investigation under subtitle A, or a review under subtitle C with respect to a countervailing duty order, the following shall apply:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority determines to investigate whether currency undervaluation provides a countervailable subsidy, the administering authority shall determine whether there is a benefit to the recipient of that subsidy and measure such benefit by comparing the simple average of the real exchange rates derived from application of the macroeconomic-balance approach and the equilibrium-real-exchange-rate approach to the official daily exchange rate identified by the administering authority.

“(ii) RELIANCE ON DATA.—In making the determination under clause (i), the administering authority shall rely upon data that are publicly available, reliable, and compiled and maintained by the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank, or other international organizations or national governments if data from the International Monetary Fund or World Bank are not available.

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) MACROECONOMIC-BALANCE APPROACH.—The term ‘macroeconomic-balance approach’ means a methodology under which the level of undervaluation of the real effective exchange rate of the currency of the exporting country is defined as the change in the real effective exchange rate needed to achieve equilibrium in the balance of payments of the exporting country, as such methodology is described in the guidelines of the International Monetary Fund’s Consultative Group on Exchange Rate Issues, if available.

“(ii) EQUILIBRIUM-REAL-EXCHANGE-RATE APPROACH.—The term ‘equilibrium-real-exchange-rate approach’ means a methodology under which the level of undervaluation of the real effective exchange rate of the currency of the exporting country is defined as the difference between the observed real effective exchange rate and the real effective exchange rate, as such methodology is described in the guidelines of the International Monetary Fund’s Consultative Group on Exchange Rate Issues, if available.

“(iii) REAL EXCHANGE RATES.—The term ‘real exchange rates’ means the bilateral exchange rates derived from converting the trade-weighted multilateral exchange rates yielded by the macroeconomic-balance approach and the equilibrium-real-exchange-rate approach into real bilateral terms.”.

SEC. 704. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF SPECIFICITY WITH RESPECT TO EXPORT SUBSIDY.

Section 771(5A)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(5A)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The fact that a subsidy may also be provided in circumstances that do not involve export shall not, for that reason alone, mean that the subsidy cannot be

considered contingent upon export performance.”.

SEC. 705. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this subtitle shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

SEC. 706. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this subtitle apply to countervailing duty investigations initiated under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and reviews initiated under subtitle C of title VII of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1675 et seq.)—

(1) before the date of the enactment of this Act, if the investigation or review is pending a final determination as of such date of enactment; and

(2) on or after such date of enactment.

Subtitle B—Engagement on Currency Exchange Rate and Economic Policies

SEC. 711. ENHANCEMENT OF ENGAGEMENT ON CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATE AND ECONOMIC POLICIES WITH CERTAIN MAJOR TRADING PARTNERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) MAJOR TRADING PARTNER REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the macroeconomic and currency exchange rate policies of each country that is a major trading partner of the United States.

(2) ELEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain—

(i) for each country that is a major trading partner of the United States—

(I) that country’s bilateral trade balance with the United States;

(II) that country’s current account balance as a percentage of its gross domestic product;

(III) the change in that country’s current account balance as a percentage of its gross domestic product during the 3-year period preceding the submission of the report;

(IV) that country’s foreign exchange reserves as a percentage of its short-term debt; and

(V) that country’s foreign exchange reserves as a percentage of its gross domestic product; and

(ii) an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and exchange rate policies for each country—

(I) that is a major trading partner of the United States;

(II) the currency of which is persistently and substantially undervalued;

(III) that has—

(aa) a significant bilateral trade surplus with the United States; and

(bb) a material global current account surplus; and

(IV) that has engaged in persistent one-sided intervention in the foreign exchange market.

(B) ENHANCED ANALYSIS.—Each enhanced analysis under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall include, for each country with respect to which an analysis is made under that subparagraph—

(i) a description of developments in the currency markets of that country, including, to the greatest extent feasible, developments with respect to currency interventions;

(ii) a description of trends in the real effective exchange rate of the currency of that country and in the degree of undervaluation of that currency;

(iii) an analysis of changes in the capital controls and trade restrictions of that country; and

(iv) patterns in the reserve accumulation of that country.

(b) ENGAGEMENT ON EXCHANGE RATE AND ECONOMIC POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the President, through the Secretary, shall commence enhanced bilateral engagement with each country for which an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and currency exchange rate policies is included in the report submitted under subsection (a), in order to—

(A) urge implementation of policies to address the causes of the undervaluation of its currency, its bilateral trade surplus with the United States, and its material global current account surplus, including undervaluation and surpluses relating to exchange rate management;

(B) express the concern of the United States with respect to the adverse trade and economic effects of that undervaluation and those surpluses;

(C) develop measurable objectives for addressing that undervaluation and those surpluses; and

(D) advise that country of the ability of the President to take action under subsection (c).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may determine not to enhance bilateral engagement with a country under paragraph (1) for which an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and exchange rate policies is included in the report submitted under subsection (a) if the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes how the currency and other macroeconomic policies of that country are addressing the undervaluation and surpluses specified in paragraph (1)(A) with respect to that country, including undervaluation and surpluses relating to exchange rate management.

(c) REMEDIAL ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, on the date that is one year after the commencement of enhanced bilateral engagement by the President with respect to a country under subsection (b)(1), the country has failed to adopt appropriate policies to correct the undervaluation and surpluses described in subsection (b)(1)(A) with respect to that country, the President may take one or more of the following actions:

(A) Prohibit the Overseas Private Investment Corporation from approving any new financing (including any insurance, reinsurance, or guarantee) with respect to a project located in that country on and after such date.

(B) Except as provided in paragraph (2), and pursuant to paragraph (3), prohibit the Federal Government from procuring, or entering into any contract for the procurement of, goods or services from that country on and after such date.

(C) Instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to call for additional rigorous surveillance of the macroeconomic and exchange rate policies of that country and, as appropriate, formal consultations on findings of currency manipulation.

(D) Instruct the United States Trade Representative to take into account, in consultation with the Secretary, in assessing whether to enter into a bilateral or regional trade agreement with that country or to initiate or participate in negotiations with respect to a bilateral or regional trade agreement with that country, the extent to which that country has failed to adopt appropriate policies to correct the undervaluation and surpluses described in subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The President may not apply a prohibition under paragraph (1)(B) with respect to a country that is a party to the Agreement on Government Procurement or a free trade agreement to which the United States is a party.

(3) CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—Before applying a prohibition under paragraph (1)(B), the President shall consult with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to determine whether such prohibition would subject the taxpayers of the United States to unreasonable cost.

(B) CONGRESS.—The President shall consult with the appropriate committees of Congress with respect to any action the President takes under paragraph (1)(B), including whether the President has consulted as required under subparagraph (A).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGREEMENT ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT.—The term “Agreement on Government Procurement” means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(17) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(17)).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(3) COUNTRY.—The term “country” means a foreign country, dependent territory, or possession of a foreign country, and may include an association of 2 or more foreign countries, dependent territories, or possessions of countries into a customs union outside the United States.

(4) REAL EFFECTIVE EXCHANGE RATE.—The term “real effective exchange rate” means a weighted average of bilateral exchange rates, expressed in price-adjusted terms.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 712. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE RATE POLICY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established an Advisory Committee on International Exchange Rate Policy (in this section referred to as the “Committee”).

(2) DUTIES.—The Committee shall be responsible for advising the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the impact of international exchange rates and financial policies on the economy of the United States.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall be composed of 9 members as follows, none of whom shall be employees of the Federal Government:

(A) Three members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon the recommendation of the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(B) Three members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives upon the recommendation of the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(C) Three members shall be appointed by the President.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members shall be selected under paragraph (1) on the basis of their objectivity and demonstrated expertise in finance, economics, or currency exchange.

(3) TERMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Members shall be appointed for a term of 2 years or until the Committee terminates.

(B) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member may be reappointed to the Committee for additional terms.

(4) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) DURATION OF COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act unless renewed by the President for a subsequent 2-year period.

(2) CONTINUED RENEWAL.—The President may continue to renew the Committee for successive 2-year periods by taking appropriate action to renew the Committee prior to the date on which the Committee would otherwise terminate.

(d) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall hold not less than 2 meetings each calendar year.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall elect from among its members a chairperson for a term of 2 years or until the Committee terminates.

(2) REELECTION; SUBSEQUENT TERMS.—A chairperson of the Committee may be reelected chairperson but is ineligible to serve consecutive terms as chairperson.

(f) STAFF.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Committee such staff, information, personnel, administrative services, and assistance as the Committee may reasonably require to carry out the activities of the Committee.

(g) APPLICATION OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall apply to the Committee.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Meetings of the Committee shall be exempt from the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of section 10 and section 11 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (relating to open meetings, public notice, public participation, and public availability of documents), whenever and to the extent it is determined by the President or the Secretary of the Treasury that such meetings will be concerned with matters the disclosure of which—

(A) would seriously compromise the development by the Government of the United States of monetary or financial policy; or

(B) is likely to—

(i) lead to significant financial speculation in currencies, securities, or commodities; or

(ii) significantly endanger the stability of any financial institution.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury for each fiscal year in which the Committee is in effect \$1,000,000 to carry out this section.

TITLE VIII—PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS**SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2015”.

SEC. 802. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE NEED FOR A MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) As of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States imposes duties on imported goods for which there is no domestic availability or insufficient domestic availability.

(2) The imposition of duties on such goods creates artificial distortions in the economy of the United States that negatively affect United States manufacturers and consumers.

(3) It is in the interests of the United States to update the Harmonized Tariff Schedule every 3 years to eliminate such artificial distortions by suspending or reducing duties on such goods.

(4) The manufacturing competitiveness of the United States around the world will be enhanced if Congress regularly and predictably updates the Harmonized Tariff Schedule to suspend or reduce duties on such goods.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, to remove the competitive disadvantage to United States manufactures and consumers resulting from an outdated Harmonized Tariff Schedule and to promote the competitiveness of United States manufacturers, Congress should consider a miscellaneous tariff bill not later than 180 days after the United States International Trade Commission and the Department of Commerce issue reports on proposed duty suspensions and reductions under this title.

SEC. 803. PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to establish a process by the appropriate congressional committees, in conjunction with the Commission pursuant to its authorities under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332), for the submission and consideration of proposed duty suspensions and reductions.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than October 15, 2015, and October 15, 2018, the appropriate congressional committees shall establish and, on the same day, publish on their respective publicly available Internet websites a process—

(1) to provide for the submission and consideration of legislation containing proposed duty suspensions and reductions in a manner that, to the maximum extent practicable, is consistent with the requirements described in subsection (c); and

(2) to include in a miscellaneous tariff bill those duty suspensions and reductions that meet the requirements of this title.

(c) REQUIREMENTS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) INITIATION.—Not later than October 15, 2015, and October 15, 2018, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission a notice requesting members of the public to submit to the Commission during the 60-day period beginning on the date of such publication—

(A) proposed duty suspensions and reductions; and

(B) Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions.

(2) REVIEW.—

(A) COMMISSION SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—As soon as practicable after the expiration of the 60-day period specified in paragraph (1), but not later than 15 days after the expiration of such 60-day period, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the proposed duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(A) and the Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(B).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF PROPOSED DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS.—Not later than 15 days after the expiration of the 60-day period specified in paragraph (1), the Commission shall publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission the proposed duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(A) and the Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(B).

(C) COMMISSION REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of publication of the proposed duty suspensions and reductions under subparagraph (B), the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each proposed duty suspension or reduction submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(1) or paragraph (1)(A) that contains the following information:

(i) A determination of whether or not domestic production of the article that is the subject of the proposed duty suspension or reduction exists and, if such production exists, whether or not a

domestic producer of the article objects to the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(ii) Any technical changes to the article description that are necessary for purposes of administration when articles are presented for importation.

(iii) The amount of tariff revenue that would no longer be collected if the proposed duty suspension or reduction takes effect.

(iv) A determination of whether or not the proposed duty suspension or reduction is available to any person that imports the article that is the subject of the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(3) **PROCEDURES.**—The Commission shall prescribe and publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission procedures for complying with the requirements of this subsection.

(4) **AUTHORITIES DESCRIBED.**—The Commission shall carry out this subsection pursuant to its authorities under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332).

(d) **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE REPORT.**—Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of publication of the proposed duty suspensions and reductions under subsection (c)(2)(B), the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each proposed duty suspension and reduction submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(1) or (c)(1)(A) that includes the following information:

(1) A determination of whether or not domestic production of the article that is the subject of the proposed duty suspension or reduction exists and, if such production exists, whether or not a domestic producer of the article objects to the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(2) Any technical changes to the article description that are necessary for purposes of administration when articles are presented for importation.

(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—A proposed duty suspension or reduction submitted under this section by a Member of Congress shall receive treatment no more favorable than the treatment received by a proposed duty suspension or reduction submitted under this section by a member of the public.

SEC. 804. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than May 1, 2018, and May 1, 2020, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the effects on the United States economy of temporary duty suspensions and reductions enacted pursuant to this title, including a broad assessment of the economic effects of such duty suspensions and reductions on producers, purchasers, and consumers in the United States, using case studies describing such effects on selected industries or by type of article as available data permit.

(b) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The Commission shall also solicit and append to the report required under subsection (a) recommendations with respect to those domestic industry sectors or specific domestic industries that might benefit from permanent duty suspensions and reductions or elimination of duties, either through a unilateral action of the United States or through negotiations for reciprocal tariff agreements, with a particular focus on inequities created by tariff inversions.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 805. JUDICIAL REVIEW PRECLUDED.

The exercise of functions under this title shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. 806. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the United States International Trade Commission.

(3) **COMMISSION DISCLOSURE FORM.**—The term “Commission disclosure form” means, with respect to a proposed duty suspension or reduction, a document submitted by a member of the public to the Commission that contains the following:

(A) The contact information for any known importers of the article to which the proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(B) A certification by the member of the public that the proposed duty suspension or reduction is available to any person importing the article to which the proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(4) **DOMESTIC PRODUCER.**—The term “domestic producer” means a person that demonstrates production, or imminent production, in the United States of an article that is identical to, or like or directly competitive with, an article to which a proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(5) **DUTY SUSPENSION OR REDUCTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “duty suspension or reduction” means an amendment to subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States that—

(i) extends an existing temporary duty suspension or reduction of duty on an article under that subchapter; or

(ii) provides for a new temporary duty suspension or reduction of duty on an article under that subchapter; and

(ii) otherwise meets the requirements described in subparagraph (B).

(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A duty suspension or reduction meets the requirements described in this subparagraph if—

(i) the duty suspension or reduction can be administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(ii) the estimated loss in revenue to the United States from the duty suspension or reduction does not exceed \$500,000 in a calendar year during which the duty suspension or reduction would be in effect, as determined by the Congressional Budget Office; and

(iii) the duty suspension or reduction is available to any person importing the article that is the subject of the duty suspension or reduction.

(6) **MEMBER OF CONGRESS.**—The term “Member of Congress” means a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress.

(7) **MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL.**—The term “miscellaneous tariff bill” means a bill of either House of Congress that contains only—

(A) duty suspensions and reductions that—

(i) meet the applicable requirements for—

(I) consideration of duty suspensions and reductions described in section 803; or

(II) any other process required under the Rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate; and

(ii) are not the subject of an objection because such duty suspensions and reductions do not comply with the requirements of this title from—

(I) a Member of Congress; or

(II) a domestic producer, as contained in comments submitted to the appropriate congressional committees, the Commission, or the Department of Commerce under section 803; and

(B) provisions included in bills introduced in the House of Representatives or the Senate pursuant to a process described in subparagraph

(A)(i)(II) that correct an error in the text or administration of a provision of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. DE MINIMIS VALUE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Modernizing international customs is critical for United States businesses of all sizes, consumers in the United States, and the economic growth of the United States.

(2) Higher thresholds for the value of articles that may be entered informally and free of duty provide significant economic benefits to businesses and consumers in the United States and the economy of the United States through costs savings and reductions in trade transaction costs.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States Trade Representative should encourage other countries, through bilateral, regional, and multilateral fora, to establish commercially meaningful de minimis values for express and postal shipments that are exempt from customs duties and taxes and from certain entry documentation requirements, as appropriate.

(c) **DE MINIMIS VALUE.**—Section 321(a)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “\$200” and inserting “\$800”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 902. CONSULTATION ON TRADE AND CUSTOMS REVENUE FUNCTIONS.

Section 401(c) of the Safety and Accountability for Every Port Act (6 U.S.C. 115(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “on Department policies and actions that have” and inserting “not later than 30 days after proposing, and not later than 30 days before finalizing, any Department policies, initiatives, or actions that will have”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “not later than 30 days prior to the finalization of” and inserting “not later than 60 days before proposing, and not later than 60 days before finalizing.”

SEC. 903. PENALTIES FOR CUSTOMS BROKERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 641(d)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1641(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) has been convicted of committing or conspiring to commit an act of terrorism described in section 2332b of title 18, United States Code.”

(b) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—Section 641 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1641) is amended—

(1) by striking “the Customs Service” each place it appears and inserting “U.S. Customs and Border Protection”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by striking “The Customs Service” and inserting “U.S. Customs and Border Protection”; and

(3) in subsection (g)(2)(B), by striking “Secretary’s notice” and inserting “notice under subparagraph (A)”.

SEC. 904. AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 98 OF THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **ARTICLES EXPORTED AND RETURNED, ADVANCED OR IMPROVED ABROAD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—U.S. Note 3 to subchapter II of chapter 98 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule

of the United States is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f)(1) For purposes of subheadings 9802.00.40 and 9802.00.50, fungible articles exported from the United States for the purposes described in such subheadings—

“(A) may be commingled; and

“(B) the origin, value, and classification of such articles may be accounted for using an inventory management method.

“(2) If a person chooses to use an inventory management method under this paragraph with respect to fungible articles, the person shall use the same inventory management method for any other articles with respect to which the person claims fungibility under this paragraph.

“(3) For the purposes of this paragraph—

“ 9801.00.11	United States Government property, returned to the United States without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any means while abroad, entered by the United States Government or a contractor to the United States Government, and certified by the importer as United States Government property	Free ”.
--------------	--	---------

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) applies to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 905. EXEMPTION FROM DUTY OF RESIDUE OF BULK CARGO CONTAINED IN INSTRUMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC PREVIOUSLY EXPORTED FROM THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—General Note 3(e) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (v), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (vi), by adding “and” at the end;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (vi) (as so amended) the following new subparagraph:

“(vii) residue of bulk cargo contained in instruments of international traffic previously exported from the United States.”; and

(4) by adding at the end of the flush text following subparagraph (vii) (as so added) the following: “For purposes of subparagraph (vii) of this paragraph: The term ‘residue’ means material of bulk cargo that remains in an instrument of international traffic after the bulk cargo is removed, with a quantity, by weight or volume, not exceeding 7 percent of the bulk cargo, and with no or de minimis value. The term ‘bulk cargo’ means cargo that is unpackaged and is in either solid, liquid, or gaseous form. The term ‘instruments of international traffic’ means containers or holders, capable of and suitable for repeated use, such as lift vans, cargo vans, shipping tanks, skids, pallets, caul boards, and cores for textile fabrics, arriving (whether loaded or empty) in use or to be used in the shipment of merchandise in international traffic, and any additional articles or classes of articles that the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection designates as instruments of international traffic.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to residue of bulk cargo contained in instruments of international traffic that are imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after such date of enactment and that previously have been exported from the United States.

SEC. 906. DRAWBACK AND REFUNDS.

(a) ARTICLES MADE FROM IMPORTED MERCHANDISE.—Section 313(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(a)) is amended by striking “the full amount of the duties paid upon the merchandise so used shall be refunded as draw-

“(A) the term ‘fungible articles’ means merchandise or articles that, for commercial purposes, are identical or interchangeable in all situations; and

“(B) the term ‘inventory management method’ means any method for managing inventory that is based on generally accepted accounting principles.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection applies to articles classifiable under subheading 9802.00.40 or 9802.00.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) MODIFICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO RETURNED PROPERTY.—

back, less 1 per centum of such duties, except that such” and inserting “an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1) shall be refunded as drawback, except that”.

(b) SUBSTITUTION FOR DRAWBACK PURPOSES.—Section 313(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “If imported” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If imported”;

(2) by striking “and any other merchandise (whether imported or domestic) of the same kind and quality are” and inserting “or merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise is”;

(3) by striking “three years” and inserting “5 years”;

(4) by striking “the receipt of such imported merchandise by the manufacturer or producer of such articles” and inserting “the date of importation of such imported merchandise”;

(5) by inserting “or articles classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such articles,” after “any such articles.”;

(6) by striking “an amount of drawback equal to” and all that follows through the end period and inserting “an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1), but only if those articles have not been used prior to such exportation or destruction.”; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF MERCHANDISE.—

“(A) MANUFACTURERS AND PRODUCERS.—Drawback shall be allowed under paragraph (1) with respect to an article manufactured or produced using imported merchandise or other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise only if the manufacturer or producer of the article received such imported merchandise or such other merchandise, directly or indirectly, from the importer.

“(B) EXPORTERS AND DESTROYERS.—Drawback shall be allowed under paragraph (1) with respect to a manufactured or produced article that is exported or destroyed only if the exporter or destroyer received that article or an article classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as that article, directly or indirectly, from the manufacturer or producer.

“(C) EVIDENCE OF TRANSFER.—Transfers of merchandise under subparagraph (A) and transfers of articles under subparagraph (B) may be evidenced by business records kept in the normal course of business and no additional certifi-

(1) IN GENERAL.—The article description for heading 9801.00.10 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting after “exported” the following: “, or any other products when returned within 3 years after having been exported”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) applies to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PROPERTY RETURNED TO THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter 1 of chapter 98 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following new heading:

categories of transfer or manufacture shall be required.

“(3) SUBMISSION OF BILL OF MATERIALS OR FORMULA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Drawback shall be allowed under paragraph (1) with respect to an article manufactured or produced using imported merchandise or other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise only if the person making the drawback claim submits with the claim a bill of materials or formula identifying the merchandise and article by the 8-digit HTS subheading number and the quantity of the merchandise.

“(B) BILL OF MATERIALS AND FORMULA DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the terms ‘bill of materials’ and ‘formula’ mean records kept in the normal course of business that identify each component incorporated into a manufactured or produced article or that identify the quantity of each element, material, chemical, mixture, or other substance incorporated into a manufactured article.

“(4) SPECIAL RULE FOR SOUGHT CHEMICAL ELEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a sought chemical element may be—

“(i) considered imported merchandise, or merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise, used in the manufacture or production of an article as described in paragraph (1); and

“(ii) substituted for source material containing that sought chemical element, without regard to whether the sought chemical element and the source material are classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number, and apportioned quantitatively, as appropriate.

“(B) SOUGHT CHEMICAL ELEMENT DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘sought chemical element’ means an element listed in the Periodic Table of Elements that is imported into the United States or a chemical compound consisting of those elements, either separately in elemental form or contained in source material.”.

(c) MERCHANDISE NOT CONFORMING TO SAMPLE OR SPECIFICATIONS.—Section 313(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking “under a certificate of delivery” each place it appears;

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking “3” and inserting “5”; and

(ii) by striking “the Customs Service” and inserting “U.S. Customs and Border Protection”; and

(C) in the flush text at the end, by striking “the full amount of the duties paid upon such merchandise, less 1 percent,” and inserting “an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1)”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “the Customs Service” and inserting “U.S. Customs and Border Protection”; and

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) EVIDENCE OF TRANSFERS.—Transfers of merchandise under paragraph (1) may be evidenced by business records kept in the normal course of business and no additional certificates of transfer shall be required.”.

(d) PROOF OF EXPORTATION.—Section 313(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) PROOF OF EXPORTATION.—A person claiming drawback under this section based on the exportation of an article shall provide proof of the exportation of the article. Such proof of exportation—

“(1) shall establish fully the date and fact of exportation and the identity of the exporter; and

“(2) may be established through the use of records kept in the normal course of business or through an electronic export system of the United States Government, as determined by the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection.”.

(e) UNUSED MERCHANDISE DRAWBACK.—Section 313(j) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(i) by striking “3-year” and inserting “5-year”; and

(ii) by inserting “and before the drawback claim is filed” after “the date of importation”; and

(B) in the flush text at the end, by striking “99 percent of the amount of each duty, tax, or fee so paid” and inserting “an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4), (5), and (6)”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “commercially interchangeable with” and inserting “classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “3-year” and inserting “5-year”; and

(ii) by inserting “and before the drawback claim is filed” after “the imported merchandise”;

(D) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following:

“(II) received the imported merchandise, other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise, or any combination of such imported merchandise and such other merchandise, directly or indirectly from the person who imported and paid any duties, taxes, and fees imposed under Federal law upon importation or entry and due on the imported merchandise (and any such transferred merchandise, regardless of its origin, will be treated as the imported merchandise and any retained merchandise will be treated as domestic merchandise);”;

(E) in the flush text at the end—

(i) by striking “the amount of each such duty, tax, and fee” and all that follows through “99 percent of that duty, tax, or fee” and inserting “an amount calculated pursuant to regulations

prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1) shall be refunded as drawback”; and

(ii) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: “Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), drawback shall be allowed under this paragraph with respect to wine if the imported wine and the exported wine are of the same color and the price variation between the imported wine and the exported wine does not exceed 50 percent. Transfers of merchandise may be evidenced by business records kept in the normal course of business and no additional certificates of transfer shall be required.”;

(3) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “the commercially interchangeable merchandise” and inserting “merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) For purposes of paragraph (2) and except as provided in subparagraph (B), merchandise may not be substituted for imported merchandise for drawback purposes based on the 8-digit HTS subheading number if the article description for the 8-digit HTS subheading number under which the imported merchandise is classified begins with the term ‘other’.

“(B) In cases described in subparagraph (A), merchandise may be substituted for imported merchandise for drawback purposes if—

“(i) the other merchandise and such imported merchandise are classifiable under the same 10-digit HTS statistical reporting number; and

“(ii) the article description for that 10-digit HTS statistical reporting number does not begin with the term ‘other’.

“(6)(A) For purposes of paragraph (2), a drawback claimant may use the first 8 digits of the 10-digit Schedule B number for merchandise or an article to determine if the merchandise or article is classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as the imported merchandise, without regard to whether the Schedule B number corresponds to more than one 8-digit HTS subheading number.

“(B) In this paragraph, the term ‘Schedule B’ means the Department of Commerce Schedule B, Statistical Classification of Domestic and Foreign Commodities Exported from the United States.”.

(f) LIABILITY FOR DRAWBACK CLAIMS.—Section 313(k) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(k)) is amended to read as follows:

“(k) LIABILITY FOR DRAWBACK CLAIMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person making a claim for drawback under this section shall be liable for the full amount of the drawback claimed.

“(2) LIABILITY OF IMPORTERS.—An importer shall be liable for any drawback claim made by another person with respect to merchandise imported by the importer in an amount equal to the lesser of—

“(A) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that the person claimed with respect to the imported merchandise; or

“(B) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that the importer authorized the other person to claim with respect to the imported merchandise.

“(3) JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY.—Persons described in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be jointly and severally liable for the amount described in paragraph (2).”.

(g) REGULATIONS.—Section 313(l) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(l)) is amended to read as follows:

“(l) REGULATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Allowance of the privileges provided for in this section shall be subject to compliance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

“(2) CALCULATION OF DRAWBACK.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment

of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (or, if later, the effective date provided for in section 906(q)(2)(B) of that Act), the Secretary shall prescribe regulations for determining the calculation of amounts refunded as drawback under this section.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations required by subparagraph (A) for determining the calculation of amounts refunded as drawback under this section shall provide for a refund of 99 percent of the duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise, except that where there is substitution of the merchandise or article, then—

“(i) in the case of an article that is exported, the amount of the refund shall be equal to 99 percent of the lesser of—

“(I) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise; or

“(II) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that would apply to the exported article if the exported article were imported; and

“(ii) in the case of an article that is destroyed, the amount of the refund shall be an amount that is—

“(I) equal to 99 percent of the lesser of—

“(aa) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise; and

“(bb) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that would apply to the destroyed article if the destroyed article were imported; and

“(II) reduced by the value of materials recovered during destruction as provided in subsection (x).

“(3) STATUS REPORTS ON REGULATIONS.—Not later than the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, and annually thereafter until the regulations required by paragraph (2) are final, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the status of those regulations.”.

(h) SUBSTITUTION OF FINISHED PETROLEUM DERIVATIVES.—Section 313(p) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(p)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States” each place it appears and inserting “HTS”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii)(III), by striking “, as so certified in a certificate of delivery or certificate of manufacture and delivery”; and

(B) in the flush text at the end—

(i) by striking “, as so designated on the certificate of delivery or certificate of manufacture and delivery”; and

(ii) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: “The party transferring the merchandise shall maintain records kept in the normal course of business to demonstrate the transfer.”.

(i) PACKAGING MATERIAL.—Section 313(q) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(q)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “of 99 percent of any duty, tax, or fee imposed under Federal law on such imported material” and inserting “in an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1)”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “of 99 percent of any duty, tax, or fee imposed under Federal law on the imported or substituted merchandise used to manufacture or produce such material” and inserting “in an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1)”;

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “they contain” and inserting “it contains”.

(j) FILING OF DRAWBACK CLAIMS.—Section 313(r) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(r)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A drawback entry shall be filed or applied for, as applicable, not later than 5 years after the date on which merchandise on which drawback is claimed was imported.";

(B) in the second sentence, by striking "3-year" and inserting "5-year"; and

(C) in the third sentence, by striking "the Customs Service" and inserting "U.S. Customs and Border Protection";

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "The Customs Service" and inserting "U.S. Customs and Border Protection";

(ii) in clauses (i) and (ii), by striking "the Customs Service" each place it appears and inserting "U.S. Customs and Border Protection"; and

(iii) in clause (ii)(I), by striking "3-year" and inserting "5-year"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "the periods of time for retaining records set forth in subsection (t) of this section and" and inserting "the period of time for retaining records set forth in"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) All drawback claims filed on and after the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (or, if later, the effective date provided for in section 906(q)(2)(B) of that Act) shall be filed electronically.".

(k) DESIGNATION OF MERCHANDISE BY SUCCESSOR.—Section 313(s) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(s)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(B) subject to paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (j), imported merchandise, other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise, or any combination of such imported merchandise and such other merchandise, that the predecessor received, before the date of succession, from the person who imported and paid any duties, taxes, and fees due on the imported merchandise;"; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking "certifies that" and all that follows and inserting "certifies that the transferred merchandise was not and will not be claimed by the predecessor.".

(l) DRAWBACK CERTIFICATES.—Section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313) is amended by striking subsection (t).

(m) DRAWBACK FOR RECOVERED MATERIALS.—Section 313(x) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(x)) is amended by striking "and (c)" and inserting "(c), and (j)".

(n) DEFINITIONS.—Section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(z) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) DIRECTLY.—The term 'directly' means a transfer of merchandise or an article from one person to another person without any intermediate transfer.

"(2) HTS.—The term 'HTS' means the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

"(3) INDIRECTLY.—The term 'indirectly' means a transfer of merchandise or an article from one person to another person with one or more intermediate transfers.".

(o) RECORDKEEPING.—Section 508(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1508(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking "3rd" and inserting "5th"; and

(2) by striking "payment" and inserting "liquidation".

(p) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the issuance of the regulations required by subsection (l)(2) of section 313 of the Tariff Act of

1930, as added by subsection (g), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the modernization of drawback and refunds under section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) include the following:

(A) An assessment of the modernization of drawback and refunds under section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this section.

(B) A description of drawback claims that were permissible before the effective date provided for in subsection (g) that are not permissible after that effective date and an identification of industries most affected.

(C) A description of drawback claims that were not permissible before the effective date provided for in subsection (g) that are permissible after that effective date and an identification of industries most affected.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(A) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) except as provided in paragraphs (2)(B) and (3), apply to drawback claims filed on or after the date that is 2 years after such date of enactment.

(2) REPORTING OF OPERABILITY OF AUTOMATED COMMERCIAL ENVIRONMENT COMPUTER SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 2 years after such date of enactment, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a report on—

(i) the date on which the Automated Commercial Environment will be ready to process drawback claims; and

(ii) the date on which the Automated Export System will be ready to accept proof of exportation under subsection (i) of section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by subsection (d).

(B) DELAY OF EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the Secretary indicates in the report required by subparagraph (A) that the Automated Commercial Environment will not be ready to process drawback claims by the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the amendments made by this section shall apply to drawback claims filed on and after the date on which the Secretary certifies that the Automated Commercial Environment is ready to process drawback claims.

(3) TRANSITION RULE.—During the one-year period beginning on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act (or, if later, the effective date provided for in paragraph (2)(B)), a person may elect to file a claim for drawback under—

(A) section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this section; or

(B) section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 907. INCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION IN SUBMISSION OF NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.

Section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) When the President submits to the Senate for its advice and consent a nomination of an individual for appointment as a Deputy United States Trade Representative under paragraph (2), the President shall include in that submission information on the country, regional offices, and functions of the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to which that individual will have responsibility.".

SEC. 908. BIENNIAL REPORTS REGARDING COMPETITIVENESS ISSUES FACING THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY AND COMPETITIVE CONDITIONS FOR CERTAIN KEY UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States International Trade Commission shall conduct a series of investigations, and submit a report on each such investigation in accordance with subsection (c), regarding competitiveness issues facing the economy of the United States and competitive conditions for certain key United States industries.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall include, to the extent practicable, the following:

(A) A detailed assessment of competitiveness issues facing the economy of the United States, over the 10-year period beginning on the date on which the report is submitted, that includes—

(i) projections, over that 10-year period, of economic measures, such as measures relating to production in the United States and United States trade, for the economy of the United States and for key United States industries, based on ongoing trends in the economy of the United States and global economies and incorporating estimates from prominent United States, foreign, multinational, and private sector organizations; and

(ii) a description of factors that drive economic growth, such as domestic productivity, the United States workforce, foreign demand for United States goods and services, and industry-specific developments.

(B) A detailed assessment of a key United States industry or key United States industries that, to the extent practicable—

(i) identifies with respect to each such industry the principal factors driving competitiveness as of the date on which the report is submitted; and

(ii) describes, with respect to each such industry, the structure of the global industry, its market characteristics, current industry trends, relevant policies and programs of foreign governments, and principal factors affecting future competitiveness.

(2) SELECTION OF KEY UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting assessments required under paragraph (1)(B), the Commission shall, to the extent practicable, select a different key United States industry or different key United States industries for purposes of each report required by subsection (a).

(B) CONSULTATIONS WITH CONGRESS.—The Commission shall consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives before selecting the key United States industry or key United States industries for purposes of each report required by subsection (a).

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 15, 2017, and every 2 years thereafter through 2025, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the most recent investigation conducted under subsection (a).

(2) EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.—The Commission may, after consultation with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, submit a report under paragraph (1) later than the date required by that paragraph.

(3) CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION.—A report submitted under paragraph (1) shall not include any confidential business information unless—

(A) the party that submitted the confidential business information to the Commission had notice, at the time of submission, that the information would be released by the Commission; or

(B) that party consents to the release of the information.

(d) **KEY UNITED STATES INDUSTRY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “key United States industry” means a goods or services industry that—

(1) contributes significantly to United States economic activity and trade; or

(2) is a potential growth area for the United States and global markets.

SEC. 909. REPORT ON CERTAIN U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION AGREEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after entering into an agreement under a program specified in subsection (b), and annually thereafter until the termination of the program, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of the development of the program.

(2) A description of the type of entity with which U.S. Customs and Border Protection entered into the agreement and the amount that entity reimbursed U.S. Customs and Border Protection under the agreement.

(3) An identification of the type of port of entry to which the agreement relates and an assessment of how the agreement provides economic benefits at the port of entry.

(4) A description of the services provided by U.S. Customs and Border Protection under the agreement during the year preceding the submission of the report.

(5) The amount of fees collected under the agreement during that year.

(6) A detailed accounting of how the fees collected under the agreement have been spent during that year.

(7) A summary of any complaints or criticism received by U.S. Customs and Border Protection during that year regarding the agreement.

(8) An assessment of the compliance of the entity described in paragraph (2) with the terms of the agreement.

(9) Recommendations with respect to how activities conducted pursuant to the agreement could function more effectively or better produce economic benefits.

(10) A summary of the benefits to and challenges faced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the entity described in paragraph (2) under the agreement.

(b) **PROGRAM SPECIFIED.**—A program specified in this subsection is—

(1) the program for entering into reimbursable fee agreements for the provision of U.S. Customs and Border Protection services established by section 560 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113–6; 127 Stat. 378); or

(2) the pilot program authorizing U.S. Customs and Border Protection to enter into partnerships with private sector and government entities at ports of entry established by section 559 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (division F of Public Law 113–76; 6 U.S.C. 211 note).

SEC. 910. CHARTER FLIGHTS.

Section 13031(e)(1) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(1) Notwithstanding section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1451) or any other provision of law (other than paragraph (2))” and inserting the following:

“(1)(A) Notwithstanding section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1451) or any other provision of law (other than subparagraph (B) and paragraph (2))”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B)(i) An appropriate officer of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may assign a sufficient

number of employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (if available) to perform services described in clause (ii) for a charter air carrier (as defined in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code) for a charter flight arriving after normal operating hours at an airport that is an established port of entry serviced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, notwithstanding that overtime funds for those services are not available, if the charter air carrier—

“(I) not later than 4 hours before the flight arrives, specifically requests that such services be provided; and

“(II) pays any overtime fees incurred in connection with such services.

“(ii) Services described in this clause are customs services for passengers and their baggage or any other such service that could lawfully be performed during regular hours of operation.”.

SEC. 911. AMENDMENT TO TARIFF ACT OF 1930 TO REQUIRE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN MARKING OF CERTAIN CASTINGS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 304(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1304(e)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “MANHOLE RINGS OR FRAMES, COVERS, AND ASSEMBLIES THEREOF” and inserting “CASTINGS”; (2) by inserting “inlet frames, tree and trench grates, lampposts, lamppost bases, cast utility poles, bollards, hydrants, utility boxes,” before “manhole rings,”; and

(3) by adding at the end before the period the following: “in a location such that it will remain visible after installation”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to the importation of castings described in such amendments on or after the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 912. ELIMINATION OF CONSUMPTIVE DEMAND EXCEPTION TO PROHIBITION ON IMPORTATION OF GOODS MADE WITH CONVICT LABOR, FORCED LABOR, OR INDENTURED LABOR; REPORT.

(a) **ELIMINATION OF CONSUMPTIVE DEMAND EXCEPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) is amended by striking “The provisions of this section” and all that follows through “of the United States.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date that is 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on compliance with section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) that includes the following:

(1) The number of instances in which merchandise was denied entry pursuant to that section during the 1-year period preceding the submission of the report.

(2) A description of the merchandise denied entry pursuant to that section.

(3) Such other information as the Commissioner considers appropriate with respect to monitoring and enforcing compliance with that section.

SEC. 913. IMPROVED COLLECTION AND USE OF LABOR MARKET INFORMATION.

Section 1137 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b–7) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “(including the occupational information under subsection (g))” after “paragraph (3) of this subsection”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “employers (as defined)” and inserting “subject to subsection (g), employers (as defined”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g)(1) Beginning January 1, 2017, each quarterly wage report required to be submitted by an employer under subsection (a)(3) shall include such occupational information with respect to each employee of the employer that permits the classification of such employees into occupational categories as found in the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system.

“(2) The State agency receiving the occupational information described in paragraph (1) shall make such information available to the Secretary of Labor pursuant to procedures established by the Secretary of Labor.

“(3)(A) The Secretary of Labor shall make occupational information submitted under paragraph (2) available to other State and Federal agencies, including the United States Census Bureau, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and other State and Federal research agencies.

“(B) Disclosure of occupational information under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the agency having safeguards in place that meet the requirements under paragraph (4).

“(4) The Secretary of Labor shall establish and implement safeguards for the dissemination and, subject to paragraph (5), the use of occupational information received under this subsection.

“(5) Occupational information received under this subsection shall only be used to classify employees into occupational categories as found in the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system and to analyze and evaluate occupations in order to improve the labor market for workers and industries.

“(6) The Secretary of Labor shall establish procedures to verify the accuracy of information received under paragraph (2).”.

SEC. 914. STATEMENTS OF POLICY WITH RESPECT TO ISRAEL.

Congress—

(1) supports the strengthening of United States-Israel economic cooperation and recognizes the tremendous strategic, economic, and technological value of cooperation with Israel;

(2) recognizes the benefit of cooperation with Israel to United States companies, including by improving United States competitiveness in global markets;

(3) recognizes the importance of trade and commercial relations to the pursuit and sustainability of peace, and supports efforts to bring together the United States, Israel, the Palestinian territories, and others in enhanced commerce;

(4) opposes politically motivated actions that penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel such as boycotts, divestment or sanctions;

(5) notes that the boycott, divestment, and sanctioning of Israel by governments, governmental bodies, quasi-governmental bodies, international organizations, and other such entities is contrary to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) principle of nondiscrimination;

(6) encourages the inclusion of politically motivated actions that penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel such as boycotts, divestment from, or sanctions against Israel as a topic of discussion at the U.S.-Israel Joint Economic Development Group (JEDG) and other areas to support the strengthening of the United States-Israel commercial relationship and combat any commercial discrimination against Israel;

(7) supports efforts to prevent investigations or prosecutions by governments or international organizations of United States persons on the sole basis of such persons doing business with Israel, with Israeli entities, or in territories controlled by Israel; and

(8) supports States of the United States examining a company's promotion or compliance

with unsanctioned boycotts, divestment from, or sanctions against Israel as part of its consideration in awarding grants and contracts and supports the divestment of State assets from companies that support or promote actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel.

TITLE X—OFFSETS

SEC. 1001. REVOCATION OR DENIAL OF PASSPORT IN CASE OF CERTAIN UNPAID TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter D of chapter 75 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 7345. REVOCATION OR DENIAL OF PASSPORT IN CASE OF CERTAIN TAX DELINQUENCIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary receives certification by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that any individual has a seriously delinquent tax debt in an amount in excess of \$50,000, the Secretary shall transmit such certification to the Secretary of State for action with respect to denial, revocation, or limitation of a passport pursuant to section 1001(d) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

“(b) SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBT.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘seriously delinquent tax debt’ means an outstanding debt under this title for which a notice of lien has been filed in public records pursuant to section 6323 or a notice of levy has been filed pursuant to section 6331, except that such term does not include—

“(1) a debt that is being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement under section 6159 or 7122, and

“(2) a debt with respect to which collection is suspended because a collection due process hearing under section 6330, or relief under subsection (b), (c), or (f) of section 6015, is requested or pending.

“(c) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—In the case of a calendar year beginning after 2016, the dollar amount in subsection (a) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2015’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

If any amount as adjusted under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of \$1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next highest multiple of \$1,000.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter D of chapter 75 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 7345. Revocation or denial of passport in case of certain tax delinquencies.”.

(c) AUTHORITY FOR INFORMATION SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (l) of section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(23) DISCLOSURE OF RETURN INFORMATION TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PURPOSES OF PASSPORT REVOCATION UNDER SECTION 7345.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, upon receiving a certification described in section 7345, disclose to the Secretary of State return information with respect to a taxpayer who has a seriously delinquent tax debt described in such section. Such return information shall be limited to—

“(i) the taxpayer identity information with respect to such taxpayer, and

“(ii) the amount of such seriously delinquent tax debt.

“(B) RESTRICTION ON DISCLOSURE.—Return information disclosed under subparagraph (A) may be used by officers and employees of the

Department of State for the purposes of, and to the extent necessary in, carrying out the requirements of section 1001(d) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (4) of section 6103(p) of such Code is amended by striking “or (22)” each place it appears in subparagraph (F)(ii) and in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting “(22), or (23)”.

(d) AUTHORITY TO DENY OR REVOKE PASSPORT.—

(1) DENIAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), upon receiving a certification described in section 7345 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State shall not issue a passport to any individual who has a seriously delinquent tax debt described in such section.

(B) EMERGENCY AND HUMANITARIAN SITUATIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary of State may issue a passport, in emergency circumstances or for humanitarian reasons, to an individual described in such subparagraph.

(2) REVOCATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may revoke a passport previously issued to any individual described in paragraph (1)(A).

(B) LIMITATION FOR RETURN TO UNITED STATES.—If the Secretary of State decides to revoke a passport under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of State, before revocation, may—

(i) limit a previously issued passport only for return travel to the United States; or

(ii) issue a limited passport that only permits return travel to the United States.

(3) HOLD HARMLESS.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State shall not be liable to an individual for any action with respect to a certification by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under section 7345 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(e) REVOCATION OR DENIAL OF PASSPORT IN CASE OF INDIVIDUAL WITHOUT SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBER.—

(1) DENIAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), upon receiving an application for a passport from an individual that either—

(i) does not include the social security account number issued to that individual, or

(ii) includes an incorrect or invalid social security number willfully, intentionally, negligently, or recklessly provided by such individual,

the Secretary of State is authorized to deny such application and is authorized to not issue a passport to the individual.

(B) EMERGENCY AND HUMANITARIAN SITUATIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary of State may issue a passport, in emergency circumstances or for humanitarian reasons, to an individual described in subparagraph (A).

(2) REVOCATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may revoke a passport previously issued to any individual described in paragraph (1)(A).

(B) LIMITATION FOR RETURN TO UNITED STATES.—If the Secretary of State decides to revoke a passport under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of State, before revocation, may—

(i) limit a previously issued passport only for return travel to the United States; or

(ii) issue a limited passport that only permits return travel to the United States.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of, and amendments made by, this section shall take effect on January 1, 2016.

SEC. 1002. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation

Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) Fees may be charged under paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) during the period beginning on July 8, 2025, and ending on July 28, 2025.”.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended—

(1) by striking “For the period” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—For the period”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) ADDITIONAL PERIOD.—For the period beginning on July 1, 2025, and ending on July 14, 2025, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

“(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’; and

“(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’.”.

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.”.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. TIBERI

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Tiberi moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title of H.R. 644 and concur in the Senate amendment to the text of H.R. 644 with the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114–146 modified by the amendment printed in part B of that report.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendments to the text is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 101. Improving partnership programs.

Sec. 102. Report on effectiveness of trade enforcement activities.

Sec. 103. Priorities and performance standards for customs modernization, trade facilitation, and trade enforcement functions and programs.

Sec. 104. Educational seminars to improve efforts to classify and appraise imported articles, to improve trade enforcement efforts, and to otherwise facilitate legitimate international trade.

Sec. 105. Joint strategic plan.

Sec. 106. Automated Commercial Environment.

Sec. 107. International Trade Data System.

Sec. 108. Consultations with respect to mutual recognition arrangements.

Sec. 109. Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee.

Sec. 110. Centers of Excellence and Expertise.

Sec. 111. Commercial risk assessment targeting and trade alerts.

- Sec. 112. Report on oversight of revenue protection and enforcement measures.
- Sec. 113. Report on security and revenue measures with respect to merchandise transported in bond.
- Sec. 114. Importer of record program.
- Sec. 115. Establishment of new importer program.
- Sec. 116. Customs broker identification of importers.
- Sec. 117. Requirements applicable to non-resident importers.
- Sec. 118. Priority trade issues.
- Sec. 119. Appropriate congressional committees defined.

TITLE II—IMPORT HEALTH AND SAFETY

- Sec. 201. Interagency import safety working group.
- Sec. 202. Joint import safety rapid response plan.
- Sec. 203. Training.

TITLE III—IMPORT-RELATED PROTECTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

- Sec. 301. Definition of intellectual property rights.
- Sec. 302. Exchange of information related to trade enforcement.
- Sec. 303. Seizure of circumvention devices.
- Sec. 304. Enforcement by U.S. Customs and Border Protection of works for which copyright registration is pending.
- Sec. 305. National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center.
- Sec. 306. Joint strategic plan for the enforcement of intellectual property rights.
- Sec. 307. Personnel dedicated to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.
- Sec. 308. Training with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.
- Sec. 309. International cooperation and information sharing.
- Sec. 310. Report on intellectual property rights enforcement.
- Sec. 311. Information for travelers regarding violations of intellectual property rights.

TITLE IV—PREVENTION OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS

- Sec. 401. Short title.
- Sec. 402. Definitions.
- Sec. 403. Application to Canada and Mexico.
 - Subtitle A—Actions Relating to Enforcement of Trade Remedy Laws
- Sec. 411. Trade remedy law enforcement division.
- Sec. 412. Collection of information on evasion of trade remedy laws.
- Sec. 413. Access to information.
- Sec. 414. Cooperation with foreign countries on preventing evasion of trade remedy laws.
- Sec. 415. Trade negotiating objectives.

Subtitle B—Investigation of Evasion of Trade Remedy Laws

- Sec. 421. Procedures for investigation of evasion of antidumping and countervailing duty orders.
- Sec. 422. Government Accountability Office report.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

- Sec. 431. Allocation and training of personnel.
- Sec. 432. Annual report on prevention of evasion of antidumping and countervailing duty orders.

- Sec. 433. Addressing circumvention by new shippers.

TITLE V—IMPROVEMENTS TO ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

- Sec. 501. Short title.
- Sec. 502. Consequences of failure to cooperate with a request for information in a proceeding.
- Sec. 503. Definition of material injury.
- Sec. 504. Particular market situation.
- Sec. 505. Distortion of prices or costs.
- Sec. 506. Reduction in burden on Department of Commerce by reducing the number of voluntary respondents.
- Sec. 507. Application to Canada and Mexico.

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

- Sec. 601. Trade enforcement priorities.
- Sec. 602. Exercise of WTO authorization to suspend concessions or other obligations under trade agreements.
- Sec. 603. Trade monitoring.

TITLE VII—CURRENCY MANIPULATION

- Sec. 701. Enhancement of engagement on currency exchange rate and economic policies with certain major trading partners of the United States.
- Sec. 702. Advisory Committee on International Exchange Rate Policy.

TITLE VIII—ESTABLISHMENT OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

- Sec. 801. Short title.
- Sec. 802. Establishment of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Sec. 901. De minimis value.
- Sec. 902. Consultation on trade and customs revenue functions.
- Sec. 903. Penalties for customs brokers.
- Sec. 904. Amendments to chapter 98 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.
- Sec. 905. Exemption from duty of residue of bulk cargo contained in instruments of international traffic previously exported from the United States.
- Sec. 906. Drawback and refunds.
- Sec. 907. Office of the United States Trade Representative.
- Sec. 908. United States-Israel Trade and Commercial Enhancement.
- Sec. 909. Elimination of consumptive demand exception to prohibition on importation of goods made with convict labor, forced labor, or indentured labor; report.
- Sec. 910. Customs user fees.
- Sec. 911. Report on certain U.S. Customs and Border Protection agreements.
- Sec. 912. Amendments to Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015.
- Sec. 913. Certain interest to be included in distributions under Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000.
- Sec. 914. Report on competitiveness of U.S. recreational performance outerwear industry.
- Sec. 915. Increase in penalty for failure to file return of tax.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

- (1) AUTOMATED COMMERCIAL ENVIRONMENT.—The term “Automated Commercial

Environment” means the Automated Commercial Environment computer system authorized under section 13031(f)(4) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)).

(2) COMMISSIONER.—The term “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, as described in section 411(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 802(a) of this Act.

(3) CUSTOMS AND TRADE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term “customs and trade laws of the United States” includes the following:

(A) The Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1202 et seq.).

(B) Section 249 of the Revised Statutes (19 U.S.C. 3).

(C) Section 2 of the Act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1453, chapter 251; 19 U.S.C. 6).

(D) The Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2071 et seq.).

(E) Section 13031 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c).

(F) Section 251 of the Revised Statutes (19 U.S.C. 66).

(G) Section 1 of the Act of June 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 817, chapter 617; 19 U.S.C. 68).

(H) The Foreign Trade Zones Act (19 U.S.C. 81a et seq.).

(I) Section 1 of the Act of March 2, 1911 (36 Stat. 965, chapter 191; 19 U.S.C. 198).

(J) The Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2102 et seq.).

(K) The Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

(L) The North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.).

(M) The Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

(N) The Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(O) The Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

(P) The African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.).

(Q) The Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-570; 100 Stat. 3207-79).

(R) The Customs and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-382; 104 Stat. 629).

(S) The Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-410; 92 Stat. 888).

(T) The Trade Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-210; 116 Stat. 933).

(U) The Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.).

(V) The Act of March 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 374, chapter 266; 19 U.S.C. 2077 et seq.).

(W) The Act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1263, chapter 566).

(X) Any other provision of law implementing a trade agreement.

(Y) Any other provision of law vesting customs revenue functions in the Secretary of the Treasury.

(Z) Any other provision of law relating to trade facilitation or trade enforcement that is administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection on behalf of any Federal agency that is required to participate in the International Trade Data System.

(AA) Any other provision of customs or trade law administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(4) PRIVATE SECTOR ENTITY.—The term “private sector entity” means—

- (A) an importer;
- (B) an exporter;
- (C) a forwarder;
- (D) an air, sea, or land carrier or shipper;
- (E) a contract logistics provider;

(F) a customs broker; or

(G) any other person (other than an employee of a government) affected by the implementation of the customs and trade laws of the United States.

(5) **TRADE ENFORCEMENT.**—The term “trade enforcement” means the enforcement of the customs and trade laws of the United States.

(6) **TRADE FACILITATION.**—The term “trade facilitation” refers to policies and activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to facilitating the movement of merchandise into and out of the United States in a manner that complies with the customs and trade laws of the United States.

TITLE I—TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 101. IMPROVING PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to advance the security, trade enforcement, and trade facilitation missions of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the Commissioner shall ensure that partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection established before the date of the enactment of this Act, such as the Customs–Trade Partnership Against Terrorism established under subtitle B of title II of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 961 et seq.), and partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection established on or after such date of enactment, provide trade benefits to private sector entities that meet the requirements for participation in those programs established by the Commissioner under this section.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—In developing and operating partnership programs under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall—

(1) consult with private sector entities, the public, and other Federal agencies when appropriate, to ensure that participants in those programs receive commercially significant and measurable trade benefits, including providing pre-clearance of merchandise for qualified persons that demonstrate the highest levels of compliance with the customs and trade laws of the United States, regulations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and other requirements the Commissioner determines to be necessary;

(2) ensure an integrated and transparent system of trade benefits and compliance requirements for all partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(3) consider consolidating partnership programs in situations in which doing so would support the objectives of such programs, increase participation in such programs, enhance the trade benefits provided to participants in such programs, and enhance the allocation of the resources of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(4) coordinate with the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and other Federal agencies with authority to detain and release merchandise entering the United States—

(A) to ensure coordination in the release of such merchandise through the Automated Commercial Environment, or its predecessor, and the International Trade Data System;

(B) to ensure that the partnership programs of those agencies are compatible with the partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(C) to develop criteria for authorizing the release, on an expedited basis, of merchandise for which documentation is required from one or more of those agencies to clear or license the merchandise for entry into the United States; and

(D) to create pathways, within and among the appropriate Federal agencies, for quali-

fied persons that demonstrate the highest levels of compliance with the customs and trade laws of the United States to receive immediate clearance absent information that a transaction may pose a national security or compliance threat; and

(5) ensure that trade benefits are provided to participants in partnership programs.

(c) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than December 31 of each calendar year thereafter, the Commissioner shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(1) identifies each partnership program referred to in subsection (a);

(2) for each such program, identifies—

(A) the requirements for participants in the program;

(B) the commercially significant and measurable trade benefits provided to participants in the program;

(C) the number of participants in the program; and

(D) in the case of a program that provides for participation at multiple tiers, the number of participants at each such tier;

(3) identifies the number of participants enrolled in more than one such partnership program;

(4) assesses the effectiveness of each such partnership program in advancing the security, trade enforcement, and trade facilitation missions of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, based on historical developments, the level of participation in the program, and the evolution of benefits provided to participants in the program;

(5) summarizes the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to work with other Federal agencies with authority to detain and release merchandise entering the United States to ensure that partnership programs of those agencies are compatible with partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(6) summarizes criteria developed with those agencies for authorizing the release, on an expedited basis, of merchandise for which documentation is required from one or more of those agencies to clear or license the merchandise for entry into the United States;

(7) summarizes the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to work with private sector entities and the public to develop and improve partnership programs referred to in subsection (a);

(8) describes measures taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to make private sector entities aware of the trade benefits available to participants in such programs; and

(9) summarizes the plans, targets, and goals of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to such programs for the 2 years following the submission of the report.

SEC. 102. REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the effectiveness of trade enforcement activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the use of resources, results of audits and verifications, targeting, organization, and training of personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

(2) a description of trade enforcement activities to address undervaluation, trans-

shipment, legitimacy of entities making entry, protection of revenues, fraud prevention and detection, and penalties, including intentional misclassification, inadequate bonding, and other misrepresentations.

SEC. 103. PRIORITIES AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR CUSTOMS MODERNIZATION, TRADE FACILITATION, AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS.

(a) **PRIORITIES AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commissioner, in consultation with the appropriate congressional committees, shall establish priorities and performance standards to measure the development and levels of achievement of the customs modernization, trade facilitation, and trade enforcement functions and programs described in subsection (b).

(2) **MINIMUM PRIORITIES AND STANDARDS.**—Such priorities and performance standards shall, at a minimum, include priorities and standards relating to efficiency, outcome, output, and other types of applicable measures.

(b) **FUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS DESCRIBED.**—The functions and programs referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The Automated Commercial Environment.

(2) Each of the priority trade issues described in section 118.

(3) The Centers of Excellence and Expertise described in section 110.

(4) Drawback for exported merchandise under section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313), as amended by section 906 of this Act.

(5) Transactions relating to imported merchandise in bond.

(6) Collection of countervailing duties assessed under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and antidumping duties assessed under subtitle B of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673 et seq.).

(7) The expedited clearance of cargo.

(8) The issuance of regulations and rulings.

(9) The issuance of Regulatory Audit Reports.

(c) **CONSULTATIONS AND NOTIFICATION.**—

(1) **CONSULTATIONS.**—The consultations required by subsection (a)(1) shall occur, at a minimum, on an annual basis.

(2) **NOTIFICATION.**—The Commissioner shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of any changes to the priorities referred to in subsection (a) not later than 30 days before such changes are to take effect.

SEC. 104. EDUCATIONAL SEMINARS TO IMPROVE EFFORTS TO CLASSIFY AND APPRAISE IMPORTED ARTICLES, TO IMPROVE TRADE ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS, AND TO OTHERWISE FACILITATE LEGITIMATE INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Commissioner and the Director shall establish and carry out on a fiscal year basis educational seminars to—

(A) improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel to classify and appraise articles imported into the United States in accordance with the customs and trade laws of the United States;

(B) improve the trade enforcement efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

(C) otherwise improve the ability and effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel to facilitate legitimate international trade.

(b) CONTENT.—

(1) CLASSIFYING AND APPRAISING IMPORTED ARTICLES.—In carrying out subsection (a)(1)(A), the Commissioner, the Director, and interested parties in the private sector selected under subsection (c) shall provide instruction and related instructional materials at each educational seminar under this section to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and, as appropriate, to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel on the following:

(A) Conducting a physical inspection of an article imported into the United States, including testing of samples of the article, to determine if the article is mislabeled in the manifest or other accompanying documentation.

(B) Reviewing the manifest and other accompanying documentation of an article imported into the United States to determine if the country of origin of the article listed in the manifest or other accompanying documentation is accurate.

(C) Customs valuation.

(D) Industry supply chains and other related matters as determined to be appropriate by the Commissioner.

(2) TRADE ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS.—In carrying out subsection (a)(1)(B), the Commissioner, the Director, and interested parties in the private sector selected under subsection (c) shall provide instruction and related instructional materials at each educational seminar under this section to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and, as appropriate, to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel to identify opportunities to enhance enforcement of the following:

(A) Collection of countervailing duties assessed under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and antidumping duties assessed under subtitle B of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673 et seq.).

(B) Addressing evasion of duties on imports of textiles.

(C) Protection of intellectual property rights.

(D) Enforcement of child labor laws.

(3) APPROVAL OF COMMISSIONER AND DIRECTOR.—The instruction and related instructional materials at each educational seminar under this section shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioner and the Director.

(c) SELECTION PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall establish a process to solicit, evaluate, and select interested parties in the private sector for purposes of assisting in providing instruction and related instructional materials described in subsection (b) at each educational seminar under this section.

(2) CRITERIA.—The Commissioner shall evaluate and select interested parties in the private sector under the process established under paragraph (1) based on—

(A) availability and usefulness;

(B) the volume, value, and incidence of mislabeling or misidentification of origin of imported articles; and

(C) other appropriate criteria established by the Commissioner.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Commissioner and the Director shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the process established under paragraph (1) and the criteria established under paragraph (2).

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall give due consideration to carrying out an

educational seminar under this section in whole or in part to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel to enforce a countervailing or antidumping duty order issued under section 706 or 736 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671e or 1673e) upon the request of a petitioner in an action underlying such countervailing or antidumping duty order.

(2) INTERESTED PARTY.—A petitioner described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as an interested party in the private sector for purposes of the requirements of this section.

(e) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—The Commissioner and the Director shall establish performance standards to measure the development and level of achievement of educational seminars under this section.

(f) REPORTING.—Beginning September 30, 2016, the Commissioner and the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report on the effectiveness of educational seminars under this section.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(2) UNITED STATES.—The term “United States” means the customs territory of the United States, as defined in General Note 2 to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(3) U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION PERSONNEL.—The term “U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel” means import specialists, auditors, and other appropriate employees of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(4) U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.—The term “U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel” means Homeland Security Investigations Directorate personnel and other appropriate employees of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 105. JOINT STRATEGIC PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall jointly develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a joint strategic plan.

(b) CONTENTS.—The joint strategic plan required under this section shall be comprised of a comprehensive multi-year plan for trade enforcement and trade facilitation, and shall include—

(1) a summary of actions taken during the 2-year period preceding the submission of the plan to improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation, including a description and analysis of specific performance measures to evaluate the progress of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement in meeting each such responsibility;

(2) a statement of objectives and plans for further improving trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(3) a specific identification of the priority trade issues described in section 118, that can be addressed in order to enhance trade enforcement and trade facilitation, and a description of strategies and plans for addressing each such issue;

(4) a description of efforts made to improve consultation and coordination among and within Federal agencies, and in particular between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, regarding trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(5) a description of the training that has occurred to date within U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation, including training under section 104;

(6) a description of efforts to work with the World Customs Organization and other international organizations, in consultation with other Federal agencies as appropriate, with respect to enhancing trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(7) a description of U.S. Custom and Border Protection organizational benchmarks for optimizing staffing and wait times at ports of entry;

(8) a specific identification of any domestic or international best practices that may further improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(9) any legislative recommendations to further improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation; and

(10) a description of efforts made to improve consultation and coordination with the private sector to enhance trade enforcement and trade facilitation.

(c) CONSULTATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In developing the joint strategic plan required under this section, the Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall consult with—

(A) appropriate officials from the relevant Federal agencies, including—

(i) the Department of the Treasury;

(ii) the Department of Agriculture;

(iii) the Department of Commerce;

(iv) the Department of Justice;

(v) the Department of the Interior;

(vi) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(vii) the Food and Drug Administration;

(viii) the Consumer Product Safety Commission; and

(ix) the Office of the United States Trade Representative; and

(B) the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established by section 109.

(2) OTHER CONSULTATIONS.—In developing the joint strategic plan required under this section, the Commissioner and the Director shall seek to consult with—

(A) appropriate officials from relevant foreign law enforcement agencies and international organizations, including the World Customs Organization; and

(B) interested parties in the private sector.

SEC. 106. AUTOMATED COMMERCIAL ENVIRONMENT.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 13031(f)(4)(B) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking “2003 through 2005” and inserting “2016 through 2018”;

(2) by striking “such amounts as are available in that Account” and inserting “not less than \$153,736,000”; and

(3) by striking “for the development” and inserting “to complete the development and implementation”.

(b) REPORT.—Section 311(b)(3) of the Customs Border Security Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 2075 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report detailing—

“(i) U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s incorporation of all core trade processing capabilities, including cargo release, entry summary, cargo manifest, cargo financial data, and export data elements into the Automated Commercial Environment computer system authorized under section 13031(f)(4) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)) not later than September 30, 2016, to conform with the admissibility criteria of agencies participating in the International Trade Data System identified pursuant to section 411(d)(4)(A)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930;

“(ii) U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s remaining priorities for processing entry summary data elements, cargo manifest data elements, cargo financial data elements, and export elements in the Automated Commercial Environment computer system, and the objectives and plans for implementing these remaining priorities;

“(iii) the components of the National Customs Automation Program specified in subsection (a)(2) of section 411 of the Tariff Act of 1930 that have not been implemented; and

“(iv) any additional components of the National Customs Automation Program initiated by the Commissioner to complete the development, establishment, and implementation of the Automated Commercial Environment computer system.

“(B) UPDATE OF REPORTS.—Not later than September 30, 2017, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives an updated report addressing each of the matters referred to in subparagraph (A), and—

“(i) evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the Automated Commercial Environment computer system; and

“(ii) detailing the percentage of trade processed in the Automated Commercial Environment every month since September 30, 2016.”.

(c) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report—

(1) assessing the progress of other Federal agencies in accessing and utilizing the Automated Commercial Environment; and

(2) assessing the potential cost savings to the United States Government and importers and exporters and the potential benefits to enforcement of the customs and trade laws of the United States if the elements identified in clauses (i) through (iv) of section 311(b)(3)(A) of the Customs Border Security Act of 2002, as amended by subsection (b) of this section, are implemented.

SEC. 107. INTERNATIONAL TRADE DATA SYSTEM.
Section 411(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1411(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (5) through (8), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall work with the head of each agency participating in the ITDS and the Interagency Steering Committee to ensure that each agency—

“(i) develops and maintains the necessary information technology infrastructure to support the operation of the ITDS and to submit all data to the ITDS electronically;

“(ii) enters into a memorandum of understanding, or takes such other action as is necessary, to provide for the information sharing between the agency and U.S. Customs and Border Protection necessary for the operation and maintenance of the ITDS;

“(iii) not later than June 30, 2016, identifies and transmits to the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection the admissibility criteria and data elements required by the agency to authorize the release of cargo by U.S. Customs and Border Protection for incorporation into the operational functionality of the Automated Commercial Environment computer system authorized under section 13031(f)(4) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)); and

“(iv) not later than December 31, 2016, utilizes the ITDS as the primary means of receiving from users the standard set of data and other relevant documentation, exclusive of applications for permits, licenses, or certifications required for the release of imported cargo and clearance of cargo for export.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require any action to be taken that would compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation or national security.”; and

(3) in paragraph (8), as redesignated, by striking “section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note)” and inserting “section 109 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 108. CONSULTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO MUTUAL RECOGNITION ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) CONSULTATIONS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to any proposed mutual recognition arrangement or similar agreement between the United States and a foreign government providing for mutual recognition of supply chain security programs and customs revenue functions, shall consult—

(1) not later than 30 days before initiating negotiations to enter into any such arrangement or similar agreement, with the appropriate congressional committees; and

(2) not later than 30 days before entering into any such arrangement or similar agreement, with the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVE.—It shall be a negotiating objective of the United States in any negotiation for a mutual recognition arrangement with a foreign country on partnership programs, such as the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism established under subtitle B of title II of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 961 et seq.), to seek to ensure the compatibility of the partnership programs of that country with the partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to enhance security, trade facilitation, and trade enforcement.

SEC. 109. COMMERCIAL CUSTOMS OPERATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly establish a Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the “Advisory Committee”).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall be comprised of—

(A) 20 individuals appointed under paragraph (2);

(B) the Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy of the Department of the Treasury and the Commissioner, who shall jointly co-chair meetings of the Advisory Committee; and

(C) the Assistant Secretary for Policy and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the Department of Homeland Security, who shall serve as deputy co-chairs of meetings of the Advisory Committee.

(2) APPOINTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly appoint 20 individuals from the private sector to the Advisory Committee.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—In making appointments under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall appoint members—

(i) to ensure that the membership of the Advisory Committee is representative of the individuals and firms affected by the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

(ii) without regard to political affiliation.

(C) TERMS.—Each individual appointed to the Advisory Committee under this paragraph shall be appointed for a term of not more than 3 years, and may be reappointed to subsequent terms, but may not serve more than 2 terms sequentially.

(3) TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security may transfer members serving on the Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations of the United States Customs Service established under section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to the Advisory Committee established under subsection (a).

(c) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee established under subsection (a) shall—

(1) advise the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security on all matters involving the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including advising with respect to significant changes that are proposed with respect to regulations, policies, or practices of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(2) provide recommendations to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security on improvements to the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(3) collaborate in developing the agenda for Advisory Committee meetings; and

(4) perform such other functions relating to the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection as prescribed by law or as the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security jointly direct.

(d) MEETINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security, or at the call of not less than ⅔ of the membership of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee shall meet at least 4 times each calendar year.

(2) OPEN MEETINGS.—Notwithstanding section 10(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), the Advisory Committee meetings shall be open to the public unless the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of Homeland Security determines

that the meeting will include matters the disclosure of which would compromise the development of policies, priorities, or negotiating objectives or positions that could impact the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection or the operations or investigations of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(e) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2016, and annually thereafter, the Advisory Committee shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) describes the activities of the Advisory Committee during the preceding fiscal year; and

(2) sets forth any recommendations of the Advisory Committee regarding the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—Section 14(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.; relating to the termination of advisory committees) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

(g) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective on the date on which the Advisory Committee is established under subsection (a), section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) is repealed.

(2) **REFERENCE.**—Any reference in law to the Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations of the United States Customs Service established under section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) made on or after the date on which the Advisory Committee is established under subsection (a), shall be deemed a reference to the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established under subsection (a).

SEC. 110. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AND EXPERTISE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commissioner shall, in consultation with the appropriate congressional committees and the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established by section 109, develop and implement Centers of Excellence and Expertise throughout U.S. Customs and Border Protection that—

(1) enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States by consistently enforcing the laws and regulations of the United States at all ports of entry of the United States and by facilitating the flow of legitimate trade through increasing industry-based knowledge;

(2) improve enforcement efforts, including enforcement of priority trade issues described in section 118, in specific industry sectors through the application of targeting information from the National Targeting Center under section 111 and from other means of verification;

(3) build upon the expertise of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in particular industry operations, supply chains, and compliance requirements;

(4) promote the uniform implementation at each port of entry of the United States of policies and regulations relating to imports;

(5) centralize the trade enforcement and trade facilitation efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(6) formalize an account-based approach to apply, as the Commissioner determines appropriate, to the importation of merchandise into the United States;

(7) foster partnerships through the expansion of trade programs and other trusted partner programs;

(8) develop applicable performance measurements to meet internal efficiency and effectiveness goals; and

(9) whenever feasible, facilitate a more efficient flow of information between Federal agencies.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Commissioner shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing—

(1) the scope, functions, and structure of each Center of Excellence and Expertise developed and implemented under subsection (a);

(2) the effectiveness of each such Center of Excellence and Expertise in improving enforcement efforts, including enforcement of priority trade issues described in section 118, and facilitating legitimate trade;

(3) the quantitative and qualitative benefits of each such Center of Excellence and Expertise to the trade community, including through fostering partnerships through the expansion of trade programs such as the Importer Self Assessment program and other trusted partner programs;

(4) all applicable performance measurements with respect to each such Center of Excellence and Expertise, including performance measures with respect to meeting internal efficiency and effectiveness goals;

(5) the performance of each such Center of Excellence and Expertise in increasing the accuracy and completeness of data with respect to international trade and facilitating a more efficient flow of information between Federal agencies; and

(6) any planned changes in the number, scope, functions or any other aspect of the Centers of Excellence and Expertise developed and implemented under subsection (a).

SEC. 111. COMMERCIAL RISK ASSESSMENT TARGETING AND TRADE ALERTS.

(a) **COMMERCIAL RISK ASSESSMENT TARGETING.**—In carrying out its duties under section 411(g)(4) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 802(a) of this Act, the National Targeting Center shall—

(1) establish targeted risk assessment methodologies and standards—

(A) for evaluating the risk that cargo destined for the United States may violate the customs and trade laws of the United States, particularly those laws applicable to merchandise subject to the priority trade issues described in section 118; and

(B) for issuing, as appropriate, Trade Alerts described in subsection (b);

(2) to the extent practicable and otherwise authorized by law, use, to administer the methodologies and standards established under paragraph (1)—

(A) publicly available information;

(B) information available from the Automated Commercial System, the Automated Commercial Environment computer system, the Automated Targeting System, the Automated Export System, the International Trade Data System, the TECS (formerly known as the “Treasury Enforcement Communications System”), the case management system of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and any successor systems; and

(C) information made available to the National Targeting Center, including information provided by private sector entities; and

(3) provide for the receipt and transmission to the appropriate U.S. Customs and Border Protection offices of allegations from interested parties in the private sector of violations of customs and trade laws of the United States of merchandise relating to the priority trade issues described in section 118.

(b) **TRADE ALERTS.**—

(1) **ISSUANCE.**—In carrying out its duties under section 411(g)(4) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 802(a) of this Act, and based upon the application of the targeted risk assessment methodologies and standards established under subsection (a), the Executive Director of the National Targeting Center may issue Trade Alerts to directors of United States ports of entry directing further inspection, or physical examination or testing, of specific merchandise to ensure compliance with all applicable customs and trade laws and regulations administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(2) **DETERMINATIONS NOT TO IMPLEMENT TRADE ALERTS.**—The director of a United States port of entry may determine not to conduct further inspections, or physical examination or testing, pursuant to a Trade Alert issued under paragraph (1) if—

(A) the director finds that such a determination is justified by port security interests; and

(B) not later than 48 hours after making the determination, notifies the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(3) **SUMMARY OF DETERMINATIONS NOT TO IMPLEMENT.**—The Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall—

(A) compile an annual public summary of all determinations by directors of United States ports of entry under paragraph (2) and the reasons for those determinations;

(B) conduct an evaluation of the utilization of Trade Alerts issued under paragraph (1); and

(C) not later than December 31 of each year, submit the summary to the appropriate congressional committees.

(4) **INSPECTION DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “inspection” means the comprehensive evaluation process used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, other than physical examination or testing, to permit the entry of merchandise into the United States, or the clearance of merchandise for transportation in bond through the United States, for purposes of—

(A) assessing duties;

(B) identifying restricted or prohibited items; and

(C) ensuring compliance with all applicable customs and trade laws and regulations administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(c) **USE OF TRADE DATA FOR COMMERCIAL ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES.**—Section 343(a)(3)(F) of the Trade Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(F) The information collected pursuant to the regulations shall be used exclusively for ensuring cargo safety and security, preventing smuggling, and commercial risk assessment targeting, and shall not be used for any commercial enforcement purposes, including for determining merchandise entry. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, nothing in this section shall be treated as amending, repealing, or otherwise modifying title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930 or regulations promulgated thereunder.”

SEC. 112. REPORT ON OVERSIGHT OF REVENUE PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than the March 31, 2016, and not later than March 31 of each second year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall submit

to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report assessing, with respect to the period covered by the report, as specified in subsection (b), the following:

(1) The effectiveness of the measures taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to protection of revenue, including—

(A) the collection of countervailing duties assessed under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and antidumping duties assessed under subtitle B of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673 et seq.);

(B) the assessment, collection, and mitigation of commercial fines and penalties;

(C) the use of bonds, including continuous and single transaction bonds, to secure that revenue; and

(D) the adequacy of the policies of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to the monitoring and tracking of merchandise transported in bond and collecting duties, as appropriate.

(2) The effectiveness of actions taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to measure accountability and performance with respect to protection of revenue.

(3) The number and outcome of investigations instituted by U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to the underpayment of duties.

(4) The effectiveness of training with respect to the collection of duties provided for personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(b) **PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT.**—Each report required by subsection (a) shall cover the period of 2 fiscal years ending on September 30 of the calendar year preceding the submission of the report.

SEC. 113. REPORT ON SECURITY AND REVENUE MEASURES WITH RESPECT TO MERCHANDISE TRANSPORTED IN BOND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than December 31 of 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on efforts undertaken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to ensure the secure transportation of merchandise in bond through the United States and the collection of revenue owed upon the entry of such merchandise into the United States for consumption.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report required by subsection (a) shall include, for the fiscal year preceding the submission of the report, information on—

(1) the overall number of entries of merchandise for transportation in bond through the United States;

(2) the ports at which merchandise arrives in the United States for transportation in bond and at which records of the arrival of such merchandise are generated;

(3) the average time taken to reconcile such records with the records at the final destination of the merchandise in the United States to demonstrate that the merchandise reaches its final destination or is re-exported;

(4) the average time taken to transport merchandise in bond from the port at which the merchandise arrives in the United States to its final destination in the United States;

(5) the total amount of duties, taxes, and fees owed with respect to shipments of merchandise transported in bond and the total amount of such duties, taxes, and fees paid;

(6) the total number of notifications by carriers of merchandise being transported in

bond that the destination of the merchandise has changed; and

(7) the number of entries that remain unreconciled.

SEC. 114. IMPORTER OF RECORD PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish an importer of record program to assign and maintain importer of record numbers.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that, as part of the importer of record program, U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(1) develops criteria that importers must meet in order to obtain an importer of record number, including—

(A) criteria to ensure sufficient information is collected to allow U.S. Customs and Border Protection to verify the existence of the importer requesting the importer of record number;

(B) criteria to ensure sufficient information is collected to allow U.S. Customs and Border Protection to identify linkages or other affiliations between importers that are requesting or have been assigned importer of record numbers; and

(C) criteria to ensure sufficient information is collected to allow U.S. Customs and Border Protection to identify changes in address and corporate structure of importers;

(2) provides a process by which importers are assigned importer of record numbers;

(3) maintains a centralized database of importer of record numbers, including a history of importer of record numbers associated with each importer, and the information described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1);

(4) evaluates and maintains the accuracy of the database if such information changes; and

(5) takes measures to ensure that duplicate importer of record numbers are not issued.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the importer of record program established under subsection (a).

(d) **NUMBER DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “number”, with respect to an importer of record, means a filing identification number described in section 24.5 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation) that fully supports the requirements of subsection (b) with respect to the collection and maintenance of information.

SEC. 115. ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW IMPORTER PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall establish a new importer program that directs U.S. Customs and Border Protection to adjust bond amounts for new importers based on the level of risk assessed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection for protection of revenue of the Federal Government.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Commissioner shall ensure that, as part of the new importer program established under subsection (a), U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(1) develops risk-based criteria for determining which importers are considered to be new importers for the purposes of this subsection;

(2) develops risk assessment guidelines for new importers to determine if and to what extent—

(A) to adjust bond amounts of imported products of new importers; and

(B) to increase screening of imported products of new importers;

(3) develops procedures to ensure increased oversight of imported products of new importers relating to the enforcement of the priority trade issues described in section 118;

(4) develops procedures to ensure increased oversight of imported products of new importers by Centers of Excellence and Expertise established under section 110; and

(5) establishes a centralized database of new importers to ensure accuracy of information that is required to be provided by new importers to U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

SEC. 116. CUSTOMS BROKER IDENTIFICATION OF IMPORTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 641 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1641) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **IDENTIFICATION OF IMPORTERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations setting forth the minimum standards for customs brokers and importers, including nonresident importers, regarding the identity of the importer that shall apply in connection with the importation of merchandise into the United States.

“(2) **MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.**—The regulations shall, at a minimum, require customs brokers to implement, and importers (after being given adequate notice) to comply with, reasonable procedures for—

“(A) collecting the identity of importers, including nonresident importers, seeking to import merchandise into the United States to the extent reasonable and practicable; and

“(B) maintaining records of the information used to substantiate a person’s identity, including name, address, and other identifying information.

“(3) **PENALTIES.**—Any customs broker who fails to collect information required under the regulations prescribed under this subsection shall be liable to the United States, at the discretion of the Secretary, for a monetary penalty not to exceed \$10,000 for each violation of those regulations and subject to revocation or suspension of a license or permit of the customs broker pursuant to the procedures set forth in subsection (d).

“(4) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the term “importer” means one of the parties qualifying as an importer of record under section 484(a)(2)(B); and

“(B) the term “nonresident importer” means an importer who is—

“(i) an individual who is not a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States; or

“(ii) a partnership, corporation, or other commercial entity that is not organized under the laws of a jurisdiction within the customs territory of the United States (as such term is defined in General Note 2 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States) or in the Virgin Islands of the United States.”.

(b) **STUDY AND REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall submit to Congress a report containing recommendations for—

(1) determining the most timely and effective way to require foreign nationals to provide customs brokers with appropriate and accurate information, comparable to that which is required of United States nationals, concerning the identity, address, and other related information relating to such foreign

nationals necessary to enable customs brokers to comply with the requirements of section 641(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (as added by subsection (a) of this section); and

(2) establishing a system for customs brokers to review information maintained by relevant Federal agencies for purposes of verifying the identities of importers, including nonresident importers, seeking to import merchandise into the United States.

SEC. 117. REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO NON-RESIDENT IMPORTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1481 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 484b the following new section:

“SEC. 484c. REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO NON-RESIDENT IMPORTERS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), if an importer of record under section 484 is not a resident of the United States, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall require the non-resident importer to designate a resident agent in the United States subject to the requirements described in subsection (b).

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements described in this subsection are the following:

“(1) The resident agent shall be authorized to accept service of process against the non-resident importer in connection with the importation of merchandise.

“(2) The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall require the non-resident importer to establish a power of attorney with the resident agent in connection with the importation of merchandise.

“(c) NON-APPLICABILITY.—The requirements of this section shall not apply with respect to a non-resident importer who is a validated Tier 2 or Tier 3 participant in the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism program established under subtitle B of title II of the SAFE Port Act (6 U.S.C. 961 et seq.).

“(d) PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person to import into the United States any merchandise in violation of this section.

“(2) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be liable for a civil penalty of \$50,000 for each such violation.

“(3) OTHER PENALTIES.—In addition to the penalties specified in paragraph (2), any violation of this section that violates any other customs and trade laws of the United States shall be subject to any applicable civil and criminal penalty, including seizure and forfeiture, that may be imposed under such customs or trade law or title 18, United States Code, with respect to the importation of merchandise.

“(4) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘customs and trade laws of the United States’ has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 484c of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by subsection (a), takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to the importation, on or after the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment, of merchandise of an importer of record under section 484 of the Tariff Act of 1930 who is not a resident of the United States.

SEC. 118. PRIORITY TRADE ISSUES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall establish the following as priority trade issues:

- (1) Agriculture programs.
- (2) Antidumping and countervailing duties.
- (3) Import safety.
- (4) Intellectual property rights.
- (5) Revenue.

(6) Textiles and wearing apparel.

(7) Trade agreements and preference programs.

(b) MODIFICATION.—The Commissioner is authorized to establish new priority trade issues and eliminate, consolidate, or otherwise modify the priority trade issues described in subsection (a) if the Commissioner—

(1) determines it necessary and appropriate to do so; and

(2) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a summary of the proposed changes to the priority trade issues not later than 60 days before such changes are to take effect.

SEC. 119. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this title, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

TITLE II—IMPORT HEALTH AND SAFETY

SEC. 201. INTERAGENCY IMPORT SAFETY WORKING GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an interagency Import Safety Working Group.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The interagency Import Safety Working Group shall consist of the following officials or their designees:

- (1) The Secretary of Homeland Security, who shall serve as the Chair.
- (2) The Secretary of Health and Human Services, who shall serve as the Vice Chair.
- (3) The Secretary of the Treasury.
- (4) The Secretary of Commerce.
- (5) The Secretary of Agriculture.
- (6) The United States Trade Representative.

(7) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(8) The Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

(9) The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(10) The Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

(11) The Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(12) The head of any other Federal agency designated by the President to participate in the interagency Import Safety Working Group, as appropriate.

(c) DUTIES.—The duties of the interagency Import Safety Working Group shall include—

(1) consulting on the development of the joint import safety rapid response plan required by section 202;

(2) periodically evaluating the adequacy of the plans, practices, and resources of the Federal Government dedicated to ensuring the safety of merchandise imported in the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise, including—

(A) minimizing the duplication of efforts among agencies the heads of which are members of the interagency Import Safety Working Group and ensuring the compatibility of the policies and regulations of those agencies; and

(B) recommending additional administrative actions, as appropriate, designed to ensure the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise and considering the impact of those actions on private sector entities;

(3) reviewing the engagement and cooperation of foreign governments and foreign manufacturers in facilitating the inspection

and certification, as appropriate, of such merchandise to be imported into the United States and the facilities producing such merchandise to ensure the safety of the merchandise and the expeditious entry of the merchandise into the United States;

(4) identifying best practices, in consultation with private sector entities as appropriate, to assist United States importers in taking all appropriate steps to ensure the safety of merchandise imported into the United States, including with respect to—

(A) the inspection of manufacturing facilities in foreign countries;

(B) the inspection of merchandise destined for the United States before exportation from a foreign country or before distribution in the United States; and

(C) the protection of the international supply chain (as defined in section 2 of the Security and Accountability For Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 901));

(5) identifying best practices to assist Federal, State, and local governments and agencies, and port authorities, to improve communication and coordination among such agencies and authorities with respect to ensuring the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise; and

(6) otherwise identifying appropriate steps to increase the accountability of United States importers and the engagement of foreign government agencies with respect to ensuring the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise.

SEC. 202. JOINT IMPORT SAFETY RAPID RESPONSE PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the interagency Import Safety Working Group established under section 201, shall develop a plan (to be known as the “joint import safety rapid response plan”) that sets forth protocols and defines practices for U.S. Customs and Border Protection to use—

(1) in taking action in response to, and coordinating Federal responses to, an incident in which cargo destined for or merchandise entering the United States has been identified as posing a threat to the health or safety of consumers in the United States; and

(2) in recovering from or mitigating the effects of actions and responses to an incident described in paragraph (1).

(b) CONTENTS.—The joint import safety rapid response plan shall address—

(1) the statutory and regulatory authorities and responsibilities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other Federal agencies in responding to an incident described in subsection (a)(1);

(2) the protocols and practices to be used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection when taking action in response to, and coordinating Federal responses to, such an incident;

(3) the measures to be taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other Federal agencies in recovering from or mitigating the effects of actions taken in response to such an incident after the incident to ensure the resumption of the entry of merchandise into the United States; and

(4) exercises that U.S. Customs and Border Protection may conduct in conjunction with Federal, State, and local agencies, and private sector entities, to simulate responses to such an incident.

(c) UPDATES OF PLAN.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall review and update the joint import safety rapid response plan,

as appropriate, after conducting exercises under subsection (d).

(d) IMPORT HEALTH AND SAFETY EXERCISES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Commissioner shall periodically engage in the exercises referred to in subsection (b)(4), in conjunction with Federal, State, and local agencies and private sector entities, as appropriate, to test and evaluate the protocols and practices identified in the joint import safety rapid response plan at United States ports of entry.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXERCISES.—In conducting exercises under paragraph (1), the Secretary and the Commissioner shall—

(A) make allowance for the resources, needs, and constraints of United States ports of entry of different sizes in representative geographic locations across the United States;

(B) base evaluations on current risk assessments of merchandise entering the United States at representative United States ports of entry located across the United States;

(C) ensure that such exercises are conducted in a manner consistent with the National Incident Management System, the National Response Plan, the National Infrastructure Protection Plan, the National Preparedness Guidelines, the Maritime Transportation System Security Plan, and other such national initiatives of the Department of Homeland Security, as appropriate; and

(D) develop metrics with respect to the resumption of the entry of merchandise into the United States after an incident described in subsection (a)(1).

(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR TESTING AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary and the Commissioner shall ensure that the testing and evaluation carried out in conducting exercises under paragraph (1)—

(A) are performed using clear and objective performance measures; and

(B) result in the identification of specific recommendations or best practices for responding to an incident described in subsection (a)(1).

(4) DISSEMINATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary and the Commissioner shall—

(A) share the recommendations or best practices identified under paragraph (3)(B) among the members of the interagency Import Safety Working Group established under section 201 and with, as appropriate—

- (i) State, local, and tribal governments;
- (ii) foreign governments; and
- (iii) private sector entities; and

(B) use such recommendations and best practices to update the joint import safety rapid response plan.

SEC. 203. TRAINING.

The Commissioner shall ensure that personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection assigned to United States ports of entry are trained to effectively administer the provisions of this title and to otherwise assist in ensuring the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise.

TITLE III—IMPORT-RELATED PROTECTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

SEC. 301. DEFINITION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

In this title, the term “intellectual property rights” refers to copyrights, trademarks, and other forms of intellectual property rights that are enforced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 302. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION RELATED TO TRADE ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by inserting after section 628 (19 U.S.C. 1628) the following new section:

“SEC. 628A. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION RELATED TO TRADE ENFORCEMENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (c) and (d), if the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection suspects that merchandise is being imported into the United States in violation of section 526 of this Act or section 602, 1201(a)(2), or 1201(b)(1) of title 17, United States Code, and determines that the examination or testing of the merchandise by a person described in subsection (b) would assist the Commissioner in determining if the merchandise is being imported in violation of that section, the Commissioner, to permit the person to conduct the examination and testing—

“(1) shall provide to the person information that appears on the merchandise and its packaging and labels, including unredacted images of the merchandise and its packaging and labels; and

“(2) may, subject to any applicable bonding requirements, provide to the person unredacted samples of the merchandise.

“(b) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person described in this subsection is—

“(1) in the case of merchandise suspected of being imported in violation of section 526, the owner of the trademark suspected of being copied or simulated by the merchandise;

“(2) in the case of merchandise suspected of being imported in violation of section 602 of title 17, United States Code, the owner of the copyright suspected of being infringed by the merchandise;

“(3) in the case of merchandise suspected of being primarily designed or produced for the purpose of circumventing a technological measure that effectively controls access to a work protected under that title, and being imported in violation of section 1201(a)(2) of that title, the owner of a copyright in the work; and

“(4) in the case of merchandise suspected of being primarily designed or produced for the purpose of circumventing protection afforded by a technological measure that effectively protects a right of an owner of a copyright in a work or a portion of a work, and being imported in violation of section 1201(b)(1) of that title, the owner of the copyright.

“(c) LIMITATION.—Subsection (a) applies only with respect to merchandise suspected of infringing a trademark or copyright that is recorded with U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(d) EXCEPTION.—The Commissioner may not provide under subsection (a) information, photographs, or samples to a person described in subsection (b) if providing such information, photographs, or samples would compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation or national security.”

(b) TERMINATION OF PREVIOUS AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2) of section 818(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1496; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note), paragraph (1) of that section shall have no force or effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 303. SEIZURE OF CIRCUMVENTION DEVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 596(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1595a(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “or”;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) U.S. Customs and Border Protection determines it is a technology, product, service, device, component, or part thereof the importation of which is prohibited under subsection (a)(2) or (b)(1) of section 1201 of title 17, United States Code.”

(b) NOTIFICATION OF PERSONS INJURED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 30 business days after seizing merchandise pursuant to subparagraph (G) of section 596(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by subsection (a), the Commissioner shall provide to any person identified under paragraph (2) information regarding the merchandise seized that is equivalent to information provided to copyright owners under regulations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for merchandise seized for violation of the copyright laws.

(2) PERSONS TO BE PROVIDED INFORMATION.—Any person injured by the violation of (a)(2) or (b)(1) of section 1201 of title 17, United States Code, that resulted in the seizure of the merchandise shall be provided information under paragraph (1), if that person is included on a list maintained by the Commissioner that is revised annually through publication in the Federal Register.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations establishing procedures that implement this subsection.

SEC. 304. ENFORCEMENT BY U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OF WORKS FOR WHICH COPYRIGHT REGISTRATION IS PENDING.

Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall authorize a process pursuant to which the Commissioner shall enforce a copyright for which the owner has submitted an application for registration under title 17, United States Code, with the United States Copyright Office, to the same extent and in the same manner as if the copyright were registered with the Copyright Office, including by sharing information, images, and samples of merchandise suspected of infringing the copyright under section 628A of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 302.

SEC. 305. NATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS COORDINATION CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) establish within U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement a National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center; and

(2) appoint an Assistant Director to head the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center.

(b) DUTIES.—The Assistant Director of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center shall—

(1) coordinate the investigation of sources of merchandise that infringe intellectual property rights to identify organizations and individuals that produce, smuggle, or distribute such merchandise;

(2) conduct and coordinate training with other domestic and international law enforcement agencies on investigative best practices—

(A) to develop and expand the capability of such agencies to enforce intellectual property rights; and

(B) to develop metrics to assess whether the training improved enforcement of intellectual property rights;

(3) coordinate, with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, activities conducted by the

United States to prevent the importation or exportation of merchandise that infringes intellectual property rights;

(4) support the international interdiction of merchandise destined for the United States that infringes intellectual property rights;

(5) collect and integrate information regarding infringement of intellectual property rights from domestic and international law enforcement agencies and other non-Federal sources;

(6) develop a means to receive and organize information regarding infringement of intellectual property rights from such agencies and other sources;

(7) disseminate information regarding infringement of intellectual property rights to other Federal agencies, as appropriate;

(8) develop and implement risk-based alert systems, in coordination with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, to improve the targeting of persons that repeatedly infringe intellectual property rights;

(9) coordinate with the offices of United States attorneys in order to develop expertise in, and assist with the investigation and prosecution of, crimes relating to the infringement of intellectual property rights; and

(10) carry out such other duties as the Secretary of Homeland Security may assign.

(c) **COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.**—In carrying out the duties described in subsection (b), the Assistant Director of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center shall coordinate with—

(1) U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(2) the Food and Drug Administration;

(3) the Department of Justice;

(4) the Department of Commerce, including the United States Patent and Trademark Office;

(5) the United States Postal Inspection Service;

(6) the Office of the United States Trade Representative;

(7) any Federal, State, local, or international law enforcement agencies that the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement considers appropriate; and

(8) any other entities that the Director considers appropriate.

(d) **PRIVATE SECTOR OUTREACH.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Assistant Director of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center shall work with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other Federal agencies to conduct outreach to private sector entities in order to determine trends in and methods of infringing intellectual property rights.

(2) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—The Assistant Director shall share information and best practices with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights with private sector entities, as appropriate, in order to coordinate public and private sector efforts to combat the infringement of intellectual property rights.

SEC. 306. JOINT STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall include in the joint strategic plan required by section 105—

(1) a description of the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to enforce intellectual property rights;

(2) a list of the 10 United States ports of entry at which U.S. Customs and Border Protection has seized the most merchandise, both by volume and by value, that infringes

intellectual property rights during the most recent 2-year period for which data are available; and

(3) a recommendation for the optimal allocation of personnel, resources, and technology to ensure that U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement are adequately enforcing intellectual property rights.

SEC. 307. PERSONNEL DEDICATED TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) **PERSONNEL OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.**—The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall ensure that sufficient personnel are assigned throughout U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, respectively, who have responsibility for preventing the importation into the United States of merchandise that infringes intellectual property rights.

(b) **STAFFING OF NATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS COORDINATION CENTER.**—The Commissioner shall—

(1) assign not fewer than 3 full-time employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center established under section 305; and

(2) ensure that sufficient personnel are assigned to United States ports of entry to carry out the directives of the Center.

SEC. 308. TRAINING WITH RESPECT TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) **TRAINING.**—The Commissioner shall ensure that officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection are trained to effectively detect and identify merchandise destined for the United States that infringes intellectual property rights, including through the use of technologies identified under subsection (c).

(b) **CONSULTATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR.**—The Commissioner shall consult with private sector entities to better identify opportunities for collaboration between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and such entities with respect to training for officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in enforcing intellectual property rights.

(c) **IDENTIFICATION OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES.**—In consultation with private sector entities, the Commissioner shall identify—

(1) technologies with the cost-effective capability to detect and identify merchandise at United States ports of entry that infringes intellectual property rights; and

(2) cost-effective programs for training officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to use such technologies.

(d) **DONATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY.**—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall prescribe regulations to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection to receive donations of hardware, software, equipment, and similar technologies, and to accept training and other support services, from private sector entities, for the purpose of enforcing intellectual property rights.

SEC. 309. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) **COOPERATION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall coordinate with the competent law enforcement and customs authorities of foreign countries, including by sharing information relevant to enforcement actions, to enhance the efforts of the United States and such authorities to enforce intellectual property rights.

(b) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide technical assistance to competent law enforcement

and customs authorities of foreign countries to enhance the ability of such authorities to enforce intellectual property rights.

(c) **INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION.**—The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall lead interagency efforts to collaborate with law enforcement and customs authorities of foreign countries to enforce intellectual property rights.

SEC. 310. REPORT ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT.

Not later than June 30, 2016, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall jointly submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report that contains the following:

(1) With respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights, the following:

(A) The number of referrals, during the preceding year, from U.S. Customs and Border Protection to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement relating to infringement of intellectual property rights.

(B) The number of investigations relating to the infringement of intellectual property rights referred by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to a United States attorney for prosecution and the United States attorneys to which those investigations were referred.

(C) The number of such investigations accepted by each such United States attorney and the status or outcome of each such investigation.

(D) The number of such investigations that resulted in the imposition of civil or criminal penalties.

(E) A description of the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to improve the success rates of investigations and prosecutions relating to the infringement of intellectual property rights.

(2) An estimate of the average time required by the Office of International Trade of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to respond to a request from port personnel for advice with respect to whether merchandise detained by U.S. Customs and Border Protection infringed intellectual property rights, distinguished by types of intellectual property rights infringed.

(3) A summary of the outreach efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement with respect to—

(A) the interdiction and investigation of, and the sharing of information between those agencies and other Federal agencies to prevent, the infringement of intellectual property rights;

(B) collaboration with private sector entities—

(i) to identify trends in the infringement of, and technologies that infringe, intellectual property rights;

(ii) to identify opportunities for enhanced training of officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

(iii) to develop best practices to enforce intellectual property rights; and

(C) coordination with foreign governments and international organizations with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.

(4) A summary of the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to address the challenges with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights presented by Internet commerce and the transit of small packages and an identification of the volume, value, and type of merchandise seized for infringing intellectual property rights as a result of such efforts.

(5) A summary of training relating to the enforcement of intellectual property rights conducted under section 308 and expenditures for such training.

SEC. 311. INFORMATION FOR TRAVELERS REGARDING VIOLATIONS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop and carry out an educational campaign to inform travelers entering or leaving the United States about the legal, economic, and public health and safety implications of acquiring merchandise that infringes intellectual property rights outside the United States and importing such merchandise into the United States in violation of United States law.

(b) **DECLARATION FORMS.**—The Commissioner shall ensure that all versions of Declaration Form 6059B of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or a successor form, including any electronic equivalent of Declaration Form 6059B or a successor form, printed or displayed on or after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act include a written warning to inform travelers arriving in the United States that importation of merchandise into the United States that infringes intellectual property rights may subject travelers to civil or criminal penalties and may pose serious risks to safety or health.

TITLE IV—PREVENTION OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Preventing Recurring Trade Evasion and Circumvention Act” or “PROTECT Act”.

SEC. 402. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) **COVERED MERCHANDISE.**—The term “covered merchandise” means merchandise that is subject to—

(A) a countervailing duty order issued under section 706 of the Tariff Act of 1930; or

(B) an antidumping duty order issued under section 736 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

(3) **ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “eligible small business” means any business concern which, in the Commissioner’s judgment, due to its small size, has neither adequate internal resources nor financial ability to obtain qualified outside assistance in preparing and submitting for consideration allegations of evasion.

(B) **NONREVIEWABILITY.**—Any agency decision regarding whether a business concern is an eligible small business for purposes of section 411(b)(4)(E) is not reviewable by any other agency or by any court.

(4) **ENTER; ENTRY.**—The terms “enter” and “entry” refer to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse for consumption, in the customs territory of the United States.

(5) **EVAD; EVASION.**—The terms “evade” and “evasion” refer to entering covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of any document or electronically transmitted data or information, written or oral statement, or act that is material and false, or any omission that is material, and that results in any cash deposit or other security or any amount of applicable antidumping or countervailing duties being reduced or not being applied with respect to the merchandise.

(6) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(7) **TRADE REMEDY LAWS.**—The term “trade remedy laws” means title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930.

SEC. 403. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), this title and the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

SUBTITLE A—ACTIONS RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT OF TRADE REMEDY LAWS

SEC. 411. TRADE REMEDY LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish and maintain within the Office of International Trade of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, established under section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), a Trade Remedy Law Enforcement Division.

(2) **COMPOSITION.**—The Trade Law Remedy Enforcement Division shall be composed of—

(A) headquarters personnel led by a Director, who shall report to the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of International Trade; and

(B) a National Targeting and Analysis Group dedicated to preventing and countering evasion.

(3) **DUTIES.**—The Trade Remedy Law Enforcement Division shall be dedicated—

(A) to the development and administration of policies to prevent and counter evasion;

(B) to direct enforcement and compliance assessment activities concerning evasion;

(C) to the development and conduct of commercial risk assessment targeting with respect to cargo destined for the United States in accordance with subsection (c);

(D) to issuing Trade Alerts described in subsection (d); and

(E) to the development of policies for the application of single entry and continuous bonds for entries of covered merchandise to sufficiently protect the collection of antidumping and countervailing duties commensurate with the level of risk of noncollection.

(b) **DUTIES OF DIRECTOR.**—The duties of the Director of the Trade Remedy Law Enforcement Division shall include—

(1) directing the trade enforcement and compliance assessment activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection that concern evasion;

(2) facilitating, promoting, and coordinating cooperation and the exchange of information between U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and other relevant agencies regarding evasion;

(3) notifying on a timely basis the administering authority (as defined in section 771(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(1))) and the Commission (as defined in section 771(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(2))) of any finding, determination,

civil action, or criminal action taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or other Federal agency regarding evasion;

(4) serving as the primary liaison between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the public regarding United States Government activities concerning evasion, including—

(A) receive and transmit to the appropriate U.S. Customs and Border Protection office allegations from parties of evasion;

(B) upon request by the party or parties that submitted an allegation of evasion, provide information to such party or parties on the status of U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s consideration of the allegation and decision to pursue or not pursue any administrative inquiries or other actions, such as changes in policies, procedures, or resource allocation as a result of the allegation;

(C) as needed, request from the party or parties that submitted an allegation of evasion any additional information that may be relevant for U.S. Customs and Border Protection determining whether to initiate an administrative inquiry or take any other action regarding the allegation;

(D) notify on a timely basis the party or parties that submitted such an allegation of the results of any administrative, civil or criminal actions taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or other Federal agency regarding evasion as a direct or indirect result of the allegation;

(E) upon request, provide technical assistance and advice to eligible small businesses to enable such businesses to prepare and submit allegations of evasion, except that the Director may deny assistance if the Director concludes that the allegation, if submitted, would not lead to the initiation of an administrative inquiry or any other action to address the allegation;

(F) in cooperation with the public, the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee, the Trade Support Network, and any other relevant parties and organizations, develop guidelines on the types and nature of information that may be provided in allegations of evasion; and

(G) regularly consult with the public, the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee, the Trade Support Network, and any other relevant parties and organizations regarding the development and implementation of regulations, interpretations, and policies related to countering evasion.

(c) **PREVENTING AND COUNTERING EVASION OF THE TRADE REMEDY LAWS.**—In carrying out its duties with respect to preventing and countering evasion, the National Targeting and Analysis Group dedicated to preventing and countering evasion shall—

(1) establish targeted risk assessment methodologies and standards—

(A) for evaluating the risk that cargo destined for the United States may constitute evading covered merchandise; and

(B) for issuing, as appropriate, Trade Alerts described in subsection (d); and

(2) to the extent practicable and otherwise authorized by law, use information available from the Automated Commercial System, the Automated Commercial Environment computer system, the Automated Targeting System, the Automated Export System, the International Trade Data System, and the TECS, and any similar and successor systems, to administer the methodologies and standards established under paragraph (1).

(d) **TRADE ALERTS.**—Based upon the application of the targeted risk assessment methodologies and standards established under subsection (c), the Director of the Trade Remedy Law Enforcement Division shall

issue Trade Alerts or other such means of notification to directors of United States ports of entry directing further inspection, physical examination, or testing of merchandise to ensure compliance with the trade remedy laws and to require additional bonds, cash deposits, or other security to ensure collection of any duties, taxes and fees owed.

SEC. 412. COLLECTION OF INFORMATION ON EVASION OF TRADE REMEDY LAWS.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO COLLECT INFORMATION.**—To determine whether covered merchandise is being entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, the Secretary, acting through the Commissioner—

(1) shall exercise all existing authorities to collect information needed to make the determination; and

(2) may collect such additional information as is necessary to make the determination through such methods as the Commissioner considers appropriate, including by issuing questionnaires with respect to the entry or entries at issue to—

(A) a person who filed an allegation with respect to the covered merchandise;

(B) a person who is alleged to have entered the covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion; or

(C) any other person who is determined to have information relevant to the allegation of entry of covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

(b) **ADVERSE INFERENCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary finds that a person who filed an allegation, a person alleged to have entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, or a foreign producer or exporter of covered merchandise that is alleged to have entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of the person's ability to comply with a request for information, the Secretary may, in making a determination whether an entry or entries of covered merchandise may constitute merchandise that is entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, use an inference that is adverse to the interests of that person in selecting from among the facts otherwise available to determine whether evasion has occurred.

(2) **ADVERSE INFERENCE DESCRIBED.**—An adverse inference used under paragraph (1) may include reliance on information derived from—

(A) the allegation of evasion of the trade remedy laws, if any, submitted to U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(B) a determination by the Commissioner in another investigation, proceeding, or other action regarding evasion of the unfair trade laws; or

(C) any other available information.

SEC. 413. ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 777(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677f(b)(1)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting “negligence, gross negligence, or” after “regarding”.

(b) **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized to provide to the Secretary of Commerce or the United States International Trade Commission any information that is necessary to enable the Secretary of Commerce or the United States International Trade Commission to assist the Secretary to identify, through risk as-

essment targeting or otherwise, covered merchandise that is entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

SEC. 414. COOPERATION WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES ON PREVENTING EVASION OF TRADE REMEDY LAWS.

(a) **BILATERAL AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall seek to negotiate and enter into bilateral agreements with the customs authorities or other appropriate authorities of foreign countries for purposes of cooperation on preventing evasion of the trade remedy laws of the United States and the trade remedy laws of the other country.

(2) **PROVISIONS AND AUTHORITIES.**—The Secretary shall seek to include in each such bilateral agreement the following provisions and authorities:

(A) On the request of the importing country, the exporting country shall provide, consistent with its laws, regulations, and procedures, production, trade, and transit documents and other information necessary to determine whether an entry or entries exported from the exporting country are subject to the importing country's trade remedy laws.

(B) On the written request of the importing country, the exporting country shall conduct a verification for purposes of enabling the importing country to make a determination described in subparagraph (A).

(C) The exporting country may allow the importing country to participate in a verification described in subparagraph (B), including through a site visit.

(D) If the exporting country does not allow participation of the importing country in a verification described in subparagraph (B), the importing country may take this fact into consideration in its trade enforcement and compliance assessment activities regarding the compliance of the exporting country's exports with the importing country's trade remedy laws.

(b) **CONSIDERATION.**—The Commissioner is authorized to take into consideration whether a country is a signatory to a bilateral agreement described in subsection (a) and the extent to which the country is cooperating under the bilateral agreement for purposes of trade enforcement and compliance assessment activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection that concern evasion by such country's exports.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31 of each year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report summarizing—

(1) the status of any ongoing negotiations of bilateral agreements described in subsection (a), including the identities of the countries involved in such negotiations;

(2) the terms of any completed bilateral agreements described in subsection (a); and

(3) bilateral cooperation and other activities conducted pursuant to or enabled by any completed bilateral agreements described in subsection (a).

SEC. 415. TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

The principal negotiating objectives of the United States shall include obtaining the objectives of the bilateral agreements described under section 414(a) for any trade agreements under negotiation as of the date of the enactment of this Act or future trade agreement negotiations.

SUBTITLE B—INVESTIGATION OF EVASION OF TRADE REMEDY LAWS

SEC. 421. PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATION OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 781 the following:

“SEC. 781A. PROCEDURES FOR PREVENTION OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.—The term ‘administering authority’ has the meaning given that term in section 771.

“(2) COMMISSIONER.—The term ‘Commissioner’ means the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(3) COVERED MERCHANDISE.—The term ‘covered merchandise’ means merchandise that is subject to—

“(A) a countervailing duty order issued under section 706; or

“(B) an antidumping duty order issued under section 736.

“(4) EVASION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘evasion’ refers to entering covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of any document or electronically transmitted data or information, written or oral statement, or act that is material and false, or any omission that is material, and that results in any cash deposit or other security or any amount of applicable antidumping or countervailing duties being reduced or not being applied with respect to the merchandise.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR CLERICAL ERROR.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term ‘evasion’ does not include entering covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of—

“(I) a document or electronically transmitted data or information, written or oral statement, or act that is false as a result of a clerical error; or

“(II) an omission that results from a clerical error.

“(ii) PATTERNS OF NEGLIGENT CONDUCT.—If the administering authority determines that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of a clerical error referred to in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) and that the clerical error is part of a pattern of negligent conduct on the part of that person, the administering authority may determine, notwithstanding clause (i), that the person has entered such covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of evasion.

“(iii) ELECTRONIC REPETITION OF ERRORS.—For purposes of clause (ii), the mere unintentional repetition by an electronic system of an initial clerical error does not constitute a pattern of negligent conduct.

“(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A determination by the administering authority that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of a clerical error referred to in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) rather than by means of evasion shall not be construed to excuse that person from the payment of any duties applicable to the merchandise.

“(b) INVESTIGATION BY ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.—

“(1) PROCEDURES FOR INITIATING INVESTIGATIONS.—

“(A) INITIATION BY ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.—An investigation under this subsection

shall be initiated with respect to merchandise imported into the United States whenever the administering authority determines, from information available to the administering authority, that an investigation is warranted with respect to whether the merchandise is covered merchandise that has entered into the customs territory of the United States by means of evasion.

“(B) INITIATION BY PETITION OR REFERRAL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The administering authority shall determine whether to initiate an investigation under this subparagraph not later than 30 days after the date on which the administering authority receives a petition described in clause (ii) or a referral described in clause (iii).

“(ii) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this clause is a petition that—

“(I) is filed with the administering authority by an interested party specified in subparagraph (A), (C), (D), (E), (F), or (G) of section 771(9);

“(II) alleges that merchandise imported into the United States is covered merchandise that has entered into the customs territory of the United States by means of evasion; and

“(III) is accompanied by information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting those allegations.

“(iii) REFERRAL DESCRIBED.—A referral described in this clause is a referral made by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (c)(1).

“(2) TIME LIMITS FOR DETERMINATIONS.—

“(A) PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the administering authority initiates an investigation under paragraph (1) with respect to merchandise, the administering authority shall issue a preliminary determination, based on information available to the administering authority at the time of the determination, with respect to whether there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that the merchandise is covered merchandise that has entered into the customs territory of the United States by means of evasion.

“(ii) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.—If the administering authority determines that expedited action is warranted with respect to an investigation initiated under paragraph (1), the administering authority may publish the notice of initiation of the investigation and the notice of the preliminary determination in the Federal Register at the same time.

“(B) FINAL DETERMINATION BY THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.—Not later than 300 days after the date on which the administering authority initiates an investigation under paragraph (1) with respect to merchandise, the administering authority shall issue a final determination with respect to whether the merchandise is covered merchandise that has entered into the customs territory of the United States by means of evasion.

“(3) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—

“(A) ENTRY DOCUMENTS, RECORDS, AND OTHER INFORMATION.—Not later than 10 days after receiving a request from the administering authority with respect to merchandise that is the subject of an investigation under paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall transmit to the administering authority copies of the documentation and information required by section 484(a)(1) with respect to the entry of the merchandise, as well as any other documentation or information requested by the administering authority.

“(B) ACCESS OF INTERESTED PARTIES.—Not later than 10 business days after the date on which the administering authority initiates an investigation under paragraph (1) with re-

spect to merchandise, the administering authority shall provide to the authorized representative of each interested party that filed a petition under paragraph (1) or otherwise participates in a proceeding, pursuant to a protective order, the copies of the entry documentation and any other information received by the administering authority under subparagraph (A).

“(C) BUSINESS PROPRIETARY INFORMATION FROM PRIOR SEGMENTS.—If an authorized representative of an interested party participating in an investigation under paragraph (1) has access to business proprietary information released pursuant to an administrative protective order in a proceeding under subtitle A, B, or C of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 that is relevant to the investigation conducted under paragraph (1), that authorized representative may submit such information to the administering authority for its consideration in the context of the investigation conducted under paragraph (1).

“(4) AUTHORITY TO COLLECT AND VERIFY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—In making a determination under paragraph (2) with respect to covered merchandise, the administering authority may collect such additional information as is necessary to make the determination through such methods as the administering authority considers appropriate, including by—

“(A) issuing a questionnaire with respect to such covered merchandise to—

“(i) a person that filed an allegation under paragraph (1)(B)(ii) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1)(A) with respect to such covered merchandise;

“(ii) a person alleged to have entered such covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of evasion;

“(iii) a person that is a foreign producer or exporter of such covered merchandise; or

“(iv) the government of a country from which such covered merchandise was exported;

“(B) conducting verifications, including on-site verifications, of any relevant information; and

“(C) requesting—

“(i) that the Commissioner provide any information and data available to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and

“(ii) that the Commissioner gather additional necessary information from the importer of covered merchandise and other relevant parties.

“(5) ADVERSE INFERENCE.—If the administering authority finds that a person described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of paragraph (4)(A) has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of the person's ability to comply with a request for information, the administering authority may, in making a determination under paragraph (2), use an inference that is adverse to the interests of that person in selecting from among the facts otherwise available to make the determination.

“(6) EFFECT OF AFFIRMATIVE PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION.—If the administering authority makes a preliminary determination under paragraph (2)(A) that merchandise is covered merchandise that has entered into the customs territory of the United States by means of evasion, the administering authority shall instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

“(A) to suspend liquidation of each entry of the merchandise that—

“(i) enters on or after the date of the preliminary determination; or

“(ii) enters before that date, if the liquidation of the entry is not final on that date; and

“(B) to require the posting of a cash deposit for each entry of the merchandise in an amount determined pursuant to the order, or administrative review conducted under section 751, that applies to the merchandise.

“(7) EFFECT OF AFFIRMATIVE FINAL DETERMINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority makes a final determination under paragraph (2)(B) that merchandise is covered merchandise that has entered into the customs territory of the United States by means of evasion, the administering authority shall instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

“(i) to assess duties on the merchandise in an amount determined pursuant to the order, or administrative review conducted under section 751, that applies to the merchandise;

“(ii) notwithstanding section 501, to reliquidate, in accordance with such order or administrative review, each entry of the merchandise that was liquidated and is determined to include covered merchandise; and

“(iii) to review and reassess the amount of bond or other security the importer is required to post for such merchandise entered on or after the date of the final determination to ensure the protection of revenue and compliance with the law.

“(B) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—If the administering authority makes a final determination under paragraph (2)(B) that merchandise is covered merchandise that has entered into the customs territory of the United States by means of evasion, the administering authority may instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to require the importer of the merchandise to post a cash deposit or bond on such merchandise entered on or after the date of the final determination in an amount the administering authority determines in the final determination to be owed with respect to the merchandise.

“(8) EFFECT OF NEGATIVE FINAL DETERMINATION.—If the administering authority makes a final determination under paragraph (2)(B) that merchandise is not covered merchandise that has entered into the customs territory of the United States by means of evasion, the administering authority shall terminate the suspension of liquidation and refund any cash deposit imposed pursuant to paragraph (6) with respect to the merchandise.

“(9) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 5 business days after making a determination under paragraph (2) with respect to covered merchandise, the administering authority may provide to importers, in such manner as the administering authority determines appropriate, information discovered in the investigation that the administering authority determines will help educate importers with respect to importing merchandise into the customs territory of the United States in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

“(10) SPECIAL RULE FOR CASES IN WHICH THE PRODUCER OR EXPORTER IS UNKNOWN.—If the administering authority is unable to determine the actual producer or exporter of the merchandise with respect to which the administering authority initiated an investigation under paragraph (1), the administering authority shall, in requiring the posting of a cash deposit under paragraph (6) or assessing duties pursuant to paragraph (7)(A), impose the cash deposit or duties (as the case may be) in the highest amount applicable to any

producer or exporter of the merchandise pursuant to any order, or any administrative review conducted under section 751.

“(11) PUBLICATION OF DETERMINATIONS.—The administering authority shall publish in the Federal Register each notice of initiation of an investigation made under paragraph (1)(A), each preliminary determination made under paragraph (2)(A), and each final determination made under paragraph (2)(B).

“(12) REFERRALS TO OTHER AGENCIES.—

“(A) AFTER PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION.—Notwithstanding section 777 and subject to subparagraph (C), when the administering authority makes an affirmative preliminary determination under paragraph (2)(A), the administering authority shall—

“(i) transmit the administrative record to the Commissioner for such additional action as the Commissioner determines appropriate, including proceedings under section 592; and

“(ii) at the request of the head of another agency, transmit the administrative record to the head of that agency.

“(B) AFTER FINAL DETERMINATION.—Notwithstanding section 777 and subject to subparagraph (C), when the administering authority makes an affirmative final determination under paragraph (2)(B), the administering authority shall—

“(i) transmit the complete administrative record to the Commissioner; and

“(ii) at the request of the head of another agency, transmit the complete administrative record to the head of that agency.

“(c) REFERRAL BY U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.—In the event the Commissioner receives information that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, but is not able to determine whether the merchandise is in fact covered merchandise, the Commissioner shall—

“(1) refer the matter to the administering authority for additional proceedings under subsection (b); and

“(2) transmit to the administering authority—

“(A) copies of the entry documents and information required by section 484(a)(1) relating to the merchandise; and

“(B) any additional records or information that the Commissioner considers appropriate.

“(d) COOPERATION BETWEEN U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.—

“(1) NOTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATIONS.—Upon receiving a petition and upon initiating an investigation under subsection (b), the administering authority shall notify the Commissioner.

“(2) PROCEDURES FOR COOPERATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, the Commissioner and the administering authority shall establish procedures to ensure maximum cooperation and communication between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the administering authority in order to quickly, efficiently, and accurately investigate allegations of evasion of antidumping and countervailing duty orders.

“(e) ANNUAL REPORT ON PREVENTING EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 28 of each year beginning in 2016, the Under Secretary for International Trade of the Department of Commerce shall submit to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the

Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the efforts being taken under subsection (b) to prevent evasion of antidumping and countervailing duty orders.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include, for the calendar year preceding the submission of the report—

“(A)(i) the number of investigations initiated pursuant to subsection (b); and

“(ii) a description of such investigations, including—

“(I) the results of such investigations; and

“(II) the amount of antidumping and countervailing duties collected as a result of such investigations; and

“(B) the number of referrals made by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (c).”

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 781 the following:

“Sec. 781A. Procedures for prevention of evasion of antidumping and countervailing duty orders.”

(c) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 516A(a)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516a(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i)(I), by striking “or (viii)” and inserting “(viii), or (ix)”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting at the end the following:

“(ix) A determination by the administering authority under section 781A.”

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out subsection (b) of section 781A of the Tariff Act of 1930 (as added by subsection (a) of this section); and

(2) the Commissioner shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out subsection (c) of such section 781A.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply with respect to merchandise entered on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 422. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report assessing the effectiveness of—

(1) the provisions of, and amendments made by, this subtitle; and

(2) the actions taken and procedures developed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Commissioner pursuant to such provisions and amendments to prevent evasion of antidumping and countervailing duty orders under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.).

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 431. ALLOCATION AND TRAINING OF PERSONNEL.

The Commissioner shall, to the maximum extent possible, ensure that U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(1) employs sufficient personnel who have expertise in, and responsibility for, preventing and investigating the entry of covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion;

(2) on the basis of risk assessment metrics, assigns sufficient personnel with primary responsibility for preventing the entry of covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion to the ports of entry in the United States at which the Commissioner determines potential evasion presents the most substantial threats to the revenue of the United States; and

(3) provides adequate training to relevant personnel to increase expertise and effectiveness in the prevention and identification of entries of covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

SEC. 432. ANNUAL REPORT ON PREVENTION OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 28 of each year, beginning in 2016, the Commissioner, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the efforts being taken to prevent and investigate evasion.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) for the calendar year preceding the submission of the report—

(A) a summary of the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and identify evasion;

(B) the number of allegations of evasion received and the number of allegations of evasion resulting in any administrative, civil, or criminal actions by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or any other agency;

(C) a summary of the completed administrative inquiries of evasion, including the number and nature of the inquiries initiated, conducted, or completed, as well as their resolution;

(D) with respect to inquiries that lead to issuance of a penalty notice, the penalty amounts;

(E) the amounts of antidumping and countervailing duties collected as a result of any actions by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or any other agency;

(F) a description of the allocation of personnel and other resources of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to prevent, identify, and investigate evasion, including any assessments conducted regarding the allocation of such personnel and resources; and

(G) a description of training conducted to increase expertise and effectiveness in the prevention, identification, and investigation of evasion; and

(2) a description of U.S. Customs and Border Protection processes and procedures to prevent and identify evasion, including—

(A) the specific guidelines, policies, and practices used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to ensure that allegations of evasion are promptly evaluated and acted upon in a timely manner;

(B) an evaluation of the efficacy of such existing guidelines, policies, and practices;

(C) identification of any changes since the last report that have materially improved or reduced the effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and identify evasion;

(D) a description of the development and implementation of policies for the application of single entry and continuous bonds for entries of covered merchandise to sufficiently protect the collection of antidumping and countervailing duties commensurate with the level of risk on noncollection;

(E) the processes and procedures for increased cooperation and information sharing with the Department of Commerce, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and any other relevant Federal agencies to prevent and identify evasion; and

(F) identification of any recommended policy changes of other Federal agencies or legislative changes to improve the effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and identify evasion.

SEC. 433. ADDRESSING CIRCUMVENTION BY NEW SHIPPERS.

Section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking clause (iii);

(2) by redesignating clause (iv) as clause (iii); and

(3) inserting after clause (iii), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this section, the following:

“(iv) DETERMINATIONS BASED ON BONAFIDE SALES.—Any weighted average dumping margin or individual countervailing duty rate determined for an exporter or producer in a review conducted under clause (i) shall be based solely on the bona fide United States sales of an exporter or producer, as the case may be, made during the period covered by the review. In determining whether the United States sales of an exporter or producer made during the period covered by the review were bona fide, the administering authority shall consider, depending on the circumstances surrounding such sales—

“(I) the prices of such sales;

“(II) whether such sales were made in commercial quantities;

“(III) the timing of such sales;

“(IV) the expenses arising from such sales;

“(V) whether the subject merchandise involved in such sales was resold in the United States at a profit;

“(VI) whether such sales were made on an arms-length basis; and

“(VII) any other factor the administering authority determines to be relevant as to whether such sales are, or are not, likely to be typical of those the exporter or producer will make after completion of the review.”.

TITLE V—IMPROVEMENTS TO ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “American Trade Enforcement Effectiveness Act”.

SEC. 502. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO COOPERATE WITH A REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IN A PROCEEDING.

Section 776 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(B) by striking “ADVERSE INFERENCES.—If” and inserting the following: “ADVERSE INFERENCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If”;

(C) by striking “under this title, may use” and inserting the following: “under this title—

“(A) may use”; and

(D) by striking “facts otherwise available. Such adverse inference may include” and inserting the following: “facts otherwise available; and

“(B) is not required to determine, or make any adjustments to, a countervailable subsidy rate or weighted average dumping margin based on any assumptions about information the interested party would have pro-

vided if the interested party had complied with the request for information.

“(2) POTENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR ADVERSE INFERENCES.—An adverse inference under paragraph (1)(A) may include”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—When the” and inserting the following: “CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The administrative authority and the Commission shall not be required to corroborate any dumping margin or countervailing duty applied in a separate segment of the same proceeding.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SUBSIDY RATES AND DUMPING MARGINS IN ADVERSE INFERENCE DETERMINATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority uses an inference that is adverse to the interests of a party under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority may—

“(A) in the case of a countervailing duty proceeding—

“(i) use a countervailable subsidy rate applied for the same or similar program in a countervailing duty proceeding involving the same country, or

“(ii) if there is no same or similar program, use a countervailable subsidy rate for a subsidy program from a proceeding that the administering authority considers reasonable to use, and

“(B) in the case of an antidumping duty proceeding, use any dumping margin from any segment of the proceeding under the applicable antidumping order.

“(2) DISCRETION TO APPLY HIGHEST RATE.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the administering authority may apply any of the countervailable subsidy rates or dumping margins specified under that paragraph, including the highest such rate or margin, based on the evaluation by the administering authority of the situation that resulted in the administering authority using an adverse inference in selecting among the facts otherwise available.

“(3) NO OBLIGATION TO MAKE CERTAIN ESTIMATES OR ADDRESS CERTAIN CLAIMS.—If the administering authority uses an adverse inference under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority is not required, for purposes of subsection (c) or for any other purpose—

“(A) to estimate what the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin would have been if the interested party found to have failed to cooperate under subsection (b)(1) had cooperated, or

“(B) to demonstrate that the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin used by the administering authority reflects an alleged commercial reality of the interested party.”.

SEC. 503. DEFINITION OF MATERIAL INJURY.

(a) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES.—Section 771(7) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(J) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY.—The Commission may not determine that there is no material injury or threat of material injury to an industry in the United States merely because that industry is profitable or because the performance of that industry has recently improved.”.

(b) EVALUATION OF IMPACT ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IN DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL IN-

JURY.—Subclause (I) of section 771(7)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(I) actual and potential decline in output, sales, market share, gross profits, operating profits, net profits, ability to service debt, productivity, return on investments, return on assets, and utilization of capacity.”.

(c) CAPTIVE PRODUCTION.—Section 771(7)(C)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking the comma and inserting “, and”;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking “, and” and inserting a comma; and

(3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 504. PARTICULAR MARKET SITUATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF ORDINARY COURSE OF TRADE.—Section 771(15) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(15)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) Situations in which the administering authority determines that the particular market situation prevents a proper comparison with the export price or constructed export price.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF NORMAL VALUE.—Section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking “in such other country.”.

(c) DEFINITION OF CONSTRUCTED VALUE.—Section 773(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “business” and inserting “trade”; and

(2) by striking the flush text at the end and inserting the following:

“For purposes of paragraph (1), if a particular market situation exists such that the cost of materials and fabrication or other processing of any kind does not accurately reflect the cost of production in the ordinary course of trade, the administering authority may use another calculation methodology under this subtitle or any other calculation methodology. For purposes of paragraph (1), the cost of materials shall be determined without regard to any internal tax in the exporting country imposed on such materials or their disposition that is remitted or refunded upon exportation of the subject merchandise produced from such materials.”.

SEC. 505. DISTORTION OF PRICES OR COSTS.

(a) INVESTIGATION OF BELOW-COST SALES.—Section 773(b)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE OR SUSPECT.—

“(i) REVIEW.—In a review conducted under section 751 involving a specific exporter, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that are less than the cost of production of the product if the administering authority disregarded some or all of the exporter’s sales pursuant to paragraph (1) in the investigation or, if a review has been completed, in the most recently completed review.

“(ii) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—In an investigation initiated under section 732 or a review conducted under section 751, the administering authority shall request information necessary to calculate the constructed value and cost of production under subsections (e) and (f) to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that represent less than the cost of production of the product.”.

(b) PRICES AND COSTS IN NONMARKET ECONOMIES.—Section 773(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930

(19 U.S.C. 1677b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) DISCRETION TO DISREGARD CERTAIN PRICE OR COST VALUES.—In valuing the factors of production under paragraph (1) for the subject merchandise, the administering authority may disregard price or cost values without further investigation if the administering authority has determined that broadly available export subsidies existed or particular instances of subsidization occurred with respect to those price or cost values or if those price or cost values were subject to an antidumping order.”.

SEC. 506. REDUCTION IN BURDEN ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF VOLUNTARY RESPONDENTS.

Section 782(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677m(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and by moving such clauses, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking “INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—In” and inserting the following: “INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In”;

(4) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (3), by amending subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), to read as follows:

“(B) the number of exporters or producers subject to the investigation or review is not so large that any additional individual examination of such exporters or producers would be unduly burdensome to the administering authority and inhibit the timely completion of the investigation or review.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DETERMINATION OF UNDULY BURDEN-SOME.—In determining if an individual examination under paragraph (1)(B) would be unduly burdensome, the administering authority may consider the following:

“(A) The complexity of the issues or information presented in the proceeding, including questionnaires and any responses there-to.

“(B) Any prior experience of the administering authority in the same or similar proceeding.

“(C) The total number of investigations under subtitle A or B and reviews under section 751 being conducted by the administering authority as of the date of the determination.

“(D) Such other factors relating to the timely completion of each such investigation and review as the administering authority considers appropriate.”.

SEC. 507. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 310 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2420) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 310. TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.

“(a) TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORT.—

“(1) TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES CONSULTATIONS.—Not later than May 31 of each calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, the United States Trade Representative (in this section referred to as the ‘Trade Representative’) shall consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives with respect to the prioritization of acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments that raise concerns with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, or otherwise create or maintain barriers to United States goods, services, or investment.

“(2) IDENTIFICATION OF TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.—In identifying acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments as trade enforcement priorities under this subsection, the United States Trade Representative shall focus on those acts, policies, and practices the elimination of which is likely to have the most significant potential to increase United States economic growth, and take into account all relevant factors, including—

“(A) the economic significance of any potential inconsistency between an obligation assumed by a foreign government pursuant to a trade agreement to which both the foreign government and the United States are parties and the acts, policies, or practices of that government;

“(B) the impact of the acts, policies, or practices of a foreign government on maintaining and creating United States jobs and productive capacity;

“(C) the major barriers and trade distorting practices described in the most recent National Trade Estimate required under section 181(b);

“(D) the major barriers and trade distorting practices described in other relevant reports addressing international trade and investment barriers prepared by a Federal agency or congressional commission during the 12 months preceding the date of the most recent report under paragraph (3);

“(E) a foreign government’s compliance with its obligations under any trade agreements to which both the foreign government and the United States are parties;

“(F) the implications of a foreign government’s procurement plans and policies; and

“(G) the international competitive position and export potential of United States products and services.

“(3) REPORT ON TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES AND ACTIONS TAKEN TO ADDRESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 31 of each calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, the Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments identified as trade enforcement priorities based on the consultations under paragraph (1) and the criteria set forth in paragraph (2).

“(B) REPORT IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—The Trade Representative shall include, when reporting under subparagraph (A) in any calendar year after the calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, a description of actions taken to address any acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments identified as trade enforcement priorities under this subsection in the calendar year preceding that report and, as relevant, any year before that calendar year.

“(b) SEMI-ANNUAL ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the same time as the reporting under subsection (a)(3), and not later than January 31 of each following year, the Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives with respect to the identification, prioritization, investigation, and resolution of acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments of concern with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, or that otherwise create or maintain trade barriers.

“(2) ACTS, POLICIES, OR PRACTICES OF CONCERN.—The semi-annual enforcement consultations required by paragraph (1) shall address acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments that raise concerns with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, or otherwise create or maintain trade barriers, including—

“(A) engagement with relevant trading partners;

“(B) strategies for addressing such concerns;

“(C) availability and deployment of resources to be used in the investigation or resolution of such concerns;

“(D) the merits of any potential dispute resolution proceeding under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party relating to such concerns; and

“(E) any other aspects of such concerns.

“(3) ACTIVE INVESTIGATIONS.—The semi-annual enforcement consultations required by paragraph (1) shall address acts, policies, or practices that the Trade Representative is actively investigating with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, including—

“(A) strategies for addressing concerns raised by such acts, policies, or practices;

“(B) any relevant timeline with respect to investigation of such acts, policies, or practices;

“(C) the merits of any potential dispute resolution proceeding under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party with respect to such acts, policies, or practices;

“(D) barriers to the advancement of the investigation of such acts, policies, or practices; and

“(E) any other matters relating to the investigation of such acts, policies, or practices.

“(4) ONGOING ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—The semi-annual enforcement consultations required by paragraph (1) shall address all ongoing enforcement actions taken by or against the United States with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, including—

“(A) any relevant timeline with respect to such actions;

“(B) the merits of such actions;

“(C) any prospective implementation actions;

“(D) potential implications for any law or regulation of the United States;

“(E) potential implications for United States stakeholders, domestic competitors, and exporters; and

“(F) other issues relating to such actions.

“(5) ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES.—The semi-annual enforcement consultations required

by paragraph (1) shall address the availability and deployment of enforcement resources, resource constraints on monitoring and enforcement activities, and strategies to address those constraints, including the use of available resources of other Federal agencies to enhance monitoring and enforcement capabilities.

“(c) INVESTIGATION AND RESOLUTION.—In the case of any acts, policies, or practices of a foreign government identified as a trade enforcement priority under subsection (a), the Trade Representative shall, not later than the date of the first semi-annual enforcement consultations held under subsection (b) after the identification of the priority, take appropriate action to address that priority, including—

“(1) engagement with the foreign government to resolve concerns raised by such acts, policies, or practices;

“(2) initiation of an investigation under section 302(b)(1) with respect to such acts, policies, or practices;

“(3) initiation of negotiations for a bilateral agreement that provides for resolution of concerns raised by such acts, policies, or practices; or

“(4) initiation of dispute settlement proceedings under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party with respect to such acts, policies, or practices.

“(d) ENFORCEMENT NOTIFICATIONS AND CONSULTATION.—

“(1) INITIATION OF ENFORCEMENT ACTION.—The Trade Representative shall notify and consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in advance of initiation of any formal trade dispute by or against the United States taken in regard to an obligation under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party. With respect to a formal trade dispute against the United States, if advance notification and consultation are not possible, the Trade Representative shall notify and consult at the earliest practicable opportunity after initiation of the dispute.

“(2) CIRCULATION OF REPORTS.—The Trade Representative shall notify and consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in advance of the announced or anticipated circulation of any report of a dispute settlement panel or the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization or of a dispute settlement panel under any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party with respect to a formal trade dispute by or against the United States.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) WTO.—The term ‘WTO’ means the World Trade Organization.

“(2) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term ‘WTO Agreement’ has the meaning given that term in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)).

“(3) WTO AGREEMENTS.—The term ‘WTO Agreements’ means the WTO Agreement and agreements annexed to that Agreement.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by striking the item relating to section 310 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 310. Trade enforcement priorities.”.

SEC. 602. EXERCISE OF WTO AUTHORIZATION TO SUSPEND CONCESSIONS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS UNDER TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 306 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2416) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) EXERCISE OF WTO AUTHORIZATION TO SUSPEND CONCESSIONS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS.—If—

“(1) action has terminated pursuant to section 307(c),

“(2) the petitioner or any representative of the domestic industry that would benefit from reinstatement of action has submitted to the Trade Representative a written request for reinstatement of action, and

“(3) the Trade Representatives has completed the requirements of subsection (d) and section 307(c)(3),

the Trade Representative may at any time determine to take action under section 301(c) to exercise an authorization to suspend concessions or other obligations under Article 22 of the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(16))).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 1 of title III of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 301(c)(1) (19 U.S.C. 2411(c)(1)), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or section 306(c)” after “subsection (a) or (b)”; and

(2) in section 306(b) (19 U.S.C. 2416(b)), in the subsection heading, by striking “FURTHER ACTION” and inserting “ACTION ON THE BASIS OF MONITORING”;

(3) in section 306(d) (19 U.S.C. 2416(d)), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by inserting “or (c)” after “subsection (b)”; and

(4) in section 307(c)(3) (19 U.S.C. 2417(c)(3)), by inserting “or if a request is submitted to the Trade Representative under section 306(c)(2) to reinstate action,” after “under section 301.”.

SEC. 603. TRADE MONITORING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 205. TRADE MONITORING.

“(a) MONITORING TOOL FOR IMPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, the United States International Trade Commission shall make available on a website of the Commission an import monitoring tool to allow the public access to data on the volume and value of goods imported to the United States for the purpose of assessing whether such data has changed with respect to such goods over a period of time.

“(2) DATA DESCRIBED.—For purposes of the monitoring tool under paragraph (1), the Commission shall use data compiled by the Department of Commerce and such other government data as the Commission considers appropriate.

“(3) PERIODS OF TIME.—The Commission shall ensure that data accessed through the monitoring tool under paragraph (1) includes data for the most recent quarter for which such data are available and previous quarters as the Commission considers practicable.

“(b) MONITORING REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and not less frequently than quarterly thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce shall publish on a website of the Department of Commerce, and notify the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representa-

tives of the availability of, a monitoring report on changes in the volume and value of trade with respect to imports and exports of goods categorized based on the 6-digit sub-heading number of the goods under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States during the most recent quarter for which such data are available and previous quarters as the Secretary considers practicable.

“(2) REQUESTS FOR COMMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall solicit through the Federal Register public comment on the monitoring reports described in paragraph (1).

“(c) SUNSET.—The requirements under this section terminate on the date that is seven years after the date of the enactment of this section.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 204 the following:

“Sec. 205. Trade monitoring.”.

TITLE VII—CURRENCY MANIPULATION

SEC. 701. ENHANCEMENT OF ENGAGEMENT ON CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATE AND ECONOMIC POLICIES WITH CERTAIN MAJOR TRADING PARTNERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) MAJOR TRADING PARTNER REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the macroeconomic and currency exchange rate policies of each country that is a major trading partner of the United States.

(2) ELEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain—

(i) for each country that is a major trading partner of the United States—

(I) that country's bilateral trade balance with the United States;

(II) that country's current account balance as a percentage of its gross domestic product;

(III) the change in that country's current account balance as a percentage of its gross domestic product during the 3-year period preceding the submission of the report;

(IV) that country's foreign exchange reserves as a percentage of its short-term debt; and

(V) that country's foreign exchange reserves as a percentage of its gross domestic product; and

(ii) an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and exchange rate policies for each country that is a major trading partner of the United States that has—

(I) a significant bilateral trade surplus with the United States;

(II) a material current account surplus; and

(III) engaged in persistent one-sided intervention in the foreign exchange market.

(B) ENHANCED ANALYSIS.—Each enhanced analysis under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall include, for each country with respect to which an analysis is made under that subparagraph—

(i) a description of developments in the currency markets of that country, including, to the greatest extent feasible, developments with respect to currency interventions;

(ii) a description of trends in the real effective exchange rate of the currency of that country and in the degree of undervaluation of that currency;

(iii) an analysis of changes in the capital controls and trade restrictions of that country;

(iv) patterns in the reserve accumulation of that country; and

(v) an analysis of the macroeconomic policy mix of that country and its pattern of savings-investment imbalances.

(3) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall publicly issue guidance not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Act that describes the factors used to assess under paragraph (2)(A)(ii) whether a country has a significant bilateral trade surplus with the United States, has a material current account surplus, and has engaged in persistent one-sided intervention in the foreign exchange market.

(b) ENGAGEMENT ON EXCHANGE RATE AND ECONOMIC POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President, through the Secretary, shall commence enhanced bilateral engagement with each country for which an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and currency exchange rate policies is included in the report submitted under subsection (a), in order to, as appropriate—

(A) urge implementation of policies to address the causes of the undervaluation of its currency, its bilateral trade surplus with the United States, and its material current account surplus, including undervaluation and surpluses relating to exchange rate management;

(B) express the concern of the United States with respect to the adverse trade and economic effects of that undervaluation and those surpluses; and/or

(C) advise that country of the ability of the President to take action under subsection (c).

(2) WAIVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may waive the requirement under subsection (b)(1) to commence enhanced bilateral engagement with a country if the Secretary determines that commencing enhanced bilateral engagement with the country—

(i) would have an adverse impact on the United States economy greater than the benefits of such action; or

(ii) would cause serious harm to the national security of the United States.

(B) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall promptly certify to Congress a determination under subparagraph (A).

(c) REMEDIAL ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, on or after the date that is one year after the commencement of enhanced bilateral engagement by the President, through the Secretary, with respect to a country under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary determines that the country has failed to adopt appropriate policies to correct the undervaluation and surpluses described in subsection (b)(1)(A) with respect to that country, the President shall take one or more of the following actions:

(A) Prohibit the Overseas Private Investment Corporation from approving any new financing (including any insurance, reinsurance, or guarantee) with respect to a project located in that country on and after such date.

(B) Except as provided in paragraph (2), and pursuant to paragraph (3), prohibit the Federal Government from procuring, or entering into any contract for the procurement of, goods or services from that country on and after such date.

(C) Instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to call for additional rigorous surveillance of

the macroeconomic and exchange rate policies of that country and, as appropriate, formal consultations on findings of currency manipulation.

(D) Instruct the United States Trade Representative to take into account, in consultation with the Secretary, in assessing whether to enter into a bilateral or regional trade agreement with that country or to initiate or participate in negotiations with respect to a bilateral or regional trade agreement with that country, the extent to which that country has failed to adopt appropriate policies to correct the undervaluation and surpluses described in subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) WAIVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the requirement under paragraph (1) to take remedial action if the President determines that taking remedial action under paragraph (1) would—

(i) have an adverse impact on the United States economy greater than the benefits of taking remedial action; or

(ii) would cause serious harm to the national security of the United States.

(B) CERTIFICATION.—The President shall promptly certify to Congress a determination under subparagraph (A).

(3) EXCEPTION.—The President may not apply a prohibition under paragraph (1)(B) in a manner that is inconsistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

(4) CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—Before applying a prohibition under paragraph (1)(B), the President shall consult with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to determine whether such prohibition would subject the taxpayers of the United States to unreasonable cost.

(B) CONGRESS.—The President shall consult with the appropriate committees of Congress with respect to any action the President takes under paragraph (1)(B), including whether the President has consulted as required under subparagraph (A).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) COUNTRY.—The term “country” means a foreign country, dependent territory, or possession of a foreign country, and may include an association of 2 or more foreign countries, dependent territories, or possessions of countries into a customs union outside the United States.

(3) REAL EFFECTIVE EXCHANGE RATE.—The term “real effective exchange rate” means a weighted average of bilateral exchange rates, expressed in price-adjusted terms.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 702. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE RATE POLICY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established an Advisory Committee on International Exchange Rate Policy (in this section referred to as the “Committee”).

(2) DUTIES.—The Committee shall be responsible for advising the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the impact of international exchange rates and financial policies on the economy of the United States.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall be composed of 9 members as follows, none of whom shall be employees of the Federal Government:

(A) Three members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon the recommendation of the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(B) Three members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives upon the recommendation of the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(C) Three members shall be appointed by the President.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members shall be selected under paragraph (1) on the basis of their objectivity and demonstrated expertise in finance, economics, or currency exchange.

(3) TERMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Members shall be appointed for a term of 2 years or until the Committee terminates.

(B) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member may be reappointed to the Committee for additional terms.

(4) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) DURATION OF COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act unless renewed by the President for a subsequent 2-year period.

(2) CONTINUED RENEWAL.—The President may continue to renew the Committee for successive 2-year periods by taking appropriate action to renew the Committee prior to the date on which the Committee would otherwise terminate.

(d) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall hold not less than 2 meetings each calendar year.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall elect from among its members a chairperson for a term of 2 years or until the Committee terminates.

(2) REELECTION; SUBSEQUENT TERMS.—A chairperson of the Committee may be reelected chairperson but is ineligible to serve consecutive terms as chairperson.

(f) STAFF.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Committee such staff, information, personnel, administrative services, and assistance as the Committee may reasonably require to carry out the activities of the Committee.

(g) APPLICATION OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall apply to the Committee.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Meetings of the Committee shall be exempt from the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of section 10 and section 11 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (relating to open meetings, public notice, public participation, and public availability of documents), whenever and to the extent it is determined by the President or the Secretary of the Treasury that such meetings will be concerned with matters the disclosure of which—

(A) would seriously compromise the development by the Government of the United States of monetary or financial policy; or

(B) is likely to—

(i) lead to significant financial speculation in currencies, securities, or commodities; or

(ii) significantly endanger the stability of any financial institution.

(h) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury for each fiscal year in which the Committee is in effect \$1,000,000 to carry out this section.

TITLE VIII—ESTABLISHMENT OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “U.S. Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act”.

SEC. 802. ESTABLISHMENT OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 211) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 411. ESTABLISHMENT OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION; COMMISSIONER, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, AND OPERATIONAL OFFICES.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in the Department an agency to be known as U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(b) **COMMISSIONER OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.**—There shall be at the head of U.S. Customs and Border Protection a Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (in this section referred to as the ‘Commissioner’), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(c) **DUTIES.**—The Commissioner shall—

“(1) ensure the interdiction of persons and goods illegally entering or exiting the United States;

“(2) facilitate and expedite the flow of legitimate travelers and trade;

“(3) detect, respond to, and interdict terrorists, drug smugglers and traffickers, human smugglers and traffickers, and other persons who may undermine the security of the United States, in cases in which such persons are entering, or have recently entered, the United States;

“(4) safeguard the borders of the United States to protect against the entry of dangerous goods;

“(5) oversee the functions of the Office of Trade established under section 802(h) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015;

“(6) enforce and administer all customs laws of the United States, including the Tariff Act of 1930;

“(7) enforce and administer all immigration laws, as such term is defined in paragraph (17) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)), as necessary for the inspection, processing, and admission of persons who seek to enter or depart the United States, and as necessary to ensure the detection, interdiction, removal, departure from the United States, short-term detention, and transfer of persons unlawfully entering, or who have recently unlawfully entered, the United States, in coordination with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and United States Citizenship and Immigration Services;

“(8) develop and implement screening and targeting capabilities, including the screening, reviewing, identifying, and prioritizing of passengers and cargo across all international modes of transportation, both inbound and outbound;

“(9) in coordination with the Secretary, deploy technology to collect the data necessary for the Secretary to administer the biometric entry and exit data system pursu-

ant to section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b);

“(10) enforce and administer the laws relating to agricultural import and entry inspection referred to in section 421;

“(11) in coordination with the Under Secretary for Management of the Department, ensure U.S. Customs and Border Protection complies with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and the Department’s acquisition management directives for major acquisition programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

“(12) enforce and administer—

“(A) the Container Security Initiative program under section 205 of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 945; Public Law 109-347); and

“(B) the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism program under sections 211 through 223 of such Act (6 U.S.C. 961-973);

“(13) conduct polygraph examinations in accordance with section 3(1) of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-376);

“(14) establish the standard operating procedures described in subsection (k);

“(15) carry out the training required under subsection (l); and

“(16) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by law or delegated by the Secretary.

“(d) **DEPUTY COMMISSIONER.**—There shall be in U.S. Customs and Border Protection a Deputy Commissioner who shall assist the Commissioner in the management of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(e) **U.S. BORDER PATROL.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in U.S. Customs and Border Protection the U.S. Border Patrol.

“(2) **CHIEF.**—There shall be at the head of the U.S. Border Patrol a Chief, who shall report to the Commissioner.

“(3) **DUTIES.**—The U.S. Border Patrol shall—

“(A) serve as the law enforcement office of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with primary responsibility for interdicting persons attempting to illegally enter or exit the United States or goods being illegally imported into or exported from the United States at a place other than a designated port of entry;

“(B) deter and prevent illegal entry of terrorists, terrorist weapons, persons, and contraband; and

“(C) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

“(f) **OFFICE OF AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in U.S. Customs and Border Protection an Office of Air and Marine Operations.

“(2) **ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.**—There shall be at the head of the Office of Air and Marine Operations an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner.

“(3) **DUTIES.**—The Office of Air and Marine Operations shall—

“(A) serve as the law enforcement office within U.S. Customs and Border Protection with primary responsibility to detect, interdict, and prevent acts of terrorism and the unlawful movement of people, illicit drugs, and other contraband across the borders of the United States in the air and maritime environment;

“(B) conduct joint aviation and marine operations with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(C) conduct aviation and marine operations with international, Federal, State,

and local law enforcement agencies, as appropriate;

“(D) administer the Air and Marine Operations Center established under paragraph (4); and

“(E) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

“(4) **AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS CENTER.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in the Office of Air and Marine Operations an Air and Marine Operations Center.

“(B) **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.**—There shall be at the head of the Air and Marine Operations Center an Executive Director, who shall report to the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Air and Marine Operations.

“(C) **DUTIES.**—The Air and Marine Operations Center shall—

“(i) manage the air and maritime domain awareness of the Department;

“(ii) monitor and coordinate the airspace for Unmanned Aerial Systems operations of the Office of Air and Marine Operations in U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

“(iii) detect, identify, and coordinate a response to threats to national security in the air domain;

“(iv) provide aviation and marine support to other Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies; and

“(v) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Assistant Commissioner.

“(g) **OFFICE OF FIELD OPERATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in U.S. Customs and Border Protection an Office of Field Operations.

“(2) **ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.**—There shall be at the head of the Office of Field Operations an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner.

“(3) **DUTIES.**—The Office of Field Operations shall coordinate the enforcement activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection at United States air, land, and sea ports of entry to—

“(A) deter and prevent terrorists and terrorist weapons from entering the United States at such ports of entry;

“(B) conduct inspections at such ports of entry to safeguard the United States from terrorism and illegal entry of persons;

“(C) prevent illicit drugs, agricultural pests, and contraband from entering the United States;

“(D) in coordination with the Commissioner, facilitate and expedite the flow of legitimate travelers and trade;

“(E) administer the National Targeting Center established under paragraph (4); and

“(F) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

“(4) **NATIONAL TARGETING CENTER.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in the Office of Field Operations a National Targeting Center.

“(B) **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.**—There shall be at the head of the National Targeting Center an Executive Director, who shall report to the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations.

“(C) **DUTIES.**—The National Targeting Center shall—

“(i) serve as the primary forum for targeting operations within U.S. Customs and Border Protection to collect and analyze traveler and cargo information in advance of arrival in the United States;

“(ii) identify, review, and target travelers and cargo for examination;

“(iii) coordinate the examination of entry and exit of travelers and cargo;

“(iv) develop and conduct commercial risk assessment targeting with respect to cargo destined for the United States;

“(v) issue Trade Alerts pursuant to section 111 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015; and

“(vi) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Assistant Commissioner.

“(5) ANNUAL REPORT ON STAFFING.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 and annually thereafter, the Assistant Commissioner shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the staffing model for the Office of Field Operations, including information on how many supervisors, frontline U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers, and support personnel are assigned to each Field Office and port of entry.

“(h) OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in U.S. Customs and Border Protection an Office of Intelligence.

“(2) ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.—There shall be at the head of the Office of Intelligence an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner.

“(3) DUTIES.—The Office of Intelligence shall—

“(A) develop, provide, coordinate, and implement intelligence capabilities into a cohesive intelligence enterprise to support the execution of the duties and responsibilities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

“(B) collect and analyze advance traveler and cargo information;

“(C) establish, in coordination with the Chief Intelligence Officer of the Department, as appropriate, intelligence-sharing relationships with Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies and intelligence agencies;

“(D) conduct risk-based covert testing of U.S. Customs and Border Protection operations, including for nuclear and radiological risks; and

“(E) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

“(i) OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in U.S. Customs and Border Protection an Office of International Affairs.

“(2) ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.—There shall be at the head of the Office of International Affairs an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner.

“(3) DUTIES.—The Office of International Affairs, in collaboration with the Office of Policy of the Department, shall—

“(A) coordinate and support U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s foreign initiatives, policies, programs, and activities;

“(B) coordinate and support U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s personnel stationed abroad;

“(C) maintain partnerships and information sharing agreements and arrangements with foreign governments, international organizations, and United States agencies in support of U.S. Customs and Border Protection duties and responsibilities;

“(D) provide necessary capacity building, training, and assistance to foreign border control agencies to strengthen global supply chain and travel security, as appropriate;

“(E) coordinate mission support services to sustain U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s global activities;

“(F) coordinate U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s engagement in international negotiations; and

“(G) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

“(j) OFFICE OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in U.S. Customs and Border Protection an Office of Internal Affairs.

“(2) ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.—There shall be at the head of the Office of Internal Affairs an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner.

“(3) DUTIES.—The Office of Internal Affairs shall—

“(A) investigate criminal and administrative matters and misconduct by officers, agents, and other employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

“(B) perform investigations of applicants for employment with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and periodic reinvestigations (in accordance with section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341; Public Law 108-458)) of officers, agents, and other employees of United States Customs and Border Protection, including investigations to determine suitability for employment and eligibility for access to classified information;

“(C) manage integrity of U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s counter-intelligence operations, including conduct of counter-intelligence investigations;

“(D) conduct research and analysis regarding misconduct of officers, agents, and other employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

“(E) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

“(k) STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall establish—

“(A) standard operating procedures for searching, reviewing, retaining, and sharing information contained in communication, electronic, or digital devices encountered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel at United States ports of entry;

“(B) standard use of force procedures that officers and agents of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may employ in the execution of their duties, including the use of deadly force;

“(C) a uniform, standardized, and publicly-available procedure for processing and investigating complaints against officers, agents, and employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for violations of professional conduct, including the timely disposition of complaints and a written notification to the complainant of the status or outcome, as appropriate, of the related investigation, in accordance with section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘Privacy Act’ or the ‘Privacy Act of 1974’);

“(D) an internal, uniform reporting mechanism regarding incidents involving the use of deadly force by an officer or agent of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including an evaluation of the degree to which the procedures required under subparagraph (B) were followed; and

“(E) standard operating procedures, acting through the Assistant Commissioner for Air and Marine Operations and in coordination with the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties and the Office of Privacy of the Department, to provide command, control, communication, surveillance, and reconnaissance assistance through the use of unmanned aerial systems, including the establishment of—

“(i) a process for other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to submit mission requests;

“(ii) a formal procedure to determine whether to approve or deny such a mission request;

“(iii) a formal procedure to determine how such mission requests are prioritized and coordinated; and

“(iv) a process regarding the protection and privacy of data and images collected by U.S. Customs and Border Protection through the use of unmanned aerial systems.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING CERTAIN NOTIFICATIONS.—The standard operating procedures established pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall require—

“(A) in the case of a search of information conducted on an electronic device by U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel, the Commissioner to notify the individual subject to such search of the purpose and authority for such search, and how such individual may obtain information on reporting concerns about such search; and

“(B) in the case of information collected by U.S. Customs and Border Protection through a search of an electronic device, if such information is transmitted to another Federal agency for subject matter assistance, translation, or decryption, the Commissioner to notify the individual subject to such search of such transmission.

“(3) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner may withhold the notifications required under paragraphs (1)(C) and (2) if the Commissioner determines that such notifications would impair national security, law enforcement, or other operational interests.

“(B) TERRORIST WATCH LISTS.—

“(i) SEARCHES.—If the individual subject to search of an electronic device pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) is included on a Government-operated or Government-maintained terrorist watch list, the notifications required under paragraph (2) shall not apply.

“(ii) COMPLAINTS.—If the complainant using the process established under subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) is included on a Government-operated or Government-maintained terrorist watch list, the notification required under such subparagraph shall not apply.

“(4) UPDATE AND REVIEW.—The Commissioner shall review and update every three years the standard operating procedures required under this subsection.

“(5) AUDITS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall develop and annually administer an auditing mechanism to review whether searches of electronic devices at or between United States ports of entry are being conducted in conformity with the standard operating procedures required under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1). Such audits shall be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees and shall include the following:

“(A) A description of the activities of officers and agents of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to such searches.

“(B) The number of such searches.

“(C) The number of instances in which information contained in such devices that were subjected to such searches was retained, copied, shared, or entered in an electronic database.

“(D) The number of such devices detained as the result of such searches.

“(E) The number of instances in which information collected from such device was subjected to such searches was transmitted to another Federal agency, including whether such transmission resulted in a prosecution or conviction.

“(6) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING OTHER NOTIFICATIONS.—The standard operating procedures established pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall require—

“(A) in the case of an incident of the use of deadly force by U.S. Customs and Border

Protection personnel, the Commissioner to notify the appropriate congressional committees; and

“(B) the Commissioner to provide to such committees a copy of the evaluation pursuant to subparagraph (D) of such paragraph not later than 30 days after completion of such evaluation.

“(7) REPORT ON UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS.—The Commissioner shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report that reviews whether the use of unmanned aerial systems are being conducted in conformity with the standard operating procedures required under subparagraph (E) of paragraph (1). Such reports—

“(A) shall be submitted with the President’s annual budget;

“(B) may be submitted in classified form if the Commissioner determines that such is appropriate, and

“(C) shall include—

“(i) a detailed description of how, where, and for how long data and images collected through the use of unmanned aerial systems by U.S. Customs and Border Protection is collected and stored; and

“(ii) a list of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies that submitted mission requests in the previous year and the disposition of such requests.

“(l) TRAINING.—The Commissioner shall require all officers and agents of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to participate in a specified amount of continuing education (to be determined by the Commissioner) to maintain an understanding of Federal legal rulings, court decisions, and departmental policies, procedures, and guidelines.

“(m) SHORT TERM DETENTION STANDARDS.—

“(1) ACCESS TO FOOD AND WATER.—The Commissioner shall make every effort to ensure that adequate access to food and water is provided to an individual apprehended and detained at or between a United States port of entry as soon as practicable following the time of such apprehension or during subsequent short term detention.

“(2) ACCESS TO INFORMATION ON DETAINEE RIGHTS AT BORDER PATROL PROCESSING CENTERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall ensure that an individual apprehended by a U.S. Border Patrol agent or an Office of Field Operations officer is provided with information concerning such individual’s rights, including the right to contact a representative of such individual’s government for purposes of United States treaty obligations.

“(B) FORM.—The information referred to in subparagraph (A) may be provided either verbally or in writing, and shall be posted in the detention holding cell in which such individual is being held. The information shall be provided in a language understandable to such individual.

“(3) SHORT TERM DETENTION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘short term detention’ means detention in a U.S. Customs and Border Protection processing center for 72 hours or less, before repatriation to a country of nationality or last habitual residence.

“(4) DAYTIME REPATRIATION.—When practicable, repatriations shall be limited to daylight hours and avoid locations that are determined to have high indices of crime and violence.

“(5) REPORT ON PROCUREMENT PROCESS AND STANDARDS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the procure-

ment process and standards of entities with which U.S. Customs and Border Protection has contracts for the transportation and detention of individuals apprehended by agents or officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. Such report should also consider the operational efficiency of contracting the transportation and detention of such individuals.

“(6) REPORT ON INSPECTIONS OF SHORT-TERM CUSTODY FACILITIES.—The Commissioner shall—

“(A) annually inspect all facilities utilized for short term detention; and

“(B) make publically available information collected pursuant to such inspections, including information regarding the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) and, where appropriate, issue recommendations to improve the conditions of such facilities.

“(n) WAIT TIMES TRANSPARENCY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall—

“(A) publish live wait times at the 20 United States airports that support the highest volume of international travel (as determined by available Federal flight data);

“(B) make information about such wait times available to the public in real time through the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Web site;

“(C) submit to the appropriate congressional committees quarterly reports that include compilations of all such wait times and a ranking of such United States airports by wait times; and

“(D) provide adequate staffing at the U.S. Customs and Border Protection information center to ensure timely access for travelers attempting to submit comments or speak with a representative about their entry experiences.

“(2) CALCULATION.—The wait times referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall be determined by calculating the time elapsed between an individual’s entry into the U.S. Customs and Border Protection inspection area and such individual’s clearance by a U.S. Customs and Border Protection officer.

“(o) OTHER AUTHORITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish such other offices or Assistant Commissioners (or other similar officers or officials) as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the missions, duties, functions, and authorities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary exercises the authority provided pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify the appropriate congressional committees not later than 30 days before exercising such authority.

“(p) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Nothing in this section may be construed as affecting in any manner the authority, existing on the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, of any other Federal agency, including the Transportation Security Administration, with respect to the duties of U.S. Customs and Border Protection described in subsection (c).”.

(b) SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) TREATMENT.—Section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall be treated as if included in such Act as of the date of the enactment of such Act, and, in addition to the functions, missions, duties, and authorities specified in such amended section 411, U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall continue to perform and carry out the functions, missions, duties, and authorities under

section 411 of such Act as in existence on the day before such date of enactment, and section 415 of such Act.

(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(A) RULES AND REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), nothing in this title or any amendment made by this title may be construed as affecting in any manner any rule or regulation issued or promulgated pursuant to any provision of law, including section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 as in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and any such rule or regulation shall continue to have full force and effect on and after such date.

(B) OTHER ACTIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), nothing in this Act may be construed as affecting in any manner any action, determination, policy, or decision pursuant to section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 as in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and any such action, determination, policy, or decision shall continue to have full force and effect on and after such date.

(C) CONTINUATION IN OFFICE.—

(1) COMMISSIONER.—The individual serving as the Commissioner of Customs on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act may serve as the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on and after such date of enactment until a Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection is appointed under section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) OTHER POSITIONS.—The individuals serving as Assistant Commissioners and other officers and officials under section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act may serve as the appropriate Assistant Commissioners and other officers and officials under such section 411 as amended by subsection (a) of this section unless the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection determines that another individual should hold such position or positions.

(d) REFERENCE.—

(1) TITLE 5.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “Commissioner of Customs, Department of Homeland Security” and inserting “Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security”.

(2) OTHER REFERENCES.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, any reference in law or regulations to the “Commissioner of Customs” or the “Commissioner of the Customs Service” shall be deemed to be a reference to the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by striking the item relating to section 411 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 411. Establishment of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, and operational offices.”.

(f) REPEALS.—Sections 416 and 418 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 216 and 218), and the items relating to such sections in the table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act, are repealed.

(g) CLERICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in title I—

(i) in section 102(f)(10) (6 U.S.C. 112(f)(10)), by striking “the Directorate of Border and

Transportation Security” and inserting “the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection”; and

(ii) in section 103(a)(1) (6 U.S.C. 113(a)(1))—
(I) in subparagraph (C), by striking “An Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security.” and inserting “A Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.”; and

(II) in subparagraph (G), by striking “A Director of the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement.” and inserting “A Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.”; and

(B) in title IV—

(i) by striking the title heading and inserting “**BORDER, MARITIME, AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY**”;

(ii) in subtitle A—

(I) by striking the subtitle heading and inserting “**Border, Maritime, and Transportation Security Responsibilities and Functions**”; and

(II) in section 402 (6 U.S.C. 202)—

(aa) in the section heading, by striking “**RESPONSIBILITIES**” and inserting “**BORDER, MARITIME, AND TRANSPORTATION RESPONSIBILITIES**”; and

(bb) by striking “, acting through the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security.”;

(iii) in subtitle B—

(I) by striking the subtitle heading and inserting “**U.S. Customs and Border Protection**”;

(II) in section 412(b) (6 U.S.C. 212), by striking “the United States Customs Service” each place it appears and inserting “U.S. Customs and Border Protection”;

(III) in section 413 (6 U.S.C. 213), by striking “available to the United States Customs Service or”;

(IV) in section 414 (6 U.S.C. 214), by striking “the United States Customs Service” and inserting “U.S. Customs and Border Protection”;

(V) in section 415 (6 U.S.C. 215)—

(aa) in paragraph (7), by inserting before the colon the following: “, and of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on the day before the effective date of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act”; and

(bb) in paragraph (8), by inserting before the colon the following: “, and of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on the day before the effective date of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act”;

(iv) in subtitle C—

(I) by striking section 424 (6 U.S.C. 234) and inserting the following new section:

“SEC. 424. PRESERVATION OF TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AS A DISTINCT ENTITY.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Transportation Security Administration shall be maintained as a distinct entity within the Department.”; and

(II) in section 430 (6 U.S.C. 238)—

(aa) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Department an Office for Domestic Preparedness.”;

(bb) in subsection (b), by striking the second sentence; and

(cc) in subsection (c)(7), by striking “Directorate” and inserting “Department”; and

(v) in subtitle D—

(I) in section 441 (6 U.S.C. 251)—

(aa) by striking the section heading and inserting “**TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS**”; and

(bb) by striking “Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security” and inserting “Secretary”;

(II) in section 443 (6 U.S.C. 253)—

(aa) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security” and inserting “Secretary”; and

(bb) by striking “the Bureau of Border Security” and inserting “U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement” each place it appears; and

(III) by amending section 444 (6 U.S.C. 254) to read as follows:

“SEC. 444. EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may impose disciplinary action on any employee of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and U.S. Customs and Border Protection who willfully deceives Congress or agency leadership on any matter.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 401 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 201) is repealed.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended—

(A) by striking the item relating to title IV and inserting the following:

“TITLE IV—BORDER, MARITIME, AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY”;

(B) by striking the item relating to subtitle A of title IV and inserting the following:

“Subtitle A—Border, Maritime, and Transportation Security Responsibilities and Functions”;

(C) by striking the item relating to section 401;

(D) by striking the item relating to subtitle B of title IV and inserting the following:

“Subtitle B—U.S. Customs and Border Protection”;

(E) by striking the item relating to section 441 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 441. Transfer of functions.”; and

(F) by striking the item relating to section 442 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 442. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.”.

(h) **OFFICE OF TRADE.**—

(1) **TRADE OFFICES AND FUNCTIONS.**—The Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2071 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 4. OFFICE OF TRADE.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in U.S. Customs and Border Protection an Office of Trade.

“(b) **ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There shall be at the head of the Office of Trade an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(2) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—The Assistant Commissioner shall have a minimum of 10 years of professional experience with the customs and trade laws of the United States.

“(3) **SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE POSITION.**—The position of Assistant Commissioner for Trade shall be a Senior Executive Service position (as defined in section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code).

“(c) **DUTIES.**—The Office of Trade shall—

“(1) direct the development and implementation, pursuant to the customs and trade laws of the United States, of policies and regulations administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

“(2) advise the Commissioner with respect to the impact on trade facilitation and trade

enforcement of any policy or regulation otherwise proposed or administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

“(3) coordinate and cooperate with the Assistant Commissioner for the Office of Field Operations with respect to the trade facilitation and trade enforcement activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection carried out at the land borders and ports of entry of the United States;

“(4) direct the development and implementation of matters relating to the priority trade issues identified by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in the joint strategic plan on trade facilitation and trade enforcement required under section 123A of the Customs and Trade Act of 1990;

“(5) otherwise advise the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to the development and implementation of the joint strategic plan;

“(6) direct the trade enforcement activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

“(7) oversee the trade modernization activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including the development and implementation of the Automated Commercial Environment computer system authorized under section 13031(f)(5) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(5)) and support for the establishment of the International Trade Data System under the oversight of the Department of Treasury pursuant to section 411(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1411(d));

“(8) direct the administration of customs revenue functions as otherwise provided by law or delegated by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

“(9) prepare an annual report to be submitted to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives not later than March 1 of each calendar year that includes—

“(A) a summary of the changes to customs policies and regulations adopted by U.S. Customs and Border Protection during the preceding calendar year; and

“(B) a description of the public vetting and interagency consultation that occurred with respect to each such change.

“(d) **TRANSFER OF ASSETS, FUNCTIONS, AND PERSONNEL; ELIMINATION OF OFFICES.**—

“(1) **OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE.**—

“(A) **TRANSFER.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, the Commissioner shall transfer the assets, functions, personnel, and liabilities of the Office of International Trade to the Office of Trade established under subsection (b).

“(B) **ELIMINATION.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, the Office of International Trade shall be abolished.

“(C) **LIMITATION ON FUNDS.**—No funds appropriated to U.S. Customs and Border Protection or the Department of Homeland Security may be used to transfer the assets, functions, personnel, and liabilities of the Office of International Trade to an office other than the Office of Trade established under subsection (a).

“(D) **OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘Office of International Trade’ means the Office of International Trade established by section 2 of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072), as added by section 402 of the Security and Accountability

for Every Port Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-347; 120 Stat. 1924), and as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

“(2) OTHER TRANSFERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner is authorized to transfer any other assets, functions, or personnel within U.S. Customs and Border Protection to the Office of Trade established under subsection (d).

“(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not less than 90 days prior to the transfer of assets, functions, or personnel under subparagraph (A)(i), the Commissioner shall notify the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives of the specific assets, functions, or personnel to be transferred, and the reason for the transfer.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘customs and trade laws of the United States’, ‘trade enforcement’, and ‘trade facilitation’ have the meanings given such terms in section 2 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.”

(2) CONTINUATION IN OFFICE.—The individual serving as the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of International Trade on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act may serve as the Assistant Commissioner for Trade on or after such date of enactment, at the discretion of the Commissioner.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2 of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072), as added by section 402 of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-347; 120 Stat. 1924), is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

(1) REPORTS AND ASSESSMENTS.—

(I) REPORT ON BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s Business Transformation Initiative, including locations where the Initiative is deployed, the types of equipment utilized, a description of protocols and procedures, information on wait times at such locations since deployment, and information regarding the schedule for deployment at new locations.

(2) PORT OF ENTRY INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS ASSESSMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall assess the physical infrastructure and technology needs at the 20 busiest land ports of entry (as measured by U.S. Customs and Border Protection) with a particular attention to identify ways to—

(A) improve travel and trade facilitation;

(B) reduce wait times;

(C) improve physical infrastructure and conditions for individuals accessing pedestrian ports of entry;

(D) enter into long-term leases with nongovernmental and private sector entities;

(E) enter into lease-purchase agreements with nongovernmental and private sector entities; and

(F) achieve cost savings through leases described in subparagraphs (D) and (E).

(3) PERSONAL SEARCHES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on supervisor-approved personal searches conducted in the previous year by U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel. Such report shall include the number of personal searches conducted in each sector and field office, the number of invasive personal searches conducted in each sector and field office, whether personal searches were conducted by Office of Field Operations or U.S. Border Patrol personnel, and how many personal searches resulted in the discovery of contraband.

(J) TRUSTED TRAVELER PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not enter into or renew an agreement with the government of a foreign country for a trusted traveler program administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection unless the Secretary certifies in writing that such government—

(1) routinely submits to INTERPOL for inclusion in INTERPOL’s Stolen and Lost Travel Documents database information about lost and stolen passports and travel documents of the citizens and nationals of such country; or

(2) makes available to the United States Government the information described in paragraph (1) through another means of reporting.

(K) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE AWARD PROGRAM.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) Congress established the Foreign Language Award Program (FLAP) to incentivize employees at United States ports of entry to utilize their foreign language skills on the job by providing a financial incentive for the use of the foreign language for at least ten percent of their duties after passage of competency tests. FLAP incentivizes the use of more than two dozen languages and has been instrumental in identifying and utilizing U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and agents who are proficient in a foreign language.

(B) In 1993, Congress provided for dedicated funding for this program by stipulating that certain fees collected by U.S. Customs and Border Protection be used to fund FLAP.

(C) Through FLAP, foreign travelers are aided by having an officer at a port of entry who speaks their language, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection benefits by being able to focus its border security efforts in a more effective manner.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that FLAP incentivizes U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers to attain and maintain competency in a foreign language, thereby improving the efficiency of operations for the functioning of U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s security mission, making the United States a more welcoming place when foreign travelers find officers can communicate in their language, and helping to expedite traveler processing to reduce wait times.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. DE MINIMIS VALUE.

(a) DE MINIMIS VALUE.—Section 321(a)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “\$200” and inserting “\$800”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 902. CONSULTATION ON TRADE AND CUSTOMS REVENUE FUNCTIONS.

Section 401(c) of the Safety and Accountability for Every Port Act (6 U.S.C. 115(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “on Department policies and actions that have” and inserting “not later than 30 days after proposing, and not later than 30 days before finalizing, any Department policies, initiatives, or actions that will have”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “not later than 30 days prior to the finalization of” and inserting “not later than 60 days before proposing, and not later than 60 days before finalizing,”.

SEC. 903. PENALTIES FOR CUSTOMS BROKERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 641(d)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1641(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) has been convicted of committing or conspiring to commit an act of terrorism described in section 2332b of title 18, United States Code.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 641 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1641) is amended—

(1) by striking “the Customs Service” each place it appears and inserting “U.S. Customs and Border Protection”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by striking “The Customs Service” and inserting “U.S. Customs and Border Protection”; and

(3) in subsection (g)(2)(B), by striking “Secretary’s notice” and inserting “notice under subparagraph (A)”.

SEC. 904. AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 98 OF THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) ARTICLES EXPORTED AND RETURNED, ADVANCED OR IMPROVED ABROAD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—U.S. Note 3 to subchapter II of chapter 98 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f)(1) For purposes of subheadings 9802.00.40 and 9802.00.50, fungible articles exported from the United States for the purposes described in such subheadings—

“(A) may be commingled; and

“(B) the origin, value, and classification of such articles may be accounted for using an inventory management method.

“(2) If a person chooses to use an inventory management method under this paragraph with respect to fungible articles, the person shall use the same inventory management method for any other articles with respect to which the person claims fungibility under this paragraph.

“(3) For the purposes of this paragraph—

“(A) the term ‘fungible articles’ means merchandise or articles that, for commercial purposes, are identical or interchangeable in all situations; and

“(B) the term ‘inventory management method’ means any method for managing inventory that is based on generally accepted accounting principles.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection applies to articles classifiable under subheading 9802.00.40 or 9802.00.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule

of the United States that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) MODIFICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO RETURNED PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The article description for heading 9801.00.10 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by

9801.00.11	United States Government property, returned to the United States without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any means while abroad, entered by the United States Government or a contractor to the United States Government, and certified by the importer as United States Government property	Free
------------	--	------

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) applies to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 905. EXEMPTION FROM DUTY OF RESIDUE OF BULK CARGO CONTAINED IN INSTRUMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC PREVIOUSLY EXPORTED FROM THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—General Note 3(e) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (v), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (vi), by adding “and” at the end;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (vi) (as so amended) the following new subparagraph: “(vii) residue of bulk cargo contained in instruments of international traffic previously exported from the United States.”; and

(4) by adding at the end of the flush text following subparagraph (vii) (as so added) the following: “For purposes of subparagraph (vii) of this paragraph: The term ‘residue’ means material of bulk cargo that remains in an instrument of international traffic after the bulk cargo is removed, with a quantity, by weight or volume, not exceeding 7 percent of the bulk cargo, and with no or de minimis value. The term ‘bulk cargo’ means cargo that is unpackaged and is in either solid, liquid, or gaseous form. The term ‘instruments of international traffic’ means containers or holders, capable of and suitable for repeated use, such as lift vans, cargo vans, shipping tanks, skids, pallets, caulk boards, and cores for textile fabrics, arriving (whether loaded or empty) in use or to be used in the shipment of merchandise in international traffic, and any additional articles or classes of articles that the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection designates as instruments of international traffic.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to residue of bulk cargo contained in instruments of international traffic that are imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after such date of enactment and that previously have been exported from the United States.

SEC. 906. DRAWBACK AND REFUNDS.

(a) ARTICLES MADE FROM IMPORTED MERCHANDISE.—Section 313(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(a)) is amended by striking “the full amount of the duties paid upon the merchandise so used shall be refunded as drawback, less 1 per centum of such duties, except that such” and inserting “an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1) shall be refunded as drawback, except that”.

inserting after “exported” the following: “, or any other products when returned within 3 years after having been exported”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) applies to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) SUBSTITUTION FOR DRAWBACK PURPOSES.—Section 313(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “If imported” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If imported”;

(2) by striking “and any other merchandise (whether imported or domestic) of the same kind and quality are” and inserting “or merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise is”;

(3) by striking “three years” and inserting “5 years”;

(4) by striking “the receipt of such imported merchandise by the manufacturer or producer of such articles” and inserting “the date of importation of such imported merchandise”;

(5) by striking “an amount of drawback equal to” and all that follows through the end period and inserting “an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1), but only if those articles have not been used prior to such exportation or destruction.”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF MERCHANDISE.—

“(A) MANUFACTURERS AND PRODUCERS.—Drawback shall be allowed under paragraph (1) with respect to an article manufactured or produced using imported merchandise or other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise only if the manufacturer or producer of the article received such imported merchandise or such other merchandise, directly or indirectly, from the importer.

“(B) EXPORTERS AND DESTROYERS.—Drawback shall be allowed under paragraph (1) with respect to a manufactured or produced article that is exported or destroyed only if the exporter or destroyer received that article, directly or indirectly, from the manufacturer or producer.

“(C) EVIDENCE OF TRANSFER.—Transfers of merchandise under subparagraph (A) and transfers of articles under subparagraph (B) may be evidenced by business records kept in the normal course of business and no additional certificates of transfer or manufacture shall be required.

“(3) SUBMISSION OF BILL OF MATERIALS OR FORMULA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Drawback shall be allowed under paragraph (1) with respect to an article manufactured or produced using imported merchandise or other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise only if the person making the drawback claim submits with the claim a bill of materials or formula identifying the merchandise and article by the 8-digit HTS subheading number and the quantity of the merchandise.

(c) DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PROPERTY RETURNED TO THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 98 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following new heading:

“(B) BILL OF MATERIALS AND FORMULA DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the terms ‘bill of materials’ and ‘formula’ mean records kept in the normal course of business that identify each component incorporated into a manufactured or produced article or that identify the quantity of each element, material, chemical, mixture, or other substance incorporated into a manufactured article.

“(4) SPECIAL RULE FOR SOUGHT CHEMICAL ELEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a sought chemical element may be—

“(i) considered imported merchandise, or merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise, used in the manufacture or production of an article as described in paragraph (1); and

“(ii) substituted for source material containing that sought chemical element, without regard to whether the sought chemical element and the source material are classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number, and apportioned quantitatively, as appropriate.

“(B) SOUGHT CHEMICAL ELEMENT DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘sought chemical element’ means an element listed in the Periodic Table of Elements that is imported into the United States or a chemical compound consisting of those elements, either separately in elemental form or contained in source material.”.

(c) MERCHANDISE NOT CONFORMING TO SAMPLE OR SPECIFICATIONS.—Section 313(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking “under a certificate of delivery” each place it appears;

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking “3” and inserting “5”; and

(ii) by striking “the Customs Service” and inserting “U.S. Customs and Border Protection”; and

(C) in the flush text at the end, by striking “the full amount of the duties paid upon such merchandise, less 1 percent,” and inserting “an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1)”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “the Customs Service” and inserting “U.S. Customs and Border Protection”; and

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) EVIDENCE OF TRANSFERS.—Transfers of merchandise under paragraph (1) may be evidenced by business records kept in the normal course of business and no additional certificates of transfer shall be required.”.

(d) PROOF OF EXPORTATION.—Section 313(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) PROOF OF EXPORTATION.—A person claiming drawback under this section based

on the exportation of an article shall provide proof of the exportation of the article. Such proof of exportation—

“(1) shall establish fully the date and fact of exportation and the identity of the exporter; and

“(2) may be established through the use of records kept in the normal course of business or through an electronic export system of the United States Government, as determined by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.”.

(e) UNUSED MERCHANDISE DRAWBACK.—Section 313(j) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(i) by striking “3-year” and inserting “5-year”; and

(ii) by inserting “and before the drawback claim is filed” after “the date of importation”; and

(B) in the flush text at the end, by striking “99 percent of the amount of each duty, tax, or fee so paid” and inserting “an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4), (5), and (6)”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “commercially interchangeable with” and inserting “classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “3-year” and inserting “5-year”; and

(ii) by inserting “and before the drawback claim is filed” after “the imported merchandise”; and

(D) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following:

“(II) received the imported merchandise, other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise, or any combination of such imported merchandise and such other merchandise, directly or indirectly from the person who imported and paid any duties, taxes, and fees imposed under Federal law upon importation or entry and due on the imported merchandise (and any such transferred merchandise, regardless of its origin, will be treated as the imported merchandise and any retained merchandise will be treated as domestic merchandise);”.

(E) in the flush text at the end—

(i) by striking “the amount of each such duty, tax, and fee” and all that follows through “99 percent of that duty, tax, or fee” and inserting “an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1) shall be refunded as drawback”; and

(ii) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: “Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), drawback shall be allowed under this paragraph with respect to wine if the imported wine and the exported wine are of the same color and the price variation between the imported wine and the exported wine does not exceed 50 percent. Transfers of merchandise may be evidenced by business records kept in the normal course of business and no additional certificates of transfer shall be required.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “the commercially interchangeable merchandise” and inserting “merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) For purposes of paragraph (2) and except as provided in subparagraph (B), merchandise may not be substituted for imported merchandise for drawback purposes based on the 8-digit HTS subheading number if the article description for the 8-digit HTS subheading number under which the imported merchandise is classified begins with the term ‘other’.

“(B) In cases described in subparagraph (A), merchandise may be substituted for imported merchandise for drawback purposes if—

“(i) the other merchandise and such imported merchandise are classifiable under the same 10-digit HTS statistical reporting number; and

“(ii) the article description for that 10-digit HTS statistical reporting number does not begin with the term ‘other’.

“(6)(A) For purposes of paragraph (2), a drawback claimant may use the first 8 digits of the 10-digit Schedule B number for merchandise or an article to determine if the merchandise or article is classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as the imported merchandise, without regard to whether the Schedule B number corresponds to more than one 8-digit HTS subheading number.

“(B) In this paragraph, the term ‘Schedule B’ means the Department of Commerce Schedule B, Statistical Classification of Domestic and Foreign Commodities Exported from the United States.”.

(f) LIABILITY FOR DRAWBACK CLAIMS.—Section 313(k) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(k)) is amended to read as follows:

“(k) LIABILITY FOR DRAWBACK CLAIMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person making a claim for drawback under this section shall be liable for the full amount of the drawback claimed.

“(2) LIABILITY OF IMPORTERS.—An importer shall be liable for any drawback claim made by another person with respect to merchandise imported by the importer in an amount equal to the lesser of—

“(A) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that the person claimed with respect to the imported merchandise; or

“(B) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that the importer authorized the other person to claim with respect to the imported merchandise.

“(3) JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY.—Persons described in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be jointly and severally liable for the amount described in paragraph (2).”.

(g) REGULATIONS.—Section 313(l) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(l)) is amended to read as follows:

“(l) REGULATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Allowance of the privileges provided for in this section shall be subject to compliance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

“(2) CALCULATION OF DRAWBACK.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (or, if later, the effective date provided for in section 906(q)(2)(B) of that Act), the Secretary shall prescribe regulations for determining the calculation of amounts refunded as drawback under this section.

“(B) CLAIMS WITH RESPECT TO UNUSED MERCHANDISE.—The regulations required by subparagraph (A) for determining the calculation of amounts refunded as drawback under this section shall provide for a refund of

equal to 99 percent of the duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise, except that where there is substitution of the merchandise or article, then—

“(i) in the case of an article that is exported, the amount of the refund shall be equal to 99 percent of the lesser of—

“(I) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise; or

“(II) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that would apply to the exported article if the exported article were imported; and

“(ii) in the case of an article that is destroyed, the amount of the refund shall be an amount that is—

“(I) equal to 99 percent of the lesser of—

“(aa) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise; and

“(bb) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that would apply to the destroyed article if the destroyed article were imported; and

“(II) reduced by the value of materials recovered during destruction as provided in subsection (x).

“(C) CLAIMS WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES INTO WHICH SUBSTITUTE MERCHANDISE IS INCORPORATED.—The regulations required by subparagraph (A) for determining the calculation of amounts refunded as drawback under this section shall provide for a refund of 99 percent of the duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise incorporated into an article that is exported or destroyed, except that where there is substitution of the imported merchandise, then—

“(i) in the case of an article that is exported, the amount of the refund shall be equal to 99 percent of the lesser of—

“(I) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise; or

“(II) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that would apply to the substituted merchandise if the substituted merchandise were imported; and

“(ii) in the case of an article that is destroyed, the amount of the refund shall be an amount that is—

“(I) equal to 99 percent of the lesser of—

“(aa) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise; and

“(bb) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that would apply to the substituted merchandise if the substituted merchandise were imported; and

“(II) reduced by the value of materials recovered during destruction as provided in subsection (x).

“(3) STATUS REPORTS ON REGULATIONS.—Not later than the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, and annually thereafter until the regulations required by paragraph (2) are final, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the status of those regulations.”.

(h) SUBSTITUTION OF FINISHED PETROLEUM DERIVATIVES.—Section 313(p) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(p)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States” each place it appears and inserting “HTS”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii)(III), by striking “, as so certified in a certificate of delivery or certificate of manufacture and delivery”; and

(B) in the flush text at the end—

(i) by striking “, so designated on the certificate of delivery or certificate of manufacture and delivery”; and

(ii) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: "The party transferring the merchandise shall maintain records kept in the normal course of business to demonstrate the transfer.".

(i) PACKAGING MATERIAL.—Section 313(q) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(q)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "of 99 percent of any duty, tax, or fee imposed under Federal law on such imported material" and inserting "in an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1)";

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "of 99 percent of any duty, tax, or fee imposed under Federal law on the imported or substituted merchandise used to manufacture or produce such material" and inserting "in an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (1)"; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking "they contain" and inserting "it contains".

(j) FILING OF DRAWBACK CLAIMS.—Section 313(r) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(r)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A drawback entry shall be filed or applied for, as applicable, not later than 5 years after the date on which merchandise on which drawback is claimed was imported.";

(B) in the second sentence, by striking "3-year" and inserting "5-year"; and

(C) in the third sentence, by striking "the Customs Service" and inserting "U.S. Customs and Border Protection";

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "The Customs Service" and inserting "U.S. Customs and Border Protection";

(ii) in clauses (i) and (ii), by striking "the Customs Service" each place it appears and inserting "U.S. Customs and Border Protection"; and

(iii) in clause (ii)(I), by striking "3-year" and inserting "5-year"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "the periods of time for retaining records set forth in subsection (t) of this section and" and inserting "the period of time for retaining records set forth in"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) All drawback claims filed on and after the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (or, if later, the effective date provided for in section 906(q)(2)(B) of that Act) shall be filed electronically.".

(k) DESIGNATION OF MERCHANDISE BY SUCCESSOR.—Section 313(s) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(s)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(B) subject to paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (j), imported merchandise, other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise, or any combination of such imported merchandise and such other merchandise, that the predecessor received, before the date of succession, from the person who imported and paid any duties, taxes, and fees due on the imported merchandise"; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking "certifies that" and all that follows and inserting "certifies that the transferred merchandise was not and will not be claimed by the predecessor.".

(l) DRAWBACK CERTIFICATES.—Section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313) is amended by striking subsection (t).

(m) DRAWBACK FOR RECOVERED MATERIALS.—Section 313(x) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(x)) is amended by striking "and (c)" and inserting "(c), and (j)".

(n) DEFINITIONS.—Section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(z) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) DIRECTLY.—The term 'directly' means a transfer of merchandise or an article from one person to another person without any intermediate transfer.

"(2) HTS.—The term 'HTS' means the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

"(3) INDIRECTLY.—The term 'indirectly' means a transfer of merchandise or an article from one person to another person with one or more intermediate transfers.".

(o) RECORDKEEPING.—Section 508(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1508(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking "3rd" and inserting "5th"; and

(2) by striking "payment" and inserting "liquidation".

(p) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the issuance of the regulations required by subsection (1)(2) of section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by subsection (g) of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the modernization of drawback and refunds under section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) include the following:

(A) An assessment of the modernization of drawback and refunds under section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this section.

(B) A description of drawback claims that were permissible before the effective date provided for in subsection (q) that are not permissible after that effective date and an identification of industries most affected.

(C) A description of drawback claims that were not permissible before the effective date provided for in subsection (q) that are permissible after that effective date and an identification of industries most affected.

(q) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(A) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) apply to drawback claims filed on or after the date that is 2 years after such date of enactment.

(2) REPORTING OF OPERABILITY OF AUTOMATED COMMERCIAL ENVIRONMENT COMPUTER SYSTEM.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 2 years after such date of enactment, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a report on—

(A) the date on which the Automated Commercial Environment will be ready to process drawback claims; and

(B) the date on which the Automated Export System will be ready to accept proof of exportation under subsection (i) of section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by subsection (d).

(3) TRANSITION RULE.—During the one-year period beginning on the date that is 2 years

after the date of the enactment of this Act (or, if later, the effective date provided for in paragraph (2)(B)), a person may elect to file a claim for drawback under—

(A) section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this section; or

(B) section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 907. OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT ON TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM AND NATIONAL TRADE POLICY AGENCY.—Section 163(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2213(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) the operation of all United States Trade Representative-led interagency programs during the preceding year and for the year in which the report is submitted."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) The report shall include, with respect to the matters referred to in paragraph (1)(C), information regarding—

"(A) the objectives and priorities of all United States Trade Representative-led interagency programs for the year, and the reasons therefor;

"(B) the actions proposed, or anticipated, to be undertaken during the year to achieve such objectives and priorities, including actions authorized under the trade laws and negotiations with foreign countries;

"(C) the role of each Federal agency participating in the interagency program in achieving such objectives and priorities and activities of each agency with respect to their participation in the program;

"(D) the United States Trade Representative's coordination of each participating Federal agency to more effectively achieve such objectives and priorities;

"(E) any proposed legislation necessary or appropriate to achieve any of such objectives or priorities; and

"(F) the progress that was made during the preceding year in achieving such objectives and priorities and coordination activities included in the statement provided for such year under this paragraph.".

(b) RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND STAFFING PLANS.—

(1) ANNUAL PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The United States Trade Representative shall on an annual basis develop a plan—

(i) to match available resources of the Office of the United States Trade Representative to projected workload and provide a detailed analysis of how the funds allocated from the prior fiscal year to date have been spent;

(ii) to identify existing staff of the Office and new staff that will be necessary to support the trade negotiation and enforcement functions and powers of the Office (including those of the Trade Policy Staff Committee) as described in section 141 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) and section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411);

(iii) to identify existing staff of the Office and staff of other Federal agencies who will be required to be detailed to support United States Trade Representative-led interagency programs, including any associated expenses; and

(iv) to provide a detailed analysis of the budgetary requirements of United States Trade Representative-led interagency programs for the next fiscal year and provide a

detailed analysis of how the funds allocated from the prior fiscal year to date have been spent.

(B) **REPORT.**—The United States Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report that contains the plan required under subparagraph (A). The report required under this subparagraph shall be submitted in conjunction with the annual budget of the United States Government required to be submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) **QUADRENNIAL PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Pursuant to the goals and objectives of the strategic plan of the Office of the United States Trade Representative as required under section 306 of title 5, United States Code, the United States Trade Representative shall every 4 years develop a plan—

(i) to analyze internal quality controls and record management of the Office;

(ii) to identify existing staff of the Office and new staff that will be necessary to support the trade negotiation and enforcement functions and powers of the Office (including those of the Trade Policy Staff Committee) as described in section 141 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) and section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411);

(iii) to identify existing staff of the Office and staff in other Federal agencies who will be required to be detailed to support United States Trade Representative-led interagency programs, including any associated expenses;

(iv) to provide an outline of budget justifications, including salaries and expenses as well as non-personnel administrative expenses, for the fiscal years required under the strategic plan; and

(v) to provide an outline of budget justifications, including salaries and expenses as well as non-personnel administrative expenses, for United States Trade Representative-led interagency programs for the fiscal years required under the strategic plan.

(B) **REPORT.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The United States Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report that contains the plan required under subparagraph (A). Except as provided in clause (ii), the report required under this clause shall be submitted in conjunction with the strategic plan of the Office as required under section 306 of title 5, United States Code.

(ii) **EXCEPTION.**—The United States Trade Representative shall submit to the congressional committees specified in clause (i) an initial report that contains the plan required under subparagraph (A) not later than February 1, 2016.

SEC. 908. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL TRADE AND COMMERCIAL ENHANCEMENT.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) Israel is America's dependable, democratic ally in the Middle East—an area of paramount strategic importance to the United States.

(2) The United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement formed the modern foundation of the bilateral commercial relationship between the two countries and was the first such agreement signed by the United States with a foreign country.

(3) The United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement has been instrumental in expanding commerce and the strategic relationship between the United States and Israel.

(4) More than \$45 billion in goods and services is traded annually between the two countries in addition to roughly \$10 billion in United States foreign direct investment in Israel.

(5) The United States continues to look for and find new opportunities to enhance cooperation with Israel, including through the enactment of the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-150) and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-296).

(6) It has been the policy of the United States Government to combat all elements of the Arab League Boycott of Israel by—

(A) public statements of Administration officials;

(B) enactment of relevant sections of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act), including sections to ensure foreign persons comply with applicable reporting requirements relating to the boycott;

(C) enactment of the 1976 Tax Reform Act (Public Law 94-455) that denies certain tax benefits to entities abiding by the boycott;

(D) ensuring through free trade agreements with Bahrain and Oman that such countries no longer participate in the boycott; and

(E) ensuring as a condition of membership in the World Trade Organization that Saudi Arabia no longer enforces the secondary or tertiary elements of the boycott.

(b) **STATEMENTS OF POLICY.**—Congress—

(1) supports the strengthening of United States-Israel economic cooperation and recognizes the tremendous strategic, economic, and technological value of cooperation with Israel;

(2) recognizes the benefit of cooperation with Israel to United States companies, including by improving American competitiveness in global markets;

(3) recognizes the importance of trade and commercial relations to the pursuit and sustainability of peace, and supports efforts to bring together the United States, Israel, the Palestinian territories, and others in enhanced commerce;

(4) opposes politically motivated actions that penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel such as boycotts, divestment or sanctions;

(5) notes that the boycott, divestment, and sanctioning of Israel by governments, governmental bodies, quasi-governmental bodies, international organizations, and other such entities is contrary to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) principle of non-discrimination;

(6) encourages the inclusion of politically motivated actions that penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel such as boycotts, divestment from, or sanctions against Israel as a topic of discussion at the U.S.-Israel Joint Economic Development Group (JEDG) and other areas to support the strengthening of the United States-Israel commercial relationship and combat any commercial discrimination against Israel;

(7) supports efforts to prevent investigations or prosecutions by governments or international organizations of United States persons on the sole basis of such persons doing business with Israel, with Israeli entities, or in Israeli-controlled territories; and

(8) supports American States examining a company's promotion or compliance with

unsanctioned boycotts, divestment from, or sanctions against Israel as part of its consideration in awarding grants and contracts and supports the divestment of State assets from companies that support or promote actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel.

(C) **PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES OF THE UNITED STATES.**—

(1) **COMMERCIAL PARTNERSHIPS.**—Among the principal trade negotiating objectives of the United States for proposed trade agreements with foreign countries regarding commercial partnerships are the following:

(A) To discourage actions by potential trading partners that directly or indirectly prejudice or otherwise discourage commercial activity solely between the United States and Israel.

(B) To discourage politically motivated actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel and to seek the elimination of politically motivated non-tariff barriers on Israeli goods, services, or other commerce imposed on the State of Israel.

(C) To seek the elimination of state-sponsored unsanctioned foreign boycotts against Israel or compliance with the Arab League Boycott of Israel by prospective trading partners.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This subsection takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to negotiations commenced before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **REPORT ON POLITICALLY MOTIVATED ACTS OF BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT FROM, AND SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on politically motivated acts of boycott, divestment from, and sanctions against Israel.

(2) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the establishment of barriers to trade, including non-tariff barriers, investment, or commerce by foreign countries or international organizations against United States persons operating or doing business in Israel, with Israeli entities, or in Israeli-controlled territories.

(B) A description of specific steps being taken by the United States to encourage foreign countries and international organizations to cease creating such barriers and to dismantle measures already in place and an assessment of the effectiveness of such steps.

(C) A description of specific steps being taken by the United States to prevent investigations or prosecutions by governments or international organizations of United States persons on the sole basis of such persons doing business with Israel, with Israeli entities, or in Israeli-controlled territories.

(D) Decisions by foreign persons, including corporate entities and state-affiliated financial institutions, that limit or prohibit economic relations with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or in Israeli controlled territories.

(e) **CERTAIN FOREIGN JUDGMENTS AGAINST UNITED STATES PERSONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no domestic court shall recognize or enforce any foreign judgment entered against a United States person that conducts business operations in Israel, or any territory controlled by Israel, if the domestic court determines that the foreign judgment is based, in whole or in part, on a determination by a foreign court that the United States person's conducting business operations therein or with Israeli entities constitutes a violation of law.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) **BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT FROM, AND SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL.**—The term “boycott, divestment from, and sanctions against Israel” means actions by states, non-member states of the United Nations, international organizations, or affiliated agencies of international organizations that are politically motivated and are intended to penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or in Israeli-controlled territories.

(2) **DOMESTIC COURT.**—The term “domestic court” means a Federal court of the United States, or a court of any State or territory of the United States or of the District of Columbia.

(3) **FOREIGN COURT.**—The term “foreign court” means a court, an administrative body, or other tribunal of a foreign country.

(4) **FOREIGN JUDGMENT.**—The term “foreign judgment” means a final civil judgment rendered by a foreign court.

(5) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term “foreign person” means—

(A) any natural person who is not lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20)) or who is not a protected individual (as defined in section 274B(a)(3) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1324b(a)(3))); or

(B) any foreign corporation, business association, partnership, trust, society or any other entity or group that is not incorporated or organized to do business in the United States, as well as any international organization, foreign government and any agency or subdivision of foreign government, including a diplomatic mission.

(6) **PERSON.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “person” means—

(i) a natural person;

(ii) a corporation, business association, partnership, society, trust, financial institution, insurer, underwriter, guarantor, and any other business organization, any other nongovernmental entity, organization, or group, and any governmental entity operating as a business enterprise; and

(iii) any successor to any entity described in clause (ii).

(B) **APPLICATION TO GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES.**—The term “person” does not include a government or governmental entity that is not operating as a business enterprise.

(7) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a natural person who is a national of the United States (as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22))); or

(B) a corporation or other legal entity which is organized under the laws of the United States, any State or territory thereof, or the District of Columbia, if natural persons described in subparagraph (A) own, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the outstanding capital stock or other beneficial interest in such legal entity.

SEC. 909. ELIMINATION OF CONSUMPTIVE DEMAND EXCEPTION TO PROHIBITION ON IMPORTATION OF GOODS MADE WITH CONVICT LABOR, FORCED LABOR, OR INDENTURED LABOR; REPORT.

(a) **ELIMINATION OF CONSUMPTIVE DEMAND EXCEPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) is amended by striking “The provisions of this section” and all that follows through “of the United States.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date that is 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on compliance with section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) that includes the following:

(1) The number of instances in which merchandise was denied entry pursuant to that section during the 1-year period preceding the submission of the report.

(2) A description of the merchandise denied entry pursuant to that section.

(3) Such other information as the Commissioner considers appropriate with respect to monitoring and enforcing compliance with that section.

SEC. 910. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) Fees may be charged under paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) during the period beginning on July 8, 2025, and ending on July 28, 2025.”.

(b) **RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.**—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended—

(1) by striking “For the period” and inserting “(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For the period”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **ADDITIONAL PERIOD.**—For the period beginning on July 1, 2025, and ending on July 14, 2025, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

“(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’; and

“(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’.”.

SEC. 911. REPORT ON CERTAIN U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION AGREEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after entering into an agreement under a program specified in subsection (b), and annually thereafter until the termination of the program, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of the development of the program.

(2) A description of the type of entity with which U.S. Customs and Border Protection entered into the agreement and the amount that entity reimbursed U.S. Customs and Border Protection under the agreement.

(3) An identification of the type of port of entry to which the agreement relates and an assessment of how the agreement provides economic benefits at the port of entry.

(4) A description of the services provided by U.S. Customs and Border Protection under the agreement during the year preceding the submission of the report.

(5) The amount of fees collected under the agreement during that year.

(6) A detailed accounting of how the fees collected under the agreement have been spent during that year.

(7) A summary of any complaints or criticism received by U.S. Customs and Border Protection during that year regarding the agreement.

(8) An assessment of the compliance of the entity described in paragraph (2) with the terms of the agreement.

(9) Recommendations with respect to how activities conducted pursuant to the agreement could function more effectively or better produce economic benefits.

(10) A summary of the benefits to and challenges faced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the entity described in paragraph (2) under the agreement.

(b) **PROGRAM SPECIFIED.**—A program specified in this subsection is—

(1) the program for entering into reimbursable fee agreements for the provision of U.S. Customs and Border Protection services established by section 560 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113–6; 127 Stat. 378); or

(2) the pilot program authorizing U.S. Customs and Border Protection to enter into partnerships with private sector and government entities at ports of entry established by section 559 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (division F of Public Law 113–76; 6 U.S.C. 211 note).

SEC. 912. AMENDMENTS TO BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL TRADE PRIORITIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015.

(a) **IMMIGRATION LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—Section 102(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) to ensure that trade agreements do not require changes to the immigration laws of the United States or obligate the United States to grant access or expand access to visas issued under section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)).”.

(b) **GLOBAL WARMING.**—Section 102(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) to ensure that trade agreements do not require changes to U.S. law or obligate the United States with respect to global warming or climate change.”.

(c) **FISHERIES NEGOTIATIONS.**—Section 102(b) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(22) **FISHERIES NEGOTIATIONS.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in fish, seafood, and shellfish products are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of fish, seafood, and shellfish products in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports of fish, seafood, and shellfish products in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in fish, seafood, and shellfish products, including by reducing or eliminating tariff and

non-tariff barriers and eliminating subsidies that distort trade.”.

(d) ACCREDITATION.—Section 104(c)(2)(C) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: “In addition, the chairman and ranking members described in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) shall each be permitted to designate up to 3 personnel with proper security clearances to serve as delegates to such negotiations.”.

(e) TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—Section 106(b)(6) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) EXCEPTION.—

“(i) INVOKING EXCEPTION.—If the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a letter stating that a country to which subparagraph (A) applies has taken concrete actions to implement the principal recommendations with respect to that country in the most recent annual report on trafficking in persons, this paragraph shall not apply with respect to agreements with that country.

“(ii) CONTENT OF LETTER; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—A letter submitted under clause (i) with respect to a country shall—

“(I) include a description of the concrete actions that the country has taken to implement the principal recommendations described in clause (i); and

“(II) be made available to the public.

“(iii) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(I) the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

“(II) the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.”.

(f) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 is amended—

(1) in section 105(b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “section 102(b)(16)” and inserting “section 102(b)(17)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “section 102(b)(16)” and inserting “section 102(b)(17)”; and

(2) in section 106(b)(5), by striking “section 102(b)(15)(C)” and inserting “section 102(b)(16)(C)”.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015.

SEC. 913. CERTAIN INTEREST TO BE INCLUDED IN DISTRIBUTIONS UNDER CONTINUED DUMPING AND SUBSIDY OFFSET ACT OF 2000.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner shall include in all distributions of collected antidumping and countervailing duties described in subsection (b) all interest earned on such duties, including—

(1) interest accrued under section 778 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677g),

(2) interest accrued under section 505(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1505(d)), and

(3) common-law equitable interest, and all interest under section 963 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (19 U.S.C. 580), awarded by a court against a surety’s late

payment of antidumping or countervailing duties and interest described in paragraph (1) or (2), under its bond,

which is, or was, realized through application of any payment received on or after October 1, 2014, by U.S. Customs and Border Protection under, or in connection with, any customs bond pursuant to a court order or judgment, or any settlement for any such bond.

(b) DISTRIBUTIONS DESCRIBED.—The distributions described in subsection (a) are all distributions made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act pursuant to section 754 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675c) (as such section was in effect on February 7, 2006) of collected antidumping and countervailing duties assessed on or after October 1, 2000, on entries made through September 30, 2007.

SEC. 914. REPORT ON COMPETITIVENESS OF U.S. RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR INDUSTRY.

Not later than June 1, 2016, the United States International Trade Commission shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the competitiveness of the United States recreational performance outerwear industry and its effects on the United States economy, including an assessment of duty structures on inputs as well as finished products and global supply chains.

SEC. 915. INCREASE IN PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE RETURN OF TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6651(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$135” in the last sentence and inserting “\$205”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6651(i) of such Code is amended by striking “\$135” and inserting “\$205”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be filed in calendar years after 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 305, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I include an exchange of letters between the committees of jurisdiction in the RECORD at this point.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Homeland Security in H.R. 1907, the “Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.” The bill includes provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security.

I recognize and appreciate the desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Homeland Security will forego consideration of this bill. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1907 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction.

This waiver is also given with the understanding that the Committee on Homeland Security expressly reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provision within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this or any similar legislation, and requests your support for such a request.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1907, and ask that a copy of this letter and your response be included in the Committee report on the bill as well as in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman,
Committee on Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee’s jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1907, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, and your willingness to forego consideration by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Homeland Security has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of the bill and that the Committee’s jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of H.R. 1907. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: Thank you for con-
sulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee
on H.R. 1907, the Trade Facilitation and
Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, which was re-
ferred to us on April 21, 2015.

I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee
may be discharged from further action on
this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously
to the Floor, subject to the understanding
that this waiver does not in any way dimin-
ish or alter the jurisdiction of the Foreign
Affairs Committee, or prejudice its jurisdic-
tional prerogatives on this bill or similar
legislation in the future. I also request your
support for the appointment of House For-
eign Affairs conferees during any House-Sen-
ate conference on this legislation.

I ask that you place our letters on H.R.
1907 into the Congressional Record during
floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate
your cooperation regarding this legislation
and look forward to continuing to work with
the Committee on Ways and Means as this
measure moves through the legislative pro-
cess.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2015.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Ray-
burn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter
regarding the Foreign Affairs Committee's
jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1907, the Trade
Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of
2015, and your willingness to forego consid-
eration by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Foreign Af-
airs has a valid jurisdictional interest in
certain provisions of the bill and that the
Committee's jurisdiction will not be ad-
versely affected by your decision to forego
consideration. As you have requested, I will
support your request for an appropriate ap-
pointment of outside conferees from your
committee in the event of a House-Senate
conference on this or similar legislation
should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter
and this response in the Congressional
Record during the floor consideration of the
bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: On April 23, 2015,
the Committee on Ways and Means ordered
H.R. 1907, the Trade Facilitation and Trade
Enforcement Act of 2015, to be reported fa-
vorably to the House. I agree to discharge
the Committee on Financial Services from
further consideration of the bill so that it
may proceed expeditiously to the House
Floor.

The Committee takes this action with our
mutual understanding that, by foregoing
consideration of H.R. 1907 at this time, we do
not waive any jurisdiction over the subject
matter contained in this or similar legisla-
tion, and that our committee will be appro-
priately consulted and involved as the bill or
similar legislation moves forward so that we
may address any remaining issues that fall
within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our com-
mittee also reserves the right to seek ap-
pointment of an appropriate number of con-
ferees to any House-Senate conference in-
volving this or similar legislation, and re-
quests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response
to this letter confirming this understanding
with respect to H.R. 1907 and would ask that
a copy of our exchange of letters on this
matter be included in your committee's re-
port to accompany the legislation and/or in
the Congressional Record during floor con-
sideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your
letter regarding the Committee's jurisdic-
tional interest in H.R. 1907, the Trade Faci-
litation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015,
and your willingness to forego consideration
by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Financial
Services has a valid jurisdictional interest in
certain provisions of the bill and that the
Committee's jurisdiction will not be ad-
versely affected by your decision to forego
consideration. As you have requested, I will
support your request for an appropriate ap-
pointment of outside conferees from your
committee in the event of a House-Senate
conference on this or similar legislation
should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter
and this response in the Congressional
Record during the floor consideration of H.R.
1907. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN, I am writing with
respect to H.R. 1907, the "Trade Facilitation
and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015." As a re-
sult of your having consulted with us on pro-
visions in H.R. 1907 that fall within the Rule
X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judi-
ciary, I agree to waive consideration of this
bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to
the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action
with our mutual understanding that by fore-
going consideration of H.R. 1907 at this time,
we do not waive any jurisdiction over the
subject matter contained in this or similar
legislation, and that our Committee will be
appropriately consulted and involved as the
bill or similar legislation moves forward so
that we may address any remaining issues in

our jurisdiction. Our Committee also re-
serves the right to seek appointment of an
appropriate number of conferees to any
House-Senate conference involving this or
similar legislation, and asks that you sup-
port any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter
confirming this understanding, and would
ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on
this matter be included in the Congressional
Record during Floor consideration of H.R.
1907.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Ray-
burn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your
letter regarding the Committee's jurisdic-
tional interest in H.R. 1907, the Trade Faci-
litation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015,
and your willingness to forego consideration
by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Judiciary
has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain
provisions of the bill and that the Commit-
tee's jurisdiction will not be adversely af-
fected by your decision to forego consid-
eration. As you have requested, I will support
your request for an appropriate appointment
of outside conferees from your committee in
the event of a House-Senate conference on
this or similar legislation should such a con-
ference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter
and this response in the Congressional
Record during the floor consideration of H.R.
1907. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1
minute to the gentleman from Arizona
(Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I thank the gen-
tleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, have you ever had one
of those moments where you are com-
pelled to come running down here and
come up to the mike because you are
so enraged with the duplicity of some
of the things you are hearing?

Beyond the simple facts of the rhet-
oric, looking at the math of our trade
surplus and deficits, the countries that
we actually have trade agreements
with, we have a surplus in manufac-
tured goods; but let's move beyond the
basic math of growing our economy,
the demographics issue we have in our
country, and the need to have markets
around the world.

Some of the crazy things I am seeing
put out in the media by Big Labor, the
willingness to make up stories, to
make up facts, Goebbels would be very
proud of them.

Having paid attention to Arizona
during the NAFTA disputes and some
of the crazy things that were said then,
now, we look back, and it wasn't true.
NAFTA has been a net positive. All the
scary things that were supposed to
happen never happened.

Be careful that we are not getting conned by made-up stories. This is good for America.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want everybody to understand how these three bills are sequenced and how and why they were set up this way by the majority so people will understand our votes.

The sequence is the first vote will be TAA; next, TPA; and next, Customs. The reason for TAA being first is to try to maximize the votes among Democrats for TPA. That is really why they were set up this way. Why is Customs last? It is because there are many Democrats who will vote for TPA—at least some, there aren't that many perhaps—who don't like the Customs bill.

Everybody who is listening should understand the rationale for this sequencing, and everybody should understand our reaction to the sequencing and what has happened here.

The way this has evolved is this. For years, I have worked to try to build strong bipartisan support for trade agreements, and we often have succeeded. With Peru, it was over 100 Democrats. We worked on Korea and got less, but the leadership and I voted for it because we worked together eventually for a truly bipartisan bill.

This TPA bill doesn't have that, and essentially, what has happened—in part, because of that—is that the leverage has been lost by the administration, to some extent, and on our side to resist items like in the Customs bill. That is really what is happening here. So this Customs bill has to go over to the Senate, but everybody should understand the predicament that this places the administration and all of us in.

For example, the language regarding Malaysia and human trafficking—or human trafficking generally. What this Customs bill does is to weaken the language that is in the Senate bill. This is on human trafficking, sex human trafficking.

It also relates to workers. Hundreds of thousands of people—for example, in Malaysia, and other countries—essentially come to those countries. Often, their passports are taken. They have no rights. We say this should not happen. Malaysia is in tier 3, and the original amendment said any country in tier 3 should not have the benefits of TPP. This weakens it and places this in—if it succeeds—in the TPA bill.

Secondly, on climate change—we worked hard in the Peru FTA to incorporate the May 10 agreement. We worked hard on worker rights, on environment, on medicines. Actually, because the then-Administration would not negotiate it, Mr. RANGEL and I negotiated the United States-Peru Free Trade Agreement with the Peruvian Government. Let no one say I am not for expanded trade—or lots of other

Democrats. It had an annex in it relating to forestation and deforestation and illegal logging. Why? It is because the Amazon affects all of us, and it affects trade.

Now, what we have is language which, if accepted here and then in the Senate, would essentially preclude that kind of an agreement. That is what happens when you don't proceed on a truly bipartisan basis and there is no leverage for some of us.

Let me also talk about currency. There is also a provision on immigration which could have an impact in terms of the negotiation. I don't know that there will be a provision. What I do know is that this amendment takes out the Schumer amendments on currency.

Let me just say a word. You have put some language into this bill on currency. It is like every other negotiating objective. It is not even Swiss cheese, with lots of holes. It is the weakest kind of cheese that has no real substance to it, except maybe a good taste, but this has a bad taste.

Those negotiating objectives really are not meaningful; they are so vague, and it is the person who negotiates it who judges whether those vague negotiating objectives have been met.

So you take out the Schumer amendment. Now, what has been the impact of currency manipulation on jobs in the United States of America? This is one of the bases of the feeling of a lot of people in various communities, including the labor community, but way beyond—and our citizenry.

Because of Japan's manipulation of currency—and then China's—we lost several million jobs. That is the reality. When people come here and say this bill of theirs, this TPA bill will help in terms of job creation, and they say, as was said many times in various places, these are jobs we have already lost, that is nonsense.

There are more jobs in manufacturing and other places that could be lost that relate to the worker provisions in terms of Mexico, which competes with us, but it also relates to currency manipulation. The President has now said that China is interested, and there will be no meaningful currency manipulation in TPP. Essentially, we are opening the door for more and more currency manipulation.

This is the reason for the depth of our feeling about this TPA and these amendments that will make it even worse. Everybody listening should understand the depth of the feeling from so many of us in and out of this place, every movement—whether labor, environmental, medicines, or whatever—to what is going on here.

I think this Customs bill makes TPA even worse and essentially has tied the hands—because there is not a strong bipartisan basis—I think, of the Administration to really throw its weight

around in terms of these amendments. I am afraid some of them are going to become law, and that should not happen.

I strongly urge strong opposition to this Customs bill, H.R. 644. It is one of the several reasons we should be voting “no” on the three votes that are coming before us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) will now control the time for the majority.

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me start by thanking the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership on the committee and his leadership on this bill. I also want to thank Chairman SESSIONS and members of the Rules Committee for all of their work.

I want to thank Mr. TIBERI, the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, for the tremendous job that he has done. I am grateful to all Members who have offered constructive contributions to this debate.

My colleagues, we are not here today to debate any particular trade bill. The day for that may come, and when it does, we want to make sure that agreement reflects the people's priorities.

That means more jobs, higher pay, and more opportunities for workers, farmers, and small businesses. That is why we want to make sure that this agreement isn't rushed and we want to make sure that there is no agreement that is in secret. We want to make sure—darn sure—that there is less authority for the President and more authority for the people.

That is what this bill does. It is a means to an end, and the end is more free trade that is good for our economy and good for our country, which brings me to another priority in this bill, and that is American leadership.

When America leads, the world is safer, for freedom and for free enterprise. When we don't lead, we are allowing and essentially inviting China to go right on setting the rules of the world economy. What that does is keep our workers and our products on the sidelines.

We are Americans, aren't we? We are not people who stand still. We don't give in to doubt and defeatism. This is one of those moments when we need to remember that this country is an idea. It is an idea of people who choose their own destiny and people who dare to be exceptional.

□ 1200

My colleagues, you will recall that the Prime Minister of Japan was here earlier this spring. And during his address, which was about the need for

America to lead on trade, he talked about how this is an "awesome country" because here, he said, "you just choose the best idea, no matter who it comes from."

Well, today, the best idea is to vote "yes," not for the President, not for ourselves, but for our kids and our grandkids.

I know some Members of this body don't like trade promotion authority, some don't like Trade Adjustment Assistance. But today I am here to vote for both because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly appreciate it, and talking about these three bills, how they are linked together.

But if we look at a couple of them, in particular, the trade adjustment is the equivalent of an execution, but you are getting to choose your last meal. But the end result is you are dead or, in this case, you are losing your job.

I am an electrician with a tie. That is where I started my career. Day in and day out I heard those struggles. I can take you to my district and show you those empty buildings from the failed promises of a trade agreement.

I joined this body on November 12, coming out of the worst economic times, and the first thing we are going to do is kick the American worker, kick him when he is down.

We have empty plants, as I mentioned before. Trade adjustment helps you get a job for lower pay, less benefits, less wages. They call it a trade bill for a reason. You are trading good jobs in here in America for trade jobs—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NORCROSS. They call it a trade bill because they are trading jobs. You lose your good job that has a pension, benefits, and a good wage that can take care of your children, for a job, after you go through the wringer, that pays less than half.

Yeah, we might have more jobs, but they are at the bottom end. They are not the kind that would help raise that.

So this body, if we worked as hard as we are on this bill for a transportation and infrastructure bill, those are jobs that are here today and are for our future and make our country stronger.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, from the time of Ben Franklin, reliable and affordable universal mail delivery service has been an essential commitment here in the

United States, particularly to rural and low-income urban areas like my own.

I am concerned when I hear my constituents assert that our ongoing trade negotiations could undermine our Postal Service. TPA and trade negotiations must not undermine the U.S. Postal Service.

I am also very concerned that continued dumped steel imports are hurting our steel manufacturers. This is a very important industry in my district. Even when we have antidumping duties to counter dumped imports, these duties are often evaded through various schemes, such as sending steel to another country to manufacture steel products, then send the finalized product to the United States.

We must address these problems in this litigation for my support.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concern about the impact of currently negotiated trade agreements on the U.S. Postal Service.

The United States has consistently excluded government services, such as mail delivery, from its obligations in past agreements. It is my understanding that the United States is continuing to do so in the ongoing Trans-Pacific, EU, and Trade in Services negotiations.

In addition, TPA specifically directs that trade agreements take into account legitimate U.S. domestic objectives, which has consistently included providing universal mail services.

Our trade remedy laws are vital for countering unfairly priced and subsidized imports. That is also why I worked with the Steel Caucus here in the House, you being a member of that, to add to our enforcement bill a series of provisions that we call "Level the Playing Field" to strengthen those laws.

Evasion of these laws is also a serious problem, which is why this enforcement bill contains extensive provisions to create new tools and authorities to both prevent and go after evasion.

I thank the gentleman and appreciate his leadership on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. BARLETTA. I thank the chairman for helping me to improve this bill by including STEVE KING's immigration prohibitions and strong tools to stop currency manipulation.

We need to establish a process at Customs that will stop duty evasion, which hurts manufacturers in my district.

You and I, Mr. Chairman, have talked about having Customs investigate and decide duty-evasion cases subject to deadlines. Subjecting the decisionmaking process at Customs to review at the U.S. Court of International Trade will allow U.S. manufacturers

hurt by duty evasion to finally get the relief that they deserve.

Mr. Chairman, do you commit to working with me on achieving these goals in conference?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, I commit to working with the gentleman to improve the bill in conference to level the playing field for American manufacturing and American workers. And I also thank the gentleman for his leadership in ensuring that we fully enforce U.S. trade laws.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and the chair of our caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Trade is pretty simple. We do it every day, whether you are trading in the old car for a newer car, or whether it is the largest economy in the world trading with the rest of the world. We do it every day.

At the end of the day, what we want is a fair deal. I give you something; the benefit of the bargain is I get something back.

Any country that wants access to our markets needs to play by the rules. We can't allow cheating to hurt our workers, their wages, our businesses, or our economy.

And the American people get it. That is why they are so apprehensive about any trade deal this Congress puts before it, because they want to know, will we lead on their behalf? Or are we going to let the special interests dictate the rules?

Will we retreat from our responsibility to make sure that if some foreign company is going to have access to our markets, they are going to play by the rules?

When I take a look at this trade promotion authority legislation, I ask myself, how can you ever get a good trade deal out of this when the rules are rigged against America?

One simple example. Everyone agrees we have had a bipartisan consensus in this House—more than 230 Members have signed on to a letter in the past saying, We have got to stop countries that manipulate their currency to try to make their products produced by their companies look cheaper than American products.

Yet, this legislation would prohibit us from going after the countries that are cheating to prevent the companies in those countries from cheating. So how are we going to stop the companies that we know are pirating, that are stealing, that are cheating against us, how are we ever going to stop them if the rules require us to go through those countries to try to get those companies to abide by the rules?

When the country is cheating, I guarantee you, the companies are going to

cheat. And that is not the way you get foreigners to access our market.

We can do much better. We have to do much better because the American people want us to lead, not retreat.

That is why we should vote this down and get a better deal that the American people know and feel is the right thing for America.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, American trade is critical to strengthening our economy and to giving American workers the competitive advantage that we need so we can go out and sell more of our goods all around the world.

There aren't many impediments for foreign countries to bring their products into our countries and sell their goods here, but there are many, many impediments when we want to sell our products that we make, by American workers, to foreign countries, especially in Asian countries and European countries.

Those countries right now, our allies around the world, want to get good trade agreements, good level playing fields, so that we can have good negotiated trade back and forth and sell more of our products in those countries.

But right now China is writing the rules while America sits on the sidelines. We are not a country that sits on the sidelines, Mr. Speaker.

This bill gets us in the game so America can go out and our workers can compete on a level playing field and we can sell more of our products overseas.

But something else that this bill does, Mr. Speaker, is it actually gives Congress a direct say in the process, every step of the way. We lay out criteria, things that cannot be in trade deals, protections against immigration and global warming-type issues being included in these trade deals.

But it also gives transparency, strong and enforceable rules so that any agreement that is reached would have to be available online, not just for us to read, as Members of Congress, but for the entire Nation to read for at least 60 days before there is even a vote in Congress. And then, of course, Congress would have the ultimate veto authority over a bad deal if it was sent.

This bill is critical to getting America back in the game so our workers can be competitive. And when America competes on a level playing field, we win.

Let's go create those American jobs by passing this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 17½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I take special pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the vote today is why I came to Congress. I promised the working men and women in my district that I would fight to make sure that they had a seat at the table when we were making decisions that impact their life and their livelihood.

We all know that we must grow our economy and we must compete in a global marketplace. We all know what great products the American worker builds, and that we can outcompete anybody in the world. But we cannot compete with the Bank of Japan and the Bank of China.

NAFTA cost us 1 million jobs, and Michigan is still paying the price. The Korea Free Trade Agreement was a great deal for South Korea. They have expanded their imports into this country by almost half a million products. And we have worked to just get 20,000 into that market.

Enough is enough. Congress cannot abdicate its responsibility to the working men and women of this country. It is our responsibility to protect our workers. Fast Track doesn't allow this. We should not pass it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I understand the importance of trade and the impact trade negotiations can have on our local economies, even back home in Illinois.

Currently, 1 in 3 manufacturing jobs depend on exports, and 1 in 3 acres on all American farms are planted for hungry families overseas.

As a Congressman, it is my job to make sure trade agreements protect American workers, farmers, manufacturers, innovators, and service providers by opening markets around the world because, when given a fair playing field, I have the utmost confidence that American companies and industries can outcompete foreign competitors.

But too many times, past trade agreements have left our industries, especially steel, vulnerable to unfair trading practices like dumping.

I will continue to fight for stronger trade enforcement and be committed to protecting American jobs.

I want to thank Chairman RYAN and Subcommittee Chairman TIBERI for their leadership on this issue. And I really want to thank my colleague from Illinois, Representative MIKE BOST, for his tireless efforts to strengthen our trade remedy laws to

protect American workers and more than 2,000 workers at our steel factory in Granite City, Illinois.

I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

□ 1215

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us here in Congress can agree that evasion of antidumping and countervailing duties is a serious problem and needs to be effectively addressed. That is why I rise in support of this bill, because I think it thoroughly and thoughtfully addresses the issue.

The seafood industry in Louisiana has been particularly hit by this, which prompted me to work with industry, the committee, and others in the administration to come up with a legislative fix for the growing problem.

Thankfully, the bill before us today contains language from my PROTECT Act, providing tools for Customs to help out our legitimate importers, distributors, and trade-affected domestic industries to prevent and combat fraud at our border, not after the fact, which makes it much more difficult to deal with.

Specifically, the language in this bill is dedicated to preventing and investigating evasion. Within that unit, there will be a point of contact for private sector evasion allegations who will have the authority to direct these evasion investigations and the duty to inform interested parties. They have to inform the interested parties about the status of the investigations.

We have also increased the types of data that Customs can use to target evading imports, and this language will increase information sharing between the Department of Commerce and the International Trade Commission to effectively investigate evasion.

Finally, the bill sets specific requirements for Customs to adequately train its personnel involved in combating this. These are necessary improvements to stop fraud before it gets to our borders.

I can tell you, I have gotten plenty of comments from folks back in my district. Kimberly Chauvin, who is the owner of Bluewater Shrimp Company in Dulac, Louisiana, said the language "creates provisions that we need. The Senate bill is a watered-down version. If we do not get BOUSTANY's bill, the whole bill does us no good whatsoever."

We need these tools. These tools are essential to effectively combat evasion. Evasion is too important a problem to

remain unaddressed, and I think we are going to get to the best possible agreement on this when we go to conference with this bill.

So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this very important piece of legislation. Let's move the ball forward. Let's really strengthen our laws to combat evasion and get this job done.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of trade promotion authority, or TPA, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, PAUL RYAN, for his leadership on this issue.

TPA, not to be confused with TPP, would put Congress in the driver's seat when it comes to negotiating trade agreements. It would ensure the President is held accountable to Congress and the American people in negotiating all trade deals. TPA, a public document which I have read and is available for the American people to read—in fact, it is right here—would require the President to make public any free trade agreement before it comes to Congress for a vote.

Trade is a vital part of our economy. One in five jobs is supported by trade, and 4.7 million jobs depend on trade in California.

Right now, American companies cannot compete on a level playing field. Trade barriers make it difficult for the U.S. to sell their goods to the 95 percent of consumers that live overseas. Free trade agreements would eliminate these barriers and put in place fair and strong rules for U.S. companies to compete and win.

Furthermore, if Congress fails to pass TPA and set the rules of the global economy, China will. We simply cannot cede our role as the global leader in the 21st century.

I urge my colleagues in the House and the American people to rally behind TPA.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), a member of our committee.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express both strong concern and guarded optimism about the customs bill before us today.

I will be voting against the underlying bill before us today because of the drastic and unnecessary changes the bill makes to TPA provisions related to human trafficking, currency manipulation, and immigration policy. However, I remain optimistic that the customs provisions in this bill can become as strong as the Senate bill during conference.

Senators worked on a bipartisan basis to reach an agreement after nearly a decade of negotiations on how we should be enforcing our trade laws. I am now hoping that House Republicans will be part of getting these provisions across the finish line.

One of my biggest priorities for many years has been finding a way to combat the blatant abuse and duty evasion by some foreign producers that undercut American industry here. Foreign companies use schemes to avoid paying the duties they owe on goods that they import into the United States. That is why I have introduced and fought for the ENFORCE Act. For the first time, it finally feels like we are very close to getting this done.

And to that end, I want to thank Representatives TIBERI and BOUSTANY, along with Chairman RYAN, for several productive discussions on the best way to get this done in conference. I hope that we will be able to keep working on a bipartisan basis to get a final, bipartisan House customs bill.

Giving up on the opportunity to give real teeth to our enforcement procedures would not only be harmful to our economy, but it sends a message to manufacturers, employers, and U.S. workers that this Congress doesn't care about them. By increasing our customs security measures, we can ensure that American companies that play by the rules are not undercut by foreign competitors who cheat by evading duties on their goods.

I urge my colleagues to work to improve this bill by incorporating final language with some teeth. U.S. manufacturers have waited long enough to have customs enforcement that works.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank Chairman RYAN for yielding, and I also thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out three things: trade promotion authority needs to pass, TAA needs to pass, and the customs bill needs to pass. Those are the toggle switches that are set up.

The negotiations with Chairman RYAN could not have been better. I laid two issues out in front: one was my concern that the President would negotiate global warming and climate change; the other one was the strong things that go beyond rumors of the negotiation of immigration provisions into the future trade agreements that would be negotiated under a trade promotion authority.

We addressed those issues. The language in the customs bill is language that is tight. I have confidence in it. It says it shall not obligate the United States to grant access or expand access to visas issued under 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15).

Mr. Speaker, this satisfies my concerns, and I know that enforcement is

a concern. But we are committed to standing together should that day come that we need to do that, and we are hopeful that and expect that the President, who we also anticipate will follow his commitment to sign this bill, will also abide by the provisions in it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the chairman.

We expect the President to abide by the provisions in it. We will follow through on our part of this bargain, if not. And this Congress has an opportunity to veto.

So what a wonderful thing it is to go into a trade promotion authority circumstance and know that for the next 6 to 9 years the U.S. Trade Representative will not be negotiating global warming, will not be negotiating immigration. We preserve that for the United States Congress, as the Constitution directs. So that level of confidence lets us then focus on the trade agreements that are good for the economic growth of the United States of America. That is what is in front of us here today, and I am very grateful we have gotten to this point.

I urge adoption of the customs bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am frustrated to be on the floor today unable to vote for H.R. 644. This bill should be about helping American businesses export more, with greater efficiency, cutting red tape at the border, and enhancing our ability to hold foreign tax cheats accountable. Instead, this bill cuts corners on what matters to America's exporters and those undercut by bad actors abroad and gives special attention to the paranoia of the Republican caucus.

The Senate passed a perfectly good, bipartisan customs bill which had a couple of strong provisions that I have authored in it. That legislation is not what we are considering. Instead, today's bill contains ill-advised language on immigration, climate change. It shorts efforts to deal with human trafficking and currency, and it reverses longstanding American policy towards Israel and settlements.

It is not so much the fact that there were these vote-buying tactics that were used to lard this up with inappropriate items that's concerning, because most will fall off in conference. I am frustrated that provisions that would strengthen the bill and get bipartisan support have been left out.

The Green 301 provisions, to help American businesses working abroad who are put at a competitive disadvantage by operating at or above local environmental laws while native companies get a free pass when it comes to

following what is on the books. It is not fair, and there should be an avenue of redress. The Green 301 would have done that.

And no one benefits from a trade agreement which can't be enforced.

I had the STRONGER Act, a trade enforcement and capacity building provision that I have offered up, that we have attempted to get through here. It is in the Senate bill—and should be in the House bill.

I will be fighting in conference to make sure that these provisions—Green 301 and STRONGER—are protected in the Senate, that we have a customs bill that is worthy of support and some of the goofy stuff gets stripped away.

I will vote for TPA, but I am really frustrated that we don't have a customs bill that we all can support.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, despite a longstanding U.S. policy against the use of offset agreements, many foreign governments continue to insist on using offset agreements, which clearly distort trade, are an unfair trade practice, and result in lost opportunities for American workers.

Offset agreements and military sales contracts are add-on provisions that require U.S. companies to reinvest in foreign companies through the purchase of additional goods and services, technology transfer, foreign-based subcontractor mandates, and other similar activities.

Chairman RYAN, under TPA, how will the Federal Government curb a foreign country's use of military offsets?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank my friend for his question.

I agree that offset agreements distort fair trade. Under TPA, Congress will establish negotiating objectives for the President to seek more open market access for U.S. companies in the reduction, elimination, or prevention of trade distortion and localization barriers. Thus, these provisions will direct the President to seek to curb our negotiating partners' insistence on the use of offset agreements.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentleman for his response, and I look forward to working with him on this important issue.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, many this morning have said TPA will protect American jobs. In Rhode Island, my home State, we know that is not true. TPA will facilitate another bad

trade deal that will result in more American jobs being shipped overseas.

Those who think this trade deal is good should come to Rhode Island and meet with the men and women who still can't find work after decades of a bad trade deal just like this one.

I have listened to former jewelry and textile workers who worked in the once bustling mills in Woonsocket, Pawtucket, and Providence, who don't understand why Congress is considering another trade bill that will eliminate more American jobs.

My State lost over 40,000 jobs after NAFTA, mostly in manufacturing.

Haven't we seen the devastating impact of bad trade deals? Haven't we learned our lesson, that a trade deal that fails to address currency manipulation, that doesn't include enforceable provisions on the environment and on labor is a bad deal for American workers?

Of course we need to compete in a global economy. Of course we need to grow our economy. But we need to do it in a way that protects American jobs and protects American workers. We need fair trade, not just free trade.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST), a member of the Steel Caucus, a Member who has been very passionate on the issue of leveling the playing field.

Mr. BOST. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, American workers can compete when everyone is on the same playing field and has the same rules.

While opening new markets in the U.S., products are important. We must have effective laws that protect companies and their workers from foreign companies who cheat. This includes nations that illegally dump into our markets.

Under our current trade laws, American companies like U.S. Steel in southern Illinois must suffer long-term harm before remedies take effect. You know, that is like waiting until the house burns to the ground before you call the fire department. It doesn't make sense.

That is why I am pleased that we are voting on the Enforcement bill today, which includes language that my friend from Illinois, Congressman RODNEY DAVIS, and I introduced to combat these illegal trade practices. This legislation speeds up the process and helps companies like U.S. Steel respond to illegal dumping before it causes serious harm to the company and its workers.

I encourage my colleagues to support today's bill, and we can protect our businesses and our workers from unfair trade.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the

gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), a member of our leadership team, the Policy Committee director.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of trade promotion authority because I am a conservative who believes trade creates jobs and opportunity.

In my district, farmers grow corn and soybeans and sell them all over the world. Factory workers, like my mom, build faucets, cars, forklifts, and castkets and sell them all over the world.

□ 1230

Trade allows that to happen. When the American worker gets a chance to compete on a level playing field, we win. That is why we need trade agreements.

The truth is, under the policies of this administration, paychecks are shrinking. For many workers, there is more month than money as they struggle to pay their bills. Killing this legislation does nothing to help those workers. In fact, it would only make their situation worse.

Trade-related jobs pay better. And when 95 percent of the Earth's population lives outside the United States, we can't afford to pull up the drawbridges and shut out the rest of the world. That is not smart policy, and it won't help the American worker.

Let's grow our economy. Let's secure good-paying jobs. And let's make sure the American worker leads this century just like we did the last.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished House majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, before I move forward, I want to thank the gentleman. He has shown true leadership in working, and working with everybody, in this House. Any time you take up a large piece of legislation, there are concerns. I have never seen another Member of this House sit with more meaning, more concerns, and try to find a solution, and I thank the chairman for that work.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, when I was headed home to California from D.C. one weekend, I saw something very troubling, but something actually today we can solve for the future. You see, it was February, and there was a labor dispute. There was a shutdown on our ports on the West Coast. So as the plane descended, instead of seeing the beaches stretched throughout California or the Santa Monica mountains, my attention was drawn to the number of ships sitting idle in the ocean and the number of ships that were just sitting in the port. You see, the docks were shut down and our economy was halted.

When Americans cannot have their products moved to willing buyers, the

men and women who are part of the creation do not receive the rewards of their efforts. And in California, we cannot afford to waste any of our resources, especially what we have a short supply of—water. So when the trade was shut down, the food that was produced throughout the Central Valley would just rot on the docks.

But what was most interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, I remember a phone call I got just another weekend after. It was the president of the Republican freshman class here. He had just done a town hall, and he is from Colorado. He said: Mr. Leader, I have got a big issue in Colorado. The ports of the West Coast are shut down. You see, my small businesses are hurt by that. They are hurt when we are not able to have trade.

I remember a big bipartisan press conference we had, Republicans and Democrats alike, the largest one I have ever been a part of in the press room, talking about the ports being shut down, because every single one of their districts were affected, especially the small businesses.

When we cannot trade, our economy suffers and our way of life suffers. In fact, during that same period of this crippling shutdown, our economy actually shrank.

Today, what we are talking about on the floor is trade promotion authority. It allows us to get to an agreement. You know, we have not had it for a few years.

So what has happened around the world while the rest of America sat idle? There have been 100 trade agreements; 100 trade agreements around the world that we would want more of our small businesses to be a part of. You know how many we were a part of during that time? Zero, because we did not have TPA.

You know, trade is the difference between rotting produce on the harbor docks and sending California goods around the world. Trade is the difference between the lines of prosperity and the lines of stagnation.

We have a unique opportunity today. It is not a trade agreement. It is an opportunity. It is an opportunity that will empower each and every Member of this floor to have input, to have transparency, but what is more important, to empower every single American to make sure they are now at the table, that when there is the next trade agreement between countries who want to engage, America won't be left out, America can lead once more.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. All the trade agreements since NAFTA have been sold on the same propaganda, that they will increase our exports and jobs, yet the results have always been the same:

they have multiplied our imports, ballooned our trade deficits, hemorrhaged our jobs, and depressed our wages.

Now we are asked to vote for a fast-track agreement that will say we cannot amend any trade agreements, only vote them up or down, even if they, like their predecessors, lack any means of protecting our workers from competition with workers who are paid 30 cents an hour and are assassinated if they try to form a union.

We know there will be a provision for private corporate tribunals that can invalidate and render unenforceable American laws and regulations. It is our constitutional duty to regulate foreign commerce and trade agreements, not take them on a take-it-or-leave-it basis from the executive branch. It is our constitutional duty to protect the American sovereignty against foreign companies invalidating our laws through private corporate tribunals.

We must vote "no" on fast track to allow Congress to do its job to see that the next trade agreement doesn't hemorrhage our jobs, doesn't ignore currency manipulation, and doesn't invalidate our consumer, labor, and environmental laws. We must say "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of an impassioned debate on trade promotion authority, trade adjustment assistance, and trade enforcement. We are hearing arguments from our colleagues on both sides of this issue, from both sides of the aisle. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to serve as the voice of my constituents from south Florida, who directly see the impact of these free trade agreements every single day.

The United States currently has 20 free trade agreements, 11 of which are with countries in South and Central America. Miami is often called the gateway to the Americas, and I am proud to represent a diverse and proud community that has seen the positive impact of free trade. Workers in south Florida create goods and services that are used throughout the world, something that is only made possible with free trade agreements.

Congress must pass TPA so the United States can open up new markets. Since 2007, there have been over 100 agreements signed on a global scale while our country has sat idly by.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want the American people's representatives to have a strong hand in negotiating future free trade agreements, and this TPA bill ensures this will happen. It provides unprecedented amounts of time for the agreements to

be read and ensures proper safeguards are in place for Congress, not the President, to drive the agenda on the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a "yes" vote on TAA, TPA, and trade enforcement. If anyone has any doubts as to whether TPA is good for our country, I encourage you to visit south Florida.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), who I think has lost his voice.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak long as I have lost my voice.

If we pass fast track, the American workers will lose their voice. This is wrong. The President has said that social mobility and income inequality are the issues of our time. If I really believed that anything we are voting on here would do anything to address that, I would sincerely be voting "yes," but it doesn't.

After 20 years of NAFTA and CAFTA and every sort of trade agreement, we have not seen our middle class benefit. Let's finally use this time to rebuild the American middle class and stand up for our workers.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a Member from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, today's vote is about America's future. Who will shape it? It is not shaped by a recitation of grievance. It is not shaped by making trade a symbol of all that we find bad in economic progress. It is by seizing that future and shaping it, and that is what TPA does. It pries open foreign markets. It sets American rules setting. It allows us to frame the issues in 40 percent of the world's trade and economic activity.

We have never had an opportunity as important as this one to shape the global economy to our advantage and to those of our trading partners. We must not lose this opportunity.

The grievances are legitimate, the concerns and fears are legitimate, but we must look beyond them. We must address the future for future generations of American workers. I support the bill in front of us and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Again, I thank Mr. RYAN for his courtesy.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. I insert in the RECORD a chart showing that we have a \$100 billion trade deficit with our FTA countries. Those are the official statistics of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

PUBLIC CITIZEN,
Washington, DC, February 2015.
JOB-KILLING TRADE DEFICITS SURGE UNDER
FTAs: U.S. TRADE DEFICITS GROW MORE
THAN 425% WITH FTA COUNTRIES, BUT DE-
CLINE 11% WITH NON-FTA COUNTRIES

The aggregate U.S. goods trade deficit with Free Trade Agreement (FTA) partners is more than five times as high as before the deals went into effect, while the aggregate trade deficit with non-FTA countries has actually fallen. The key differences are soaring imports into the United States from FTA partners and lower growth in U.S. exports to

those nations than to non-FTA nations. Growth of U.S. exports to FTA partners has been 20 percent lower than U.S. export growth to the rest of the world over the last decade (annual average growth of 5.3 percent to non-FTA nations vs. 4.3 percent to FTA nations from 2004 to 2014).

The aggregate U.S. trade deficit with FTA partners has increased by about \$144 billion, or 427 percent, since the FTAs were implemented. In contrast, the aggregate trade deficit with all non-FTA countries has decreased by about \$95 billion, or 11 percent, since 2006 (the median entry date of existing

FTAs). Using the Obama administration's net exports-to-jobs ratio, the FTA trade deficit surge implies the loss of about 780,000 U.S. jobs. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) contributed the most to the widening FTA deficit—under NAFTA, the U.S. trade deficit with Canada has ballooned and a U.S. trade surplus with Mexico has turned into a nearly \$100 billion deficit. More recent deals have produced similar results. Under the 2012 Korea FTA, the U.S. template for the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the U.S. trade deficit with Korea has already surged 72 percent.

FTA partner	Entry date	Pre-FTA trade balance	2014 Balance	Change in balance since FTA
Israel *	1985	(\$1.0)	(\$15.2)	(\$14.2)
Canada	1989	(23.9)	(82.4)	(58.5)
Mexico	1994	2.6	(99.8)	(102.3)
Jordan	2001	0.3	0.6	0.3
Chile	2004	(2.0)	5.8	7.8
Singapore	2004	0.8	10.2	9.4
Australia	2005	7.4	13.6	6.2
Bahrain	2006	(0.1)	0.1	0.2
El Salvador	2006	(0.2)	0.7	0.9
Guatemala	2006	(0.6)	1.5	2.1
Honduras	2006	(0.7)	1.2	1.9
Morocco	2006	0.1	1.0	1.0
Nicaragua	2006	(0.7)	(2.2)	(1.5)
Dominican Republic	2007	0.6	2.8	2.2
Costa Rica	2009	1.2	(3.2)	(4.4)
Oman	2009	0.6	0.9	0.4
Peru	2009	(0.2)	2.9	3.0
Korea	2012	(15.4)	(26.6)	(11.2)
Colombia	2012	(10.0)	(1.2)	11.2
Panama	2012	7.8	9.4	1.6
FTA TOTAL:		(\$33.7)	(\$177.5)	(\$143.9)
Non-FTA TOTAL:	[2006]	(\$829.3)	(\$734.2)	\$95.1
FTA Deficit Increase: 427% Non-FTA Deficit Decrease: 11%				

Source: U.S. International Trade Commission. Units: billions of 2014 dollars. (*Measured since 1989 due to data availability)

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, Members, trade adjustment assistance should not be a sweetener, a trade-in coin. Trade adjustment assistance should be what we do no matter what. It shouldn't pave the way for trade promotion authority.

It is important and good to stand with dislocated workers who basically are pushed off their jobs because of bad trade deals, which we have been pursuing for 40 years. Yet here we are today, told that we have got to vote for this trade adjustment authority, which does not include public sector workers, which is smaller than it should be. We have got to support it because—and the only reason we are here to support it, the only reason we have been lobbied by no less than the President and three top Cabinet officials, is because they know it paves the way to trade promotion authority, which is what they really want so that, literally, Members give up our constitutional duty.

Where are my constitutional conservatives when you need them?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I come from Flint, Michigan. Flint, Michigan, was the birthplace of General Motors, a place that put the world on wheels. In

the last couple of decades, it has seen 90 percent of our manufacturing jobs go away. Now, true, not all of them were lost because of bad trade deals, but many of them were. And bad trade deals have exacerbated that job loss and have ruined many parts of that community.

I support, as virtually all of us do, expanded trade as a way of growing the U.S. economy. I am a member of the President's Export Council. This is something we have to do. But this TPA is not a "yes" or "no" question on whether we should expand trade. This TPA is flawed. It fails to address the most significant trade barriers hurting American manufacturers. It fails to address currency manipulation by our trading partners. And if we don't address the most significant barrier, how can we expect any trade deal to have the effect? All we have to do is look at the performance of past deals that have had similar flaws and we can see why we have failed.

If we are going to engage in expanded trade, we have to do it right, in a way that deals with currency, that deals with labor obligations, that deals with environmental obligations.

□ 1245

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, today's vote to grant the President trade promotion authority is about America's future in a globalized world.

Let's be clear what is at stake. America's standing as a global leader has not come without strong leadership from this body, and it will not be sustained if we act out of fear rather than on facts. The most basic fact is that nations around the world are fighting for trade agreements for every advantage they can get for their economies and their workers.

It then raises the question: If we don't pass this agreement, who will set the standards of trade? Will it be us, or will it be China? If this bill fails, it will be China.

The bill before us today is a bipartisan effort to ensure that trade deals negotiated by the Executive will be guided by congressional directives to reach the highest, most transparent, and progressive standards ever required by law.

This bill should have the support of any Member who cares about the enforceable labor and environmental standards, promoting the rule of law, greater congressional oversight, and greater transparency for the American people.

Today, we are also considering Trade Adjustment Assistance, a program that for years Democrats have promoted to provide income and job training for those affected. TAA should pass also.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), chairman of the Trade Subcommittee and member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and thank him for his leadership, credible leadership, on this debate, about American leadership, quite frankly.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are here to debate three bills today: trade assistance for displaced workers, trade promotional and accountability authority that inserts Congress into the President's ability under the Constitution to negotiate a trade agreement with anybody he or she wants, and then finally customs and enforcement.

Enforcement is critical, ladies and gentlemen. It is a bill I am so thrilled and honored to have had the opportunity to introduce here in the House. This is a key bill as part of trade. Far too long, we haven't had as good of enforcement, quite frankly, as we need to have, and I am committed to that.

Now, let me just mention one thing—trade deficits, trade surpluses. We have 20 countries that we have agreements with, trade agreements with, 20 of them. Two of them happen to be on our borders, Mexico and Canada.

You take out energy that we import from them—and I would rather import it from them than anywhere else in the world—we have a trade surplus with those 20 countries, a surplus in manufacturing.

My dad was in manufacturing. I already told you before—and Mr. LEVIN has heard this 1,000 times, I think; he is probably tired of hearing it—my dad lost his job of 25 years, and I lost my health care as a kid in the household, along with my sisters, long before NAFTA.

Globalization began occurring, as Dr. BOUSTANY said, after World War II. We can either engage or disengage. When we disengage, we lose. When America engages, we win. We can outwork anybody.

What trade agreements do actually is break down barriers so we can compete, and then we have to have the enforcement piece. Ladies and gentlemen, that is what this is about. It is about breaking down barriers.

My State of Ohio has been devastated by globalization. My dad's job before NAFTA was devastated by globalization. Forty-eight countries in Asia have had trade agreements with

each other. For the last 10 years, we are party to two. The world is passing us by. We are being left behind. We can compete if we break down barriers. That is what we need to do today.

Trade assistance—insert Congress into the President's ability to negotiate because he already has that ability. This doesn't change that. This inserts us. This inserts slow track. With that agreement, whatever that agreement is, in Asia, in Europe, 60 days in public before the President can sign it, 60 days.

I wish I had 6 hours—6 hours—to review the Affordable Care Act before I had to vote on it. This is 60 days where Members will have an ability to look at what was negotiated. If we don't like it, we will vote it down. We have the constitutional authority to do that.

This is about jobs. Vote all three bills “yes.”

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of American workers, American manufacturing, and the environment and in strong opposition to TPA.

TPA is woefully inadequate when it comes to stopping currency manipulation, enforcing labor standards, and protecting American consumer and environmental protections. This is exactly the wrong time for Congress to be giving up its authority, which is our constituents' ability to have a voice on trade deals.

This is not labor versus business. Lapham-Hickey Steel, Independence Tube, and countless other manufacturers across my district oppose this. Ford Motor opposes this because they know past trade agreements sold as economic boons have been a bust, and they are gravely concerned about how the massive TPP enabled by this TPA will kill more Americans jobs. We need fair trade and American workers will win, but that is not what they are being given.

It is time for Congress to stand up for the middle class and American manufacturing and stop passing bad trade deals. Vote “no” on TPA.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This reminds me of the song: Are you going to believe me or your lying eyes? When you come from areas of the country that some of us represent, you see what has happened with these trade deals.

Adelphi factory in Warren, Ohio, had 13,000 workers. NAFTA passed; they moved over the border and ship their products back to the United States. We will be lucky if there are even 2,000

workers there. An auto plant had 16,000 workers, General Motors. Now, they are down to 3,000–4,000 because of the trade agreements.

The chairman talked about currency manipulation. We have countries shipping products to the United States; their final product lands on our shores, and it is the same cost as the raw materials for the American company. That is not free trade. That is not fair trade. That is a raw deal for the companies in the United States and the American workers.

Let's even say that these trade agreements are good for the economy, as many people may believe. You still need immigration reform; you still need a transportation bill; you still need investments in research, in biosciences, and renewable energy.

I can't believe that some of us are voting for this and not getting any of those other things implemented. No, no, no.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in strong support of trade. It is time for us to lead. When you open up markets to our manufacturers, to our workers, you are creating jobs here on American soil.

I am a firm believer in U.S. manufacturing, Mr. Speaker. I co-chair with my colleague from Ohio the Manufacturing Caucus here, and what we are seeing is a renaissance in U.S. manufacturing. We are finally driving utility costs down. We are creating an opportunity where U.S. manufacturers are coming back on shore.

What do we need to do? We need to create markets. Ninety-five percent of the world's population lives outside of America's borders. Forty percent of the world's market is represented in the negotiations that are going on with the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Why in the world would we not lead and negotiate an openness and fair level playing field for our American workers and our American manufacturers? It doesn't make any sense.

I ask my colleagues to join us, join with us, to open up these markets so that we can create the jobs of today and tomorrow where we make it here to sell it there. That is what this is doing. That is what trade is all about. When we have rules-based trade, our workers and our manufacturers win.

I encourage us not to get into these petty political fights and have some type of litmus test as to who is on whose side in regards to this issue. Stand with the American workers; stand with the American manufacturers; open up those world markets to our rules-based system, and I would agree, at the end of the day, we all win, and America will win.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON), as I understand he hasn't been able to get time from his side.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am for opportunity for everyone and fairness for everyone, including American companies and American workers.

Since leaving my career in the automotive industry, I often run into folks that I used to know from the industry, except now they work at CVS or they work at the TSA. They say: Mr. CLAWSON, any chance the plant is going to open back up? I am having a hard time making ends meet. I am having a hard time paying for my kid's college education.

I, unfortunately, can't give them much hope. If those plants close because of lack of American competitiveness, I can swallow hard, and I can accept it; but when those plants close because of currency manipulations, which is an afterthought today, then I don't accept it, and my sadness for this unemployment turns to hardness, which is where I am today.

This is not about American competitiveness; this is about getting a chance for world-class manufacturing facilities who eliminate jobs.

I say currency manipulation, no way. I say TPA, no way. I say vote "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how many speakers are left on the other side?

Mr. LEVIN. We have one, and I will close.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee, the coauthor of the TPA bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the young chairman from Wisconsin for his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, before we pass TPA today, the law is that the President of the United States can go negotiate whatever he wants without negotiation with the Congress and just go do it and come and plop it on our doorstep.

I disagree with that, and that is why we are doing TPA, trade promotion authority, where the House of Representatives maintains its constitutional prerogatives and is empowering through TPA any President, whoever the President is, for the next 7 years to go negotiate in some 150 parameters as they negotiate.

We maintain our sovereignty in this bill, including additions that we say the President cannot go negotiate—a new global warming trade bill, climate change, he cannot go negotiate anything new on immigration; it goes on and on and on—steel, and other things.

We are giving the President our authority and expecting him to negotiate therein. This is a good deal for the American worker.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my real pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our leader.

□ 1300

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today, we have a very important decision to make in this Congress.

I join with the Speaker in acknowledging the hard work that so many have put in on this important subject.

I want to thank the President of the United States and his administration for being available with their Cabinet officers and the rest to explain to us how they see what is in the TPA—let me call it "fast track" so we separate this out—and what the prospects are now for the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I want to thank our friends in labor, environmental groups, and faith-based groups who have expressed their opposition to so much of what has been presented, all of which will be constructive as we try to move forward with a better trade promotion act—fast track. Not so fast fast track.

We all understand that we live in a global economy. Some of us, as I do, represent cities that are built on trade, the city of San Francisco, and I grew up in a city where the famous clipper ships brought product to and from our shores in Baltimore, Maryland. It is a great and exciting prospect to expand markets for our products and having U.S. global leadership.

I was hopeful from the start of all of this discussion that we could find a path to "yes" for the fast-track legislation that was being put forth. There were some bumps in the road along the way and some potholes along the way—unfortunately, I think, sinkholes as well—but that doesn't mean that that road cannot be repaired. I just believe that it must be lengthened.

Each week, each of us goes home to our districts, and in the case of many of us, we put our hands on a very hot stove. We hear the concerns of so many families who have financial instability and uncertainty. Some of it is still springing from 2008 when they were threatened with the loss of their homes, their jobs, and their pensions, when they were living on their savings, with the inability to send their kids to college—all of it undermining the American Dream. As the economy has improved under the leadership of President Obama, still, middle class economics have not fully turned around the country, because the consumer confidence that people must have in order to invest, to spend, to inject demand into the economy is simply not there.

So my concern about all of this, it is about time. Why are we fast-tracking trade and slow-walking the highway bill? It is about time. Again, people have not recovered from 2008 sufficiently to have the consumer con-

fidence to turn around our consumer economy. I think, today, we have an opportunity to slow down. We all know we want to engage in trade promotion and the rest of that, but we have to slow down. With whatever the deal is with other countries, we want a better deal for America's workers.

Another element of time that I am concerned about is the time that is running out for us to rein in the consequences of climate change. I want to just talk about myself for a moment, and I am bragging. I hold myself second to none in this body on the subject of protecting the environment and recognizing the challenges of climate crisis.

When I first came to the Congress, President George Herbert Walker Bush was President, and he signed my legislation, which is now called the Pelosi Amendment to the International Development and Finance Act of 1989. It said that any of our directors with any of our multilateral development banks had to have an environmental assessment made—and made known—to the indigenous people who were affected by whatever development was there and made known to the world. The connection between the environment and commerce is inseparable, and for over 25 years, the Pelosi Amendment has been in effect.

When I became Speaker, my flagship issue was energy independence and climate, so I speak from some authority on this subject. The son of George Herbert Walker Bush, President George W. Bush, signed the energy bill of 2007. We worked together to find alternatives to fossil fuels. He wanted nuclear, and I wanted renewables. We had a very successful energy bill of 2007, done under the auspices of the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming that I established as Speaker, which has been abolished since then.

Pope Francis, in another week, will be announcing his initiative on climate. While this is all going on—while schoolchildren know that this is a challenge that we must face to protect our planet, while people of faith join us and say, "This is God's creation, and we have a moral responsibility to be good stewards of it"—in this bill today, which is the customs bill that is on the floor right now, it prohibits the USTR from negotiating on climate change. How could it be? Twenty-five years ago, the Pelosi Amendment was passed because we saw melting snow in regions, and areas as big as the United Kingdom were burning in the Amazon. This is 25 years later, and we are putting in the bill that the USTR cannot negotiate on climate change. You cannot separate commerce and the environment.

I salute the President. He has been magnificent and courageous in going out there and taking up the fight for America's leadership on climate

change. He has been great. He has an agreement with China, which almost could not have been foreseen except for his leadership and the cooperation between our two countries. So it is not that he isn't doing his part. It is Congress. Again, it is about time, slowing down our responses when we should be proactive, yet fast-tracking legislation to do that.

What is interesting is, we in the House, are we labeling ourselves the "lower body" and giving new meaning to that term when the Senate could have opportunity for amendment after amendment if their colleagues gave them the votes? In this House, we fast-track the fast track with no chance to amend any of it. Just vote it up or down. I find that unnecessary, unacceptable, and one place we could go to have a discussion on how to improve the fast-track legislation. At the same time, the Republican majority is allowing in the customs bill amendments to the fast-track bill, this amendment on climate, other amendments on immigration, and they were spelled out by Mr. SESSIONS earlier and with great pride—amendments to the fast track in the customs bill but no amendments for Democrats. Again, I don't see how this Congress can ignore that. I don't see how this trade agreement can ignore it.

Much has been said about security issues that are involved in this agreement and that we have to make a geopolitical case for this trade agreement. Of course, we always have the safety of the American people as our first responsibility. Their security is what we come here to protect. Yet how could it be that we are allowing—again, let me say it another way because I am being very prayerful about this. Pope Paul VI said—I mentioned Francis earlier—if you want peace, work for justice, economic justice. I don't see this happening in this fast-track bill, or the lifting up of people in the rest of the world or having trade agreements that increase the paycheck of America's workers. That should be our first order of business—environmental justice, looking at these prohibitions on dealing with climate in 11 other countries in the world and then our own.

I commend the President because, in the fast-track bill, there are some good provisions, issues, on the environment. I am talking about an ethic, a responsibility, a comprehensive view of the future. Again, the Pelosi Amendment addressed the indigenous people, all of these people, who will be not of the first, shall we say, priority for many of these countries as they make their economic decisions.

On the subject of security, last year, 16 former three- and four-star generals and admirals who served on the CNA Corporation's Military Advisory Board released a report, and 16 former three- and four-star generals said that cli-

mate change is a catalyst for conflict. Climate change, they said, will have an impact on military readiness, strain base resilience both at home and abroad, and it may limit our ability to respond to future demands.

We have rejected fast track before. After NAFTA, President Clinton sent a fast-track bill to the Congress, and it didn't even have enough votes to be taken up. The second time, it was rejected. When we had a majority in the House, we did not have fast track for President Bush. So, when people say this is the first time, it isn't so. Instead, under the leadership of Mr. LEVIN and Mr. RANGEL, we had the May 10 agreement with the basic principles of how we should engage other countries. That is part of—and thank you, Mr. President—what the TPA has as its goals, but we were dealing bilaterally, one country at a time. This is a multilateral agreement with 11 other countries—12 countries and growing—and we need to slow this fast track down. I think it is possible.

One of the questions that arises is the question of the trade adjustment assistance. Most of us have not only voted for this but have been champions of it over time. In speaking about myself again, it was one of the first issues I dealt with when I came to the Congress. It is really important, but as some of my colleagues have said, our people would rather have a job than trade adjustment assistance. I talked about that red-hot stove that people put their hands on when they go home. Mr. CICILLINE talked about his district, Mr. NORCROSS about his, Mr. BOYLE about his, and the list goes on and on. How do we say to these people, "We are here for you; you are our top priority" when the impression that they have is that this is not a good deal for them? But it can be. I am hopeful that it can be. So, while I am a big supporter of TAA, if TAA slows down the fast track, I am prepared to vote against TAA because, then, its defeat, sad to say, is the only way that we will be able to slow down the fast track.

Now, I understand there will be some manipulations here one way or another as to what bill comes first and what can come up and what can't, but the facts are these, actually: if TAA fails, the fast track bill is stopped. They may take up the vote, as they said they would not, but they have changed. They may take up the vote, but it doesn't go anyplace. It is stuck in the station. And for that reason, because the Senate has sent us the bill that way, connected—and if the fast track passes, we will need TAA—sadly, I would vote against the TAA, and I just wanted you to know where I was coming from on that.

For these and other reasons, I will be voting today to slow down the fast track in order to get a better deal for the American people—bigger pay-

checks, better infrastructure. Help the American people fulfill the American Dream.

Again, I thank Mr. LEVIN for his leadership, and I thank all of our colleagues who have worked so hard on this, really, on both sides of the issue.

□ 1315

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. How much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Given that I have the right to close, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am ready to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today the votes on TAA and TPA are combined, and we did not do that. The Republicans did so to win votes for TPA, so they used TAA as a bargaining chip. I don't support their doing so, as someone who has been a lead sponsor of TAA. Voting "no" on TAA gives us a better chance to get all of these issues right.

Throughout my career, I have voted on lots of trade agreements, and I have voted for most of them. I negotiated a few of them when USTR would not do so. As mentioned, we Democrats are responsible for the labor and environmental standards and, very importantly, access to medicines that we worked out with difficulty also on May 10. So we Democrats built the foundation, and we don't want to see it eroded. Language in bills isn't enough; it is what will happen in terms of the implementation of that language.

I want to say just a few words about jobs, because it is often said we have lost those jobs, they have gone away, so, therefore, don't worry. There are millions of jobs in this country that are in danger of being lost if we don't do trade right. That is why we need to do it right. I think TPA essentially puts TPP on a fast track when it is on the wrong track. It is on the wrong track. There are negotiating objectives, but they are so vague, they don't really mean anything.

We put forth a very, very important alternative, a substitute bill that laid out instructions on each of these 10 or 11 issues, whether it was workers' rights—I can go down the list—currency, environment, investment, access to medicines, automotive market access, rules of origin, tobacco controls, state-owned enterprises, agricultural market access, food safety. There has been a response to none of these.

So as someone who believes in expanded trade, we have to do better, and to fast-track TPA is on the wrong track. I urge a "no" vote on all of these bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I make two points. This is about bringing transparency and accountability to government. We are not considering a trade agreement today. We are considering a process by which we consider trade agreements. That is what trade promotion authority is. In this process, we are saying you have got to let Members of Congress see the negotiating text, you have got to let the country see a trade agreement once an agreement is reached, and you have got to follow Congress' rules, Congress' direction. That is what this does to make sure that the executive branch follows the track laid out by the legislative branch. The bigger point is this: this is about jobs; it is about income, take-home pay, American leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the world is watching us right now. They are watching this vote. Since TPA lapsed in 2007, the rest of the world kept going. While America stood still on trade, the rest of the world created 100 trade agreements, negotiated and passed 100 trade agreements, to which the United States was a party to zero of them. What this means is other countries are going around the world getting better agreements between other countries, lower tariffs, lower nontariff barriers, so their trade grows, and as a result the barriers against American products go higher.

Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers don't live here; they live in other countries. If we want good jobs and good wages, we need to make and grow more things in America and sell them overseas. What is happening is, every single day we do nothing to open these markets up, we lose, and the rest of the world gets those jobs.

The last point is a point that I think people don't appreciate as well. We are in the dawn of the 21st century with enormous issues: cyber threats, intellectual property, you name it. The rule book on how the global economy works is being written right now. The only way for us to be in the game to write that rule book is through trade agreements: get other countries to agree to our rules, get other countries to agree to our standards, open their markets to our products. That is how we write the rules for the global economy. That is how America leads.

A "no" vote is to say America can't even try. A "yes" vote is to say more transparency, more accountability. Then Congress decides, and we are giving America a chance to stay in the leading position in the world. That is why I argue for a "yes," "yes," "yes" vote.

I want to thank everyone on the staff of the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee.

Our staff director, Angela Ellard, Geoff Antell, Stephen Claeys, Nasim, Neena Shenai, Casey Higgins, Paul Guaglianone.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to fast track author-

ity and the Trade Act of 2015. Passage of this legislation today will undermine Congress's constitutional authority to regulate trade and, I fear, accelerate the de-industrialization of our great country.

The Constitution is very clear that it is Congress, and Congress alone, that has the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations." Passage of fast track, which grants the Executive Branch authority over how and when legislation must be considered by Congress, undermines our chamber's very ability to effectively regulate foreign commerce.

I share the concerns of many Members and middle class families in Texas and around the country about the Trans-Pacific Partnership—TPP—this mega-trade deal we are negotiating with Japan, Vietnam, and other countries.

To this date, Congress has been left in the dark as to what's in TPP, let alone made public to the American people. We are told that TPP will help American businesses export billions of dollars of manufactured and services each year and has labor and environmental protections that all countries will have to abide by. But we simply don't know because we haven't seen the text.

What I do know is that these so-called free trade deals have displaced millions of middle class jobs to developing countries over the past 20 years.

Our district in Houston and Harris County, Texas saw first-hand the consequences of free trade when five plants moved to Mexico in the years immediately after we joined NAFTA.

If TPP benefits the American people as much its supporters say, it doesn't need fast track. It can—and should—be considered under regular order and give Congress and the American people the time to debate the merits of this trade agreement, the largest our country has ever negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Members from both sides of the aisle to stand with America's working families and small businesses and to vote no on fast track.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Customs bill—a bill that was included as part of a trade package that includes Trade Adjustment Assistance and Trade Promotion Authority, also known as Fast Track. This vote represents a flawed and hurried process to expedite the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. Moreover, the Customs Bill fails to strengthen trade policy and enforcement and instead is being used as a way to weaken TPA and its negotiating objectives.

While the Customs bill is designed to modernize customs operations and promote enforcement at the border through trade laws, it takes a number of steps back in these areas. For example, this bill cuts funding for the Inter-agency Trade Enforcement Center and the Trade Enforcement Trust Fund. It also removes a currency manipulation provision that passed out of the Senate with bipartisan support that would have imposed countervailing duties against countries that manipulate their currencies. I am also troubled by a provision that weakens a human trafficking negotiating objective that would have prevented the U.S. from entering into trade agreements with countries in the State Department Human

Trafficking Report such as Malaysia, by allowing the President to simply certify that countries are taking "concrete steps" to address human trafficking.

In addition, I am deeply opposed to a new negotiating objective that was added in the 11th hour, which ensures that trade agreements do not create new obligations related to combating climate change or that would require changes in U.S. domestic laws. Trade agreements must not restrict our ability to tackle climate change in the 21st century.

This bill also adds restrictive language related to immigration to ensure that trade agreements do not require changes to U.S. immigration laws or the issuance of new visas.

Mr. Speaker, we have to strengthen TPA and its negotiating objectives—not weaken it. We must improve TPA before moving forward on any future trade agreement that will have wide-ranging consequences for America's working class. I strongly urge a "no" vote.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, although I oppose H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, I rise in support of Section 302 of the bill because it wisely allows Customs and Border Protection (CBP) the flexibility to determine when there is a suspicion that goods are counterfeit. The section clarifies that CBP shall consult with Intellectual Property (IP) owners and preserves the flexibility of customs to first consult as appropriate with the importer. However, it does not direct CBP to modify in any particular way its procedures regarding notice to importers prior to determining whether there is a suspicion that their detained goods are possibly counterfeit. This should result in earlier and more accurate decisions by CBP and preserve the ability of lawful importers to protect their confidential information from disclosure.

I am aware of cases where importers of genuine material have suffered significant and real costs because of CBP suspicions that the material was counterfeit. These losses occurred because shipments that were detained or seized were ultimately determined to be genuine and released long after their arrival and expected delivery dates. For example, in one case, a company suffered delays and increased costs for over 17 shipments that were seized or intensively examined by CBP over a three-month period after which all of the goods were ultimately determined to be genuine and were released long after their arrival and expected delivery dates. In another case, a company reported one shipment was seized and another one was detained for more than 30 days before both of these shipments were found to be genuine and were released. As a result of these long delays, the importers in each of these cases suffered significant costs for storage, brokerage, legal fees, product damage, and losses in customer good will.

I thank Chairman RYAN as well as the other Ways & Means Committee members who remain as committed as I am to preventing counterfeit merchandise from crossing our borders. I look forward to working with them to ensure smooth implementation of this new policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion to

concur with an amendment is postponed.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 305, the previous question is ordered.

The question of adoption of the motion is divided. The first portion of the divided question is on concurring in section 212 of the Senate amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 305, the first portion of the divided question is adopted.

Pursuant to House Resolution 305, the second portion of the divided question is: Will the House concur in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the second portion of the divided question will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the remaining portion of the divided question, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 302, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

AYES—126

Aderholt	Curbelo (FL)	Johnson, E. B.
Ashford	Davis (CA)	Jolly
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Katko
Barr	Delaney	Kelly (PA)
Barton	DelBene	Kilmer
Bass	Dent	Kind
Benishek	Dold	King (NY)
Bera	Donovan	Kinzing (IL)
Beyer	Emmer (MN)	Kline
Bishop (MI)	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Blum	Farr	Larson (CT)
Blumenauer	Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer
Bonamici	Fortenberry	Marino
Bost	Foster	McCarthy
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Brooks (IN)	Grothman	McMorris
Calvert	Guinta	Rodgers
Carney	Guthrie	Meehan
Clyburn	Hanna	Meeks
Coffman	Heck (WA)	Messer
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Mica
Comstock	Himes	Miller (MI)
Cannolly	Hoyer	Moolenaar
Cooper	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Costa	Hurt (VA)	Nunes
Costello (PA)	Israel	O'Rourke
Crenshaw	Issa	Paulsen
Cuellar	Johnson (OH)	Perlmutter

Peters	Royce
Pitts	Ryan (WI)
Polis	Scalise
Price (NC)	Schrader
Quigley	Sewell (AL)
Reed	Shimkus
Reichert	Shuster
Rice (NY)	Simpson
Richmond	Smith (WA)
Rigell	Stefanik
Rogers (AL)	Stivers
Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Rokita	Thornberry
Roskam	Tiberi

NOES—302

Abraham	Engel	Levin
Adams	Esty	Lewis
Aguilar	Farenthold	Lieu, Ted
Allen	Fattah	Lipinski
Amash	Fincher	LoBiondo
Babin	Fleischmann	Loeback
Beatty	Fleming	Loftgren
Becerra	Flores	Long
Bilirakis	Forbes	Loudermilk
Bishop (GA)	Fox	Love
Bishop (UT)	Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal
Black	Franks (AZ)	Lowey
Blackburn	Fudge	Lucas
Boehner	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham
Boyle, Brendan F.	Galleo	(NM)
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brat	Garrett	(NM)
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Lummis
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	Lynch
Brown (FL)	Gohmert	MacArthur
Brownley (CA)	Goodlatte	Maloney
Buchanan	Gowdy	Gosar
Buck	Graham	Maloney, Sean
Bucshon	Granger	Marchant
Burgess	Graves (GA)	Massie
Bustos	Graves (LA)	Matsui
Butterfield	Grayson	McCaul
Byrne	Green, Al	McClintock
Capps	Green, Gene	McCollum
Capuano	Griffith	McDermott
Cárdenas	Grijalva	McGovern
Carter (GA)	Gutiérrez	McNerney
Carter (TX)	Hahn	McSally
Cartwright	Hardy	Meadows
Castor (FL)	Harper	Meng
Castro (TX)	Harris	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hartzler	Mooney (WV)
Chaffetz	Hastings	Moore
Chu, Judy	Heck (NV)	Moulton
Cicilline	Hensarling	Mullin
Clark (MA)	Hice, Jody B.	Mulvaney
Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Murphy (FL)
Clawson (FL)	Hill	Nadler
Clay	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Cleaver	Holding	Neal
Cohen	Honda	Neugebauer
Collins (GA)	Hudson	Newhouse
Collins (NY)	Huelskamp	Noem
Conaway	Huffman	Nolan
Conyers	Hultgren	Norcross
Cook	Hunter	Nugent
Courtney	Hurd (TX)	Olson
Cramer	Jackson Lee	Palazzo
Crawford	Jeffries	Pallone
Crowley	Jenkins (KS)	Palmer
Culberson	Jenkins (WV)	Pascarell
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Davis, Danny	Johnson, Sam	Pearce
DeFazio	Jones	Pelosi
DeGette	Jordan	Perry
DeLauro	Joyce	Petersen
Denham	Kaptur	Pingree
DeSantis	Keating	Pittenger
DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)
Deutch	Kennedy	Poliquin
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Pompeo
Dingell	King (IA)	Posey
Doggett	Kirkpatrick	Price, Tom
Doyle, Michael F.	Knight	Rangel
Duckworth	Kuster	Ratcliffe
Duffy	Labrador	Renacci
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Ribble
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rice (SC)
Edwards	Langevin	Roby
Ellison	Latta	Roe (TN)
Ellmers (NC)	Lawrence	Rohrabacher
	Lee	Rooney (FL)
		Ros-Lehtinen

Ross	Sherman	Walker
Rothfus	Sinema	Walorski
Rouzer	Sires	Walz
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter	Waters, Maxine
Ruiz	Smith (MO)	Watson Coleman
Ruppersberger	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
Rush	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)
Russell	Smith (TX)	Welch
Ryan (OH)	Stewart	Wenstrup
Salmon	Stutzman	Westerman
Sánchez, Linda T.	Swalwell (CA)	Westmoreland
Sanchez, Loretta	Takai	Williams
Sanford	Takano	Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	Wittman
Schakowsky	Tipton	Womack
Schiff	Titus	Woodall
Schweikert	Tonko	Yarmuth
Scott (VA)	Torres	Yoder
Scott, Austin	Tsongas	Yoho
Scott, David	Van Hollen	Young (AK)
Sensenbrenner	Veasey	Young (IN)
Serrano	Vela	Zeldin
Sessions	Velázquez	Zinke
	Visclosky	

NOT VOTING—6

Amodei	LaMalfa	Thompson (CA)
Carson (IN)	Speier	Vargas

□ 1347

Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. CRAMER, RENACCI, GIBBS, CARTER of Texas, BOEHNER, BUCSHON, HARPER, JENKINS of West Virginia, CHABOT, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. PITTENGER, BUTTERFIELD, RUSH, and DENHAM changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. MCKINLEY changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the second portion of the divided question was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 361, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 361 I was unavoidably detained in office meeting on the legislation and the roll was closed upon entrance to the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an announcement.

Members are advised that we are proceeding to votes on the remaining two motions. I would advise the Members that the world is watching, and I encourage every Member of the House to vote “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 305, the third portion of the divided question is: Will the House concur in the matter preceding title II of the Senate amendment?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 211, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

AYES—219

Abraham Graves (MO) Pitts
 Allen Grothman Poe (TX)
 Ashford Guinta Polis
 Babin Guthrie Pompeo
 Barletta Hanna Price, Tom
 Barr Hardy Quigley
 Barton Harper Ratcliffe
 Benishek Hartzler Reed
 Bera Heck (NV) Reichert
 Beyer Hensarling Renacci
 Bilirakis Herrera Beutler Ribble
 Bishop (MI) Hice, Jody B. Rice (NY)
 Bishop (UT) Hill Rice (SC)
 Black Himes Rigell
 Blackburn Hinojosa Roby
 Blum Holding Roe (TN)
 Blumenauer Hudson Rogers (AL)
 Boehner Huelskamp Rogers (KY)
 Bonamici Huizenga (MI) Rokita
 Bost Hultgren Rooney (FL)
 Boustany Hurd (TX) Ros-Lehtinen
 Brady (TX) Hurt (VA) Roskam
 Brooks (IN) Issa Ross
 Buchanan Jenkins (KS) Rouzer
 Bucshon Johnson (OH) Royce
 Byrne Johnson, E. B. Ryan (WI)
 Calvert Johnson, Sam Salmon
 Carter (GA) Kelly (MS) Sanford
 Carter (TX) Kelly (PA) Scalise
 Chabot Kilmer Schrader
 Chaffetz Kind Schweikert
 Coffman King (IA) Scott, Austin
 Cole King (NY) Sensenbrenner
 Comstock Kinzinger (IL) Sessions
 Conaway Kline Sewell (AL)
 Connolly Knight Shimkus
 Cooper LaMalfa Shuster
 Costa Lamborn Simpson
 Costello (PA) Lance Smith (MO)
 Cramer Larsen (WA) Smith (NE)
 Crawford Latta Smith (TX)
 Crenshaw Long Stefanik
 Cuellar Loudermilk Stewart
 Culberson Love Stivers
 Curbelo (FL) Lucas Stutzman
 Davis (CA) Luetkemeyer Thompson (PA)
 Davis, Rodney Marchant
 Delaney Marino Thornberry
 DeBene McCarthy Tiberi
 Denham McCaul Tipton
 Dent McClintock Trott
 DeSantis McHenry Turner
 DesJarlais McMorris Upton
 Diaz-Balart Rodgers Valadao
 Dold McSally Wagner
 Duffy Meehan Walberg
 Ellmers (NC) Meeks Walden
 Emmer (MN) Messer Walker
 Farr Mica Walorski
 Fincher Miller (FL) Walters, Mimi
 Fitzpatrick Miller (MI) Wasserman
 Fleischmann Moolenaar Schultz
 Flores Mullin Weber (TX)
 Forbes Murphy (PA) Wenstrup
 Fortenberry Neugebauer Westerman
 Foxx Newhouse Whitfield
 Franks (AZ) Noem Williams
 Frelinghuysen Nunes Wilson (SC)
 Gibbs O'Rourke Womack
 Goodlatte Olson Woodall
 Gowdy Palazzo Yoder
 Granger Paulsen Young (IA)
 Graves (GA) Peters Young (IN)
 Graves (LA) Pittenger Zinke

NOES—211

Adams Bridenstine Carson (IN)
 Aderholt Brooks (AL) Cartwright
 Aguilar Brown (FL) Castor (FL)
 Amash Brownley (CA) Castro (TX)
 Bass Buck Chu, Judy
 Beatty Burgess Cicilline
 Becerra Bustos Clark (MA)
 Bishop (GA) Butterfield Clarke (NY)
 Boyle, Brendan Capps Clawson (FL)
 F. Capuano Clay
 Brady (PA) Cardenas Cleaver
 Brat Carney Clyburn

Cohen Jolly Pelosi
 Collins (GA) Jones Perlmutter
 Collins (NY) Jordan Perry
 Conyers Joyce Peterson
 Cook Kaptur Pingree
 Courtney Katko Pocan
 Crowley Keating Poliquin
 Cummings Kelly (IL) Posey
 Davis, Danny Kennedy Price (NC)
 DeFazio Kildee Rangel
 DeGette Kirkpatrick Richmond
 DeLauro Kuster Rohrabacher
 DeSaulnier Labrador Rothfus
 Deutch Langevin Roybal-Allard
 Dingell Larson (CT) Ruiz
 Doggett Lawrence
 Donovan Lee Ruppertsberger
 Doyle, Michael Levin Rush
 F. Lewis Russell
 Duckworth Lieu, Ted Ryan (OH)
 Duncan (SC) Lipinski Sanchez, Linda
 Duncan (TN) LoBiondo T.
 Edwards Loebbeck Sanchez, Loretta
 Ellison Lofgren Sarbanes
 Engel Lowenthal Schakowsky
 Eshoo Lowey Schiff
 Esty Lujan Grisham Scott (VA)
 Farenthold (NM) Scott, David
 Fattah Lujan, Ben Ray Serrano
 Fleming (NM) Sherman
 Foster Lummis Sinema
 Frankel (FL) Lynch Sires
 Fudge MacArthur Slaughter
 Gabbard Maloney, Carolyn Smith (NJ)
 Gallego Carolyn Smith (WA)
 Garamendi Maloney, Sean Swallow (CA)
 Garrett Massie Takai
 Gibson Matsui Takano
 Gohmert McCollum Thompson (MS)
 Gosar McDermott Titus
 Graham McGovern Tonko
 Grayson McKinley Torres
 Green, Al McNeermy Tsongas
 Green, Gene Meadows Van Hollen
 Griffith Meng Veasey
 Grijalva Mooney (WV) Vela
 Gutierrez Moore Velázquez
 Hahn Moulton Visclosky
 Harris Mulvaney Walz
 Hastings Murphy (FL) Waters, Maxine
 Heck (WA) Nadler Watson Coleman
 Higgins Napolitano Webster (FL)
 Honda Neal Welch
 Hoyer Nolan Westmoreland
 Huffman Norcross Wilson (FL)
 Hunter Nugent Wittman
 Israel Pallone Yarmuth
 Jackson Lee Palmer Yoho
 Jeffries Pascrell Young (AK)
 Jenkins (WV) Payne Zeldin
 Johnson (GA) Pearce

NOT VOTING—4

Amodei Thompson (CA)
 Speier Vargas

□ 1354

So the third portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider this portion of the divided question was laid on the table.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER OFFERED BY MR.

BOEHNER

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Boehner moves that the House reconsider the vote on the question of concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could the Clerk read what the motion is?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote is on the question to reconsider the motion just made by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk will re-report the motion. The Clerk re-read the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on the preceding question will be postponed.

AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 305, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion may be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 190, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

AYES—240

Abraham Brooks (IN) Cramer
 Aderholt Buchanan Crawford
 Allen Buck Crenshaw
 Ashford Bucshon Cuellar
 Babin Burgess Culberson
 Barletta Byrne Curbelo (FL)
 Barr Calvert Davis, Rodney
 Barton Carter (GA) Denham
 Benishek Carter (TX) Dent
 Bilirakis Chabot DeSantis
 Bishop (MI) Chaffetz DesJarlais
 Bishop (UT) Clawson (FL) Diaz-Balart
 Black Coffman Dold
 Blackburn Cole Donovan
 Blum Collins (GA) Duffy
 Boehner Collins (NY) Duncan (SC)
 Bost Comstock Duncan (TN)
 Boustany Conaway Ellmers (NC)
 Brady (TX) Cooper Emmer (MN)
 Bridenstine Costa Farenthold
 Brooks (AL) Costello (PA) Fincher

Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn

Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

NOES—190

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver

Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Amodei
Speier

Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

NOT VOTING—4

Thompson (CA)
Vargas

□ 1414

Messrs. BURGESS and ROHR-
ABACHER changed their vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the motion to concur was agreed
to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish the
record to reflect that I would have voted to
oppose the following items on the House floor
today: 1) Motion to Concur in the Senate
Amendment to H.R. 1314—Trade Act of 2015
(Trade Adjustment Assistance Provision); 2)
Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment to
H.R. 1314—Trade Act of 2015 (Trade Pro-
motion Authority Provision); 3) Motion to Con-
cur in the Senate Amendments with an
Amendment to H.R. 644—Trade Facilitation
and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The un-
finished business is the question on
agreeing to the Speaker's approval of
the Journal, which the Chair will put
de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's ap-
proval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Jour-
nal stands approved.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY,
JUNE 12, 2015, TO MONDAY, JUNE
15, 2015

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speak-
er, I ask unanimous consent that when
the House adjourns today, it adjourn to
meet on Monday, June 15, 2015, when it
shall convene at noon for morning-hour

debate and 2 p.m. for legislative busi-
ness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

THANK THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS
AND MEANS STAFF

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and
was given permission to address the
House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker,
I simply want to thank the incredible
hard work of our staff. In particular, I
would like to single out Angela Ellard,
our chief trade counsel and staff direc-
tor of the Ways and Means trade staff;
Stephen Claeys, our trade counsel;
Geoffrey Antell, our trade counsel;
Neena Shenai, our trade counsel;
Nasim Deylami, our trade counsel;
Casey Higgins, our trade counsel; and
Paul Guaglianone, our legislative as-
sistant.

If it weren't for the late nights, hard
work of our hard-working, dedicated
staff that go all too often unrecognized
around here, this effort would not have
been possible. I just want to say from
the bottom of my heart how appreci-
ative I am for their dedication and
hard work.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF BURNEY
STARKS

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given
permission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend her re-
marks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to
pay tribute to the life of Burney
Starks, a man who was beloved by
many in southern Arizona and who re-
cently, suddenly passed away.

Burney dedicated his life to service
as an Army veteran, a school coun-
selor, and drop-out prevention spe-
cialist for the Tucson Unified School
District. He played football for the
University of Arizona and graduated
from the U of A with honors.

Southern Arizonans will remember
his incredible singing voice, his love
for Motown and karaoke, and his ac-
tive involvement in the community. He
was a lead organizer for the Juneteenth
Festival, and he was involved in many
local organizations, including the Tuc-
son Boys Choir, Tucson MLK Celebra-
tion Committee, and the Warrior
Alumni Foundation.

He had a passion for helping others
succeed and a unique gift for bringing
out their best. I had the distinct pleas-
ure of seeing Burney a few weeks ago
on Memorial Day before he died. He
was as lighthearted and dynamic as
ever.

His smile and laughter will be missed
by many, but no doubt his spirit will
live on through the countless lives he
touched during his life.

DETERMINING A PATH FORWARD

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of hours, we had the opportunity to discuss some important issues that, as they were framed, many Americans might not understand. They are called trade issues or trade legislation to discuss the interactions between the United States and its future world trading partners.

No vote here should be maligned. When I stand here to emphasize that whatever the ultimate results are, if these bills do not generate into actual jobs for our local districts, then we have all failed.

That is the question for this Congress and that is the question for those who are working so intently and for those of us who raise the question whether jobs are created. And we will only move forward if we can determine a pathway of a structure that actually addresses the question of documented jobs, nonlost jobs or substituting jobs for the American people.

Trade, yes, it is business. But it is also the business of the American people and the constituents of the 18th Congressional District in areas like Fifth Ward and southeast and South Park and Acres Home and Independence Heights. It is a question of whether or not jobs are created.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to that answer being answered as "yes."

NATIONAL GUARDSMAN FLORICH BURIAL AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

(Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, this place works. Recently, we had a National Guardsman, Sergeant Florich, who perished along with a number of U.S. marines in the Gulf of Mexico as their Black Hawk went down.

The Secretary of the Army is granted the authority to grant exemptions to allow these heroes to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery. Unfortunately, the initial decision by the Army was to reject Sergeant Florich's burial request and that of his family. He was a fourth-generation Armed Forces military man serving our country.

Just today, Secretary McHugh reversed that decision. Along with the support of 120 Members of this body, on both the Republican and Democrat side, they all came together and asked the Secretary to review the decision.

I want to thank the Members of this House, Republican and Democrat, Members that I want to ask that you

all continue to keep the Florich family in your prayers as his wife is about to deliver their new child.

Thanks again to the Members, Mr. Speaker.

MARITIME NATIONAL HERITAGE ACT

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the end of Capitol Hill Ocean Week.

In my region, the Pacific Ocean was and is central to Native American communities. It also gave rise to a proud maritime tradition along our coast. Entire industries sprang up and, for generations, folks have made a good living as fishermen, boat builders, dock workers, and servicemembers.

The Pacific is a place teaming with a diverse life that we ought to protect for future generations. If we want to protect our natural resources for our children, it is time to cherish our past and protect our future.

With that in mind, I will soon introduce the Maritime National Heritage Act. This legislation would designate the first and only heritage area in the country focused on maritime heritage. It would give Washington State greater access to resources to protect lighthouses, vessels, and other landmarks that contribute to the history and who we are in Washington State.

This bill is a good way to remind folks what our oceans mean to us and why they are so vital.

TO EXTEND THE AUTHORIZATION TO CARRY OUT THE REPLACEMENT OF THE EXISTING MEDICAL CENTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS IN DENVER, COLORADO

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1568) to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, although I don't object.

I just want to thank my friend from Colorado, the authorizing committee, and the appropriators for providing some time through the end of the fiscal year. It gives the Army Corps of Engi-

neers, the VA, and the contractor an opportunity to continue construction of our big VA Medical Center in Colorado. We still have a long-term solution that has to be resolved, but this gives everybody some breathing room to get that done.

With that, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1568

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED.

Section 2(a) of the Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act (Public Law 114-19) is amended—

- (1) by striking "in fiscal year 2015,"; and
- (2) by striking "\$900,000,000" and inserting "\$1,050,000,000".

SEC. 2. LIMITED, ONE-TIME AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER SPECIFIC AMOUNTS TO CARRY OUT MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT IN DENVER, COLORADO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the unobligated balances of amounts available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2015, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may transfer amounts from the appropriations accounts under the following headings, in the amounts and from the activities specified, to the appropriations account under the heading "Construction, Major Projects":

- (1) "Medical Services", \$6,494,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (2) "Medical Support and Compliance", \$1,611,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (3) "Medical Facilities", \$80,735,000 to be derived from amounts available for green energy projects of the Department.
- (4) "National Cemetery Administration", \$60,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (5) "General Administration", \$1,130,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Office of the Secretary.
- (6) "General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration", \$670,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (7) "Information Technology Systems", \$240,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (8) "Construction, Minor Projects", \$3,000,000 to be derived from amounts available for minor construction projects at the staff offices of the Department.

(b) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS AVAILABLE IN FUNDS.—

(1) REVOLVING SUPPLY FUND.—Of the unobligated balances of amounts available in the revolving supply fund of the Department under section 8121 of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary may transfer \$20,030,000 to the appropriations account under the heading "Construction, Major Projects".

(2) FRANCHISE FUND.—Of the unobligated balances of amounts available in the Department of Veterans Affairs Franchise Fund established in title I of the Departments of

Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104-204; 31 U.S.C. 501 note), the Secretary may transfer \$36,030,000 to the appropriations account under the heading "Construction, Major Projects".

(c) USE OF AMOUNTS AND AVAILABILITY.—The amounts transferred under subsections (a) and (b) shall—

(1) be used only to carry out the major medical facility construction project in Denver, Colorado, specified in section 2 of the Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act (Public Law 114-19); and

(2) remain available until September 30, 2016.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADE

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today on behalf of the Michigan 14th District, which includes the great city of Detroit, to make clear my strong opposition to TPP and TAA.

As a native of Detroit and a longtime public servant, I have seen firsthand the devastating impact of global trade agreements like NAFTA. I will always fight for our businesses and manufacturing so that they can remain competitive globally, but never at the expense of hard-working Americans.

The TAA is underfunded by \$125 million. The TAA also excluded public sector workers, which is unacceptable. Passage of TPP and TAA will only increase the risk of loss of American jobs.

I greatly appreciate the help the TAA provides to workers who have lost their jobs in trade in Michigan and the livelihoods of nearly 500,000. This is why I want to be on the record why my vote was a "no."

I will never accept cuts to these training programs. I will never agree to leave any hard-working Americans uncovered.

□ 1430

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, trade promotion authority has passed the House on a pretty good bipartisan basis here. This will give the United States the tools it needs to send a message around the world that we are going to be competitive and we are going to be serious about trade.

It also gives the Congress very important tools to adhere to the principles that we in this House believe are important to hold the USTR and the

White House accountable with all of our principles together for what is good for the country.

When we have huge tariffs on some of the products we try and export around the world, it makes it noncompetitive. This will send, again, a very strong signal the U.S. is ready to compete; it is not going to be pushed around on trade, and TPA will be a good tool to do that.

However, it is not TPP, which we haven't had much input on lately, and is very difficult to get at. People need to understand, there is a strong difference between TPA, that authorization, and TPP, which is still not finished, still not negotiated, and is something that is a complete separate question from TPA, which I think was a responsible measure we got done here today.

We need to clear up the misconceptions on what is happening and the good measures we in this House did today in order to have America and more jobs be able to come home and stay in the U.S. because of better trade policy.

800TH ANNIVERSARY OF MAGNA CARTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 15, we will celebrate the 800th anniversary of Magna Carta, a document that revolutionized the world and is the foundation for the freedoms that so many take for granted today.

It is impossible to overstate the significance of that day at Runnymede in 1215 when King John of England declared that everyone, including the King, was subject to the rule of law; and as a result, constitutional government was born.

Magna Carta is Latin for "great charter," and it was so named because of the document's protracted length. Only later, did the world realize how visionary the name truly is.

Most of the 63 clauses granted by King John dealt with specific grievances of a group of barons relating to his rule, but that framework for the relationship between the King and his subjects initiated the concept of freedom under law.

Clause 1 states:

First, that we have granted to God, and by his present charter have confirmed for us and our heirs in perpetuity, that the English Church shall be free, and shall have its rights undiminished, and its liberties unimpaired. That we wish this so to be observed, appears from the fact that of our own free will, before the outbreak of the present dispute between us and our barons, we granted and confirmed by charter the freedom of the Church's elections—a right reckoned to be of the greatest necessity and importance

to it—and caused this to be confirmed by Pope Innocent III. This freedom we shall observe ourselves, and desire to be observed in good faith by our heirs in perpetuity.

To all free men of our kingdom we have also granted, for us and our heirs forever, all the liberties written out below, to have and to keep for them and their heirs, of us and our heirs.

Clause 12 reads:

No scutage or aid will be levied in our kingdom without its general consent.

Clause 13 says:

The city of London shall enjoy all its ancient liberties and free customs, both by land and by water. We also will and grant that all other cities, boroughs, towns, and ports shall enjoy all their liberties and free customs.

Clause 38 reads:

In future no official shall place a man on trial upon his own unsupported statement, without producing credible witnesses to the truth of it.

Finally, clause 39 states:

No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any way, nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land.

Let me repeat those last few words, Mr. Speaker, "the law of the land." In those words, we see the idea that the law does not come from any individual person or government. To quote Daniel Hannan, who wrote a wonderful essay on the 800th anniversary of Magna Carta for The Wall Street Journal last month: "It is immanent in the land itself, the common inheritance of the people living there."

Mr. Speaker, the language may sound a little stilted, and folks may think, goodness, that doesn't sound like something we would say today, but it is so important for us to understand the direct link between Magna Carta and the Revolution that occurred in this country in 1776.

Although Magna Carta failed to resolve the conflict between King John and his barons, it was reissued several times after his death. Again, Magna Carta's legacy is particularly evident in the documents that form the basis of our government, the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

At the National Archives, visitors to Washington have the opportunity to view one of four surviving originals of the 1297 Magna Carta alongside the remarkable documents it inspired. When visitors come here to the House, I often point out to them on the walls the profiles of the ancient lawgivers. Pope Innocent III is one of those ancient lawgivers shown here in the House.

Again, we can see directly, in many cases, how our Constitution and our Bill of Rights are derived from Magna Carta and also from the Bible, that we can see those direct connections.

Today, I would like to acknowledge the debt of gratitude we owe to those rebel barons with grievances against

their King, and I am reminded that we must always be attentive to the freedom we have inherited.

Ronald Reagan said famously:

Freedom is not in our genes. It is only a generation away from being lost. It is something we have to cherish.

Also, Mr. Speaker, with freedom comes opportunity and responsibility, and I want to say how grateful I am for the opportunity I have had to serve in the House of Representatives along with my colleagues.

I often tell, particularly school-children, when I talk to them about this country and the radical idea that it represents, that I am a person who grew up in a house with no electricity and no running water, extraordinarily poor, and with parents with no privilege, no exalted status in our country.

As I said, with the freedom that we have comes opportunity. We on our side of the aisle—and I know many of my colleagues, or most of my colleagues, on the other side of the aisle—want to see that opportunity that has been made available to those of us who currently serve, many of whom come from no privilege, to be able to hold onto that opportunity.

To do that, Mr. Speaker, we have to hold on to freedom. We are the freest country in the world, and that, the rule of law, and our capitalistic system are those things that make us such a great country.

I want to express again my appreciation to those rebel barons and to all the people who came after them who kept the idea of Magna Carta alive to the time when we could develop our Constitution and Bill of Rights and to the present time when we fight so hard to maintain those principles.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRATULATING ROBERTA GIANFORTONI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, today, it is my honor to recognize and congratulate Roberta Gianfortoni, assistant dean for professional education at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, as she retires after 26 years of service.

Assistant Dean Gianfortoni has been an inspirational leader and adviser in the School of Public Health for more than 4,000 graduates, including myself. Her guidance and mentorship during my time at Harvard opened my eyes to new issues and innovative solutions, inspiring me to think outside the box to address our public health challenges.

The students she mentored have gone on to become doctors, professors, na-

tional and international leaders, and advocates all working to improve public health conditions right here at home and across the globe. Her contributions to our Nation's public health will last for generations.

I cherish my time and the lessons I learned from Assistant Dean Gianfortoni. After 26 years of service, I congratulate her on her retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1445

THE POWER OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it seems so often in this body we tend not to learn from mistakes. We passed a bill—I guess part of a bill—that the Senate sent, referred to as the TPA, but it is all about a trade agreement that will provide a structure in which the President can negotiate and dock other agreements into it. Since the TAA did not pass, then it can't, apparently, go directly to conference unless we pass an amendment to allow it to go to conference or find some other way to effectuate a conference on agreement. Mr. Speaker, I can only surmise that, since the Speaker, himself, moved to reconsider, then there is something afoot in order to keep it from dying, as it should have, since both the TPA and the TAA did not pass.

The TPA, I read it. It has got some good aspects to it, but it is not, in and of itself, free trade. As a judge in a district court—our highest level trial court in Texas—so many times, I would be the fact finder without a jury. So often, you would sit and listen to the evidence, and you would wonder why someone would take the action he did. There has got to be some motivating factor. You consider all of the possibilities.

We had a very rare visit from President Obama to the Capitol, trying to push people to vote for the TPA—this trade agreement—and the TAA. It was great to see him come out to the Congressional Baseball Game last night. It is not something he does regularly. So, Mr. Speaker, I am left to wonder. I mean, we have not seen this President push this hard on very many bills over the last 6½ years, and I am left wondering: Why would President Obama push so hard to pass this trade agreement structure that allows him to negotiate so many deals with so many different countries?

One possibility is he did it because he knew that Speaker BOEHNER was pushing to pass it, and it is possible that he

really wanted to make Speaker BOEHNER and MITCH MCCONNELL, the leader down in the Senate, look good. That is a possibility. I don't think it is terribly probable. In weighing all of the evidence, it would seem to me that it is far more probable that the TPA will give this President far more power to fundamentally transform America in his remaining year and a half or so as President. That is what it appears to be to me.

Now, one of our Republicans speaking, whom I have tremendous respect and admiration for, commented that we are not a nation that sits on the sidelines. I agree that that used to be true, but we have basically sat on the sidelines as Christians and Jews are being persecuted and killed around the world in greater numbers than ever before. We have sat on the sidelines in Nigeria as precious little African girls are kidnapped and brutally, sexually assaulted day after day, month after month.

Then we see an article. According to the article, actually, this administration communicated to Nigeria that, if they will change their laws to provide for same-sex marriage and possibly for abortions to be paid for, then the United States would not continue to sit on the sidelines, that we would actually help them stop radical Islamists. Of course, they didn't use the term "radical Islamists," but that is what they are. They would stop them, the radical Islamists, from continuing to kill and persecute Christians the way they are doing in Nigeria.

I have talked to some folks who have been on a recent trip to eastern Africa and who have met and even prayed with leaders in east Africa. I was going to be on the trip, but, apparently, the Speaker feels, if you oppose him, then you are not allowed to travel, that those rewards are saved for people who vote as he tells them to. I will tell you what: if that is the price of speaking truth to power, it is still a great country.

The people who went on that trip indicated that leaders in eastern Africa had indicated that the United States administration, the Obama administration, was telling them, in essence, what the article said happened in Nigeria, which is that, if you will change your laws to allow for same-sex marriage, though it is totally against their spiritual beliefs as Christians or as Muslims, then we would help them with things like radical Islam, but, otherwise, we are not going to help them.

So I appreciate hearing a Republican say the United States is not a nation that sits on the sidelines, but this administration does. It sits on the sidelines and uses power to fundamentally transform this country and other countries. We have seen that.

I see my very dear friend from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) here on the floor,

and I would like to yield to him for his comments and thoughts.

Mr. MASSIE. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we had a vote on the TPA here, and I just wanted to take some time to explain, and I think my colleague from Texas probably feels the same way. I am for trade. I think trade is good. I am not against trade, but, today, I voted against the trade promotion authority, which would fast track the TPP. I just wanted to take a second to explain why I was compelled to vote against this legislation today.

First of all, like my colleague, I have read the TPP. I have been down to the confidential room. It is a very thick document, and there are two bound volumes, and there is a binder that goes with it as sort of a guide. What struck me the most about this TPP document is the enormity of it. My staff isn't even allowed to read the document. We are not allowed to have access to the Internet while we are in there when we are looking at the document. We are not allowed to take notes from the room, and this document references other bound documents.

So how could I possibly—one person, by myself in a confidential room—understand what some of the unintended consequences of this trade agreement would be if I can't understand the document and if I am not allowed the resources to fully analyze this document? I want there to be more daylight on this document before we put it on a path to approval.

The other reason I voted "no" today was the implication of ceding our authority to the World Trade Organization, which struck me this week when we voted to overturn our country of origin labeling on beef and pork. Now, whether you think we should require companies to label beef and pork when they bring them into this country from another country—whether that is a good thing or whether that is a bad thing—that doesn't matter. What disturbs me is that the reason for writing this law this week was the World Trade Organization told us we had to. They said we have got to do that. We swore an oath to the Constitution, not to the World Trade Organization. My concern is that this trade agreement could bind us to things that we don't even understand yet because, surely, some trade agreement years ago has caused us this week to change our food labeling laws.

The third and final reason I voted against the TPA today—and this may be the best reason, in fact—is that my constituents don't like it. I have received 30 phone calls a day for the past week against this. I might have received 1 or 2 all week saying to vote for it. We didn't get a chip implanted in our brains when we came to Congress that makes us smarter than all of our constituents. I think it is important to be humble, to know that we don't al-

ways have the right answer. We don't really have a whole lot more information than our constituents have in this case. I think that their concern that they expressed to me, like of the President getting too much authority and that this President does not need more authority, is a valid concern; that there is not enough transparency is another valid concern.

I know my friend from Texas has expressed both of those concerns himself, and I am sure he is hearing those from his constituents as well.

Mr. GOHMERT. I would like to follow up with the observation there about our constituents because—I wish I didn't—I remember all too well how things went in this room on TARP, the Wall Street bailout. The vast number of Americans—a huge percentage of Americans—did not want us to pass the Wall Street bailout. There was an FDIC former Director, named Isaac, who came. He had a lot of economists' support, and he had a great free market solution. People were excited when that passed. I know we had people clapping today just like they did when ObamaCare passed. A lot of people clapped when ObamaCare passed. Then they got defeated in the next election, so they were not here to clap for this one. There were people who clapped for the Wall Street bailout's passing. Some of them didn't come back because the people could see this was not a good way to go.

Now, one of the things I love about being a Republican is that, basically, as conservatives, we are optimists. We think things can get better, and that is why we are here. I know you and I have worked so many times together, and that is why we are here. We want to make things better, and we think we can—that we have got a shot at making things better. But at some point, you at least have to take notice of the old Washington saying that, no matter how cynical you get here in Washington, it is never enough to catch up.

I love that people are aware that the President promised in ObamaCare that, if you liked your insurance, you could keep it and that, if you liked your doctor, you could keep him. He promised that nobody on Medicare would be affected, that it would only affect the reimbursements. Well, people have found out that those things were not true. They did lose the insurance they liked, and they lost the doctors they liked. Medicare recipients had found out: Wait a minute. You said it wouldn't affect me, but what I found out is, when you cut \$700 billion from how much you reimburse the health care providers, my doctors are not able to see me. It does affect me.

Then, of course, I remember—and I did consider Bart Stupak a friend. I saw him not long ago, and I still think of him as a friend. I know he was pro-life and wanted to do what was right.

He was promised by the President that nothing in or about ObamaCare would cause anybody who disagreed with abortion or who had spiritual beliefs against abortion—that nothing that they would ever have to buy would pay for abortion, that no Federal money would go for abortion. As I understood it, he was even getting the President to put that in writing for him.

□ 1500

Well, as JOE WILSON observed during a speech being given in here, I think he said it differently, but it turned out those things weren't true. Abortion is paid for with Federal dollars. The Federal Government even has fought people in court, like these precious Catholic nuns, the Little Sisters of the Poor. They have dedicated their lives to helping our Nation's poor and people that are downtrodden. Those are the kind of people that government officials used to revere, admire, respect. Not now. Because those broken promises even resulted in this administration fighting them in court to try to force them to have insurance that paid for abortion that these precious nuns believed was murdering a child in the womb.

Constituents were against TARP. There were people here that supported this free trade agreement, just as you and I support free trade, but they supported this TPA that truly will give the President more authority.

I remember some of these same people saying: Look, we don't have to worry because by passing the bill we are about to pass, the President can't remove anybody from Guantanamo without giving us notice, and when he gives us notice, we can stop him. I mean, I have been told that. And, in fact, the law is, he can't remove anybody from Guantanamo without first giving us notice. The American people remember that.

They also happen to have noticed that the President cut a deal for a guy that looks like he is going to be charged with desertion, and released five terrorists from Guantanamo and didn't give us notice until after he had released them. So I love the optimism that says, yes, there have been misrepresentations from this administration over and over and over and over, and now we have had 6½ years of continued misrepresentations from the administration, and the good news is this time we really think he means it. Now, I love that kind of optimism; I really do.

I want to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my friend, for his thoughts.

Mr. MASSIE. Well, you are an optimist, Mr. GOHMERT, and I would wholeheartedly second that, but, look, you are also a realist, and I think we all need to be realists. The best way to keep those promises is not to make a

promise you can't keep or not to make a promise that you can't make somebody else keep. So far, we have shown that we are pretty ineffectual here in Congress at keeping the President maintaining those promises. If you like the plan you have, you can keep it was one of those promises I remember.

While we are talking about the Affordable Care Act, I remember Congress was told to pass it so you can see what is in it. And we are being told: Pass the TPA so you can see what is in the TPP, at least so our constituents can see it.

I just want to close with this and not consume any more of the gentleman's time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Before the gentleman gets too far, reclaiming my time, I want to point out, he and I have been down to the classified area and viewed the TPP, but as I understand it, the President is going to be allowed to add like 20 percent to that that we have not even had an opportunity to see. So even when we say we have been down to the classified area, they made it available, we have been through it, we can't say that all of it was provided.

Is that your understanding?

Mr. MASSIE. That is absolutely correct. Furthermore, the document that we viewed was a draft. It is not complete. If you read it, virtually every page of it has a little footnote that says, oh, we are still working on this page here. So, yeah, we are fast-tracking something that we can't see, we are not really going to be a party to the negotiations, and we can't control the outcome of it. So I think we should do that with great caution.

I just want to close with this. I want to say that the vote today was not a referendum on free trade. It was not a referendum on whether it benefits our country to trade with other countries. We know that. We believe it. We have seen it. Trade is good. But this was a referendum on giving the President more authority; this was a referendum on voting for something we can't see, we can't verify; and this was a referendum on a huge, giant document. It reminds me of some of the omnibus bills we are given 2 days to read that come to this body, 1600 pages.

But this was a referendum on the process. That is why they couldn't get the bill passed today. TPA is not a law yet. It didn't pass today, but we support free trade. I know my colleague does. We just don't support the TPA.

Mr. GOHMERT. My friend has observed all the goings-on very closely. The President has acted extraordinarily in reaching out to Congress, trying to push through this trade bill.

I am curious whether the gentleman from Kentucky, my friend, thinks maybe this, for the first time, is an effort by the President reaching out to make the Republican Party, Republican leadership look good. Or what

kind of motivation do you think most likely caused him to reach out more than he has, as I recall, on a bill?

Mr. MASSIE. Well, I don't want to question anybody's motivations here in this body or in the other branch of the government, but I will say I have seen a zeal for the deal, a zeal for the trade deal, a zeal for a deal that people don't fully even understand but they want to get the deal done.

So I think they just need to slow down, look at the terms of the deal, get some experts in that room with you when you are looking at that secret document, have them tell you what all those things mean in there and just kind of calm down the zeal for the deal. We can do trade, we can do free trade, we can do trade agreements, but not this giant omnibus-like trade agreement.

Thank you.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend, but my problem is, having had so many provisions explained, for example, oh, this won't affect seniors by cutting \$700 billion out of Medicare, and, gee, if you will just renew the PATRIOT Act, section 215, gosh, you have got to be a terrorist before we get any of your personal information, your data—there have just been so many explanations and promises that have been made. With regard to section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, that was over two administrations. But there have been so many representations on what an administration—particularly this administration—believes something means that allowed activity far beyond that, that even if this administration or the prior administration says this is what something means, I am sorry, the judge completely hasn't left me, the chief justice completely hasn't left me, and so I care more about what the language says on its face than what somebody tells me they think it will mean or how they will apply it. Again, you know, we were told things about ObamaCare and the way it would be interpreted and carried out, the PATRIOT Act, the way it would be interpreted and carried out. It turns out it simply was not the case.

It is still why I am concerned over the part of section 215, even though I have been assured, oh, no, it really doesn't mean anything. But it says not only can they gather the data of people associated with terrorists or involved in international terrorism, but it has this little two-letter disjunctive, the "or," clandestine intelligence activities. Nobody will explain where that is defined in writing because until it is defined adequately in writing, that can mean anything anybody wants it to mean. It is just too vague, allows too much arbitrariness and capriciousness. So I am not as concerned about what people tell me something says or means because I know when you put words in a bill, at some point some judge somewhere is going to say, you

know what those words actually say; they mean exactly what they say.

So I am concerned about the power that is given to the President. I am concerned about the ability of the President to cut deals, and if he happens to forget to give us notice, as he happened to do with regard to the five terrorists that were released from Guantanamo, then I don't see this body stepping up and stopping him. I know we absolutely pledged we were going to on the illegal, unconstitutional amnesty he did, but then we decided, well, we will just trust the judge in Texas that his ruling will be upheld all the way to the Supreme Court. So we gave up on that fight as a body.

But I just have not seen anything from the House and Senate, either when it was under total Democratic control or now, that indicates we are going to be able to step up and stop the President if there is a violation of the law or a violation of personal commitments that were made. Because of that, I was not comfortable voting for TPA. I could not vote for it. I voted against TAA because it would facilitate TPA.

I do have to make a parenthetical note here. It is interesting, we are assured that TPA is going to create this massive number of jobs, but we have to—absolutely have to—pass TAA, which creates additional welfare because there are going to be so many Americans that lose their jobs as a result of TPA. So it is going to create all these American jobs, but we have got to have TAA so we can cover all the American jobs that are lost that go overseas, when the fact is: You want a free trade agreement, you want to blow the doors off the barriers in the world to American goods and services? Let's cut the biggest tariff that any nation in the world puts on its own goods and services called a corporate tax. Let's cut it, if not eliminate it, at least get it below that of China. And the cuts to the prices will be so astounding that the doors will come down. They will have to come down, because our goods will not only be the best in the world, but they will be the best prices in the world.

So we want real free trade. You are not going to get it by cutting a deal with countries that manipulate their currencies. Those were excellent points that some across the aisle made. If you are talking about free trade with countries that manipulate their own currencies, you are not going to get free trade with countries that manipulate their own currency because they can always maneuver around you and make their product better. So this didn't address the manipulative nature of some nations' currencies. Without that, you are not going to have a free trade deal.

I would like to be an optimist and say that this bill that President Obama pushed so hard—historically hard for his administration—to get passed, I

would like to be the optimist, as so many of my colleagues are, and say, but the reason President Obama was pushing for this so hard is this will really curtail his ability to make agreements without our agreement. I would like to think that he worked that hard to curtail his own power, but the realist, the old judge in me comes back and has to say, the verdict is he pushed for this TPA because it was going to give him a lot more power than he has now.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH0).

Mr. YOH0. I thank my colleague from Texas. I appreciate his loyalty and his patriotism to our country. I look forward to working with him in the future to talk about future negotiations to make sure that the Federal Government, every time we act, every time we move, every time we vote is to do what is best for America, to make America stronger, more competitive, and a better nation to pass on to our next generation.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend and yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 15, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Ralph Lee Abraham, Alma S. Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, Pete Aguilar, Rick W. Allen, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Brad Ashford, Brian Babin, Lou Barletta, Andy Barr, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Ami Bera, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Gus M. Bilirakis, Mike Bishop, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Rod Blum, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mike Bost, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Brendan F. Boyle, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Dave Brat, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Ken Buck, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Bradley Byrne, Ken Calvert, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cardenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, Earl L. "Buddy" Carter, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Judy

Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Curt Clawson, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, Barbara Comstock, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Ryan A. Costello, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Carlos Curbelo, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Mark DeSaulnier, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Debbie Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Daniel M. Donovan, Jr., Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Tom Emmer, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Ruben Gallego, John Garamendi, Scott Garrett, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Gwen Graham, Kay Granger, Garret Graves, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Glenn Grothman, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Richard L. Hanna, Cresent Hardy, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Jody B. Hice, Brian Higgins, J. French Hill, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Will Hurd, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Evan H. Jenkins, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, David W. Jolly, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, John Katko, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Trent Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Stephen Knight, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Robert E. Latta, Brenda L. Lawrence, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Ted Lieu, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Barry Loudermilk, Mia B. Love, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Thomas MacArthur, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Thomas Massie, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy,

Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Martha McSally, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Candice S. Miller, Jeff Miller, John R. Moolenaar, Alexander X. Mooney, Gwen Moore, Seth Moulton, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Dan Newhouse, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Donald Norcross, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee*, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Gary J. Palmer, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Stacey E. Plaskett, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Bruce Poliquin, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Amata Coleman Radewagen, Charles B. Rangel, John Ratcliffe, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Kathleen M. Rice, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, David Rouzer, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Steve Russell, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Aaron Schock*, Kurt Schrader, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason Smith, Lamar Smith, Jackie Speier, Elise M. Stefanik, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takai, Mark Takano, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Norma J. Torres, David A. Trott, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Mark Walker, Jackie Walorski, Mimi Walters, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Bruce Westerman, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, David Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young, Lee M. Zeldin, Ryan K. Zinke

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Of-

ficial Foreign Travel during the first and second quarters of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO JAPAN, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 6 AND MAY 9, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/8	5/9	Japan		533.00		5,233.00				5,766.00
Wyndee Parker	5/8	5/9	Japan		533.00		5,993.40				6,526.40
Kate Knudson	5/6	5/9	Japan		1,059.00		5,667.90				6,726.90
Committee total					2,125.00		16,894.30				19,019.30

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, May 19, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter Welch	1/17	1/19	Cuba		822.00						822.00
Hon. Jason Chaffetz	3/5	3/9	South Africa		1,296.00		9,139.00				10,435.00
Hon. Steve Russell	3/5	3/9	South Africa		1,296.00		8,670.00				9,966.00
Andrew Dockham	3/5	3/9	South Africa		1,296.00		12,397.00				13,693.00
Jaron Bourke	3/5	3/9	South Africa		1,296.00		10,430.00				11,726.00
Hon. Stephen Lynch	3/5	3/9	South Africa		1,296.00						1,296.00
Bruce Fernandez	3/9	3/11	Nigeria		780.00		10,754.00				11,534.00
Bruce Fernandez	3/9	3/9	South Africa		1,296.00						1,296.00
Bruce Fernandez	3/9	3/11	Nigeria		780.00		13,817.00				14,597.00
Delegation expenses								5,843.00			5,843.00
Committee total					10,158.00		65,207.00		5,843.00		81,208.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JASON CHAFFETZ, Chairman, May 20, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1821. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Michael J. Connor, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1822. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral John W. Miller, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1823. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing three officers on the enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, as indicated, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1824. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update of Pre-approved Plan Revenue Procedure (Rev. Proc. 2015-36) received June 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1825. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Substantial Business Activities [TD 9720] (RIN: 1545-BK85) received June 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1826. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Segregation Rule Effective Date [TD 9721] (RIN: 1545-BM17) received June 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1190. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board (Rept. 114-150, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1991. A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-151, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2505. A bill to amend

title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans; with an amendment (Rept. 114-152, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Rules discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1190 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1991 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2505 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2745. A bill to amend the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that the Federal Trade Commission

shall exercise authority with respect to mergers only under the Clayton Act and only in the same procedural manner as the Attorney General exercises such authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 2746. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for hurricane and tornado mitigation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2747. A bill to authorize the award of a military service medal to members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to ionizing radiation as a result of participation in the testing of nuclear weapons or under other circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2748. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program of hearing aids and related hearing services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KNIGHT, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. COOK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 2749. A bill to amend the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 2750. A bill to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, streamline transportation security regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 2751. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WALZ, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. LOEBACK, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 2752. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer

firefighters and emergency medical responders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (for himself and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 2753. A bill to require the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to make video recordings of the examination and testing of firearms and ammunition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 2754. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the work opportunity credit permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 2755. A bill to provide relocation subsidies for the long-term unemployed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 2756. A bill to reform the provision of health insurance coverage by promoting health savings accounts, State-based alternatives to coverage under the Affordable Care Act, and price transparency, in order to promote a more market-based health care system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 2757. A bill to prohibit United States voluntary contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations or any United Nations agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2758. A bill to make permanent the returning worker exception to the annual numerical limitation on nonimmigrant visas issued under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2759. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JONES, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COOK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ZINKE, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 2760. A bill to establish the American Indian Trust Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2761. A bill to provide that human life shall be deemed to exist from conception; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2762. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to eligible local educational agencies to encourage female students to pursue studies and careers in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2763. A bill to provide support to develop career and technical education programs of study and facilities in the areas of renewable energy; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2764. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen the provisions relating to child labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2765. A bill to prohibit the National Science Foundation from obligating amounts for the Polar Learning and Responding Climate Change Educational Partnership; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 2766. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PERRY, Ms. MENG, and Mr. COOK):

H. Res. 310. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding Srebrenica; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 311. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should confirm that money is not free speech and that corporations are not people for purposes of the First Amendment right to make campaign contributions by enacting a constitutional amendment overturning the decision of the Supreme Court in

the case of *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, and should restore the right of Congress and the States to impose limits on the amount of expenditures that may be made by candidates and others in support of elections for public office by enacting a constitutional amendment overturning the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Buckley v. Valeo*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Res. 312. A resolution supporting raising awareness and educating the public about upper limb and lower limb differences; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H. Res. 313. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 23rd as "National Rosie the Riveter Day"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 314. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the eligibility of veterans service organizations for community development block grant funding; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 2745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes," Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof," and, Article III of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects powers of the Judiciary that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 14; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 2749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of section 8 and clause 7 of section 9 of article I, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 2750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes" and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 2751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution that states that Congress shall have Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . ."

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 2755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 2756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this legislation is found within Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 2757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 2759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article 1.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is constitutionally appropriate pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause) which grants Congress the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes" and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause) which states "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States".

The Supreme Court, in *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832), reasoned that Indian Nations have always been considered as distinct, independent political communities, as the undisputed possessors of the soil, from time immemorial.

Thus, conducting a review of the Congress' trust relationship with American Indian tribes is permitted by the Constitution and confirmed by the courts..

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Sanctity of Life Act is authorized by Article 1, Section 8 and Article 3, Section 1 which gives the Congress power to establish and limit the jurisdiction of lower federal courts as well as Article III, Section 2 which gives Congress the power to make exceptions to Supreme Court regulations.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 169: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 213: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 237: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 282: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 292: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 304: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 341: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 381: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 427: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 467: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 511: Mr. BLUM and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 540: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 556: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 619: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 680: Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 702: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 721: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 746: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 767: Mr. TONKO, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 774: Mr. McCAUL, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 879: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 882: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 918: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 973: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 985: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1062: Mr. BRAT and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1088: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1114: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1142: Mr. DOLD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1196: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1197: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1234: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 1283: Mr. GOHMEYER.
H.R. 1288: Mr. BEYER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1388: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1401: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1427: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1462: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1475: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1479: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1505: Mr. POSEY and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1566: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1608: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1635: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1643: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1683: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1760: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1768: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 1814: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. STEFANK.
H.R. 1834: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1853: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. LANCE, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1859: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1901: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 1910: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1920: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1921: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1935: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2042: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2050: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2061: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2140: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2145: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2147: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2149: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2156: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2209: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2255: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2259: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2290: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 2293: Mr. KILMER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOLD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESTY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 2315: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. GRAHAM.
H.R. 2358: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2400: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2404: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2431: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2449: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2460: Mr. WALZ and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2490: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 2493: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JONES, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 2510: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2522: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 2523: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2530: Ms. MENG and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2606: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 2643: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BARR, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 2646: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2647: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2652: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2654: Mr. COHEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2655: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2663: Mr. BLUM, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2680: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2694: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2698: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 2719: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2726: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2740: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DOLD, and Mrs. TORRES.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. PERRY.

H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. BOST, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LANCE.

H. Res. 110: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Res. 112: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 130: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 147: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H. Res. 203: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 230: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. DOLD.

H. Res. 233: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 235: Mr. SIMPSON.

H. Res. 259: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 262: Mr. POCAN and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 284: Ms. BORDALLO and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Res. 286: Mr. BENISHEK.

H. Res. 290: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. VARGAS.

H. Res. 294: Mr. STEWART.

H. Res. 296: Mr. MEEKS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING DONNA LEITERMANN FOR HER HARD WORK AND DEDICATION AS A PUBLIC SERVANT IN THE FIFTH DISTRICT

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Donna Leitermann as she transitions from Bangor Township Treasurer to Bay City Treasurer. She will start her new career with the city on June 22, 2015.

Ms. Leitermann began her work as a public servant as Deputy Treasurer in December 1992. Two years later, she was elected as Bangor Township Treasurer and continued to serve for five terms.

Concurrent to serving as Bangor Township Treasurer, Ms. Leitermann was the treasurer of Bangor Township Downtown Development Authority and committee member of Bangor Township Department of Public Works. For two decades, there has not been a major infrastructure project in Bangor Township for which she was not responsible.

Public servants like Donna Leitermann deserve respect and appreciation. Every day, she has done important work that has positively affected her community. Ms. Leitermann has also been a member and past president of the Bay County Treasurer's Association, member of the Michigan Treasurer's Association, and treasurer and board director of Bay Future of Bay County.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Donna Leitermann for her commitment to public service and thank her for diligently serving as Bangor Township Treasurer these past 21 years. I wish her all the luck as she begins a new chapter as Bay City Treasurer.

IN HONOR OF THE LAUNCHING OF DIRECT FLIGHTS BETWEEN HOUSTON GEORGE BUSH INTERCONTINENTAL AIRPORT (IAH) AND TAIWAN TAOYUAN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (TPE)

HON. JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the launch of direct flights between Taipei and Houston. The inaugural flight BR-52 is scheduled to arrive in Houston Airport at around 4:30 p.m. on June 19th, 2015. The new direct service will make it easier for my constituents to travel to Taiwan and destinations throughout Asia for both business and leisure.

The United States and Taiwan share a thriving economic partnership. The new direct route will further enhance our close relationship by promoting business and tourism, which will result in new jobs and economic benefits for my constituents and all of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize and congratulate Houston Airport, U.S. and Taiwanese officials involved, and the large Taiwanese-American community in Houston for their years of effort to achieve this significant milestone.

RECOGNIZING DIANE GERBER

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tireless dedication of Staten Island's Diane Gerber in serving our veterans.

Originally from Brooklyn, Diane currently resides on Staten Island, and as a grandmother of eight, who single-handedly raised three children, she found time to commit 25 years to the American Legion's Cespino Russo Auxiliary Unit #1544.

Ms. Gerber served on American Legion Auxiliary Unit and County committees. She later ascended to the roles of Secretary, Vice President, and President. While serving as chair of these committees, she was the model of a true American citizen: fundraising to purchase holiday gifts for hospitalized veterans and helping bridge the educational gap by granting scholarships to many students.

During her term as President, she geared her attention toward her project, "Soldier's Wish—Making Our Heroes' Wishes Come True." Through her leadership, over \$57,000 has been raised so far. These funds are dedicated to identify the unmet needs of uniformed heroes regardless of rank or branch of service.

Mr. Speaker, Diane Gerber's commitment to improving and supporting the lives of those who have served our great nation is the perfect example of a model American citizen. I commend her outstanding achievements and I am proud to honor this hero from New York's 11th District.

THE GOLDMAN ACT TO RETURN ABDUCTED AMERICAN CHILDREN: ASSESSING THE COMPLIANCE REPORT AND REQUIRED ACTION

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, international parental child abduction rips chil-

dren from their homes and families and whisks them away to a foreign land, alienating them from the love and care of the parent and family left behind. Child abduction is child abuse, and it continues to plague families across the United States.

Every year, an estimated 1,000 American children are unlawfully removed from their homes by one of their parents and taken across international borders. Less than half of these children ever come home.

The problem is so consequential and the State Department's previous approach of "quiet diplomacy" so inadequate, that Congress unanimously passed the Goldman Act last year to give teeth to requests for return and access. These actions increase in severity, and range from official protests through diplomatic channels, to extradition, to the suspension of development, security, or other foreign assistance.

The Goldman Act is a law calculated to get results, as we did in the return of Sean Goldman from Brazil in 2008.

But a law is only as good as its implementation.

Broken-hearted parents across America waited four years for the Goldman Act to become law and still await full U.S. government implementation of the law.

The State Department's first annual report that we are reviewing today should be a roadmap for action.

The State Department must get this report right in order for the law to be an effective tool.

If the report fails to accurately identify problem countries, the actions I mentioned above are not triggered.

Countries should be listed if they have high numbers of cases—30 percent or more—that have been pending over a year or if they regularly fail to enforce return orders, or if they have failed to take appropriate steps in even a single abduction case pending more than a year.

Once these countries are properly identified, the Secretary of State then determines which of the aforementioned actions the U.S. will apply to the country in order to encourage the timely resolution of abduction and access cases.

While the State Department has choice of which actions to apply, and can waive actions for up to 180 days, the State Department does not have discretion over whether to report accurately to Congress on the country's record, or on whether the country is objectively a non-compliant.

As we have seen in the human trafficking context, (I authored both the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 as well as the Goldman Act) accurate accounting of a country's record, especially in comparison with other countries, can do wonders to prod much needed reforms.

Accurate reporting is also critical to family court judges across the country and parents

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

considering their child's travel to a foreign country where abduction or access problems are a risk.

The stakes are high: misleading or incomplete information could mean the loss of another American child to abduction.

For example, a judge might look at the report table filled with zeros in the unresolved cases category, erroneously conclude that a particular country is not of concern, and give permission to an estranged spouse to return to their country with the child for a vacation. The taking parent then abducts the child and the left behind parent then spends her life savings and many years trying to get her child returned to the U.S. All of which could have been avoided with accurate reporting on the danger.

I am very concerned that the first annual report contains major gaps and even misleading information, especially when it comes to countries with which we have the most intractable abduction cases.

For instance, the report indicates that India, which has consistently been in the top five destinations for abducted American children, had 19 new cases in 2014, 22 resolved cases and no unresolved cases. However, we know from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) that India has 53 open abduction cases—and that 51 have been pending for more than 1 year.

The report shows zero new cases in Tunisia for last year, 3 resolved cases, and zero unresolved cases. And yet Ms. Edeanna Barbirou testified to her more than 3-year battle to bring her children home from Tunisia. NCMEC's numbers show 6 ongoing abductions in Tunisia, all of which have been pending for more than a year.

Nowhere is the report's disconnect with reality more clear than in its handling of Japan, a country that has never issued and enforced a return order for a single one of the hundreds of American children abducted there, and was not listed as a country showing failing to cooperate in returns.

In March, nearly two months before the annual report was released, I chaired a hearing in the subcommittee which I chair featuring Ambassador Susan Jacobs in which it was made perfectly clear that, "Congress expects that Japan will be evaluated not just on its handling of new abduction cases after it joined the Hague Convention last year, but on its work to resolve ALL open abduction cases," including the more than 50 cases I and others have been raising with the State Department for the last 5 years.

Among such cases is that of Sgt. Michael Elias, who has not seen his children, Jade and Michael Jr., since 2008. Michael served as a Marine who saw combat in Iraq. His wife, who worked in the Japanese consulate, used documents fraudulently obtained with the apparent complicity of Japanese consulate personnel to kidnap their children, then aged 4 and 2, in defiance of a court order, telling Michael on a phone call that there was nothing that he could do, as "my country will protect me."

Her country, very worried about its designation in the new report, sent a high-level delegation in March to meet with Ambassador Jacobs and explain why Japan should be excused from being listed as "non-compliant,"

despite the fact that more than one year after signing the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, Japan has ordered zero returns to the U.S.

Just before the report was released in May—two weeks late—Takashi Okada, Deputy Director General in the Secretariat of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, told the Japanese Diet that he had been in consultation with the State Department and "because we strived to make an explanation to the U.S. side, I hope that the report contents will be based on our country's efforts."

In other words, Japan got a pass from the State Department and escaped the list of countries facing action by the U.S. for their failure to resolve abduction cases based on what Mr. Okada euphemistically refers to as "efforts," not results.

Sgt. Michael Elias's country has utterly failed to protect him. He has seen zero progress in his case over the last year—the 7th year of his heart-wrenching ordeal—and yet the State Department cannot even bring itself to hold Japan accountable by naming Japan an offender in the annual report.

It is disappointing, discouraging, and disgraceful. The report whitewashes Japan's egregious record on parental child abduction.

Adding insult to injury, the report table that was to show the unresolved abduction cases in Japan failed to include a single one of the more than 50 cases, 36 of which have been dragging on for more than 5 years, according to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Instead, the table listed Japan as having a 43% resolution rate.

Japan has never issued and enforced a return order for an American child. These young victims, like their left-behind parents, are American citizens who need the help of their government.

The Goldman Act is clear: All requests for return that the State Department submitted to the foreign ministry and that remained unresolved 12 months later are to be counted against Japan. Nearly 100% of the abduction cases to Japan remain open; and the report's conclusion of 43% resolution is indefensible.

Moreover, not a single left behind parent pursuing access was allowed in-person contact with their child over the last year.

The Goldman Act has given the State Department new and powerful tools to bring Japan, and other countries, to the resolution table. The goal is not to disrupt relations but to heal the painful rifts caused by international child abduction.

The question still remains, will the State Department use the Goldman Act as required by law?

I appreciate the Department's presence at yesterday's hearing to discuss ways that we can improve the report and ensure that it fulfills the purposes for which it was intended—namely, the prevention of abduction and the reunification of the thousands of American families that have been suffering forced separation for too long.

WELCOMING THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL OFFICE, TECO, TO DENVER

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to welcome the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office, TECO, to the city of Denver. The establishment of this important office in Denver is a testament to the strong relationship the people of Colorado have developed over the years with the people of Taiwan. Colorado counts Taiwan as its 6th largest Asian trading partner and its 13th overall trading partner. Locating this office in Denver not only reflects the depth of our current relationship with Taiwan but will surely contribute to deepening our trade, education, and cultural ties in the coming years.

My district in Colorado has a growing Taiwanese population and their presence greatly enriches the district economically, culturally, and civically. Taiwanese entrepreneurs, business community, civic leaders, and students contribute greatly to our community. Over the past 50 years Taiwan has also proven itself as a significant political, economic, and security partner of the United States and I fully expect that strong relationship to grow even stronger in the years to come.

Having Taiwan as a meaningful partner clearly benefits both of our citizens, and I am proud that Colorado now has a direct relationship with Taiwan through the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office.

I look forward to doing whatever I can to further enhance our close and growing relationship.

MIDDLE EAST WARS ARE A
HORRIBLE MISTAKE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Sowell is one of this Nation's most-respected economists and syndicated columnists.

His latest column is about the lessons we should learn from our seemingly-endless war in Iraq.

Mr. Sowell wrote: "Going back to square one, what lessons might we learn from the whole experience of the Iraq War?"

If nothing else, we should never again imagine that we can engage in "nation-building" in the sweeping sense that term acquired in Iraq—least of all building a democratic Arab nation in a region of the world that has never had such a thing in a history that goes back thousands of years."

Mr. Sowell is right.

It has been a horrible mistake for this Nation to spend trillions of dollars on unnecessary wars in the Middle East.

We should never have gotten involved in all these civil wars between Shi'a and Sunni.

Yet, we keep on pouring mega-billions down these ratholes, voting for even more billions

over there as recently as yesterday. When will we ever learn?

HONORING THE ROTARY CLUB OF
NORTH CHICAGO AND THE RE-
CIPIENTS OF THE ROTARY HU-
MANITARIAN PATRIOT AWARD

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the outstanding community service of The Rotary Club of North Chicago and to recognize this year's recipients of The Rotary Humanitarian Patriot Award.

The Rotary Humanitarian Patriot Program was established by The Rotary Club of North Chicago in 2013 with three primary objectives: 1) recognizing individuals throughout Northeast Illinois who are the best at providing humanitarian support for our United Armed Forces Veterans and their families; 2) highlighting veteran services provided by local North Chicago institutions including the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center and its integrated relationships with the active duty component at Great Lakes Naval Training Center and Rosalind Franklin University College of Medicine and Science; and 3) supporting research, treatment, and awareness for individuals living with post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury.

Rotary was founded on the principle of service, and The Rotary Humanitarian Patriot Program is an inspiring extension of this mission. The award recipients all demonstrate an extraordinary sense of commitment to the men and women of our armed forces. These individuals understand that veterans have sacrificed greatly for this country and deserve nothing less than our highest gratitude and respect.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate this year's recipients of The Rotary Humanitarian Patriot Award: Bryan Anderson, Joyce Campbell, Mary Carmody, Larry Crone, Jeff Harger, Gander the Service Dog, Lon Hodges, Robert Kauffman, Don Long, Rob Paddor, Judge John Philips, Anthony Sarpe, Craig Steichen, Matt Steichen, Angela Walker, Scott Watkins, Bill Wolff, Michael Woods, and Frank Yurasek.

Even more so, I thank these outstanding individuals and canine for the incredible work they continue to do. Their service strengthens our communities and our country, and I am grateful for the work of The Rotary Club of North Chicago and all of this year's honorees.

CONGRATULATING MR. D. EDWARD
SMYTH ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor D. Edward ("Ted") Smyth on his retirement from McGraw Hill Financial, following a distinguished career at the highest levels of government and business.

In 2009, Ted joined the company as its Executive Vice President for Corporate Affairs, overseeing worldwide marketing, communications, government affairs and corporate responsibility. During his tenure, Ted helped lead the company's transformation into a focused provider of credit ratings, benchmarks and analytics to the financial marketplace, with marquee brands that include Standard & Poor's, Platts and J.D. Power. He also lent his expertise in corporate governance to the company's Board of Directors and served as a trusted counselor to two chief executive officers: Harold W. ("Terry") McGraw, III, and more recently, Douglas L. Peterson.

Ted came to McGraw Hill Financial after more than two decades at H.J. Heinz Company, where he held the dual roles of Senior Vice President for Corporate and Government Affairs and Chief Administrative Officer. In his time at Heinz, Ted created world-class communications and government relations functions and chaired both the Heinz Global Communications Committee and the Heinz Crisis and Issues Committee, reporting directly to Bill Johnson, Heinz's former chairman, president and CEO. Ted also built and sustained the company's talent management process, designed to attract and retain the best minds in the food industry.

Prior to joining Heinz in 1988, Ted spent 15 years as a senior diplomat for Ireland, serving in embassies and offices in Geneva, Portugal, Washington, D.C. and London. Among the many highlights of his diplomatic career, Ted served as a delegate to the 36-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in Switzerland and was a special advisor to the Irish Prime Minister in seeking a peaceful resolution to the Northern Ireland conflict. Ted also was a member of the Secretariat of the New Ireland Forum and was Press Secretary for the Irish government in the United Kingdom.

A talented writer and sought-after speaker, Ted has authored numerous articles on public policy, has participated in leading conferences worldwide and has contributed thoughtful bylines to several leading newspapers. He lends his considerable leadership skills to a number of organizations, currently serving as a Director of Glucksman Ireland House at New York University, a member of the Global Studies Program of the Center for International Studies at the University of Pittsburgh, a trustee of the Clinton Institute in University College, Dublin, and a trustee of Marlboro College, Vermont. He also is a former Director of the Hain Celestial Company, the Africa America Institute and the Ireland Funds. Ted graduated with honors in History and Political Science from Trinity College in Dublin.

Mr. Speaker, apart from his countless accomplishments, Ted Smyth is a true gentleman and a friend to all who know him. I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Ted for his many contributions and congratulating him on his remarkable career.

CONGRATULATING THE D.C. CHAPTER
OF THE BLACK DATA PROC-
ESSING ASSOCIATES ON ITS 37TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the District of Columbia chapter of the Black Data Processing Associates (BDPA) on its 37th anniversary of service to the residents of the District of Columbia and the national capital region.

Founded in May 1978 by Norman Mays, the D.C. chapter is the second chapter of BDPA formed, preceded only by the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania chapter, 1977. In 1979, BDPA was restructured as a national organization, and has 45 active chapters across the United States.

As the oldest and largest African American information technology (IT) organization, comprised of over 2,000 African-American IT professionals, as well as science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) college students, BDPA's vision is to be a powerful advocate for their interests within the global technology industry. Its mission is to be a global, member-focused technology organization that delivers programs and services for the professional well-being of its members.

BDPA continues to promote professional growth and technical development for young people and those entering into information and communication technology (ICT) in academia and corporate America. We also appreciate BDPA and its 45 chapters for continuing to provide ICT opportunities for STEM students and professionals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 37th anniversary of the D.C. chapter of the Black Data Processing Associates, in congratulating BDPA for its outstanding accomplishments and commitment to the residents of the District of Columbia and around the country, and in welcoming those attending the BDPA Annual National Technology Conference and Career Fair, titled "Evolution of IT—Embracing the Digital Future," on August 18–22, 2015, at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

HONORING NORTH CAROLINA
STATE UNIVERSITY WRESTLER,
NICK GWIAZDOWSKI

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Nick Gwiazdowski, a member of the North Carolina State University wrestling team, on winning his second straight NCAA Division I Individual Championship.

Mr. Gwiazdowski is the first Wolffpack wrestler to ever win multiple NCAA titles and one of the most successful student-athletes in NC

State's history. He finished this season with a perfect 35-0 record and holds a record of 55 straight wins since last year—the nation's longest current winning streak.

North Carolina State has a long history of success in wrestling, with seven national championships. Gwiazdowski's remarkable victory—17 seconds into the championship match—adds yet another chapter to that storied tradition.

Congratulations to Nick Gwiazdowski. Wolf-pack fans everywhere are proud of your championship and look forward to your senior season next year and the promise of a threepeat.

OUR SHREDDED FLAG

HON. JOSEPH J. HECK

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was contacted by a constituent, Colonel Paul Dudley, United States Air Force, Retired. He wrote to express his patriotic feelings for our country and the treatment of our flag. Attached to his letter was a poem he wrote titled, "Our Shredded Flag." Since this Sunday, June 14th, is Flag Day, I thought it appropriate to submit his poem.

I am a United States of America shredded flag.

I fly from the roof of many typical American homes.

Some time ago, I was new and radiant when they placed me there,

But the wind and rain have reduced me to strings of red, white, and blue.

Sometimes I fly from vehicles until I am torn to shreds;

Though I still wave proudly, and can be recognized, I need replaced,

And here's why:

Brave military have carried me into battles in many wars

To save and preserve our nation, and restore peace.

I fly proudly above our military bases and naval vessels

To show that we are, yet today, a nation of strength and honor.

Our Veterans, Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines and Coast Guard

Still honor me, care for me, protect me, and rescue me when torn;

With them, I am in good hands.

When they see that I am weathering from the elements,

They take me down and honorably, ceremonially give me final rest,

And as a service to those citizens who do not seem to know, or do the same,

They do it for them, with great respect and understanding.

I am called "Old Glory", "The Star Spangled Banner", and other respected names, Which make me flow and flutter proudly in the wind,

For I am the true vision of our great nation.

I represent a people who have achieved their freedom;

I remind a people of the sacrifices that we have made to keep it;

I go off to war with the greatest warriors, many who die defending it;

And I grieve when draped over their coffins when they are returned.

I am placed into the hands of their greatest loved ones

To honor them and remember them forevermore.

Those who dishonor me, stomp on me, and burn me, only destroy my cloth.

My meaning, my purpose, my honor and representation still live on;

These cannot be taken away so long as there remains a United States of America.

So, fellow citizens, protect what I stand for, not for me, but for you;

For I am merely dye on cloth with a God blessed meaning.

Honor me; respect me for what I represent, And I will fly over you wherever, and forever.

I am the "Stars and Stripes Forever".

Written by Paul Frederick Dudley, Colonel, USAF (Ret) USMC (WWII) USAF (Vietnam) March 6, 2011.

RECOGNIZING DR. STEVEN A. LOOMIS

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my constituent, Dr. Steven A. Loomis of Littleton, Colorado. Dr. Loomis will soon be elected the 93rd president of the American Optometric Association (AOA) during their 118th annual meeting on June 27, 2015, in Seattle, Washington.

Dr. Loomis is a graduate of Pacific University College of Optometry and owns Mountain Vista EyeCare and Dry Eye Center in Littleton, Colorado. He was first elected to the American Optometric Association Board of Trustees in 2007, and elected President-Elect at the 117th Annual AOA Congress & 44th Annual AOSA Conference: Optometry's Meeting in June 2014. Dr. Loomis has continuously proven to be a leader in his profession at the local, state, and national levels. In addition to his duties as President-Elect, Dr. Loomis is chair of the AOA Building Committee and serves as a member of the AOA Agenda, Executive, and Personnel Committees.

Dr. Loomis' enthusiasm for optometry and commitment to excellence in eye and vision care has earned him this prestigious national office. I take great pride representing Dr. Loomis in Colorado's Sixth Congressional District and I join his family, friends, and colleagues in congratulating him on this achievement. I am confident that he will have a very successful term as president of the AOA and I wish him the very best of luck.

MAYOR KURT D. DYKSTRA

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Kurt D. Dykstra and his commendable service to the City of Holland as its 40th Mayor.

Mayor Dykstra was the first of his family to attend college, and earned his Bachelor of

Arts degree, Magna Cum Laude, at Northwestern College, in Orange City, Iowa, and his Juris Doctor at Marquette University Law School, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, graduating first in class, Summa Cum Laude.

Mayor Dykstra has been a member of the City Council since 2005 and represented Holland's fifth ward until his election to Mayor. As Holland's mayor since 2009, he has provided strong leadership for this thriving and successful lakefront city. Today, Holland is a bright, vibrant city thanks to his vision and leadership.

During his tenure, Holland was named the 2013 winner of Outstanding Achievement in Heritage Preservation, the 2012 winner of Environmental Efforts, named in Forbes list of America's Prettiest Towns, a Top Five Safest Cities in the U.S., and the 3rd Best Place for Families in the U.S.

Mayor Dykstra's record of successful leadership has enabled the City of Holland to continue to be recognized as a place to live, work and play. Under Mayor Dykstra, the city has become a place where businesses are able to grow, strong and safe neighborhoods flourish, and visitors are warmly welcomed. The City of Holland has been well served by his tenure.

I wish Mayor Dykstra the best of luck as he leaves West Michigan to become President of Trinity Christian College.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mayor Kurt Dykstra for his service to the City of Holland.

HONORING THE GLEN MOORE FIRE COMPANY

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Glen Moore Fire Company on its 100th anniversary of serving and protecting families in Chester County.

Glen Moore's first apparatus was horse-drawn. It was bought for \$100 in 1915 after local residents saw the need for fire protection in the community. Since then, the Company has grown and thrived and the Glen Moore area now benefits from the protection of a highly-trained team of expert officers and members, modern apparatus and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, in 2014 alone, the Glen Moore Fire Company responded to more than 300 incidents—one every 29 hours. We are grateful to the fine firefighters of the Glen Moore Fire Company and I wish them another 100 years of success in serving the community.

HONORING COUNCILMAN THOMAS D. MISERENDINO

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Navy and Vietnam veteran Thomas Miserendino of New Jersey's Third Congressional District, who passed away last week,

and express my deepest condolences to his family and friends.

Councilman Miserendino served our country valiantly during the Vietnam War and in his position as Senior Chief of the U.S. Navy. Councilman Miserendino continued his service to the country after his time in the Navy by actively serving his community.

Among his many volunteer services he was a Councilman to the Borough of Beachwood, the longest serving Chief of Beachwood Volunteer Fire Company, Ocean County manager for the NJ Firemen's Home, Secretary of the Beachwood Fire Relief Association, Life member of Ocean County Firemen's Association and past board member for Toms River Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, South Jersey is tremendously grateful for Councilman Thomas Miserendino's service to our nation and its communities. It is my honor to recognize his service and achievements before the United States House of Representatives.

YOUNG AMERICA'S NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL LEADERSHIP CON- FERENCE

HON. ALEXANDER X. MOONEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate all of the students who will take part in the Young America's National High School Leadership Conference from July 8th to 11th. At this conference, the students will learn leadership skills along with discussing the ideas of individual freedom, a strong national defense, free enterprise, and traditional values. It is extremely important for young people in the United States to learn about the virtues of these ideas.

I join with the students' families and friends in wishing these young conservative leaders a successful conference, and excellent time in our nation's capital.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANTHONY "TONY" GIANNETTA

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Anthony Dominic "Tony" Giannetta, who passed away on May 30, 2015, at the age of 94. As the founder of Hallmark Homes, Tony helped expand the California home building industry and devoted much of his life to maintaining it. His kind heart, talent, and contributions to the Central Valley will be greatly missed.

Tony was born on November 7, 1920, in Fresno, California. Raised in Fresno, Tony graduated from Edison High School. He married Alice Therese Baraldi on November 22, 1942, and shortly thereafter the two moved to Marysville, CA, to fulfill Tony's duties in the

United States Army. After the war the couple moved back to Fresno, where they settled and raised six sons.

During the late 1940's, Tony began his career in the home building industry as a carpenter. In 1951 Tony and John Mortillaro formed the Quality Homes Construction Company, which merged with the Cetti Brothers Construction Company a year later. Under the Hallmark Homes name, the company developed 27 subdivisions and built more than 4,500 homes in the Fresno, Clovis, and Madera areas, in addition to the construction of many commercial projects. This made Hallmark Homes one of the largest regional builders for three decades, and it marked the association of the name Tony Giannetta within the home building industry. In fact, the two became synonymous in Fresno.

Tony was a member of the Building Industry Association of the San Joaquin Valley, and served as president in 1967, 1979, and 1980. He acted as a Director to the California Building Industry Association and was a life director to the National Association of Homebuilders who on February 15, 2008 acknowledged him as a 50 year member, and he served on various committees for the California Building Industry Association including its Legislative Committee, Executive Committee, Insurance Committee, and Long Range Planning Committee.

As a Fresno native, maintaining community involvement was important to Tony. In partnership with the Construction Department at Fresno City College, Tony provided work experience training for students in the building industry. He was also instrumental in creating the National Association of Home Builders-Building Industry Association student chapters at Fresno City College and California State University, Fresno.

For his contributions to homebuilding and its community, Tony became a lifetime member of the Building Industry Association of the San Joaquin Valley in 1986 and was inducted into the California Housing Foundation Hall of Fame in 1988—the first inductee to come from the Central Valley. He was also awarded the Oscar Spano Lifetime Service Award in 1988 by his local building industry association.

In his spare time, Tony enjoyed traveling, playing sports and cherished his time with family and friends. He was a devoted husband to Alice, his bride of 72 years; a loving father to his sons, Gerald, Ronald, Anthony Jr., James, Michael and John; and the kind and generous grandfather of 12 grandchildren and 10 great-grandchildren. Tony's favorite memories included celebrating the holidays in his home as well as gathering for Sunday pasta lunches, a tradition he shared with his family.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life of Anthony Dominic "Tony" Giannetta, a Central Valley pioneer and influential figure in the California home building industry.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,758,342,047.24. We've added \$7,525,881,293,134.16 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING THE OPENING OF THE RICHARD AND GINA SANTORI LIBRARY OF AURORA, ILLINOIS

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the opening of the Richard and Gina Santori Library of Aurora, Illinois.

Since its founding in 1838, the Aurora Public Library system has nurtured education in our diverse community and has instilled a love of reading for generations of Aurorans. By establishing locations throughout the city, developing bookmobiles and robust outreach efforts, the library has made educational resources accessible to all Aurorans and been a strong contributor to community growth.

With the opening of the new library in downtown Aurora, the Aurora Public Library has embraced the challenges and opportunities of the next century. The building will feature a "Makers Space" on the first floor with a 3D printer, laser cutter, vinyl cutter, plotter printer, computers with CAD, CAM, Adobe Cloud and other creation software for students and community members to experiment and train with modern manufacturing tools. It will also feature an audio/visual library, the Kiwanis Club of Aurora Children's Library, and a Teen Space with a state-of-the-art media studio. These new resources will allow the Aurora Public Library to continue its mission and serve the new needs of our community.

Congratulations to the City of Aurora and the Aurora Public Library on the opening of the new facility. The Richard and Gina Santori Library will no doubt inspire future generations to become lifelong learners.

THE FUTURE OF U.S.-ZIMBABWE RELATIONS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 12, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Zimbabwe is a country the size of the state of

Montana, with a population of nearly 14 million people. However, its mineral wealth gives it an outsized importance. The southern African nation is the world's third largest source of platinum group metals and has significant reserves of nickel, gold, chromium and dozens of other metals and minerals. Significant diamond reserves were discovered in 2006. Currently, about 40 percent of the country's foreign exchange is earned from the export of these metals and minerals.

It was the abundance of such mineral resources, and their exploitation, which has driven the relationship between the West and Zimbabwe. Since its colonization by Cecil Rhodes' British South Africa Company in 1889 on behalf of Great Britain, the area once known as Southern Rhodesia has experienced a tumultuous history. The white minority gained self-governance in 1922, and a 1930 Land Apportionment Act restricted black access to land, making many Africans laborers and not land owners. In 1964, the white minority government unsuccessfully sought independence from Great Britain, and then unilaterally declared independence a year later under white rule. This move sparked international outrage and economic sanctions, and that regime was never widely recognized by the international community, though the support of white-ruled South Africa enabled the government to limp along.

Meanwhile, black opposition to minority rule, which began in the 1930s, erupted into a guerrilla war in 1972. Attempts to end the conflict diplomatically failed until the 1979 talks brokered by Great Britain resulted in British-supervised independence elections. The winner of those elections was Robert Mugabe, leader of the Zimbabwe African National Union, or ZANU, who at age 91 continues to rule this country, in large part through intimidation and manipulation of elections.

As a hero of the independence and majority rule movements, Mugabe has enjoyed the support of many other African leaders, who have considered him an honored elder and have generally declined to join in international efforts to sanction his government. This has placed the United States in an awkward posi-

tion, with limited African support for political and economic reforms in Zimbabwe.

Although many observers have credited the Mugabe government with productive management until fairly recent years, there were political problems from the beginning of his rule. For example, Mugabe fired fellow independence leader Joshua Nkomo in 1982 and then launched a campaign to suppress what his government called a rebellion by pro-Nkomo forces. The Mugabe regime has been accused of killing thousands of ethnic Ndebele citizens over the next few years to end the supposed rebellion, assisted by military advisors from East Germany and North Korea.

Once one of the leading industrial nations in Africa, Zimbabwe began a long economic downward spiral in the late 1990s. Squatters, with the support of the Zimbabwe government, seized white farms they claimed had been stolen by white settlers in the past. Despite government assurances, these farms were not transferred to black farm workers, but rather to cronies of the Mugabe government who lacked agricultural experience. Both whites and blacks in Zimbabwe acknowledged that the land policies had been unfair, but the manner of addressing this problem led to serious economic problems for the country.

Agricultural production fell, and the manufacturing sector, heavily tied to agriculture, also diminished. Efforts to squeeze currency for shrinking national reserves from businesses, coupled with the disastrous requirement that businesses use the fictitious exchange rate, caused retailers to lose money with each sale. The effort to close the many vendors who supplied tourists with souvenirs and citizens with necessary household items was yet another milestone in Zimbabwe's economic collapse. By 2006, year-on-year inflation exceeded 1,000 percent. Devaluation of the currency and the subsequent use of foreign currency are credited with eventually preventing a complete economic collapse.

Zimbabwe and the United States have had a tempestuous relationship since that southern African country emerged from white minority rule. Part of the problem has been resentment by Zimbabwe President Robert Mugabe and his closest advisers against the United States

for not supporting their liberation movement, the backdrop to which was the geopolitical conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States. Another part of the problem has been the justifiable public criticism of repressive political policies by the Mugabe government by successive U.S. administrations. Consequently, the minimal communications between our two governments has contributed to suspicions and an inability for U.S. officials to reach out to cooperative Zimbabwe officials.

Successive elections have been the subject of opposition and international criticism for the lack of political space allowed to those who would challenge the ruling ZANU party. Arrests, incarcerations, torture in custody, beatings at public rallies and demonstrations and disappearances of government opponents have denied legitimacy to the Zimbabwe election processes. The country's commitment to democratic governance has been further placed in question due to a series of repressive laws preventing freedoms of speech, association and movement.

As if the government's repressive tactics are not troubling enough, political jockeying in Zimbabwe, including the recent dismissal of Vice President Joice Mujuru, places the succession to President Mugabe in doubt, which puts U.S. policy in question. Last week's hearing examined current U.S. policy toward Zimbabwe and the prospects for an enhanced relationship depending on events that have not yet taken place.

Of course, in foreign policy, one cannot wait until a crisis materializes in order to create a planned response. A leader nearing the century mark, presiding over a fractious political scene in a country that has experienced political and economic turmoil creates a situation in which planning for a positive outcome to regime change must be devised.

Zimbabwe is a country rich in both natural and human potential. Once the resentments of the current old guard have passed and democratic governance can be established, U.S.-Zimbabwe relations can become what they have never been: harmonious and mutually beneficial.

SENATE—Monday, June 15, 2015

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Holy One, teach us to do Your will. Help us to see life's troubles from a spiritual perspective as we continue to place our trust in You. May our hearts find repose in You.

Direct our Senators in all their doings, surrounding them with Your favor. Lord, be continually available to help them in their work so that Your Name will be glorified and righteousness will exalt our Nation. Keep our lawmakers captive only to Your Spirit, that they may be free from bondage to self. Guide them so that they will pursue only what is good and true and just, as You empower them to live God-centered lives.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Democratic leader is recognized.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Statue of Liberty stands as a universal symbol of hope and freedom. Engraved within its pedestal are the words of Emma Lazarus, a call etched for the world to see.

Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door!

For countless generations, our fathers and grandfathers, mothers and grandmothers, have braved oceans, deserts, and rivers to answer that call. As a result, the United States has been empowered by the contributions of immigrants from around the world—immigrants who came in pursuit of the American dream and have pursued this dream through strong family values, hard work, and love of country.

My wife's father, my father-in-law, emigrated here from Russia. My grandmother came from England. My family, like so many American families, has its immigrant stories to tell.

This month is Immigrant Heritage Month. As we celebrate our shared immigrant heritage, we must work to ensure that America welcomes future generations of immigrants with the dignity and respect we wish for our own families.

The United States has become the greatest Nation on Earth because of the hard work, dedication, and diversity immigrants brought to these shores. Our strength lies in our ability to embrace the richness immigrants bring to the American story. Just look at some of our Nation's most successful companies: Google, Yahoo, General Electric, IBM. These are all modern companies, but over the centuries, we have had life stories, where just like Google, Yahoo, General Electric, and IBM, all these American companies were founded by immigrants or the children of immigrants.

I have seen personally the contributions of immigrants and the positive impact that a diversity of backgrounds has on shaping public policy. My staff represents generations of immigrants brought to this country. One staff member was born in the Philippines and emigrated with her mother to Las Vegas. Another left Nicaragua in the 1980s in the midst of a brutal civil war and settled in Carson City. Others came from Mexico, El Salvador, and Poland. Much like our Nation, my office is all the better because it reflects the diverse backgrounds, communities, and perspectives of those who have immigrated to Nevada.

Nevada has a particularly vibrant international community. Las Vegas is home to large Latino, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Armenian communities. Northern Nevada has the same, but in addition to that, it is the home to proud descendants of immigrants from the Basque Country.

Without the contributions made by generations of proud immigrants, Nevada would not be the State that it is today. Immigrants have been leaders. They protect our Nation, and they have taught our children. The immigrants who heeded the call engraved on the Statue of Liberty have altered this country for the better. We are and will always be a Nation of immigrants.

I have devoted years of legislative effort to fixing our broken immigration system. In 2010 after Republicans blocked the DREAM Act, it became clear to me and to other Senators that

Republicans were not going to cooperate. So we urged the President to take administrative action as the Republicans continued to block legislative efforts.

Three years ago today, the President announced that young people who do not present a risk to national security would become eligible for relief from deportation through the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program. As a result of this action, over 660,000 DREAMers have been approved, including almost 12,000 Nevadans. These individuals no longer live in fear of deportation. They can now contribute more fully to our country, as college students, teachers, small business owners, and artisans. These individuals were brought here as young children. Most do not remember the countries in which they were born. When they pledge allegiance it is to the United States. They love this country and are Americans in all but paperwork. These young people can now become teachers, own businesses, and further contribute to the American economy. They can secure a better future for themselves, their families, and our country. The program is a temporary solution for a broken immigration system.

Comprehensive immigration reform is the best way to repair our immigration system and preserve the integrity of the American dream. In the Senate we passed a bill almost 2 years ago for comprehensive immigration reform, but House Republicans refused even to allow a vote on that legislation. Had they allowed a vote on the legislation, it would have passed by a big margin because virtually every Democrat would have voted for it and a number of Republicans would have voted for it. But the Speaker decided no, they wouldn't allow a vote on it, and they haven't. But because the Republicans would not pass immigration reform, President Obama acted again within his legal authority to create a new program for the parents of U.S. citizens and green card holders that would in effect take care of the parents of these DREAMers. Those programs would be in effect now if it were not for a politically motivated lawsuit filed by a Republican challenging the program.

The Republicans say it is about the President, but they really are attacking and separating American families. In the Senate, Republicans have tried repeatedly to stop President Obama's efforts.

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program has transformed the lives of hundreds of thousands of young people over the past 3 years. Shutting

down this program would cause the deportation of young men and women to countries they don't know.

We, with the President, will do everything in our power to protect and defend this program and to fight the baseless lawsuit that is preventing over 5 million additional people for the American dream. The Supreme Court has been clear that Presidents have the authority for Federal immigration enforcement priorities. I am confident that the President's actions will ultimately be upheld, and I will continue to fight to protect those programs and keep families together.

I look forward to the day when programs such as DACA are replaced with permanent comprehensive immigration reform, which is so vitally important.

Before closing, on the floor today is the assistant Democratic leader. He has been on this floor articulating the importance of these DREAMers and what they do for our country, and what initially was their potential for our country. Now of course it has already been proven that their potential was even underscored. They have done so much more than we even anticipated they could do. I appreciate very much my friend, the senior Senator from Illinois, for his advocacy of this program and his tireless efforts for justice in America.

So I hope that we will live up to the words on the Statue of Liberty, at the lamp beside the golden door, which is beckoning to people from other shores.

Mr. President, will you announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant Democratic leader.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank the Democratic leader for his kind words.

Today is the third anniversary of DACA.

It was 15 years ago when I received a call to my Senate office in Chicago. A Korean-American woman who worked at a drycleaners in the city of Chicago had a question for me. It turned out that her daughter, Tereza Lee, had been offered an opportunity to go to school at one of the best music schools in America, but she had problems filling out her application.

The whole story is that this family had come through Brazil from Korea to the United States years before. The family, including Tereza, who was then 2 years old, came in on a tourist visa. The idea behind their arrival in America was that her father was going to open a church. He would be a minister with his own congregation. It was a dream that was never realized. The family struggled. They were very poor. Tereza's mother went to work at a dry-cleaners. Her father didn't work much. He had health problems.

Luckily, Tereza, this young girl, when she was about 10 or 12 years old, was enrolled in a music program in Chicago called the Merit Music Program. The Merit Music Program offers to children from poor families musical instruction and instruments. They introduced Tereza to the piano, and an amazing thing happened. She turned out to be an incredible musician. So she was finishing high school and was offered an opportunity to go to school in New York to a music school—the Manhattan School of Music.

She had other offers, too, but when she went to fill out the application and they asked her to put in her citizenship and nationality, she asked her dad and mom: What am I supposed to put there? They said: We didn't file any papers for you. You are technically undocumented in America. Your sister and brother were born here and are legal citizens. We have become legal in America, but as for you, we are not sure. So what should we do? Let's call DURBIN's office.

They called my Senate office and the law is very clear. If you were brought to the United States undocumented and lived your entire life here and wanted to stay here, the law said you had to leave the United States for 10 years and then apply to come back.

They asked me if there was anything else under the law, and I said no, that was it. It is because of that that I introduced the DREAM Act 15 years ago. This DREAM Act said that young people under circumstances like Tereza's, who were brought to the United States at a very young age, were raised in this country, were finishing school, and who had no criminal record, would be given a chance—a chance to become legal in America, the DREAM Act.

Well, that DREAM Act has been a dream for 15 years. It is not a law. But, fortunately for me, when I served in the Senate, at one point I had a colleague named Barack Obama, who was my fellow Senator and cosponsor of the DREAM Act in his day. When he became President and it became clear we were not going to pass comprehensive immigration reform or make the DREAM Act the law of the land, this President said: I will give to these young people who would qualify for the DREAM Act temporary status so they can stay in America on a temporary

basis without fear of deportation. That is what the President did 3 years ago with DACA, deferred action for childhood arrivals.

As the Democratic leader reported, 660,000 young people have signed up, paid a hefty filing fee, had a criminal background check, and submitted their names to the government. It was a leap of faith for these young people to do this because if you grew up undocumented in America, you were told at a very early age by your parents: For goodness' sakes, keep your head down; don't ever get arrested; don't try to drive a car. Not only could you get deported, our whole family could get deported.

Well, these young people wanted to be heard, and they stepped up and they signed up for the President's program.

It has been an incredible story. Five years ago, in April 2010, I joined with my former colleague Richard Lugar in writing a letter to President Obama asking him to establish this program. Later that year, Senator REID, who just spoke, brought the DREAM Act to the Senate floor. The Senate Gallery was filled with young people, undocumented people, who came for that bill to be considered wearing caps and gowns. They wanted to make it clear they were not looking for a free ride in America. They were looking for a chance. But despite the fact that 55 Senators out of 100 voted for it, we did not get the magic number—60—and the DREAM Act did not become law.

Senator REID joined me, with 22 other Democratic Senators, asking President Obama to create this DACA Program so these children could sign up. The President did. It is an amazing success. What has happened to these DREAMers when they are given a chance to have a future in America, when they are not afraid of the knock on the door and being deported? Well, what has happened? Amazing things have happened. They are beginning to contribute to America as engineers, teachers, small business owners, and more.

I know this policy of the President to give these young people a chance to be part of America absolutely infuriates most of my Republican colleagues. They cannot stand the thought that the President by Executive order would give these young people a chance. In fact, the House of Representatives on several occasions has tried to reverse this and take away this recognition that these young people can stay here on a temporary basis without being deported.

Last fall, the President extended the program in what is known as DAPA—deferred action for parental accountability—for those who have been here for a long period of time and would also be given temporary status, registered with the government, and be able to work in our country.

Today, the Center for American Progress released a new report on the impact on the economy of the United States of these people eligible for DACA, the young people, and DAPA, their parents. Over the next 10 years, in my home State of Illinois, these two Presidential policies will increase my State's gross domestic product by almost \$15 billion, and it will increase the overall earnings of the people living in my State.

How is that possible? How is it possible to take these undocumented people and turn them into a positive for the economy? Well, I will tell you, that is what happens when they are on the books and working and paying their taxes, as they want to be, as they should be.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona was just on the floor. He was one of four Republican Senators—it took some courage—who stepped up and worked with four of us on the Democratic side to write a comprehensive immigration bill. We believe that our immigration system is broken in America, and we want to fix it. We met together for months working on that bill. One of the good reports that came out of the bill was that a comprehensive immigration system where people register, submit themselves to a background check, and pay their taxes has a positive impact on the economy of the United States.

Unfortunately, the expansion of these two programs has been blocked by a lawsuit in Texas filed against the President. Earlier this month, Republicans in the House of Representatives voted to block the administration from any money to defend this lawsuit. That amendment was offered by a Republican Congressman from Iowa named STEVE KING, who has falsely claimed that DREAMers are actually drug dealers with “calves the size of cantaloupes”—a direct quote from Congressman KING—because they are carrying drugs across our border. That is a cruel game Congressman KING is playing with the lives of these young people. And now they want to fix the game by blocking the Obama administration from defending the lawsuit. Clearly, the proponents of this lawsuit and their destructive efforts will ultimately fail. But the Supreme Court has been clear—the President has the power to make these policies.

It is so troubling that so many on the other side of the aisle are determined to block immigration in America.

I have come to the floor many times to tell the stories of these DREAMers, and I would like to tell one of those stories today on the third anniversary of this DACA Program.

As shown in picture, this is Denisse Rojas. In 1990, when she was just a little infant, her parents carried her across the southwest border with the hope of giving her and her siblings a

better life. Denisse and her family settled in Fremont, CA. Denisse said: “In grade school, I recall feeling different from my peers. . . . my skin color was darker, my English was stilted, I was poor, and I was undocumented.”

Denisse remembers her dad in a restaurant uniform studying late at night so he could pass the GED test. And her mother attended community college part time for 7 years to earn a nursing degree. It was this perseverance that inspired Denisse to try harder.

In high school she was an excellent student and athlete. She graduated with a 4.3 grade point average, and she received the U.S. Army Reserve National Scholar Athlete Award.

Denisse was accepted to the University of California, Berkeley—one of the best colleges in the country—but because of her undocumented status, she did not qualify for any financial aid or government help. Denisse worked 30 hours a week while attending school full time, and she commuted an hour each way to and from school every day so she could live in affordable housing.

At Berkeley, Denisse Rojas majored in integrative biology and sociology. Because she was such a good student, she was selected to work in the genetics lab. Her research was published in the journal Science.

I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes. I know the Senator is anxious, but if I could have 2 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator allow me to propound a unanimous consent request?

Mr. DURBIN. Of course.

I am sorry, the staff said we have one more thing to check. If you will give me 2 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Please proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I would have gladly yielded to my friend from Arizona but a higher order prevails.

As a senior at Berkeley, Denisse co-founded Pre-Health Dreamers, a national organization of undocumented students who want to become health care professionals.

She volunteers at the San Francisco General Hospital Community to Clinic Linkage Program, where she helps patients who are seeking affordable housing, healthy food, and employment.

In 2012, when President Obama established DACA—its third anniversary today—her life changed. As a DACA recipient, Denisse's dreams finally seemed within reach.

In this picture I have in the Chamber, Denisse is holding her letter of acceptance to Mount Sinai Medical School in New York. She will be in classes this fall. She wrote me a letter. She said:

I have pledged allegiance to this nation's values since my first day of

school; I consider the United States my home. Furthermore, serving others has instilled in me the notion that everyone deserves the opportunity for prosperity. I thus aim to dedicate my life to serving others as a physician and continuing to be a voice for immigrants.

Would America be a better country if she were deported? Would we be better as a nation if Denisse Rojas was told: Leave. We don't need you. We don't want you. The fact that you have spent your entire life here means nothing. The fact that you are an exceptional student means nothing. Leave.

It sounds like a harsh point of view, but it is shared by many in Congress.

This last weekend, I took my two little grandkids—my wife and I did—out to the Statue of Liberty on Ellis Island. I took a look at that statue and was reminded that we are a nation of immigrants. I was blessed that my mother came to this country as an immigrant, and I stand on the Senate floor trying to do my best to make it a better country.

There are people like Denisse Rojas who want to make this a better America. DACA has given them that chance. Today, we celebrate the third anniversary of this Executive order, but more importantly, we celebrate who we are—a nation of immigrants always striving to make life better for the next generation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and thank my colleague from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO THE SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to express my appreciation to the Senator from Illinois for his passion, for his commitment, for his advocacy for people who sometimes do not have a voice here in the U.S. Senate. I congratulate him, and I express my heartfelt appreciation for his efforts on behalf of people who are unable to speak for themselves. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, June 16, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the Senate vote in relation to the McCain-Feinstein amendment No. 1889, with no second-degree amendments in order to the McCain-Feinstein amendment prior to the vote; further, that at 2:15 p.m., the Senate vote in relation to the Ernst amendment No. 1549, followed by a vote on the Gillibrand amendment No. 1578, as under the previous order, followed by the cloture vote with respect to the McCain substitute amendment No. 1463.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask to modify that unanimous consent request by adding further that no second-degree amendments be in order to the Ernst or Gillibrand amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO IRAQI KURDISH PESHMERGA FORCES

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, as we continue to fight against ISIS and their radical allies, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Ernst-Boxer amendment, which provides authority for direct assistance to a critical partner in that fight: the Iraqi Kurds.

Defeating ISIS is critical to maintaining an inclusive and unified Iraq, and the Iraqi Kurds are the key to that goal and helping to improve the humanitarian crisis in the region through their support and protection of over 1.6 million displaced persons from Iraq and Syria.

This bipartisan amendment, also co-sponsored by Senators GRAHAM, TILLIS, RUBIO, and GARDNER, provides temporary authority for the President, in consultation with the Iraqi Government—and I say, again, in consultation with the Iraqi Government—to provide weapons directly to Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga forces in the fight against ISIS should the administration choose to do so.

Currently, by law, the United States must provide support to the Iraqi Kurds through the Iraqi central government in Baghdad, which has often not been timely or adequate in the past. These delays have had a negative impact on the Kurds' ability to defend Iraqi territory and provide security for those who have sought refuge in Iraqi Kurdistan. The President's recent decision to expedite arms to the Kurds as a way to improve the counter-ISIS effort, I believe, speaks for itself.

Additionally, last year, Secretary of State John Kerry said to the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

You said the administration is responsible for sending all these weapons through Baghdad. No, we're not. You are. We're adhering to U.S. law passed by Congress.

Secretary Kerry continued:

We have to send it to the [Iraqi] government because that's U.S. law. If you want to change it, fix it, we invite you.

Well, this amendment does just that, and it does so in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion. It builds upon a similar bill in the House led by Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL. This bill and my amendment are quite different than the House NDAA language.

My amendment provides a 3-year authorization to reduce delays and inefficiencies in arming Peshmerga forces to fight ISIS while ensuring the Iraqi Government is an integral part of the process. The amendment continues to promote a unified Iraq and enhances the ability to fight our common enemy—an enemy that ultimately seeks to bring their terror to our shores.

Furthermore, the amendment preserves the President's ability to notify the Iraqi Government before weapons, equipment, defense services or related training is provided to Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga forces. It ensures this emergency authorization does not construct a precedent of providing direct support to organizations other than a country or an international organization. Most important to remember, it does not require the President to act. It provides him the authorization to do so if he feels the situation warrants it.

Beginning in the first gulf war, the Iraqi Kurds and their Peshmerga security forces have played a vital role in supporting U.S. interests and fostering a free Iraq, despite limited means of doing so. Last week, they not only held their ground but made some gains against ISIS in the Kirkuk Province. There are far too few positive news stories out of Iraq recently, but when there are some, it is often the Kurds who are making that progress.

ISIS is deadly and determined, and Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga forces—our critical partner in the fight against ISIS—need U.S. weapons as quickly as possible. We simply cannot afford future delays at this critical moment in the battle. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this much needed bipartisan legislation to arm the Iraqi Kurds in the fight against ISIS.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICA'S SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I wish to address the issue of America's space program.

Some very disturbing news has come out over the course of the Appropria-

tions Committee's deliberations on the House-passed Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill, which, it is my understanding, has passed the House. It includes the funding for NASA. What is disturbing about it is that at a time when we are recognizing that Vladimir Putin is increasingly trying to thwart the interests of the United States with his aggressiveness and invasion of Ukraine, his threats to the Baltic States, his invasion of that part of Ukraine known as Crimea, and the various other semi-threats he has made to us, it would certainly seem to be in the interests of the United States that where we have a joint shared and mutually agreed-to space program which goes all the way back to 1975 when in the middle of the Cold War an American spacecraft rendezvoused and docked with a Russian spacecraft, Soyuz—and the Apollo-Soyuz mission made extraordinary political as well as scientific history for those two crews, led by Gen. Tom Stafford on the American side and General Alexei Leonov on the Soviet side. After they docked, those two crews lived together in space for 9 days in the middle of the Cold War, 1975. That set us on the course—with the Soviet Union still in existence—of starting to cooperate. We actually had an American space shuttle rendezvous and dock with the first Russian space station, MIR. From there, we went on to build the International Space Station with the Russians as well as a dozen other nations as our partners. This space station, on orbit 250 to 325 miles high, is 120 yards long. In other words, if you sat at the 50-yard line in a football stadium, you would look from one goalpost to the other goalpost and that is how big this is, the International Space Station. There are six human beings up there. There is an international crew. There are Russians, there are Americans, and from time to time there are Italians, Germans, French, Japanese—a whole host of nations that are our partners.

So it has been that as we built this space station, the Russians would launch on their Soyuz spacecraft, to and from the International Space Station, supply and human supply, and the Americans, who had the capacity of 45,000 pounds on the space shuttle, would take up the component parts of the space shuttle and assemble them in orbit. We continued that over the better part of a decade and a half, until the space station was complete.

In the interim, we lost 14 souls and 2 space shuttles, the last one of which was Columbia in the winter of 2003. The investigation board, led by Navy Admiral Gehman, said: As soon as you get the space station assembled—it was necessary to fly the space shuttle to take up the component parts—you shut it down and you replace the space shuttle with a safer rocket.

I won't take the time right now to explain the engineering and design of

the space shuttle versus the future rocket, but for this discussion, suffice it to say that when you put the crew in a capsule at the top of the rocket, they have the capability to escape, saving the crew, even if there is an explosion of the rocket on the pad because the capsule can separate with the escape rockets and land some distance away via parachutes.

By the way, one of those rockets under development right now just had its pad-abort test—SpaceX—and it was very successful.

I am giving all this background to get to what was almost a dagger in the heart coming out of the Appropriations Committee in both the House and the Senate, and that is, they have funded NASA fairly well given the fact that they are trying to cut in order to satisfy this tea party-inspired sequester, which is this cut across the board, but in doing so, what they have done is cut the development funds for the humans riding on American rockets to get to and from our International Space Station, the essence of which is that if those funding cuts the committee has done are sustained, it will delay us from putting Americans on American rockets going to and from the space station until, instead of 2017, very likely 2019.

Ask almost any American whether they want a successful American space program, and they will clearly tell you yes, and that means Americans on American rockets. We have those rockets. They are sending cargo to and from. But we have to go in and do the designs of the redundancies and the escape systems on these commercial rockets, the two companies of which in competition are Boeing and SpaceX.

Now let me get back to Vladimir Putin. Do we think it is a matter of wise public policy that we would continue our dependence on Vladimir Putin on our ability to get to our own International Space Station by having to ride and pay what he now charges—\$75 million a ride per U.S. astronaut? Do we think that is wise public policy given this President of the Russian Federation who is so predictable? I don't think so.

So what the House did—the President's request for this next round of competition—and they have come a long way. They are ready to go. I just said that one of the competitors, SpaceX, just did a pad-abort test by showing that the capsule could separate from the rocket and safely land 3,600 feet away in a splashdown with the parachutes.

It is not wise public policy to cut funding so this development of safe human space travel on these commercial rockets of Boeing and SpaceX—it is not good public policy, it is not in the interests of U.S. public policy that we would stay tied to Vladimir Putin in order to get to and from our own space station with astronauts.

It is just a small amount of money. The President requested for this next year of competition \$1.24 billion to put in the redundancies and the escape systems and have them tested. It is a critical year. It is 2015. It is the middle of 2015. We are going to start flying U.S. astronauts 2 years from now, in 2017. But when you start cutting that funding from the President's request to \$900 million, as the Senate Appropriations Committee just did last week, or to \$1 billion, which the House has just done in the passage of their appropriations bill—when you do that, that is going to stretch out the development that it is very likely we can't send our own astronauts to our own space station on our own rockets. We will have to keep paying Vladimir Putin \$75 million every time we go to ride on the Soyuz to go to our own space station. Now, you figure it out. How many rides is that over an additional 2 years? That is probably \$300 million right there. That is only four rides, assuming he is going to be charging us in 2018 and 2019 the same price he is charging now. He could jack that up.

I think it was a sad day in the Senate Appropriations Committee when the committee turned down, by a very narrow vote of 14 to 12, Senator MIKULSKI's amendment to restore the cut from \$900 million to \$1.24 billion. Sooner or later, that appropriations bill is going to come out here. It has a lot of other problems, as every appropriations bill does, as the Senate is finding out on this Defense authorization bill right now—all the funny money that is baked into it because of this so-called sequester. But when it comes out here, I am going to ask the Senators: Do you think it is wise policy that we continue our reliance on Vladimir Putin?

As we have been doing the Defense bill, JOHN MCCAIN, our chairman, has been on a rampage against giving money to Vladimir Putin by virtue of us buying the Russian engine, which is a very good engine and which became an engine for American rockets, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, as a way of keeping their Russian—formerly Soviet—scientists engaged in an aerospace industry so they did not get secreted off to become scientists for rogue nations such as North Korea or Iran. But Senator MCCAIN has pointed out—rightly this Senator believes—that you want to reduce your reliance on those Russian engines called the RD-180 that are the main engines for the Atlas V, one of the absolute prime horses in the stable for our assured access to space. If we are going to lessen our dependence on the Russian engine, why wouldn't we lessen our dependence on Russian spacecraft being the only means by which we would get to orbit to our own International Space Station? The logic is too compelling. Yet it is this ideological furor that has lapsed over into partisanship that has

so gripped these Halls of Congress into making irrational decisions.

We can correct this decision when that appropriations bill comes to the floor of the Senate. I hope we will. I hope folks such as Senator MCCAIN—one of this country's two heroes who is taking this on in the defense committee—are going to help us out here on the floor by taking this on in the Appropriations Committee.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation Congress considers each and every year. That is why the new majority has made it one of our top priorities. It is why we have reversed the worrying trend of recent years, when we had seen such an important bill crammed in at the very last minute with little time for debate or for amendment.

This year's Defense bill has undergone weeks of thorough and serious consideration under the regular order, both in committee and here on the floor. This year's Defense bill has been open to a vigorous and bipartisan amendment process, with amendments from both sides having been adopted already.

It is a reform bill that aims to transform bureaucratic waste into crucial investments for the men and women who give everything—everything—to protect us. It contains important quality-of-life programs for these service-members and for their families. It holds the promise of compassion for wounded warriors, and it extends a

hand of understanding to heroes who struggle with mental health challenges. It also authorizes the pay raises our troops have surely earned.

It is a bill that contains input from both sides, and it is a bill that reflects priorities from both sides. That is why it sailed out of committee with huge bipartisan support, 22 to 4. That is why the House of Representatives passed a similar version with support from both parties.

That is why one would think it would be headed towards strong bipartisan passage here in the Senate as well. But some Democratic leaders now want to hold pay raises and important medical programs for our troops hostage as leverage for unrelated partisan gains.

It is all part of the filibuster summer they promised us. Democratic leaders have been quite open in detailing their strategy, which basically boils down to this: Deny our troops the benefits they have earned and even shut down the government if they can't extract more taxpayer dollars for bureaucracies such as the IRS.

The American people don't want any part of this senseless filibuster summer vacation. But Democratic leaders already packed up their dusty Winnebago and—with "Bigger IRS or bust" scrawled on the back—are now barreling toward our troops and their families in a dangerous game of chicken.

I am asking these leaders to please stop—please stop. This isn't some game. Please think about what you are doing.

We live in exceedingly dangerous times. We are faced with the most "diverse and complex array of crises" in the postwar era, and that is Henry Kissinger saying that. Nearly every week seems to bring another new example of ISIL's brutality.

This is certainly not a moment to use our military as leverage in order to secure a few more bucks—a few more bucks—for bloated bureaucracies such as the IRS.

All of this must make some of our Democratic colleagues uneasy. Some of them must be cringing at this strategy.

I am asking every Democrat who is serious about supporting our troops and our national security to stand with the American people in rejecting these partisan games. Our all-volunteer force should be focused on training in combat and preparing for conflict, not worrying about the partisan delay of important policy authorizations. We all know how vital our troops are to both our country and our own local communities. I have come to the floor recently to talk about what the men and women of our military mean to Kentucky.

I noted how, at Fort Campbell, more than 30,000 Army personnel trained for important missions around the world, from repeated deployments to Afghanistan to providing humanitarian sup-

port in places such as Africa. I noted how the base enriches the surrounding region with an economic impact of \$5 billion each year. I noted how Fort Knox houses many different military commands in both a truly impressive array of training grounds and training facilities. I noted how the base makes an economic impact of more than \$2 billion in Hardin County and the surrounding community.

So today I wish to speak a little bit about Blue Grass Army Depot. The depot, located in Richmond, is integral to both the Army and our national security as a facilitation site for the storage, renovation, and disposal of conventional munitions. It also serves as a reminder of the many important tasks undertaken by the Department of Defense—and one more reason Kentuckians don't want to see the Department distracted or disrupted by partisan games here in Washington, because, after having personally implored the Department of Defense for several decades to meet our national commitment, the Department is now close to completing construction of a state-of-the-art chemical demilitarization facility at the depot. That would allow for the proper disposal of dangerous chemical weapons that are stored there.

This is important for our country, and it is critical to the health and safety of my constituents in central Kentucky.

But it has also become a good jobs story for the region too. There are more than 1,400 jobs at the Blue Grass Army Depot, and hiring will continue when operations at the new facility begin.

Kentuckians know that passing the Defense bill before us would authorize a new Special Forces facility at Fort Campbell. Kentuckians know it would authorize construction projects and an important new medical clinic at Fort Knox.

Kentuckians also know it would help the Department of Defense from becoming unnecessarily distracted or disrupted as it continues carrying out critical tasks such as the kind we see at the Blue Grass Army Depot, disposing of these dangerous chemical weapons.

I am asking every Senator to remember all the ways our troops and our military enrich our States and local communities. I am asking every Senator to consider the serious times we live in, too. And I am asking every Senator to keep those things in mind when casting votes on the Defense bill.

We may be Republicans, we may be Democrats, but in the end we should all be able to come together to support the people who support us. Let's stand together in rejecting partisan games in favor of a bipartisan bill that contains good ideas from both parties and gives President Obama the exact funding level he asked for. This bill gives Presi-

dent Obama the exact funding level he asked for. Let's worry less about the demands of one party's political base and more about supporting the brave men and women who live on the base.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHILD ABUSE REPORTING LOOPHOLE ON MILITARY BASES

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I rise today to enable my colleagues to become aware of the tragic circumstances that led to the untimely death of 5-year-old Talia Williams and an amendment I have submitted that seeks to close the loophole that allowed Talia to slip through our child abuse safety net.

In 2005, Talia Williams moved to Hawaii to live with her father, Naeem Williams, and his wife, Talia's stepmother, Delilah Williams. Mr. Williams was in the military, stationed at Schofield Barracks. Mr. Williams' defense attorney argued that Mr. Williams was ill-equipped to care for his daughter. That may be true, but what we know for a fact is that Talia Williams suffered 7 months of near constant abuse at the hands of her father and stepmother. This torture ended on July 16, 2005, when Mr. Williams hit Talia so hard it left his fist imprinted on her chest and killed her. Mr. Williams was convicted of murdering his daughter last year, and he was sentenced to life without the possibility of parole. Her stepmother, Delilah Williams, was given a reduced sentence of 20 years in prison for providing testimony against her husband.

Tarshia Williams, Talia's mother, sued the military in 2010 for the death of her daughter. Her case was settled earlier this year, with the Department of Defense agreeing to a \$2 million settlement for not doing enough to save Talia Williams.

In the course of those two proceedings, it became clear that Talia Williams could have been saved if one thing occurred—reporting the abuse to Hawaii's Child Welfare Services branch or CPS. Through a memorandum of understanding—MOU—with the State of Hawaii, the Department of Defense established a system in which Hawaii's Child Welfare Services would be "the agency primarily responsible for intake, investigation, and the provision of protective services as deemed necessary to abused children within the State of Hawaii," including the children of military families both on and off base.

Under statute and reiterated in the MOU, only Hawaii's State agencies have the authority—not the military—to take emergency custody and order foster care placement for children without the consent of a parent. But this could only happen if officials in Hawaii knew about the abuse.

In Talia's case, a number of people were aware of her maltreatment. Yet no report was received by the report point of contact, who was the person on base mandated to report to Hawaii's Child Protective Services. The court in Tarshia Williams' civil suit found that military law enforcement, the doctors who treated Talia, and at least one or two family counselors had reason to suspect that violence was occurring in the Williams home. At least one person on base directly reported to the family advocacy program her concerns for Talia's well-being. No action was taken. Talia remained in the home while time and again law enforcement personnel and others were called to investigate or received reports of abuse. Not enough was done to remove her from her home. This lack of action was and is unacceptable. No one followed up on Talia's case to the degree we all should expect. Information about the abuse she lived through never reached the Army provost, who, under the MOU with the State of Hawaii, was the single person required to alert Child Welfare Services. And Talia died.

This loophole, which puts us in a position of hoping and trusting that information of abuse makes it to the reporting point of contact, must be addressed. My amendment would fix this problem by establishing a legal requirement that any federally mandated reporter with credible evidence or suspicion of child abuse notify both the DOD's Family Advocacy Program and the appropriate State's child welfare department. This amendment would eliminate the bottleneck of having only one reporting point of contact. Instead, mandatory reporters—which include teachers, doctors, law enforcement, and others—must directly report such evidence or suspicion both up the chain of command and also over to the appropriate State authorities. I am hopeful that by requiring such dual reporting, no military-connected children will remain in abusive homes because information never made it to the right person.

There were many mistakes made in Talia's case. Some of those mistakes are of the type that no law might rectify—a reluctance of people to get involved in the affairs of others, the reluctance to implicate abuse, perhaps fear of repercussions or out of respect for a member's service and personal affability. However, in a case such as Talia's, more should have been done and could have been done if only the right people were made aware of the situation.

I hope we do not continue to ignore this one glaring reporting loophole, leaving in place a hole in our safety net wide enough to miss the torture and untimely death of a child like Talia.

I recognize that time on the Defense authorization is short. I am sure the Department of Defense shares my concerns on this issue. I look forward to working with the Department and my colleagues to close this reporting loophole.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I would like to take a few minutes to shift gears to another issue of great importance. This issue is more hopeful. On June 15, 2012, President Obama enacted DACA—or Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals—granting deferred action to DREAMers all across the country. Three years later, almost 700,000 hard-working young people are proof that deferred action works.

DACA has changed the lives of countless students who were brought to our country as undocumented children through no fault of their own. The President's action has been truly transformative for many young people in Hawaii. Let me tell you about three such young people.

Gabriela emigrated from Brazil with her family at the age of 15. Despite a 3.8 GPA in high school, she found herself unable to go to college because she lacked required documentation. After receiving DACA, Gabriela enrolled in a community college, paying instate tuition, and is receiving her associate's degree in the spring of 2015 and transferring to the University of Hawaii to earn her bachelor's degree. Receiving DACA was a life-changing moment for Gabriela because it enabled her to do everyday things that she was never able to do before, such as getting a driver's license, opening a bank account, renting her own apartment. It also enabled her to get an education, start a career, and live up to her full potential.

Sam was born in Tonga and brought to Hawaii when he was only 4 years old. His parents petitioned for residency for the whole family. But as a result of a slow and ineffective immigration system, Sam was over 18 years old by the time their petition became current. As a result, 18-year-old Sam was put into deportation proceedings and came very close to being torn away from his family and deported to a country he no longer remembered. Thankfully, the President announced the DACA Program and Sam was granted a stay of deportation and allowed to remain with his family. Today, Sam works as a music director at his church and is currently saving money to return to school and seek his dream of higher education.

Shingai is a DREAMer from Zimbabwe, who immigrated to the United States when he was 12. He did not find out he was undocumented until he graduated from high school and decided to apply for college. Shingai was a star football athlete and won a full football scholarship to go to college. Unfortunately, with stardom came immediate attention. Due to his undocumented status, he was forced to quit his dream and protect himself and his family from the public eye. Shingai knew the importance of education, so he pursued his degree a few classes at a time. This semester, he is finally set to graduate and earn a bachelor's in political science from Hawaii Pacific University. Receiving DACA has enabled Shingai to come out of the shadows and share his story in order to raise awareness and empower immigrant youth in Hawaii.

These DREAMers no longer have the fear of deportation and family separation hanging over their heads each and every day. DACA recipients are now free to live their lives, to seek an education and work as teachers, engineers, enter our armed services, become business owners.

DACA is life-changing for these young people, but it also has helped all Americans.

Forty-nine percent of DREAMers who were granted DACA were able to open their first bank account, 33 percent were able to obtain a credit card, 60 percent have been able to gain new jobs, contributing to our tax base and our economy. Experts estimate that all deferred action recipients will add \$230 billion to our gross domestic product in the next decade. Quite simply, DACA works.

The American public stands with our DREAMers and immigrant families and smart policies like DACA. Over 70 percent of Americans reject the mass deportation approach favored by some and instead support the President's Executive action. However, DACA is only a temporary solution to address one part of our broken immigration system. It is not a substitute for comprehensive immigration reform.

It has been roughly 2 years since the Senate passed an immigration reform bill with strong bipartisan support. After House Republicans refused to act on comprehensive immigration reform, President Obama built on the success of DACA to use his well-established Executive authority to expand the DACA Program and create a new program for the parents of children born as U.S. citizens. I strongly support the President's action.

Both of these programs could be up and running, helping families and individuals, millions of them, but for a lawsuit filed by some Republican Governors opposed to immigration reform. We must continue fighting to provide relief for millions of parents who

should be signing up for DAPA right now, paying their fees and applying for work permits, additional young people who qualify for DACA as well as millions of other hard-working families facing deportation every single day in our country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Madam President, this is week 14 of "Waste of the Week." I have been coming to the floor for 14 weeks while the Senate has been in session this year to talk about yet another waste which, if we can correct, can save the taxpayers a lot of money. In this case, we are talking about several billion dollars that have been determined by the inspector general of the Social Security Administration to have been spent improperly, accidentally—by whatever reason—money that belongs to the taxpayers and falls under the category of waste.

It is waste, and I give this inspector general and his staff great credit for doing something very creative and interesting. Actually, this is their job, delving into how an agency handles its business and, more importantly, how it handles the taxpayers' money. Whether you are looking at big business or big government, you find examples of cost cutting that can save the company and, in this case, save the taxpayer, a very significant amount of money.

The inspector general decided to take a random sample of over 1,500 beneficiaries of the Social Security disability fund, and 44.5 percent of them received an overpayment at some point during the 10-year period that he studied. And based on this sample, the Social Security inspector general estimated that overpayments totaled about \$16.8 billion over a period of time from October 2003 to February 2014, covering nearly 4 million beneficiaries. Now, that is a lot of people, but in this digital age, there are ways in which we can ensure that correct payments are made to the right people and that we don't end up overspending money that comes from hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

Now, there is some good news to this story because the Social Security Administration, following up on this study, determined to go through its records and try to recover some of this money that had been overpaid. They were successful in recovering nearly half of the \$16.8 billion. They recovered

\$8.1 billion of overpayments during this period of time, and I commend them for their effort in doing that. But while we celebrate the good news, we also need to dig in and determine how we make sure this doesn't continue.

There is another \$8.7 billion out there that needs to be recovered and, of course, the goal is to not only recover that money, if possible, but also to keep this from continuing in out-years. So let us put the steps in place that will give us the ability to stop this from happening going forward.

Now, let me go back and give a little background, the history of how this all came about and how this happened. Of those who improperly received benefits, the circumstances break down like this: Nearly 40 percent—actually 37.9 percent—of the overpayments happened when individuals started working and made enough money by law to support themselves and, therefore, no longer qualified for Social Security disability benefits. Another 23 percent had their medical condition improved to the point where they could go back to work.

Now, interestingly enough, I believe it was my very first "Waste of the Week" that I pointed out that a very significant number of individuals were receiving payments both from Social Security disability and unemployment insurance. To receive unemployment insurance, you have to prove you cannot work or you have been thrown out of work and can't get back. To receive Social Security disability payments, you have to prove you no longer are able to work and get back. Yet these people were receiving payments from both of those sources.

That was the very first "Waste of the week," and we put up a chart indicating that we are hoping to reach our goal of \$100 billion of waste, fraud, and abuse, to show the example of money being sent to Washington. Some say: We can't cut a penny from any program. Well, every business that has gone through this great recession—now going on for the sixth year or so—has had to make sacrifices and they have had to cut costs. Families have had to cut costs. Businesses have had to cut costs. Only the Federal Government says we can't cut a penny; every program we have is valuable and has to be saved and, in fact, needs more money to be efficient.

So let's start with those issues that have been determined, through inspections by independent agencies, and proven to have fraud and waste and see if we can add this up. As you can see, this gauge is growing every week.

Returning to the breakdown of those who improperly received benefits: Another 8.6 percent had multiple reasons they were no longer eligible for the benefit, 7.5 percent were imprisoned and had fugitive status, which means they were no longer qualified for the

disability benefits, but 7.2 percent of those people continued to receive checks after they had died. So you not only have people in prison and therefore no longer eligible, but 7.2 percent of the people receiving benefits received those after they died, and that totaled up to a very significant amount of money.

Again, we certainly have the technology and the capability to run the death records through the system to make sure checks are not continuing to be sent out to the last home address or whatever to deceased individuals and then taken in and cashed perhaps by family or who knows who.

There were 3.4 percent who weren't entitled to benefits in the first place. It should be pretty easy to scratch those names and save some money. There were 1.8 percent who had their payment improperly computed—in other words, overpayment, a mistake made by the Social Security Administration—1.8 percent had financial resources exceeding the limit which they were supposed to get, 1.7 percent had a change in their living arrangements—they moved abroad and no longer were eligible—and 5 percent fell under another category of reasons.

The bottom line is an inspection was made, a study was conducted to see how this came about, and we now have the information that money was returned through legal process, but there is still \$8.7 billion out there we didn't get back. So we want to make sure measures are now put in place so this doesn't continue. We certainly don't want some Senator on the floor 5 years or 10 years from now saying: Let me tell you about the latest study of the Social Security inspector general, and when the former Senator from Indiana came to the floor he announced there was \$8.7 billion still out there and that we ought to make changes in the system so it wouldn't happen again. But guess what. It didn't get done, and now here I am back at it.

So let's do this now. Let's make these changes now so the American people understand we are here not to extort them from the kind of overpayment that is taking place and using their taxpayer dollars to achieve that goal. We can fix this problem, but it is going to take some work.

We need better cross-referencing for beneficiaries with other government lists or private lists to help identify earned wages or other assets. We need information sharing that can save billions and make a significant financial debt into these unfortunate overpayments.

Assuming the trend of the IG report continues, this change can be made, and the missing \$8.7 billion in overpayments can be recovered by the Social Security Administration in future payments. We haven't calculated what potentially we could save in out-years because, hopefully, we will be able to put

measures in place, now that we have this information, that will stop these overpayments from being made. But we do know there is \$8.7 billion out there of money that can be recovered.

So we are adding today a big chunk of money, bringing us up nearly to three-quarters of our goal of reaching \$100 billion in savings from waste, fraud, and abuse. We are only into week 14, and we have several more weeks and months ahead of us. I am hoping we are going to have to put an extension onto this chart. We will see how high it goes. Because our goal is to save the taxpayer dollars that the Federal Government has been proven to waste through waste, fraud, and abuse.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MATTHEW T. MCGUIRE TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

NOMINATION OF GENTRY O. SMITH, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS, AND TO HAVE THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Matthew T. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years; and Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly our colleagues will have an opportunity to vote on two nominations that are being recommended by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I see that Senator CORKER is on the floor, and I thank him for his help in bringing these two confirmations to the floor of the Senate. Both of these individuals are well qualified, and I urge our colleagues to support both nominations.

One is the nomination of Matthew McGuire to be United States Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The other is the nomination of Gentry Smith to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions.

Mr. McGuire is the Assistant to the Secretary and Director of the Office of Business Liaison at the Department of Commerce, where he leads engagement with the business community, works to strengthen the international economic position of the United States, and advocates for U.S. trade and investment. Prior to joining the U.S. Government, Mr. McGuire worked as a senior executive in the financial services industry for more than 8 years, but he also has been active with nonprofit and civic organizations throughout his career, working on a range of public policy issues across the country and around the world.

In a world where global health, environmental resources, and security challenges far outstrip any one country's ability to respond, it is in our clear interest to have strong U.S. leadership in the World Bank—the foremost international organization promoting economic development, poverty alleviation, and good governance around the world.

Prominent Members of the House of Representatives emphasized this critical role of the World Bank in their May 15 letter supporting Mr. McGuire's nomination. Representatives MEEKS, CLAY, MURPHY, SEWELL, MENG, RANGEL, and others stated that Mr. McGuire's senior executive experience in the financial services industry and leadership roles with nonprofit and civic organizations working on public policy issues around the world "make him distinctly qualified for this position." Mr. McGuire's highly relevant experience in his current position at the Department of Commerce, added to his extensive background working in both for-profit and nonprofit sectors, make him an excellent choice to represent the United States at this insti-

tution that is so crucial for global stability. I am confident he will serve with distinction.

Gentry O. Smith is currently a Senior Advisor at the Bureau of Diplomatic Security. The Office of Foreign Missions assists and regulates services for foreign missions in the United States, negotiates with foreign diplomatic representatives to improve operating conditions for U.S. diplomatic missions and personnel abroad, ensures that U.S. diplomatic missions abroad receive equivalent treatment with respect to benefits, privileges, and immunities accorded by the host countries, and, as necessary, adjusts the benefits accorded to foreign missions in the United States on the basis of the principle of reciprocity.

Mr. Smith has an exemplary record of serving his country for well over a quarter of a century, starting with his service as a Raleigh police officer. Mr. Smith's thorough and highly relevant experience as a Regional Security Officer for American Embassies in Egypt, Japan, and Burma, and his employment with the Bureau of Diplomatic Security as Director of Physical Security Programs, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Countermeasures, and Senior Advisor gives him the expertise and fortitude to head the agency responsible for both improving the operating conditions for U.S. diplomatic missions and for adjusting the benefits accorded to foreign missions if our missions abroad face mistreatment.

Mr. Smith is a proven leader with extensive management experience and skills, and I am confident he will be an excellent Director of the Office of Foreign Missions.

Let me also point out that I know our committee has been very, very busy. We have been able to successfully steer towards enactment the bill for congressional review of the Iranian nuclear agreement. We recently were able to report out in a 19-to-0 vote State Department authorization. I must say that not a day goes by that our committee is not doing some work on behalf of the Senate and the American people.

But I need to point out that we need to pay more attention to getting the President's nominees to the floor with recommendations from our committee. If we complete these two nominations tonight—and I assume that we will—I believe that will make four nominees on which we have completed our work in confirmation that the President has sent to us. There are nine other recommendations, five of which are career officers, that have been reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and have yet to be brought to the floor. Five of those nine are career people, and yet we have had no action on the floor of the Senate. Of more concern, there are 35 nominees currently pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Of these 35, only 4

have had hearings, and 22 of the 35 are career diplomats.

I understand we have had an extremely busy schedule within the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator CORKER and I have talked about this, and I know we will use our best efforts to get these nominations moving forward. I just really wanted to report that because I think we need to work—not only our committee but the leadership of the Senate—to make sure the President's nominees are timely considered and are timely brought forward to the full Senate. I know Senator CORKER has been a true advocate of that process and certainly worked very well in the last Congress to make sure our committee acted in a timely way. I look forward to working with Senator CORKER in this Congress to advance those nominees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise in support of these two nominations. I appreciate the distinguished ranking member, Senator CARDIN, for reading out their bios. They are Foreign Service officers and have been in government service for some time. I applaud their desire to serve at this level and certainly plan to support them here at our 5:30 vote and hope other Members of the Senate will.

As to the point regarding nominations, I think our committee last year couldn't have acted in a more speedy fashion in getting nominees out. I know we are starting a new Congress, and there is a little backlog that takes place. But I can assure the Senator and others on the committee and others in this body that I have no desire to hold up especially Foreign Service officers who have committed their lives to the Foreign Service and have handled themselves in such a professional manner nor, actually, other nominees. So I do look forward to working with Senator CARDIN to clear some folks through. I know we have had conversations today regarding moving them across the Senate floor. I know every time there is a recess, typically a large swath of people are actually moved out right before recess. Hopefully, that will be the case as it relates to some of the Foreign Service nominations that are here.

But I appreciate the Senator raising it. I appreciate the way he works with me, and I look forward to things picking up speed now that the backlog of the first-of-the-year beginning and some of the many activities that have been under way have been completed. So I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, again, let me thank Senator CORKER. It has been a real pleasure to work with him on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He has put the interest of the

Senate and our Nation as the principle guiding force and the appropriate role for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In that regard, there is an amendment pending that we will be voting on tomorrow on the National Defense Authorization Act. It comes under the jurisdiction of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Let me comment on that, if I might. That is an amendment offered by Senator ERNST, and her amendment would provide temporary authority to provide arms directly to the Kurds, the Kurdish regional government's security forces, outside the process established with coordinating all U.S. weapons deliveries and training with the Government of Iraq and Baghdad. Not only is it the U.S. policy to ensure that all armed transfers are coordinated and approved by the Government of Iraq, it is also the law of our country.

I very much oppose this amendment, and I just want my colleagues to understand why I hope they will reject this amendment. I know it is well intended, but it would undermine the authority of the central government. What we are looking for, how we are going to ultimately be able to bring stability to Iraq, we need to have a central government that represents all the communities of Iraq, that represents the Shias, represents the Sunnis, represents the Kurds. If the central government cannot be the coordinating entity, then we are going to have a void in that country which only fuels the ability of organizations such as ISIS to be able to get recruits and resources for their terrorist activities.

We are sending military advisers, funding, and arms to the Iraqis and leading a global coalition and working every day with the Iraqi leaders and communities at all levels because we have an interest in a stable, unified, and Federal Iraq. To achieve this goal, we must have the confidence of all of the Iraqi leaders, and that is why it is important for us to coordinate our strategy through a central government.

I want to make one other point absolutely clear. There is absolutely no evidence that the Baghdad government is delaying or denying arms to the Kurds. To date, the United States and the anti-ISIL coalition has provided over 47 million rounds of ammunition, thousands of artillery pieces and rifles, 1,000 AT4 shoulder-fired, anti-armor systems, hundreds of vehicles, including Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles, known as the MRAPs, and European missiles to counter vehicle-borne improvised explosive devices. They have been receiving arms.

We have received letters, both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, from Secretary of State Kerry and Secretary of Defense Carter in opposition to the Ernst amendment.

If I might quote from Secretary Kerry, where he said:

Any language that calls for preferred treatment for one region of Iraq strengthens voices that have been working against the pragmatic reconciliation policies advocated by Prime Minister Abadi. . . . It also reinforces Iran's narrative that the United States seeks Iraq's partition and that Iran is Iraq's only true and reliable partner. The result, therefore, is the precise opposite of what may have been intended: the language strengthens ISIL and other extremists, weakens Iraqi voices committed to working with the Coalition to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL, increased Iran's prominence, and erodes state authority at a time when such authority is vitally needed to isolate and defeat extremist actors.

What Secretary Kerry is saying is—it should be pretty obvious—that in order to diminish Iran's influence in Iraq, you need a central government that has the confidence of the Sunni population and the Kurdish population. If, on the other hand, we are talking about trying to divide the country, that we are going to deal differently with the Kurdish defense and not through the central defense, then it feeds into the point that the United States is not serious about developing a unified Iraqi authority. We must have that if we are going to be able to succeed in Iraq.

What Secretary Carter said, Secretary of Defense:

Directly arming the Kurds or other groups within Iraq is inconsistent with the longstanding U.S. foreign policy of working to maintain a stable, unified, Iraq. . . . Legislative language of this type risks undermining the Government of Iraq and undercutting ongoing coalition military operations that are conducting in coordination with the Government of Iraq to degrade, destroy, and ultimately defeat ISIL.

Once again, we have our two top individuals both telling us this would be counterproductive. I know my colleague is well intentioned with her amendment, but the fact is that the only way we are going to succeed in Iraq is if we can have a Government of Iraq that has the confidence of all the communities and an Iraqi Government that believes the United States is not picking sides among the ethnic communities in Iraq and that Iraq does not have to rely on Iran for its security needs.

That means this amendment could be counterproductive to those very goals, our very goals in Iraq. When this amendment comes up for vote tomorrow, I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I will be supporting the nominee who is going to be shortly voted on.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to rise on the third anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program for all of the young men and women it has helped—young men and women who came to this country as young children through no choice of their own. Their parents made that decision for them. The only country they have ever known is that of the United States. The only flag they pledge allegiance to is the American flag. The only national anthem they know is “The Star-Spangled Banner.” And because of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, they have had temporary deportation relief and work authorizations so they could achieve their full potential as young Americans.

I celebrate what we call this program, DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, with great pride because I pushed very hard to make it a reality. I spoke to the President many times about granting long overdue administrative relief to DREAMers, who are Americans in every way except for a piece of paper. And 3 years ago with the tireless advocacy of DREAMers, the immigrant community, community leaders in cities and towns across America, and with the help of countless Members of Congress, the President took action and changed the lives of millions of young men and women living in this country, allowing them to fully contribute to the country they call home.

Today, the dream is still very much alive. This Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program has harnessed the talent of hundreds of thousands of young Americans in immeasurable ways since its successful inception, and it is a success because of the bold Executive actions taken in June of 2012.

In an immigration system that is as flawed as ours, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program has been a beacon of hope, one step toward a more fair and just reality for immigrants in our great country. The numbers tell the story.

The action gave 700,000 young immigrants a chance at a better life. It has strengthened our economy and has generated roughly \$422 million in application fees over the last 3 years. It has allowed young Americans to open bank accounts, get a driver's license, get a new job, prepare for the future with a growing sense of stability, economic security, and financial solvency.

This program has been a model of success, shaped by the courageous individuals who have decided to come forward, register with the government, pass a criminal background check, work hard, and take advantage of the opportunities the deferred action program provides.

In my home State of New Jersey alone, more than 25,000 young people have been granted the peace of mind that comes with temporary protection from deportation and the ability to work. We are talking about young people who attend our schools, serve our communities, people who dream just like all children dream of becoming doctors or teachers, artists, and entrepreneurs with a full stake in America.

We are talking about people like Deyanira Aldana, who graduated from Essex County College just this past May. She came to the United States when she was 4 years old. She now works and lives in New Jersey with her mom and dad and older brother and sister who are also DACA recipients. She plans on becoming a substitute teacher and is grateful to the doors the deferred action program has opened to her.

Deyanira, like other new Americans and future Americans, is part of the rich fabric that forms New Jersey's and America's histories and destiny. Her family represents who we are as a nation. They embody the spirit of American life, which has always been shaped by the hopes, dreams, and courage of those who have made it to this country and called it their home.

It is appropriate that these deferred action beneficiaries—the children of immigrants we refer to as DREAMers—have the chance to fully contribute their talents and live the American dream because of the deferred action program. In the absence of comprehensive immigration reform, DACA allows them to live with dignity and fulfill their full potential. Because of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, hundreds of thousands of DREAMers no longer have the fear of deportation and family separation hanging over their heads and now are our newest college students, teachers, and small business owners. If we look closely at who those individuals are, we see that this program is about families like Deyanira's. By removing the fear of deportation, of being unnecessarily torn from your loved ones at a moment's notice, more families can now live in peace, with dignity, and with real hopes of building a stronger future together.

Three years later, we see how our Nation's dreams and aspirations are more attainable when DREAMers can achieve their full potential. The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program is living proof that all of America benefits when an undocumented individual steps out of the shadows and is able to fully contribute to the economy through their ingenuity, skills, and hard work.

We need to build upon programs like DACA, not turn our backs on extending opportunities to those who are willing to work hard for them. It is long past time for us to replace the lingering

anxiety and fear in immigrant communities with smart policies that make good on America's promise to provide opportunity and freedom for all.

For many, the dream began with the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program. For others, that dream is still delayed. I look forward to the day the President's more recent Executive actions announcing the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability Program and expanded DACA are implemented.

Despite the obstructionism of some, I am confident justice will ultimately prevail, and the President's actions will be upheld by our courts. I will continue to fight not just for the DACA recipients but for their parents, other DREAMers, and for every immigrant family. I will continue to fight for comprehensive immigration reform that will fix our Nation's broken immigration system once and for all, not just because it makes good economic sense but because it is the right thing to do.

I am not alone. Seventy-two percent of Americans believe undocumented immigrants who currently live in the United States should have a path toward permanent residency and ultimately to legal citizenship. Americans continue to overwhelmingly support fixing our broken system, and the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program's success should further encourage Congress to move forward, fortified by the conviction that comprehensive immigration reform is a fight worth fighting for.

Let me close by saying, in the meantime, I join my colleagues in commemorating DACA's anniversary as a day that marks 3 years of smart and successful policy, as a step in the right direction, and as a foundation upon which we can continue to build. It is an opportunity for the American dream to be realized by some of the youngest and best and brightest whom we have in the Nation. Many of these young men and women—I have met them—are valedictorians, salutatorians, and we need to use their intellect, energy, and creative talents to build a better America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON MCGUIRE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Matthew T. McGuire, of the District of Columbia,

to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years?

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Feinstein	Mikulski
Ayotte	Flake	Murphy
Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gardner	Nelson
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Peters
Booker	Grassley	Portman
Brown	Hatch	Reed
Cantwell	Heinrich	Reid
Cardin	Heitkamp	Sanders
Carper	Hirono	Schatz
Casey	Johnson	Schumer
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Coats	King	Stabenow
Collins	Kirk	Tester
Coons	Klobuchar	Tillis
Corker	Leahy	Udall
Cornyn	Manchin	Warner
Cotton	Markey	Warren
Donnelly	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden
Ernst	Merkley	

NAYS—24

Barrasso	Hoeven	Roberts
Blunt	Isakson	Rounds
Boozman	Lankford	Sasse
Capito	McConnell	Scott
Daines	Moran	Sullivan
Enzi	Paul	Thune
Fischer	Perdue	Toomey
Heller	Risch	Wicker

NOT VOTING—14

Boxer	Graham	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Lee	Shelby
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SMITH NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, a Career

Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

800TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAGNA CARTA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Eight hundred years ago on this very day, at the field of Runnymede alongside the River Thames in England, King John granted the document that came to be known as the Magna Carta—in our language, the Great Charter. This was the result of negotiations between King John and rebellious barons who objected to what they saw as violations of their customary privileges. By affixing his Great Seal to the document 800 years ago today, the King accepted limits on his power to impose his will on his subjects.

It was a momentous occasion, as evidenced by the fact that four original copies of the Magna Carta remain carefully preserved, but its significance has grown over time. It is true that the original Magna Carta was only in effect for a couple months before King John then at that time got the Pope to annul it. Subsequent Kings voluntarily reissued the charter as a way of gaining the support of the barons, and portions still retain legal force in England today.

While many of the specific provisions in the Magna Carta dealt with very medieval concerns, such as how heirs and widows of deceased barons should be treated, a couple clauses resonate very strongly to this very day.

No free man shall be seized or imprisoned or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any other way, nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land.

To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay justice or rightful justice.

In these clauses, you can see the specific right of habeas corpus that was included in the U.S. Constitution as well as a right to speedy trial by jury in the Sixth Amendment. You can also see a reference to property rights.

Moreover, what comes through is the overarching theme of the Magna Carta—something very basic to U.S. governance—the rule of law or what John Adams called “a government of laws, and not of men.”

In the 17th century, the Magna Carta was increasingly cited to criticize the King's exercise of arbitrary power in the tug-of-war for supremacy between the English Crown and the Parliament. It became a potent symbol of an inviolable liberties of Englishmen.

For instance, when William Penn was put on trial in England for practicing his Quaker faith, he used the Magna Carta in his defense. He later wrote a commentary on the Magna Carta for a work printed in Philadelphia called “The Excellent Privilege of Liberty and Property Being the Birth-Right of the Free-born Subjects of England,” which contained the first edition of the Magna Carta printed in the New World. In this work, William Penn explained the significance of the English tradition where the ruler is bound by the law, in contrast to countries such as France, where the King was actually the law.

He wrote, again quoting William Penn:

In England the Law is both the measure and the bound of every Subject's duty and allegiance, each man having a Fixed Fundamental right born with him, as to freedom of his person and property in his estate, which he cannot be deprived of, but either by his consent, or some crime, for which the law has imposed such a penalty for forfeiture.

It is in this environment that the English philosopher John Locke developed his theory of natural rights, which was so influential in the drafting of the Declaration of Independence. The natural rights philosophy went a step further than the ancient rights of Englishmen, positing that the rights are God-given and self-evident and that the very purpose of government is to secure those rights.

However, you can clearly trace the lineage of the notion of limited government and consent of the governed to the Magna Carta. In fact, the original version of the Magna Carta contained a clause limiting the ability of the King to levy certain taxes on the barons without first consulting them. I think you can clearly see that this is an early version of what we say: No taxation without representation.

While that provision did not last, the custom of needing consent for taxation eventually led to the evolution of the parliamentary system and representative government. Still, it is important to note that representative government grew out of even more fundamental principles, such as the rule of law, limited government, and the notion that citizens retain rights that the government may not in any way violate.

Our Founding Fathers thought that representative government was the

best way to guard against tyranny and preserve the rights of citizens. But that is not sufficient, because without a strong tradition of respect for the rule of law, even duly-elected governments can descend into tyranny. Now, remember the history of Germany pre-World War II. Hitler came to power as a result of a democratic process and then proceeded to act in the very definition of tyranny.

In more recent times, Vladimir Putin was elected President of Russia and then stifled opposition and consolidated power to himself, essentially putting himself above the law. When Sergei Magnitsky stood up for the rule of law in Russia and exposed corruption at the highest levels in that country, he was imprisoned in appalling conditions, where he died a slow, agonizing death.

By contrast, the 800-year old Anglo-American tradition of the rule of law acts as a crucial safeguard to our liberty—not only that, but it is also an essential foundation for prosperity. An organization called World Justice Project has ranked countries based on various factors that indicate how a strong the rule of law is in that particular country. The countries at the top tend to not only be ones we recognize as very free but also tend to be much more prosperous than countries ranked at the bottom of the rule of law index.

Now, maybe to us in America that makes common sense. I think it is common sense. You are less likely, then, to work hard to generate wealth or invest in a business if you cannot be sure that the law will protect what you worked for. Still, we should not take this 800-year-old document and tradition for granted. It will continue to preserve our liberty and provide for our prosperity only so long as it retains the reverence it has built up over the generations.

Human nature being what it is, there is still always a temptation for those in power to think they are above the law. For instance, in the famous Frost interviews after he resigned the Presidency over the Watergate scandal, Richard Nixon was asked about the legal limits of what a President can do. Nixon answered: "If the President does it, that means it's not illegal."

He could not have been more wrong from the standpoint of the U.S. Constitution and the fundamental principles on which it is founded, going all the way back to the Magna Carta. Still the danger does not just come from megalomaniacs and others who seek to use power for their own purposes. Those entrusted with power who would act outside the law, even when they think it is good for their people as they see it, end up eroding the bulwark of liberty that is the rule of law. Ever since the Progressive Era, there has been a powerful school of thought that

our system of divided and limited government is somehow inefficient, that we should have evolved beyond the need for limits on governmental power, and that power concentrated in the right hands can be used to help people.

This is a temptation for every President and one I fear the current President is particularly susceptible to. In fact, modern Presidents have tools at their disposal that go far beyond anything envisioned by the Framers of the Constitution. The Constitution says that the role of the President is not to write laws, but to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

We now have a massive administrative state made up of departments and agencies to which Congress has delegated enormous power and that make regulations with the force of law. Moreover, these agencies have the power to enforce their own regulations and the primary role in interpreting their regulation in individual cases. Thus, they exercise legislative, executive, and judicial power all in the one.

But this concentration of power in executive branch agencies creates a strong temptation for Presidents to use it to implement their agenda irrespective of Congress or the law of the land. I have been very critical of President Obama for a number of actions that I think exceed his legal authority, from using the Clean Water Act to try to regulate land use decisions in virtually every county in our country to forcing States to adopt his preferred education policies in order to get funding and waivers to granting a massive amnesty from our immigration laws, which even he previously admitted he did not have the legal authority to do.

I think these are bad policies. But even those who see these as short-term policy victories should be very wary of the long-term consequences of anything that erodes our tradition of respect for the rule of law.

Now, as I finish, it took 800 years to build up, and once it is eroded it will not be easy to restore. It is vital that Presidents exercise restraint out of respect for the rule of law.

Congress should also work to reclaim much of the power it has delegated to the executive branch in order to reduce the temptation and the opportunity for abuse of executive power. It is not just up to elected officials. Our ancient tradition of the rule of law draws its authority from the fact that generations have demanded that their leaders adhere to the rule of law. As such, this 800th anniversary of the Magna Carta is an occasion for Americans to remember our heritage and to rededicate ourselves to this bedrock of liberty, the rule of law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, for most children around the country the school year has ended and the summer has begun. Some 700,000 children in Ohio, my home State, during the school year receive free or reduced-price school lunches on an average day—some 700,000 children. Those children might not have access to a nutritious meal when school cafeterias close for the summer.

Summer break should not mean a break from good nutrition. That is where the Summer Food Service Program steps in. The U.S. Department of Agriculture works with State departments of education to ensure that every child has sufficient, adequate, nutritious food to keep growing and learning after the final school bell rings. This year in Ohio there will be 1,500 Summer Food Service Program sites across the State.

Last year these sites served almost 4 million meals. Last week, I spoke with Winnie Brewer, who runs these sites in Marion County, OH, in a city about the size of Mansfield, near where I grew up.

According to Winnie, more than one in four kids in her county is food insecure. She talked about one of their newest volunteers, who came to her in tears after watching a 6-year-old boy clean the shelves in an SFSP site—a feeding site—and then start digging through the trash. He was just that hungry. That is why the work Winnie does and her volunteers do is so important.

Right now, too many families don't know about this critical program. Too many families miss out on receiving its assistance once school lets out. Winnie reports that just 1 in 10 children who receive breakfast or lunch during the school year comes to summer feeding sites. That means that in my State almost 700,000 children on any given school day will be getting a free or reduced-price breakfast or lunch—700,000. But during the summer months, only about 70,000 of those children get these meals or snacks. We need to do all we can to raise public awareness of these programs so that families know that the end of the school year does not mean an end to food services for their children.

In Marion, the city I mentioned where Winnie runs her program, she anticipates she will triple the number of meals she serves this year compared to 5 years ago. That is because she and other community partners have committed to making this program a success. At approved schools, in churches, in summer camps, in synagogues, and in community centers, pools, and recreation centers, volunteers and organizers are ensuring that children have the healthy food they need to succeed.

Those sites often offer more than just healthy meals. They provide summer

enrichment activities for kids. We know that low-income children whose parents typically have less education, in the months from school closing in late May or early June until school returns in late August or early September, tend to fall back on their education. In districts such as that where the parents have less education, less ability or know-how to read to the children, to take them on field trips that might make their minds more active, we know those children start every fall having to catch up just to get back to where they were in the spring.

That is one of the beauties of the summer feeding program. So you are not just giving these children nutritious meals, but you are also giving these children library activities and sports activities and other kinds of organized activities at churches, at community centers, at schools, and at libraries that can matter. The sites in Marion County partner with the YMCA to offer exercise. They run a literacy program that provides free books to kids at feeding sites. Getting a new book can turn a child on and get that child more excited about reading.

Earlier this month, I was in Youngstown—a city in northeast Ohio—to get the word out about the summer food and feeding program. I met with Mark Samuel, who operates a site at the West Side Community Center and a couple dozen other sites in Mahoning Valley. I also met with Retha Austin, who has children and grandchildren in the program, and now she is working a few hours a week as a paid worker to help get this program up and running.

Families need to know about these sites and the dedicated folks like Mark, Winnie, and Retha who run them. Summer break shouldn't mean a break from good nutrition.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

MILITARY JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, tomorrow we will vote on a very important amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, the Military Justice Improvement Act, introduced by my colleague and friend, the junior Senator from the State of New York. I have worked with her and have been privileged to help craft this very important legislative measure, not because sexual assault is a uniquely military problem—in fact, just the contrary. Sexual assault afflicts our campuses and our workplaces. The battle against sexual assault is hardly limited to the military. But we have the opportunity to take a step that will set a model and send a message to other places where sexual assault is a problem and where underreporting, because

of lack of trust and confidence in the prosecutorial system or the administrative apparatus, is a major reason that sexual assault continues. Without confidence, trust, effective results, and protection of privacy and physical safety, survivors will simply not come forward. If they do not come forward, there will be no discipline or prosecution. That is the fundamental reason why I believe the amendment we will address tomorrow is so important.

I have held roundtables on campus sexual assault all around the State of Connecticut—more than 12 or 13 of them—and have worked with a bipartisan group of Senators, including not only Senator GILLIBRAND, who is the major sponsor of this amendment, but also Senator MCCASKILL, who has been an extraordinary leader in this area having been a prosecutor herself, and Senator HELLER as well as others on both sides of the aisle, to devise a solution to campus sexual assault—not just a single panacea but a set of measures that addresses one of the major obstacles to effective action against campus sexual assault, which is the underreporting of this heinous, horrific crime. It is a crime wherever it occurs, whether in the military or on campus. That is why we have to combat and conquer it, just as we do an enemy who preys on our men or women in uniform or on campuses or elsewhere.

We went through this debate last year. We reached a solution last year, which we hoped would, in fact, be a solution. But the simple, plain fact is that this insidious, pernicious epidemic of sexual assault in the military continues unabated or at least unreduced by the amount that we should regard as minimum for judging this supposed solution a success.

The fact is that the Department of Defense's own research shows that 52 unwanted sexual contacts occur every day on average across the military. That is the same rate it was 5 years ago in 2010. The fact is that in fiscal year 2014, the Department of Defense estimates 62 percent of servicewomen experienced retaliation for coming forward, the same percentage as 2012. Servicemembers who report assault are 12 times more likely to experience retaliation for reporting their cases than seeing the assailant convicted of a crime. Retaliation is more likely than effective discipline or punishment against the perpetrator.

The amendment we have offered, the Military Justice Improvement Act, seeks to address this issue through explicit codification of punishment for any person—any person—deciding to retaliate against anyone who reports this crime of sexual assault. Explicit punishment for retaliation will not only send a message, but it will deter what is in civilian terms one of the most severe crimes, known as obstruction of justice.

The reason why retaliation or obstruction of justice is so insidious is it prevents the justice system from reaching a just result. It not only deters victims and survivors from coming forward regardless of the crime, it also permits perpetrators and criminals to go free and feel they can again commit the crime of sexual assault or other crimes. But in the case of sexual assault, it is particularly pernicious because we know also from statistics that this crime is recommitted. There is recidivism at a higher rate than many others. A large proportion of sexual assaults is committed by a very tiny fraction of members of the military.

What happens, in effect, on campuses or in the military is there are serial rapists, serial perpetrators of sexual assault. If they feel they can do it without consequences, they will continue to commit this crime.

We have learned from many survivors that the anxiety to come forward stems not only from the fear of retaliation but from the bias and inherent conflict of interest entrenched in the chain of command. The fact is that the Department of Defense estimates that 60 percent of cases involve a supervisor or a unit leader. Think of that number—60 percent of cases involving alleged sexual assault are committed by the supervisor or the unit leader in the U.S. military.

The MJIA—the Military Justice Improvement Act—the amendment we will offer tomorrow and will vote on, will address this obstacle by amending the Uniform Code of Military Justice to assign the decisionmaking power regarding sexual assault to an independent, trained prosecutor or, actually, a team of professional military prosecutors, while leaving decisions to the chain of command regarding purely military crime.

I recognize there is an argument that good order and discipline require the chain of command to work as a source of discipline and punishment and justice. But where retaliation, bias, and conflicts of interest are so prevalent and so inherent in the process, where the chain of command is making decisions about the perpetrator, who so commonly is in that chain of command, these decisions should be made by independent, trained, military prosecutors.

The type of crime involved here, sexual assault, is one that is very difficult, excruciatingly daunting to prosecute simply because of the nature of this crime, the nature of the evidence, and the nature of the testimony. So trained, professional military lawyers are in a better position to make these decisions about whether to go forward—not just decisions about what evidence to introduce but whether the evidence justifies the prosecution, whether proof can be presented that

will do justice, not just reach a conviction.

Our amendment will entrust military lawyers with specialized training in prosecuting complex cases to make those prosecutorial decisions.

Removing the commanders from the prosecutorial process will also protect the privacy of victims when reporting these crimes. Typically, they involve some of the most intimate of details.

A trained, independent, military prosecutor and removing the commander from those decisions will protect privacy and encourage reporting. I believe this step is a critical next step in this effort to improve the military justice system.

I have immense respect for colleagues who disagree with me. Some of them are seasoned prosecutors, extraordinarily talented and dedicated lawyers, and we may differ on these issues.

Many of our allies, including the United Kingdom, Canada, Israel, Germany, Norway, and Australia, have already taken steps to remove sexual assault reporting and prosecution from the regular chain of command. Military leaders there report no particular change in their ability to maintain good order or discipline. The facts are there to justify removing these decisions from the chain of command.

But I hope colleagues who disagree with me will continue this effort—I know they will—to improve our military justice system. We can agree to disagree on this step. We should agree to move forward on other steps where we can reach consensus because we have in common much more than we have in conflict—that the greatest, strongest military in the history of the world should be rid of this heinous crime. That is our military. We owe it to the men and women who serve in uniform to have a system of justice that matches their courage, strength, and skill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BURUNDI

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the political crisis in Burundi, and to urge continued action by the administration and the international community to prevent violence and mass atrocities. As my colleagues may be aware, the country has a troubled history of violence and instability. A 12-year civil war resulted in 300,000 deaths. Though the past 10

years have been relatively stable, there have been troubling reports of murders, harassment, and intimidation in rural areas carried out by the Imbonerakure, an armed youth group believed to be associated with the ruling party. According to the United Nations, U.N., over 90,000 refugees have fled Burundi since April, concerned about potential violence in the runup to the July 15 Presidential election. Some of the refugees claim they fear being targeted by government-allied militia. More than 27,000 refugees have fled to Rwanda, a country with its own troubled history of ethnic conflict.

President Pierre Nkurunziza's announcement on April 25 that he was running for a third term—a move which appears to violate the Burundian constitution—has caused over 1 month of protests in the Burundian capital, Bujumbura. The Burundian Red Cross has stated that at least 21 people have died during the protests, most reportedly killed by police who have fired live ammunition at protesters. Others have been killed by a series of grenade attacks by unknown parties and more than 500 have been injured. On May 23, opposition leader Zedi Feruzi was killed by unidentified gunmen, and private radio and television stations have been raided, burned, and shut down. Social media websites used to organize protests have been blocked and prominent journalists and activists have been arrested. While some of these individuals have since been released, the crackdown on dissenting voices is disturbing. There are also reports of smaller protests outside of the capital, which signals the potential for the violence to spread, should the police respond in a similarly heavyhanded way. The situation is volatile and analysts are increasingly concerned that the situation could suddenly erupt into wide-scale killings resulting in hundreds of deaths.

The Obama administration has been actively engaged in an effort to avert mass atrocities in Burundi for more than a year. Various senior-level administration officials—including former U.S. Special Envoy for the African Great Lakes Russ Feingold, Ambassador Samantha Power, Assistant Secretary Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Under Secretary Wendy Sherman, Under Secretary Sarah Sewall, and even Secretary of State John Kerry—have spoken with Burundian officials, regional leaders, and other international donors in an effort to dissuade President Nkurunziza from running for office again.

In the wake of the protests, regional leaders are playing an active role in trying to calm the situation. The countries of the East African Community, EAC, have sent Foreign Ministers to Bujumbura to discuss the crisis with a range of stakeholders. The organization held two emergency meetings in

May, one of which Assistant Secretary of State Thomas-Greenfield attended. The African Union and the International Conference of the Great Lakes have also convened to discuss the crisis.

I applaud ongoing administration and regional efforts. I am concerned, however, that they may not be sufficient. The U.N. Special Envoy for the Great Lakes, Said Djinnit, was dispatched to bring the parties together to find a negotiated solution, but he has stepped down after being accused by opposition groups of being biased toward the government's position. Despite the delay in the polls from June to July, conditions for a democratic contest do not exist. There is no space for the opposition to campaign and the media cannot operate freely. And even in the face of the international community's repeated visits, calls, and messaging on the importance of putting the good of the country before personal political ambitions, President Nkurunziza still has refused to do the right thing and step aside as his party's candidate.

I recommend that we take three additional steps. No. 1, urge U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon and African Union, AU, Chairperson Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma to work with regional leaders to achieve a common approach to a political settlement for Burundi that includes Pierre Nkurunziza stepping aside as his party's candidate. It should also include a postponement of elections until a way forward is agreed to by the ruling party and the opposition that lays the groundwork for a legitimate contest. The current delay in the polling date gets us nowhere if conditions for credible elections still are not in place. A show of solidarity on these issues will powerfully signal the international community's commitment to a transparent, fair democratic process, and could serve to alleviate tension on the ground. President Nkurunziza should be urged to hold police responsible for killing protesters, ensure that media can operate freely, and allow for some means of verification that he is disarming the Imbonerakure and other armed militia as called for by the EAC and referenced by the African Union.

No. 2, I urge President Obama to appoint a Great Lakes Special Envoy to replace Russ Feingold as soon as possible. Having a senior-level State Department official working fulltime toward a negotiated settlement at this volatile time will greatly enhance the efforts that administration officials are making to ensure peace.

Finally, I call upon the administration to refrain from beginning new training of, or making additional plans to provide military equipment to, the Burundian military at this juncture. While the military has not been accused of violence against civilians or abuses related to the protests, I see no

advantage in moving forward with additional programs given the volatile situation on the ground. We can resume assistance once we are confident that the security situation is stable.

The situation in Burundi is troubling, but I do not believe it is hopeless. I stand ready to support the administration's efforts to prevent another tragedy from unfolding in the Great Lakes region of Africa.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 12, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1568. An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2685. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1295) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, June 15, 2015, he has signed the following bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY):

S. 1568. An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2685. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 15, 2015, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1568. An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1868. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2015-2016 Marketing Year" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0096; FV15-985-1 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1869. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0106; FV15-925-2 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1870. A communication from the Director of the Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Descriptive Designation for Needle- or Blade-Tenderized (Mechanically Tenderized) Beef Products" (RIN0583-AD45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1871. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2014-15 Crop Year for Tart Cherries" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0077; FV14-930-2 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1872. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, trans-

mitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2014-2015 Marketing Year" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0087; FV14-985-1B FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1873. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Relaxation of the Handling Regulation for Area No. 3" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0092; FV15-948-1 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1874. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the current and future military strategy of Iran (OSS-2015-0852); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1875. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral John W. Miller, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1876. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1877. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Minimum Requirements for Appraisal Management Companies" (RIN3170-AA44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1878. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2015-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1879. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Certain Person to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AG55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1880. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Clarification for Energy Conservation Standards and Test Procedures for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts" ((RIN1904-AB99) (Docket No. EERE-2009-BT-TP-0016)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1881. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for calendar year 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1882. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning operations at the Naval Petroleum Reserves for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1883. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District, Feather River Air Quality Management District, and San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution District" (FRL No. 9928-09-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1884. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9928-78-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1885. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standard and Repeal of Cement Kilns Rule" (FRL No. 9928-80-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1886. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Decommissioning of Stage II Vapor Recovery Systems and Amending Stage I Vapor Recovery Requirements" (FRL No. 9928-86-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1887. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Transportation Conformity and Conformity of General Federal Actions" (FRL No. 9928-79-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1888. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air

Quality Implementation Plans; Iowa; Grain Vacuuming Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Rescission Rules" (FRL No. 9928-90-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1889. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Section 503 of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act: Prospective Payment System for Federally-Qualified Health Centers and Rural Health Clinics Transition Grants"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1890. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to the Visa Waiver Program to Implement the Electronic System for Travel Authorization (ESTA) Program and the Fee for Use of the System ." (RIN1651-AA72 and RIN1651-AA83) (CBP Dec. 15-08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1891. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Medicare Shared Savings Program: Accountable Care Organizations" (RIN0938-AS06) (CMS-1461-F) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1892. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0895); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1893. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0894); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1894. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0892); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1895. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0893); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1896. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-016); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1897. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015-0059-2015-0066); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1898. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Synthetic Iron Oxide; Confirmation of Effective Date" (Docket No. FDA-2013-C-1008) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1899. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Postmarketing Safety Reports for Human Drug and Biological Products; Electronic Submission Requirements; Delay of Compliance Date; Safety Reporting Portal of Electronic Submission of Postmarketing Safety Reports for Human Drugs and Non-vaccine Biological Products" ((RIN0910-AF96) (Docket No. FDA-2008-N-0334)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1900. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Veterinary Feed Directive" ((RIN0910-AG95) (Docket No. FDA-2010-N-0155)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1901. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criterion—First in the World Program" (Docket No. ED-2015-OPE-0001) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1902. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Banned Devices; General Provisions; Technical Amendment" (Docket No. FDA-2015-N-0011) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1903. A communication from the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1904. A communication from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report from the Office of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1905. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress and the Pension

Benefit Guaranty Corporation Management's Response for the period from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1906. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1907. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Effects of the District's Sick and Safe Leave Act"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1908. A communication from the Inspector General, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1909. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Labor's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1910. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Education's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1911. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1912. A communication from the Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2014 Report to Congress on the Disclosure of Financial Interest and Recusal Requirements for Regional Fishery Management Councils and Scientific and Statistical Committees and on Apportionment of Membership of the Regional Fishery Management Councils"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1913. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North and South Atlantic 2015 Commercial Swordfish Quotas" (RIN0648-XD726) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1914. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2015 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whit-

ing" (RIN0648-BE74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1915. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions No. 1 and No. 2" (RIN0648-XD868) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1916. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacktip Sharks, Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks, and Hammerhead Sharks in the Gulf of Mexico Region" (RIN0648-XD911) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1917. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD908) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1918. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, transmitting proposed legislation to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the Quarterly Financial Report (QFR) program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1919. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-1278)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1920. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0589)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1921. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0074)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1922. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Zodiac Aerotechnics (formerly Intertechnique Aircraft Systems) Oxy-

gen Mask Regulators" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1107)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1923. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0766)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1924. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0491)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1925. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Enstrom Helicopter Corporation" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-1537)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1926. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0636)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1927. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0415)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1928. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0429)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1929. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-1130)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1930. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France)" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0038)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1931. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0936)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1932. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0286)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1933. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (12); Amdt. No. 3639" ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1934. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (131); Amdt. No. 3640" ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1935. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Baghdad (ORBB) Flight Information Region (FIR)" ((RIN2120-AK60) (Docket No. FAA-2003-14766)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1936. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Portland Rose Festival on Willamette River, Portland, OR" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0484)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1937. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Lakeside July 4th Fireworks, Lake Erie; Lakeside, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0388)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1938. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones, Captain of the Port New Orleans Zone" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-1069)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1939. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Great Lakes Pilotage Rates—2015 Annual Review and Adjustment" ((RIN1625-AC22) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0481)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1940. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Loading and Outbound Transit of TUG THOMAS and BARGE OCEANUS, Savannah River; Savannah, GA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0280)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1941. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation, Annual Dragon Boat Races, Portland, Oregon" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0453)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1942. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Biscayne Bay, Miami Beach, FL" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0719)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1943. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Fireworks Displays in the Sector Columbia River Captain of the Port Zone" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0300)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1944. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Detroit Belle Isle Grand Prix, Detroit River; Detroit, MI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0389)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1945. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Safety Zone; Rotary Club of Fort Lauderdale New River Raft Race, New River; Fort Lauderdale, FL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0024)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1946. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition of Fixed-Wing Special Visual Flight Rules Operations at Washington-Dulles International Airport; Withdrawal" ((RIN2120-AK69) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0190)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1947. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Pasco, WA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0279)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1948. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Cypress, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0743)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1949. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Proposed Amendment of Class E Airspace; Jupiter, FL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0796)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1950. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Providence, Rhode Island)" (MB Docket No. 15-98, DA 15-621) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1951. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 15, 25, 27, 74, 78, 80, 87, 90, 97, and 101 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Implementation of the Final Acts of the World Radiocommunication Conference (Geneva, 2007), Other Allocation Issues, and Related Rule Updates" (ET Docket No. 12-338; ET Docket No. 15-99; and IB Docket No. 06-123, FCC 15-50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 558. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-65).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*David S. Shapira, of Pennsylvania, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2019.

*Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1571. A bill to preserve the constitutional authority of Congress and ensure accountability and transparency in legislation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1572. A bill to end the practice of including more than one subject in a single bill by requiring that each bill enacted by Congress be limited to only one subject, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 1573. A bill to establish regional weather forecast offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1574. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish a community care wrap-around support demonstration program, a pilot project on services for recipients of federally assisted housing, and a national campaign to raise awareness of the aging network and to promote advance integrated long-term care planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1575. A bill to end the unconstitutional delegation of legislative power which was exclusively vested in the Senate and House of Representatives by article I, section 1 of the Constitution of the United States, and to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to issue a report to Congress detailing the extent of the problem of unconstitutional delegation to the end that such delegations can be phased out, thereby restoring the constitutional principle of separation of powers set forth in the first sections of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1576. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prevent fraud by representative payees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1577. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REID, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 201. A resolution designating June 19, 2015, as "Juneteenth Independence Day" in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which slavery legally came to an end in the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 202. A resolution designating June 15, 2015, as "World Elder Abuse Awareness Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 248

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 248, a bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 257

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 257, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 258

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 355

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 355, a bill to support the provision of safe relationship behavior education and training.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 453

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 453, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to States to streamline State requirements and procedures for veterans with military emergency medical training to become civilian emergency medical technicians.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 667, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 683

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 683, a bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 812, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 849, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for systematic data collection and analysis and epidemiological research regarding Multiple Sclerosis (MS), Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 1002, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1424

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1424, a bill to prohibit the sale or distribution of cosmetics containing synthetic plastic microbeads.

S. 1458

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1458, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to ensure scientific transparency in the development of environmental regulations and for other purposes.

S. 1483

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1483, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the James K. Polk Home in Columbia, Tennessee, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1513

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1513, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1532

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1532, a bill to ensure timely access to affordable birth control for women.

S. 1539

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 1547

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1547, a bill to provide high-skilled visas for nationals of the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1565

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1565, a bill to allow the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to provide greater protection to service members.

S. RES. 193

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 193, a resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the historic *Griswold v. Connecticut* decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and expressing the sense of the Senate that the case was an important step forward in helping ensure that all people of the United States are able to use contraceptives to plan pregnancies and have healthier babies.

AMENDMENT NO. 1474

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1474 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1549

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1549 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1549 proposed to H.R. 1735, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 1550

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1550 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1578

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1578 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1687

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1687 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1707

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1707 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1725

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1725 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1759

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1759 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1815

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1815 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1889

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1889 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1889 proposed to H.R. 1735, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 1892

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1892 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1966

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1966 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe mili-

tary personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2013

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2013 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1577. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today, along with Senator DAINES, I introduced the East Rosebud Creek Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. This legislation will help ensure that one of my state's most striking waterways is preserved for the use and enjoyment of future generations.

In south central Montana, East Rosebud Creek meanders through the Absoraka-Beartooth Wilderness before pooling briefly at East Rosebud Lake. From there, the creek continues to flow down through the Custer National Forest and on, eventually, to the Yellowstone River.

My legislation would protect 20 of the most scenic miles of East Rosebud Creek: those 13 miles above East Rosebud Lake and seven more on the downstream side. Designating these sections of river will protect its water quality and the free-flowing nature of the river, and will have no impact on private property.

Local ranchers, businesses, homeowners associations, conservation groups, and everyday Montanans have recognized the need for a Wild and Scenic Rivers designation and have voiced their support. In its current management plan for Custer National Forest, the Forest Service also recognizes the incredible scenic and recreational values of East Rosebud Creek, and the river's potential for designation.

In short, this bipartisan legislation is a proposal that comes tailor-made from folks on the ground and will preserve a portion of Montana's outdoor heritage for our kids and grandkids.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 201—DESIGNATING JUNE 19, 2015, AS “JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY” IN RECOGNITION OF JUNE 19, 1865, THE DATE ON WHICH SLAVERY LEGALLY CAME TO AN END IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REID, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 201

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach the frontier areas of the United States, in particular the State of Texas and the other Southwestern States, until months after the conclusion of the Civil War, more than 2 ½ years after President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African-Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as “Juneteenth Independence Day”, as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas African-Americans from the Southwest have continued the tradition of observing “Juneteenth Independence Day” for 150 years;

Whereas 43 States, the District of Columbia, and other countries have designated “Juneteenth Independence Day” as a special day of observance in recognition of the emancipation of all slaves in the United States;

Whereas “Juneteenth Independence Day” celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves and the descendants of former slaves remain an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race;

Whereas slavery was not officially abolished until the ratification of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States in December 1865;

Whereas Frederick Douglass, born in the State of Maryland in 1818, escaped from slavery and became a leading writer, orator, publisher, and one of the most influential advocates in the United States for abolitionism and the equality of all people;

Whereas Frederick Douglass was recognized for his accomplishments with a statue that was unveiled during a ceremony on June 19, 2013, in Emancipation Hall in the United States Capitol;

Whereas 2015 marks the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.), signed into law on August 6, 1965, a milestone in providing equal protections for African-Americans, including former slaves and the descendants of former slaves; and

Whereas, over the course of its history, the United States has grown into a symbol of democracy and freedom around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 19, 2015, as “Juneteenth Independence Day”;

(2) recognizes the historical significance of “Juneteenth Independence Day” to the United States;

(3) supports the continued nationwide celebration of “Juneteenth Independence Day” to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the United States; and

(4) recognizes that the observance of the end of slavery is part of the history and heritage of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 202—DESIGNATING JUNE 15, 2015, AS “WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY”

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 202

Whereas Federal Government estimates show that more than 1 in 10 persons over age 60, or 6,000,000 individuals, are victims of elder abuse each year;

Whereas the vast majority of the abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older adults in the United States goes unidentified and unreported;

Whereas only 1 in 44 cases of financial abuse of older adults is reported;

Whereas at least \$2,900,000,000 is taken from older adults each year due to financial abuse and exploitation;

Whereas elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation have no boundaries and cross all racial, social, class, gender, and geographic lines;

Whereas older adults who are abused are 3 times more likely to die earlier than older adults of the same age who are not abused;

Whereas ½ of all older adults with dementia will experience abuse;

Whereas providing unwanted medical treatment can be a form of elder abuse and exploitation;

Whereas public awareness has the potential to increase the identification and reporting of elder abuse by the public, professionals, and victims, and can act as a catalyst to promote issue-based education and long-term prevention;

Whereas private individuals and public agencies must work together on the Federal, State, and local levels to combat increasing occurrences of abuse, neglect, and exploitation crime and violence against vulnerable older adults and vulnerable adults, particularly in light of limited resources for vital protective services; and

Whereas 2015 is the 10th anniversary of World Elder Abuse Awareness Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 15, 2015, as “World Elder Abuse Awareness Day”;

(2) recognizes judges, lawyers, adult protective services professionals, law enforcement officers, long-term care ombudsmen, social workers, health care providers, professional guardians, advocates for victims, and other professionals and agencies for the efforts to advance awareness of elder abuse; and

(3) encourages members of the public and professionals who work with older adults to act as catalysts to promote awareness and long-term prevention of elder abuse by reaching out to local adult protective services agencies, long-term care ombudsman programs, and the National Center on Elder Abuse, and by learning to recognize, detect, report, and respond to elder abuse.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2016. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2017. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2018. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2019. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2020. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2021. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2022. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2023. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2024. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2025. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2026. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2027. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2028. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2029. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2030. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2031. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2032. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2033. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2034. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2035. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2036. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2037. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2038. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2039. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2040. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MORAN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. PETERS, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2041. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2042. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2043. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2044. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2045. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2046. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1927 submitted by Mr. ISAKSON and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2016. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

Subtitle F—Construction Consensus Procurement Improvement

SEC. 891. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This subtitle may be cited as the “Construction Consensus Procurement Improvement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 892. DESIGN-BUILD CONSTRUCTION PROCESS IMPROVEMENT.

(a) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) CRITERIA FOR USE.—

“(1) CONTRACTS WITH A VALUE OF AT LEAST \$750,000.—Two-phase selection procedures shall be used for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when a contracting officer determines that the contract has a value of \$750,000 or greater, as adjusted for inflation in accordance with section 1908 of this title.

“(2) CONTRACTS WITH A VALUE LESS THAN \$750,000.—For projects that a contracting officer determines have a value of less than \$750,000, the contracting officer shall make a determination whether two-phase selection procedures are appropriate for use for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when—

“(A) the contracting officer anticipates that 3 or more offers will be received for the contract;

“(B) design work must be performed before an offeror can develop a price or cost proposal for the contract;

“(C) the offeror will incur a substantial amount of expense in preparing the offer; and

“(D) the contracting officer has considered information such as—

“(i) the extent to which the project requirements have been adequately defined;

“(ii) the time constraints for delivery of the project;

“(iii) the capability and experience of potential contractors;

“(iv) the suitability of the project for use of the two-phase selection procedures;

“(v) the capability of the agency to manage the two-phase selection process; and

“(vi) other criteria established by the agency.”; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the agency determines with respect to” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the contracting activity, delegable to a level no lower than the senior contracting official within the contracting activity, approves the contracting officer’s justification that an individual solicitation must have greater than 5 finalists to be in the Federal Government’s interest. The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number of offerors exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection process.”.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 30 of 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, the head of each agency shall compile an annual report of each instance in which the agency awarded a design-build contract pursuant to section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, during the fiscal year ending in such calendar year, in which—

(i) more than 5 finalists were selected for phase-two requests for proposals; or

(ii) the contract was awarded without using two-phase selection procedures.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall facilitate public access to the reports, including by posting them on a publicly available Internet website. A notice of the availability of each report shall be published in the Federal Register.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) CRITERIA FOR USE.—

“(1) CONTRACTS WITH A VALUE OF AT LEAST \$750,000.—Two-phase selection procedures shall be used for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when a contracting officer determines that the contract has a value of \$750,000 or greater, as adjusted for inflation in accordance with section 1908 of title 41, United States Code.

“(2) CONTRACTS WITH A VALUE LESS THAN \$750,000.—For projects that a contracting officer determines have a value of less than \$750,000, the contracting officer shall make a determination whether two-phase selection procedures are appropriate for use for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when—

“(A) the contracting officer anticipates that 3 or more offers will be received for the contract;

“(B) design work must be performed before an offeror can develop a price or cost proposal for the contract;

“(C) the offeror will incur a substantial amount of expense in preparing the offer; and

“(D) the contracting officer has considered information such as—

“(i) the extent to which the project requirements have been adequately defined;

“(ii) the time constraints for delivery of the project;

“(iii) the capability and experience of potential contractors;

“(iv) the suitability of the project for use of the two-phase selection procedures;

“(v) the capability of the agency to manage the two-phase selection process; and

“(vi) other criteria established by the Department of Defense.”; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the agency determines with respect to” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the contracting activity approves the contracting officer’s justification that an individual solicitation must have greater than 5 finalists to be in the Federal Government’s interest. The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number of offerors exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection process.”.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 30 of 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall compile an annual report of each instance in which the Department awarded a design-build contract pursuant to section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, during the fiscal year ending in such calendar year, in which—

(i) more than 5 finalists were selected for phase-two requests for proposals; or

(ii) the contract was awarded without using two-phase selection procedures.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall facilitate public access to the reports, including by posting them on a publicly available Internet website. A notice of the availability of each report shall be published in the Federal Register.

(c) GAO REPORTS.—

(1) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—Not later than 270 days after the deadline for the final reports required under subsection (f) of section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report analyzing the compliance of the various Federal agencies with the requirements of such section.

(2) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—Not later than 270 days after the deadline for the final reports required under subsection (f) of section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report analyzing the compliance of the Department of Defense with the requirements of such section.

SEC. 893. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF A REVERSE AUCTION FOR THE AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council, in consultation with the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, shall amend

the Federal Acquisition Regulation to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for awarding contracts for construction and design services.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term “design and construction services” means—

(A) site planning and landscape design;

(B) architectural and engineering services (including surveying and mapping defined in section 1101 of title 40, United States Code);

(C) interior design;

(D) performance of substantial construction work for facility, infrastructure, and environmental restoration projects;

(E) delivery and supply of construction materials to construction sites; and

(F) construction or substantial alteration of public buildings or public works; and

(2) the term “reverse auction” means, with respect to procurement by an agency—

(A) a real-time auction conducted through an electronic medium between a group of offerors who compete against each other by submitting bids for a contract or task order with the ability to submit revised bids throughout the course of the auction; and

(B) the award of the contract or task order to the offeror who submits the lowest bid.

SEC. 894. ASSURING PAYMENT PROTECTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION SUBCONTRACTORS AND SUPPLIERS UNDER AN ALTERNATIVE TO A MILLER ACT PAYMENT BOND.

Chapter 93 of subtitle VI of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 9310. Individual sureties

“If another applicable law or regulation permits the acceptance of a bond from a surety that is not subject to sections 9305 and 9306 and is based on a pledge of assets by the surety, the assets pledged by such surety shall—

“(1) consist of eligible obligations described under section 9303(a); and

“(2) be submitted to the official of the Government required to approve or accept the bond, who shall deposit the assets with a depository described under section 9303(b).”; and

(2) in the table of sections for such chapter, by adding at the end the following new item:

“9310. Individual sureties.”.

SEC. 895. SBA SURETY BOND GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

Section 411(c)(1) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(c)(1)) is amended by striking “70” and inserting “90”.

SA 2017. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE USE OF TUBULAR LIGHT-EMITTING DIODE (T-LED) LIGHTING IN THE UNIFIED FACILITIES CRITERIA.

It is the sense of Congress that, given the significant cost savings and energy efficient

benefits that have been realized from the installation of tubular light-emitting diode (T-LED) lighting aboard Navy vessels, and in order to provide the Department of Defense greater flexibility in lighting options which would reduce energy costs, the Department of Defense should modify the Universal Facilities Code to include tubular LED (T-LED) as an option within its specifications.

SA 2018. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. EXPANSION OF EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS TO SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND TRANSITION.

Section 2194 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “business, law, technology transfer or transition,” after “mathematics,”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (5) through (7), respectively;

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph (4):

“(4) providing sabbatical opportunities for faculty and internship opportunities for students.”; and

(C) in paragraphs (5) and (6), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), by striking “research projects” both places it appears and inserting “projects, including research and technology transfer or transition projects”.

SA 2019. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 540. RECEIPT BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH PRIMARY MARINER DUTIES OF TRAINING THAT COMPLIES WITH NATIONAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b) MEMBERS WITH PRIMARY MARINER DUTIES.—(1) For purposes of the program under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that members of the armed forces with primary mariner duties receive training that complies with national standards and requirements under the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping (STCW).

“(2) The following shall comply with basic training standards under national requirements and the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping:

“(A) The recruit training provided to each member of the armed forces.

“(B) The training provided to each member of the armed forces who is assigned to a vessel.

“(3) Under the program, each member of the armed forces who is assigned to a vessel of at least 100 gross tons (GRT) in a deck or engineering career field shall be provided the following:

“(A) A designated path to applicable credentials under the national requirements and the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping consistent with the responsibilities of the position to which assigned.

“(B) The opportunity, at Government expense, to attend credentialing programs that provide merchant mariner training not offered by the armed forces.

“(4)(A) For purposes of the program, the material specified in subparagraph (B) shall be submitted to the National Maritime Center of the Coast Guard for assessment of the compliance of such material with national requirements and the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping.

“(B) The material specified in this subparagraph is as follows:

“(i) The course material of each unclassified course for members of the armed forces in marine navigation, leadership, and operation and maintenance.

“(ii) The unclassified qualifications for assignment for deck or engineering positions on waterborne vessels.

“(C) The National Maritime Center shall conduct assessments of material for purposes of this paragraph. Such assessments shall evaluate the suitability of material for the service at sea addressed by such material and without regard to the military pay grade of the intended beneficiaries of such material.

“(D) If material submitted to the National Maritime Center pursuant to this paragraph is determined not to comply as described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary offering such material to members of the armed forces shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the actions to be taken by such Secretary to bring such material into compliance.”.

(b) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Secretary of a military department shall establish, for members of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of such Secretary, procedures as follows:

(A) Procedures by which members identify qualification gaps in training and proficiency assessments and complete training or assessments approved by the Coast Guard in addressing such gaps.

(B) Procedures by which members obtain service records of any service at sea.

(C) Procedures by which members may submit service records of service at sea and other military qualifications to the National Maritime Center for evaluation and issuance of a Merchant Marine Credential.

(D) Procedures by which members may obtain a medical certificate for use in applications for Merchant Marine Credentials.

(2) **USE OF MILITARY DRUG TEST RESULTS IN MERCHANT MARINE CREDENTIAL APPLICATIONS.**—The Secretaries of the military departments shall jointly establish procedures

by which the results of appropriate drug tests administered to members of the Armed Forces by the military departments may be used for purposes of applications for Merchant Marine Credentials.

SA 2020. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. EXEMPTION OF ARMY OFF-SITE USE AND OFF-SITE REMOVAL ONLY NON-MOBILE PROPERTIES FROM CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Excess or unutilized or underutilized non-mobile property of the Army that is situated on non-excess land shall be exempt from the requirements of title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411 et seq.) upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that—

(1) the property is not feasible to relocate;

(2) the property is located in an area to which the general public is denied access in the interest of national security; and

(3) the exemption would facilitate the efficient disposal of excess property or result in more efficient real property management.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—Before making an initial determination under the authority provided under subsection (a), and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of the Army shall consult with the Executive Director of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness on types of non-mobile properties that may be feasible for relocation and suitable to assist the homeless.

(b) **SUNSET.**—The authority under subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2017.

SA 2021. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE FULFILLMENT BY THE UNITED STATES OF ITS OBLIGATIONS TO THE REPUBLIC OF PALAU.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Republic of Palau is comprised of 300 islands and covers roughly 177 square miles strategically located in the western Pacific Ocean between the Philippines and the United States territory of Guam.

(2) The United States and Palau have forged close security, economic, and cultural

ties since the United States defeated the armed forces of Imperial Japan in Palau in 1944.

(3) The United States administered Palau as a District of the United Nations Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands from 1947 to 1994.

(4) In 1994, the United States and Palau entered into a 50-year Compact of Free Association which provided for the independence of Palau and set forth the terms for close and mutually beneficial relations in security, economic, and governmental affairs.

(5) The security terms of the Compact grant the United States full authority and responsibility for the security and defense of Palau, including the right to foreclose the territory of Palau to any nation except the United States and to establish and use defense sites in Palau.

(6) The Compact entitles any citizen of Palau to volunteer for service in the Armed Forces of the United States, and the citizens of Palau volunteer for such service at a rate that exceeds that of any of the 50 States.

(7) In 2009, in accordance with section 432 of the Compact, the United States and Palau reviewed their overall relationship. In 2010, the two nations signed an agreement updating and extending several provisions of the Compact including an extension of United States financial and program assistance to Palau, and the establishment of increased immigration protections in the wake of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. However, the United States has not yet approved this agreement or provided the assistance called for in the agreement.

(8) On July 1, 2013 the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary Defense submitted to the Senate proposed legislation to approve the agreement described in paragraph (7) and included an analysis of the budgetary impact of the proposed legislation. The letter transmitting the proposed legislation concluded that “[a]pproving the results of the Agreement is of import to the national security of the United States, to our bilateral relationship with Palau and to our broader strategic interest in the Asia-Pacific region”.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) in order to fulfill the promises and commitment of the United States to our ally, the Republic of Palau, and reaffirm the special relationship between the United States and Palau, Congress and the President should place a top priority on the approval of and full funding for the agreement signed by the United States and Palau in 2010; and

(2) Congress and the President should immediately seek a mutually acceptable means of funding the legislation proposed to implement the agreement.

SA 2022. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 565. REPORTING ON ALLEGATIONS OF CHILD ABUSE IN MILITARY FAMILIES AND HOMES.

(a) **REPORTS TO FAMILY ADVOCACY PROGRAM OFFICES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The following information shall be reported immediately to the Family Advocacy Program office at the military installation to which the member of the Armed Forces concerned is assigned:

(A) Credible information (which may include a reasonable belief), obtained by any individual within the chain of command of the member, that a child in the family or home of the member has suffered an incident of child abuse.

(B) Information, learned by a member of the Armed Forces engaged in a profession or activity described in subsection (b) of section 226 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13031) for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, that gives reason to suspect that a child in the family or home of the member has suffered an incident of child abuse.

(2) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Navy when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall jointly prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection.

(3) **CHILD ABUSE DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “child abuse” has the meaning given that term in subsection (c) of section 226 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

(b) **REPORTS TO STATE CHILD WELFARE SERVICES.**—Section 226 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (title II of Public Law 101–647; 104 Stat. 4806; 42 U.S.C. 13031) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “ and to the agency or agencies provided for in subsection (e), if applicable” before the period;

(2) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

“(e) **REPORTERS AND RECIPIENT OF REPORT INVOLVING CHILDREN AND HOMES OF MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES.**—

“(1) **RECIPIENTS OF REPORTS.**—In the case of an incident described in subsection (a) involving a child in the family or home of member of the Armed Forces (regardless of whether the incident occurred on or off a military installation), the report required by subsection (a) shall be made to the appropriate child welfare services agency or agencies of the State in which the child resides. The Attorney General, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Navy when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall jointly, in consultation with the chief executive officers of the States, designate the child welfare service agencies of the States that are appropriate recipients of reports pursuant to this subsection. Any report on an incident pursuant to this subsection is in addition to any other report on the incident pursuant to this section.

“(2) **MAKERS OF REPORTS.**—For purposes of the making of reports under this section pursuant to this subsection, the persons engaged in professions and activities described in subsection (b) shall include members of the Armed Forces who are engaged in such professions and activities for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.”.

SA 2023. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr.

MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO ENGAGE UNITED STATES MANUFACTURERS AND SERVICE PROVIDERS IN PROCUREMENT OPPORTUNITIES RELATED TO EQUIPPING THE AFGHAN NATIONAL SECURITY FORCES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Secretary to engage United States manufacturers and service providers in procurement opportunities related to equipping the Afghan National Security Forces.

SA 2024. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1257. REPORT ON EUROPEAN ENERGY SECURITY AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION'S ABILITY TO USE ENERGY SUPPLIES AS TOOLS OF COERCION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing the energy security of NATO members, other European nations who share a border with the Russian Federation, and Moldova, as well as the ability of the Government of the Russian Federation to use energy supplies to undermine the security of these nations.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include assessments of the following issues:

(1) The extent of reliance by these nations on the Russian Federation for supplies of oil and natural gas.

(2) The ability of the Government of the Russian Federation to use these energy supplies as tools of coercion or intimidation to undermine the security of these nations.

(3) Whether such reliance by these nations creates vulnerabilities that negatively affect their security.

(4) The magnitude of those vulnerabilities.

(5) The impacts of those vulnerabilities on the national security and economic interests of the United States.

(6) Any other aspect that the Director determines to be relevant to these issues.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 2025. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. 593. AUTHORIZATION FOR AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE CROSS FOR ACTS OF EXTRAORDINARY HEROISM DURING THE KOREAN WAR.

Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of the Army may award the Distinguished-Service Cross under section 3742 of such title to Edward Halcomb who, while serving in Korea as a member of the United States Army in the grade of Private First Class in Company B, 1st Battalion, 29th Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division, distinguished himself by acts of extraordinary heroism from August 20, 1950, to October 19, 1950, during the Korean War.

SA 2026. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . BONUSES FOR COST-CUTTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “or identification of surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority” after “mismanagement”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “or identification” after “disclosure”; and

(C) in the matter following paragraph (2), by inserting “or identification” after “disclosure”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) The Inspector General of an agency or other agency employee designated under subsection (b) shall refer to the Chief Financial Officer of the agency any potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee, along with any recommendations of the Inspector General or other agency employee.

“(d)(1) If the Chief Financial Officer of an agency determines that rescission of potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee would not

hinder the effectiveness of the agency, except as provided in subsection (e), the head of the agency shall transfer the amount of the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority from the applicable appropriations account to the general fund of the Treasury.

“(2) Any amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction, except that in the case of a fiscal year for which there is no Federal budget deficit, such amounts shall be used to reduce the Federal debt (in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

“(e) The head of an agency may retain not more than 10 percent of amounts to be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury under subsection (d) for the purpose of paying a cash award under subsection (a) to the employee who identified the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority.

“(f)(1) The head of each agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management an annual report regarding—

“(A) each disclosure of possible fraud, waste, or mismanagement or identification of potentially surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority by an employee of the agency determined by the agency to have merit;

“(B) the total savings achieved through disclosures and identifications described in subparagraph (A); and

“(C) the number and amount of cash awards by the agency under subsection (a).

“(2)(A) The head of each agency shall include the information described in paragraph (1) in each budget request of the agency submitted to the Office of Management and Budget as part of the preparation of the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

“(B) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Government Accountability Office an annual report on Federal cost saving and awards based on the reports submitted under subparagraph (A).

“(g) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

“(1) ensure that the cash award program of each agency complies with this section; and

“(2) submit to Congress an annual certification indicating whether the cash award program of each agency complies with this section.

“(h) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and every 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the operation of the cost savings and awards program under this section, including any recommendations for legislative changes.

“(i) In this section—

“(1) the term ‘effectiveness of an agency’ means the ability of an agency to fully carry out the mission of the agency, or of a program or activity of the agency, under the statutes establishing the mission, duties, and authorities of the agency, or under the program or activity; and

“(2) the term ‘unnecessary budget authority’ means budget authority that is not necessary to fully carry out the mission of an agency, or of a program or activity of the agency, under the statutes establishing the mission, duties, and authorities of the agency, or under the program or activity.”.

(b) OFFICERS ELIGIBLE FOR CASH AWARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4509 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ‘agency’—

“(1) has the meaning given that term under section 551(1); and

“(2) includes an entity described in section 4501(1).

“(b) PROHIBITION.—An officer may not receive a cash award under this subchapter if the officer—

“(1) serves in a position at level I of the Executive Schedule;

“(2) is the head of an agency; or

“(3) is a commissioner, board member, or other voting member of an independent establishment.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4509 and inserting the following:

“4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers.”.

SA 2027. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 573. REPORT ON CERTAIN APPLICATIONS FOR UPGRADE IN DISCHARGE STATUS FROM THE ARMED FORCES BASED ON POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER OR TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the number of former members of the Armed Forces who applied for an upgrade in discharge status between September 3, 2009, and September 3, 2014, on the basis of post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury. The report shall set forth the following:

(1) The number of applications in which the member concerned was wounded or injured in military service and received a discharge on other than honorable conditions.

(2) The number of applications for which relief was granted.

SA 2028. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1614. REPORT ON FEASIBILITY, COSTS, AND COST SAVINGS OF ALLOWING FOR COMMERCIAL APPLICATIONS OF EXCESS BALLISTIC MISSILE SOLID ROCKET MOTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing—

(1) the feasibility of permitting excess ballistic missile solid rocket motors, including excess ballistic missile solid rocket motors from the Minotaur launch vehicle, to be made available for commercial applications, including an assessment of any policy or statutory restrictions that would prevent the use of such motors for commercial applications;

(2) the costs to the Federal Government of, and the cost savings for the Federal Government anticipated to result from, making such motors available for commercial applications;

(3) the effects of making such motors available for commercial applications on programs of the Federal Government;

(4) any implications of making such motors available for commercial applications for the international obligations of the United States;

(5) any implications for the United States commercial launch market and launch industrial base of making such motors available for commercial applications; and

(6) considerations for fair and equitable pricing of such motors if such motors were made available for commercial applications.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

SA 2029. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLES.

Section 32906(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or (F)” after “described in subparagraph (E)”.

SA 2030. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal

year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COORDINATION OF HUNTING, FISHING, AND OTHER RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES ON MILITARY LAND.

It is the sense of Congress that, in situations where military lands are open to public access for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities, the Department of Defense should seek to ensure that coordination with State fish and wildlife managers, tribes, and local governments occurs sufficiently in advance of traditional hunting, fishing, and recreational use seasons to facilitate communication with hunting, fishing, and recreational user groups.

SA 2031. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COORDINATING MILITARY TRAINING EXERCISES WITH FISHERIES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Office of the Secretary of Defense, or through its designee, should notify and consider comments from the National Marine Fisheries Service, affected state and tribal fisheries management agencies, and appropriate fishing user groups as early as is reasonably practicable when scheduling and selecting a location for training exercises to minimize the impact on subsistence, sport and commercial fisheries and to ensure the long term health and availability of fish species and stocks

SA 2032. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE EASING OF RESTRICTIONS ON THE SALE OF LETHAL MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF VIETNAM.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Vietnam is an important emerging partner with which the United States increasingly shares strategic and economic interests, including improving bilateral and multilateral capacity for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, upholding the principles of freedom of the seas and peaceful resolution of international disputes, strengthening an open regional trading

order, and maintaining a favorable balance of power in the Asia-Pacific region;

(2) the Government of Vietnam has recently taken modest but encouraging steps to improve its human rights record, including signing the United Nations Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly December 10, 1984, increasing registrations for places of worship, taking greater action to combat human trafficking, reviewing the Criminal Code, and continuing to conduct high-level engagement with the United States and international human rights nongovernmental organizations;

(3) in light of growing challenges in the Asia-Pacific region and some steps by the Government of Vietnam to improve its human rights record, in 2014 the Department of State, in close consultation with the United States Senate, took steps to ease the United States prohibition on the sale of lethal military equipment to Vietnam for maritime and coastal defense;

(4) easing the prohibition on the sale of lethal military equipment to Vietnam at this time, solely regarding platforms that facilitate the ability of the armed forces of Vietnam to operate more effectively on, above, and within its territorial waters and for coastal defense, would further United States national security interests, but steps beyond this to ease further the prohibition would require the Government of Vietnam to take significant additional and sustained steps to protect human rights, including releases of prisoners of conscience and legal reforms;

(5) the United States Government should continue to support civil society in Vietnam, including advocates for religious freedom, press freedom, and labor rights who seek to use peaceful means to build a strong and prosperous Vietnam that respects human rights and the rule of law; and

(6) the United States Government should continue to engage the Government of Vietnam in a high-level dialogue and specify what steps on human rights would be necessary for the Government of Vietnam to take in order to continue strengthening the bilateral relationship.

SA 2033. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION E—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016”.

SEC. 5002. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term “Department” means the Department of State.

(3) **PEACEKEEPING CREDITS.**—The term “peacekeeping credits” means the amounts by which United States assessed peacekeeping contributions exceed actual expenditures, apportioned to the United States, of peacekeeping operations by the United Nations during a United Nations peacekeeping fiscal year.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of State.

**TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AUTHORITIES AND ACTIVITIES**

Subtitle A—Basic Authorities and Activities

SEC. 5101. AMERICAN SPACES REVIEW.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) the full costs incurred by the Department to provide American Spaces, including—

(A) American Centers, American Corners, Binational Centers, Information Resource Centers, and Science Centers; and

(B) the total costs of all associated—

(i) employee salaries, including foreign service, American civilian, and locally employed staff;

(ii) programming expenses;

(iii) operating expenses;

(iv) contracting expenses; and

(v) security expenses;

(2) a breakdown of the total costs described in paragraph (1) by each space and type of space;

(3) the total fees collected for entry to, or the use of, American Spaces and related resources, including a breakdown by the type of fee for each space and type of space; and

(4) the total usage rates, including by type of service, for each space and type of space.

SEC. 5102. IDENTIFYING BILATERAL INVESTMENT TREATY OPPORTUNITIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes a detailed description of—

(1) the status of all ongoing investment treaty negotiations, including a strategy and timetable for concluding each such negotiation;

(2) a strategy to expand the investment treaty agenda, including through—

(A) launching new investment treaty negotiations with foreign partners that are currently capable of entering into such negotiations; and

(B) building the capacity of foreign partners to enter into such negotiations, including by encouraging the adoption of best practices with respect to investment; and

(3) an estimate of any resources that will be needed, including anticipated staffing levels—

(A) to conclude all ongoing negotiations described in paragraph (1);

(B) to launch new investment treaty negotiations, as described in paragraph (2)(A); and

(C) to build the capacity of foreign partners, as described in paragraph (2)(B).

SEC. 5103. REINSTATEMENT OF HONG KONG REPORT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

and annually thereafter through 2020, the Secretary shall submit the report required under section 301 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5731) to the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) **PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) should be unclassified and made publicly available, including through the Department's public website.

(c) **TREATMENT OF HONG KONG UNDER UNITED STATES LAW.**—

(1) **SECRETARY OF STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall certify to Congress whether Hong Kong Special Administrative Region is sufficiently autonomous to justify different treatment for its citizens from the treatment accorded to other citizens of the People's Republic of China in any new laws, agreements, treaties, or arrangements entered into between the United States and Hong Kong after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) **FACTOR FOR CONSIDERATION.**—In making a certification under subparagraph (A), the Secretary should consider the terms, obligations, and expectations expressed in the Joint Declaration with respect to Hong Kong.

(C) **EXCEPTION.**—A certification shall not be required under this subsection with respect to any new laws, agreements, treaties, or arrangements that support human rights, rule of law, or democracy in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

(2) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may waive the application of paragraph (1) if the Secretary—

(A) determines that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States; and

(B) on or before the date on which such waiver would take effect, submits a notice of, and justification for, the waiver to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5104. INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism. For purposes of carrying out the duties described in paragraph (2), such officer shall have the title of "Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator".

(2) **DUTIES.**—The Coordinator shall have the following duties:

(A) Coordinate and direct all activities of the Federal Government relating to each hostage situation described in paragraph (1) to ensure efforts to secure the release of all hostages in the hostage situation are properly resourced and correct lines of authority are established and maintained.

(B) Establish and direct a fusion cell consisting of appropriate personnel of the Federal Government with purview over each hostage situation described in paragraph (1).

(C) Develop a strategy to keep family members of hostages described in paragraph (1) informed of the status of such hostages and inform such family members of updates, procedures, and policies that do not compromise the national security of the United States.

(b) **LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.**—The authority of the Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator shall be limited to hostage cases outside the United States.

(c) **QUARTERLY REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On a quarterly basis, the Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the members of Congress described in paragraph (2) a report that includes a summary of each hostage situation described in sub-section (a)(1) and efforts to secure the release of all hostages in such hostage situation.

(2) **MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DESCRIBED.**—The members of Congress described in this subparagraph are, with respect to a United States person hostage covered by a report under paragraph (1), the Senators representing the State, and the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives representing the district, where a hostage described in subsection (a)(1) resides.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report under this subsection may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

(4) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Federal Government to negotiate with a state sponsor of terrorism or an organization that the Secretary has designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189) or any other hostage-takers.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **HOSTILE GROUP.**—The term "hostile group" means—

(A) a group that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a));

(B) a group that is engaged in armed conflict with the United States; or

(C) any other group that the President determines to be a hostile group for purposes of this paragraph.

(2) **STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.**—The term "state sponsor of terrorism"—

(A) means a country the government of which the Secretary has determined, for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or any other provision of law, to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; and

(B) includes North Korea.

SEC. 5105. UNITED STATES-CHINA STRATEGIC AND ECONOMIC DIALOGUE REVIEW.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, and in consultation with other departments and agencies, as appropriate, shall—

(1) conduct a review of the United States-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (referred to in this section as the "Dialogue"); and

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that contains the findings of such review.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report described in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a list of all commitments agreed to by the United States and China at each of the first 6 rounds of meetings;

(2) an assessment of the status of each commitment agreed to by the United States and China at each of the first 6 rounds of meetings, including a detailed description of—

(A) any actions that have been taken with respect to such commitments;

(B) any aspects of such commitments that remain unfulfilled; and

(C) any actions that remain necessary to fulfill any unfulfilled commitments described in subparagraph (B);

(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of the Dialogue in achieving and fulfilling significant commitments on United States priorities in the bilateral relationship, including—

(A) the security situation in the East and South China Seas, including a peaceful resolution of maritime disputes in the region;

(B) denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula;

(C) cybertheft of United States intellectual property;

(D) the treatment of political dissidents, media representatives, and ethnic and religious minorities;

(E) reciprocal treatment of United States journalists and academics in China, including issuance of visas;

(F) expanding investment and trade opportunities for United States businesses;

(G) repatriation of North Korean refugees from China to North Korea; and

(H) promoting and protecting rule of law and democratic institutions in Hong Kong; and

(4) recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of the Dialogue in achieving and fulfilling significant commitments on United States priorities described in paragraph (3), including consideration of the use of predetermined benchmarks for assessing whether the commitments achieved are significantly furthering such priorities.

SEC. 5106. REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN BURMA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that—

(1) describes in detail all known widespread or systematic civil or political rights violations, including violations that may constitute crimes against humanity against ethnic, racial, or religious minorities in Burma, including the Rohingya people; and

(2) provides recommendations for holding perpetrators of the violations described in paragraph (1) accountable for their actions.

SEC. 5107. COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for Diplomatic and Consular Programs, \$500,000 shall be made available to the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, to be used in support of efforts by American and European Jewish and other civil society organizations, focusing on youth, to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of religious, ethnic, or racial intolerance in Europe.

SEC. 5108. BIOTECHNOLOGY GRANTS.

Title I of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 63. BIOTECHNOLOGY GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State is authorized to support, through grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, outreach, and public diplomacy activities, activities promoting the benefits of agricultural biotechnology, biofuels, science-based regulatory systems, and the application of such technologies for trade and development.

"(b) **LIMITATION.**—The total amount of grants provided pursuant to subsection (a) shall not exceed \$500,000 in any fiscal year."

SEC. 5109. DEFINITION OF "USE" IN PASSPORT AND VISA OFFENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before section 1541 the following:

"SEC. 1540. DEFINITION OF 'USE' AND 'USES'.

"In this chapter, the terms 'use' and 'uses' shall be given their plain meaning, which shall include use for identification purposes."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 1541 the following:

"1540. Definition of 'use' and 'uses'."

SEC. 5110. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIPS.

Section 504 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1979 (22 U.S.C. 2656d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS RELATED TO SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide grants or enter into cooperative agreements for science and technology fellowship programs of the Department of State.

"(2) RECRUITMENT; STIPENDS.—Assistance authorized under paragraph (1) may be used—

"(A) to recruit fellows; and

"(B) to pay stipends, travel, and other appropriate expenses to fellows.

"(3) CLASSIFICATION OF STIPENDS.—Stipends paid under paragraph (2)(B) shall not be considered compensation for purposes of section 209 of title 18, United States Code.

"(4) LIMITATION.—The total amount of assistance provided under this subsection may not exceed \$500,000 in any fiscal year."

SEC. 5111. NAME CHANGES.

(a) PUBLIC LAW 87-195.—Section 607(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2357(d)) is amended by striking "Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs" and inserting "Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science".

(b) PUBLIC LAW 88-206.—Section 617(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7671p(a)) is amended by striking "Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs" and inserting "Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science".

(c) PUBLIC LAW 93-126.—Section 9(a) of the Department of State Appropriations Authorization Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2655a) is amended—

(1) by striking "Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs" and inserting "Bureau of Oceans, Environment, and Science"; and

(2) by striking "Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs" and inserting "Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science".

(d) PUBLIC LAW 106-113.—Section 1112(a) of the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (22 U.S.C. 2652c(a)) is amended by striking "Verification and Compliance." and inserting "Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance (referred to in this section as the 'Assistant Secretary')".

SEC. 5112. ANTI-PIRACY INFORMATION SHARING.

The Secretary is authorized to provide for the participation of the United States in the

Information Sharing Centre located in Singapore, as established by the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery Against Ships in Asia, done at Singapore November 11, 2004.

SEC. 5113. REPORT REFORM.

(a) HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT.—Section 549 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347h) is repealed.

(b) ROUGH DIAMONDS ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 12 of the Clean Diamond Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 3911) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. REPORTS.

"For each country that, during the preceding 12-month period, exported rough diamonds to the United States, the exportation of which was not controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, and if the failure to do so has significantly increased the likelihood that those diamonds not so controlled are being imported into the United States, the President shall submit a semi-annual report to Congress that explains what actions have been taken by the United States or such country since the previous report to ensure that diamonds, the exportation of which was not controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, are not being imported from that country into the United States. A country shall be included in the report required under this section until the country is controlling the importation and exportation of rough diamonds through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme."

SEC. 5114. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES ALLIANCE WITH JAPAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the alliance between the United States and Japan is a cornerstone of peace, security, and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and around the world;

(2) Prime Minister Shiuzo Abe's visit to the United States in April 2015 and historic address to a Joint Session of Congress symbolized the strength and importance of ties between the United States and Japan;

(3) in 2015, which marks 70 years since the end of World War II, the United States and Japan continue to strengthen the alliance and work together to ensure a peaceful and prosperous future for the Asia-Pacific region and the world;

(4) the Governments and people of the United States and Japan share values, interests, and capabilities that have helped to build a strong rules-based international order, based on a commitment to rules, norms and institutions;

(5) the revised Guidelines for United States-Japan Defense Cooperation and Japan's policy of "Proactive Contribution to Peace" will reinforce deterrence, update the roles and missions of the United States and Japan, enable Japan to expand its contributions to regional and global security, and allow the United States Government and the Government of Japan to enhance cooperation on security issues in the region and beyond;

(6) the United States remain resolute in its commitments under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security to respond to any armed attack in the territories under the administration of Japan;

(7) although the United States Government does not take a position on the ultimate sovereignty of the Senkaku Islands, the United States Government acknowledges that they are under the administration of Japan and opposes any unilateral actions that would seek to undermine such administration;

(8) the United States Government reaffirms that the unilateral actions of a third

party will not affect the United States acknowledgment of the administration of Japan over the Senkaku Islands;

(9) the United States Government and the Government of Japan continue to work together on common security interests, including to confront the threat posed by the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

(10) the United States Government and the Government of Japan remain committed to ensuring maritime security and respect for international law, including freedom of navigation and overflight; and

(11) the United States Government and the Government of Japan continue to oppose the use of coercion, intimidation, or force to change the status quo, including in the East and South China Seas.

SEC. 5115. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DEFENSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States has an upgraded, strategic-plus relationship with India based on regional cooperation, space science cooperation, and defense cooperation.

(2) The defense relationship between the United States and the Republic of India is strengthened by the common commitment of both countries to democracy.

(3) The United States and the Republic of India share a common and long-standing commitment to civilian control of the military.

(4) The United States and the Republic of India have increasingly worked together on defense cooperation across a range of activities, exercises, initiatives, and research.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue to expand defense cooperation with the Republic of India;

(2) welcome the role of the Republic of India in providing security and stability in the Indo-Pacific region and beyond;

(3) work cooperatively with the Republic of India on matters relating to our common defense;

(4) vigorously support the implementation of the United States-India Defense Framework Agreement; and

(5) support the India Defense Trade and Technology Initiative.

SEC. 5116. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES ALLIANCE WITH THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea has served as an anchor for stability, security, and prosperity on the Korean Peninsula, in the Asia-Pacific region, and around the world;

(2) the United States and the Republic of Korea continue to strengthen and adapt the bilateral, regional, and global scope of the comprehensive strategic alliance between the 2 nations, to serve as a linchpin of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, recognizing the shared values of democracy, human rights, free and open markets, and the rule of law, as reaffirmed in the May 2013 "Joint Declaration in Commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States of America";

(3) the United States and the Republic of Korea continue to broaden and deepen the alliance by strengthening the combined defense posture on the Korean Peninsula, enhancing mutual security based on the Republic of Korea-United States Mutual Defense

Treaty, and promoting cooperation for regional and global security in the 21st century;

(4) the United States and the Republic of Korea share deep concerns that the nuclear, cyber, and ballistic missiles programs of North Korea and its repeated provocations pose grave threats to peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia and recognize that both nations are determined to achieve the peaceful denuclearization of North Korea and remain fully committed to continuing close cooperation on the full range of issues related to North Korea;

(5) the United States and the Republic of Korea are particularly concerned that the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of North Korea, including North Korean efforts to miniaturize their nuclear technology and improve the mobility of their ballistic missiles, have gathered significant momentum and are poised to expand in the coming years;

(6) the Republic of Korea has made progress in enhancing future warfighting and interoperability capabilities by taking steps toward procuring Patriot Advanced Capability missiles, F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Aircraft, and RQ-4 Global Hawk Surveillance Aircraft;

(7) the United States supports the vision of a Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons, free from the fear of war, and peacefully reunited on the basis of democratic and free market principles, as articulated in President Park's address in Dresden, Germany; and

(8) the United States and the Republic of Korea share the future interests of both nations in securing peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia.

SEC. 5117. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States policy toward Taiwan is based upon the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96-8), which was enacted in 1979, and the Six Assurances given by President Ronald Reagan in 1982;

(2) provision of defensive weapons to Taiwan should continue as mandated in the Taiwan Relations Act; and

(3) enhanced trade relations with Taiwan should be pursued to mutually benefit the citizens of both countries.

SEC. 5118. REPORT ON POLITICAL FREEDOM IN VENEZUELA.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an assessment of the support provided by the United States to the people of Venezuela in their aspiration to live under conditions of peace and representative democracy (as defined by the Inter-American Democratic Charter of the Organization of American States, done at Lima September 11, 2001);

(2) an assessment of work carried out by the United States, in cooperation with the other member states of the Organization of American States and countries of the European Union, to ensure—

(A) the peaceful resolution of the current political situation in Venezuela; and

(B) the immediate cessation of violence against antigovernment protestors;

(3) a list of the government and security officials in Venezuela who—

(A) are responsible for, or complicit in, the use of force in relation to antigovernment protests and similar acts of violence; and

(B) have had their financial assets in the United States frozen or been placed on a visa ban by the United States; and

(4) an assessment of United States support for the development of democratic political processes and independent civil society in Venezuela.

SEC. 5119. STRATEGY FOR THE MIDDLE EAST IN THE EVENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN.

(a) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of State shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, other members of the National Security Council, and the heads of other appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government, develop a strategy for the United States for the Middle East in the event of a comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy shall include the following:

(1) Efforts to counter Iranian-sponsored terrorism in Middle East region.

(2) Efforts to reassure United States allies and partners in Middle East.

(3) Efforts to address the potential for a conventional or nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

(c) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 60 days after entering into a comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran, the Secretary shall submit the strategy developed under subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5120. DEPARTMENT OF STATE INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE POLICY STRATEGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall produce a comprehensive strategy, with a classified annex if necessary, relating to United States international policy with regard to cyberspace.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy required in subsection (a) shall include:

(1) A review of actions and activities undertaken by the Secretary of State to date to support the goal of the President's International Strategy for Cyberspace, released in May 2011, to “work internationally to promote an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable information and communications infrastructure that supports international trade and commerce, strengthens international security, and fosters free expression and innovation”;

(2) A plan of action to guide the Secretary's diplomacy with regard to nation-states, including conducting bilateral and multilateral activities to develop the norms of responsible international behavior in cyberspace, and status review of existing discussions in multilateral fora to obtain agreements on international norms in cyberspace.

(3) A review of the alternative concepts with regard to international norms in cyberspace offered by other prominent nation-state actors, including China, Russia, Brazil, and India.

(4) A detailed description of threats to United States national security in cyberspace from other nation-states, state-sponsored actors and private actors, to United States Federal and private sector infrastructure, United States intellectual property, and the privacy of United States citizens.

(5) A review of policy tools available to the President of United States to deter nation-

states, state-sponsored actors, and private actors, including, but not limited to, those outlined in Executive Order 13694, released on April 1, 2015.

(6) A review of resources required by the Secretary, including the Office of the Coordinator for Cyber Issues, to conduct activities to build responsible norms of international cyber behavior.

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall consult with other United States Government agencies, including the intelligence community, and, as appropriate, the United States private sector and United States non-governmental organizations with recognized credentials and expertise in foreign policy, national security, and cybersecurity.

(d) **RELEASE.**—The Secretary shall publicly release the strategy required in subsection (a) and brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives upon its release, including on the classified annex, should the strategy include such an annex.

SEC. 5121. WAIVER OF FEES FOR RENEWAL OF IMMIGRANT VISA FOR ADOPTED CHILD IN CERTAIN SITUATIONS.

Section 221(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **PERIOD OF VALIDITY; RENEWAL OR REPLACEMENT.**—

“(1) **IMMIGRANT VISAS.**—An immigrant visa shall be valid for such period, not exceeding 6 months, as shall be by regulations prescribed, except that any visa issued to a child lawfully adopted by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business, shall be valid until such time, for a period not to exceed 3 years, as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his service, employment, or business.

“(2) **NONIMMIGRANT VISAS.**—A non-immigrant visa shall be valid for such periods as shall be prescribed by regulations. In prescribing the period of validity of a non-immigrant visa in the case of nationals of any foreign country who are eligible for such visas, the Secretary of State shall, insofar as practicable, accord to such nationals the same treatment upon a reciprocal basis as such foreign country accords to nationals of the United States who are within a similar class, except that in the case of aliens who are nationals of a foreign country and who either are granted refugee status and firmly resettled in another foreign country or are granted permanent residence and residing in another foreign country, the Secretary of State may prescribe the period of validity of such a visa based upon the treatment granted by that other foreign country to alien refugees and permanent residents, respectively, in the United States.

“(3) **VISA REPLACEMENT.**—An immigrant visa may be replaced under the original number during the fiscal year in which the original visa was issued for an immigrant who establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer that the immigrant—

“(A) was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity because of reasons beyond his control and for which he was not responsible;

“(B) is found by a consular officer to be eligible for an immigrant visa; and

“(C) pays again the statutory fees for an application and an immigrant visa.

“(4) **FEE WAIVER.**—If an immigrant visa was issued, on or after March 27, 2013, for a child

who has been lawfully adopted, or who is coming to the United States to be adopted, by a United States citizen, any statutory immigrant visa fees relating to a renewal or replacement of such visa may be waived or, if already paid, may be refunded upon request, subject to such criteria as the Secretary of State may prescribe, if—

“(A) the immigrant child was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity as a direct result of extraordinary circumstances, including the denial of an exit permit; and

“(B) if such inability was attributable to factors beyond the control of the adopting parent or parents and of the immigrant.”.

SEC. 5122. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ANTI-ISRAEL AND ANTI-SEMITIC INCITEMENT WITHIN THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that the 1995 Interim Agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, commonly referred to as Oslo II, specifically details that Israel and the Palestinian Authority shall “abstain from incitement, including hostile propaganda, against each other and, without derogating from the principle of freedom of expression, shall take legal measures to prevent such incitement by any organizations, groups or individuals within their jurisdiction”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) expresses support and admiration for individuals and organizations working to encourage cooperation between Israeli Jews and Palestinians, including—

(A) Professor Mohammed Dajani Daoudi, who took students from al-Quds University in Jerusalem to visit Auschwitz in March 2014 only to return to death threats by fellow Palestinians and expulsion from his teacher's union;

(B) the Israel Palestine Center for Research and Information, the only joint Israeli-Palestinian public policy think-tank,

(C) United Hatzalah, a nonprofit, fully volunteer Emergency Medical Services organization that, mobilizing volunteers who are religious or secular Jews, Arabs, Muslims, and Christians, provides EMS services to all people in Israel regardless of race, religion, or national origin; and

(D) Breaking the Impasse, an apolitical initiative of Palestinian and Israeli business and civil society leaders who advocate for a two-state solution and an urgent diplomatic solution to the conflict;

(2) reiterates strong condemnation of anti-Israel and anti-Semitic incitement in the Palestinian Authority as antithetical to the stated desire to achieve a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace settlement; and

(3) urges President Abbas and Palestinian Authority officials to discontinue all official incitement that runs contrary to the determination to put an end to decades of confrontation.

SEC. 5123. SUPPORT FOR THE SOVEREIGNTY, INDEPENDENCE, TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY, AND INVIOABILITY OF POST-SOVIET COUNTRIES IN LIGHT OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION AND INTERFERENCE.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress—

(1) supports the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and inviolability of post-Soviet countries within their internationally recognized borders;

(2) expresses deep concern over increasingly aggressive actions by the Russian Federation;

(3) is committed to providing sufficient funding for the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs of the Department of State to address subversive and destabilizing activi-

ties by the Russian Federation within post-Soviet countries;

(4) supports robust engagement between the United States and post-Soviet countries through—

(A) the promotion of strengthened people-to-people ties, including through educational and cultural exchange programs;

(B) anticorruption assistance;

(C) public diplomacy;

(D) economic diplomacy; and

(E) other democratic reform efforts;

(5) encourages the President to further enhance nondefense cooperation and diplomatic engagement with post-Soviet countries;

(6) condemns the subversive and destabilizing activities undertaken by the Russian Federation within post-Soviet countries;

(7) encourages enhanced cooperation between the United States and the European Union to promote greater Euro-Atlantic integration, including through—

(A) the enlargement of the European Union; and

(B) the Open Door policy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

(8) urges continued cooperation between the United States and the European Union to maintain sanctions against the Russian Federation until the Government of Russia has—

(A) fully implemented all provisions of the Minsk agreements, done at Minsk September 5, 2014 and February 12, 2015; and

(B) demonstrated respect for the territorial sovereignty of Ukraine;

(9) calls on the member states of the European Union to extend the current sanctions regime against the Russian Federation; and

(10) urges the consideration of additional sanctions if the Russian Federation continue to engage in subversive and destabilizing activities within post-Soviet countries.

SEC. 5124. RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA REPORT.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Russian Federation is waging a propaganda war against the United States and our allies; and

(2) a successful strategy must be implemented to counter the threat posed by Russian propaganda.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually for the following 3 years, the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal officials, shall submit an unclassified report, with a classified annex, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that contains a detailed analysis of—

(1) the recent use of propaganda by the Government of Russia, including—

(A) the forms of propaganda used, including types of media and programming;

(B) the principal countries and regions targeted by Russian propaganda; and

(C) the impact of Russian propaganda on such targets;

(2) the response by United States allies, particularly European allies, to counter the threat of Russian propaganda;

(3) the response by the United States to the threat of Russian propaganda;

(4) the extent of the effectiveness of programs currently in use to counter Russian propaganda;

(5) a strategy for improving the effectiveness of such programs;

(6) any additional authority needed to counter the threat of Russian propaganda; and

(7) the additional funding needed to successfully implement the strategy referred to in paragraph (5).

SEC. 5125. APPROVAL OF EXPORT LICENCES AND LETTERS OF REQUEST TO ASSIST THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) EXPORT LICENSE APPLICATIONS.—

(A) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all export license applications, including requests for marketing licenses, for the sale of defense articles and defense services to Ukraine.

(B) CONTENTS.—The list submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) the date on which the application or request was first submitted;

(ii) the current status of each application or request; and

(iii) the estimated timeline for adjudication of such applications or requests.

(C) PRIORITY.—The Secretary should give priority to processing the applications and requests included on the list submitted under subparagraph (A).

(2) LETTERS OF REQUEST.—The Secretary shall submit to the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all pending Letters of Request for Foreign Military Sales to Ukraine, including—

(A) the date on which each such letter was first submitted;

(B) the current status of each such letter; and

(C) the estimated timeline for the adjudication of each such letter.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until the date set forth in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall submit a report to the specified congressional committees that describes the status of the applications, requests for marketing licenses, and Letters of Request described in subsection (a).

(2) TERMINATION DATE.—The date set forth in this paragraph is the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the President certifies to Congress that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Government of Ukraine has been restored; or

(B) the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “specified congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Additional Matters

SEC. 5131. ATROCITIES PREVENTION BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President is authorized to establish, within the Executive Office of the President, an Interagency Atrocities Prevention Board (referred to in this section as the “Board”).

(b) DUTIES.—The Board is authorized—

(1) to coordinate an interagency approach to preventing mass atrocities;

(2) to propose policies to integrate the early warning systems of national security agencies, including intelligence agencies, with respect to incidents of mass atrocities

and to coordinate the policy response to such incidents;

(3) to identify relevant Federal agencies, which shall track and report on Federal funding spent on atrocity prevention efforts;

(4) to oversee the development and implementation of comprehensive atrocities prevention and response strategies;

(5) to identify available resources and policy options necessary to prevent the emergence or escalation of mass atrocities;

(6) to identify and propose policies to close gaps in expertise, readiness, and planning for atrocities prevention and early action across Federal agencies, including training for employees at relevant Federal agencies;

(7) to engage relevant civil society and nongovernmental organization stakeholders in regular consultations to solicit current information on countries of concern; and

(8) to conduct an atrocity-specific expert review of policy and programming of all countries at risk for mass atrocities.

(c) LEADERSHIP.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall be headed by a Senior Director, who—

(A) shall be appointed by the President; and

(B) shall report to the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

(2) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The Senior Director is authorized to have primary responsibility for—

(A) recommending and, if adopted, promoting United States Government policies on preventing mass atrocities; and

(B) carrying out the duties described in subsection (b).

(d) **COMPOSITION.**—The Board shall be composed of—

(1) representatives from—

(A) the Department of State;

(B) the United States Agency for International Development;

(C) the Department of Defense;

(D) the Department of Justice;

(E) the Department of the Treasury;

(F) the Department of Homeland Security;

(G) the Central Intelligence Agency;

(H) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence;

(I) the United States Mission to the United Nations; and

(J) the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(2) such other individuals as the President may appoint.

(e) **COORDINATION.**—The Board is authorized to coordinate with relevant officials and government agencies responsible for foreign policy with respect to particular regions and countries to help provide a cohesive, whole of government response and policy direction to emerging and ongoing atrocities.

(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a classified report, with an unclassified annex, which shall include—

(1) an update on the interagency review mandated by Presidential Study Directive 10 that includes—

(A) an evaluation of current mechanisms and capacities for government-wide detection, early warning, information-sharing, contingency planning, and coordination of efforts to prevent and respond to situations of genocide, mass atrocities, and other mass violence, including such mass gender- and ethnicity-based violence;

(B) an assessment of the funding spent by relevant Federal agencies on atrocity prevention activities;

(C) current annual global assessments of sources of conflict and instability;

(D) recommendations to further strengthen United States capabilities to improve the mechanisms described in subparagraph (A); and

(E) evaluations of the various approaches to enhancing capabilities and improving the mechanisms described in subparagraph (A);

(2) recommendations to ensure burden sharing by—

(A) improving international cooperation and coordination to enhance multilateral mechanisms for preventing genocide and atrocities, including improving the role of regional and international organizations in conflict prevention, mitigation, and response; and

(B) strengthening regional organizations; and

(3) the implementation status of the recommendations contained in the interagency review described in paragraph (1).

(g) **MATERIALS AND BRIEFINGS.**—The Senior Director and the members of the Board shall brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives at least annually.

(h) **SUNSET.**—This section shall cease to be effective on June 30, 2017.

SEC. 5132. UNITED STATES ENGAGEMENT IN THE INDO-PACIFIC.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a comprehensive assessment to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States engagement in the Indo-Pacific, including with partners across the Indo-Pacific region.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a review of current and emerging United States diplomatic, national security, and economic interests and trends in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) a review of resources devoted to United States diplomatic, economic, trade, development, and cultural engagement and plans in the Indo-Pacific region during the 10-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(3) options for the realignment of United States engagement in the Indo-Pacific region to respond to new opportunities and challenges, including linking United States strategy more broadly across the Indo-Pacific region; and

(4) the views of noted policy leaders and regional experts, including leaders and experts in the Indo-Pacific region, on the opportunities and challenges to United States engagement across the Indo-Pacific region.

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary, as appropriate, shall consult with—

(1) other United States Government agencies; and

(2) independent, nongovernmental organizations with recognized credentials and expertise in foreign policy, national security, and international economic affairs that have access to policy experts throughout the United States and from the Indo-Pacific region.

SEC. 5133. JOINT ACTION PLAN TO COMBAT PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION AND TO FOSTER INCLUSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to enter into a bilateral joint action plan with the European Union to combat prejudice and discrimination and to foster

inclusion (referred to in this section as the “Joint Action Plan”).

(b) **CONTENTS OF JOINT ACTION PLAN.**—The Joint Action Plan shall—

(1) address anti-Semitism;

(2) address prejudice against, and the discriminatory treatment of, racial, ethnic, and religious minorities;

(3) promote equality of opportunity for access to quality education and economic opportunities; and

(4) promote equal treatment by the justice system.

(c) **COOPERATION.**—In developing the Joint Action Plan, the Secretary shall—

(1) leverage interagency policy expertise in the United States and Europe;

(2) develop partnerships among civil society and private sector stakeholders; and

(3) draw upon the extensive work done by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe to address anti-Semitism.

(d) **INITIATIVES.**—The Joint Action Plan may include initiatives for promoting equality of opportunity and methods of eliminating prejudice and discrimination based on religion, race, or ethnicity, including—

(1) training programs;

(2) regional initiatives to promote equality of opportunity through the strengthening of democratic institutions;

(3) public-private partnerships with enterprises and nongovernmental organizations;

(4) exchanges of technical experts;

(5) scholarships and fellowships; and

(6) political empowerment and leadership initiatives.

(e) **DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall task an existing Deputy Assistant Secretary with the responsibility for coordinating the implementation of the Joint Action Plan with his or her European Union counterpart.

(f) **LEGAL EFFECTS.**—Any Joint Action Plan adopted under this section—

(1) shall not be legally binding; and

(2) shall create no rights or obligations under international or United States law.

(g) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize—

(1) the Secretary to enter into a legally binding agreement or Joint Action Plan with the European Union; or

(2) any additional appropriations for the purposes and initiatives described in this section.

(h) **PROGRESS REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a progress report on the development of the Joint Action Plan to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5134. REPORT ON DEVELOPING COUNTRY DEBT SUSTAINABILITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Treasury, shall submit a report containing an assessment of the current external debt environment for developing countries and identifying particular near-term risks to debt sustainability to—

(1) the appropriate congressional committees;

(2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall assess—

(1) the impact of new lending relationships, including the role of new creditors;

(2) the adequacy of current multilateral surveillance mechanisms in guarding against debt distress in developing countries;

(3) the ability of developing countries to borrow on global capital markets; and

(4) the interaction between debt sustainability objectives of the developing world and the development-oriented investment agenda of the G-20, including the impact of—

(A) current debt sustainability objectives on investment in developing countries; and

(B) investment objectives proposed by the G-20 on the ability to meet the goals of—

(i) the Heavily Indebted Poor Country Initiative; and

(ii) the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative.

SEC. 5135. UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO PREVENT AND RESPOND TO GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE GLOBALLY.

(a) **GLOBAL STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter for 6 years, the Secretary of State shall develop or update a United States global strategy to prevent and respond to violence against women and girls. The strategy shall be transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees and made publicly available on the Internet.

(b) **INITIAL STRATEGY.**—For the purposes of this section, the “United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally”, issued in August 2012, shall be deemed to fulfill the initial requirement of subsection (a).

(c) **COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION.**—In developing the strategy under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall consult with—

(1) the heads of relevant Federal agencies;

(2) the Senior Policy Operating Group on Trafficking in Persons; and

(3) representatives of civil society and multilateral organizations with demonstrated experience in addressing violence against women and girls or promoting gender equality internationally.

(d) **PRIORITY COUNTRY SELECTION.**—To further the objectives of the strategy described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall identify no less than 4 eligible low-income and lower-middle income countries with significant levels of violence against women and girls, including within displaced communities, that have the governmental or non-governmental organizational capacity to manage and implement gender-based violence prevention and response program activities and should, when possible, be geographically, ethnically, and culturally diverse from one another.

(e) **COUNTRY PLANS.**—In each country identified under subsection (d) the Secretary shall develop comprehensive, multisectoral, and holistic individual country plans designed to address and respond to violence against women and girls that include—

(1) an assessment and description of the current or potential capacity of the government of each identified country and civil society organizations in each such identified country to address and respond to violence against women and girls;

(2) an identification of coordination mechanisms with Federal agencies that—

(A) have existing programs relevant to the strategy;

(B) will be involved in new program activities; and

(C) are engaged in broader United States strategies around development;

(3) a description of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms established for each identified country, and their intended use in assessing overall progress in prevention and response;

(4) a projection of the general levels of resources needed to achieve the stated objectives in each identified country, including an accounting of—

(A) activities and funding already expended by the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, other Federal agencies, donor country governments, and multilateral institutions; and

(B) leveraged private sector resources; and

(5) strategies, as appropriate, designed to accommodate the needs of stateless, disabled, internally displaced, refugee, or religious or ethnic minority women and girls.

(f) **REPORT ON PRIORITY COUNTRY SELECTION AND COUNTRY PLANS.**—Not more than 90 days after selection of the priority countries required under subsection (d), and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the priority country selection process, the development of specific country plans, and include an overview of all programming and specific activities being undertaken, the budget resources requested, and the specific activities to be supported by each Executive agency under the strategy if such resources are provided.

(g) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize any additional appropriations for the purposes and initiatives of this section.

SEC. 5136. INTERNATIONAL CORRUPTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than June 1 of each year, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this section as the “USAID Administrator”), the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of appropriate intelligence agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a Country Report on Corruption Practices, with a classified annex, which shall include information about countries for which a corruption analysis was conducted under subsection (b).

(b) **CORRUPTION ANALYSIS ELEMENTS.**—The corruption analysis conducted under this subsection should include, among other elements—

(1) an analysis of individuals and associations that comprise corruption networks in the country, including, as applicable—

(A) government officials;

(B) private sector actors;

(C) criminals; and

(D) members of illegal armed groups;

(2) the identification of the state functions that have been captured by corrupt networks in the country, including, as applicable functions of—

(A) the judicial branch;

(B) the taxing authority;

(C) the central bank; and

(D) specific military or police units;

(3) the identification of—

(A) the key economic activities, whether licit or illicit, which are dominated by members of the corrupt network; and

(B) other revenue streams that enrich such members; and

(4) the identification of enablers of corrupt practices, within the country and outside the country.

(c) **PUBLICATION AND BRIEFINGS.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) publish the Country Report on Corruption and Accountability submitted under subsection (a) on the website of the Department; and

(2) brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on

Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on the information contained in the report published under paragraph (1).

SEC. 5137. QUADRENNIAL DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW.

(a) **REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **QUADRENNIAL REVIEWS REQUIRED.**—Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of State shall every 4 years, during a year following a year evenly divisible by 4, conduct a review of United States diplomacy and development (to be known as a “quadrennial diplomacy and development review”).

(2) **SCOPE OF REVIEWS.**—Each quadrennial diplomacy and development review shall be a comprehensive examination of the national diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework of the United States for the next 4-year period until a subsequent review is due under paragraph (1). The review shall include—

(A) recommendations regarding the long-term diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework of the United States;

(B) priorities of the United States for diplomacy and development; and

(C) guidance on the related programs, assets, capabilities, budget, policies, and authorities of the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development.

(3) **CONSULTATION.**—In conducting each quadrennial diplomacy and development review, after consultation with Department of State and United States Agency for International Development officials, the Secretary of State should consult with—

(A) the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, including the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the Director of National Intelligence;

(B) any other Federal agency that provides foreign assistance, including at a minimum the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and, as appropriate, other members of Congress; and

(D) other relevant governmental and non-governmental entities, including private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts.

(b) **CONTENTS OF REVIEW.**—Each quadrennial diplomacy and development review shall—

(1) delineate, as appropriate, the national diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework of the United States, consistent with appropriate national, Department of State, and United States Agency for International Development strategies, strategic plans, and relevant presidential directives, including the national security strategy prescribed pursuant to section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404a);

(2) outline and prioritize the full range of critical national diplomacy and development areas, capabilities, and resources, including those implemented across agencies, and address the full range of challenges confronting the United States in this regard;

(3) describe the interagency cooperation, and preparedness of relevant Federal assets, and the infrastructure, budget plan, and

other elements of the diplomacy and development policies and programs of the United States required to execute successfully the full range of mission priorities outlined under paragraph (2);

(4) describe the roles of international organizations and multilateral institutions in advancing United States diplomatic and development objectives, including the mechanisms for coordinating and harmonizing development policies and programs with partner countries and among donors;

(5) identify the budget plan required to provide sufficient resources to successfully execute the full range of mission priorities outlined under paragraph (2);

(6) include an assessment of the organizational alignment of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development with the national diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework referred to in paragraph (1) and the diplomacy and development mission priorities outlined under paragraph (2);

(7) review and assess the effectiveness of the management mechanisms of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development for executing the strategic priorities outlined in the quadrennial diplomacy and development review, including the extent to which such effectiveness has been enhanced since the previous report; and

(8) the relationship between the requirements of the quadrennial diplomacy and development review and the acquisition strategy and expenditure plan within the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development.

(c) **FOREIGN AFFAIRS POLICY BOARD REVIEW.**—The Secretary of State should apprise the Foreign Affairs Policy Board on an ongoing basis of the work undertaken in the conduct of the quadrennial diplomacy and development review.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize any additional appropriations for the purposes and initiatives under this section.

SEC. 5138. DISAPPEARED PERSONS IN MEXICO, GUATEMALA, HONDURAS, AND EL SALVADOR.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States—

(A) values governance, security, and the rule of law in Mexico and Central America; and

(B) has reemphasized its commitment to this region following the humanitarian crisis of unaccompanied children from these countries across the international border between the United States and Mexico in 2014.

(2) Individuals migrating from Central America to the United States face great peril during their journey. Many go missing along the way and are often never heard from again.

(b) **REPORT OF DISAPPEARED PERSONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary, in close consultation with the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that includes—

(1) the number of cases of enforced disappearances in Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador;

(2) an assessment of causes for the disappearances described in paragraph (1);

(3) the primary individuals and groups responsible for such disappearances; and

(4) the official government response in those countries to account for such disappeared persons.

SEC. 5139. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF BAHRAIN OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE BAHRAIN INDEPENDENT COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an unclassified report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the implementation by the Government of Bahrain of the recommendations contained in the 2011 Report of the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (referred to in this section as the “Bahrain Report”).

(b) **CONTENT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the specific steps taken by the Government of Bahrain to implement each of the 26 recommendations contained in the Bahrain Report;

(2) an assessment of whether the Government of Bahrain has “fully complied with”, “partially implemented”, or “not meaningfully implemented” each recommendation referred to in paragraph (1); and

(3) an assessment of the impact of the findings in the Bahrain Report for the United States security posture in the Arab Gulf and the area of responsibility of the United States Central Command.

SEC. 5140. REPORT ON UNITED STATES HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO HAITI AND WHETHER RECENT ELECTIONS IN HAITI MEET INTERNATIONAL ELECTION STANDARDS.

(a) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Section 5(a) of the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2022”.

(b) **REPORT.**—Section 5(b) of the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) a determination of whether recent Haitian elections are free, fair and responsive to the people of Haiti; and

“(15) a description of any attempts to disqualify candidates for political officers in Haiti for political reasons.”.

SEC. 5141. SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (in this section referred to as the “DPRK”) tested nuclear weapons on 3 separate occasions, in October 2006, in May 2009, and in February 2013.

(2) Nuclear experts have reported that the DPRK may currently have as many as 20 nuclear warheads and has the potential to possess as many as 100 warheads within the next 5 years.

(3) According to the 2014 Department of Defense report, “Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea” (in this subsection referred to as the “2014 DoD report”), the DPRK has proliferated nuclear technology to

Libya via the proliferation network of Pakistani scientist A.Q. Khan.

(4) According to the 2014 DoD report, “North Korea also provided Syria with nuclear reactor technology until 2007.”.

(5) On September 6, 2007, as part of “Operation Orchard”, the Israeli Air Force destroyed the suspected nuclear facility in Syria.

(6) According to the 2014 DoD report, “North Korea has exported conventional and ballistic missile-related equipment, components, materials, and technical assistance to countries in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.”.

(7) On November 29, 1987, DPRK agents planted explosive devices onboard Korean Air flight 858, which killed all 115 passengers and crew on board.

(8) On March 26, 2010, the DPRK fired upon and sank the South Korean warship Cheonan, killing 46 of her crew.

(9) On November 23, 2010, the DPRK shelled South Korea’s Yeonpyeong Island, killing 4 South Korean citizens.

(10) On February 7, 2014, the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on human rights in DPRK (in this subsection referred to as the “Commission of Inquiry”) released a report detailing the atrocious human rights record of the DPRK.

(11) Dr. Michael Kirby, Chair of the Commission of Inquiry, stated on March 17, 2014, “The Commission of Inquiry has found systematic, widespread, and grave human rights violations occurring in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. It has also found a disturbing array of crimes against humanity. These crimes are committed against inmates of political and other prison camps; against starving populations; against religious believers; against persons who try to flee the country—including those forcibly repatriated by China.”.

(12) Dr. Michael Kirby also stated, “These crimes arise from policies established at the highest level of the State. They have been committed, and continue to take place in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, because the policies, institutions, and patterns of impunity that lie at their heart remain in place. The gravity, scale, duration, and nature of the unspeakable atrocities committed in the country reveal a totalitarian State that does not have any parallel in the contemporary world.”.

(13) The Commission of Inquiry also notes, “Since 1950, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea has engaged in the systematic abduction, denial of repatriation, and subsequent enforced disappearance of persons from other countries on a large scale and as a matter of State policy. Well over 200,000 persons, including children, who were brought from other countries to the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea may have become victims of enforced disappearance,” and states that the DPRK has failed to account or address this injustice in any way.

(14) According to reports and analysis from organizations such as the International Network for the Human Rights of North Korean Overseas Labor, the Korea Policy Research Center, NK Watch, the Asian Institute for Policy Studies, the Center for International and Strategic Studies, and the George W. Bush Institute, there may currently be as many as 100,000 North Korean overseas laborers in various nations around the world.

(15) Such forced North Korean laborers are often subjected to harsh working conditions under the direct supervision of DPRK officials, and their salaries contribute to anywhere from \$150,000,000 to \$230,000,000 a year to the DPRK state coffers.

(16) According to the Director of National Intelligence's 2015 Worldwide Threat Assessment, "North Korea's nuclear weapons and missile programs pose a serious threat to the United States and to the security environment in East Asia."

(17) The Worldwide Threat Assessment states, "North Korea has also expanded the size and sophistication of its ballistic missile forces, ranging from close-range ballistic missiles to ICBMs, while continuing to conduct test launches. In 2014, North Korea launched an unprecedented number of ballistic missiles."

(18) On December 19, 2015, the Federal Bureau of Investigation declared that the DPRK was responsible for a cyberattack on Sony Pictures conducted on November 24, 2014.

(19) From 1988 to 2008, the DPRK was designated by the United States Government as a state sponsor of terrorism.

(20) The DPRK is currently in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695 (2006), 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), and 2094 (2013).

(21) The DPRK repeatedly violated agreements with the United States and the other so-called Six-Party Talks partners (the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Russian Federation, and the People's Republic of China) designed to halt its nuclear weapons program, while receiving significant concessions, including fuel, oil, and food aid.

(22) The Six-Party Talks have not been held since December 2008.

(23) On May 9, 2015, the DPRK claimed that it has test-fired a ballistic missile from a submarine.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the DPRK represents a serious threat to the national security of the United States and United States allies in East Asia and to international peace and stability, and grossly violates the human rights of its own people;

(2) the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury should impose additional sanctions against the DPRK, including targeting its financial assets around the world, specific designations relating to human rights abuses, and a redesignation of the DPRK as a state sponsor of terror; and

(3) the President should not resume the negotiations with the DPRK, either bilaterally or as part of the Six-Party Talks, without strict preconditions, including that the DPRK—

(A) adhere to its denuclearization commitments outlined in the 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party Talks;

(B) commit to halting its ballistic missile programs and its proliferation activities;

(C) cease military provocations; and

(D) measurably and significantly improve its human rights record.

TITLE II—ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Subtitle A—Organizational Matters

SEC. 5201. RIGHTSIZING ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after receiving rightsizing recommendations pursuant to a review conducted by the Office of Management, Policy, Rightsizing, and Innovation relating to overseas staffing levels at United States overseas posts, the relevant chief of mission, in coordination with the relevant regional bureau, shall submit a response to the Office of Management, Policy, Rightsizing, and Innovation that describes—

(1) any rightsizing recommendations that are accepted by such chief of mission and regional bureau;

(2) a detailed schedule for implementation of any such recommendations;

(3) any recommendations that are rejected; and

(4) a detailed justification providing the basis for the rejection of any such recommendations.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—On the date on which the President's annual budget request is submitted to Congress, the Secretary shall submit an annual report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the status of all rightsizing recommendations and responses described in subsection (a) from the preceding 5 years, including—

(1) a list of all such rightsizing recommendations made, including whether each such recommendation was accepted or rejected by the relevant chief of mission and regional bureau;

(2) for each accepted recommendation, a detailed description of the current status of its implementation according to the schedule provided pursuant to subsection (a)(2), including an explanation for any departure from, or changes to, such schedule; and

(3) for any rejected recommendations, the justification provided pursuant to subsection (a)(4).

(c) REPORT ON REGIONAL BUREAU STAFFING.—In conjunction with each report required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit a supplemental report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an enumeration of the domestic staff positions in each regional bureau of the Department;

(2) a detailed explanation of the extent to which the staffing of each regional bureau reflects the overseas requirements of the United States within each such region;

(3) a detailed plan, including an implementation schedule, for how the Department will seek to rectify any significant imbalances in staffing among regional bureaus or between any regional bureau and the overseas requirements of the United States within such region if the Secretary determines that such staffing does not reflect—

(A) the foreign policy priorities of the United States; or

(B) the effective conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States; and

(4) a detailed description of the implementation status of any plan provided pursuant to paragraph (3), including an explanation for any departure from, or changes to, the implementation schedule provided with such plan.

SEC. 5202. INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in conjunction with the Under Secretary of Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment, shall establish—

(1) foreign economic policy priorities for each regional bureau, including for individual countries, as appropriate; and

(2) policies and guidance for integrating such foreign economic policy priorities throughout the Department.

(b) DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—Within each regional bureau of the Department, the Secretary shall task an existing Deputy Assistant Secretary with appropriate training and background in economic and commercial affairs with the responsibility for economic matters and interests within the responsibilities of such regional bureau, including the integration of the foreign economic policy

priorities established pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) COORDINATION.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary given the responsibility for economic matters and interests pursuant to subsection (b) within each bureau shall—

(1) at the direction of the relevant Assistant Secretary, review and report to the Assistant Secretary of such bureau on all economic matters and interests; and

(2) serve as liaison with the Office of the Under Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment.

SEC. 5203. REVIEW OF BUREAU OF AFRICAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS JURISDICTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct a review of the jurisdictional responsibility of the Bureau of African Affairs and that of the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs relating to the North African countries of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya; and

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(A) the findings of the review conducted under paragraph (1); and

(B) recommendations on whether jurisdictional responsibility among the bureaus referred to in paragraph (1) should be adjusted.

(b) REVIEW.—The review conducted under subsection (a)(1) shall—

(1) identify regional strategic priorities;

(2) assess regional dynamics between the North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa regions, including the degree to which the priorities identified pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) are distinct between each such region; or

(B) have similar application across such regions;

(3) identify current priorities and effectiveness of United States Government regional engagement in North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa, including through security assistance, economic assistance, humanitarian assistance, and trade;

(4) assess the degree to which such engagement is—

(A) inefficient, duplicative, or uncoordinated between the North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa regions; or

(B) otherwise harmed or limited as a result of the current division of jurisdictional responsibilities;

(5) assess the overall coherence and effectiveness of the current division of jurisdictional responsibilities in Africa between the Bureau of African Affairs and the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, including with regard to coordination with other United States departments or agencies; and

(6) assess any opportunities and costs of transferring jurisdictional responsibility of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya from the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs to the Bureau of African Affairs.

SEC. 5204. SPECIAL ENVOYS, REPRESENTATIVES, ADVISORS, AND COORDINATORS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on special envoys, representatives, advisors, and coordinators of the Department, which shall include—

(1) a tabulation of the current names, ranks, positions, and responsibilities of all special envoy, representative, advisor, and coordinator positions at the Department, with a separate accounting of all such positions at the level of Assistant Secretary (or equivalent) or above; and

(2) for each position identified pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) the date on which the position was created;

(B) the mechanism by which the position was created, including the authority under which the position was created;

(C) the positions authorized under section 1(d) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(d));

(D) a description of whether, and the extent to which, the responsibilities assigned to the position duplicate the responsibilities of other current officials within the Department, including other special envoys, representatives, and advisors;

(E) which current official within the Department would be assigned the responsibilities of the position in the absence of the position;

(F) to which current official within the Department the position directly reports;

(G) the total number of staff assigned to support the position; and

(H) with the exception of those created by statute, a detailed explanation of the necessity of the position to the effective conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States.

SEC. 5205. CONFLICT PREVENTION, MITIGATION AND RESOLUTION, AND THE INCLUSION AND PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN.

Section 704 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4024) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) The Secretary, in conjunction with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall ensure that all appropriate personnel, responsible for, or deploying to, countries or regions considered to be at risk of, undergoing, or emerging from violent conflict, including special envoys, members of mediation or negotiation teams, relevant members of the civil service or foreign service, and contractors, obtain training, as appropriate, in the following areas, each of which shall include a focus on women and ensuring women’s meaningful inclusion and participation:

“(1) Conflict prevention, mitigation, and resolution.

“(2) Protecting civilians from violence, exploitation, and trafficking in persons.

“(3) International human rights law and international humanitarian law.”.

SEC. 5206. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall regularly consult with the Director of the National Security Agency and any other departments or agencies the Secretary determines to be appropriate regarding the security of United States Government and non-government information technology systems and networks owned, operated, managed, or utilized by the Department, including any such systems or networks facilitating the use of sensitive or classified information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In performing the consultations required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make all such systems and networks available to the Director of the National Security Agency and any other such departments or agencies to carry out such tests and procedures as are necessary to ensure adequate policies and protections are in place to prevent penetrations or compromises of such systems and networks, including by malicious intrusions by any unauthorized individual or state actor or other entity.

(c) SECURITY BREACH REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the en-

actment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the National Security Agency and any other departments or agencies the Secretary determines to be appropriate, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that describes in detail—

(1) all known or suspected penetrations or compromises of the systems or networks described in subsection (a) facilitating the use of classified information; and

(2) all known or suspected significant penetrations or compromises of any other such systems and networks that occurred since the submission of the prior report.

(d) CONTENT.—Each report submitted under subsection (c) shall include—

(1) a description of the relevant information technology system or network penetrated or compromised;

(2) an assessment of the date and time such penetration or compromise occurred;

(3) an assessment of the duration for which such system or network was penetrated or compromised, including whether such penetration or compromise is ongoing;

(4) an assessment of the amount and sensitivity of information accessed and available to have been accessed by such penetration or compromise, including any such information contained on systems and networks owned, operated, managed, or utilized by any other department or agency of the United States Government;

(5) an assessment of whether such system or network was penetrated by a malicious intrusion, including an assessment of—

(A) the known or suspected perpetrators, including state actors; and

(B) the methods used to conduct such penetration or compromise; and

(6) a description of the actions the Department has taken, or plans to take, to prevent future, similar penetrations or compromises of such systems and networks.

SEC. 5207. ANALYSIS OF EMBASSY COST SHARING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that assesses the cost-effectiveness and performance of the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system (referred to in this section as the “ICASS system”), including by assessing—

(1) the general performance of the ICASS system in providing cost-effective, timely, efficient, appropriate, and reliable services that meet the needs of all departments and agencies served;

(2) the extent to which additional cost savings and greater performance can be achieved under the current ICASS system and rules;

(3) the standards applied in the selection of the ICASS provider and the extent to which such standards are consistently applied; and

(4) potential reforms to the ICASS system, including—

(A) the selection of more than 1 service provider under certain circumstances;

(B) options for all departments or agencies to opt out of ICASS entirely or to opt out of individual services, including by debundling service packages;

(C) increasing the reliance on locally employed staff or outsourcing to local firms, as appropriate; and

(D) other modifications to the current ICASS system and rules that would incentivize greater effectiveness and cost efficiency.

SEC. 5208. PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

Section 433(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 241(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—

“(1) INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—The Secretary of State shall convene and chair an interagency working group to prevent international parental child abduction, which shall be composed of presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed, officials from—

“(A) the Department of State;

“(B) the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(C) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(2) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary of State shall convene an advisory committee to the interagency working group established pursuant to paragraph (1), for the duration of the working group’s existence, which shall be composed of not less than 3 left-behind parents, serving for 2-year terms, who—

“(A) shall be selected by the Secretary; and

“(B) shall periodically consult with the interagency working group on all activities of the interagency working group, as appropriate.”.

SEC. 5209. IMPROVING RESEARCH AND EVALUATION OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) conduct regular research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs and activities of the Department, including through the routine use of audience research, digital analytics, and impact evaluations, to plan and execute such programs and activities; and

(2) make the findings of the research and evaluations conducted under paragraph (1) available to Congress.

(b) DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint a Director of Research and Evaluation in the Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources for the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENT.—The appointment of a Director of Research and Evaluation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not result in an increase in the overall full-time equivalent positions within the Department.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Director of Research and Evaluation shall—

(A) coordinate and oversee the research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs of the Department—

(i) to improve public diplomacy strategies and tactics; and

(ii) to ensure that programs are increasing the knowledge, understanding, and trust of the United States by relevant target audiences;

(B) report to the Director of Policy and Planning;

(C) routinely organize and oversee audience research, digital analytics and impact

evaluations across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department;

(D) support embassy public affairs sections;

(E) share appropriate public diplomacy research and evaluation information within the Department and with other Federal departments and agencies;

(F) regularly design and coordinate standardized research questions, methodologies, and procedures to ensure that public diplomacy activities across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices are designed to meet appropriate foreign policy objectives; and

(G) report quarterly to the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, through the Commission's Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation established pursuant to subsection (e), regarding the research and evaluation of all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(4) **GUIDANCE AND TRAINING.**—Not later than 180 days after his or her appointment pursuant to paragraph (1), the Director of Research and Evaluation shall create guidance and training for all public diplomacy officers regarding the reading and interpretation of public diplomacy program evaluation findings to ensure that such findings and lessons learned are implemented in the planning and evaluation of all public diplomacy programs and activities throughout the Department.

(c) **PRIORITIZING RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of Policy, Planning, and Resources shall ensure that research and evaluation, as coordinated and overseen by the Director of Research and Evaluation, supports strategic planning and resource allocation across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(2) **ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES.**—Amounts allocated for the purposes of research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs and activities pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made available to be disbursed at the direction of the Director of Research and Evaluation among the research and evaluation staff across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(3) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Department should allocate, for the purposes of research and evaluation of public diplomacy activities and programs pursuant to subsection (a)—

(A) 3 to 5 percent of program funds made available under the heading “EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS”; and

(B) 3 to 5 percent of program funds allocated for public diplomacy programs under the heading “DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS”.

(d) **LIMITED EXEMPTION.**—The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) shall not apply to collections of information directed at foreign individuals conducted by, or on behalf of, the Department for the purpose of audience research and impact evaluations, in accordance with the requirements under this section and in connection with the Department's activities conducted pursuant to the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act (22 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) or the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.).

(e) **ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.**—

(1) **SUBCOMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.**—The Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy shall establish a Subcommittee for Research and Evaluation to monitor and advise on the research and evaluation activities of the Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

(2) **REPORT.**—The Subcommittee for Research and Evaluation established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall submit an annual report to Congress in conjunction with the Commission on Public Diplomacy's Comprehensive Annual Report on the performance of the Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors in carrying out research and evaluations of their respective public diplomacy programming.

(3) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Section 1334 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6553) is amended by striking “October 1, 2015” and inserting “October 1, 2020”.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AUDIENCE RESEARCH.**—The term “audience research” means research conducted at the outset of public diplomacy program or campaign planning and design on specific audience segments to understand the attitudes, interests, knowledge and behaviors of such audience segments.

(2) **DIGITAL ANALYTICS.**—The term “digital analytics” means the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, accumulated in digital format, to indicate the outputs and outcomes of a public diplomacy program or campaign.

(3) **IMPACT EVALUATION.**—The term “impact evaluation” means an assessment of the changes in the audience targeted by a public diplomacy program or campaign that can be attributed to such program or campaign.

SEC. 5210. ENHANCED INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY OF THE BUREAU OF AFRICAN AFFAIRS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall strengthen the institutional capacity of the Bureau of African Affairs to oversee programs and engage in strategic planning and crisis management by—

(1) establishing an office within the Bureau of African Affairs that is separate and distinct from the regional affairs office specifically charged with overseeing strategy development and program implementation related to security assistance;

(2) planning to facilitate the long-term planning process; and

(3) developing a concrete plan to rightsize the Bureau of African Affairs not later than 180 days after the date enactment of this Act.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the actions that have been taken to carry out subsection (a).

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts to carry out this section, and the Secretary shall use existing resources to carry out the provisions of this section.

Subtitle B—Personnel Matters

SEC. 5211. REVIEW OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER COMPENSATION.

(a) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall commission an independent assessment of Foreign Service Officer compensation to ensure that such compensation is achieving its purposes and the goals of the Department, including to recruit, retain, and maintain the world's premier diplomatic corps.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(A) the results of the independent assessment commissioned pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(B) the views of the Secretary regarding Foreign Service Officer compensation.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a list of all compensation received by Foreign Service Officers assigned domestically or overseas, including base salary and any other benefits, allowances, differentials, or other financial incentives;

(2) for each form of compensation described in paragraph (1)—

(A) an explanation of its stated purpose;

(B) a description of all relevant authorities, including statutory authority; and

(C) an assessment of the degree to which its historical and current use matches its stated purpose; and

(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of each form of compensation described in paragraph (1) in—

(A) achieving its stated purpose;

(B) achieving the recruiting and retention goals of the Department; and

(C) achieving the assignment placement needs of the Department.

SEC. 5212. REPEAL OF RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE.

Section 305 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3945) is amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 5213. COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR TRAVEL.

Section 5550b of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) The maximum amount of compensatory time off that may be earned under this section may not exceed 104 hours during any leave year (as defined in section 630.201(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations).”.

SEC. 5214. CERTIFICATES OF DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE.

Not later than 7 days after submitting the report required under section 304(a)(4) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3944(a)(4)) to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the President shall make the report available to the public, including by posting the on the website of the Department in a conspicuous manner and location.

SEC. 5215. FOREIGN SERVICE ASSIGNMENT RESTRICTIONS.

(a) **APPEAL OF ASSIGNMENT RESTRICTION.**—The Secretary shall establish a right and process for employees to appeal any assignment restriction or preclusion.

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—Upon full implementation of a right and process for employees to appeal an assignment restriction or preclusion, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) certifies that such appeals process has been fully implemented; and

(2) includes a detailed description of such process.

(c) **NOTICE.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) publish the right and process established pursuant to subsection (a) in the Foreign Affairs Manual; and

(2) include a reference to such publication in the report required under subsection (b).

(d) **PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION.**—Section 502(a)(2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3982(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) In making assignments under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure that a

member of the Service is not assigned to, or restricted from, a position at a post in a particular geographic area, or domestically in a position working on issues relating to a particular geographic area, exclusively on the basis of the race, ethnicity, or religion of that member.”.

SEC. 5216. SECURITY CLEARANCE SUSPENSIONS.

(a) SUSPENSION.—Section 610 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4010) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

“SEC. 610. SEPARATION FOR CAUSE; SUSPENSION.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) In order to promote the efficiency of the Service, the Secretary may suspend a member of the Service without pay when—

“(A) the member’s security clearance is suspended; or

“(B) there is reasonable cause to believe that the member has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment may be imposed.

“(2) Any member of the Foreign Service for whom a suspension is proposed under this subsection shall be entitled to—

“(A) written notice stating the specific reasons for the proposed suspension;

“(B) a reasonable time to respond orally and in writing to the proposed suspension;

“(C) representation by an attorney or other representative; and

“(D) a final written decision, including the specific reasons for such decision, as soon as practicable.

“(3) Any member suspended under this subsection may file a grievance in accordance with the procedures applicable to grievances under chapter 11.

“(4) If a grievance is filed under paragraph (3)—

“(A) the review by the Foreign Service Grievance Board shall be limited to a determination of whether the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) have been fulfilled; and

“(B) the Board may not exercise the authority provided under section 1106(8).

“(5) In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘reasonable time’ means—

“(i) with respect to a member of the Foreign Service assigned to duty in the United States, 15 days after receiving notice of the proposed suspension; and

“(ii) with respect to a member of the Foreign Service assigned to duty outside the United States, 30 days after receiving notice of the proposed suspension.

“(B) The terms ‘suspend’ and ‘suspension’ mean placing a member of the Foreign Service in a temporary status without duties and pay.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 610 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 610. Separation for cause; suspension.”.

SEC. 5217. ECONOMIC STATECRAFT EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

The Secretary shall establish curriculum at the Foreign Services Institute to develop the practical foreign economic policy expertise and skill sets of Foreign Service officers, including by making available distance-learning courses in commercial, economic, and business affairs, including in—

- (1) the global business environment;
- (2) the economics of development;
- (3) development and infrastructure finance;
- (4) current trade and investment agreements negotiations;
- (5) implementing existing multilateral and World Trade Organization agreements, and

United States trade and investment agreements;

(6) best practices for customs and export procedures; and

(7) market analysis and global supply chain management.

SEC. 5218. REPORT ON DIVERSITY RECRUITMENT, EMPLOYMENT, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and quadrennially thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a comprehensive report to Congress that—

(1) describes the efforts, consistent with existing law, including procedures, effects, and results of the Department since the period covered by the prior such report, to promote equal opportunity and inclusion for all American employees in direct hire and personal service contractors status, particularly employees of the Foreign Service, to include equal opportunity for all races, ethnicities, ages, genders, and service-disabled veterans, with a focus on traditionally underrepresented minority groups;

(2) includes a section on—

(A) the diversity of selection boards;

(B) the employment of minority and service-disabled veterans during the most recent 10-year period, including—

(i) the number hired through direct hires, internships, and fellowship programs;

(ii) the number promoted to senior positions, including FS-01, GS-15, Senior Executive Service, and Senior Foreign Service; and

(iii) attrition rates by grade, civil and foreign services, and the senior level ranks listed in clause (ii);

(C) mentorship and retention programs; and

(3) is organized in terms of real numbers and percentages at all levels.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall describe the efforts of the Department—

(1) to propagate fairness, impartiality, and inclusion in the work environment domestically and abroad;

(2) to eradicate harassment, intolerance, and discrimination;

(3) to refrain from engaging in unlawful discrimination in any phase of the employment process, including recruitment, hiring, evaluation, assignments, promotion, retention, and training;

(4) to eliminate illegal retaliation against employees for participating in a protected equal employment opportunity activity;

(5) to provide reasonable accommodation for qualified employees and applicants with disabilities;

(6) to resolve workplace conflicts, confrontations, and complaints in a prompt, impartial, constructive, and timely manner;

(7) to improve demographic data availability and analysis regarding recruitment, hiring, promotion, training, length in service, assignment restrictions, and pass-through programs;

(8) to recruit a diverse staff by—

(A) recruiting women, minorities, veterans, and undergraduate and graduate students;

(B) recruiting at historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic serving institutions, women’s colleges, and colleges that typically serve majority minority populations;

(C) sponsoring and recruiting at job fairs in urban communities;

(D) placing job advertisements in newspapers, magazines, and job sites oriented toward women and people of color;

(E) providing opportunities through the Foreign Service Internship Program and other hiring initiatives; and

(F) recruiting mid- and senior-level professionals through programs such as—

(i) the International Career Advancement Program;

(ii) the Public Policy and International Affairs Fellowship Program;

(iii) the Institute for International Public Policy Fellowship Program;

(iv) Seminar XXI at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Center for International Studies; and

(v) other similar, highly respected, international leadership programs; and

(9) to provide opportunities through—

(A) the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Fellowship Program;

(B) the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program; and

(C) the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program.

(c) SCOPE OF INITIAL REPORT.—The first report submitted to Congress under this section shall include the information described in subsection (b) for the 3 fiscal years immediately preceding the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

SEC. 5219. EXPANSION OF THE CHARLES B. RANGEL INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS PROGRAM, THE THOMAS R. PICKERING FOREIGN AFFAIRS FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, AND THE DONALD M. PAYNE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) ADDITIONAL FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED.—Beginning in fiscal year 2016, the Secretary shall—

(1) increase by 10 the number of fellows selected for the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Program;

(2) increase by 10 the number of fellows selected for the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program; and

(3) increase by 5 the number of fellows selected for the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program.

(b) PAYNE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—Undergraduate and graduate components of the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program are authorized to conduct outreach to attract outstanding students who represent diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds with an interest in pursuing a Foreign Service career.

SEC. 5220. RETENTION OF MID- AND SENIOR-LEVEL PROFESSIONALS FROM UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary should provide attention and oversight to the employment, retention, and promotion of underrepresented groups to promote a diverse ethnic representation among mid- and senior-level career professionals through programs such as—

(1) the International Career Advancement Program;

(2) Seminar XXI at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Center for International Studies; and

(3) other highly respected international leadership programs.

(b) REVIEW OF PAST PROGRAMS.—The Secretary should review past programs designed to increase minority representation in international affairs positions, including—

(1) the USAID Undergraduate Cooperative and Graduate Economics Program;

(2) the Public Policy and International Affairs Fellowship Program; and

(3) the Institute for International Public Policy Fellowship Program.

SEC. 5221. REVIEW OF JURISDICTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE TO AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN AND THE BUREAU OF SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIAN AFFAIRS.

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Secretary of State shall conduct a review of the jurisdictional responsibilities of the Special Representative to Afghanistan and Pakistan (SRAP) and the Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs (SCA).

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the findings of the review conducted under subsection (a), including recommendations on whether jurisdictional responsibility between the 2 offices should be adjusted.

SEC. 5222. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF COUNTRIES COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 110 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 30 days before the anticipated submission of each annual report under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary of State shall notify and brief the appropriate congressional committees concerning the countries that will be upgraded to a higher tier or downgraded to a lower tier in such report.”.

SEC. 5223. INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 708 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4028) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) in subsection (d), as redesignated, by inserting “REFUGEES” before “The Secretary of State”;

(3) in subsection (e), as redesignated, by inserting “CHILD SOLDIERS” before “The Secretary of State”; and

(4) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) **DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULUM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall develop a curriculum for Foreign Service Officers that includes training on—

“(A) the scope and strategic value of international religious freedom;

“(B) how violations of international religious freedom harm fundamental United States interests;

“(C) how the advancement of international religious freedom can advance such interests;

“(D) how United States international religious freedom policy should be carried out in practice by United States diplomats and other Foreign Service Officers; and

“(E) the relevance and relationship of international religious freedom to United States defense, diplomacy, development, and public affairs efforts to combat violent extremism.

“(2) **ROLE OF OTHER OFFICIALS.**—The Secretary of State shall carry out paragraph (1)—

“(A) with the assistance of the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom appointed under section 101(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6411(b));

“(B) in coordination with the Director of the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center and other Federal officials, as appropriate; and

“(C) in consultation with the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom established under section

201(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(a)).

“(3) **RESOURCES.**—The Secretary of State shall ensure the availability of sufficient resources to develop and implement the curriculum required under this subsection.

“(b) **RELIGIOUS FREEDOM TRAINING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016, the Director of the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center shall begin training on religious freedom, using the curriculum developed under subsection (a), for Foreign Service officers, including—

“(A) entry level officers;

“(B) officers prior to departure for posting outside the United States; and

“(C) incoming deputy chiefs of mission and ambassadors.

“(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The training required under paragraph (1) shall be substantively incorporated into—

“(A) the A-100 course attended by Foreign Service Officers;

“(B) the specific country courses required of Foreign Service Officers prior to a posting outside the United States, with training tailored to—

“(i) the particular religious demography of such country;

“(ii) religious freedom conditions in such country;

“(iii) religious engagement strategies; and

“(iv) United States strategies for advancing religious freedom.

“(C) the courses required of incoming deputy chiefs of mission and ambassadors.

“(c) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—The curriculum and training materials developed pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall be shared with the United States Armed Forces and all other Federal departments and agencies whose personnel serve as attachés, advisors, detailees, or otherwise in United States embassies globally to provide training on—

“(1) United States religious freedom policies;

“(2) religious traditions;

“(3) religious engagement strategies;

“(4) religious and cultural issues; and

“(5) efforts to combat terrorism and violent religious extremism.”.

TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Subtitle A—United States Contributions to International Organizations

SEC. 5301. REPORTS CONCERNING THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) **REPORT ON ANTI-SEMITIC ACTIVITY AT THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS AGENCIES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes—

(1) all activities at the United Nations and its subagencies that can be construed to exhibit an anti-Semitic bias, including official statements, proposed resolutions, and United Nations investigations;

(2) the use of United Nations resources to promote anti-Semitic or anti-Israel rhetoric or propaganda, including publications, internet websites, and textbooks or other educational materials used to propagate political rhetoric regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and

(3) specific actions taken by the United States Government to address any of the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) **REPORT ON ALL UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NA-**

TIONS.—Section 4(c) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287b(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) **CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A detailed description of all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind contributions, of the United States to the United Nations and to each of its affiliated agencies and related bodies—

“(i) during the preceding fiscal year;

“(ii) estimated for the fiscal year in which the report is submitted; and

“(iii) requested in the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for the following fiscal year.

“(B) **CONTENT.**—The description required under subparagraph (A) shall, for each fiscal year specified in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of that subparagraph, include—

“(i) the total amount or value of all contributions described in that subparagraph;

“(ii) the approximate percentage of all such contributions by the United States compared to all contributions to the United Nations and to each of its affiliated agencies and related bodies from any source; and

“(iii) for each such contribution described in subparagraph (A)—

“(I) the amount or value of the contribution;

“(II) whether the contribution was assessed by the United Nations or voluntary;

“(III) the purpose of the contribution;

“(IV) the department or agency of the United States Government responsible for the contribution; and

“(V) whether the United Nations or an affiliated agency or related body received the contribution and, if an affiliated agency or related body received the contribution, which such agency or body.

“(C) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—Not later than 14 days after submitting a report required under this subsection to the designated congressional committees, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall post a text-based, searchable version of the description required by subparagraph (A) on a publicly available Internet website of that Office.”.

SEC. 5302. ANNUAL REPORT ON FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 4(b) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287b(b)) is amended by striking “in which the United States participates as a member” and inserting “, including”.

“(1) the amount of such contributions that were assessed by an international organization and the amount of such contributions that were voluntary; and

“(2) the ratio of United States contributions to total contributions received for—

“(A) the United Nations, specialized agencies of the United Nations, and other United Nations funds, programs, and organizations;

“(B) peacekeeping;

“(C) inter-American organizations;

“(D) regional organizations; and

“(E) other international organizations.”.

SEC. 5303. REPORT ON PEACEKEEPING ARREARS, CREDITS, AND CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 4(c) of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287b(c)), as amended by section 5301(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) PEACEKEEPING CREDITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A complete and full accounting of United States peacekeeping assessments and contributions for United Nations peacekeeping operations, including the following:

“(i) A tabulation of annual United Nations peacekeeping assessment rates, the peacekeeping contribution rate authorized by the United States, and the United States public law that authorized the contribution rate for the United Nations peacekeeping budget for each fiscal year beginning in fiscal year 1995 through the fiscal year following the date of the report.

“(ii) A tabulation of current United States accrued shortfalls and arrears in each respective ongoing or closed United Nations peacekeeping mission.

“(iii) A tabulation of all peacekeeping credits, including—

“(I) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States;

“(II) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be unavailable to the United States;

“(III) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States from each open and closed peacekeeping mission;

“(IV) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be unavailable to the United States from each open and closed peacekeeping mission;

“(V) the total amount of peacekeeping credits applied by the United Nations toward shortfalls from previous years that are apportioned to the United States;

“(VI) the total amount of peacekeeping credits applied by the United Nations toward offsetting future contributions of the United States; and

“(VII) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States that could be applied toward offsetting United States contributions in the following fiscal year.

“(iv) An explanation of any claim of unavailability by the United Nations of any peacekeeping credits described in clause (iii)(IV).

“(v) A description of any efforts by the United States to obtain reimbursement in accordance with the requirements of this Act, including Department of Defense materiel and services, and an explanation of any failure to obtain any such reimbursement.

“(B) PEACEKEEPING CREDITS DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘peacekeeping credits’ means the amounts by which, during a United Nations peacekeeping fiscal year, the contributions of the United States to the United Nations for peacekeeping operations exceed the actual expenditures for peacekeeping operations by the United Nations that are apportioned to the United States.”.

SEC. 5304. ASSESSMENT RATE TRANSPARENCY.**(a) REPORT.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after each time the United Nations General Assembly modifies the assessment levels for peacekeeping operations, the Secretary shall submit a report, which may include a classified annex, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall describe—

(A) the change, by amount and percentage, of the peacekeeping assessment charged to each member state; and

(B) how the economic and strategic interests of each of the permanent members of the Security Council is being served by each peacekeeping mission currently in force.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF PEACEKEEPING ASSESSMENT DATA.—The Secretary shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to urge the United Nations—

(1) to share the raw data used to calculate member state peacekeeping assessment rates; and

(2) to make available the formula for determining peacekeeping assessments.

Subtitle B—Accountability at International Organizations**SEC. 5311. PREVENTING ABUSE IN PEACEKEEPING.**

Not later than 15 days before the anticipated date of a vote (or, in the case of exigent circumstances, as far in advance of the vote as is practicable) on a resolution approving a new peacekeeping mission under the auspices of the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or any other multilateral organization in which the United States participates, or to reauthorize an existing such mission, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on that mission that includes the following:

(1) A description of the specific measures taken and planned to be taken by the organization related to the mission—

(A) to prevent individuals who are employees or contractor personnel of the organization, or members of the forces serving in the mission from engaging in acts of trafficking in persons, exploitation of victims of trafficking, or sexual exploitation or abuse; and

(B) to hold accountable any such individuals who engage in any such acts while participating in the mission.

(2) An assessment of the effectiveness of each of the measures described in paragraph (1).

(3) An accounting and assessment of all cases in which the organization has taken action to investigate allegations that individuals described in paragraph (1)(A) have engaged in acts described in that paragraph, including a description of the status of all such cases as of the date of the report.

SEC. 5312. INCLUSION OF PEACEKEEPING ABUSES IN COUNTRY REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

Section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11)(C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (12)(C)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) for each country that contributes personnel to United Nations peacekeeping missions, a description of—

“(A) any allegations of such personnel engaging in acts of trafficking in persons, exploitation of victims of trafficking, or sexual exploitation and abuse while participating in such a peacekeeping mission;

“(B) any repatriations of such personnel resulting from an allegation described in subparagraph (A);

“(C) any actions taken by such country with respect to personnel repatriated as a result of allegations described in subparagraph (A), including whether such personnel faced prosecution related to such allegations; and

“(D) the extent to which any actions taken as described in subparagraph (C) have been communicated by such country to the United Nations.”.

SEC. 5313. EVALUATION OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) a comprehensive evaluation of current United Nations peacekeeping missions;

(2) a prioritization of the peacekeeping missions;

(3) plans for phasing out and ending any mission that—

(A) has substantially met its objectives and goals; or

(B) will not be able to meet its objectives and goals; and

(4) a plan for reviewing the status of open-ended mandates for—

(A) the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK);

(B) the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO); and

(C) the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP).

(b) APPROVAL OF FUTURE PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to ensure that no new United Nations peacekeeping mission is approved without a periodic mandate renewal.

(c) FUNDING LIMITATION.—The United States shall not provide funding for any United Nations peacekeeping mission beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act unless the mission has a periodic mandate renewal.

Subtitle C—Personnel Matters**SEC. 5321. ENCOURAGING EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS AT THE UNITED NATIONS.**

Section 181 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (22 U.S.C. 276c-4) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 181. EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS BY CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

“Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report that provides—

“(1) for each international organization that had a geographic distribution formula in effect on January 1, 1991, an assessment of whether that organization—

“(A) is taking good faith steps to increase the staffing of United States citizens, including, as appropriate, as assessment of any additional steps the organization could be taking to increase such staffing; and

“(B) has met the requirements of its geographic distribution formula; and

“(2) an assessment of United States representation among professional and senior-level positions at the United Nations, including—

“(A) an assessment of the proportion of United States citizens employed at the United Nations Secretariat and at all United Nations specialized agencies, funds, and programs relative to the total employment at the United Nations Secretariat and at all such agencies, funds, and programs;

“(B) as assessment of compliance by the United Nations Secretariat and such agencies, funds, and programs with any applicable geographic distribution formula; and

“(C) a description of any steps taken or planned to be taken by the United States to

increase the staffing of United States citizens at the United Nations Secretariat and such agencies, funds and programs.”.

SEC. 5322. ENSURING APPROPRIATE UNITED NATIONS PERSONNEL SALARIES.

(a) **COMPENSATION OF UNITED NATIONS PERSONNEL.**—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations—

(1) to establish appropriate policies, procedures, and assumptions for—

(A) determining comparable positions between officials in the professional and higher categories of employment at the United Nations headquarters in New York, New York, and in the United States Federal civil service;

(B) calculating the margin between the compensation of such officials at the United Nations headquarters and the civil service; and

(C) determining the appropriate margin for adoption by the United Nations to govern compensation for such officials;

(2) to make all policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1) available to the public; and

(3) to limit increases in the compensation of United Nations officials to ensure that such officials remain within the margin range established by United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/40/244, or any subsequent margin range adopted by the United Nations to govern compensation for United Nations officials.

(b) **REPORT ON SALARY MARGINS.**—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the appropriate congressional committees, at the time of the submission of the budget of the President to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, that

(1) describes the policies, procedures, and assumptions established or used by the United Nations—

(A) to determine comparable positions between officials in the professional and higher categories of employment at the United Nations headquarters in New York, New York, and in the United States Federal civil service;

(B) to calculate the percentage difference, or margin, between the compensation of such officials at the United Nations headquarters and the civil service; and

(C) to determine the margin range established in United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/40/244, or any subsequent margin range adopted by the United Nations to govern compensation for United Nations officials;

(2) assesses, in accordance with the policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1), the margin between net salaries of officials in the professional and higher categories of employment at the United Nations in New York and those of comparable positions in the United States Federal civil service;

(3) assesses any changes in the margin described in paragraph (2) from the previous year;

(4) assesses the extent to which any changes in that margin resulted from modifications to the policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1); and

(5) provides the views of the Secretary on any changes in that margin and any such modifications.

TITLE IV—CONSULAR AUTHORITIES

SEC. 5401. VISA INELIGIBILITY FOR INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTORS.

Section 212(a)(10)(C)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(10)(C)(iii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by adding “or” at the end;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking “; or” at the end and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 5402. PRESUMPTION OF IMMIGRANT INTENT FOR H AND L VISA CLASSIFICATIONS.

Section 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(other than a nonimmigrant described in subparagraph (L) or (V) of section 101(a)(15), and other than a nonimmigrant described in any provision of section 101(a)(15)(H)(i) except subclause (b1) of such section)”;

(2) by striking “under section 101(a)(15).” and inserting “under the immigration laws.”; and

(3) by striking “he” each place such term appears and inserting “the alien”.

SEC. 5403. VISA INFORMATION SHARING.

Section 222(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “issuance or refusal” and inserting “issuance, refusal, or revocation”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “and on the basis of reciprocity”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “illicit weapons; or” and inserting “illicit weapons, or in determining the removability or eligibility for a visa, admission, or another immigration benefit of persons who would be inadmissible to, or removable from, the United States.”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “for the purposes” and inserting “for 1 of the purposes”;

(ii) by striking “or to deny visas to persons who would be inadmissible to the United States.” and inserting “; or”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) with regard to any or all aliens in the database, specified data elements from each record, if the Secretary of State determines that it is in the national interest to provide such information to a foreign government.”.

TITLE V—EMBASSY SECURITY

Subtitle A—Allocation of Authorized Security Appropriations.

SEC. 5501. WORLDWIDE SECURITY PROTECTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in fiscal year 2016 for worldwide security protection shall, before any such funds may be allocated to any other authorized purpose, be allocated for—

(1) immediate threat mitigation support in accordance with subsection (b) at facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531;

(2) immediate threat mitigation support in accordance with subsection (b) at other facilities; and

(3) locations with high vulnerabilities.

(b) **IMMEDIATE THREAT MITIGATION SUPPORT PRIORITIZATION.**—In allocating funding for immediate threat mitigation support pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall prioritize funding for—

(1) the purchasing of additional security equipment, including additional defensive weaponry;

(2) the paying of expenses of additional security forces; and

(3) any other purposes necessary to mitigate immediate threats to United States personnel serving overseas.

SEC. 5502. EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in fiscal year 2016 for “embassy security, construction and maintenance” shall, before any funds may be allocated to any other authorized purpose, be allocated in the prioritized order of—

(1) immediate threat mitigation projects in accordance with subsection (b) at facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531;

(2) other security upgrades to facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531;

(3) all other immediate threat mitigation projects in accordance with subsection (b); and

(4) security upgrades to all other facilities or new construction for facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531.

(b) **IMMEDIATE THREAT MITIGATION PROJECTS PRIORITIZATION.**—In allocating funding for immediate threat mitigation projects pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall prioritize funding for the construction of safeguards that provide immediate security benefits and any other purposes necessary to mitigate immediate threats to United States personnel serving overseas.

(c) **ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.**—No funds authorized to be appropriated shall be obligated or expended for new embassy construction, other than for high threat, high risk facilities, unless the Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the Department has fully complied with the requirements of subsection (a);

(2) high threat, high risk facilities are being secured to the best of the United States Government’s ability; and

(3) the Secretary will make funds available from the Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance account or other sources to address any changed security threats or new or emergent security needs, including new immediate threat mitigation projects.

(d) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall report to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on—

(1) funding for the priorities described in subsection (a);

(2) efforts to secure high threat, high risk facilities as well as high vulnerability locations facilities; and

(3) plans to make funds available from the Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance account or other sources to address any changed security threats or new or emergent security needs, including new immediate threat mitigation projects.

Subtitle B—Contracting and Other Matters.

SEC. 5511. LOCAL GUARD CONTRACTS ABROAD UNDER DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 136(c)(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (22 U.S.C. 4864(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) in evaluating proposals for such contracts, award contracts to technically acceptable firms offering the lowest evaluated price, except that—

“(A) the Secretary may award contracts on the basis of best value (as determined by a

cost-technical tradeoff analysis), especially for posts determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531 of the Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016; and

“(B) proposals received from United States persons and qualified United States joint venture persons shall be evaluated by reducing the bid price by 10 percent;”.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that includes—

(1) an explanation of the implementation of section 136(c)(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, as amended by subsection (a); and

(2) for each instance in which a contract is awarded pursuant to subparagraph (A) of such section, a written justification and approval that describes the basis for such award and an explanation of the inability of the Secretary to satisfy the needs of the Department by awarding a contract to the technically acceptable firm offering the lowest evaluated price.

SEC. 5512. DISCIPLINARY ACTION RESULTING FROM UNSATISFACTORY LEADERSHIP IN RELATION TO A SECURITY INCIDENT.

Section 304(c) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834 (c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by striking “Whenever” in the first sentence immediately following the subsection heading and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Whenever”;

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

“(2) **CERTAIN SECURITY INCIDENTS.**—

“(A) **UNSATISFACTORY LEADERSHIP.**—Unsatisfactory leadership by a senior official with respect to a security incident involving loss of life, serious injury, or significant destruction of property at or related to a United States Government mission abroad may be grounds for disciplinary action.

“(B) **DISCIPLINARY ACTION.**—If a Board finds reasonable cause to believe that a senior official provided such unsatisfactory leadership, the Board may recommend disciplinary action subject to the procedures in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 5513. MANAGEMENT AND STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) **AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF STATE.**—Nothing in this division or in any other provision of law may be construed to prevent the Secretary from using all authorities invested in the office of Secretary to take personnel action against any employee or official of the Department that the Secretary determines has breached the duty of that individual or has engaged in misconduct or unsatisfactorily performed the duties of employment of that individual, and such misconduct or unsatisfactory performance has significantly contributed to the serious injury, loss of life, or significant destruction of property, or a serious breach of security, even if such action is the subject of an Accountability Review Board’s examination under section 304(a) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834(a)).

(b) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—Section 304 of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by inserting “or has engaged in misconduct or unsatisfactorily performed the duties of employment of that

individual, and such misconduct or unsatisfactory performance has significantly contributed to the serious injury, loss of life, or significant destruction of property, or the serious breach of security that is the subject of the Board’s examination as described in subsection (a),” after “breached the duty of that individual”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY.**—Whenever a Board determines that an individual has engaged in any conduct described in subsection (c), the Board shall evaluate the level and effectiveness of management and oversight conducted by employees or officials in the management chain of such individual.”.

SEC. 5514. SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS FOR SOFT TARGETS.

Section 29 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2701) is amended, in the third sentence, by inserting “physical security enhancements and” after “Such assistance may include”.

Subtitle C—Marine Corps Security Guard Program

SEC. 5521. ADDITIONAL REPORTS ON EXPANSION AND ENHANCEMENT OF MARINE CORPS SECURITY GUARD PROGRAM.

Section 1269(a)(2) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 10 U.S.C. 5983 note) is amended by inserting “and not less frequently than once each year thereafter until the date that is three years after such date” after “of this Act”.

Subtitle D—Defending High Threat, High Risk Posts

SEC. 5531. DESIGNATION AND REPORTING FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, shall submit, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, a classified report, with an unclassified summary, evaluating Department facilities that the Secretary determines to be high threat, high risk in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) **CONTENTS.**—For each facility determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to subsection (a), the report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a narrative assessment describing the security threats and risks facing posts overseas and the overall threat level to United States personnel under chief of mission authority;

(2) the number of diplomatic security personnel, Marine Corps security guards, and other Department personnel dedicated to providing security for United States personnel, information, and facilities;

(3) an assessment of host nation willingness and capability to provide protection in the event of a security threat or incident, pursuant to the obligations of the United States under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24,

1963, and the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961;

(4) an assessment of the quality and experience level of the team of United States senior security personnel assigned to the facility, considering collectively the assignment durations and lengths of government experience;

(5) the number of Foreign Service Officers who have received Foreign Affairs Counter Threat training;

(6) a summary of the requests made during the previous calendar year for additional resources, equipment, or personnel related to the security of the facility and the status of such requests;

(7) an assessment of the ability of United States personnel to respond to and survive a fire attack, including—

(A) whether the facility has adequate fire safety and security equipment for safe havens and safe areas; and

(B) whether the employees working at the facility have been adequately trained on the equipment available;

(8) if it is a new facility, a detailed description of the steps taken to provide security for the new facility, including whether a dedicated support cell was established in the Department to ensure proper and timely resourcing of security; and

(9) a listing of any high threat, high risk facilities where the facilities of the Department and other government agencies are not collocated, including—

(A) a rationale for the lack of collocation; and

(B) a description of what steps, if any, are being taken to mitigate potential security vulnerabilities associated with the lack of collocation.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK FACILITY.**—In determining which facilities of the Department constitute high threat, high risk facilities under this section, the Secretary shall take into account with respect to each facility whether there are—

(1) high to critical levels of political violence or terrorism;

(2) national or local governments with inadequate capacity or political will to provide appropriate protection; and

(3) in locations where there are high to critical levels of political violence or terrorism or where national or local governments lack the capacity or political will to provide appropriate protection—

(A) mission physical security platforms that fall well below the Department’s established standards; or

(B) security personnel levels that are insufficient for the circumstances.

(d) **INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW AND REPORT.**—The Inspector General for the Department of State and the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall annually—

(1) review the determinations of the Secretary with respect to high threat, high risk facilities, including the basis for making such determinations;

(2) review contingency planning for high threat, high risk facilities and evaluate the measures in place to respond to attacks on such facilities;

(3) review the risk mitigation measures in place at high threat, high risk facilities to determine how the Secretary evaluates risk and whether the measures put in place sufficiently address the relevant risks;

(4) review early warning systems in place at high threat, high risk facilities and evaluate the measures being taken to preempt and disrupt threats to such facilities; and

(5) provide to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) an assessment of the determinations of the Secretary with respect to high threat, high risk facilities, including recommendations for additions or changes to the list of such facilities; and

(B) a report on the reviews and evaluations undertaken pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (4).

SEC. 5532. DESIGNATION AND REPORTING FOR HIGH-RISK COUNTERINTELLIGENCE THREAT POSTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives

(2) **PRIORITY 1 COUNTERINTELLIGENCE THREAT NATION.**—The term “Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nation” means a country designated as such by the October 2012 National Intelligence Priorities Framework (NIPF).

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in conjunction with appropriate officials in the intelligence community and the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that assesses the counterintelligence threat to United States diplomatic facilities in Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nations.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the use of locally employed staff and guard forces and a listing of diplomatic facilities in Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nations without controlled access areas; and

(B) recommendations for mitigating any counterintelligence threats and for any necessary facility upgrades, including costs assessment of any recommended mitigation or upgrades.

SEC. 5533. ENHANCED QUALIFICATIONS FOR DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

The Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 206 (22 U.S.C. 4824) the following new section:

“SEC. 207. DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

“The individual serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for High Threat, High Risk Posts shall have 1 or more of the following qualifications:

“(1) Service during the last 6 years at 1 or more posts designated as high threat, high risk by the Secretary of State at the time of service.

“(2) Previous service as the office director or deputy director of 1 or more of the following Department of State offices or suc-

cessor entities carrying out substantively equivalent functions:

“(A) The Office of Mobile Security Deployments.

“(B) The Office of Special Programs and Coordination.

“(C) The Office of Overseas Protective Operations.

“(D) The Office of Physical Security Programs.

“(E) The Office of Intelligence and Threat Analysis.

“(3) Previous service as the Regional Security Officer at two or more overseas posts.

“(4) Other government or private sector experience substantially equivalent to service in the positions listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).”

SEC. 5534. SECURITY ENVIRONMENT THREAT LIST BRIEFINGS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and upon each subsequent update of the Security Environment Threat List (SETL), the Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security shall provide classified briefings to the appropriate congressional committees on the Security Environment Threat List.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The briefings required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an overview of the Security Environment Threat List; and

(2) a summary assessment of the security posture of those facilities where the Security Environment Threat List assesses the threat environment to be most acute, including factors that informed such assessment.

SEC. 5535. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF BENGHAZI ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that describes the progress of the Secretary in implementing the recommendations of the Benghazi Accountability Review Board.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the progress the Secretary has made in implementing each specific recommendation of the Accountability Review Board; and

(2) a description of any impediments to recommended reforms, such as budget constraints, bureaucratic obstacles within the Department or in the broader interagency community, or limitations under current law.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 5536. FOREIGN AFFAIRS SECURITY TRAINING CENTER.

(a) **OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees all documents and materials related to its consideration and analysis concerning the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center at Fort Picket, Virginia, and any alternative facilities.

(b) **DEPARTMENT OF STATE.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees all documents and materials related to the de-

termination to construct a new Foreign Affairs Security Training Center at Fort Picket, Virginia, including any that are related to the development and adoption of all related training requirements, including any documents and materials related to the consideration and analysis of such facility performed by the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 5537. LANGUAGE TRAINING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IV of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4851 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 416. LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Diplomatic security personnel assigned permanently to, or who are serving in, long-term temporary duty status as designated by the Secretary of State at a high threat, high risk post should receive language training described in subsection (b) in order to prepare such personnel for duty requirements at such post.

“(b) **LANGUAGE TRAINING DESCRIBED.**—Language training referred to in subsection (a) should prepare personnel described in such subsection—

“(1) to speak the language at issue with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on subjects germane to security; and

“(2) to read within an adequate range of speed and with almost complete comprehension on subjects germane to security.

“(c) **INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.**—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors shall—

“(1) review the language training conducted pursuant to this section; and

“(2) make the results of such review available to the Secretary of State and the appropriate congressional committees.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-399) is amended by inserting after the item relating the section 415 the following:

“Sec. 416. Language requirements for diplomatic security personnel assigned to high threat, high risk posts.”

Subtitle E—Accountability Review Boards

SEC. 5541. PROVISION OF COPIES OF ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 2 days after an Accountability Review Board provides its report to the Secretary of State in accordance with title III of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4831 et seq.), the Secretary shall provide copies of the report to the appropriate congressional committees for retention and review by those committees.

SEC. 5542. STAFFING.

Section 302(b)(2) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4832(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Such persons shall be drawn from bureaus or other agency subunits that are not impacted by the incident that is the subject of the Board’s review.”

TITLE VI—MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 5601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Improving Department of State Oversight Act of 2015”.

SEC. 5602. COMPETITIVE HIRING STATUS FOR FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any employee of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction who completes at least 12 months of service at any time prior to the date of the termination of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (October 5, 2013), and was not terminated for cause shall acquire competitive status for appointment to any position in the competitive service for which the employee possesses the required qualifications.

SEC. 5603. ASSURANCE OF INDEPENDENCE OF IT SYSTEMS.

The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors, shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the Department has made reasonable efforts to ensure the integrity and independence of the Office of the Inspector General Information Technology systems.

SEC. 5604. PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF INTERNAL INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 209(c)(5) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3929(c)(5)) is amended by inserting at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) REQUIRED REPORTING OF ALLEGATIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS AND INSPECTOR GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each bureau, post or other office (in this subparagraph, an ‘entity’) of the Department of State shall, within five business days, report to the Inspector General any allegations of—

“(I) waste, fraud, or abuse in a Department program or operation;

“(II) criminal or serious misconduct on the part of a Department employee at the FS–1, GS–15, GM–15 level or higher;

“(III) criminal misconduct on the part of any Department employee; and

“(IV) serious, noncriminal misconduct on the part of any individual who is authorized to carry a weapon, make arrests, or conduct searches, such as conduct that, if proved, would constitute perjury or material dishonesty, warrant suspension as discipline for a first offense, or result in loss of law enforcement authority.

“(ii) INSPECTOR GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Inspector General may, pursuant to existing authority, investigate matters covered by clause (i).

“(iii) LIMITATION ON INVESTIGATIONS OUTSIDE OF OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—No entity in the Department of State with concurrent jurisdiction over matters covered by clause (i), including the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, may initiate an investigation of such matter unless it has first reported the allegations to the Inspector General as required by clause (i), except as provided in clause (v) and (vi).

“(iv) COOPERATION.—If an entity in the Department of State initiates an investigation of a matter covered in clause (i) the entity must, except as provided in clause (v), fully cooperate with the Inspector General, including—

“(I) by providing to the Inspector General all data and records obtained in connection with its investigation upon request of the Inspector General;

“(II) by coordinating, at the request of the Inspector General, such entity’s investigation with the Inspector General; and

“(III) by providing to the Inspector General requested support in aid of the Inspector

General’s oversight and investigative responsibilities.

“(v) EXCEPTIONS.—The Inspector General may prescribe general rules under which any requirement of clause (iii) or clause (iv) may be dispensed with.

“(vi) EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.—Compliance with clauses (i), (iii), and (iv) of this subparagraph may be dispensed with by an entity of the Department of State if complying with them in an exigent circumstance would pose an imminent threat to human life, health or safety, or result in the irretrievable loss or destruction of critical evidence or witness testimony, in which case a report of the allegation shall be made not later than 48 hours after an entity begins an investigation under the authority of this clause and cooperation required under clause (iv) shall commence not later than 48 hours after the relevant exigent circumstance has ended.

“(vii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph may be interpreted to affect any duty or authority of the Inspector General under any provision of law, including the Inspector General’s duties or authorities under the Inspector General Act.”.

SEC. 5605. REPORT ON INSPECTOR GENERAL INSPECTION AND AUDITING OF FOREIGN SERVICE POSTS AND BUREAUS AND OPERATING UNITS DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the requirement under section 209(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3929(a)(1)) that the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors inspect and audit, at least every 5 years, the administration of activities and operations of each Foreign Service post and each bureau and other operating unit of the Department.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF MULTI-TIER SYSTEM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall assess the advisability and feasibility of implementing a multi-tier system for inspecting Foreign Service posts featuring more (or less) frequent inspections and audits of posts based on risk, including security risk, as may be determined by the Inspector General.

(c) COMPOSITION.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include separate portions prepared by the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the Comptroller General of the United States, respectively.

SA 2034. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RECRUITING SEPARATING SERVICE MEMBERS AS CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Customs and Border Protection Officers at United States ports of entry carry out

critical law enforcement duties associated with screening foreign visitors, returning United States citizens, and imported cargo entering the United States;

(2) it is in the national interest for United States ports of entry to be adequately staffed with Customs and Border Protection Officers in a timely fashion, including meeting the congressionally mandated staffing level of 23,775 officers for fiscal year 2015;

(3) an estimated 250,000 to 300,000 members of the Armed Forces separate from military service every year; and

(4) recruiting efforts and expedited hiring procedures should be undertaken to ensure that individuals separating from military service are aware of, and partake in, opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection Officer positions.

(b) EXPEDITED HIRING OF APPROPRIATE SEPARATING SERVICE MEMBERS.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSFERABLE QUALIFICATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, shall jointly identify Military Occupational Safety Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, and Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators and Coast Guard Competencies that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(2) HIRING.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider hiring qualified candidates with the Military Occupational Safety Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, and Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators identified as transferable under paragraph (1) who are eligible for veterans recruitment appointment authorized under section 4214 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) ESTABLISHING A PROGRAM FOR RECRUITING SERVICE MEMBERS SEPARATING FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICER VACANCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish a program to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The program established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) include Customs and Border Protection Officer opportunities in relevant job assistance efforts under the Transition Assistance Program;

(B) place U.S. Customs and Border Protection officials or other relevant Department of Homeland Security officials at recruiting events and jobs fairs involving members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service;

(C) provide opportunities for local U.S. Customs and Border Protection field offices to partner with military bases in the region;

(D) conduct outreach efforts to educate members of the Armed Forces with Military Occupational Safety Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, and Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection Officers;

(E) require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to work cooperatively to identify shared activities and opportunities for reciprocity related to steps in hiring U.S. Customs and Border Patrol officers with the goal of minimizing the time required to hire qualified applicants;

(F) require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to work cooperatively to ensure the streamlined interagency transfer of relevant background investigations and security clearances; and

(G) include such other elements as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service are aware of opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection Officer positions.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and December 31 of each year thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes a description and assessment of the program established under subsection (c).

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a detailed description of the program established under subsection (c), including—

(i) programmatic elements;

(ii) goals associated with those elements; and

(iii) a description of how the elements and goals will assist in meeting statutorily mandated staffing levels and agency hiring benchmarks;

(B) a detailed description of the program elements that have been implemented under subsection (c);

(C) a detailed summary of the actions taken under subsection (c) to implement such program elements;

(D) the number of separating service members made aware of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies;

(E) the Military Occupational Safety Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, and Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators identified as transferable under subsection (b)(1) and a rationale for such identifications;

(F) the number of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies filled with separating service members;

(G) the number of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies filled with separating service members under Veterans' Recruitment Appointment authorized under the Veterans Employment Opportunity Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-339); and

(H) the results of any evaluations or considerations of additional elements included or not included in the program established under subsection (c).

(e) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

(1) as superseding, altering, or amending existing Federal veterans' hiring preferences or Federal hiring authorities; or

(2) to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts to carry out this section.

SA 2035. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. Kaine) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. ACCESS TO CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER PURPOSES.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 9101(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) The terms ‘Security Executive Agent’ and ‘Suitability Executive Agent’ mean the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent, respectively, established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.”

(b) COVERED AGENCIES.—Section 9101(a)(6) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) The Department of Homeland Security.

“(H) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

“(I) An Executive agency that—

(i) is authorized to conduct background investigations under a Federal statute; or

(ii) is delegated authority to conduct background investigations in accordance with procedures established by the Security Executive Agent or the Suitability Executive Agent under subsection (b) or (c)(iv) of section 2.3 of Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

“(J) A contractor that conducts a background investigation on behalf of an agency described in subparagraphs (A) through (I).”

(c) APPLICABLE PURPOSES OF INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i), as redesignated—

(A) by striking “the head of”;

(B) by inserting “all” before “criminal history record information”; and

(C) by striking “for the purpose of determining eligibility for any of the following:” and inserting “, in accordance with Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Suitability Executive Agent and Security Executive Agent, for the purpose of—

“(A) determining eligibility for—”;

(3) in clause (i), as redesignated—

(A) by striking “Access” and inserting “access”; and

(B) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(4) in clause (ii), as redesignated—

(A) by striking “Assignment” and inserting “assignment”; and

(B) by striking the period and inserting “or positions”;;

(5) in clause (iii), as redesignated—

(A) by striking “Acceptance” and inserting “acceptance”; and

(B) by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(6) in clause (iv), as redesignated—

(A) by striking “Appointment” and inserting “appointment”;

(B) by striking “or a critical or sensitive position”; and

(C) by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) conducting a basic suitability or fitness assessment for Federal or contractor employees, using Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent in accordance with—

“(i) Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto; and

“(ii) the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum ‘Assignment of Functions Relating to Coverage of Contractor Employee Fitness in the Federal Investigative Standards’, dated December 6, 2012;

“(C) credentialing under the Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004); and

“(D) Federal Aviation Administration checks required under—

“(i) the Federal Aviation Administration Drug Enforcement Assistance Act of 1988 (subtitle E of title VII of Public Law 100-690; 102 Stat. 4424) and the amendments made by that Act; or

“(ii) section 44710 of title 49.”

(d) BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC SEARCHES.—Section 9101(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2)(A) A State central criminal history record depository shall allow a covered agency to conduct both biometric and biographic searches of criminal history record information.

“(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Bureau of Investigation from requiring a request for criminal history record information to be accompanied by the fingerprints of the individual who is the subject of the request.”

(e) USE OF MOST COST-EFFECTIVE SYSTEM.—Section 9101(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) If a criminal justice agency is able to provide the same information through more than 1 system described in paragraph (1), a covered agency may request information under subsection (b) from the criminal justice agency, and require the criminal justice agency to provide the information, using the system that is most cost-effective for the Federal Government.”

(f) SEALED OR EXPUNGED RECORDS; JUVENILE RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9101(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: “, and includes any analogous juvenile records”; and

(B) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “The term includes those records of a State or locality sealed pursuant to law if such records are accessible by State and local criminal justice agencies for the purpose of conducting background checks.”

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not uniformly reject applicants for employment with the Federal Government or Federal contractors based on—

(A) sealed or expunged criminal records; or

(B) juvenile records.

(g) INTERACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES ABROAD.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Upon request by a covered agency and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this section, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Overseas Citizens Services shall make available criminal history record information collected by the Deputy Assistant Secretary with respect to an individual who is under investigation by the covered agency regarding any interaction of the individual with a law enforcement agency or intelligence agency of a foreign country.”

(h) CLARIFICATION OF SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTRACTORS CONDUCTING BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this section, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) If a contractor described in subsection (a)(6)(J) uses an automated information delivery system to request criminal history record information, the contractor shall comply with any necessary security requirements for access to that system.”.

(i) CLARIFICATION REGARDING ADVERSE ACTIONS.—Section 7512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or”;
- (2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period and inserting “, or”;
- (3) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) a suitability action taken by the Office under regulations prescribed by the Office, subject to the rules prescribed by the President under this title for the administration of the competitive service.”.

(j) ANNUAL REPORT BY SUITABILITY AND SECURITY CLEARANCE PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY COUNCIL.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this section, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) The Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, an annual report that—

“(1) describes efforts of the Council to integrate Federal, State, and local systems for sharing criminal history record information;

“(2) analyzes the extent and effectiveness of Federal education programs regarding criminal history record information;

“(3) provides an update on the implementation of best practices for sharing criminal history record information, including ongoing limitations experienced by investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency with respect to access to State and local criminal history record information; and

“(4) provides a description of limitations on the sharing of information relevant to a background investigation, other than criminal history record information, between—

“(A) investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency; and

“(B) State and local law enforcement agencies.”.

(k) GAO REPORT ON ENHANCING INTEROPERABILITY AND REDUCING REDUNDANCY IN FEDERAL CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION ACCESS CONTROL, BACKGROUND CHECK, AND CREDENTIALING STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the background check, access control, and credentialing requirements of Federal programs for the protection of critical infrastructure and key resources.

(2) CONTENTS.—The Comptroller General shall include in the report required under paragraph (1)—

(A) a summary of the major characteristics of each such Federal program, including the types of infrastructure and resources covered;

(B) a comparison of the requirements, whether mandatory or voluntary in nature, for regulated entities under each such program to—

(i) conduct background checks on employees, contractors, and other individuals;

(ii) adjudicate the results of a background check, including the utilization of a standardized set of disqualifying offenses or the consideration of minor, non-violent, or juvenile offenses; and

(iii) establish access control systems to deter unauthorized access, or provide a security credential for any level of access to a covered facility or resource;

(C) a review of any efforts that the Screening Coordination Office of the Department of Homeland Security has undertaken or plans to undertake to harmonize or standardize background check, access control, or credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs overseen by the Department; and

(D) recommendations, developed in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, regarding—

(i) enhancing the interoperability of security credentials across critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(ii) eliminating the need for redundant background checks or credentials across existing critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(iii) harmonizing, where appropriate, the standards for identifying potentially disqualifying criminal offenses and the weight assigned to minor, nonviolent, or juvenile offenses in adjudicating the results of a completed background check; and

(iv) the development of common, risk-based standards with respect to the background check, access control, and security credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs.

SA 2036. Mr. **TESTER** (for himself and Mr. **KAINE**) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. **MCCAIN** to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. REFORM AND IMPROVEMENT OF PERSONNEL SECURITY, INSIDER THREAT DETECTION AND PREVENTION, AND PHYSICAL SECURITY.

(a) PERSONNEL SECURITY AND INSIDER THREAT PROTECTION IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) PLANS AND SCHEDULES.—Consistent with the Memorandum of the Secretary of Defense dated March 18, 2014, regarding the recommendations of the reviews of the Washington Navy Yard shooting, the Secretary of Defense shall develop plans and schedules—

(A) to implement a continuous evaluation capability for the national security population for which clearance adjudications are conducted by the Department of Defense Central Adjudication Facility, in coordination with the Suitability Executive Agent, the Security Executive Agent, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(B) to produce a Department-wide insider threat strategy and implementation plan, which includes—

(i) resourcing for the Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center (DITMAC) and component insider threat programs, and

(ii) alignment of insider threat protection programs with continuous evaluation capabilities and processes for personnel security;

(C) to centralize the authority, accountability, and programmatic integration responsibilities, including fiscal control, for personnel security and insider threat protection under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(D) to align the Department's consolidated Central Adjudication Facility under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(E) to develop a defense security enterprise reform investment strategy to ensure a consistent, long-term focus on funding to strengthen all of the Department's security and insider threat programs, policies, functions, and information technology capabilities, including detecting threat behaviors conveyed in the cyber domain, in a manner that keeps pace with evolving threats and risks;

(F) to resource and expedite deployment of the Identity Management Enterprise Services Architecture (IMESA); and

(G) to implement the recommendations contained in the study conducted by the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation required by section 907 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 1564 note), including, specifically, the recommendations to centrally manage and regulate Department of Defense requests for personnel security background investigations.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the plans and schedules required under paragraph (1).

(b) PHYSICAL AND LOGICAL ACCESS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Secretary of Defense shall define physical and logical access standards, capabilities, and processes applicable to all personnel with access to Department of Defense installations and information technology systems, including—

(A) periodic or regularized background or records checks appropriate to the type of physical or logical access involved, the security level, the category of individuals authorized, and the level of access to be granted;

(B) standards and methods for verifying the identity of individuals seeking access; and

(C) electronic attribute-based access controls that are appropriate for the type of access and facility or information technology system involved;

(2) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of General Services, and in consultation with representatives from stakeholder organizations, shall design a capability to share and apply electronic identity information across the Government to enable real-time, risk-managed physical and logical access decisions; and

(3) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in conjunction with the

Director of the Office of Personnel Management and in consultation with representatives from stakeholder organizations, shall establish investigative and adjudicative standards for the periodic or regularized reevaluation of the eligibility of an individual to retain credentials issued pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004), as appropriate, but not less frequently than the authorization period of the issued credentials.

(c) **SECURITY ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) formalize the Security, Suitability, and Credentialing Line of Business;

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committee that describes plans—

(A) for oversight by the Office of Management and Budget of activities of the executive branch of the Government for personnel security, suitability, and credentialing;

(B) to designate enterprise shared services to optimize investments;

(C) to define and implement data standards to support common electronic access to critical Government records; and

(D) to reduce the burden placed on Government data providers by centralizing requests for records access and ensuring proper sharing of the data with appropriate investigative and adjudicative elements.

(d) **RECIPROCITY MANAGEMENT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council shall ensure that—

(1) a centralized system is available to serve as the reciprocity management system for the Federal Government; and

(2) the centralized system described in paragraph (1) is aligned with, and incorporates results from, continuous evaluation and other enterprise reform initiatives.

(e) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Security Executive Agent, the Suitability Executive Agent, and the Secretary of Defense, shall jointly develop a plan to—

(1) implement the Security Executive Agent Directive on common, standardized employee and contractor security reporting requirements;

(2) establish and implement uniform reporting requirements for employees and Federal contractors, according to risk, relative to the safety of the workforce and protection of the most sensitive information of the Government; and

(3) ensure that reported information is shared appropriately.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(C) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term “Performance Accountability Council” means the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto; and

(3) the terms “Security Executive Agent” and “Suitability Executive Agent” mean the

Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent, respectively, established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

SA 2037. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. PILOT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO COMMERCIAL INNOVATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Defense may conduct a program to increase access to commercial innovation to meet the mission critical technology needs of the Department of Defense.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The program authorized under this section may include the following elements:

(1) Funding qualified non-profit entities that invest in privately-held companies that are developing technologies that are potentially mission critical to the Department of Defense and that have secured investments from “venture capital funds” (as defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to section 203(l) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C 80b-3(l)) subject to the following conditions:

(A) The Secretary of Defense shall appoint an individual to manage all such investments who possesses demonstrated knowledge and experience in—

(i) understanding developing technologies; and

(ii) managing investments in “venture capital funds” (as defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to section 203(l) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C 80b-3(l)).

(B) For each investment in a qualified non-profit entity, the Secretary of Defense shall secure the ability to select at least one member of the qualified non-profit entity's board of directors, board of trustees, or equivalent governing body to actively monitor the Department of Defense's investment in the qualified non-profit entity.

(C) The Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report describing each of the Department of Defense's investments in each qualified non-profit entity, including, at a minimum—

(i) a description and evaluation of the Department of Defense mission each such investment is intended to help accomplish; and

(ii) a financial evaluation that estimates the current and projected value the Department of Defense is securing from each of its investments.

(2) Conducting cost-effective outreach efforts and establishing points of entry for non-traditional defense contractors whose products and technologies could be acquired by the Department of Defense.

(3) Training Federal acquisition personnel in innovative acquisition techniques to access non-traditional defense contractors.

(4) Use of other transactions authority under section 2371 of title 10, United States Code, and authority to award prizes for ad-

vanced technology achievements under section 2374a of such title.

(c) **AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY CONTRACTS AND OTHER AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to use intelligence community contracts and other agreements to meet the needs of the program established under this section.

(d) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the unobligated amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for science and technology, \$10,000,000 may be used for technology innovation, as described in the reprogramming action prior approval request submitted by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to Congress on May 15, 2015.

(2) **DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE FUND.**—The Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund may be used for the training of Department of Defense employees under this section.

(e) **SUNSET.**—The authority to carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) shall terminate one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2038. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1261 and insert the following:

SEC. 1261. MARITIME SECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING PROGRAM.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State is authorized, using funds transferred pursuant to subsection (b), to provide assistance for the purpose of increasing maritime security and domain awareness for countries in the Asia-Pacific region.

(2) **DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance provided by the Secretary under this section shall be known as the “Maritime Security Capacity Building Program” (in this section referred to as the “Program”).

(3) **CONSTRUCTION OF LIMITATIONS.**—The Secretary may provide assistance under this section without regard to any other provision of law, other than section 620J of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378d).

(b) **TRANSFER AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall transfer, from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense by this Act, \$50,000,000 to the Secretary of State for the Program. Any amount so transferred shall be deposited in the “Foreign Military Finance” account for purposes of the Program.

(c) **ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.**—In selecting countries in the Asia-Pacific region to which assistance is to be provided under the Program, the Secretary of State shall prioritize the provision of assistance to countries that will contribute to the achievement of following objectives:

(1) Retaining unhindered access to and use of international waterways in the Asia-Pacific region that are critical to ensuring the

security and free flow of commerce and achieving United States national security objectives.

(2) Improving maritime domain awareness in the Asia-Pacific region.

(3) Countering piracy in the Asia-Pacific region.

(4) Disrupting illicit maritime trafficking activities and other forms of maritime trafficking activity in the Asia-Pacific that directly benefit organizations that have been determined to be a security threat to the United States.

(5) Enhancing the maritime capabilities of a country or regional organization to respond to emerging threats to maritime security in the Asia-Pacific region.

(d) **PRIORITIES FOR ASSISTANCE.**—In carrying out the purpose of the Program, the Secretary of State—

(1) shall place priority on assistance to enhance the maritime security capabilities of the military or security forces of countries in the Asia-Pacific region that have maritime missions and the government agencies responsible for such forces; and

(2) may provide assistance to a country in the Asia-Pacific region to enhance the capabilities of that country, or of a regional organization that includes that country, to conduct one or more of the following:

(A) Maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

(B) Littoral and port security.

(C) Coast guard operations.

(D) Command and control.

(E) Management and oversight of maritime activities.

(e) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress each year a report on the status of the provision of equipment, training, supplies or other services provided pursuant to the Program during the preceding year.

(f) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee of Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee of Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1261A. REPORT ON PLANS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF FREEDOM OF OPERATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL WATERS AND AIRSPACE IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC MARITIME DOMAINS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, with the concurrence with the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report (in classified form) setting forth a plan, for each of the six-month, one-year, and three-year periods beginning on the date of such report, for Freedom of Navigation Assertions, Shows of Force, bilateral and multilateral military exercises, Port Calls, Training, and assistance intended to enhance the maritime capabilities, respond to emerging threats, and maintain freedom of operations in international waters and airspace in the Asia-Pacific maritime domains.

(b) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee of Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee of Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 2039. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ROLE OF CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER IN RESOURCES, PLANNING, AND PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT OF HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in applying the implementation guidance for section 11319 of title 40, United States Code (M-15-14, dated June 10, 2015), the Department of Energy and the Office of Management and Budget should work collaboratively to—

(1) ensure the unique issues associated with the Department of Energy’s High Performance Computing (HPC) program are given appropriate consideration;

(2) avoid unnecessarily duplicating the Department of Energy’s existing project management processes for the HPC program; and

(3) avoid creating any unnecessary layers of approval that may impede the Department of Energy’s deployment of mission-critical HPC systems.

SA 2040. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MORAN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. PETERS, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 355. STARBASE PROGRAM.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 and available for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4301—

(1) the amount available for the STARBASE program is hereby increased by \$25,000,000; and

(2) the amount available by reason of increased bulk fuel cost savings is hereby decreased by \$25,000,000.

SA 2041. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1005. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUDIT AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PROCESSES.

(a) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall obtain from an entity independent of the Department of Defense selected by the Secretary for purposes of this section an assessment of the audit and financial management processes of the Department.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A comparison of the audit and financial management processes of the Department with the audit and financial management processes of other appropriate Federal agencies, and appropriate private sector entities, including the qualifications of officials responsible for audit oversight and compliance, for purposes of identifying best practices to be adopted by the Department for its audit and financial management processes.

(B) An analysis of the progress and investments made by the Department under its Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) Plan, and a comparison of such progress and investment with the progress and investments made by other Federal agencies under their Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plans, for purposes of determining the extent to which Department progress on financial management and audit readiness is consistent with results achieved by other appropriate Federal agencies and appropriate private sector entities.

(C) An identification of recommendations on policies and management and other activities that could be undertaken by the Department to enhance its audit and financial management processes in order to obtain and maintain clean audit opinions of its financial statement as effectively and efficiently as possible.

(3) **ACCESS TO INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the entity conducting the assessment required by paragraph (1) has access to all the information, data, and resources necessary to conduct the assessment in a timely manner.

(4) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall require the entity conducting the assessment required by paragraph (1) to submit to the Secretary and the congressional defense committees a report on the assessment by not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **TRANSMITTAL.**—Not later than 60 days after receiving the report described in subsection (a)(4), the Secretary shall transmit the report to Congress, together with the following:

(1) An analysis by the Secretary of the findings and recommendations of the report.

(2) A description of the response of the Department to such finding and recommendations.

(3) Such other matters with respect to the audit and financial management processes of the Department as the Secretary considers appropriate.

SA 2042. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS.

Section 312 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) Whenever the Inspector General, in carrying out the duties and responsibilities established under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), issues a report or audit (or any portion of any report or audit) in final form, the Inspector General shall—

“(A) submit the report or audit (or portion of report or audit), as the case may be, to—

“(i) the Secretary;

“(ii) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(iii) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(iv) if the report or audit (or portion of report or audit) was initiated upon request by an individual or entity other than the Inspector General, that individual or entity, using reasonable and appropriate efforts; and

“(B) not later than 3 days after the report or audit (or portion of report or audit), as the case may be, is submitted in final form to the Secretary, post the report or audit (or portion of report or audit) on the Internet website of the Inspector General.

“(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the public disclosure of information that is specifically prohibited from disclosure by any other provision of law.”.

SA 2043. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 344. REIMBURSEMENT OF STATES FOR CERTAIN FIRE SUPPRESSION SERVICES AS A RESULT OF FIRE CAUSED BY MILITARY TRAINING OR OTHER ACTIONS OF THE ARMED FORCES OR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REIMBURSEMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, upon application by a State, reimburse the State for the reasonable costs of the State for fire suppression services coordinated by the State as a result of a wildland fire caused by military training or other actions of units or members of the Armed Forces in Federal status or employees of the Department of Defense on a military training installation owned by the State. A State may apply for reimbursement under this section only if a personal damage or loss claim caused by the fire concerned was awarded under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

(2) SERVICES COVERED.—Services reimbursable under this subsection shall be limited to services proximately related to the fire for which reimbursement is sought under this subsection.

(3) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall apply to Department-owned military training installations. Nothing in this section shall affect existing memoranda of understanding between Department-owned military training installations and local governments. Reimbursement may not be made under this section for any services for which a claim may be made under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

(b) APPLICATION.—Each application of a State for reimbursement for costs under subsection (a) shall set forth an itemized request of the services covered by the application, including the costs of such services.

(c) FUNDS.—Reimbursements under subsection (a) shall be made from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance.

SA 2044. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. USE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD FOR SUPPORT OF CIVILIAN FIRE-FIGHTING ACTIVITIES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Modular Airborne Firefighting System Flexibility Act”.

(b) OPERATIONAL USE AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§116. Operational use: support for civilian firefighting activities

“The Secretary of Defense may authorize members and units of the National Guard performing duty under section 328(b), 502(f), or 709(a) of this title, or on active duty under title 10, to support firefighting operations, missions, and activities, including aerial firefighting employment of the Mobile Airborne Firefighting System (MAFFS), under-

taken in support of a request from the National Interagency Fire Center or another Federal agency.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“116. Operational use: support for civilian firefighting activities.”.

SA 2045. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add following:

SEC. 1085. INCREASE IN SPECIAL PENSION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1562(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$1,000” and inserting “\$3,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DELAY OF ANNUAL COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary shall not make an increase pursuant to subsection (e) of section 1562 of such title effective December 1, 2015, if the amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect before such date.

SA 2046. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1927 submitted by Mr. ISAKSON and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, strike lines 3 through 6.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 15, 2015, at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on June 15, 2015, at 5 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Lifting Sanctions on Iran: Practical Implications."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jessica Cleary, a Navy fellow in my office, be granted privileges of the floor through the end of the calendar year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL VEHICLE REPAIR COST SAVINGS ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 101, S. 565.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 565) to reduce the operation and maintenance costs associated with the Federal fleet by encouraging the use of remanufactured parts, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 565) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:
S. 565

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that, in March 2013, the Government Accountability Office issued a report that confirmed that—

(1) there are approximately 588,000 vehicles in the civilian Federal fleet;

(2) Federal agencies spent approximately \$975,000,000 on repair and maintenance of the Federal fleet in 2011;

(3) remanufactured vehicle components, such as engines, starters, alternators, steering racks, and clutches, tend to be less expensive than comparable new replacement parts; and

(4) the United States Postal Service and the Department of the Interior both informed the Government Accountability Office that the respective agencies rely on the use of remanufactured vehicle components to reduce costs.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term "Federal agency" has the meaning given that term in section 102 of title 40, United States Code; and

(2) the term "remanufactured vehicle component" means a vehicle component (includ-

ing an engine, transmission, alternator, starter, turbocharger, steering, or suspension component) that has been returned to same-as-new, or better, condition and performance by a standardized industrial process that incorporates technical specifications (including engineering, quality, and testing standards) to yield fully warranted products.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENT TO USE REMANUFACTURED VEHICLE COMPONENTS.

The head of each Federal agency—

(1) shall encourage the use of remanufactured vehicle components to maintain Federal vehicles, if using such components reduces the cost of maintaining the Federal vehicles while maintaining quality; and

(2) shall not encourage the use of remanufactured vehicle components to maintain Federal vehicles, if using such components—

(A) does not reduce the cost of maintaining Federal vehicles;

(B) lowers the quality of vehicle performance, as determined by the employee of the Federal agency responsible for the repair decision; or

(C) delays the return to service of a vehicle.

JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 201, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 201) designating June 19, 2015, as "Juneteenth Independence Day" in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which slavery legally came to an end in the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 201) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 202, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 202) designating June 15, 2015, as "World Elder Abuse Awareness Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 202) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, June 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1735, with the time until 11:30 a.m. equally divided in the usual form; further, that the filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to H.R. 1735 and the McCain substitute amendment No. 1463 be at 12:15 p.m. tomorrow; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:06 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 16, 2015, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15, 2015:

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

MATTHEW T. MCGUIRE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GENTRY O. SMITH, OF NORTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS, AND TO HAVE THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 15, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MESSER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 15, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LUKE MESSER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the strange kaleidoscope of this congressional session began with the proposed shutdown of Homeland Security but moved on to the bipartisan action to fix the vexing SGR-Medicare funding formula, the so-called “doc fix” to prevent dramatic cuts to providers.

Yes, it is still hard to overcome deep divisions, philosophical difference, and some real serious politics. The heated rhetoric and convoluted voting on the recent trade package is the latest example. Wouldn't it be great if we could take a step back and find ways to unite us to solve a major problem?

Well, we have got a major problem that is staring us in the face right now. We are in the midst of the 33rd short-term transportation funding extension that is a result of our inability to pay for 2015 infrastructure with 1993 dollars. That is because of our inability to raise the gas tax since 1993.

The demands for transportation solutions grow, and the harm inflicted on

families occurs every day. It costs them over \$300 a year just in damage to their cars from road maintenance that has fallen apart. We are paying a \$125-billion-a-year penalty for congestion.

Americans, make no mistake, are paying the price for this dysfunction, and the people who are partners at the State and local level and in the private sector are having great difficulty doing their part without the certainty of the Federal partnership that has been the bedrock, that has been the foundation of national transportation policy since President Eisenhower.

Now, there is a little hint of sunshine here because this week, on Wednesday, we will be having the first hearing on transportation finance since my Republican friends took control of Congress 56 months ago.

What if we took advantage of that daylight to expand the scope of the discussion? What if we were able to have at the same witness table the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Tom Donohue, and the president of the AFL-CIO, Richard Trumka, who don't much agree on anything, but they are united in their firm belief that raising the gas tax, getting the transportation funding to rebuild and renew America, is absolutely essential?

We could be joined by people who understand that hundreds of thousands of family-wage jobs would be possible if we met our transportation obligations.

We could have representatives from State and local government, transit agencies, the environmental community, safety advocates all joined at the same table. We could have the eloquence of Governor Bill Graves, who is currently president of the American Trucking Association, but he was Republican Governor of Kansas, who raised the gas tax not once, but twice. He could be joined by the American Automobile Association, which has come out strongly in favor of a gas tax to be able to meet the needs of the motoring public. Why wouldn't we want those people there?

We could invite State legislators from six very red Republican States—Idaho, Utah, Georgia, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa—that all raised the gas tax this year. They didn't just talk about it; they acted. Six red States raising the gas tax already in 2015.

I am optimistic that we can capitalize on the glimmers of life we are seeing. If we can just listen to the people at the State and local level, the private sector, organized labor, people who build, maintain, and use our trans-

portation system, they could be part of that deliberative process. I am confident that we, in Congress, could develop a united front on an issue that has been controversial in the past but is no longer.

When people step up, when they accept responsibility and work cooperatively, we can do what was done in Idaho, Georgia, Utah, Iowa, South Dakota, and Nebraska. Congress can do that. And after all the acrimony and bad feeling and partisan division that has lingered, wouldn't this be the right time to do so?

PIVOT TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a chance this week to turn the President's pivot to Asia into a pivot to America. The question is: Will we listen to the American people, or will we double down on a watered-down policy that has divided both the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle? To stop the TPA, we must hold firm.

Republicans and Democrats all want trade barriers to be removed, but we are at a crossroads because both parties have voiced a lack of trust in the President's ability to be able to negotiate what is best for America. That is why we are still fighting to stop the trade promotional authority, better known as fast track.

Fast track will not be the panacea of all ills. In fact, if granted, we could see President Obama move swiftly on the Trans-Pacific Partnership that will likely not deliver the goods and have harmful secondary effects in multiple areas.

Dr. Aurolyn Luykx, from the University of Texas at El Paso, makes this analysis: “I think the consequences could be very dire. We already saw under NAFTA how so many jobs left the United States and, also, went from Mexico. Then we saw, as well, tens of thousands of low-income Mexican families being put out of work and losing their land, and we saw how that drove migration to the United States.”

The architects of the TPA in both Congress and the White House claim that with fast track they can lower barriers on U.S. exports among the 11 other TPP nations in the negotiation, thus, increasing jobs and wages.

Now to the facts. We already have high-standard, free-trade agreements

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

with 7 of those 11 other nations in the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership. We are writing the rules in the Pacific. Let's write them some more with good bilateral agreements.

If you don't believe me, how about Simon Johnson, a former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund and a professor at MIT Sloan. Here is what he says about the myth of needing the TPA to lower tariffs among the proposed members of the Trans-Pacific Partnership:

Almost all tariffs on trade among Canada, Mexico, and the United States are long gone. Under the Australian and Singapore free trade agreements, almost all tariffs on U.S. goods have been eliminated. Goods from the United States have entered Chile without tariffs since January 1 of this year, and most tariffs imposed by Peru have already been phased out.

The TPP will amount to a free trade agreement with Brunei, with a population less than Omaha, Nebraska, and New Zealand, with a population less than Louisiana. Encouraging exports to these countries is surely desirable, but the economic impact on the United States is unlikely to be more than a rounding error.

That leaves three larger countries where the issues are more complex: Japan, Malaysia, and Vietnam.

And TPP will also confer special status on foreign investors, allowing them to sue for financial judgments against host-country regulations. Creating a quasi-legal process outside the regular court system just for foreigners can go wrong in many ways.

I would add, from my own reading of the TPP, without divulging the details, concerns about private rights in disputes; the transnational panel empowered with a living agreement even after the accord is signed; and possible exceptions granted to Brunei, whose legal system is not to the same standard as other nations.

So, one says, What solutions do you have? Well, here are a couple:

First, listen to the American people. If the majority of Americans completely across the political spectrum have voiced concerns against TPA, then our actions this week will truly reflect if we are being representative of that voice.

Second, the President must demonstrate he can lead on foreign policy. He has yet to do it. Granting fast track to negotiate with 40 percent of the world's economy should be based on how well he has handled foreign policy. Have we forgotten the handling of Syria, ISIS, Iraq, Crimea, Ukraine, and Iran? I can go on, but the question is, Why are we? The President must show us some deeds, not words. He should start by negotiating a bilateral agreement with our ally Japan. Intently focus there. Bring that to us, and we will likely approve it.

Third, negotiate an interim agreement with China. We still have much to do with raising the standards bar on Chinese trade, but China lacks lawyers to fight these problems. Well, do we know how to make plenty of those. Ne-

gotiate a law school program all across our land's rich institutions to create Chinese attorneys to help fight these issues.

As to goods, China is seeking oil, natural gas, coal, timber, aggregate, beef, and pork. We have an abundance of these. How about a trade agreement on these narrow products that will immediately benefit us all?

It is not impossible. We have the resource. We have the technology. What we need are the guts to do it, a rekindling of the American spirit, and the leadership to get it done. It starts by putting the brakes on fast track. We need the right track instead.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I am going to talk about campaign finance reform.

First of all, though, I want to say that the United States of America is the greatest country in the world. You can see by our economic dominance, by our cultural dominance, and by our military power. But we face some very big challenges. Unless we are able to tackle those challenges, our dominance may be in peril.

Some of those challenges are climate change, global competitiveness. We need to make sure our manufacturing is up to par and can compete with any country on Earth. We have a vanishing middle class, which is very devastating to our country. We have a crumbling infrastructure. We also need to work on our educational system. But I can tell you, it is very difficult to attack any of these problems in a serious way with the current system of campaign financing.

So let me go over some of the problems with campaign financing in our current system:

First of all, you can see on the list here, campaign financing makes elected officials less effective because of the amount of time that we must spend raising money for the next election, which leaves less time to work on the issues that need to move our country forward.

The campaign money fuels negative campaign ads that turn off voters and suppress vote turnout.

Campaign financing causes wasteful government spending on programs that big donors want to see out there.

The threat of negative campaign ads—and this is very corrosive—causes elected officials to avoid taking stands and leadership on important issues, and this reduces the effectiveness of our government institutions.

□ 1215

Nowadays, even our judicial races are becoming expensive and tainted by the influence of money.

Next, people have become cynical about the government and disillusioned about the United States of America because, in part, of negative advertising.

Next, the super-PACs and dark money coming into campaigns are no longer controlled by the candidates on the ballot.

Lastly—and I think this is very important—excessive election spending drowns out free speech. If you look at campaign ads, what is happening is that the Big Money comes in, buys all the campaign ad time on TV, and floods our mailboxes with literature.

People are only going to listen to so much campaign rhetoric, so they turn it off. The people with the most money are the ones who are listened to, and the ideas of the folks without much money are never heard. They don't ever get very far. I think this is a very critical issue.

We see the problems that we have with the current system; but how do we change it? There are some very big challenges that we face in terms of changing the current campaign financing system.

First of all, the Supreme Court of the United States of America has shown a very strong bias in the last decade or so toward putting more money in politics. That is right. The Supreme Court has made it so that more money is coming into politics and election campaigns every single year.

The Citizens United decision by the Supreme Court ruled that corporations have the same free speech rights as people, allowing corporations to use their treasuries to finance campaigns. I can't think of anything that would be more corrosive to campaigns than to see a plethora of corporate and union money coming in with no controls and controlling the message.

In fact, just this year, the Republicans in the House and the Senate passed legislation that increases the total that an individual American citizen can contribute to political parties almost by a factor of 10, going from \$35,000 to \$300,000, so an individual can donate \$300,000 to a political campaign; yet there is significant public support for taking money out of politics.

According to a June 2015 New York Times-CBS poll, 84 percent of Americans say money has too much influence in politics, and 85 percent of those surveyed said that the campaign financing system should be either completely rebuilt or fundamentally changed.

The growth of money in politics represents a threat to our cherished democratic institutions that were built by our Founding Fathers. This is not what the American people want for our democracy. It is critical to inform the American public about what is happening and what can be done about the problem. There are reform options of two kinds.

The first kind is legislative reform actions, and there are three or four

types of those. The first and most important is disclosure and transparency, and then there are constitutional amendments. Constitutional amendments are very hard to pass, but they are not subject to be overturned by the Supreme Court. I have a proposed constitutional amendment, H.J. Res. 31, which will do away with PACs and super-PACs.

I hope the American public will examine those alternatives and decide what they want to see because our system is in desperate need of change.

ABOVE THE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much the comments of my friend Mr. RUSSELL, a neighbor from an adjoining State. He is right. The American people have made clear that they did not want the TPA passed. They certainly don't want the TAA passed.

How ironic that we are told that TPA's passage will create a massive number of jobs; yet the people who have really looked at it on the Democratic side say, "Huh-uh, this is going to cost a lot of jobs so that we have got to have more unemployment benefits and more government help for people who are going to lose their jobs," which is what the TAA basically does, "or we can't vote for the TPA"—how ironic.

Also how ironic that President Obama seems to have worked harder on this bill than he has on anything since ObamaCare—he has come to the Hill; he went to the baseball game. He is really pushing people to join him. It is rather ironic because it is just hard to believe that he would be working this hard to limit his own powers. He has never done that before. He has never worked to limit his own powers.

It also strikes me as a bit interesting that some of the same people who pushed so hard to pass TARP, the Wall Street bailout, are also pushing for this. There was a former FDIC Chairman named Isaac, who came to the Hill with the support of many economists, saying: "Please, don't get into this socialist activity where government partners with private business. Don't do that and certainly not for \$700 billion. There is no justification."

Look, we clearly have more than that, that American individuals and American businesses have overseas in banks that they will never bring into the United States. They have already paid a massive amount of tax on it overseas.

A far better, free market approach would be to just pass a bill and say, "If you want to shore up any asset or any entity, like Goldman Sachs"—you could have saved Lehman Brothers, AIG, Chrysler, GM; you could have

saved any of them if you had just said: "Bring that money in from overseas, no tax."

We could have made it very attractive to do that, and then we wouldn't have had to have given the government \$700 billion with basically no limits on how the Secretary of the Treasury could spend his money.

He couldn't prop up a central bank of a foreign government, but I read the bill. I couldn't believe we were going to give that kind of power to one person. We have not done that since the Constitution passed.

It also should be noted, I think, that, if we had not passed that \$700 billion Wall Street bailout—that giveaway—then President Obama would never have gotten \$900 billion. He would never have been able to push so much more for bigger government and had gotten it.

We would have been able to have stood stronger against that, which could have prevented ObamaCare from even coming up or passing. It had terribly damaging effects. Some of the same people who wanted TARP are now wanting TPA and TAA. It is a bad idea.

I just want to just finish, Mr. Speaker, by noting that we have the Supreme Court taking up an issue—it is supposedly going to come out with an opinion before the end of the month—and ruling in a case involving same-sex marriage.

Neither the Constitution nor the Bill of Rights provides any power for the Federal Government to get involved in the issue of marriage. That has always been a State issue. It should be under the 10th Amendment; yet we have the Supreme Court potentially going to weigh in and take over that power.

We also know that the law is very clear: 28 U.S. Code, section 455, says that any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

Two Justices have made clear how they feel. They have presided over same-sex marriage ceremonies. If they do not disqualify themselves and if they rule on this case, they have shown a total contempt for the law. That should lead to impeachment, but America would have to rise up to make that known.

We will see here, in the 800th year anniversary of the Magna Carta, when it was made clear that nobody, not even the King, is above the law, if the Supreme Court will say, 800 years later: "We are the Supreme Court, and we are above the law, and there is nothing you can do about it."

I hope and pray they are not that arrogant in trying to bring down this constitutional Republic. We will see.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

During these busy weeks of House work, we ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this assembly. Issues of national security, trade, and the welfare of our citizens stand in the balance of the deliberations of these days.

May each Member be filled with a surfeit of wisdom, patience, and equanimity that these weeks of appropriations might issue forth in solutions that benefit the Nation.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

KING V. BURWELL

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, it seems like the whole of Washington is awaiting the result of a Supreme Court decision in reference to King v. Burwell.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you the simple truth. As I see it, the President broke the law. He broke the law, and people are hurting as a consequence.

Once this ruling comes down, Congress will be required to put in place mechanisms to keep people from being hurt any further, but the fact of the matter remains that premiums have gone up, deductibles are completely out of sight, leaving many families functionally uninsured. We need to address these problems.

Furthermore, power needs to be devolved back to the States. States can do a better job of running their healthcare systems because they are closer to the people that they represent.

The fact of the matter is this healthcare law was a big mistake. It is time that it be fixed, and this will be a first step in the road to do so.

AIRPORT SECURITY ACT

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's airports are economic and cultural engines that drive our local, State, and national economy. They are the front door for many of our communities. Unfortunately, they are also a known target for those seeking to incite fear.

Two weeks ago, a man entered the world's busiest airport in Atlanta, Georgia, carrying a loaded AR-15 automatic weapon with an extended capacity 100-round magazine. He did so only to make a point, and that was to show that he was legally able to carry his firearm in the airport.

Mr. Speaker, actions like this, which follow shootings at airports in Los Angeles and Houston, undermine public security in the same way as yelling "fire" in a crowded theater.

Today, I will introduce legislation to prohibit the carrying of loaded weapons in our Nation's airports. The Airport Security Act is a commonsense bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in keeping the traveling public safe.

DACA ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to commemorate the 3-year anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, also known as DACA.

Over the past 3 years, DACA has changed the lives of more than 640,000 young undocumented immigrants who were brought to the United States as children, including an impressive intern in my office named Maria. Maria moved to the United States when she was only 6 years old. Now, as a college student with a 4.0 GPA, Maria tutors

children and is giving back to the country that has helped her reach her goals.

As we mark DACA's 3-year anniversary and all that it has accomplished to support students like Maria, thousands more DREAMers are waiting for their opportunity to come out of the shadows. Sadly, the court battle over DACA continues.

We must rededicate ourselves to fixing our broken immigration system. Students like Maria deserve the chance to live free of fear and contribute their talents to keep our country vibrant and the envy of the world.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, House Republican leadership is, once again, threatening to bring us to the edge of yet another deadline that threatens American jobs and our very economy.

There are just 7 days left for Congress to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, a critical agency that gives American manufacturers and small businesses the tools and access to capital that they need to sell American-made goods overseas. It is how we grow our economy. Letting the Export-Import Bank expire endangers hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs in the United States.

In my home State of Michigan alone, 228 exporters with \$11 billion in export value are at risk if Congress fails to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank. That will all end on June 30—no new support, no new loan guarantees, no new loans to help exporters sell goods across the country and keep Americans at work.

It is reckless and it is irresponsible that we are facing another fiscal cliff. This is a cliff for our own manufacturers and our own economy.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of this House of Representatives supports the Export-Import Bank. Let's vote this week to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by Speaker pro tempore THORNBERRY on Friday, June 12, 2015:

S. 1568, to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

J. WATIES WARING JUDICIAL CENTER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2131) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2131

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. J. WATIES WARING FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2131.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2131 designates the Federal building and the United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the J. Waties Waring Judicial Center.

Judge Waring was born in Charleston, South Carolina, in 1880. After becoming a lawyer, he was in the private practice of law and eventually served as corporation counsel for Charleston, South Carolina.

In 1942, after serving as assistant U.S. Attorney, Judge Waring was appointed by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to serve as a judge for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

During his tenure on the bench, Judge Waring's opinions had a significant impact on civil rights. For example, in the case of *Duvall v. School Board*, he ruled that equal pay must be guaranteed for equally qualified schoolteachers, regardless of race, and his dissent in *Briggs v. Elliott* stating that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" formed the legal foundation for the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

This bill is supported by the entire South Carolina delegation. Given Judge Waring's dedication to the law, it is fitting to name this Federal building and courthouse after him.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. This bill is, of course, to name the U.S. courthouse in Charleston, South Carolina, after Judge Julius Waties Waring.

During Judge Waring's time as a Federal judge in the Eastern District of South Carolina, he was a trailblazer in pursuit of justice for African Americans. Judge Waring consistently ruled for African American plaintiffs in cases involving voting rights, unequal pay, and civil rights.

Before Judge Waring was named to the Federal bench, he served as assistant U.S. attorney and as corporation counsel for the City of Charleston.

He is most famously remembered for a 1951 landmark school segregation case. Judge Waring wrote in his dissent on a three-judge panel that racial segregation in public schools was "per se inequality." He became the first Federal judge to take that position since *Plessy v. Ferguson* ruled for separate but equal. In his dissent, he went further to denounce segregation as an "evil that must be eradicated." His dissent is commonly understood to provide the intellectual underpinning of the Supreme Court outlawing school

segregation in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Because Judge Waring's decisions were considered controversial at the time, he endured threats of violence and was alienated from most of Charleston. Soon after Judge Waring's momentous decision, he retired from the Federal bench and moved to New York, where he later died.

Fifty years after his death, this legislation naming the Federal courthouse in Charleston in his honor is appropriate because of Judge Waring's courageous judicial service in the face of fierce opposition to the bedrock American value of "justice for all."

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, again, I would just urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2131.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2131, a bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center" and urge my colleagues to support this bill. I thank Representative JIM CLYBURN for introducing the bill, which has the full support of our state's congressional delegation.

This bill is a reflection of two things: human kindness and bold leadership. There is a saying that, "One of the most difficult things to give away is kindness; it usually comes back to you." This bill is, in some ways, a reflection of that notion. Under the category of human kindness, this bill came as a result of a phone call from Senator Fritz Hollings asking that the name on the courthouse in Charleston named after him be changed to honor the memory of the late Judge Julius Waties Waring. Although Judge Waring has a remarkable legal legacy, in the case of Senator Hollings, it all began with human kindness. In the 1940's, Fritz Hollings was a young attorney in Charleston and practiced in front of Judge Waring. What impressed him was that Judge Waring was, "damned nice to me. He made sure young lawyers weren't bumfuzzled or run over by senior lawyers." If the story stopped there, we probably would not be discussing this bill today.

Instead, it is Judge Waring's bold leadership that makes this commemoration particularly fitting. As a federal district court judge, J. Waties Waring ruled on several key cases that set the stage for one of the most significant court cases in our nation's history. In the 1940's, Judge Waring heard and ruled on cases that opened South Carolina's "white only" Democratic primary and forcing equal pay for black and white school teachers. By 1948, *TIME* Magazine declared him as "The Man They Love to Hate" in South Carolina. In fact, in 1950, the South Carolina House of Representatives debated a resolution asking Judge Waring and his wife to leave the state and even offered to pay for the one-way tickets. This all came before his dissenting vote in the 1951 *Briggs v. Elliott* case involving segregated busing in Clarendon County in South

Carolina. In that case, Thurgood Marshall argued that black students were being treated unfairly because although there were three times as many black students, funding for transportation was only half. As a result, black students were walking up to nine miles to school. The case was decided against the plaintiff by a 2-1 vote, with Judge Waring voting in dissent. In his opinion, Waring argued that segregation was "an evil that must be eradicated" and a result of "unreasonable, unscientific and . . . unadulterated prejudice." His dissent would travel with the case all the way to the Supreme Court, where the *Briggs* case became one of five cases decided with *Brown v. Board of Education*, which recognized segregation as a violation of the 14th Amendment.

Although Judge Waring left the bench not long after the *Briggs* case, the impact of his leadership still resides today. I think naming this building after Judge Waring is a particularly fitting commemoration of his bold leadership, his willingness to take a stand, and the human kindness that's being extended by Senator Hollings back to Judge Waring.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2131, a bill to rename the federal courthouse in Charleston, South Carolina in honor of Judge J. Waties Waring. This bill is a tribute to two men, two outstanding South Carolinians. The first, Judge Waring, for whom the bill will name the courthouse, was a federal judge in South Carolina during the 1940s and 50s who made landmark and courageous rulings on civil rights.

The second is known to many in the Congress, Senator Ernest F. "Fritz" Hollings whose name is currently on this courthouse, and who has requested it be changed as a long overdue honor to Judge Waring.

The son of a confederate soldier, Julius Waties Waring, was born July 27, 1880 in Charleston, and graduated from the College of Charleston in 1900. He became an attorney and after practicing in Charleston for several decades was nominated by President Franklin Roosevelt to the U.S. District Court in 1941.

While there was little in his background that foretold an evolution on the issue, soon after ascending to the bench, Waring would become an iconoclast and an outcast in his hometown because of his rulings on civil rights cases.

In the 1944 *Duvall v. School Board* decision, Judge Waring ordered equal pay for teachers, regardless of race.

In 1947, in *Elmore v. Rice*, Judge Waring struck down South Carolina's all-white Democratic primary.

In 1952, in his most famous opinion, Judge Waring dissented from the ruling in *Briggs v. Elliott*, arguing that "separate but equal" was unconstitutional. While a dissenting opinion at the time, on appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, his opinion would form the basis of the unanimous decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, which struck down racial segregation in all public schools in America.

For my entire tenure in Congress, these words from Judge Waring's dissent have been on the wall of my Congressional Office: "They showed beyond a doubt that the evils of segregation and color prejudice come from early training . . . and that is an evil that must be eradicated."

Taking these stands in the 1940s and 50s was not without consequence. His experiences gave currency to the biblical admonition that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own homeland." Waring was ostracized in Charleston and endured harassment and attacks on his home. He retired from the bench in 1952, left his hometown and moved to New York.

He had made his mark, however, and his legacy endures. I recall attending his graveside services in 1968, which was sparsely attended except for several of Charleston's African American community and a few whites who stood off at a distance.

Thankfully, history has given Judge Waring the favorable recognition denied to him during his life, and passage of his bill will rightfully add to this acclaim.

It is often stated that "the difference between a moment and a movement is sacrifice." Judge Waring's sacrifices put him at the forefront of a movement. His courage in standing up for what was right, will endure in our nation's memory as a powerful example of statesmanship that must continually be sought, regardless of the issues of the day.

Of course, none of this today would be possible were it not for Senator Ernest Frederick Hollings. Fritz Hollings' record is familiar to all of us here.

Throughout his career, as Governor of South Carolina when Clemson University was integrated and in the United States Senate, when Fritz saw a problem he set about to solve it. When the plight of the poor was exposed to him in the late 1960s, he authored the book, *The Case Against Hunger*.

He led hunger tours to highlight the problem, and ultimately championed the successful Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children or WIC. As Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, he helped usher in a generation of landmark social policy, providing aid of the needy and protecting our environment.

He was never afraid to make difficult choices, or to change positions when he thought it warranted.

In the 1980s, Fritz helped secure funding to build the annex to the Courthouse that is the subject of this legislation, and the entire facility was subsequently named in his honor.

Never content to allow past injustices to go unaddressed, however, he has publicly called on Congress to replace his name on the building, with that of the highly deserving, long unheralded, J. Waties Waring. This selfless act of statesmanship is just the most recent example of Fritz's visionary leadership.

I thank my colleagues in the South Carolina delegation for their unanimous support of this bill. I urge its passage by the House to honor this outstanding South Carolinian and great American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2131.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PFC MILTON A. LEE MEDAL OF HONOR MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2559) to designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2559

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The segment of Interstate Route 10 between milepost 535 and milepost 545 at Kendall County, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the segment of Interstate Route 10 referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2559.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2559, which names a segment of Interstate 10 between mile markers 535 and 545 in Kendall County, Texas, after Private First Class Milton A. Lee.

PFC Milton A. Lee joined the Army in San Antonio in 1967 as a member of the 101st Army Airborne Division and served in Vietnam as a radio telephone operator.

PFC Lee was killed in action at the age of 19 and is buried at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty.

H.R. 2559 is supported by all the local elected officials, community leaders, and veterans organizations.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2559.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2559, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill designates a 10-mile segment of Interstate 10 between milepost

535 and milepost 545 in Kendall County, Texas, as the PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill along with my colleagues from Texas.

Private Lee was a hero who tragically lost his life at the age of 19 while fighting for his country in Vietnam. Milton A. Lee was born February 28, 1949, in Shreveport, Louisiana. He later moved to Texas and attended Harlandale High School in San Antonio before enlisting in the Army.

The actions preceding his death were nothing short of heroic. While serving as a radio operator with the 3rd Platoon, Company B, the platoon was surprised by hostile fire by the North Vietnamese Army. Private Lee moved through the heavy enemy fire to give lifesaving first aid to his wounded fellow soldiers.

As the platoon was advancing to reorganize, Private Lee noticed four hidden North Vietnamese soldiers with automatic weapons and a rocket launcher ready to attack the lead element of the platoon. He selflessly charged through the enemy fire and overran their position, killing the attackers and capturing their weapons. His actions saved the lives of his fellow soldiers and were instrumental in the destruction of the key position of the enemy defense.

Private Lee died April 26, 1968. He was awarded the Medal of Honor in 1970 for his gallantry at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we can come to the floor of the House today and celebrate this young man's courage and conviction by naming a portion of Interstate 10 in his honor. This bill is a fitting tribute.

Before I close, I would like to remind my colleagues that there are only 23 legislative days left before highway and transit program authorizations expire. Here we are again on the brink of yet another extension in the middle of the summer construction season. I strongly urge my colleagues to take up the charge to restore our Nation's infrastructure. If we do not act quickly, we will soon not have any miles of road left worthy of naming after any great American. I support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), my good friend.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from Missouri, Representative GRAVES, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to recognize veteran, patriot, and Medal of Honor recipient Milton A. Lee today. Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 2559, which designates a portion of Interstate Highway 10 in Boerne, Texas, as PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway.

PFC Lee was born on February 28, 1949, in Shreveport, Louisiana. While he was not born in Texas, Lee entered the Army in San Antonio, served honorably in the Vietnam war, and was laid to rest at Fort Sam Houston, which is located in my district.

□ 1615

PFC Lee served as a radio telephone operator with the 3rd Platoon, Company B, during an intense, surprise hostile attack by North Vietnamese army fighters. The 3rd Platoon maneuvered to a position of cover to treat their wounded and reorganize. Meanwhile, PFC Lee moved through the heavy enemy fire to give lifesaving first aid to his wounded fellow soldiers. During the subsequent assault, PFC Lee continuously kept close radio contact with the company commander and relayed precise and understandable information to his platoon leader.

While advancing toward the objective, PFC Lee observed four North Vietnamese soldiers with automatic weapons and a rocket launcher lying in wait for his platoon. PFC Lee immediately, and with great risk to his own personal safety, passed his radio to another soldier and charged through the barrage of fire. Without hesitation, he continued his attack and successfully overran the enemy position, killing all occupants and capturing four automatic weapons and a rocket launcher.

PFC Lee continued his one-man assault on another enemy position through a heavy barrage of enemy automatic weapons fire. Although wounded, he continued to press the attack and crawled forward into a firing position to deliver accurate cover fire for his platoon. This enabled his platoon to maneuver and destroy the enemy position. Not until the position was overrun did PFC Lee falter in his steady volume of fire and succumb to his wounds.

PFC Lee's heroic actions saved the lives of many in his platoon and were instrumental in the destruction of a key position of the enemy's defense. PFC Lee's gallantry at the risk of life above and beyond the call of duty epitomizes the highest traditions of the military service and reflects great credit on himself, the 502nd Infantry, and the U.S. Army.

So today, I urge my colleagues to support this bill in honor of an American hero. In giving his life for our country in such a selfless and heroic fashion, PFC Lee is deserving of our naming a portion of a Federal highway in his honor.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to urge my colleagues to support this bill. I think what we are trying to do here is very fitting.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2559.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

URGING IRAN TO RELEASE ALL DETAINED UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION REGARDING UNITED STATES CITIZENS THAT HAVE DISAPPEARED WITHIN ITS BORDERS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 233) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Iran should immediately release the three United States citizens that it holds, as well as provide all known information on any United States citizens that have disappeared within its borders.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 233

Whereas three United States citizens have been held captive in Iran, some of them for multiple years;

Whereas one United States citizen disappeared in Iran over eight years ago; and

Whereas Iranian President Hassan Rouhani has stated that his government wishes to engage in a constructive interaction with the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that Iran should release all detained United States citizens immediately and provide any information it possesses regarding any United States citizens that have disappeared within its borders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, we consider H. Res. 233, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Iran should immediately release all detained U.S. citizens as well as provide all known information on any U.S. citizens who have disappeared within the borders of Iran.

As always, I appreciate the support of the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL of New York, in bringing this resolution to the floor. I also want to acknowledge the author of this measure, Congressman KILDEE of Michigan, as well as those Members who continue to stress how important it is that this body speak out on this issue. These citizens need to be allowed to come home now. They are U.S. citizens.

In particular, I want to thank Mr. DEUTCH, who is with us here today, who is a senior member of our committee. He has been consistently focused for many years on the case of his missing constituent.

Two weeks ago, the Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing at which the family members of four Americans—three in prison and one missing in Iran for 8 years—testified. This was the first time all four of the families came together for such a hearing. We heard and saw the excruciating pain that they are living with day in and day out, not knowing if and when they will see their husband, their father, or their brother again. Each of these tragic cases underscores the complete lack of justice and, frankly, the brutal treatment that these Americans have faced in Iran.

Jason Rezaian is a journalist who was born and raised in California. He had hoped to use his position at The Washington Post to present a greater understanding of the Iranian people. Instead, he has been arrested on trumped-up charges and has been held for over 300 days at the infamous Evin Prison. Last week, a second closed hearing in his trial was held, which, like all other aspects of his case, was shrouded in secrecy.

In September of 2012, Iran arrested and later sentenced Pastor Saeed Abedini to 8 years in prison for gathering with others to study the Bible, which, as his wife told the committee, is, in fact, a lawful act, even under Iranian law, but one which the regime deemed a threat to national security. In jail, his guards have attempted to coerce him and torture him to get him to renounce his faith, telling him that otherwise he will serve an even longer time.

In August of 2011, Amir Hekmati, who is a former United States marine, was sentenced to death for alleged espionage. This is someone who went to visit his grandparents. Upon appeal, his sentence was reduced, by the way, to 10 years. As his sister described to the committee, her family was told by Iranian officials not to go public with

Amir's imprisonment or he would be put in even greater danger. Well, as she described to us through tears, despite their silence, Amir suffered extensive and repeated torture: beaten on his feet with cables and tasered repeatedly in the kidneys. At home, his father is gravely ill. But locked up, Amir can't travel back to see his father.

In 2007, Robert Levinson went missing on Iran's Kish Island. Eight years later, Iran continues to refuse to assist the United States in locating him. As his son testified, his father is now the longest held hostage in American history.

Mr. Speaker, the House stands in solidarity with each of these families. Our hearts break for them, and we share their anger and frustration at the desperate position they are facing.

As we approach the deadline for negotiations on a nuclear agreement with Iran—one that, no matter the terms, will require us to have at least some trust in the regime—I have to ask the question: What do these four cases say about the regime we are dealing with? If a journalist can be suddenly imprisoned on bogus charges, what treatment can international inspectors expect?

But more fundamentally, if top Iranian officials can't be counted on to assist these wrongfully jailed American citizens, can they be counted on to honor the commitments they make at the negotiating table?

This, by the way, is why verification is such an important part of an agreement. But on the question of whether they can be counted on, call me a skeptic.

I also have to ask why the administration, on the brink of striking a deal in which we would give the Iranians tens of billions of dollars in sanctions relief, is failing here.

The bottom line expressed in this resolution today is that these four Americans must be allowed home now, and that is a sentiment that all of us can support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 233, calling for the release of Americans held or missing in Iran.

First of all, I want to associate my feelings with the remarks of our chairman, Congressman ROYCE. I think he hit the nail right on the head several times with his statement. I agree with every word he uttered.

It is just ludicrous that at a time where we are weeks away from ostensibly completing an agreement with Iran, that our hostages—I can't think of any other word for them—are being treated so shabbily by the Iranian regime. As far as I am concerned, it casts a pall on any potential agreement that we have with Iran on June 30. If this is the way they are treating Americans, how can we rely on them or count on

them to fulfill their obligations under any agreement we sign with them?

It is just ludicrous that here we are at the eleventh hour. You would think the Iranian regime would want to start acting favorably so that we in Congress might favorably look upon any deal that could be reached. Instead, they are continuing their old ways and doing just the opposite. It just doesn't make any sense. It doesn't help us to trust them, it doesn't help us to believe them, and it only furthers all the things that we have seen and heard and questioned about this rogue regime in Tehran.

I want to thank Representative KILDEE for authoring this resolution. He has been a champion for these four Americans and their families. As I said at our hearing, he has been unrelenting in terms of fighting for his constituent and for the others who are held in Iranian prisons.

Representative DEUTCH, the ranking member of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee, who also has a constituent who is a hostage, has also been very vociferous. And Representative HUFFMAN is always talking to us about these issues and always looking to free all these Americans in prison. Also Representative LABRADOR, and Representative KILDEE has assured that these Americans are not forgotten in Congress.

As was mentioned, 2 weeks ago, our committee heard from the Hekmati, Rezaian, Levinson, and Abedini families. Their stories were heartbreaking, their pleas heartfelt, and as they made clear in their testimony, their cause is our cause. It is America's cause.

We are a few weeks away, as I said before, from an important deadline in the Iranian nuclear talks. It is ridiculous that our citizens languish in Iranian jails while we negotiate. At the same time, as the families of the Americans point out, these negotiations have given us the only opportunity to directly raise the cases of the four Americans with the Iranian Government, and we are assured by the administration that at every instance they raise these cases with the Iranian Government.

I am happy they raise the cases. I am grateful that they raise these cases. But, of course, if we don't get these people home, it is all for naught. I cannot imagine having an agreement with Iran that doesn't take into account these people, that doesn't release these people. It would just be a dereliction of our duties and responsibility to have an agreement with Iran while not bargaining or getting the freedom of these people. We don't want these people used as a bargaining chip, but on the other hand, we don't want these people to remain in jail after there is some kind of an agreement with Iran.

I wish we knew more about the conditions of these four Americans, but in

these cases, Iran isn't playing by the rules once again. Typically, if an American were detained in Iran, Switzerland, the U.S. "protecting power" in Iran, would have access to them for consular services. It is not the case here.

In the cases of these three Iranian Americans, Iran doesn't even acknowledge their dual citizenship—only their Iranian citizenship. This position runs roughshod over long-established international law.

□ 1630

Without consular access, we cannot judge the health and welfare of our own American citizens. This is unacceptable. The United States respects this access for Iranian citizens held here. Reciprocal privileges are the least they could provide.

Sadly, Mr. DEUTCH's constituent—Robert Levinson's whereabouts are unknown. I simply don't believe the Iranians have been forthcoming at all about his status. If he is, indeed, still a hostage, he is now the longest held hostage in American history. We shouldn't stand for this. We shouldn't sit still while this continues.

I will weigh the nuclear deal carefully when it comes to us, but Iran's leaders could send the American people a gesture of goodwill by providing more information about Robert Levinson and by freeing Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, and Jason Rezaian.

By the way, Mr. Rezaian is the bureau chief, the Tehran bureau chief of The Washington Post, unbelievable that he would be arrested for espionage, ludicrous, ridiculous.

This is a concern all of us share. It doesn't matter where you come from in this country or what your political affiliation is. These are Americans, and we all want to see these four Americans come home safely to their families.

I applaud this resolution, urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. ENGEL has shared with you that the government in Iran refuses to recognize the U.S. nationality for Jason Rezaian. Jason was born in California. He was born a U.S. citizen here in the United States, raised in California; and their position is that, no, he is an Iranian citizen.

He was over there to see his grandmother. No, he was over there reporting because he wanted to get an opportunity for greater understanding of the citizens in Iran.

The fact that we allow a situation like this to stand, when American citizens are being held like this and subjected to show trials, is appalling.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global

Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, and a longtime critic of the human rights abuses that have occurred in Iran.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished chairman and thank both he and ELIOT ENGEL for the leadership that they have both shown.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for keeping that focus on all issues related to Iran and for doing it so effectively, including and especially the human rights abuses that are occurring there each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, the most important duty of the President of the United States is to keep Americans safe from harm, whether they are at home or abroad. Three innocent Americans continue to be brutalized in Iran prisons and trapped in a system of sham trials. A fourth American, another innocent man, has been missing from Iran for more than 8 years and presumed to also be imprisoned in that country.

When Americans have been hostages in foreign lands or on foreign seas, Presidents from both parties have prioritized their rescue, sometimes even asking the finest from our fighting forces to risk their lives to save them.

It is an important question why the President has failed to make the release of our fellow Americans his top priority with the Iranian regime. How often have we heard the administration speak out, pressure being put to bear on the Iranian regime, even as the talks continue on the nuclear issue?

It seems to me I will never forget when Nagameh Abedini came and testified at one of Frank Wolf's hearings. She said they told her there was nothing they could do for her husband at the U.S. Department of State.

Thankfully, a call to John Kerry by Mr. Wolf, chairman of the Lantos committee at the time, did yield fruit; and they did begin to raise his name and his calls.

The President seems to think, however, that the Iranian regime can be trusted to keep a nuclear deal and no longer seek to develop and make nuclear weapons. I would suggest that a regime that continues to imprison our fellow citizens cannot be trusted.

A regime that so regularly and violently violates human rights and basic freedoms of its own people cannot be trusted. A regime that sponsors terrorism against other countries as a tool of foreign policy cannot be trusted.

H. Res. 233 makes very clear that Iran should release all detained U.S. citizens immediately and provide any information it possesses regarding any United States citizens that have disappeared within its borders.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember the husbands and fathers, sons and daughters, the families, in addition to those

who are being exploited and cruelly mistreated.

I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for the hearing that he just convened a few days ago. We heard from the family members. Their plea was impassioned. It was heartbreaking, and it was very, very motivating.

Imprisoned since 2012, Pastor Abedini, 35 years old, husband of Nagameh Abedini—who testified several times before my subcommittee and has been an extraordinary champion for his release—father of two children, he had returned to Iran to build an orphanage. He had gotten prior clearance, told that he could do it. Once he was there, they arrested him, and they have mistreated him ever since then.

Imprisoned since 2012, Amir Hekmati, 31 years old, a former sergeant in the U.S. Marine Corps. He had returned to Iran to visit his grandmother and other relatives. They scooped him up, and he has been mistreated ever since.

Imprisoned since 2011, Jason Rezaian, 39 years old, Tehran's bureau chief for The Washington Post, a reporter who publishes what is going on in that regime, he now is facing a trial, a show trial, a sham trial.

Imprisoned since 2014, Robert Levinson, 67 years old, husband, father, grandfather, he has been missing in Iran since the year 2007.

Mr. Speaker, Pastor Abedini, Mr. Hekmati, Mr. Rezaian, and Mr. Levinson are all Americans, and they are being, right today, subjected to abuse and cruelty. They are all prisoners or missing in Iran.

We call on the administration to re-triple its efforts to secure their release.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who has been the staunchest supporter of getting these people free, who has raised this issue so many times, and who is the author of this resolution.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking Chairman ROYCE for his efforts on this resolution and my friend Ranking Member ENGEL, as well, for his efforts, along with the 201 Members of this body who have cosponsored this, most particularly Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. LABRADOR, who have worked with me and my staff in preparing this resolution.

I want to speak briefly about Amir Hekmati, my constituent, a young man who is an American citizen, born in the United States, raised in my hometown of Flint, Michigan, served in the United States Marine Corps. He is a brother; he is a son; he is a Michigander.

Back in 2011, for the first time, he traveled to Iran to visit his grandmother, as has been said. He notified the Iranian Government that he was going to Iran. He traveled under his

own name. He disclosed his history as a member of the United States Marine Corps.

He was in Iran for almost 3 weeks when he was apprehended. Initially tried and convicted and sentenced to death for espionage, that sentence was later set aside, but he continues to languish in Evin Prison, serving a 10-year sentence.

I want the world to know about Amir. I want people to know his name, just as we want the world to know the names of Jason Rezaian, Saeed Abedini, and Bob Levinson. These are real people. Amir is a real person. He grew up in my hometown of Flint, like me, played high school hockey.

It is important that we remember these names. These are individuals. They are not just pawns in a geopolitical struggle between Iran and the rest of the world. They are individuals. They are people. They have families. They feel pain. They suffer.

Amir Hekmati has been in Evin Prison for 1,386 days. It is long past time for him to be reunited with his family. He has committed no crime; yet he continues to sit in that prison, in a dark cell.

If Iran is serious about rejoining the community of nations, about being a member of the international community, they will release—immediately release—Amir Hekmati and the other Americans that they hold.

That is why it is so important that this House pass this resolution and speak for the American people with one voice. We have lots of disagreements in this place.

There should be no question here in the United States, across the world, but especially within the Iranian Government and among the Iranian people, there should be no question that this body, this House of Representatives, which often disagrees, has no disagreement on the question of these Americans.

If Iran wants to be taken seriously, if anything they do, if any engagement that they have with the world, whether it is a nuclear agreement or economic engagement, if any of that is to be legitimate, they cannot hold political prisoners; and they need to take action to release Amir Hekmati and the other Americans that they hold.

Now, the fact that the P5+1 negotiations are underway does give us space for something that we haven't had in 35 years, and that is bilateral discussion on the sidelines of those nuclear agreements, but while it does provide the moment, there is one point that I do want to make, and others have spoken to this.

It is difficult to imagine taking any agreement with them seriously as long as Iran holds these Americans, but it is also important that we keep in mind that we never want to be in a position where, as part of a transaction with

Iran, we exchange the freedom of these Americans for a concession at the nuclear negotiating table, a concession that may make the world a less safe place.

We don't want that, and I know that Amir Hekmati, through his family, has communicated to us that he does not want to be exchanged for anything.

I think it is fair, as Members have said, that Congress considers all of Iran's behavior when considering any engagement with them, whether it is a nuclear agreement or anything else.

When I have spoken to the President and the Vice President or Wendy Sherman or Samantha Power, our U.N. representative, I have made it clear to them that, while it is important that we get our Americans home, we don't want to see the world become a less safe place in exchange for the freedom of innocent people. They have agreed with that, and they have shared that with the Iranian Government at every opportunity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend.

Simple point, Congress, today, will speak with one voice and say to the Iranian people, say to the world, that these Americans—this resolution will say, with absolute clarity, that if Iran expects to be treated as a member of the international community, they will unilaterally release these Americans.

It would advance their cause, presumably, of joining the global community. It would send a strong message to the rest of the world and to the United States and to this Congress that they can and should be taken seriously, but it is very difficult to imagine doing that if they continue to hold Amir Hekmati and the other Americans they hold.

I just want to reiterate my gratitude to Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and the whole committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the whole House for their support of this. The families of these individuals, I know, appreciate it very deeply, and I do as well.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), a Member who has also been fighting for his constituent, who has brought this issue up with us so many times, who has been unyielding in trying to get freedom for all the hostages.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do want to start by thanking Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for moving this bill forward; and a huge thanks to my great colleague from Michigan, Representative KILDEE, he has been described as tireless and courageous and relentless. He is all of that

and more in working to highlight the injustice that these American detainees are facing in Iran.

□ 1645

One of these detainees, Jason Rezaian, has been mentioned as having grown up in California. He actually grew up in my district. I have gotten to know his family. And in some way, I feel like I have gotten to know Jason—at least a little bit—through this tragic situation. So I know something about the terrible hardship that he and his family have been going through for this past year.

It is with that unconscionable level of hardship in mind that I am proud to join with my colleagues in working to make sure that Congress does everything that it can to secure Jason's safe release and also the safe release of these other unjustly detained Americans.

Passing this resolution on a bipartisan basis is one of the most important things that we can do to reaffirm to the Iranian regime that the whole world is watching.

Jason Rezaian was The Washington Post Tehran bureau chief when he was arrested in Tehran on July 22 last year. He has now been held twice as long as any previous western journalist in Iran.

The circumstances under which he has been held are an absolute mockery of justice. There has never been any evidence brought against him. For 9 months, there were no charges brought against him publicly. Jason was denied the most basic rights: denied access to a lawyer for months, denied bail after he was charged, and held in solitary confinement after his investigation ended.

Jason's family members and his fellow journalists have been fierce advocates for his freedom. I hope that the passage of this resolution today will make the sentiment of Congress very clear: that Iran should immediately release Jason Rezaian and the other detained Americans.

Whatever issues or disagreements that we may have about broader issues involving Iran, it is important that we are able to speak today with one voice for the Americans who are unjustly detained and for their families. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), one of the senior members of our Foreign Affairs Committee, the ranking member on the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee, and someone whom I turn to very often for advice and counsel, who has been a clear and effective voice in trying to bring our hostages home.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member, for yielding. I thank the chairman. I especially went to thank my friend and colleague from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for spearheading this resolution and for his tireless efforts to bring back his constituent. And I want to thank the fellow original cosponsors, Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. LABRADOR.

Each of us here has the solemn responsibility to represent the families of these American citizens—in this case, our constituents who are missing or held in Iran. Each of us has seen the suffering of these families firsthand. We have also seen a remarkable strength of purpose as they live this real-life nightmare and do everything they can to bring their loved ones home.

For the family of Robert Levinson, my constituent, 8 years is 8 years too long not to have their husband, their father, and their grandfather home.

Bob Levinson went missing on Iran's Kish Island on March 9, 2007. Since his disappearance, the Levinson family has received proof of life in the form of pictures and videos. Iran's leaders have never provided any information about Bob's disappearance, despite repeated pledges to aid in the investigation.

As negotiations with Iran have taken place over the past year and a half, many of us have doubts about the ability to trust Iran to follow through on the terms of any nuclear deal. We distrust because we have seen this regime time and again lie to the international community, support the world's worst actors and terrorists, destabilize the region, deny history, and chant "death to America." So if Iran wants to be taken seriously by the international community, then it must start by dropping the bogus charges and releasing Amir Hekmati, Saeed Abedini, and Jason Rezaian; and immediately assist in locating and returning Bob Levinson.

Mr. Speaker, we are just weeks away from the June 30 deadline for a nuclear deal. We are grateful that the Secretary and the other negotiators have raised this issue inside meetings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEUTCH. But we have enormous leverage right now, and we must use it for Jason Rezaian, for Saeed Abedini, for Amir Hekmati, and for my constituent Bob Levinson.

If Iran wants the world to believe what it says at the negotiating table, if it expects the world to trust any of the commitments that it will make or promises to make in a nuclear deal, then it should send these Americans home.

By passing this bipartisan resolution today, we will show the world that this is an issue that transcends politics. We

gather here today in the United States House of Representatives, the people's House, to show that Members of Congress and the American people are united in demanding the safe return of these four Americans. Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring them home.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I, again, urge my colleagues to support this resolution at this critical time.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), for his work on this.

We are in the final days of the nuclear negotiations, as has been mentioned before, with Iran. And as the families of these Americans point out, when these negotiations are over, if we do nothing, so too may be the chance of the United States to engage directly with Iran over the fate of their family members. So we must not let this opportunity go to waste.

We call on Iran to release Amir Hekmati, Jason Rezaian, Saeed Abedini, and Robert Levinson; to live up to their pledge to provide further information about Robert Levinson; and to bring these men home to their families.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I have made clear before, I have serious reservations about the direction of our negotiations with Iran, and this is based in no small part on its treatment of the four Americans we are speaking about today and what that predicts going forward.

Let's not forget, this is a regime—and we can turn on the set and watch their rallies—where regularly the chant “death to America” is used to rouse the most fervent supporters of the Supreme Leader. This is a regime that has killed its own citizens outright or convicted and imprisoned them based on confessions obtained by torture. This is a regime that takes U.S. citizens into captivity, tortures them, and then denies them medical treatment, denies them basic legal representation, denies them due process.

Last month, just prior to Jason's so-called trial, Washington Post editor Martin Baron issued a compelling statement, and I will read part of it:

“It's worth recalling what kind of system we're dealing with. Jason was arrested without charges. He was imprisoned in Iran's worst prison. He was placed in isolation for many months and denied medical care he needed. His case was assigned to a judge internationally notorious for human rights violations. He could not select the lawyer of his choosing. He was given only an hour and a half to meet with a law-

yer approved by the court. No evidence has ever been produced by prosecutors or the court to support these absurd charges. The trial date was only disclosed to Jason's lawyer last week. And now, unsurprisingly but unforgivably, it turns out the trial will be closed.”

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow ourselves to lose sight of these facts. Faced with this, those making the case that Iran will be transparent with the international community on inspections that will be part of any nuclear deal seem to be thinking about the Iran they want, not the one in actuality, the one that is brutalizing Americans.

Nuclear deal or not, these Americans deserve to be back with their families today.

I urge all Members to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of H. Res. 233, I rise to encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution urging Iran to release all American citizens currently being illegally held in that country. This resolution also urges the immediate release of information about any other American citizens who have disappeared within Iran's borders. Iranian President Hassan Rouhani has stated publicly that his government wishes to engage in a constructive interaction with the world. This resolution challenges President Rouhani to back up his words with action. If the Iranian people want to earn the trust of the American people, they must honor their commitments and keep their word. Americans Amir Hekmati, Saeed Abedini, Jason Rezaian and Robert Levinson have been unjustly held against their will in Iran for years. This resolution urges Iran to do the right thing and release them so that they can come home and rejoin their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 233.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1705

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

FLORESVILLE VETERANS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 891) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the “Floresville Veterans Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 891

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FLORESVILLE VETERANS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, shall be known and designated as the “Floresville Veterans Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Floresville Veterans Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 891, introduced by Representative HENRY CUELLAR.

H.R. 891 designates the post office located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the Floresville Veterans Post Office Building.

This excellent bill honors the men and women of Floresville, Texas, who served our country. We are grateful for their service and for the service of all of our veterans and their sacrifices in the service to our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting H.R. 891, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as

the Floresville Veterans Post Office Building.

This legislation commemorates the sacrifices made by the servicemen and -women of Floresville, Texas. Whether they served abroad or at home, our military men and women have courageously given their time and energy to defend the many freedoms we Americans hold so dear. Recognizing the loyalty and bravery of our veterans by naming this post office in their honor is the least we can do.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill that would recognize the honorable service and countless sacrifices made by our veterans and their families. I urge the passage of H.R. 891, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Delegate PLASKETT for yielding the time to me, and thank you so much also to the majority manager for speaking in favor of this bill. And certainly I also want to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their leadership and support, along with the committee members, for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 891, which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service, located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the Floresville Veterans Post Office Building.

Floresville is the county seat of Wilson County, Texas, which has 4,636 veterans currently residing there. Just across the street from this postal facility is the Frank M. Tejeda Texas State Veterans Home, which currently houses about 154 of our American veterans. It is fitting that we provide this acknowledgement to our Floresville veterans directly across the street from where many of them live now.

There are many stories from veterans all across Wilson County that have served, but I want to highlight a few of those from Floresville. Let me start first with Frank Villarreal, who is a veteran who served in Vietnam with the U.S. Navy Seawolves helicopter squadron, which provided support for the Navy SEALs. Mr. Villarreal has received 15 awards for his service, including the Distinguished Flying Cross, the National Defense Service Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal with two Bronze Stars, the Vietnam Campaign Medal, the Gallantry Cross with Palm and Frame, the Civil Action Color with Palm and Frame, and the Combat Aircrewman Insignia.

To highlight a couple of other gentlemen also, Pedro Devora and Rufino Gonzales both served on the same ship in World War II, on the USS *Sangamon*. They survived a kamikaze attack on

their vessel, and they went home to live long lives in Floresville.

Additionally, I want to also say that Mr. Devora and Mr. Gonzales obtained the medals they earned during their service that they recently just got from the Department of the Navy. For Mr. Devora, these medals are the World War II Victory Medal, the American Campaign Medal, the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon, the Combat Action Ribbon, the Honorable Service Lapel Pin, and the Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal with the Bronze Star also.

For Mr. Gonzales, these medals include the World War II Victory Medal, the American Campaign Medal, the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon, the Combat Action Ribbon, along with the Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal along with the Bronze Star also.

Again, those are only just a few examples of the men and women from Wilson County—in particular, from Floresville—that have served. So I want to acknowledge the sacrifice of those veterans along with the veterans from my 28th Congressional District, individuals who served and put their country ahead of self and for whom I am recognizing with the renaming of the Floresville postal facility service.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank also the work of The American Legion Post 38 in Floresville and the VFW Post 8555 in Wilson County for the work that they have done in supporting our local veterans. The VFW Post 8555 in Wilson County has done a great job, and I want to thank them.

So, Mr. Speaker, and to our ranking member and our ranking delegate, I just want to say thank you so much.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 891.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERGEANT FIRST CLASS DANIEL M. FERGUSON POST OFFICE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1326) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the “Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1326

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SERGEANT FIRST CLASS DANIEL M. FERGUSON POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, shall be known and designated as the “Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1326, introduced by Representative DENNIS ROSS. H.R. 1326 would designate the post office located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting H.R. 1326, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office.

Born and raised in Mulberry, Florida, Daniel Ferguson was a standout athlete at Mulberry High School, where he lettered in five sports, including baseball, football, and track. After joining the Army in 1993, Daniel dedicated the rest of his life to the service of our country. Over the next 20 years, Daniel completed tours in Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan. Following his final deployment, Sergeant First Class Ferguson was stationed as an Army transportation supervisor at Fort Hood, Texas, beginning in March 2013.

On April 2, 2014, Sergeant First Class Ferguson made the ultimate sacrifice. Sergeant First Class Ferguson witnessed a shooting rampage break out on base, and seeing the shooter approaching the room where he and his colleagues gathered, held himself

against an unlocked door and used his body as a shield. Tragically, Sergeant First Class Ferguson lost his life that day, but through his courage and selflessness, many of his colleagues survived. Sergeant First Class Ferguson is remembered by his fiancée, fellow soldier Kristen Haley, and all those who knew him for his loyalty, bravery, and heroism. He was awarded the Bronze Star and a Meritorious Service Medal, among others, for his military service.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to commemorate the ultimate sacrifice made by Sergeant First Class Daniel Ferguson, and to honor his devoted service to the protection of our country abroad, as well as his fellow soldiers at home.

I urge the passage of H.R. 1326, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from North Carolina and my colleague from the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 1326, to dedicate the post office located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, after Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson.

The tragic events of April 2, 2014, when a shooter killed three of his fellow servicemembers at Fort Hood, Texas, shook our military community and our Nation.

However, some may not remember a story of heroism that came out of that horrific event. Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson, who was stationed at Fort Hood along with his fiancée, sacrificed his life to save his fellow soldiers. A veteran of Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan, Sergeant First Class Ferguson bravely wedged himself against a set of unlocked doors to block the attacker's advance. Without his heroic actions, those present that day have said there would have been many more casualties and fatalities.

Sergeant First Class Ferguson succumbed to the wounds he sustained during this act of violence, leaving behind many heartbroken loved ones but also very many grateful soldiers. Without hesitation, Sergeant First Class Ferguson gave his own life to protect the lives of his fellow men and women in uniform.

Sergeant First Class Ferguson was a tremendous soldier and a graduate of Mulberry High School who gave the ultimate sacrifice for the love of his country.

That is why, in honor of his courageous sacrifice, I am proud to introduce this bill and proud to ask my colleagues to recognize such an honorable American.

For Sergeant First Class Ferguson, his family, and the residents of Mulberry, Florida, I ask that my col-

leagues join me in supporting such a worthy cause.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1326.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HERMAN BADILLO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1350) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1350

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. HERMAN BADILLO POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1350, introduced by Representative JOSÉ E. SERRANO.

H.R. 1350 designates the post office located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the Herman Badillo Post Office Building.

Mr. Badillo was a United States Congressman who represented the South Bronx. He was born in Puerto Rico and has the distinction of being the first United States Congressman of Puerto Rican heritage.

Throughout his life, Mr. Badillo overcame hardship and adversity. After being orphaned at a young age, he moved to the United States when he was 11. From there, he went on to achieve great things.

Mr. Badillo graduated with honors from City College in 1951 and, shortly thereafter, graduated from Brooklyn Law School, where he was valedictorian of his class. In addition to the first Puerto Rican-born Congressman, he was the first Puerto Rican-born city commissioner and Bronx Borough president.

I agree with my colleague Representative SERRANO's assessment of Mr. Badillo: he truly is a testament to the American Dream.

Herman Badillo passed away on December 3, 2014. Naming a postal facility for Mr. Badillo in the community that he served will honor him as the great public servant he was.

I urge Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a Virgin Islander living next door to Puerto Rico and as a former assistant district attorney in Bronx County, where Mr. Badillo lived, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues in supporting H.R. 1350, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the Herman Badillo Post Office Building.

Born in Caguas, Puerto Rico, on August 21, 1929, Mr. Badillo went on to become America's first Puerto Rican-born Congressman and a prominent figure in New York City politics. The only son of Francisco and Carmen Rivera Badillo, he suffered the loss of both his parents by his fifth birthday. He was taken in by relatives, and at the age of 11, without knowing English, moved to East Harlem, New York. He learned English and excelled in school, working his way through college and law school as a dishwasher, bowling pinsetter, and accountant. After graduating with high honors from City College in 1951, Herman went on to become valedictorian of his Brooklyn Law School class in 1954.

Herman Badillo practiced law in New York and won election as Bronx Borough president in 1965. He ran for Congress and won in 1970. While Mr. Badillo was considered a Democrat during his 7 years in this Chamber, he did not view himself as bound by party loyalties. Mr. Badillo served this Chamber with honor and distinction for 7 years before resigning his seat in 1977 to serve the people of New York as deputy mayor to New York Mayor Ed Koch.

Mr. Badillo continued to serve the city of New York and remained involved in education reform until he died at age 85 on December 3, 2014. He is survived by his wife, Gail, and his son, David.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill to honor Herman Badillo's lifetime of service and dedication to the city of New York and to this country.

I urge the passage of H.R. 1350, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. PLASKETT for the time, and thank both Mr. WALKER and Ms. PLASKETT for that wonderful presentation of the life of one of my predecessors, Herman Badillo. And so rather than get into the details that have already been mentioned, let me just tell you personally what it means to me, what he meant to me, and what this loss of his passing means to all of us.

Herman came along at a time when Puerto Ricans in New York were seen as good, hard-working people, but some people were not crazy about the idea of us being in public office or in government, and he showed the way. Having been valedictorian at law school, he came and he immediately got involved in local politics. It is said that by the age of 18, he was already running for local office in East Harlem.

He became the first Bronx Borough president. That is equivalent to a county executive of Puerto Rican background. Then he ran for Congress, being the first voting Member of Congress. Let me just explain that for a second. There has been a Member of Congress from Puerto Rico since 1998, but none, to this day, has had full voting rights. He was the first one of Puerto Rican background with full voting rights in 1970.

He left this place that he loved so much to become deputy mayor because he felt that he could make a difference in New York, and he served under the administration of Ed Koch. During the time he was here, he helped to found the Congressional Hispanic Caucus; he helped with issues of education and housing, and just economic development for our community.

But for those of us who were starting out, he stood as a giant. He stood as this tall man, which he was, who was totally bilingual, who could speak well, who could think well, who was so calm yet so aggressive, and he inspired all of us. I know that on the House floor we don't mention political campaigns, but it can be said that when I first ran in 1974 for the State assembly, he was at my side. And that was part of who he was.

He encouraged young people from the community, from all walks of life, to

get involved in politics. I remember he always used to tell me, Make sure the same thing everywhere you go. Don't play to that audience and then play to that audience, because, first of all, that is wrong and, secondly, you will get caught up in making a mistake or telling a lie. So make sure you say what you feel from the heart, even if it upsets people.

Now in New York, it is very fashionable, although it takes hard work, for Latinos of all different groups to be members of the city council and the State assembly and the State Senate and, yes, the Congress. But when Herman came along, that wasn't the case. He opened up those doors, and he inspired all of us to become who we are today. I could not be a Member of Congress now had he not shown the way that people like us could, in fact, be a Member of Congress.

Part of most of the district I represent used to be in his district, so this was a great loss to us. By naming a post office, we can at least always have his name vivid and that respect vivid for this person who came from Puerto Rico and, as was said, who lost both his parents before the age of 5; who came to New York with an aunt not speaking English hardly at all, and yet who excelled in school and became this figure who was nationally known.

So, Herman, we thank you for who you were. We thank you for your leadership. But most of all, we thank you for putting our community on the political map.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1350.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

SERGEANT FIRST CLASS WILLIAM B. WOODS, JR. POST OFFICE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 728) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 728

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SERGEANT FIRST CLASS WILLIAM B. WOODS, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 728, introduced by Representative BLAINE LUETKEMEYER. H.R. 728 designates the post office located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office.

Sergeant First Class Woods was a Special Forces senior medical sergeant and native of Hermann, Missouri. After graduation from Northwest High School in Cedar Hill, Missouri, he enlisted with the United States Marine Corps as a rifleman in 1996. Sergeant First Class Woods later enlisted in the United States Army, and in 2003, he attended the Special Forces qualifications course. Sergeant First Class Woods earned the distinguished green beret and was deployed to Afghanistan in July 2009 in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

He gave his life for his country about a month later. On August 16, 2009, in a hospital in Germany, Sergeant First Class Woods died from wounds he sustained while conducting a mounted patrol in Ghazni province, Afghanistan, 2 days before.

Sergeant First Class Woods will be remembered not only for his personal accomplishments, graduating from many of the Army's elite schools and earning numerous medals, but also as the example of courage and sacrifice. I urge Members to support this bill to name a post office in honor of this brave young soldier.

I would like to add that Congressman LUETKEMEYER was, unfortunately, unable to make it this evening for the consideration of his bill, so I will submit for the RECORD a statement from the Congressman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting H.R. 728, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office.

Born in Hermann, Missouri, William Woods, Jr., studied photography at Montana State University. Following in the footsteps of a long line of military men in his family, William enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in 1996.

There, he served as a scout sniper until joining the U.S. Army Special Forces as a senior medical sergeant in 2003. He was assigned to B Company, 2nd Battalion, 20th Special Forces Group and was stationed in Glen Arm, Maryland.

Tragically, while serving as a doctor in Ghazni province, Afghanistan, Sergeant First Class Woods, Jr., was shot and killed while on patrol on August 16, 2009.

Sergeant First Class Woods, Jr., is survived by his wife, Elizabeth, and two daughters, Lily and Ella. He is remembered as an adventurous outdoorsman, as well as a dedicated family man, loyal husband, and loving father. Sergeant First Class Woods, Jr., received a number of awards, including the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart, for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill to honor the valiant service and sacrifices of Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr., and of his family. I urge the passage of H.R. 728.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, H.R. 728, which would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office."

SFC Woods was a decorated constituent of the Third district of Missouri who dedicated his life to protecting our country. After graduation from Northwest High School in Cedar Hill, Missouri, he first enlisted with the United States Marine Corps in 1996 as a rifleman, and later enlisted in the United States Army where he attended the Special Forces Qualification Course in 2003 and earned the Green Beret. While in the U.S. Army, SFC Woods was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 20th Special Forces Group (Airborne) and deployed to Afghanistan in 2009 during Operation Enduring Freedom.

On August 16, 2009, SFC Woods died in Germany from wounds sustained while conducting a mounted patrol in the Ghazni Province, Afghanistan on August 14, 2009. He is

survived by his loving wife, Elizabeth, and two daughters.

SFC Woods' many awards and decorations include the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart Medal, Combat Infantryman Badge, Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, National Defense Medal, and Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, among many others.

I am honored to name this post office after SFC Woods. His dedication and sacrifices for our country should not go unnoticed, and it is the least I can do to honor such a courageous soldier.

I want to thank the entire Missouri Delegation for coming together to cosponsor this legislation, and Chairman CHAFFETZ for promptly considering this legislation in the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. It would be an honor to name the Cedar Hill post office in my district after this courageous soldier, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 728.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REED) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 233, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2559, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

URGING IRAN TO RELEASE ALL DETAINED UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION REGARDING UNITED STATES CITIZENS THAT HAVE DISAPPEARED WITHIN ITS BORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 233) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Iran should immediately release the three United States citizens that it holds, as well as provide all known information on any United States citizens that have disappeared within its borders, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 364]

YEAS—391

Abraham	Clark (MA)	Fincher
Adams	Clawson (FL)	Fitzpatrick
Aderholt	Clay	Fleischmann
Aguilar	Cleaver	Fleming
Allen	Coffman	Flores
Amash	Cohen	Forbes
Amodei	Cole	Fortenberry
Ashford	Collins (GA)	Foster
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Fox
Barr	Comstock	Frankel (FL)
Bass	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Beatty	Connolly	Frelinghuysen
Becerra	Cook	Gabbard
Benishek	Cooper	Gallego
Bera	Costa	Garamendi
Beyer	Costello (PA)	Garrett
Bilirakis	Courtney	Gibson
Bishop (GA)	Cramer	Gohmert
Bishop (MI)	Crawford	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gosar
Black	Crowley	Gowdy
Blackburn	Cuellar	Graham
Blumenauer	Culberson	Granger
Bonamici	Cummings	Graves (GA)
Boustany	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (LA)
Boyle, Brendan	Davis (CA)	Graves (MO)
F.	DeFazio	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Green, Gene
Brady (TX)	Delaney	Grijalva
Brat	DeLauro	Grothman
Bridenstine	DelBene	Guinta
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Guthrie
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Hahn
Brown (FL)	DeSantis	Hanna
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Hardy
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Harper
Buck	Deutch	Harris
Bucshon	Diaz-Balart	Hartzer
Burgess	Dingell	Hastings
Butterfield	Doggett	Heck (NV)
Calvert	Donovan	Heck (WA)
Capps	Doyle, Michael	Hensarling
Capuano	F.	Herrera Beutler
Cárdenas	Duffy	Hice, Jody B.
Carney	Duncan (SC)	Hill
Carson (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Himes
Carter (GA)	Ellison	Holding
Carter (TX)	Ellmers (NC)	Honda
Cartwright	Emmer (MN)	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Engel	Hudson
Castro (TX)	Eshoo	Huelskamp
Chabot	Esty	Huffman
Chaffetz	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Chu, Judy	Farr	Hultgren
Ciilline	Fattah	Hunter

Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows

Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarelli
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford

NOT VOTING—42

Babin
Barton
Blum
Bost
Bustos
Byrne
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Conyers
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Dold
Duckworth
Edwards

Fudge
Gibbs
Grayson
Griffith
Gutiérrez
Higgins
Hinojosa
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kind
King (NY)
Lipinski
Luetkemeyer
Meeks

Barbano
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

□ 1858

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 364, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PFC MILTON A. LEE MEDAL OF HONOR MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2559) to designate the “PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway” in the State of Texas, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

YEAS—389

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguiar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Carney
Carson (IN)

Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch

Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows

Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarelli
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell

Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—44

Barton
Blum
Bost
Bustos
Byrne
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn

Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Dold
Duckworth
Edwards
Fudge
Gibbs

Grayson
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Higgins
Hinojosa
Kelly (IL)

Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)	Stutzman
Kind	Quigley	Tipton
King (NY)	Ribble	Walters, Mimi
Larsen (WA)	Rokita	Wilson (SC)
Lipinski	Roskam	Wittman
Luetkemeyer	Rush	
McHenry	Sanchez, Loretta	
Meeks	Schakowsky	
Moore	Sewell (AL)	

□ 1906

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the votes on H. Res. 233 and H.R. 2559, I was inescapably detained and away handling important matters related to my District and the State of Alabama. If I had been present I would have voted "yes" on both of the aforementioned bills.

REPORT ON H.R. 2772, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Ms. GRANGER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-154) on the bill (H.R. 2772) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

CONGRATULATIONS TO EDEN PRAIRIE GIRLS LACROSSE

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Eden Prairie High School Girls Lacrosse Team for clinching the Minnesota State Championship. Winning the title was no easy task for the Eagles as it took back-to-back overtime wins in both the semifinals and finals before they were crowned champions.

In the finals, it even took a second overtime before junior Kelly Wolfe tossed in the winning goal with just over a minute left to deliver the title to Eden Prairie.

Mr. Speaker, in order to compete at a high enough level to win a State championship, these student athletes devote countless hours honing their athletic skills, while still excelling in the classroom and juggling family and social responsibilities. The parents, the families, friends, and fans and the entire

Eden Prairie community is very proud of these high school athletes.

Once again, congratulations to the Eden Prairie Girls Lacrosse Team on a job well done.

CONGRATULATING THE NESHANNOCK HIGH LANCERS AND KNOCH HIGH KNIGHTS PENNSYLVANIA STATE CHAMPION BASEBALL TEAMS

(Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to congratulate not one, but two Pennsylvania State champion baseball teams from the Third Congressional District. The Neshannock High Lancers and Knoch High Knights capped off historic seasons last week to take home the PIAA Class AA and AAA baseball championships.

It was the Lancers' second baseball State title in school history and the first State title in any sport for the Knoch Knights.

It takes a lot of special people and a lot of hard work to mold a champion, so I offer a sincere thank you to the players, to their families, and to Lancer Coach Mike Kirkwood and Knight Coach George Bradley for not bringing just a championship to your communities, but just as importantly, the pride that comes with it.

Last week, your baseball teams earned a special place in the long and storied history of western Pennsylvania student athletics. Because of it, I am very proud to say: Go Lancers, and go Knights.

RECIPIENTS OF THE ANNUAL YELLOW DOG AWARD

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Susan Gibson Perry and Sherri Huston Schulze, both recipients of the annual Yellow Dog Award.

This award, presented by the Penn Brad Oil Museum in Custer City, Pennsylvania, honors Susan and Sherri's leadership and dedication in preserving the history of the Bradford Oil Field.

The Bradford Oil Field was the world's first billion-dollar oilfield, and today, the Penn Brad Oil Museum preserves the philosophy and spirit of the historic oil community.

Mr. Speaker, Susan and Sherri have strong ties to the oil industry, each dating back five generations. Susan recalls learning about the oil industry from her father and uncle. In 1995, she began work with the Penn Brad Oil Museum and eventually served as its president from 2003 to 2014.

Sherri originally came to the museum for research purposes, but began working at the museum in 2000 and spent 10 years serving the museum in various roles.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to congratulate these two outstanding women, and I thank them for their years of dedicated service and contributions to the Pennsylvania oil industry and the Bradford community.

WE NEED TO SAVE RIVERSIDE HOSPITAL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, before leaving my district, I had the great excitement of presiding over or introducing a new medical center to the Acres Homes community and to the community of Houston, the UMC Center, organized by committed and dedicated doctors. This facility is formerly the Doctor's Hospital Tidwell in historic Acres Homes community.

The real value and significance are two things. One, Americans need access to good health care. With the Affordable Care Act, we have been able to sizably bring down the 25 percent of Texans who are uninsured. We have been able to expand with community health clinics.

For those States who have accepted the expanded Medicaid, which includes Ohio under Governor Kasich, a former Member of this body, and, as well, the State of Kentucky, they have seen a sizable dent in those who are uninsured.

I want to thank those doctors working with me and working with the Texas Department of State Health Services, the U.S. Department of Health, recognizing that an inner-city hospital, a hospital dealing with those aged populations and children and young families, is valuable to save. We need to save Riverside Hospital.

I want to congratulate those doctors, and we will work together to be able to provide good health care for all of the community.

□ 1915

CONGRATULATING THE CLASS OF 2015

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, over the last few weeks, many families have proudly watched their sons and daughters receive their high school diplomas at ceremonies across North Carolina. On Saturday, I cheered as my grandson Kenan walked across that stage and graduated from Watauga High School.

These new graduates have been blessed with some wonderful teachers.

They have learned a great deal—lessons in math, science, history, and literature—but they have also learned lessons in self-discipline, compassion, patience, and understanding.

This learning didn't all take place in the classroom. Much of it was learned at home with their families, out with their friends, on the football field, during summer jobs, and even in brief interactions with unexpected people.

The choices ahead of them are many, and the road to success will have its detours, but they can be anything they want to be by meeting every challenge with integrity and determination.

The class of 2015, set your goals and find your dreams. Congratulations.

MAGNA CARTA'S 800TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, today, we celebrate the 800th anniversary of the Magna Carta, a document with principles that served as a cornerstone in our Nation's founding as the Republic of the United States of America.

Eight hundred years ago to the day, following the unyielding and commendable efforts of rebel barons who would no longer accept the arbitrary abuses under a tyrannical monarchy, King John placed his seal on this Latin text, subjecting every person, whether he be king or peasant, to the rule of law. It was this exact premise on which the document based its lasting legacy, to be a nation of laws rather than a nation of men.

This idea is just as important today as it was 800 years ago. It can be no better represented than in the protections guaranteed under the Fifth Amendment of our Constitution, stating that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

I rise today to honor 800 years of Magna Carta and to show my appreciation for all those who have made the tremendous sacrifice to defend the founding principles derived from the ideas of liberty and justice.

MAY GOD BLESS THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE ARMED SERVICES

(Mr. CHAFFETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the hope that we will, as a nation, pause and thank the men and women who have served in our armed services.

Every day, men and women who wake up and serve their Nation do so at the risk of their own lives. They leave behind loved ones and families and brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers and kids.

They serve, who knows where? When they enter the service, they don't know where they are going to serve, but they know that they love the United States of America, and they are willing to put their lives on the line. That has happened throughout generations of time. Millions of people have answered that call to serve.

The least we can do as a nation is be grateful and give pause, give prayer, and give thanks to these men and women who will serve us in the future and who have served us in the past. May God bless them, and may God bless the United States of America.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, the House faces yet another deadline at the end of this month to reauthorize an agency that levels the playing field for American manufacturers, reduces the deficit, and has supported 1.3 million jobs since 2009. That agency is the Export-Import Bank.

In my district alone, Ex-Im has supported a total export of more than \$2.4 billion, and more than half of the companies that work with them are local small businesses. From New York Apple Sales to Imperial Pools, businesses in New York's capital region and across the Nation have benefited greatly from the work of the Export-Import Bank, and there is absolutely no reason it should fall victim to the same culture of politics and brinksmanship that has cloaked this body for the past few years.

There are 1,053 business organizations, including the United States Chamber of Commerce and the Capital Region Chambers of Commerce, that have urged Republican House leadership to renew Ex-Im.

A majority of this House, including 180 of my Democratic colleagues who have signed the discharge petition to reauthorize the Bank, have expressed support to renew Ex-Im.

All we need now is a vote. Our small businesses, our workers, and our taxpayers deserve it. Let's make it happen.

NO PERSON IS ABOVE THE LAW

(Mr. YOUNG of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in search of an answer to a very simple question.

Assistant Secretary Sarah Saldana, the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, appeared before the House Appropriations Home-

land Security Subcommittee on April 15. I serve on the subcommittee, and I questioned the Assistant Secretary about President Obama's comments he made in February of this year.

The President said: "If somebody is working for ICE and there is a policy and they don't follow the policy, there are going to be consequences to it." He was commenting on ICE agents' following his directives and guidelines.

I used this opportunity to tell the Assistant Secretary that, if I had office policies that were contrary to the law, I would understand if my employees did not want to follow them. "I would expect them to follow the law first," I said.

Director Saldana interrupted me to say: "That is where you and I probably have a fundamental disagreement."

America was founded on the principle that no person is above the law. I take that very seriously. The culture problems at ICE run very deep, but I think they start at the top.

My colleagues and I decided this was unacceptable and that we needed to investigate her statement and philosophy further, so we followed up with a letter to Assistant Secretary Saldana on May 15, asking for clarification.

I should note we asked for a response by June 5; yet, 31 days since the request and 10 days since the deadline, we have not seen a response from the Assistant Secretary. This should be deeply troubling to all in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a copy of this letter for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2015.

SARAH R. SALDANA,
Assistant Secretary, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Washington, DC.

DEAR ASSISTANT SECRETARY SALDANA: We write to request additional information and clarification regarding your recent testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security. We are greatly troubled by this administration's directives attempting to supersede immigration enforcement protocols laid out in federal law. Just as troubling is President Obama's assertion that Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents who do not follow his directives will be held "answerable to the head of the Department of Homeland Security," and "there will be consequences to it."

When questioned during the hearing about your actions to implement the President's policies, you stated that you have a "fundamental disagreement" that ICE agents should follow federal law if a superior has instructed them not to. We want to be clear: your agency is not above the law, and you and your employees are expected to uphold the laws of this country, as you have sworn to.

We have heard reports of agents who face retribution or threats for following the law. ICE agents are diligently working to enforce the laws of this nation. They should not be worried about facing disciplinary action for faithfully executing their duty.

We write today seeking specific answers to these questions on ICE's actions to implement these policies.

(1) We would like to know the legal rationale your agency has used to justify holding executive memos as superior to the plain language of federal statute and how that allows you to punish agents who are following the law.

(2) We also request that you provide us with the protocols agents have been instructed to follow dealing with the President's directives and current guidelines on the disciplinary actions that agents face for not following them.

(3) To date, has ICE taken any adverse action against any career employee for not following the President's policy and what are the details of that action?

(4) Lastly, if these executive actions are ultimately found to be illegal through the current litigation challenging them and struck down by a federal court, how will punished agents receive restitution in full from ICE?

You are responsible for making sure these agents are equipped with the resources they need to do this, not threaten them with punishment for it. We ask that you respond to these questions by June 5th.

Sincerely,

DAVID YOUNG,
Member of Congress.

JOHN CULBERSON,
Member of Congress.

CHUCK FLEISCHMANN,
Member of Congress.

JOHN CARTER,
Member of Congress.

DR. ANDY HARRIS,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS: THE MISSING BLACK MALE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the members of the Congressional Black Caucus who are joining me here tonight.

The topic of tonight's discussion is: the missing Black male. Tonight, as a caucus, we will address the issues affecting Black males, including incarceration, health, the increasing suicide rate among Black youth, and the missing Black male in our society.

It was recently reported by The New York Times that 1.5 million African American men are missing. What do we mean when we say 1.5 million Black men are missing? As we speak, hundreds of thousands of Black men are sitting in prisons throughout this Nation. Others have died from homicide—the leading cause of death for young Black men—and from diseases that disproportionately impact African American males.

Then there are others, like Freddie Gray, Michael Brown, Tamir Rice, and Eric Garner, who are no longer with us because of excessive force by police which has cut their lives short.

It is clear that our law enforcement system and criminal justice system aren't working for African Americans and other minorities. It is also clear that we need a new approach into other areas, including reducing health disparities among African American men and boys. Tonight, we will diagnose the problems behind America's 1.5 million missing African American men and help identify solutions to this national problem.

While African Americans make up 14 percent of the U.S. population, they comprise 38 percent of those in the U.S. prison population and 60 percent of those in solitary confinement. In 2010, African American men were six times as likely as White men to be incarcerated in Federal, State, and local jails.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that is plaguing the African American community, as we see a disproportionate number of African American men who are incarcerated in this Nation. We are trying to figure out why they make up 14 percent of the population and 60 percent of those incarcerated. It just doesn't add up.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, who has allowed me to anchor this hour.

It is my honor to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. First, let me begin by thanking the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership and for his willingness to lead this hour, not only tonight, but for agreeing to do it throughout this year. I thank the gentleman so very much for his leadership and for all that he does not only for the people of the State of New Jersey, but for America.

Mr. Speaker, statistic: for every 100 African American women, there are only 83 African American men. This gap equals 1.5 million Black men who are essentially missing from everyday life in America. These numbers are simply staggering. The fact that Black men have long been more likely to be locked up and more likely to die is a problem.

Compounded with the deep disparities that continue to impact the opportunities afforded to African American males, the gender gap leaves, as reported, many households without enough men to be fathers and husbands within the community.

The statistics show that most African Americans live in places with a significant shortage of African American men while most Whites live in places with rough parity between White men and White women. The two leading causes of this gap are incarceration

and early deaths, with homicide being the leading cause of death for young African American males; but Black males also die from heart disease, respiratory disease, and accidents more often than other demographic groups, including African American women.

This gender gap does not exist in childhood as there are roughly as many African American boys as there are African American girls; yet, as they grow up, an imbalance begins to appear during their teenage years, and it persists through adulthood.

We now see an increasing number of suicides—yes, suicides—by young African American males while the rate for White children has declined. While any increase is problematic, we have to wonder: What is happening? What is happening with our African American youth that has led to this staggering increase?

The CBC is committed to reducing the school to prison pipeline so that our kids aren't unfairly profiled and placed in the criminal justice system. We are committed to ensuring funding for summer jobs programs and job training programs so that our youth have opportunities to develop their skills instead of having idle time during the summer months.

The CBC is committed to increasing resources for families and increasing family engagement. We must support programs and initiatives that will help us provide opportunities for young African American men.

Again, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for gracing us with his comments and for demonstrating true leadership in the Congressional Black Caucus.

Next, we have a distinguished member of this caucus. She hails from Houston, Texas, and has always been on the right side of these issues and has brought light to them.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the manager of this hour, Mr. PAYNE, and all of my colleagues and my chairman, who has just spoken and who set the tone very eloquently and with deep conviction.

In his having served on the supreme court for the State of North Carolina, Mr. BUTTERFIELD understands the issues of justice, and I applaud him for taking this cause up as well. The gentlewoman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Louisiana, let me thank them as well for the words that they will say.

Let me also say that this is a team and that we will work as a team on our respective committees to be able to bring this issue to a productive solution.

□ 1930

I have always said—as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for a

number of years now, serving on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations—that we must breathe life into change, and as legislators we must come to a point where we bring legislation for final signature by the President of the United States of America. So I thank Mr. PAYNE for giving us this opportunity.

Let me rush quickly through my remarks because one could be here for a very long time. As I do so, let me take note that this is the 150th year commemoration of the 13th Amendment; that is the freeing of individuals from slavery. It is the 150th year also of the commemoration of Juneteenth, and that is, of course, a regional holiday that the Nation celebrates, which is the acknowledgment that the slaves were freed pursuant to the Emancipation Proclamation issued in 1863. Texans, who will celebrate this on June 19th, and many others travel throughout the Nation Juneteenth. I say that because it is a question of freedom. When we have the ability, Mr. PAYNE, to save lives, that is a question of freedom.

I want to thank The New York Times for writing about this research. I want to hold this up. “Rise in Suicide By Black Children Surprises Researchers.” Researchers did not come predisposed to get this answer, but they got this answer. The opening sentence says: “The suicide rate among Black children has nearly doubled since the early 1990s.” They did not expect this to come forward, but it contributes to the story in The New York Times: about 1.5 million men are missing. In New York almost 120,000 Black men between ages 25 and 54, missing from everyday life; Chicago, 45,000; and more than 30,000 are missing in Philadelphia. Across the South, from North Charleston, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and up into Ferguson, hundreds of thousands more are missing.

African American men have long been more likely to be locked up, more likely to die young. A city with at least 10,000 Black residents that has the single largest population of missing men? Ferguson, Missouri, where a fatal police shooting catapulted this question to the national attention.

Incarceration and early deaths are overwhelming. Of the 1.5 million missing men from 25 to 54, which demographers call the prime-age years, higher imprisonment rates account for almost 600,000. Let me say that again: higher imprisonment rates account for 600,000. Almost 1 in 12 Black men in this age group are behind bars, compared with 1 in 60 non-Black men in the same age group.

Whenever we talk about the shootings in South Carolina, Ohio, Ferguson, I hear people saying, what about Black-on-Black crime? As if we, as African Americans, run away from facts.

We do not. But we recognize that the fight to preserve lives in the African American community is societal and holistic. It deals with education and job opportunities and health care and mental health care, and it calls upon the Nation to respond. But it does not put aside what we have faced over the years by killings of Black men, even from the time of slavery and Reconstruction into the 1900s, all through the time of segregation. We found that they were in the eye of the storm.

So let's not distract or detour from the crisis of incarceration and the crisis of what happens in the African American community in the justice system by suggesting that any of us are ignoring Black-on-Black crime. I am glad that the Congressional Black Caucus wants to look at the holistic issue of how do you solve this problem. It does not take the attacking of the Black community, of ignoring the fact that crime is perpetrated there. I think everyone knows that perpetrating crime impacts your neighbors, impacts where you live, just as it does in incidents dealing with White crime or White-on-White crime or Hispanic or Asian. People usually engage with those who are familiar.

So I am looking to work with this very august body to talk about how we can stop the tide of suicide and the incarceration of our young people. Let me cite these examples as I come to a close. Let me just give you the example of Kelvin Mikhail Smallwood-Jones, who was a dean's list student with a 4.0 grade point average on a full academic scholarship to one of the most respected historically Black colleges in the country. Prior to enrolling in Atlanta's Morehouse College in the fall of 2006, he was a football star and homecoming king at his Washington, D.C.-area high school. An English sophomore, he dabbled in photography, mentoring at-risk youth in his free time. Last winter he was planning an elaborate birthday celebration, and he was preparing to accept a prestigious summer internship. He never made it to either. On February 23, 2008, less than 2 weeks before his 20th birthday, Kelvin shot himself in the head with his mother's gun on the deck of a suburban Atlanta farmhouse that she bought to live closer to him.

This very statement is hurting, is hurting the family, but it means that we must collectively come together to address the question of the pain, of the disparate treatment, the disparate treatment in education, and to get to the source of Mr. Smallwood-Jones' pain so that we can, in fact, find a solution.

On the criminal justice—and I realize that criminal justice is not the answer to all, but it is a side parallel effort that we must correct in order to give dignity to those who may have detoured but yet do not need to be con-

demned for life. I intend to introduce a number of legislative initiatives besides those which are ongoing, as we are discussing the mandatory minimums, to focus on the criminal justice side of dealing with juveniles: an effective speedy trial, bail reform, and a solitary confinement safeguards for juveniles act. Most people don't realize that when these young men are incarcerated, rather than giving them an opportunity, rather than promoting the PROMISE Act of our colleague, Mr. SCOTT, and giving alternatives to incarceration, but more importantly to people's lives, we throw them in jail. Many of us know the tragic story of the 16-year-old who was in solitary confinement for 3 years, was ultimately released, and committed suicide.

So we look forward to our colleagues joining in this legislation, an effective, speedy trial, bail reform, and solitary confinement safeguards for juveniles act of 2015, to alter the holding of juveniles so that they come out whole and ready to be rehabilitated and to be welcomed into society. The Nonviolent Offenders Act, which will diminish the amount of time that African American men serve in a Federal prison system that does not have parole. And then we want to introduce the RAISE Act to establish a better path for young offenders to ensure that there is a way for judges, even though juveniles are treated differently, to give an alternative assessment in giving them or sentencing them when they run afoul of the law.

Mind you, they are in juvenile court for status offenses, for truancy and others. This young man was incarcerated for taking a knapsack, and he insisted he did not take it. That is why he was still there. He did not take it, but he couldn't get to trial. How horrible a life, 3 years of solitary confinement.

So, Mr. PAYNE, let me thank you for leading forward on this august day and time, this year of commemorating the 150th year of the 13th Amendment, when we were declared free, meaning the ancestors' African American slaves. It should be a telling moment that this is also the 50th year of the commemoration of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. This should be the year that we restore the voting rights to individuals who have detoured. We should restore section 5. We should preach freedom. We should encourage those who want to advocate for fixing the criminal justice system, which can incarcerate and enslave and as well deny freedom.

This is a time that we can join together in the Congressional Black Caucus and free people in the right way and put them on a pathway of contributing to this great country. They are worthy, and they have the talent, the stardom to contribute. I look forward

to working with all of you for that journey and for those results.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus in this Special Order to speak to the issues that Members of the 114th Congress must address.

I thank my colleagues Congressman DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr. and Congresswoman ROBIN L. KELLY for leading this evening's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order on "The Missing Black Male".

We are in a time where the news of young black men being incarcerated and losing their lives is all too common.

As highlighted in a recent NY Times article, 1.5 million black men are missing from everyday life, as a result of incarceration or early death.

In New York, almost 120,000 black men between the ages of 25 and 54 are missing from everyday life. In Chicago, 45,000 are, and more than 30,000 are missing in Philadelphia. Across the South—from North Charleston, S.C., through Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi and up into Ferguson, Mo.—hundreds of thousands more are missing.

African-American men have long been more likely to be locked up and more likely to die young, but the scale of the combined toll is jolting.

It is a measure of the deep disparities that continue to afflict black men—disparities being debated after a recent spate of killings by the police—and the gender gap is itself a further cause of social ills, leaving many communities without enough men to be fathers and husbands.

And what is the city with at least 10,000 black residents that has the single largest proportion of missing black men? Ferguson, Mo., where a fatal police shooting last year led to nationwide protests and a Justice Department investigation that found widespread discrimination against black residents.

It is critical that we look to training that will lead to cohesive policing in areas of minority concentrations.

We need to focus on improving relationships between law enforcement and communities most impacted by cases of police brutality and incarceration.

Incarceration and early deaths are the overwhelming drivers of the gap.

Of the 1.5 million missing black men from 25 to 54—which demographers call the prime-age years—higher imprisonment rates account for almost 600,000.

Almost 1 in 12 black men in this age group are behind bars, compared with 1 in 60 nonblack men in the age group, 1 in 200 black women and 1 in 500 nonblack women.

Higher mortality is the other main cause.

Homicide, the leading cause of death for young African-American men, plays a large role, and they also die from heart disease, respiratory disease and accidents more often than other demographic groups, including black women.

We also are seeing a shocking and troubling increase in suicide rates amongst our young black youth.

Also noted by the NY Times, the suicide rate among black children has nearly doubled since the early 1990s.

Between 1993 and 1997 suicide was the 14th cause of death among black children.

Between 2008 and 2012, suicide was the 9th leading cause of death among black children.

In 2005, when suicide was the 3rd leading cause of death among African-American youth—1621 of the 1,992 suicides completed by African-Americans were black boys (371 of 1,992 were female).

Thus, looking specifically to our young black men with this growing trend of suicide rates, we must highlight the fact that black males are six times more likely to commit suicide than their female counterparts.

Increase in Black male suicides is not surprising considering the "unique social and environmental stressors, including racism," they have to deal with.

Interestingly, just 4 percent of the nation's psychiatrists, 3 percent of the psychologists and 7 percent of social worker are black.

The mental health profession needs to become more culturally sensitive to the needs of our black youth and get out the message that it's OK to get help and be vulnerable.

Noticeably, girls get depressed and gravitate toward friends, family, church or other social institutions while through social conditioning.

Yet, black males are taught to tough it out, stand strong, to get a grip, and ultimately isolate when mental anguish becomes visible.

As we saw with the recent and tragic case of Kalief Browder in New York—his plight was ignored and overlooked for far too long.

Continued statistics and reports documenting the death and disappearance of our young black males is unacceptable and must be addressed.

We know that the disappearance of these men has far-reaching implications.

We know there is a correlation between the mass incarceration and the destruction of the black home.

The absence of black men disrupts family formation and foundation building for our young people.

This in turn results in vulnerable feelings of little or no self-value or self-worth and lacking direction or foresight on ways to overcome dangerous ways of thinking and living.

We need to give special attention to families and communities affected by incarceration and mental health problems—as we know many of our young black men are afflicted with abuse, trauma and unresolved stigmas of mental and emotional health.

It is time to acknowledge the cracks in our foundation and treat our young with the attention they deserve.

We can no longer ignore gaping deficits that exist for our young black males—namely, in education, health care, mental health services, and general opportunities for growth and success.

This special order is an opportunity to highlight and raise awareness to the stark and tragic reality of young black males in America.

Now is the time to change the course and save their lives.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Houston, who always brings clarity to these issues and is a great contributor to the conscience of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman brings up a lot of good points in reference to incarceration and speaking about the young 16-year-old boy who spent that much time in solitary confinement and comes out and ends up committing suicide.

What we have found in this country, as they have broken down the mental health institutions over the years, that what we are doing in this country is warehousing people who have mental health issues in prisons, and it is a way to warehouse and get the problem out of the way so we don't see it, but a lot of people who are in prison these days have mental health issues and should be dealt with from that perspective as opposed to incarceration.

It is my honor and privilege to ask my colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN, who is known in New Jersey for her work around criminal justice in the State legislature and has joined us this year in the 114th Congress, for her remarks with respect to tonight's topic.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding and giving me the opportunity to lend my voice to what I think is a crisis that we are experiencing.

As my colleagues before me have pointed out, particularly Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, we are in the midst of an American crisis, shaking the very foundation of the Black community. The word crisis should motivate us to act now. Crisis describes a need for immediate action. Crisis calls for an immediate infusion of resources. Crisis requires a meeting of minds to find answers.

If thousands of people disappeared in the prime of their lives, their friends, their families, their coworkers having no idea where they went, we would be calling that a crisis. Yet, for years, our young, Black men have disappeared from their homes, their communities, and everything that would have been their lives.

Violence has taken them. Violence that we could have avoided with stronger schools to give youth the outlet that they need. Better jobs and job training to prepare these men to be supporters of strong families. Prisons have taken these men, prisons that we support through a legal system that dehumanizes men of color and enforces policies that all but ensure these men will enter an endless cycle of recidivism where more than 67 percent of them will come back into the communities with no preparation, no assistance whatsoever in becoming whole and healthy in their communities.

This is a nation that is quick to see these Black men as a problem, and this is a nation that seems to continue to ignore and deceive the slow, steady disappearance of 1.5 million Black men. This is devastating to our families and to our whole communities. It is past

time that we see this for the crisis that it is and invest the resources and intellectual power that will end it and save our men and our families and our communities.

There is a very witty African American comic who refers to the crisis of Black men and the need to get them on the endangered species list, because when we recognize that a species is endangered, we place value on that species. We place resources in every opportunity to ensure that they continue, that they thrive, and that they live in the habitats that are healthy for them.

Well, this is a situation of an endangered species. This is, indeed, a crisis. So I thank my colleagues for drawing attention to this issue.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to thank my colleague from the Garden State of New Jersey. She has come to the Congress and hit the ground running. As great a legislator as she was in New Jersey, she is doing a magnificent job here in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we have touched on many different topics, many different issues, and it is just really a difficult circumstance that these individuals face, you know; tremendous barriers to reentering society and pursuing education and gainful employment.

When these men are incarcerated, their children suffer, too. Nearly 2 million children grow up in homes where one parent is in jail. Of course, lowering the incarceration rates means we need to reevaluate the war on drugs. One out of every three African American men will be incarcerated at some point in their lives. Most of these arrests are drug related. According to the National Urban League, mandatory minimums and disparities in crack cocaine sentencing incarcerates countless African Americans for an inhumane length of time, and that made the U.S. the world leader in prison population.

□ 1945

Now, is that something that this country wants to be known for? This has created a modern-day caste system in America. The incarceration rate for African Americans convicted of drug offenses is 10 times greater than that of White Americans, even though Americans engage in drug offenses at higher rates.

We need to focus on rehabilitating drug users instead of incarcerating them and making it nearly impossible to reenter society.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to introduce the hero from last week's game between the Republicans and the Democrats where he pitched a magnificent game. Once again, we were victorious. I don't believe that we have lost since he has arrived in Congress. It is the honorable gentleman from New Orleans, the honorable CEDRIC RICHMOND, also known as "The Franchise."

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for hosting our hour tonight, Congressman DONALD PAYNE, who, like the old adage, is "a chip off the old block." His father was an outstanding Congressman from the district who did a lot for Africa, did a lot for urban cities. I see that Congressman PAYNE, although in his second term, has taken up the banner and is following in his father's footsteps quite adequately.

Tonight we are talking about the missing Black male. The good news and the bad news is that I found him, and we know where they are. They are incarcerated in prisons, they are in cemeteries, and they are in unemployment lines.

We know where they are not. They are not in the homes, and they are not providing leadership and mentoring to our young African American male children.

The question tonight, I think, why we are here and why we are talking about it is, if you can't talk about the problem and you can't identify it, then you will never get to a solution.

I come from an area and I was raised by parents who always told me that you can achieve anything you want to achieve. They gave me the nurturing and the support and the push up when I needed it, and they gave me the swift kick in the rump when I needed that, also. That is where we are.

I had prepared remarks, and I will defer to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) on how he wants to go. But I think there are things that we can learn, and I think there are things that we should focus on when we talk about the schools, the prison pipeline, when we talk about youth summer employment.

You know, it is amazing that we never, ever talk about it, but some of the kids in some of our neighborhoods should get the Congressional Gold Medal just for showing up at school every day, because what they go through when they get home from school and all night until it is time to come to school again are conditions that we shouldn't have children living in. The good news is that we can overcome all of that by doing criminal justice reform and providing another chance for kids and for parents who are incarcerated.

I had a juvenile court judge a long time ago write an essay and tell me a story about the fact that there are so many parents that are in jail, but the children are doing the time. And we have to make sure that children are not paying for the sins of their parents. That is where society will come in, and that is why I thank the gentleman. And I have more stuff, and it is just you would like to go forward, Mr. Congressman.

Well, I think it is worthwhile to probably go into a little bit of my story, which is a little bit different from your story. And I think it is important for kids around the country and some of our colleagues to know it.

My mother is from the poorest place in America. She had 15 brothers and sisters. My grandmother was a housekeeper. So the family pulled together to take care of the 15 children.

My mother finished high school, and she went to college at Southern University. My father, on the other hand—my grandfather owned a funeral home, owned a farm, and was very well-to-do. My mother went to Southern University, sharing a jacket with her sister. My father went to Southern University with a brand-new deuce-and-a-quarter car because my grandfather didn't want him walking around his college campus with a bad heart.

They meet. They get married. They have two boys, and I am the youngest. My father dies when I was 7 years old of a heart attack while I was home. And I don't say that to say I grew up without a father figure and times were hard, because I missed my father and I missed out on the love and the nurturing, but I had a mother who was there every step of the way as a public schoolteacher. Then I had a grandfather and two grandmothers who stepped in to also give me guidance.

But one of the biggest factors in me developing into what I am today is the fact that I lived across the street from a public playground that was well funded. So my mother, who was the teacher, and my grandfather and grandmother who lived in Mississippi, and my other grandmother who lived in Lake Providence, the message was the same: Go home from school; do your homework; and then go across the street to the playground so that you could participate in organized sports.

That became very, very important because those men that coached me were role models. They didn't know it, and I didn't know it. But I can remember them saying: CEDRIC, you are too talented. You need to be a little more serious. You need to get focused.

They would do the same thing my parents would do, which was give me a push when I needed it and give me a swift kick in the butt when I needed it. And they led me to do and push myself to achieve things that I never thought I could achieve.

But we don't have that anymore. We have decimated the funding for after-school programs. We have decimated the funding for recreation in our urban cities. We have decimated the funding for public schools and the athletics and the extracurricular activities that go along with them.

I am not sure about your life, Congressman PAYNE, but those activities expose kids to things they never thought that they would ever, ever realize. Exposure is very, very good when

a mind is developing. I don't know if you had those same experiences when you were growing up.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, Mr. RICHMOND, let me just say, and we have discussed it in private before, that I am the product of a very blessed circumstance in my life. My mother died when I was 4, and my father raised us, my sister and me.

All the things you talk about benefiting from, I have benefited from. But I have never lost the sight and was taught: There but for the grace of God go I.

So I have had circumstances in my life where I have been stopped by the police and have been told by that officer using the N word that if I did not find my license, they would throw me so far under the jail they would never find me.

Well, I was able to find my license after that and showed it to the police officer, and lo and behold, I become a human being again. Because, you see, my father was a councilman in that town. But prior to me showing my identification, there was the potential of someone never seeing me again because a police officer decided that that should be my fate. So now this police officer becomes nurturing and is parental and he is asking me: Well, don't you know you could get hurt by doing that?

I had made a U-turn somewhere as a youngster I shouldn't have. But does my life have to end because I made a U-turn that I am thrown so far under the jail they will never find me until I become a human being because my father is a councilman in that city and now there is a concern for my well-being? No.

What about the 1.5 million Black males that don't have that recognition that we have? That is why I do what I do every day, to make sure that in this Nation, the greatest country in the world, every man is playing by the rules, doing what he is supposed to do, has that equal opportunity, and the men that need that kick in the rump or that extra push get that.

So my story is a little different, although it sounds the same.

My father lost his mother at a very early age. He was 8. And the family got together to buy a house, some aunts and uncles and the grandparents, so they could bring my father and his siblings in so they wouldn't get bounced around anymore like they were. And I truly believe that is the reason my father never gave my sister and me up because of what he went through as a child and his experiences.

So we have been very fortunate; and your articulation of your experience and us understanding that we have an obligation, being as fortunate as we have been and to have this bully pulpit, it is our obligation to speak out against the injustices that these 1.5 million missing Black men face every single day.

Mr. RICHMOND. Well, Congressman, I would tell you, except that, you know, I won't go into any incident that I have had with law enforcement. Let's just stipulate and agree that there have been many, and each one has made me a better person, some of which were warranted and some of which were unwarranted.

I will say we have raised an interesting question. And your last comment, I think, when you described your story with your parents, I think, shows how separate all of these issues are, but then how whole they are at the same time.

Because one of the things that many people don't talk about—and I wish our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we could stop talking at one another and talk to one another—is that the issue of parental lead is so important because, as a bus driver once told our leader, every day she sees a parent coming to put their kid on the bus with tears in their eyes because they know that that child is sick and they should be home with that child, but they absolutely cannot lose a day's pay because they won't be able to feed that kid or pay the rent or pay to keep the lights on at the end of the month. Those are very real circumstances.

You have to believe that as America, as the United States of America, as the greatest country on Earth, the exceptional country that we are, we are better than that. We are better than making a parent put that kid on the school-bus going to school sick because they can't afford to lose a day's work.

Let me just give you these statistics in Louisiana, because I don't want people to get the impression that it is just urban or it is just single-parent families. The Jesuit community at Loyola University in Louisiana did a study. One out of three two-parent households in Louisiana is economically insecure. Four out of five single-parent households, that is 80 percent of the single-parent households in Louisiana, are economically insecure. We have to do better than that.

Raising the minimum wage raises 14 million people out of poverty the day the President would sign the law. Those things are important.

What do those things have to do with the African American male? Well, the young African American male has parents. Too often, it is just a single mother raising that family. And we have to make sure that they have the means and ability to make sure that that kid can eat every day, because you absolutely cannot learn in school if you are hungry or if you have had a night where you are sleeping in a car or you don't have heat and all of those things. I think, as a Congress, we ought to come together and look at those very specific issues.

Mr. PAYNE. You know, the gentleman is absolutely correct. It re-

minds me of another story of some of those households where the circumstances are unfathomable.

My sister is a kindergarten teacher of 25 years. I don't know if she would like me telling the length of time, but she had a child in one of her classes several years ago, and the child would sleep all through class. You know, once or twice, she let it go, but it became a persistent pattern.

□ 2000

She calls the parents and finds out that the reason that the child slept in school was it was the only safe place to sleep because, in the evening, the rodents that came out of the walls would bite them at night, and they would stay up most of the night trying to keep this circumstance off of them. When the child got to school, it was the only place that they could rest.

In this country, that is unacceptable, absolutely unacceptable. It is circumstances like that—now, how does that child get ahead? They are falling behind already, and this is kindergarten. The deck is stacked against a lot of these children when they show up to school.

Head Start and these programs have shown and demonstrated the upward mobility that they have given generations of children that need this type of service; yet our colleagues continue to thwart efforts to increase efforts we know that work—really, just kind of just dismiss that any of these social programs that have been instituted have any benefit.

That is not true. It is just not true. We need to continue to bring these stories up and explain to people why we fight every single day for these issues.

The whole issue, once again, around mental health issues, people walking the streets that need help and end up doing something that they are really unable to control and end up incarcerated—how does that help them? How does that help the circumstance in this country? Is it that we are just hiding the issue? We don't want to deal with it, so we just lock it up?

It is absolutely unconscionable, in this country, that we still act as if we are in the 1800s in this day and age.

Mr. RICHMOND. I am glad you brought up the monetary aspect of it because, look, Morehouse College, accounting major, I get numbers, and I get the concern that we have about the budget, the deficit and the national debt. The other thing that I know from my basic accounting classes is that we shouldn't talk about spending as the only criteria for how we judge things.

The conversation in D.C. should be about return on investment. Anything that gives us greater than a 1 to 1 return, then we can use whatever is greater than 1 to pay down the debt and the deficit and get us to a more balanced country.

Let me give you an exact example. You used Head Start, early childhood education. You get a 9 to 1 return on every dollar that you spend. Now, I am not chairman of Ways and Means; I am not over the Budget Committee; I am not on Appropriations, but in my simple household, when I was young, I knew that \$9 was greater than \$1, and that if you spend \$1 and you could get \$9 back, you could do great things with that extra \$9, like spend \$4 of it on reducing the debt, spend another \$5 on other programs that would give kids the opportunity to reach their full development, to also reduce crime, which means not only do you have less people incarcerated, but you have less victims of crime.

When we start evaluating the programs that we are talking about, that is what we need to focus on.

In Louisiana, when I was in the legislature, we paid around \$9,000 a year to our public schools to educate each kid, and we were spending about \$45,000 a year to incarcerate a juvenile. Now, in my public school education, that \$45,000 is far greater than that \$9,000, and it just doesn't make sense.

As we talk about the \$6 billion that we spend on incarcerating juveniles in this country—any given day, we have 70,000 juveniles that are in jail—\$6 billion. We could spend that money in better places to do better things to make the country safer and to help them reach their potential.

That is why I am glad that we are having this conversation tonight because it is about not just complaining about the problem, but identifying it and figuring out a way to solve it. I think that both sides could come together to try to solve this problem because, hey, victims of crime are victims of crime, and we should do everything we can to reduce that number.

Also, we need to get back to what I thought and still do think makes this country the greatest country on Earth, is the fact that we care and we love our neighbors and we want to see them do well. If we really want to see them do well, then let's invest in those things. Let's put our money where our mouth is, and let's do the things that we know we can do.

If anybody is interested in really having that conversation, I know that both of us and the entire Black Caucus, we are willing to engage in that conversation. It is not all about spending money, but it is about spending it where you get a return and helping families be a family unit to nurture and push kids to achieve everything they can and give them that swift kick in the butt when they need it to achieve that also.

I just want to thank you, Congressman, for allowing me to participate in this Special Order Hour tonight to talk about an amazing—well, not an amazing problem, but an incredible problem

that this country faces and the fact that we have the leadership to help solve that problem.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the adage, "Education is the only sure way for many children to escape poverty."

CREATING OPPORTUNITY FOR OUR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS

Invest in our economy and infrastructure, 21st century manufacturing, job training, and raise the minimum wage.

More investments in summer jobs, summer recreation, and summer community service.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORMS TO HELP GIVE OUR YOUNG MEN A SECOND CHANCE AFTER MISTAKES MADE

Better training for our police forces on cultural sensitivity and proper respect for our communities.

End the school to prison pipeline—pass my bill (see separate section).

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY LEGISLATION

To help ensure a strong, coordinated effort to give schools the tools they need to be schools instead of "pipelines to prison," and do more to build habits that will lead to success in the future, I have introduced the Student Disciplinary Fairness Act of 2015 and the Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act of 2015.

Juveniles that have been incarcerated are much more likely to become criminals later in life and much less likely to achieve economic success but providing employment opportunity increases the likelihood of favorable outcomes.

All of us who care about building strong, prosperous communities must do everything we can to ensure that involving our youth in the criminal justice system is used as a last resort, not as a routine first response.

We must make smart investments in our youth so that they can be present and visible in society and the 21st century economy.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his remarks, and I appreciate him being involved in tonight's Special Order.

I am not surprised that he would be here on such an important topic. He has demonstrated numerous times his commitment to young people and their aspirations and motivating them to do the right thing and be successful, as he has been.

One thing that comes to my mind, Mr. Speaker, is as we talk about this issue, what is it that we find these 1.5 million men missing? They are human beings. They are Americans. What is the difference about these 1.5 million men, that they are African American? Does it go back in our history of 300 years? Does it have something to do with us, as a race?

I just wonder, sometimes, what is the difference; but I won't go there.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank the members of the Congressional Black Caucus here tonight for sharing their profound insights and observations. Your participation was greatly appreciated.

Every Monday night in this House, we have a remarkable opportunity to speak about the important work of the

CBC to advance full equality and justice for African Americans in all communities in this Nation.

One of the most significant challenges our communities face is that of "the missing black male." Once again, to quote *The New York Times*: "More than one out of every six black men who today should be between 25 and 54 years old have disappeared from daily life."

Many of these men are incarcerated. Others have died from homicide and from disease that disproportionately affects African American males. The consequences of these missing men are severe, not just for the men themselves, but for their families and for the entire society.

Strong communities lay the foundation to strong societies, but when our criminal justice system emphasizes incarceration over rehabilitation, we make it increasingly difficult for those individuals to become productive members of society. We need a system that holds criminals accountable, while focusing on rehabilitation of nonviolent criminals.

If we are truly to make our communities more secure, we also need to address health disparities among African American men. Health disparities are a burden to African American communities. African American men suffer from a number of disease, including colorectal cancer, at higher rates than their White counterparts.

Part of the problem has to do with stigmas, and this is an area which I have been working hard to address in my capacity as co-chair of the Congressional Men's Health Caucus.

Along those lines, we need to eliminate the stigmas around mental health and make sure that those suffering from mental illness have the resources they need. No one struggling with mental illness should feel isolated and that they have nowhere to turn. It is clear that we are not doing enough, as a society, to get them the help they need.

We should not be seeing an uptick in the number of African American boys dying from suicide, that dreaded suicide rate. For these young boys and for others, we need to listen, and we need to encourage them not to be afraid to seek help.

The problem of "the missing black male" is not going to be resolved overnight, but closing the gap is a goal we all need to aspire to for ourselves, for our community, and for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding as we continue our conversation about the challenges facing black males today.

As Chairwoman of the CBC Health Braintrust, I want to discuss the health challenges and health outcomes for black men.

There are a wide range of dangers and health threats that disproportionately affect

black men. Some of these, we've known about for decades, and can be mitigated with the right treatments. While others are emerging issues that require more research, more debate, and more innovation. The end result is that black men have the lowest life expectancy, highest death rate, and have some of the worst health outcomes across demographics.

Black men suffer disproportionately from chronic illnesses, such as cancer and heart disease. In fact, according to the Centers for Disease Control and prevention, heart disease and cancer are the two leading causes of death for African American men.

Heart disease is the number one killer for all American men. But today, African American men remain disproportionately at risk for heart disease. 42.6 percent of black men suffer from high blood pressure, compared to 33.4 percent of white men. And nearly 44 percent of African American men suffer from some form of cardiovascular disease that can lead to strokes and heart attacks.

As for cancer, black men are more than twice as likely to die from prostate cancer as white men and have a higher incidence and death rate from colorectal cancer.

A study published this April in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* found that African Americans were 58 percent more likely than white people to develop prostate cancer. The same study also found that obese black men had a 103 percent increased prostate cancer risk compared to obese white men.

Obesity has also been connected with heart disease and other chronic illnesses. And today almost 40 percent of African American men are obese, 69 percent are obese or overweight.

These are serious issues that pose serious health dangers to black men. We may not know exactly why black men are so much more at risk for these ailments. But we DO know what we can do to reduce the health risks and take action to prevent disease.

That's why as we celebrate National Men's Health Week this week, I want to encourage all men to take action—exercise, eat right, and get a check up. As Chairwoman of the CBC Health Braintrust, I'll be pushing the conversation forward and working to pass legislation to fund more research and promote health education so that all Americans can continue living healthy lives.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to discuss two issues that are plaguing the next generation of black Americans. These being issues related to violence—gun violence and suicide.

Starting with gun violence. In underserved communities around America, children are growing up in fear. Kids are playing tag indoors, instead of out on their front lawn. Mothers worry about their child walking home from school.

Gun violence in America disproportionately affects African Americans and more specifically African American males. Today, 50 percent of all deaths for black males aged 15–24 are homicides, usually involving a gun. And this year, we are on track for gun violence to become the leading cause of death for young black males.

In the first six months of this year, the Red-eye Chicago, a local publication, tracked 157

gun related homicides in the city. Nearly 130 of them involved black males. This isn't an isolated problem. An analysis of the FBI's national database of supplementary homicide reports revealed that across the country 17,422 black males ages 13 to 30 have been killed by firearms since 2008.

It's time we change this. Through common-sense legislation, we can ensure that fear of gun violence is no longer the status quo in our communities. That's one of the reasons I released the Kelly Report on Gun Violence last summer. This was the first comprehensive Congressional report on the gun violence problem in America, and included effective policy strategies to reduce gun violence in America. I ask that my colleagues consider some of the ideas in that report online.

And continuing to speak of violence, I want to bring attention to the alarming increase in suicide among young black boys.

In 1982, the *New York Times* wrote an article entitled, "Why Are Blacks Less Suicide Prone than Whites?" I stand here now asking "Why are black boys becoming more suicide prone?"

According to a recently published study in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, while the overall suicide rate has remained stagnant over the past 20 years, tragically the suicide rate among black boys as young as ten years old has nearly doubled. Almost 20 percent of these suicides are attributed to gun-related wounds.

This shocking and tragic issue is receiving very little attention in our national media and it's being overlooked in our national discussion on mental health. Just last month, our colleague, Congressman EMANUEL CLEAVER wrote President Barack Obama calling for a task force to examine this issue. In his letter, Congressman CLEAVER noted that this was the first time that any national survey found a higher suicide rate for blacks than for individuals of other ethnicities.

Whether you're black, white, Latino, or a veteran, Congress can do more to take necessary health care measures to address suicides. This Congress must work to end the horrific epidemic that is preventing young black boys from growing up and reaching their full potential.

THE PEOPLE'S NIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, tonight is a night about accountability, about

taking responsibility. Many of my colleagues that will speak here tonight were sent by districts of people who wanted to hold this government accountable in both the fiscal and social arenas.

I think back today, though it was unplanned, on June 15, 1775, 240 years ago this very day, George Washington accepted the position as commander in chief of the Continental Army.

Washington was serving in the Second Continental Congress as a delegate from Virginia when his peers voted unanimously to hand him the reins of the entire Revolutionary Army.

About 100 paces from where I am standing, on the back of these Chambers, standing in the Capitol's rotunda is the history of how America was birthed into existence. It is displayed through the most glorious artwork.

Of all those paintings in the rotunda, I am most intrigued by John Trumbull's work on Washington submitting his resignation in 1783, after completing his assignment, through struggles and severe setbacks, more than 8 years after accepting the position.

Now, while some of these paintings depict those of conquests or discoveries, this particular work captures the great character of Washington. You see, Congress had granted Washington the powers equivalent to a dictator; yet the humility and the wisdom of Washington understood that, for a republic to survive, it must be held accountable by the people.

His resignation that day stated this:

I resign with satisfaction the appointment I accepted with diffidence or a lack of self-confidence in my own abilities to accomplish so arduous a task which, however was superceded by a confidence in the rectitude of our cause, the support of the supreme power of the Union, and the patronage of Heaven.

You see, Washington had resolved that a citizen-ruled government, though different than others in the past, had a chance to do something, to be something, something exceptional. Two hundred and forty years ago today, Washington laid the cornerstone of freedom through accountability to the people with a unique blessing from the divine power of Heaven.

□ 2015

That is why we have assembled tonight, to talk about what Washington's vision was: a citizen-ruled government that would hold the Federal Government and this administration accountable.

Tonight I would like to introduce the chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, a committee that I am privileged to serve on, someone who has been a champion on government oversight.

I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I thank those who are with us tonight because this topic is one of, I think, the most important to our Nation. It certainly was key to the foundation of this Nation.

And the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) is right, because if you go back and you read that farewell address that Washington gave, it is one of the most inspirational pieces. He had the power. He had the position. He had the respect of the people. But he did probably the most admirable thing that we have seen in this Nation, in that he voluntarily gave it up because he knew that the power didn't reside in the President. He knew that the power didn't reside in him, as an individual. He understood that the power of this Nation stood with the people. And with that power comes a responsibility. It is a responsibility that all of us hold, as citizens of the United States of America. For it is truly a privilege and an honor to be a citizen in this country.

I hearken back a couple hundred years ago to those who blazed new trails and decided that this Nation was going to be an inspired nation, inspired by God, that we weren't bashful about recognizing that God played a role in our lives and that the power of prayer was an important part of our Nation.

But also incumbent upon that was that every man, woman, and child—every able-bodied person—do their part, that we all had accountability and responsibility not only to take care of ourselves but to also do what we can to help foster a greater community.

You see, this was a new idea. It wasn't that way across the world. There were dictators, and there were others that really wanted to rule and control people. But the inspiration that our Founders had in the foundation of our Nation was rooted in this idea that the people—the people—had the power.

Fast-forward now to those who serve—whether they serve in the armed services, whether they serve in the Federal Government or the State government or wherever they might serve, it should be a recognition that we serve the American people, that we serve them.

So as we look at all the issues that face us—whether we are going to spend money, whether we should pass this bill or not—let's remember a couple of things.

And I would mention this to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) because I know he knows this. And I know it. But I want my kids to know it.

As we look at things we do in Congress, as we look at the men and women who serve our Nation, most do it in a very admirable way. They are patriotic. They are hard-working. They care about this Nation. But we have some that don't really meet that

standard. And it is probably most fair, most humane, most decent that we hold people to a high standard.

One of the things I want my kids to understand about government, about life in general, is that when they talk about the government and they talk about the Federal Government, it is really interesting. We will have this happen in our committee from time to time. We will say, well, whose money is it? And they will say, well, it is the government's money.

No, it is not. It is the people's money.

You see, every time we decide to spend money in Congress, what we are really deciding is, should we pull money out of somebody's pocket—should we pull money out of your wallet, take it over here, and hand it to somebody else?

Now there are some worthwhile causes for doing that, right? There are some worthwhile things to do: the protection of our Nation, for our armed services. I buy that. I get that. But we are spending far too much money on too many things. We can't be all things to all people.

So going back to my original premise here, as I try to teach my own kids and try to remember myself, we have to be exceptionally responsible stewards of these assets and resources that aren't ours. They are an individual's.

For you see, at the heart of this, it is something that I think President Washington understood: that the most powerful thing upon our Nation is the power of the people, and it is their own self-determination that should rule the day. You limit their self-determination the more you regulate them and the more you pull that money directly out of their pockets and give it to somebody else.

Now, there is room for regulation. There is room for certain things in the public good. But I tell you, most of what happens, most of what goes on in Washington, it is far too much. It is excessive. And we have to remember at its core that accountability and responsibility for those of us who are fortunate enough to serve in a public role is imperative, but it is also imperative that each individual takes upon themselves their own accountability and their own responsibility.

As able-bodied men and women, children, you have got to pull your own weight. You have got to carry your own bucket. You have got to do what you have got to do not only to help yourself but to help your community, your friends, and loved ones as well.

And that is the heart of what I think the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) brings to this body. I know he cares about it passionately. It is what we are here talking about tonight. There are a host of examples where we are not holding people accountable, and we want to change that. I hope we are able to talk about that a

bit tonight. But for the moment, I would say to the gentleman, thank you for allowing me to participate.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Chairman CHAFFETZ. We are going to talk about some specific egregious behavior.

It wasn't long that I was here and serving with Chairman CHAFFETZ on the House Oversight Committee that we were requested to meet with the inspector general of the EPA. It was in that moment, only weeks after I had arrived, that here we have an inspector general, a gentleman appointed by the President, who had reached out to us in his tireless efforts to even so much as to get the EPA to respond. The arrogance that stems from that agency has been grossly misused and abused.

It is my privilege tonight to acknowledge one of my North Carolina colleagues to talk specifically more about the Environmental Protection Agency. With that, I yield to the gentleman from the Charlotte, North Carolina, area, Mr. HUDSON.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank you for your strong leadership here in Congress. Often a new Member of Congress comes to town and spends a little bit of time learning the ropes, maybe sitting in the back row observing, but that is not true of MARK WALKER. MARK WALKER has quickly become a leader in Congress and particularly on issues such as this.

Tonight is the people's night. Government accountability is the topic.

I thank the gentleman for bringing up the issue of the EPA. We had a hearing Friday in the Energy and Commerce Committee, on which I serve, in which we had the acting assistant administrator who oversees the Clean Air Act. We were looking at this new proposed rule that the EPA has put out having to do with ground-level ozone.

Now in 2008, the EPA issued a rule that brought the levels of ground-level ozone down to 75 parts per billion. Based on that number, many counties in North Carolina and across this country were out of attainment.

Everyone wants clean air. Everyone wants clean water. Even those of us who are concerned about jobs know that if you don't have clean air and clean water, you can't attract industry, and you can't have businesses grow in your community. But you have to look at the real science, and you have to look at the real numbers. And the truth is, since 1980, we have cut ground-level ozone levels 30 percent in this country. We have done a tremendous job, and that has been driven by industry.

This new rule was issued in 2008, but the instructions to States weren't issued until March of this year. So in March of this year, the EPA finally told the States how to comply with these new levels of 75 parts per billion. But now they have come out with a new rule that says, we are going to

drop that to 65 or maybe even 60. If that is the case, every county in North Carolina—except one county in western North Carolina—would be out of attainment.

So what does that mean? That means you can't have a road project. It means you can't build a new home. It means you can't add any jobs to any existing industry. It means you can't bring any new industry into the State. And they are doing this at a time when we haven't even implemented the old rule, when we have already cut ground-level ozone 30 percent.

So what I would say is, let's wait and look at the science. Let's look at the real health impacts. Let's see what the results of the current regulations are before we rush out with some new regulations which we are told could cost as much as 270,000 jobs in North Carolina. I have seen a figure of 1.3 million jobs in the country. Before we bring on this cost, before we threaten these jobs, before we basically shut down all growth and development, let's take a look at the actual science.

So this is just one example of one agency that is overreaching. We have got other examples. You have got the IRS using "the dog ate my homework" excuse to duck responsibility. We have also got the Department of Veterans Affairs failing to provide adequate care for our heroes.

When he established the VA, President Abraham Lincoln promised that our Nation would take care of our men and women in uniform and their families who have served and defended our country.

Mr. Speaker, it is an understatement to say that today, the VA is failing and falling extremely short of that promise that President Lincoln made. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines have endured traumatic experiences on the battlefield and should not have to continue to fight to receive proper care when they return home.

Make no mistake, there are many good and dedicated people at VA medical facilities across the country who do a tremendous job every day caring for our veterans. In fact, many of the folks working at VA facilities are veterans themselves. The problem is, the bureaucracy has gotten so massive and so out of control, the resources are wasted and the quality of care delivered to veterans has decreased.

This culture of unaccountability has led to long wait times, 10,000 disability claims still in backlog, and millions of our tax dollars wasted. Our veterans are being ignored and tragically, in some cases, left to die.

It was George Washington who has been talked about by my colleague. Mr. WALKER mentioned the anniversary of him resigning his commission. George Washington said: "The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how jus-

tified, shall be directly proportional to how they perceive how the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their Nation."

Mr. Speaker, I know we will continue our efforts to reshape the culture at the VA, but it is high time this administration takes responsibility and joins those of us who want to give veterans a choice.

Every veteran in this country should have the choice to go to any doctor of their choosing, and the VA should not have to preapprove it, and the VA should pay for that medical care. That is the proposal that I have talked about. I think that is the way that we could finally end these wait times, and we can break down these backlogs.

I call on the administration to work with us. It is time for the people to have accountability from their government. It is time for our veterans to have accountability from the VA. They put everything on the line for our country, for our freedom. It is time for us to do the same.

God bless our veterans and their families. It is time to get to work.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Representative HUDSON, for the passionate remarks regarding our veterans.

It is a shame, the abuse that we see sometimes of the veterans. But there has probably been no greater abuse than that of our own Internal Revenue system. With 75,000 pages, 8,000 pages that have been added under this administration, we can see why abuse and corruption exist.

What better person to speak on that than an economics professor. So I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT), a new Member of the Congress.

Mr. BRAT. Thank you, Mr. WALKER.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, more details emerged about the IRS' targeting of conservative groups, where the agency tried to extort information on donors, find out what Members talked about at their meetings and probe into what Members did in their very free time.

We learned this month that the IRS had set up yet another roadblock to prevent Congress and the American people from getting to the bottom of this scandal.

The IRS established a team of hundreds of lawyers to redact information from the documents Congress had requested for its investigations. This obstruction makes me extremely concerned for every American who voices political beliefs that don't agree with this administration's, whether they are conservative, liberal, green, religious, or agnostic.

I am grateful for the organization in my own district that exposed this scandal to the American people. The Richmond Tea Party was the first in the country to go public with the IRS' abuse. Once it was exposed, conserva-

active groups from all over the country came forward and revealed that they were victims of the same IRS tactics.

The IRS specifically targeted groups with "Tea Party" and "patriot" in their names because of their political positions. The IRS targeted them for increased scrutiny, and it delayed processing their applications for nonprofit status.

□ 2030

Let me go over that again just real slowly so the American people understand what is going on here.

The Tea Party group, the T stands for "taxed enough already." They are being targeted by the very government agency tasked with ensuring fairness in our tax revenue collections system. The irony could not be clearer. The groups were subjected to unprecedented and intimidating questioning. The IRS demanded resumes of board members, lists of all donors, and screen shots of blogs and social media posts to determine if their speech was acceptable to the Big Brother government. The agency asked some groups for minutes of every board meeting as well as lists of positions they took on certain issues.

On April 15, 2009, thousands of average Virginians showed up to the Richmond Tea Party's first rally in the pouring rain to stand together against government run amuck and President Obama's promise to fundamentally transform America. People became engaged—many for the first time. After word of IRS targeting broke, people stopped coming to meetings and stopped giving money for fear of being targeted themselves.

It has been 2 years since the Justice Department opened its investigation, and it has been 2 years of waiting as nothing ever seems to happen. The IRS has tried to cover its tracks at every turn. It lied to the public and to this Congress about its secret targeting program. To this day, document requests submitted by Congress remain unfulfilled. The IRS complained it had lost thousands of emails belonging to Lois Lerner. Since then, the inspector general recovered more than 6,000 of them. They were located where anyone would expect: in the IRS data backup facility.

Congress held Lois Lerner in contempt after she claimed she knew nothing about the targeting and refused to answer questions about it. Yet the Obama Justice Department—the Justice Department—has never prosecuted her. This all creates the frightening potential that we could foresee a repeat of this very same behavior in the future. We need this President and this administration to live up to their promise of transparency rather than their practice of obstruction.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress can put an end to this kind of mistreatment of

our citizens by passing a fair tax or a flat tax. Either tax system would treat citizens more equally and would take away the IRS' power to discriminate and investigate against Americans who hold beliefs contrary to those in power.

Ladies and gentlemen, the right to express your political views is so critical to the foundation of a free society that it is enshrined in our First Amendment—the First Amendment. Our very freedoms and the future of our constitutional form of government depend on the ability of all Americans to freely exercise that right. That is why it is incumbent upon this Congress to put forth every effort to protect that precious right and to hold those who would infringe upon it accountable to the fullest extent of the law.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Congressman BRAT. I appreciate your shedding light.

Mr. Speaker, this administration, from the very beginning, went a long way in promising transparency and accountability. In fact, it was President Obama himself who expressed: "My administration is committed to creating an unprecedented level of openness in government." In the same speech, President Obama went on to say: "Transparency promotes accountability and provides information for citizens about what their government is doing. Information maintained by the Federal Government is a national asset." President Obama said: "My administration will take appropriate action consistent with law and policy to disclose information rapidly in forms that the public can readily find and use." Well, that is what he said, but it has been the exact opposite for the Department of Justice.

Many of us have heard about Fast and Furious, and we may have time to get to it. What I want to talk about tonight is Operation Choke Point, and here to do that tonight is one of the strong conservatives in all of Congress, my colleague from South Carolina, Mr. MICK MULVANEY.

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. I thank him for doing this. I think it is wonderful that we are having a night designated as the people's night. You would think that we would do that just every day in here, but I think that more often than not we probably don't, so it is good to be here to talk about things that affect the people.

Some things that affect the people, Mr. Speaker, back where I live is Operation Choke Point. Where I live, people buy guns at gun shows. They use pawnshops. They might go to a payday lender every now and again. They might go and buy ammunition. Because of what has happened in Operation Choke Point the last year and a half or so, they are starting to lose the ability to do that.

I want to explain to people very briefly what Operation Choke Point is.

This is not some rightwing conspiracy. It is not some Internet myth. This has been acknowledged by the Department of Justice.

Several years ago, the DOJ, along with the FDIC, one of the banking regulators, set out to attack legal businesses, businesses that were perfectly legal and permitted under the law, but they were in disfavor with this administration. Instead of trying to drive those businesses out of business by using the law, this administration decided to use the regulatory environment. Instead of going directly after those businesses, this administration went after their banks and said:

Look, we know that this pawnshop is a legal business, and we know that you have done business with them for a long time, but we could really make your life difficult if you continue to bank this particular pawnshop. In fact, your life will be much easier if you didn't bank this pawnshop.

Time and again, Mr. Speaker, what we found was these small businesses—a woman-owned business in my district—losing their banking relationships. The banks that had 25-year relationships with them would come to them and say:

Look, we simply can't bank with you anymore. It is too difficult to do. There is too much pressure to stop.

I had a woman-owned business, a pawnshop in my district. She tried to expand the business so that the business was big enough to give to both of her sons. She was a single mother. She wanted to get the business big enough to where both boys could inherit part of the business. She went to her local bank where she had more than a 20-year relationship, and she was told that, no, that she was now too hot to handle. Not only could they not give her a loan to expand the business, they had to pull back on the services they already provided.

There is another business elsewhere in the State, a large financial concern, and a little tiny piece of what they do is payday lending. You can say what you want to about it, Mr. Speaker. You may not like payday lending. A lot of people don't. But people use it, and people need it.

I will never forget when I was in the State legislature, we had a hearing on payday lending. One of the witnesses that spoke before me in the senate was an employee of one of the local credit unions. I knew who she was. I walked up to her afterwards and said: You are here to talk in favor of payday lending?

She said: Yes.

I said: But you work for a credit union.

She said: Yes.

I said: Why are you here?

She said: Because everybody in town knows who I am. I am having a tough divorce, and I need a little bit of money. If I go to my local bank or I go to my credit union where I work, ev-

erybody is going to know about it. I don't want people to know about my business.

She needed that particular service. Folks need this service. It may not be the proudest thing we do as a nation, but people need it.

This company in Greenville, South Carolina, had a little, tiny piece of their business in payday, a 30-year banking relationship for all the rest of their businesses. The bank came over one day and said: Look, we are under a great deal of pressure. We are going to have to pull all our relationships with you.

Maybe 5, maybe 2½ percent of their business was payday, and now this large employer in my district is struggling to find financial services.

It is so offensive, Mr. Speaker, that a couple of months ago, the DOJ finally acknowledged that it was wrong, and they agreed to stop the program. The FDIC agreed to stop as well. All I can tell you is that while the letter went out saying it was stopped, we are still hearing stories to this day that it is still going on.

My dad told me about a year ago, I had been here 3 years at the time, and he started paying attention to politics after I got here. He said: Do you want to know the difference, MICK, between government today and government when I was your age?

I said: What is that, Dad?

He said: When I was your age, you might not like what the government did, you might not like the party that was in power, but it never even occurred to us to be afraid of the government. It never even occurred to us that we might be targeted for what we believe or what we think or what we do for a living. That is what is different now.

Mr. Speaker, people are afraid of their government. And if you are home tonight, you are watching this, and you run an ammunition store in Union, South Carolina, you are legitimately afraid that the government is going to try and come and put you out of business. That is a dramatic change, Mr. Speaker, and not a change for the better.

To that extent, a group of men and women come here tonight at the invitation of the good gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), come and just tell people that we think it is wrong, too, we have heard what they have had to say back home, and just deliver the message that they are not alone, that there are some men and women here in Washington who are just as outraged as they are, and they are dedicated to making sure that when our time here is done, they won't have to fear their government anymore.

So with that, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, again, for setting up this Special Order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about accountability, we think of great leaders here in the Congress, even people who have reached out as mentors. I can think of no one higher than that honor for my respect than the colleague, the part of our delegation from North Carolina, Mr. MARK MEADOWS, and with that, I yield to him.

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his leadership and truly for being willing to be the voice of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to really highlight what so many Americans have a hard time understanding, and that is why we as the American people can continue to allow a government to overreach its true authority and not be reined in, Mr. Speaker. So tonight I want to highlight just a few things.

Before I do that, I think it is important that we talk about the Federal workers here that work for the American people, the vast majority of which—I would say almost 99 percent of which—are dedicated public servants who each and every day give their utmost for their fellow man, truly, to serve this great country.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, I rise to really highlight some of those that give the rest of those great Federal workers a bad name. For many of us, they also give us a reason to pause and say: Wait just a minute. How can that happen in this great land?

So tonight I feel like it is important that we identify some of these workers who truly have displaced the trust of the American people. They have taken Federal tax dollars, they have continued to take a salary, and yet what we find is they did not uphold their constitutional duty to do what is right on behalf of the American people.

We know one example is with the EPA, the gentleman who worked to define the Clean Air Act. We found that, over time, he was not even showing up for work, that he would continue to be paid for years and years and years, that he was paid without showing up. Now, certainly his colleagues would have to know that there was an empty cubicle next to them, but yet, for over a decade, we have an EPA employee who pretended to be a CIA agent.

Now, when we start to look at this, here he was not showing up for work. He was traveling all over the world at taxpayers' expense. Indeed, what he was continuing to do is pretend like he was an employee of the Federal Government, but not showing up.

□ 2045

So my question is really more about accountability, Mr. Speaker. Where was the management team? Where was the accountability? We can understand one bad apple, but where was the management?

Well, let me tell you where they were. This particular EPA employee

decides that they are going to go and they are going to retire, and so all the management comes together. They give him a great retirement party. He retires and he says: But wait just a minute. You need to continue to pay me because I am still working for the CIA.

Now, the sad part about it is they continued to pay him for another 18 months. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't know about you, but that is just hard to believe. It is the thing that novels are made of, but yet this is not fictitious; it is the truth.

We have got other EPA employees that are there that are watching porn on their government computer over 6 hours a day for 4 years. Where is the oversight there?

And yet, when people are willing to blow the whistle and say, "This is not right with some of my colleagues," what do they meet with?

Well, we heard at a hearing just this last week that a whistleblower for the Department of Homeland Security in their EB-5 program was punished because she dared to speak up.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that the American people start to hold the management of Federal workers accountable because they are entrusted with that trust that needs to be carried out each and every day. And so tonight I am here to call out Mr. Mayorkas. Recently, an IG report identified Mr. Mayorkas as doing special favors for political operatives—allegedly, the Governor of Virginia; allegedly, the brother of our former Secretary of State.

What the American people will not stand for, Mr. Speaker, is a double standard. If political favors are going to be given out, the people who give them out should be held accountable. And I appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina, his leadership, because not only is this service on Oversight and Government Reform designed to make sure that we get to the truth of it, but he is unrelenting in his willingness to go after those who live by a double standard.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Congressman MEADOWS. I appreciate your words tonight.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of interest these days in the growing list of candidates that we have running for the 2016 Presidential election, and one of the things that drove me to make a decision in running for Congress to begin with was the great abuses that we have in some of the particular agencies.

Three years ago, none were more glaring than the State Department and the actions taken by then Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. To this day, I can't understand why she could look and even hug a family and tell them point-blank that this was about a

video. Nine days later, our President followed up with pretty much the same inaccurate jargon.

It is my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, Representative KEN BUCK, my friend, tonight, who is going to talk some about her work and her time. He is a great conservative from the State of Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my friend from North Carolina for putting this together and for yielding to me.

Many of us know that today marks an important anniversary in world history. Eight hundred years ago, following a populist revolution led by courageous English barons demanding the protections from executive overreach, England's King John signed into law a document known as the Magna Carta. This "Grand Charter" marked the first time that everyone, including kings, were subjected to the rule of law, that everyone would enjoy the benefits of due process and equal protection under the law.

The Magna Carta inspired our Founding Fathers to demand liberty in the Declaration of Independence. Many Magna Carta principles appeared again in the United States Constitution. This one single document became the basis of our Republic and established one of our greatest founding principles, the rule of law, and the rule of law remains as important as ever.

President Obama is working to fundamentally transform our laws without consent, granting citizenship to illegal immigrants, making recess appointments to the NLRB when the Senate is not in recess, and changing the healthcare law without an act of Congress.

The IRS ignored the rule of law by targeting and harassing individuals based on their political beliefs. And who could forget the ATF's Fast and Furious program, which allowed U.S. weapons to be walked across the U.S.-Mexico border in hopes of catching Mexican drug lords, but ended with the tragic murder of U.S. Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry.

It is time to prevent future would-be monarchs from being elected and further eroding our proud tradition for the rule of law. While the Clinton family has been known to play by their own set of rules and has a laundry list of scandals that goes back decades, I am squarely focused on two dubious, dishonest, and dangerous scandals that Hillary Clinton was involved in while serving as Secretary of State.

As the Nation's top diplomat, Secretary Clinton used her position of power to create her own set of rules, using a personal email account for official State Department business. She continued to do so even after issuing a memo calling on staff to use official government email accounts.

Secretary Clinton ignored the rule of law when she deleted over 30,000 State

Department emails from a personal server located in the basement of her Georgetown mansion. What makes this worse is that she deleted these emails even as Congress called for her to release them. Storing these emails on a private server violates Federal records law. Deleting these emails also raises questions not seen since the IRS targeting investigation. What is she hiding in these deleted emails? Did she even consider what might happen if these records fell into the wrong hands? Would she even know if her server had been breached?

Secretary Clinton proudly stated during a March 10 press conference: I fully complied with every rule I was governed by.

Americans will never know because she ignored the rule of law. By exclusively using a personal email account to conduct State Department business, Secretary Clinton put the State Department at a great risk just for her personal convenience. The Secretary of State is also not allowed to conduct and store official State Department business on a private, unsecured server. If any other hard-working American conducted their business this way, they would be out of a job and most likely in jail.

This brings me to the Clinton family's next scandal. While Hillary Clinton served as Secretary of State, the Clinton family foundation continued to accept millions of dollars in donations from foreign governments. All told, seven foreign nations, including Kuwait, Qatar, Oman, and Algeria, donated money to the Clinton Foundation during the time Hillary Clinton was Secretary of State.

These contributions raised questions about Secretary Clinton's independence and ethical judgment. But when some of the \$1 million donations in question came from nations like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, and Oman, it raises concerns about whether these nations were hoping to gain better diplomatic ties to the United States through sizable donations to the Clinton Foundation. When the Secretary of State is playing fast and loose with the rule of law, even ignoring a memorandum of understanding with the White House regarding a questionable donation from the Algerian Government, it is extremely difficult to trust her judgment or her word when she claims not to have broken any laws.

The rule of law has been a core principle since our founding. Brave men and women have fought and died to protect this idea and preserve the liberty we hold so dearly. This is why I find it especially tragic that Secretary Clinton blatantly ignored the rule of law.

The Magna Carta's anniversary is a great opportunity to remember the courageous barons who secured the

rule of law. We must restore this key principle and stop the attacks on our founding principles. It is our job to safeguard those liberties and protect the America we know and love for generations to come.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Congressman BUCK.

With that, it is my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JODY HICE, my colleague and a former fellow minister.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to be just astounded at the lack of accountability and transparency surrounding the scandal with the IRS as it relates to conservative groups and the targeting that the IRS had towards those groups.

It is absolutely unacceptable that we have waited now for over 2 years to get answers to this scandal and the targeting of conservative groups. Right at the epicenter of all of that is Lois Lerner. We requested emails some 2 years ago and only right now, 2 years later, some of these requests for emails are coming to light. These documents and communications requested should have been brought forth long ago. In fact, we are at the time now in this investigation, we are at the point now that I believe we need to seriously question the process by which Congress' requests for information from the IRS are being handled by the IRS.

One example, Mr. Speaker, in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, where I have the distinct honor of serving, it came to light in that committee that the IRS actually formed a special project team in order to deal with the Lois Lerner investigation.

According to testimony by Ms. Mary Howard, who is the Director of the Privacy, Governmental Liaison and Disclosure for the IRS, according to her testimony, all congressional subpoenas, requests for information, Freedom of Information Act requests, and other investigative requests were directed to this special group, this special project team, rather than going through the normal process of investigations that other similar investigations might go through.

According to her testimony, Mr. Speaker, these requests were handled primarily by the IRS Commissioner and the IRS Office of Chief Council rather than the normal process. In other words, this special project team handled the issue with Lois Lerner differently than they handle other similar investigations.

Ms. Howard's testimony further revealed that the IRS, on numerous occasions, went away from the standard way of dealing with freedom of information requests and, if her testimony is true, the handling of the FOIA requests not only for Ms. Lois Lerner,

but for other 501(c)(3) and (c)(4) organizations, and may have gone beyond what is even permissible under the Freedom of Information Act.

Following her testimony, Chairmen CHAFFETZ and JORDAN sent a letter to the IRS Commissioner, John Koskinen, requesting more information so that the Oversight Committee could better understand the process that they used in dealing with Ms. Lois Lerner. And I am told that, even as recently as this past Friday, the letter received back from the IRS is totally inadequate. It does not answer the questions, and here we are still years removed from it.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely frustrating that now, 2 years later, we are still dealing with this issue. It is frustrating that in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee we are still dealing with the deplorable activities of how the IRS has been handling this.

It is up to Congress. We must continue pushing forward for increased accountability and transparency in all areas of our government, particularly as it relates to this with the IRS.

I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Congressman HICE.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from the State of Texas, Mr. JOHN RATCLIFFE, one of our sharpest new Members from the State of Texas, a district attorney, who we asked specifically to come out to share some thoughts tonight specifically about some of the continued abuses.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding this evening.

Mr. Speaker, the most fundamental principle of our criminal justice system is that we are innocent until proven guilty. Operation Choke Point turns that most sacred tenet on its head.

When President Obama and his administration uses agencies like the Department of Justice and the FDIC to target legal businesses without due process, without any public debate, and when he bases his attacks not on the rule of law but on his own political beliefs, well, that is a tragic breakdown of the system of checks and balances and separation of powers that our Founding Fathers deliberately designed.

Mr. Speaker, Operation Choke Point is just flat wrong. Folks all across the Fourth Congressional District of Texas in cities and towns like Bonham, Denison, Sulphur Springs, Texarkana, and Sherman, they all just want to run their businesses and enjoy their freedoms without fear of persecution from a President that has overstepped his authority time and time again.

Many of the Texans that I represent are deeply troubled and concerned about Operation Choke Point, an initiative which is pressuring banks and

others in the financial industry to deny access to financial services to businesses like gun sellers and coal producers.

□ 2100

My constituents see this operation for what it really is, a blunt weapon that targets and stigmatizes entire industries that the Obama administration dislikes, instead of an honest effort to get rid of actual bad actors and lawbreakers.

Sadly, as a direct result of Operation Choke Point, legitimate businesses in Texas and across the country have been forced to close simply because the President and his activist bureaucrats have a political agenda, and they don't like what these businesses are selling. When you weaponize your government to go after folks you don't like and when you target your own citizens as political enemies, that is the way that Third World governments operate, not the greatest country the world has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, this is the United States of America, and our government should never go after its own citizens for political reasons. This is especially outrageous when the administration does so by targeting the Bill of Rights, and that is exactly what is happening here.

When you specifically target gun dealers and ammunition manufacturers, that is an affront to and an assault upon our Second Amendment rights. No President or administration is above the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I have met recently with far too many honest, hard-working, law-abiding folks in the gun industry who have been politically targeted by this initiative.

We can't allow this administration to continue to target legitimate businesses, like gun stores and cigar and pawn shops, through Operation Choke Point, just because the President doesn't like what they sell. Pressuring and forcing banks to stop engaging with legal industries needs to stop. We can't allow unelected bureaucrats to make such a brazen, backdoor assault on legitimate businesses and the hard-working, law-abiding citizens who own and operate them.

In July of 2014, one of the Judiciary subcommittees on which I now serve held a hearing on Operation Choke Point, and because of that hearing and of the due process concerns raised by the testimony there, the DOJ and the FDIC announced it would rescind its list of so-called high-risk merchants.

That move seemed to be an apparent recognition of the fact that Operation Choke Point is wrongfully inflicting collateral damage on legitimate businesses that are losing access to financial services. Despite this acknowledgment and admission from those at the top, companies across my district tell

me that the administration's foot soldiers on the ground simply haven't gotten the message yet. The harassment is continuing, and this is simply unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, we should stand up for the rights of every American. I am saddened to see a President who is so out of touch with what has made this country great, who is so out of touch that he would use an army of unelected bureaucrats to attack businesses that don't toe the ideological line with his administration.

Mr. Speaker, congressional oversight demands that we refuse to step aside, that we refuse to let this unprovoked attack on our constitutional and fundamental rights go unchallenged. I will continue to stand watch against this overreach. My colleagues and I will not allow our constituents' rights to be violated or our Constitution to be trampled.

Mr. WALKER. I thank Congressman RATCLIFFE for his powerful stance.

Mr. Speaker, since 2012, one of the bulldogs that has been holding the IRS accountable is the Congressman from central Florida. At this point, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, if you are a taxpayer and if you become subjected to an IRS audit, you have got to prove and justify what you have submitted to the IRS. If you tell the IRS, "I don't really have those documents. They were destroyed, and there is nothing I can do. Let's just move along," I don't think most IRS agents are going to accept that, and I think the taxpayer would likely find himself in hot water.

I think it is really unacceptable that the IRS seems to think it could operate under a totally different standard than the standard that it imposes on American taxpayers.

We have been going through this now since 2013 with Lois Lerner and the targeting scandal in our trying to get more information. Last year, before Congress, John Koskinen, the IRS Commissioner, said: We are going to produce Lois Lerner's emails. We will produce all of them. We have nothing to hide.

A couple of months later, he said: Actually, most of Lois Lerner's emails were destroyed because, you see, they are held on these backup tapes, and we recycle the backup tapes. We destroy the tapes, so there is just nothing we can do here. We are just going to move along, and we are not going to participate in any meaningful way with your investigation.

Most Americans didn't accept that, and it really was not worth the paper it was printed on in terms of an excuse. It was, obviously, much different than what the IRS would impose on a taxpayer, but it was even more than that.

It was more than just a weak excuse; it was false.

Once Koskinen said that the emails were destroyed—guess what?—the Inspector General for Tax Administration in the Treasury Department did basic due diligence and said: Do you know what? I am going to check to see whether Koskinen is telling the truth.

What did the IG do? He drove out to West Virginia where they have the warehouse of all of the backup tapes. What did they find? The Lois Lerner emails on the backup tapes. They were there the whole time. Now, they have pulled thousands and thousands of Lois Lerner emails.

These are emails that are, in many cases, different than the emails that the IRS begrudgingly produced to Congress and to the American people. This is a major, major issue. Of course, there is the targeting, but then there are the lengths that the IRS has gone to stymie Congress' investigation.

Just this week in Federal court, they are fighting Judicial Watch. They don't want to turn over even these new emails that the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration provided to the IRS.

They are saying: We can't turn them over to you now in the course of the litigation. We are not going to turn them over to Congress because we need to check to see whether there are any duplicates from the emails that we have already turned over.

Really? Who cares? Give us the emails. Give the American people the truth. What they are trying to do is to stonewall and drag this out as long as they can, hoping that the American people will forget about it. Then, basically, they get away scot-free, with nobody in their organization being held accountable.

I think it is a test of this institution here in the Congress about whether somebody like Commissioner Koskinen is going to be held to account for misleading Congress, for providing false information to Congress.

The fact of the matter is, if an American taxpayer were hauled in front of a Federal grand jury or a Federal court and if he gave testimony like that, that was not true, he would face consequences. You can bet your bottom dollar.

I think the IRS is kind of the grossest example that we have in Washington of really a fundamental problem with how our government operates, which is that the people who work and operate in and around Washington, D.C.—6 of the 10 wealthiest counties in our country are now suburbs of Washington, D.C. We are not producing shale here. We don't have technology—nothing—in Washington.

It is all because of the power and growth of government, so people inside the beltway are not held accountable. You have people at the IRS, and you

have people at the EPA, and you have people in all of these different agencies. Essentially, they are allowed to operate under a lower standard of conduct than what an American taxpayer or a citizen would be allowed or permitted to do by the government. That is unacceptable.

I think that this IRS issue is as important a government accountability issue as we are facing in this Congress. I think it is a test for the House as to whether we are going to be serious about this and hold these IRS officials accountable.

I am glad my friend from North Carolina had the time here today. I think it was very productive to listen to some of the other Members. I just want the American people to know that I am committed to getting to the bottom of this and to holding these people accountable not only for the targeting, but for obstructing the investigation when it has been obstructed over and over again.

Mr. WALKER. I thank Congressman DeSANTIS.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, in closing, we have had an evening which we have called and labeled "the People's Night," one of many that we plan on holding. I thank the dozen or so colleagues who have shown their concern.

We talk much about awareness these days, but few times do we get to the accountable and to the action step process. Government has run amuck. That is why many of us ran to begin with.

I sent out an email this afternoon, asking a few of the constituents back home what some of the things are they are concerned about. The president of our local women's Republican club sent back two paragraphs and listed about 12 or 13 things. Those are the kinds of things we need to be calling out.

It has been a privilege to be with my colleagues this evening. I appreciate their time as they continue to show strong support for these wonderful men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2596, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the Special Order of Mr. WALKER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-155) on the resolution (H. Res. 315) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

IRAN'S HISTORY OF TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, this evening, I would like to take some time to remind the American people of the nature of a sworn enemy of the United States, whose leaders to this day, as they have for the past 36 years, continue to chant, "Death to America."

That enemy, Mr. Speaker, is Iran. Mr. Speaker, the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, and China, plus Germany, this group known as the P5+1—have engaged in negotiations with Iran in an attempt to halt Iran's development of nuclear weapons.

Of significant note, unlike the negotiations that we had with North Korea years ago regarding its pursuit of nuclear weapons, those negotiations included the United States and North Korea's neighbors—China, Russia, South Korea, and Japan. Iran's regional neighbors and closest targets, however—Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Israel—were not invited to participate in these talks.

A framework for an agreement with the P5+1 and Iran was reached in April, but that framework is simply inadequate to halt the regime's march to a nuclear weapon.

Iran cannot be allowed to get a nuclear weapon. Such an event would set off a destabilizing arms race in a region of the world that is already afire with sectarian hatred. It is a real threat that Iran would use such a weapon against Israel, Europe, or with its continued development of long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles against the United States.

Iran's surface-to-surface missile expansion is a threat typically left out of discussions over its nuclear program, but we cannot ignore that Iran has now built itself the largest and most sophisticated long-range missile arsenal in the Middle East.

The current nuclear framework agreed to in April represents a significant shift in U.S. policy regarding Iran's nuclear program. Under the agreed upon framework, Iran's nuclear centrifuges will be allowed to keep spinning for the next decade. This is the first Presidential administration to agree to a deal that allows Iran to continue enriching uranium, thereby legitimizing Iran's entire nuclear program.

Importantly, the administration's notion that oversight from international atomic inspectors can keep Iran from developing a weapon is simply not true. For over a decade, Iran has evaded the very oversight body tasked with conducting inspections and monitoring its nuclear stockpiles.

If the past 15 years are any indication, we know that Iran will incur enormous financial costs and wreck its domestic economy, all to continue enriching uranium and developing and testing nuclear weapons at secret facilities and undeclared sites.

In light of the past 15 years, we know Iran will continue to evade the international community just as it did when building and operating its Natanz and Fordow facilities in complete secrecy, concealed from international atomic inspectors.

Those who choose can ignore the writing on the wall and whitewash Iran's previous violations of numerous international treaties while continuing to operate its covert nuclear program. Those who choose can ignore the hostile rhetoric that still spews from the mouths of Iran's so-called reformers, including so-called moderates, like President Rouhani, who publicly brags about Iran's ability to deceive the West, using stall tactics at the negotiating table when, all the while, Iran continues making progress behind the scenes on its nuclear program.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have grave concerns about the deal being negotiated in that it will leave Iran on the path to nuclear weapons while allowing for the complete relief from the sanctions that forced Iran to the table.

I suggest that, even if Iran abandons its path to the bomb, it is completely reasonable to leave the sanctions in place until Iran stops the terror campaign it has been on for the last 36 years.

□ 2115

I simply ask fellow Americans to be skeptical of any assurances that Iran has stopped or will stop pursuing a nuclear weapon. Just 6 months ago President Obama used these Iran negotiations to silence critics who oppose his foreign policy. In an interview with CNN, the President suggested that the year-and-a-half of ongoing negotiations with Iran is probably the first time that Iran "has not advanced its nuclear program in the last decade."

President Obama didn't stop there. He went on to assure people that this freeze on Iran's nuclear program had been verified by the U.N. and the international atomic inspectors, who acknowledge that Iran has not made progress. Yet, we know now that the opposite is true. In the last 18 months of negotiations, Iran has not frozen its nuclear program, by any stretch, but has actually increased its nuclear stockpiles by 20 percent.

Iran's nuclear program is a very serious problem. But it is only one of the dimensions of the threat that Iran poses to the world. It remains only one part of an overall program of terror that has been carried out by Iran for a very long time.

I wanted to offer this Special Order about Iran today because it is a very

important anniversary. Thirty years ago today Navy Seabee diver Robert Stethem was singled out and murdered by Iranian-backed terrorists because he was a United States servicemember. He was only 23 years old at that time, the same age that I was. His murder was at the hands of Hezbollah, an Iran-funded militant terror group aboard the hijacked TWA flight 847. We can never forget the barbaric way in which he was murdered and his body subsequently dropped from the plane onto the Beirut runway.

Master chief constructionman Stethem, we will never forget the sacrifice you gave for our country, and together we pray for your family.

Robert was born in Connecticut to parents Richard and Patricia Stethem. Just as his mother and father had done, Robert followed his family footsteps and signed up to serve in the U.S. Navy shortly before he would celebrate his 20th birthday. He was returning from an assignment in Greece aboard TWA flight 847 headed to Beirut when the aircraft was seized by militants.

Bobby Stethem never got to pursue the hopes and dreams that every American has: settling down, raising a family, and contributing more of himself to this wonderful, exceptional Nation. His parents lost the comfort and grace of seeing a son grow old, and his siblings lost a lifelong friend and companion. And lest we forget, it was Iranian-backed terrorists who put an end to this young life. Bobby Stethem was one victim of Iran's reign of terror. There have been many more.

Iran's hostility toward America emerged in full force in 1979 when it failed to protect the American Embassy in Tehran and allowed radical Islamist students to seize the Embassy and take American diplomats and marines hostage, holding 52 of them hostage for 444 days. The attempted rescue of the hostages in April 1980 resulted in the deaths of eight Americans, and Iran bears full responsibility for those deaths.

Throughout the 1980s, Iran funded terrorists in Lebanon who were responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans. To recall some of the events: Between 1982 and 1992, Iranian-backed Hezbollah systematically kidnapped 96 foreign nationals, 25 of them Americans. At least eight died in captivity. Some were murdered, while others died as a result of inadequate medical attention.

On April 18, 1983, Hezbollah bombed the American Embassy in Beirut, killing 63, including 17 Americans. Six months later, on October 23, 1983, a Hezbollah suicide bomber drove a truck laden with more than 15,000 pounds of explosives into the U.S. Marine barracks at the Beirut airport, killing 241 marines and wounding more than 100 more. Fifty-eight French paratroopers were also killed.

On September 20, 1984, Hezbollah struck again with another bombing, this time carrying out an attack on the U.S. Embassy annex in Beirut, killing 24 people, including two Americans.

The reign of terror moved from the 1980s to the 1990s, when Iranian-backed terrorists attacked the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia in 1996, killing 19 airmen of the United States Air Force.

Iran continued its attacks on Americans throughout the 2000s and the 2010s with its backing of terrorists who killed American servicemembers using IEDs in Iraq and Afghanistan. An article from March 2015 quotes a former U.S. war general who served in Iraq and estimates that Iran was responsible for about one-third of U.S. casualties during the war, which amounts to approximately 1,500 sons and daughters of America who never came home alive.

In addition to its attacks on Americans, Iran-backed terrorists attacked other nations around the world. In March of 1992, Hezbollah detonated a truck bomb at the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires, killing 29 people and injuring 240 others.

On July 18, 1994, Iran bombed a Jewish community center in Buenos Aires, which took the lives of 85 innocent civilians and injured more than 300. Again, in July of 2012, Hezbollah operatives claimed responsibility after a suicide bomber detonated a bomb on an Israeli bus in Bulgaria, killing five Israelis and wounding 30 people.

Until Iran stops its export of terror and stops its threats to Israel, the United States, and other nations, no sanction relief should be granted. If Iran does not abandon its nuclear ambitions, sanctions should be increased.

I am privileged this evening, Mr. Speaker, to be joined by some colleagues. I would like to yield to my colleague from New York, Congressman LEE ZELDIN, who represents a part of Long Island. Congressman ZELDIN is a great addition to this House, serving in his freshman year, and also a veteran of the U.S. Army. I yield to Congressman ZELDIN.

Mr. ZELDIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Iran is a nation led by a regime threatening the stability of the free world. That is nothing new. Iran has a long history of supporting terrorism and working to overthrow foreign governments. Since 1984, over 30 years ago, the United States has called Iran a state sponsor of terrorism, not only for their direct participation in attacks, but for their financing and other support for others who pursue terror.

Iran has brought instability to the Middle East and does not act in good faith, blowing up mock U.S. warships, pledging to wipe Israel off the map, developing ICBMs, and chanting in their streets: "Death to America." The Ira-

nian Government threatens peace and democracy all across the globe. Nuclear weapons in the hands of our enemies harms the security of our freedoms and liberties that America cherishes and has worked so hard to defend.

The Iranian Government came to the negotiating table dealt an impossible hand, you would think. In Texas Hold'Em, they call it a 7-2 off suit. In 2009, when the economy was doing better in Iran—oil was \$100 a barrel—millions of Iranians took to the streets to overthrow their own government. The President of the United States essentially made it out to be just their problem, not ours, and did not engage. Now look at the predicament we find ourselves in here today.

The President of the United States comes into office, inheriting pocket aces when he sits down at the table, and pocket aces happen to be the best hand you can have in Texas Hold'Em. The President sits down with the leadership of the Iranian Government and asks to swap hands, in the spirit of fairness and equality and good faith. Yes, the pocket aces earned on the backs of generations of Americans who have shed blood—they have fought and died to protect the United States, the greatest nation on God's green Earth—and as a negotiating style, the President swaps hands with the bad guys.

As we inch closer to the June 30 deadline, I want to reinforce that a bad deal is worse than no deal at all. Mr. President, you are getting played at the table. Take a walk; it is okay. It is time to strengthen your hand. Please do not prop up this regime with tens of billions of dollars in relief from sanctions. They are using that money to finance terror and overthrow foreign governments aligned with America, and that is with a bad economy and oil half the price.

Don't make a slew of permanent concessions on our side in exchange for temporary concessions on the part of the Iranians. Show strength, not weakness. Too many Americans have shed their blood to make our great Nation what it is today. We need strength in your voice and an articulation of resolve that there will be no death to America.

It is not okay for Iran to wipe Israel off the map. We demand the release of our Americans being unjustly imprisoned in their nation, which includes a United States marine. Where is the passion to free Amir now and the others of our fellow citizens wrongfully kept in their jails? Play the pocket aces, Mr. President. America's greatness, its exceptionalism, its strength is nothing to ever apologize for.

About a month-and-a-half ago I was with former President George Bush, and a couple things he said then strike me, and I want to reference them here today. One is very simple. He says: The world needs America to lead. We can

have a different understanding or philosophy on tactics of what that means. It is something that we all know to be true. The world needs America to lead.

The other was a story about him throwing out the first pitch at Yankee Stadium right after 9/11. He knew the stadium was going to be filled up. It was the World Series. It was right after 9/11. America was watching, and they were looking for something to be able to celebrate. Now, he was down getting ready to come out of the dugout, wearing a bulletproof vest, and he had a conversation with Derek Jeter. Derek Jeter asked the President whether or not he was going to throw from the top of the mound or the front of the mound, and the President answered: "What should I do?" Derek Jeter says: "You have to throw from the top of the mound or they won't respect you." A few moments later, the President is getting ready to walk out onto the field, and Derek Jeter said one other last word of advice. His last words were: "Don't bounce it. They will boo you."

We need a perfect strike here, Mr. President, from the top of the mound, and don't bounce it. Don't bring home a bad deal. The resulting boos would be the least of America's problems. Right now is a time for strength and not weakness.

For that reason, I once again want to thank the gentleman for bringing this important Special Order here tonight.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague for his remarks and reminding us of the stakes. Also, Mr. Speaker, in a recent hearing held by the newly formed Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, one expert we heard from described the threat posed by just one of the many Iranian-backed terror groups. He told us: Hezbollah remains one of the most capable terror organizations in the world. The group's original aims were to establish a radical Shia Islamist theocracy in Lebanon and destroy Israel. However, in recent years Hezbollah has "established cells and infrastructure in places across the globe, from Latin America and Africa to Europe and Asia." As a former Hezbollah leader confirmed years ago, "Hezbollah has been receiving since 1982 all kinds of moral, political, and material backing from the Islamic Republic of Iran."

We must consider the implications that lifting sanctions could have on Iran's ability to export terror and finance military operations around the world. To this very day, we know that Iran remains the most active and largest state sponsor of terrorism. The wide array of terror activities Iran either supports financially or militarily include but are not limited to Hezbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, Hamas, the Houthi in Yemen, Shiite militias in Iraq, and militants in Afghanistan, while also maintaining its

own terrorism apparatus, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

Notably, many of the terror financing experts we have heard from throughout our terror task force hearings have emphasized their concerns over the Obama administration's willingness to lift sanctions and free up billions of dollars for the Iranian regime to use at large. Many experts agree that these sanctions have, without a doubt, diminished Iran's ability to support terrorism and proliferation.

It is shocking to think that the current administration would provide billions of dollars in a windfall for the Iranian regime in return for promises that Iran will limit its nuclear weapons pursuit without stringent mechanisms that can guarantee Iran will not use that money to send paychecks to militants or the family of militants who plan to use it for attacks against innocent civilians.

□ 2130

Sanctions relief will provide money Iran can continue to use to set up and enhance militant training groups for Hezbollah and Hamas and groups in northern Africa. It is money Tehran can continue to send for covert weapons shipments and support terror operations across the globe. Lifting economic sanctions will allow Iran to again use the international banking sector and make it more difficult to prevent them from conducting transfers and finding ways to support illicit terror groups.

Mr. Speaker, we must wake up and recognize that the Iranian threat is much greater than the administration would have us believe. The threat is complex, multifaceted, and we must be combating the Iranian regime on multiple fronts instead of providing the regime billions of dollars in bonus money, all for agreeing to cooperate and pretend, if only for a short time, that they will act in good faith and adhere to international law and norms.

I am also joined this evening by my colleague from Florida, Congressman RON DESANTIS, himself a veteran of the Navy JAG Corps. He has been outspoken on these issues.

I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania.

I was listening intently to our colleague from New York talk about the President needing to get up on the top of the mound and throw a perfect strike here with this deal. I have seen the President throw a baseball, and Lord help us if that is what we need to stop this, because I think we are in a major, major pickle here, and it has been the result of bad policies from the beginning.

Almost 2 years ago, in 2013, this House voted to increase sanctions on Iran. And we did that with over 400

votes, on a bipartisan basis. And that was really the obvious thing to do at the time because the leadership of Iran, the mullahs, were chafing under the sanctions regime that was in place. And the way to deal with a country like Iran, with a leadership that is dedicated to militant Islam, is when they are starting to chafe, you turn the screws harder.

We did that thing. We did the right thing. In the Senate, HARRY REID would not bring that up for a vote. The President decided that rather than that route, he would simply provide unilateral sanctions relief to Iran, saying: This is a gesture of good faith. Now we want you to reciprocate with your nuclear program.

Basically, from that time forward, Iran has said: Go fly a kite. We are not giving up anything.

So the agreement we seem to be on the verge of submitting to the Congress allows Iran to keep their entire nuclear infrastructure. The underground bunker at Fordow is fortified for a missile attack. Why do you need to fortify a nuclear facility against a missile attack if it is for peaceful purposes? So they get to keep that.

They have a heavy water reactor in Iraq that they get to keep. That is used to produce plutonium. They don't need it for peaceful purposes. They have advanced centrifuges that they are allowed to keep. Again, no use for those for peaceful purposes.

So Iran is basically in a situation where, if you turn back the clock almost 2 years, when this House voted those sanctions with over 400 votes, if you asked Iran and the Iranian leadership what they most wanted, they probably said: Well, look, we want to keep our nuclear infrastructure, but we want to get rid of these sanctions.

And guess what? That looks to be what is going to happen. And that is going to be a very, very dangerous and bad deal.

I do think it is worth pointing out as much as we can the nature of this regime. They are not only fomenting problems in the Middle East, they are not only dedicated to the destruction of Israel, they are dedicated to the destruction of the United States.

The most deadly attack on U.S. marines since Iwo Jima was in 1983 at the Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, when Hezbollah, which was supported by Iran, bombed and killed 220 U.S. marines, another 21 personnel. That is a major amount of American blood on their hands.

In Iraq, in 2006, 2007, and 2008, they were responsible for killing hundreds of our servicemembers through the Shiite militias that were operating as their proxy forces, and may have killed as many as 1,500. So, again, that is major, major American blood on their hands.

This is a regime that has never, since 1979, showed any evidence of changing

or deviating from their ideology-rooted and militant Islam. They are a danger not only to the region, but to the world.

We have seen now for some time, since this President has taken office, Iran has steadily increased its influence and power in the region. They are the number one actor in Iraq, by far. They are now battling for Yemen with the Houthis. They are the number one patron of Hamas on the Gaza Strip. They are the number one patron of Hezbollah in Lebanon, and they are the number one patron of Assad in Syria. And so this is a massive Shiite crescent throughout the Middle East.

And guess what? When Sunni Arabs see our administration bending over backwards to cut deals with Iran, they see the Shiite-backed militias that are backed by Iran and Iraq—the ones fighting ISIS—that makes the average Sunni Arab say: You know what? I am much more likely to want to join ISIS than have to live under Shiite oppression.

So the President's policy, I think, has been bad for expanding Iran's influence, but I think it also has the effect of driving more Sunni Arabs into the hands of ISIS, and so it is lose-lose policy.

I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for having this discussion. I hope that this bad deal doesn't happen, but if it does, we need to have robust debate in the House. We need to pick apart the deal piece by piece and show how this is not something that is good for security in the world.

We can see that already before the deal has even been agreed to because you see an arms race in the Middle East with the Sunni Arab states that has been underway now for some time. That is a direct result of the bad policies that this administration has engaged in vis-à-vis Iran.

So the regime in Iran is an enemy of the country. We need to recognize that. And we need to make sure that we scrutinize any deal that comes to this Congress that allows Iran to maintain a nuclear capacity and that it is voted down resoundingly.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague.

There is plenty to consider as the negotiations continue between the P5+1 and Iran as we look forward to what deal will be produced.

Again, with the concerns that have been expressed by my colleagues from Florida and New York, we must be vigilant, particularly when you look at the context of what has been happening with Iran over the 36 years.

Again, today we mark the sad anniversary of the murder of Bobby Stethem at the hands of Iranian-backed terrorists. Bobby is one of many victims that this Islamic regime out of Iran has been responsible for over nearly four decades.

Going forward, an agreement where Iran would not even be required to actually stop enriching uranium merits our grave concern. In light of a final agreement's far-reaching implications for the security of both our allies in the region and our own national defenses, we must be extremely vigilant.

As a Member who sits on a House committee that has been tasked with investigating the financial backers that keep international terror groups well-armed and operating, we cannot ignore Iran's leading role in international terror financing.

As many experts have warned our Committee, once the administration agrees to lift all economic sanctions and free up billions of dollars to the Iranian regime, there is no guarantee that deepening the regime's pockets will not result in increased financing for acts of terror that will kill innocent people.

In addition, contrary to what has been publicly suggested by the President, it will be all but impossible to simply slap those economic sanctions back into effect should Iran break the terms of a final nuclear weapons deal.

We must look to the past and consider the present situation. We owe as much to all those who were murdered at the hand of the Iranian regime and by terror groups who would use Iranian money and weapons to take the lives of innocent men, women, and children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PIVOT TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) until 10 p.m.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a chance this week to turn the President's "Pivot to Asia" into a "Pivot to America." The question is: Will we as Members listen to the people, or will we double down on a watered-down policy that has divided both the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle?

We often complain about lack of bipartisanship, but in this case, we are seeing it stop the trade promotion authority, or TPA, fast track. We must hold firm.

Republicans and Democrats have a long history of being for free trade. We all want our goods to go to international markets and for trade barriers to be removed. We find ourselves at a crossroads today because both parties have voiced a lack of trust in the President's ability to be able to negotiate what is best for America. That is why we are still fighting to stop the trade promotion authority, better known as fast track.

Fast track will not be the panacea of all ills. In fact, if granted, we could see

the President move swiftly on the Trans-Pacific Partnership that will likely not deliver the goods, potentially binding our Nation to an agreement that could circumvent U.S. interests and law and have secondary harmful effects in multiple areas.

Dr. Aurolyn Luykx, an anthropology professor at the University of Texas at El Paso, makes this analysis:

I think the consequences could be very dire. We already saw under NAFTA how so many jobs left the United States and also went from Mexico. Then we saw, as well, tens of thousands of low-income Mexican families being put out of work and losing their land, and we saw how that drove migration to the United States.

The architects of the TPA in both Congress and the White House take offense at any opposition, leveling the charge that we are being protectionists. The White House claims that with fast track they can move the TPP to lower barriers on U.S. exports among the 11 other nations, thus increasing jobs and wages.

Now to the facts.

Contrary to what we hear, we already have high-standard free trade agreements with 7 of those other 11 nations in the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership. We are writing the rules in the Pacific. Let's write them some more, with good bilateral agreements that will allow the American people to have a voice, not some council or transnational commission that sets our fate.

If you don't believe me, then how about Simon Johnson, a former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, a professor at MIT Sloan, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics? Maybe he knows something about it. Here is what he says about the myth of needing the TPA to lower tariffs among the proposed members of the Trans-Pacific Partnership:

Almost all tariffs on trade among Canada, Mexico, and the United States are long gone—that was the effect of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Under the Australia and Singapore free trade agreements as well, almost all tariffs on U.S. goods sold in those countries have been eliminated. Goods from the United States have entered Chile without tariffs since January of this year, and most tariffs imposed by Peru have already been phased out.

The TPP will amount to a free trade agreement with Brunei, with a population less than Omaha, Nebraska, I might add, and New Zealand, with a population less than Louisiana. Encouraging exports to these countries is surely desirable, but the economic impact on the U.S. is unlikely to be more than a rounding error.

That leaves three larger countries where the issues are more complex: Japan, Malaysia, and Vietnam. And TPP will also confer special status on foreign investors, allowing them to sue for financial judgments against host-country regulations.

Why we would want to provide such differential protection to nondomestic companies is a mystery. Creating a quasi-legal

process outside the regular court system, just for foreigners, can go wrong in many ways.

From my own reading of the TPP, without divulging the details, I would add the concern about private rights in disputes, the transnational panel empowered with a living agreement—and yes, it is there; I have seen it with my own eyes—even after the accord is signed by member nations.

There are also the possible exceptions granted to Brunei, whose legal system is not to the same standard as the other nations.

Of great concern is a stated intention to economically integrate like the EU—Not cooperate, but integrate.

So, one says: What solutions do you have? Here are a few.

First, we must start by listening to the American people. If the majority of Americans—from socialists to progressives, to liberals, to moderates, to conservatives, to constitutionalists, to the Tea Parties—have voiced concerns and do not want TPA granted, then our actions this week will truly reflect if we are being representative of that voice.

□ 2145

Second, the President must demonstrate he can lead on foreign policy. He has yet to do it. Granting fast track to negotiate with 40 percent of the world's economy should be based on how well he has handled negotiations with other nations in his tenure. It is here, in the foreign policy arena, he is found wanting.

The President's talent for negotiation among nations should be measured by his foreign policy record. Have we forgotten the line in the sand, the arming of al Qaeda and other nefarious Syrian rebels to fight Assad, only to watch them morph into ISIS, then dismiss them as a JV team, only to see them tear through Iraq, which fell apart after we abandoned it, after we were assured they could stand on their own if we left early, and now, no strategy to fix it?

Then, there is the Arab Spring, which has morphed into a potential for nuclear winter with Iran. Let's not forget Crimea and Ukraine. I can go on. The question is: Why are we?

As I have said before, like Lucy holding the football, we are told that the President needs the power to negotiate; if we just come and take a kick at it, all will be fine.

We cannot take such chances with our Nation; instead, the President must show us some deeds, not words. He should start by negotiating a bilateral free trade agreement with Japan, an ally, the biggest nation of those that remain and the one that has the greatest economic impact. Intently focus there, bring that to us, and we will likely approve it.

Third, negotiate an interim agreement with China. We still have much

to do with raising the bar on Chinese trade due to corruption, piracy of intellectual property, standards of goods, and other concerns. We made those same claims with Japan in the 1960s and with South Korea in the 1980s. Today, we no longer have those concerns.

China lacks lawyers to fight against these problems. Well, we certainly know how to make plenty of those. Negotiate a law school program all across our land's rich institutions to create Chinese attorneys to enforce the economic benefits of the rule of law.

As to goods, China is seeking oil, natural gas, coal, timber, aggregate, beef, and pork to expand their infrastructure and to feed their people. We have an abundance of these and hard-working Americans that will gladly produce and send these goods.

Instead of making China turn to terrorist states like Sudan and troublemakers like Venezuela to pursue these resources, how about a trade agreement on these narrow products that will immediately benefit the American people, reduce our debt with China, and strengthen our friendly ties?

It is not impossible. We have the resources. We have the technology. What we need are the guts to do it, a rekindling of the American spirit, and the leadership to get it done. It starts by putting the brakes on fast track. We need the right track instead.

I urge my colleagues, left and right, to stand your ground. It is time for Congress to lead and be the clarion voice of the American people that we represent. That leadership starts this week in the United States House of Representatives.

Let's hold our ground. Let's pivot back to the American people, invest in ourselves, and benefit not just the Pacific, but the entire world, as we have clearly demonstrated we can do in the last 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a flight delay.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today through June 26 on account of mandatory military service with the Mississippi Army National Guard.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1568. An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1827. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board for FY 2014, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113(c)(2); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1828. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement; Capital Adequacy of Board-Regulated Institutions; Bank Holding Companies; Savings and Loan Holding Companies [Docket No.: R-1509] (RIN: 1700-AE 30) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1829. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Minimum Requirements for Appraisal Management Companies (RIN: 3170-AA44) received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1830. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Waldo County, ME, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8385] received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1831. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRA, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Minimum Requirements for Appraisal Management Companies [Docket No.: OCC-2014-0002] (RIN: 1557-AD64) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1832. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment to the Commission's Rules Concerning Effective Competition; Implementation of Section 111 of the STELA Reauthorization Act [MB Docket No.: 15-53] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1833. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments [Docket Nos.: FDA-2014-C-1616 and FDA-2015-C-0245] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1834. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-056; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1835. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-026; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1836. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-017; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1837. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1838. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Secs. 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1839. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to the Congress during the period from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1840. A letter from the Chairwoman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, during the period from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of Pub. L. 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1841. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Requirements for Collective Trademarks and Service Marks, Collective Membership Marks, and Certification Marks [Docket No.: PTO-T-2013-0027] (RIN: 0651-AC89) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1508. A bill to promote the development of a United States commercial space resource exploration and utilization industry and to increase the exploration and utilization of resources in outer space; with an amendment (Rept. 114-153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. GRANGER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2772. A bill making appropri-

tions for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 315. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-155). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 2767. A bill to prohibit certain individuals from possessing a firearm in an airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PALONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 2768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the use of funds in the Hazardous Substance Superfund for the purposes for which they were collected, to ensure adequate resources for the cleanup of hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 2769. A bill to require the National Credit Union Administration to conduct a study of the appropriate capital requirements for credit unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Miss RICE of NEW YORK (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 2770. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require certain maintenance of security-related technology at airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the dollar limi-

tation on employer-provided group term life insurance that can be excluded from the gross income of the employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2773. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to local educational agencies to encourage girls and underrepresented minorities to pursue studies and careers in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2774. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prohibit recovery of certain overpayments through tax refund offsets and to prohibit the application of the earnings test with respect to child's insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DOLD, Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. CURELO of Florida, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2775. A bill to grant States authority to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws on remote transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2776. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations with respect to the size standards certain air carriers utilize for carry-on baggage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2777. A bill to direct the Commissioner of Social Security to implement certain record keeping recommendations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2778. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for Congressional oversight of agency rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2779. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the 7-year restriction on eligibility for widow's and widower's insurance benefits based on disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2780. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the two-year waiting period for divorced spouse's benefits

following the divorce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2781. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for full benefits for disabled widows and widowers without regard to age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2782. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for increases in widow's and widower's insurance benefits by reason of delayed retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2783. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the financing of the Superfund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 2784. A bill to suspend United States assistance to Brazil until such time as Brazil amends its laws to remove the prohibition on extradition of nationals of Brazil to other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 2785. A bill to suspend the issuance of visas to nationals of Brazil until such time as Brazil amends its laws to remove the prohibition on extradition of nationals of Brazil to other countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VELA (for himself and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 2786. A bill to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to submit a report on cross-border rail security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 2787. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 316. A resolution observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 2767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass tax legislation. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . ." (Section 8, Clause 1). This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 2769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 2770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, clause 1 enumerates that, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . ." Further, Amendment XVI states that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 2772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states, "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 2774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which reads "The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes."

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' powers granted under article I of the United States Constitution, including the legislative vesting clause of article I, section 1; the power granted to each House of Congress under article I, section 5, clause 2; and the power granted to Congress under article I, section 8, clause 18.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The general welfare clause of section 8 of article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The general welfare clause of section 8 of article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2781.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The general welfare clause of section 8 of article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The general welfare clause of section 8 of article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VELA:

H.R. 2786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 2787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mrs. TORRES, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HARDY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 9: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 167: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 197: Ms. BASS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. FUDGE, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 276: Mr. LONG and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 282: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 353: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 379: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 473: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 501: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 503: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 511: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 563: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 571: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 592: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 674: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 706: Mr. POCAN and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 774: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 815: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 829: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 863: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 893: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SANFORD, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 911: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 918: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 920: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 921: Ms. ESHOO and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 936: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 953: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 969: Mr. HINOJOSA and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 980: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 985: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 990: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1018: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1041: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1078: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1188: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1197: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1211: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1221: Ms. ESTY, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1249: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1258: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1284: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1312: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1342: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1343: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1344: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1356: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 1365: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 1387: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1399: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1427: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 1462: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1468: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1475: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mrs. COMSTOCK.

Mr. KEATING, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1490: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1503: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1608: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1610: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1624: Mr. DOLD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1635: Mr. RIGELL and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1701: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 1736: Mr. BUCHSON.

H.R. 1786: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1849: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1902: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1908: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1911: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1919: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TAKAI, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1924: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1953: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1971: Mr. GALLEG0 and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1977: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1982: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1986: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 1994: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 2017: Mr. LUCAS and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2019: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2058: Mr. BRAT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 2063: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 2076: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2083: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2096: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 2102: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 2123: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2152: Mr. BABIN and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2213: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 2216: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2222: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2230: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2233: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2237: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 2246: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2266: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. FARR, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2270: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2274: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2287: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 2302: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2303: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2315: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2400: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2494: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2497: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2506: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2507: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2526: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2560: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 2591: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2594: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2606: Mr. COOK and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 2620: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2646: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2650: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 2652: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2653: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 2658: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 2660: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2670: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2680: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2689: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2692: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2698: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 2719: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2730: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2732: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2737: Ms. TITUS and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2738: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2739: Mr. HANNA and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. J. Res. 49: Mr. MEADOWS.

H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. COHEN and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 14: Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 54: Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 130: Mr. JORDAN.

H. Res. 209: Mr. KLINE and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 233: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.

H. Res. 276: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of Rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

13. The SPEAKER presented a petition of District 6 City Councilman Don Zimmerman, Austin, TX, relative to repealing Section 42, of the Internal Revenue Code, on the subject of low-income housing federal tax credits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO McDERMOTT AND SON ROOFING

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the McDermott and Son Roofing Company of Atlantic, Iowa, which is celebrating 80 years in business. McDermott and Son Roofing is a four-generation, family-owned business that has been operating in southwest Iowa since 1935.

Ted McDermott, the first owner of the business could be described as the "classic entrepreneur." Mr. McDermott farmed, worked construction, and when he realized there was a need in the community, he founded the roofing company. Today, McDermott and Son Roofing Company is owned and operated by his great-grandson, Rob Clausen, and his wife, Sonya. The business is a Master Elite Contractor for Duro Last Roofing products, and they are the recipient of the highest quality award given by Duro Last Roofing. Over the past 80 years, the company has experienced many changes within the roofing industry and with roofing products used. McDermott and Son Roofing takes great pride in the customer services they provide to the Atlantic area and southwest Iowa. The business cherishes the many friends and customers they have served for the past 80 years.

I commend McDermott and Son Roofing and their staff for their 80 years of dedicated service to southwest Iowa. I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating McDermott and Son Roofing for their many achievements in the roofing industry. I wish them and all of their employees nothing but success moving forward.

CONGRATULATING YOUTH HOPE ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate YouthHope on its 20th anniversary.

For two decades now, YouthHope has been a safe, educational, and fun environment for children and teens from the Illinois Quad-Cities. YouthHope is an excellent example of how a group of dedicated citizens can have an outsized impact on their community. As a mother, I appreciate how important it is to protect our children and provide them with positive role models, encouragement and avenues to success, the very elements that YouthHope

has provided to our young people for the last twenty years.

The staff, volunteers and everyone else involved at YouthHope should be truly proud of the impact that they have had on young people's lives in the Quad-Cities. I hope that others in our community and throughout the entire state of Illinois and country will look to YouthHope as a model for strengthening and giving back to the areas in which we live.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again congratulate YouthHope on its 20th anniversary. I look forward to hearing more about YouthHope's good work over the next twenty years and beyond.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID HOLDEN

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solemn memory of my friend David Holden who went to be with the Lord on June 8, 2015.

Dave was a great family man and role model in our community.

He was an active leader in the Saline Area Schools, serving as President and Vice President of the Board of Education. His three sons—Dylan, Derek, and Reed—all graduated from Saline High School.

Dave also volunteered his time as a basketball and baseball coach in the area for 16 years.

He truly understood the meaning of civic duty, as he reminded us through his example day in and day out.

The countless hours he spent to better our community, especially in the area of education, will not be forgotten.

The citizens of Saline and Washtenaw County are fortunate to have had a man of Dave's character and dedication as a leader in our community. He will be greatly missed.

On behalf of this Congress, I offer our deepest sympathies to his wife, Raye, his three sons, and his extended family and friends. Our heartfelt prayers are with them during this difficult time.

TRIBUTE TO SOUTHWEST IOWA MENTAL HEALTH CENTER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Southwest Iowa Mental Health Center of Atlantic, Iowa for 50 years of service to Southwest Iowa. This 50th anniversary is a testament of the great work that is

performed every day by the staff at Southwest Iowa Mental Health Center.

The Southwest Iowa Mental Health Center partners with the Cass County Health System to meet the needs of children, adolescents and adults. The treatment team includes board-certified professionals in disciplines of psychiatry, social work, psychology and psychiatric nursing. Their specialized areas of expertise include child and adolescent psychiatry, family therapy, psychological testing, psychotherapy and marital therapy. Inpatient and outpatient services include 24-hour emergency care, consultation, evaluation, education, targeted case management, school-based mental health services, employee assistance programs, and integrated health programs.

I commend the Southwest Iowa Mental Health Center and the staff for providing dedicated, committed and crucial mental health care to the Southwest Iowa area and the Cass County community. There is great work being done every day at the Southwest Iowa Mental Health Center. I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating the Southwest Iowa Mental Health Center for achieving 50 years of service. I wish them and all of the staff the best of luck moving forward.

HONORING DR. SADIQ MOHYUDDIN, MRS. TALAT GUL MOHYUDDIN AND DR. YUSUF MOHYUDDIN

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituents, Dr. Sadiq Mohyuddin, Mrs. Talat Gul Mohyuddin, and their son Dr. Yusuf Mohyuddin, who have established an endowment fund at OSF St. Anthony's Health Center in Southwestern Illinois to promote and enhance pulmonary medicine.

Forty-four years ago, Dr. Sadiq Mohyuddin began serving on the medical staff at St. Anthony's, consistently demonstrating a dedication to promoting pulmonary disease awareness and prevention.

In 2007, Dr. Sadiq Mohyuddin's son, Dr. Yusuf Mohyuddin, joined the St. Anthony's Physician Group, further demonstrating this family's dedication to the well-being of their community.

This dedication has been evident for years. In 1989, Dr. Mohyuddin served as chairman for an oriental garden project that was donated to the city of Alton and, to this day, serves as a reminder of the family's commitment to their community.

I am proud to recognize the Mohyuddin family's most recent endeavor of establishing an endowment fund to promote and enhance pulmonary medicine. The endowment will not just

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

increase awareness and prevention of pulmonary diseases, but will also support technological advances in both Illinois and Missouri.

As more than 20 percent of all cancer cases at St. Anthony's are lung and bronchus cases, this new endowment will benefit and make a significant impact on the region's healthcare system.

I am proud to honor them for their exemplary efforts to save lives and improve the healthcare services throughout the southwestern Illinois and Missouri.

INTRODUCTION OF RISK-BASED CAPITAL STUDY ACT OF 2015

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my bill, the Risk-Based Capital Study Act of 2015. My legislation requires the NCUA to perform a study of appropriate capital requirements for credit unions to ensure that these institutions and their members are not harmed by overregulation that suggests a solution in search of a problem.

On January 15, 2015, the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA) Board, in a 2–1 vote, issued a revised risk-based capital proposed rule for credit unions. While the revised proposal addresses some concerns expressed by Congress and by credit unions regarding the initial proposal, it still has raised a lot of concern in the credit union community—as evidenced by the revised proposal receiving over 2,150 comments during the comment period. A thorough study of the proposal before it moves forward is necessary to ensure credit unions and the communities they serve are not unduly burdened.

The bill would require the NCUA to provide to Congress an analysis on their legal authority with respect to certain aspects of the proposal, rationale behind the risk-weights assigned to various asset classes, and a close look at how the proposal would impact lending to credit union members before moving forward with their proposed rule. Given the critical role credit unions play in lending to our local communities, it's absolutely imperative that this proposal is reviewed closely before a judgement is made relative to moving forward.

TRIBUTE TO FLOYD AND BETTY FOREMAN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Floyd and Betty Foreman of Council Bluffs, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. Floyd and Betty were married on June 12, 1955. They were married at St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church in Council Bluffs, where they continue to be active members.

Floyd and Betty's lifelong commitment to each other and to their children, Kathryn, Cindy, and Steve, and their grandchildren truly embodies our Iowa values. I salute this devoted couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion. I wish them and their family all the best moving forward.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SUPERFUND REINVESTMENT ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, joined by 16 original cosponsors, I am pleased to introduce legislation to reauthorize the Superfund taxes on polluting industries. The Superfund Reinvestment Act will provide much needed funding to clean up toxic waste sites throughout the United States and relieve the financial burden currently shouldered by the American taxpayers who currently pay for this cleanup.

Across the country there are more than 1,100 severely polluted Superfund sites. Approximately 49 million Americans live within three miles of a Superfund site. These contaminated sites threaten humans with exposure to toxins such as arsenic, benzene, PCBs, mercury and a wide range of solvents, resulting in health problems such as infertility, low birth weight, birth defects, leukemia and respiratory difficulties. This contamination also threatens the economic and social vitality of the communities that play host to these dirty sites.

The Superfund program was originally created in 1980 to cleanup these contaminated sites and free residents of the health risks and fears that come from living close to toxic waste. In most cases, the EPA works with responsible parties to compel them to pay for cleanup. At approximately 30 percent of Superfund sites, however, those responsible for the pollution cannot be found or do not have the ability to pay, so the federal government pays for the cleanup. Historically, the Superfund Trust Fund, financed by taxes on petroleum products, chemicals and corporate income, was used for this purpose. Because Congress has not reauthorized the Superfund taxes since 1995, the Trust Fund has been depleted and the funding for the cleanup of orphan sites has shifted primarily to general funds.

The Superfund Reinvestment Act restores the "polluter pays" taxes and updates these taxes for inflation, returning fairness to the process and once again making those responsible for pollution pay for the cleanup. The bill includes excise taxes of \$.163 per barrel on crude oil or refined oil products and taxes ranging from \$.51 to \$11.35 per ton on certain chemicals. The bill reinstates a corporate environmental income tax of .12% on a corporation's modified alternative minimum taxable income that exceeds \$3.735 million. This legislation expands the definition of oil to include

unconventional crude oil sources, such as tar sands and oil shale. This legislation also includes language to guarantee that money from the Trust Fund is only spent on Superfund cleanups.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working to strengthen the Superfund program by ensuring that polluters continue to pay. Restoring the Superfund taxes will go a long way towards making certain that funds are available to cleanup America's most toxic waste sites and to help keep our communities and our families safe, healthy and economically secure.

TRIBUTE TO LORRAINE GENTRY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Lorraine Gentry on the celebration of her 100th birthday. Ms. Gentry celebrated her 100th birthday on April 22nd, 2015.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Ms. Gentry's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones, and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism, and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Ms. Gentry has lived through seventeen United States Presidents and twenty-four Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Ms. Gentry in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Ms. Gentry on reaching this incredible milestone, and wishing her even more health and happiness in the years to come.

21ST CENTURY STEM FOR GIRLS AND UNDERREPRESENTED MI- NORITIES ACT OF 2015

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced the 21st Century STEM for Girls and Underrepresented Minorities Act because I strongly believe that we need more girls and minorities represented in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) careers and professions.

Large segments of our population are underrepresented in those academic and professional areas, which means that our nation is leaving a significant amount of talent on the table—not engaging with or being exposed to tools for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, here is the problem.

According to a 2014 National Science Board annual report, African Americans, Hispanics,

American Indians, and Alaska Natives accounted for only 10 percent of U.S. workers in science and engineering in 2010.

This is a far smaller proportion than their share of the general population, which was 26 percent.

Women are also underrepresented in the science and engineering workforce.

While women represent half of all college-educated workers in the United States, they made up just 28 percent of science and engineering workers in 2010.

These statistics make clear we are ignoring an untapped opportunity to expand STEM employment in the United States, employment which leads to good jobs, steady wages, and the ability to join the middle class.

The development of world-class talent in the STEM fields here at home is critical to America's global leadership.

Supporting women and minorities in STEM is not only an essential part of America's strategy to out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world, it is also important to students themselves.

STEM careers offer women and minorities the opportunity to engage in some of the most exciting fields of discovery and technological innovation.

A highly-skilled STEM educated workforce is essential to ensuring the United States' ability to succeed in the 21st century global economy.

By broadening the STEM pipeline to include those who have been historically underrepresented in STEM fields, we will create a larger, more diverse STEM talent pool of problem solvers and inventors.

We can increase the number of girls and underrepresented minorities in the STEM fields by getting these groups interested in STEM early and keeping them engaged.

Students from historically disadvantaged groups such as African Americans and Hispanics, both female and male, are less likely to have access to advanced courses in math and science in high school, which negatively affects their ability to enter and successfully complete STEM majors in college.

That is why I am introducing the 21st Century STEM for Girls and Underrepresented Minorities Act.

This bill would provide funding to local school districts to carry out activities designed to better engage girls and underrepresented minorities in STEM.

This way we can be sure to tap into these vast talent pools of students, while they are young.

Allowable activities under the legislation include improving professional development for teachers and other school personnel, strengthening outreach to parents, providing mentoring and tutoring programs, improving access to afterschool and summer programs that provide additional enrichment opportunities in STEM, and providing academic advice and assistance in high school course selection that encourages girls and underrepresented minorities to take advanced STEM classes.

Diversity is key for the United States to continue to prosper and compete: We must do more to recruit women and underrepresented minorities into the science, technology, engineering and math fields.

Diversity drives innovation, and its absence imperils our creativity and our productivity.

By training our nation's underserved talent in STEM fields, we will ensure that we have the intellectual capital essential to enhance our position as the world's strongest economy, passing American greatness to the next generation.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in this effort my co-sponsoring.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. GARY HOLLANDER

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gary Hollander who has served as a mentor, teacher, union leader, college instructor, consultant, and academic administrator. Gary Hollander is the first and only President of Diverse & Resilient, Inc. He founded this nonprofit organization to become a voice for the healthy development of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered (LGBT) people in Wisconsin during his 20 years with the agency. He officially steps down as President and CEO of Diverse & Resilient, Inc. in July, 2015.

The agency's name serves to remind us that LGBT people are everywhere, engage in interesting and meaningful lives, and contribute to the welfare of each other and the broader community. Diverse & Resilient serves over 5,000 LGBT people every year. The agency has built the capacity of LGBT groups in Wisconsin and provided direct-service work to address the health disparities experienced by LGBT people in Wisconsin. The agency has focused on six priority areas: Acceptance, Cultivating Leaders, Mental Health, Sexual Health, Partner & Community Violence, and Substance Use.

Gary Hollander is a life-long resident of Wisconsin. He earned a doctorate in educational psychology from the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee where he earned both graduate and undergraduate honors. Gary has both taught and served as a school psychologist in Milwaukee Public Schools. He worked at Planned Parenthood of Wisconsin and was also a national consultant for Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Gary has worked in health care heading up educational and research programs, starting and managing an HIV clinic, and held clinical positions in family medicine, psychiatry, and psychology. He is also a very active volunteer serving on boards of directors of agencies and other leadership roles.

Hollander is an outspoken proponent for LGBT people across Wisconsin. He has used his platform to build strong relationships with other community agencies in order to educate people on the impact of HIV/AIDS in our community and to look at LGBT issues as part of a broader public health agenda. Under his leadership, the agency has increased its visibility and expanded the number of age groups it attracts and serves.

Although he will no longer be at the helm of Diverse & Resilient, Hollander will continue to

advocate and empower people who remain marginalized based on their race, gender or sexual orientation. He also will continue to honor his late husband of 32 years, Paul Mandracchia, an artist and dancer who died December 24, 2014 after a long battle with multiple sclerosis.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Dr. Gary Hollander. He has left a legacy of advocacy and compassion. He is a true trailblazer who has labored to increase acceptance and tolerance for not just gay people but for all of us. The citizens of the Fourth Congressional District, the State of Wisconsin and the nation have benefited tremendously from his dedicated service. I am honored for these reasons to pay tribute to Dr. Gary Hollander.

TRIBUTE TO REBEKAH TOPHAM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Rebekah Topham of Griswold, Iowa, for her extraordinary accomplishment as one of Iowa's most decorated track athletes. In May, Rebekah ended her brilliant high school track career at Griswold High School, winning her 11th state championship gold medal.

Rebekah's love for running began at a young age. As a freshman, Rebekah rocketed onto the scene by winning three state titles along with a runner-up medal. But that was only a glimpse of what was to come. Rebekah won eight more gold medals in the next three years, rounding out one of the best track seasons in Iowa high school history. Rebekah's success on the track demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance.

It is with great honor that I recognize Rebekah for her outstanding achievements. I am proud to represent her, and her family in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Rebekah and wishing her nothing but the best as she continues working towards her dreams as a collegiate track athlete.

RECOGNIZING THE APPOINTMENT OF STUDENTS FROM FLORIDA'S NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT TO THE U.S. SERVICE ACADEMIES

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the students of Florida's Ninth Congressional District who received an appointment to one of the United States Service Academies for 2015. One of my favorite duties as a Member of Congress is to nominate the best and brightest young men and women of my district to our nation's Service Academies.

This year, my district received a total of 13 offers of appointment, the highest number my

office has ever received. Additionally, one student received an appointment to the Naval Academy Preparatory School. It is my honor to publicly recognize these students for their accomplishments and service to our country.

The following students were appointed to the U.S. Military Academy: Jeremy Beesley of St. Cloud, FL; Carla Figueroa of Kissimmee, FL; Lily McDonough of Celebration, FL; John Roche of Orlando, FL; and Elizabeth Rodriguez of St. Cloud, FL. Ms. Rodriguez also received an offer of appointment to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The following students were appointed to the U.S. Air Force Academy: Ashley Gooden of St. Cloud, FL; Kevin Mendez of Kissimmee, FL; and Joshua Rice of Orlando, FL.

The following students were appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy: Christina Potts of Orlando, FL; Joshua Volpert of Orlando, FL; Andrew Abdelnour of Orlando, FL; and Mason Hooten of Orlando, FL.

Joel Oviedo of Orlando, FL received an appointment to the Naval Academy Preparatory School.

I congratulate them all and wish them much success in their military careers.

THANKING VIRGIL JULIOT FOR
HIS SERVICE IN WORLD WAR II

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Reverend Virgil Juliot of Geneseo for his brave service in the United States Army Air Corps during World War II.

At 18 years old, Mr. Juliot enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps. He served the Army Air Corps for three years during World War II, from 1943 to 1946, as a navigator on a B-29 aircraft with the 313th Wing of the 9th Bomb Group in the Pacific Theater. He was stationed on the Island of Tinian, which is part of the Mariana Islands and home to the world's largest air field. Mr. Juliot completed his service with the rank of First Lieutenant.

In May, Mr. Juliot celebrated his 60th wedding anniversary with his wife, Marilyn. He has been blessed with five children, 12 grandchildren, and 16 great-grandchildren and active in a wide range of church and community organizations across the country. Additionally, Mr. Juliot has had the distinction of receiving a master Gardener Certificate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. Juliot once again for his outstanding service to our nation during World War II and his dedicated service to communities across the country over the past decades. I wish him, and his family, nothing but the very best going forward.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,758,771,144.62. We've added \$7,525,881,722,231.54 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

TRIBUTE TO RUSSELE SLEEP

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mr. Russele Sleep, of Bedford, Iowa. Russele participated in the 52nd annual World Livestock Auctioneer Championship in Clifton, Texas, from June 10th to the 14th as part of the Livestock Marketing Association's annual convention.

Each year over 100 auctioneers attempt to qualify for the event and as one of the 31 semi-finalists, Russele will compete in a live interview and auctioneering contest. Russele is an accomplished auctioneer having competed in this competition multiple times. As one of the top auctioneers in the U.S., Russele carries on the rich tradition of competitive livestock marketing through hard-work and dedication to his craft.

I applaud and congratulate Russele for this achievement and for representing Iowa at this year's World Livestock Auctioneer Championship. I am proud to represent him in the U.S. Congress and I know that my colleagues join me in congratulating Russele and wishing him nothing but continued success in his career.

RECOGNIZING KATHLEEN MILLETT
ON HER CAREER

HON. KATHERINE M. CLARK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to congratulate Ms. Kathleen Millett on more than three decades of service to the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

For more than 37 years, "Katie" has played a vital role in overseeing and administering the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) nutrition programs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

As the Executive Director for the Office of Nutrition, Health and Safety Programs at the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and

Secondary Education, Katie oversaw the policy and training development, fiscal and operational work of the office for all federal child nutrition programs including the National School Lunch Program, NSLP, USDA Foods, Child and Adult Care Food Program, CACFP, and the Summer Food Service Program, SFSP. Collectively, these programs annually totaled more than \$300 million in federal nutrition funding.

To ensure that Massachusetts held its spot as a leader in child nutrition programming and outreach, Katie served on many national and state committees. She was State Agency Representative for the national School Nutrition Association's Board of Directors and an advisor to the Massachusetts School Nutrition Association. She was also founding co-chair of the Massachusetts' Action for Healthy Kids State Team, Mass AFHK. Katie also served in numerous leadership positions with national child nutrition groups such as the National Food Service Management Institute, NFSMI, and the Food Research and Action Center, FRAC.

With Katie's help, Massachusetts has always been on the cutting edge of new funding opportunities and practices, including USDA pilot grant programming. Katie has funded and supported The Child Nutrition Outreach Program, CNOP, since 1994, which works to increase participation in NSLP and SFSP. Katie has also funded and supported the John C. Stalker Institute of Food and Nutrition at Framingham State University since May of 1988 when it was dedicated as a source of education for food service directors, managers, and workers. Since 1988 a variety of workshops have been provided for both educators and food service staff.

Under Katie's leadership, Massachusetts has received multiple Direct Certification Performance Awards from USDA for improving direct certification rates. Massachusetts now has almost 95% of their eligible children living in households receiving benefits under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, directly certified for free school meals.

With Katie's help, Massachusetts school districts have also dramatically increased school breakfast participation, which is proven to positively impact students' academic success. For example, Katie spearheaded an initiative to increase statewide breakfast participation by 35% and was instrumental in the recent state regulation change, February 2015, allowing Breakfast in the Classroom to count towards instructional time.

Ahead of the USDA Smart Snacks regulations, Katie also helped lead Massachusetts' implementation of nutrition standards for all foods and drinks sold or provided during the school day.

As you can see from these accomplishments, Katie's tireless efforts have significantly advanced the quality of and access to healthy meals for infants, toddlers, adolescents and seniors across the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I salute my constituent Katie Millett, on a job well done.

HONORING GENERAL RAYMOND T. ODIERNO

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor General Raymond T. Odierno, the 38th Chief of Staff of the United States Army, for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to our Nation. After 39 years of distinguished service, General Odierno will retire from active military duty in September 2015, leaving behind a legacy that will live on for generations to come.

As co-chairs of the House Army Caucus, Representative RUPPERSBERGER and I had the honor of working with General Odierno as he led our Army while the Nation fought two wars and deployed or maintained a presence in more than 150 locations around the world. All the while, General Odierno remained the consummate professional, exemplifying the qualities exhibited by all great, transformational leaders: a strong sense of duty, honor, courage, character, and commitment to this great country.

General Odierno was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Field Artillery upon graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1976. He commanded units at every echelon, from platoon to theater. He deployed in support of Operations DESERT SHIELD and DESERT STORM, commanded the 4th Infantry Division during Operation IRAQI FREEDOM, and served as the Commanding General of Multi-National Corps-Iraq and Multi-National Force-Iraq between 2006 and 2010.

During his tenure in Iraq, General Odierno was the architect of the troop surge that turned the tide of the war; he implemented the transition plan to an Iraqi-civilian run effort; and he oversaw the largest retrograde operation since the Vietnam War. His success in all of these endeavors led to his appointment as the 38th Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army in 2011. Since then, General Odierno's leadership and commitment to his Soldiers, the Army, and the Nation ensured that the U.S. Army remained the most highly trained and professional land force the world has ever known.

General Odierno is an American patriot of the highest caliber. He has dedicated his entire life to the security of our Nation, but most importantly, he is a man of character. His tireless commitment to Soldiers and their Families has never wavered. In his wake stands an impeccable organization, full of leaders capable of confronting the complex global challenges we face today.

With profound admiration and deep respect, we pay tribute to him for all he has done for our Nation. We thank General Odierno, his wife, Linda, and his three children, Tony, Katie, and Mike for their dedication and sacrifice. And we wish them all the fullest measure of peace and happiness in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO LINDEMAN TRACTOR

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a great Iowa company, Lindeman Tractor. Lindeman Tractor celebrated 70 years of business in December 2014.

Bob Lindeman's father started selling machinery in Cumberland, Iowa with one employee and two children to help out. That business expanded to Atlantic Iowa and now employs 40 people. They sell a range of products from tractors, planters, and various other equipment. Fundamental to Lindeman Tractor's success has been their dedication to customer service and handling their customers' needs on a day-to-day basis.

I applaud and congratulate Lindeman Tractor for their 70 years in Iowa's Third Congressional District. I am proud to represent them in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Lindeman Tractor and wishing them and their employees nothing but success in the future.

HONORING FRANK FANELLI

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Frank Fanelli, who is retiring after 43 years of outstanding service as a teacher, coach, and administrator in the Port Chester-Rye Union Free School District, which I am proud to represent.

Mr. Fanelli was born and raised in Port Chester, New York, and first distinguished himself on the high school gridiron as the last district player to be named an All-American football player. He began to think of a teaching career in high school and started as the junior high school health teacher in the 1970s. After teaching for 23 years, Mr. Fanelli moved into administration, holding positions including Assistant Principal, Director of Grants, and currently Assistant Superintendent.

Mr. Fanelli has devoted his professional career in the Port Chester schools to his philosophy of educating the whole child. During his tenure, the Port Chester school district implemented Full Service Community Schools, two of which have received National Blue Ribbons, and developed the JFK Early Learning Center. Under his leadership, the district received grants totaling more than \$50 million that enhanced the educational opportunities for students. In more than four decades of service, his achievements have won many well-deserved awards including Westchester County Health Teacher of the Year, Port Chester Teacher of the Year, and most recently, special recognition from the Port Chester, Rye Brook, and Rye Town Council of Community Services. Mr. Fanelli's leadership and tireless efforts have truly ensured that Port Chester students are prepared to excel in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Frank Fanelli for his 43 years of dedicated service to his community. He truly has improved the lives of thousands of students and their families as well as inspired hundreds of educators, many whom he has selflessly mentored. I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating his exemplary career and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

ACKNOWLEDGING LUCILLE HARRIS

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Lucille Harris, who will be honored by the Manteca Chamber of Commerce with their Lifetime Achievement Award. This award is given to prominent individuals who diligently enhance the lives of the residents, youth, and businesses in the community.

Lucille Harris was born in Manteca, California to John and Mary Mendosa. Following her graduation from Manteca High School in 1950, she furthered her education by attending Humphreys Business College.

In 1951, Lucille married the late William Robert Harris, and together they laid the foundation of a successful business enterprise. In 1955, Lucille and Bill purchased the Smith Welding Company, and five years later, the business evolved into Tuff Boy Sales Inc., also known as Tuff Boy Leasing and Equipment Sales. This year, the business will be celebrating its 60th anniversary. In addition to Tuff Boy Sales Inc., Lucille and Bill also own W/L Harris Ranches, where Lucille remains an active manager in both companies today.

Community involvement has always been an important part of the Harris family, which is why they are devoted to several different clubs and organizations. Believing that history is vital to the community, Lucille is the trustee of the Manteca Historical Society and a member of the Ripon Historical Society. She puts a high emphasis on reading and writing and has a significant role in both Manteca and Ripon "Friends of the Library" programs. Furthermore, Lucille is an active member of the Manteca, Lathrop, and Ripon, Chambers of Commerce.

Lucille has always believed education to be essential, and has committed herself to several youth programs. The Harris name is renowned for their gracious donations and extensive dedication to fund many educational endeavors. They have been major sponsors of the California State University, Stanislaus "Great Valley Writing Project", St. Anthony's School, Boys and Girls Club, RCAF Ripon Community Athletic Foundation, FFA, 4H programs, as well as supporting the Give Every Child a Chance program.

For many years, Lucille has been a strong supporter of two grass root organizations; Citizens for Judicial Integrity, supporting ADA Legislation Reform, and Neighbor's United, supporting sensible growth and agriculture protection. In addition, she has joined Californians against Lawsuit Abuse, the Civil Justice Association of California, and the National Federation of Independent Business.

Over her lifetime, Lucille has received many awards, one of the most recent being the Women's Connection—Lady of Influence Award in 2012, for leading the way in business, industry, and enterprise. In 2013, Bill and Lucille were inducted into the Manteca Hall of Fame in the fields of business, community service, and at-large.

Together, Lucille and Bill raised three children, son Martin Harris and two daughters Marcia Perkins and Melissa King, who all reside locally. They are also proud grandparents to seven grandkids and five great-grandchildren. Unfortunately, on October 27, 2012, Lucille's beloved husband Bill passed away after 61 years of marriage.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in acknowledging Lucille Harris, an extraordinary woman whose contributions to her family, community and the economic vitality of Manteca have made her an ideal candidate to receive the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Manteca Chamber of Commerce.

TRIBUTE TO CHERYL PERDEW

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Cheryl Perdeu for opening her new florist business, LaNae's Enchanted Florist and Gifts, in Bedford, Iowa.

Cheryl, her husband Daven, and their three daughters moved to Bedford from Tennessee. In Tennessee she had been the youngest business owner for a number of years, having opened her first florist business from her home when she was just 16. I recognize that our nation's small businesses are critical to our economy, and I support hardworking Iowans like Cheryl who have done so much to help their neighbours and communities by following their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Cheryl on a job well done, and wishing her and her family continued success for years to come.

HONORING THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE OF MAJOR GENERAL ROBERT G. KENNY

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and 37 year military career of Major General Robert G. Kenny of Bethlehem Township, New Jersey and his dedication to the Nation. Born in New Brunswick, New Jersey in 1956, and a graduate of Rutgers University and Seton Hall Law School, Major General Robert G. Kenny deserves our sincerest thanks as he retires as the Mobilization Assistant to The Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, Headquarters United States Air Force on July 1, 2015.

Major General Kenny's initial active duty assignment was with the 366th Tactical Fighter Wing, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho from January 1982 to July 1984. He served as the Chief of Claims, Chief of Civil Law, Chief of Military Justice and the Area Defense Counsel. Major General Kenny separated from active duty and became a member of the Air Force Reserve attached to Headquarters Air Force District of Washington, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, DC, serving as an IMA from June 1987 to January 1992. Additionally, he became an adjunct member of the faculty of the Judge Advocate General School, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama where he was an instructor for the Advanced Trial Advocacy Course.

Major General Kenny transferred to the Category A Program and became the Deputy Staff Judge Advocate of the 514th Air Mobility Wing, McGuire Air Force Base in January 1992. In June of 1998, he became the Staff Judge Advocate. He received the Reginald C. Harmon Award naming him the Outstanding Reserve Judge Advocate of the Air Force in 1998. He was promoted to Lieutenant Colonel on 27 July 1999. He deployed to Southwest Asia in support of Operation Southern Watch on four occasions from 1998 to 2001. He also deployed during September and October 2001 and served as the 60th Air Expeditionary Group Combat Support Squadron Commander at a classified location and Al Udeid AB during Operation Enduring Freedom. He was the Senior IMA to HQ 21AF/JA from 1 April 03 to 30 Sept 03; Senior IIMA to HQ 18AF/JA from 1 October 2003 to 6 January 2005; Senior IMA to HQ AETC/JA from 7 January 2005 to 31 January 2006, Senior IMA to AFLOA/CC from January 2006 to January 2007; Mobilization Assistant to AMC/JA from January 2007 to April 2008; and, Mobilization Assistant to the Deputy Judge Advocate General from April 2008 to October 2010. Most notably, General Kenny also Performed the Duties of the Judge Advocate General (PDOTJAG) from March 2014 until May 2014.

He has been awarded the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal (3 OLC), Air Force Commendation Medal (3 OLC), Air Force Achievement Medal (1 OLC), Air Force Outstanding Unit Award (2 OLC), Air Force Organizational Excellence Award, Air Force Recognition Ribbon, National Defense Service Medal (1 BS), Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Military Outstanding Volunteer Service Medal, Air Force Longevity Service (5 OLC), Armed Forces Reserve Medal (M Device/Silver X), Small Arms Expert Marksmanship Ribbon, and the Air Force Training Ribbon. He also was honored as the 1998 Reginald C. Harmon Outstanding Reserve Judge Advocate of the Year.

In his civilian capacity, Major General Kenny is a senior partner with the firm Hoagland, Longo, Moran, Dunst & Doukas in New Brunswick, New Jersey where he is a Chief Litigation Counsel.

Today I rise to share Major General Robert G. Kenny's tremendous accomplishments and dedicated public service with the House of Representatives. I extend my gratitude to his wife, Kathy, and his three daughters, LeAnne, Michelle and Jacqueline, and I sincerely thank

the Major General for his lifetime of service and leadership.

H-E-B 110TH BIRTHDAY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish H-E-B Grocery Stores a very happy 110th birthday.

H-E-B has been serving the great State of Texas for 110 and strives to give back to all Texans. They continue to support our community through quality food, incredible service and various philanthropic efforts throughout Texas. We are extremely proud of the accomplishments made by H-E-B and are proud of their deep Texas roots.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, happy birthday again to H-E-B, and we look forward to 110 more years.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY DRAKE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Nancy Drake of Bedford, Iowa, on her retirement from the Bedford School. Ms. Drake has been a dedicated public servant helping to educate the future of Iowa—its students.

Ms. Drake began her career in education in 1976. In 1995 she began her work at the Bedford School as an At-Risk teacher, helping to reach students in need. During her tenure at Bedford she has helped countless students as a K-6 At-Risk teacher, ELL, middle school Language Arts, 10th grade English, and HAS teacher.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent dedicated public servants like Ms. Drake from the great state of Iowa in the United States Congress. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Nancy Drake on reaching this important milestone, and wishing her continued success for years to come.

CONGRATULATING LONNIE R. STEPHENSON ON HIS POSITION AS THE NEW PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Moline, Illinois' own Lonnie Stephenson on becoming the President of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, representing 750,000 of its members worldwide. The IBEW represents a variety of

workers spanning the utilities, manufacturing, communications and infrastructure industries.

Mr. Stephenson has been an active member and dedicated leader within IBEW for many years. He joined IBEW Local 145 in Rock Island in 1976 and worked his way up to become Vice-President and then President of his local organization. He was later appointed as an international regional representative, leading operations across Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin and Minnesota.

Mr. Stephenson has championed the IBEW's mission for decades, and his service and dedication have never wavered. As the new international President, I know he will continue to champion the causes important to electrical workers and working men and women across the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. Stephenson for his longtime commitment to the IBEW and wish him the best of luck in his new role. He has been an exceptional leader, and I know he will continue serving electrical workers, and all working families, everywhere for years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. WILLIAM MCCOY

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. William McCoy on his 31 years of service as Chief Apostle and CEO of Brothers Keeper Community Outreach Church.

Dr. William McCoy, through his calling of spreading the word of God, has done great work for his community by way of his organization's involvement with kingdom building feats like jail ministry, and parole chaplaincy, which are just a couple of examples of his many deeds that shine as a beacon of hope for those in need.

Dr. McCoy began his pastoral career in 1986, serving first at God's House of Deliverance Holiness Church in 1989, and then he earned his Certificate of Ordination from the Pentecostal Apostolic Assemblies of Jesus Christ. In 1991, he graduated from the United Theological Seminary, and in 1993, Dr. McCoy received an Honorary Doctorate of Divinity from the Apostolic Baptist Seminary in Evansville, Indiana. In 1994, he was consecrated as the Presiding Prelate Bishop of IPAE and AIMBK by Bishop Lester P. Bell, and earned his Prison Fellowship Training Diploma. In 1995, Dr. McCoy earned his Doctorate of Philosophy in Pastoral Theology from the International College of Bible Theology.

The Brothers Keeper Community Outreach Church was created to call attention to the need for a message of deliverance from substance addictions, domestic abuse and other challenges plaguing the lives of some of God's children; the organization has done great work at conveying its belief in the importance of teaching deliverance through parole chaplaincy training, ministerial training and other outreach practices.

Dr. William McCoy has served his community outside of his work with the Brothers

Keeper Community Outreach Church as well, some positions such as an Auxiliary Chaplain of the Cook County Sheriff Department since 1994; as a board member of the Cook County Jails Alternative Schools L.S.C., since 1997 and as the Superintendent Parole Chaplain of Cook County. In 2002 Dr. McCoy was elected to serve as President of the Illinois Community Chaplaincy Council, and in 2009, he became President of the South Suburban Action Conference and became a member of the IPAE-NETWORK Cook County Sheriff's Department Re-Entry Initiative and the Advisory Board of Cook County Clergy United, Inc.

Dr. William McCoy in his many roles and his work with the Brothers Keeper Community Outreach Church has not only been inspirational, but vital to the life we live as both God's children and Americans.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. William McCoy for his many years of dedicated service and wish him continued success and happiness in the future.

FOR ALL THE FATHERS

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of all the Fathers of The Armed Forces who have served, or who have family members who have served. Let us remember their sacrifice, and give thanks to them and their families on this Father's Day. I submit this poem which was penned in their honor, by Albert Carey Caswell.

For all the Fathers this Father's Day
who go off to war for us we pray
And for all the ones who aren't coming home,
all because of what they gave
That Last Full Measure,
the greatest of all treasure's teaching us how
men of honor behave
Who take up our Nation's defense so very brave,
who now lie all in such cold deep dark quiet graves.
Whose sons and daughters will never see them again,
all for the price of freedom they paid
And for all the Fathers who went off to war,
for The Greater Good who such heartache endure
This Father's Day,
our Nation gives thanks to you and your families so all the more
And for all the families now separated across the shores.
Whose children cannot be in your arms in yours.
Remember my children how much your Father you adores
And for all those Fathers who raised all of their fine daughters and sons.
The ones who meant the most,
who'll no longer get to see the morning's sun.
And the chance to raise all of their own most precious daughters and sons.
And for all those Fathers who sit for hours by a hospital bed,
with all of their sons and daughters in pieces who died and bled
Watching them in awe at what their courage has said

As your tears run down your cheeks never seeming to ebb

Inspired by watching them rebuild their lives coming out of such dread

And yes for all of our Fathers this Father's Day,

upon bended knee for all of you we now so pray.

And remember to give thanks to all of them this day

For all of those most precious gifts for us the price of freedom they paid

And for all of their children in the coming years who stand on this day in tears.

Because their Daddy isn't coming home as they've realize their darkest fears

We pray our Lord give them the strength and courage,

in what your Father's life so meant here on earth to your souls so nourish

And to lead your life with the same kind of faith and courage,

that made your Fathers' hearts so flourish.

As we'll see your Fathers in all your faces.

And when we hear your voices to them you will so take us

And you will carry your Father's heart with you to all places.

To help you to somehow all to so face this

And we pray you will grow up to be strong and tall.

Just like your Fathers one and all

So one day too,

you can teach your children all about your Father's most heroic hue

All in such admiration, of what is brilliant, of what is true

And hush my children please don't you cry, because one day up in Heaven you will look into your Father's eyes

And you won't have to cry no more and ask why?

This Father's Day please,

please remember all of those Fathers who answered our Nation's battle cry

America's greatest of all Fathers, who did not hesitate or ask why

This Father's Day, God Bless them all with tear in eye.

RECOGNIZING DR. CHIU L. TSANG
FOR HIS DEDICATED SERVICE TO
SANTA MONICA COLLEGE

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with my colleague, Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY, to recognize Dr. Chiu L. Tsang, a progressive thinker, visionary leader, and passionate educator who has spent the majority of his career promoting excellence in education. For almost a decade, Dr. Tsang has demonstrated his insightful and exemplary leadership and dedication to Santa Monica College (SMC) as its Superintendent and President.

Throughout his nine years of service to the institution, Dr. Tsang was able to enhance SMC's reputation as a leading job trainer in the region by pursuing greater opportunities for students and anticipating the needs of the local workforce. During his tenure at SMC, Dr. Tsang pioneered an inter-disciplinary model to take advantage of thousands of job opportunities in the information, communication and technology industry for students. This model

has now become the foundation for a Los Angeles-based community college, high school and industry consortium, "LA HI-TECH," which was recognized by President Obama as part of his TechHire Initiative.

Santa Monica College's student support culture also blossomed under the leadership of Dr. Tsang with the implementation of new student service programs such as the Veterans Resource Center and Guardian Scholars for foster youth. Furthermore, Dr. Tsang's leadership helped establish excellent and mutually-beneficial relationships with the City of Santa Monica, the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District and other local organizations.

Another admirable accomplishment Santa Monica College was able to obtain under Dr. Tsang's leadership included maintaining its place as the number one transfer institution to the University of California, transferring more Latino and African-American students to the UC system than any other community college.

In addition to his time as the SMC Superintendent and President, Dr. Tsang has had a remarkable and accomplished career. Dr. Tsang earned his B.A. Degree in Linguistics from UC Berkeley and went on to earn his doctorate in Linguistics from Stanford University. During his extensive years in a higher education career, Dr. Tsang served as President of San Jose City College and as dean at the City College of San Francisco. He also taught at Stanford University, De Anza in Cupertino and San Francisco State University. Being a recognized leader in the field of higher education, Dr. Tsang has been asked to speak at venues including the Royal Society of London and he has guest lectured at the UCLA Anderson School of Management and the USC Rossier School of Education.

Dr. Tsang's passion for higher education for all students is unquestionable. For decades, Dr. Tsang has been a trailblazer in his field. He has led a career focused on supporting higher education and the students who seek it. It is our sincere pleasure to recognize Dr. Tsang on his tenure as the Santa Monica College Superintendent and President and thank him for his unwavering service to the students, faculty, staff and community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 2015, the House of Representatives considered H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015. During the roll call vote, I mistakenly voted no on H.R. 1295. Therefore, I submit this statement to clarify my intention was to vote yes on H.R. 1295.

TRIBUTE TO KAY GOODRIDGE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Kay

Goodridge of Bedford, Iowa, on her retirement from the Bedford School. Ms. Goodridge has been a dedicated public servant helping to educate the future of Iowa—its students.

Ms. Goodridge has worked at the Bedford School for 15 years. During her tenure at Bedford she has worked diligently to support her community. She performed many different roles and worked with 26 different teachers and staff during her tenure.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent dedicated public servants like Kay Goodridge from the great state of Iowa in the United States Congress. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on reaching this important milestone, and wishing her continued success for years to come.

BAKERS CREEK TRAGEDY

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have sought recognition today to honor the forty American soldiers who tragically perished at Bakers Creek, Queensland, Australia, June 14, 1943, during World War II.

Their deaths came as a result of the crash of a B-17C Flying Fortress, which proved to be the worst aviation disaster of the Southwest Pacific war. More men died on that plane from my home state of Pennsylvania—six—than from any other State. The six men were: Pvt. James E. Finney, from Erie; T/Sgt. Alfred H. Frezza, from Altoona; Sgt. Donald B. Kyper, from Huntingdon; Pfc. Frank S. Penska, from Moscow; Sgt. Anthony Rudnick, from Philadelphia; and Cpl. Raymond H. Smith, from Oil City.

Only recently has Congress officially recognized the previously classified wartime accident. As a result, most of the crash victims' families were left in the dark about the specifics surrounding their loved ones' deaths in World War II.

Five years ago, many of my Congressional colleagues actively supported efforts to place a memorial monument in Arlington. Moreover, in June 2008, the Pennsylvania State Legislature passed a resolution designating June 14th as "Bakers Creek Memorial Day."

The monument, dedicated at Selfridge Gate entrance to Arlington National Cemetery on June 12, 2009 by the Secretary of the Army, honors the sole survivor and the 40 members of the Army Air Corps who lost their lives when a B-17C Flying Fortress crashed soon after take-off. The men were being returned to combat in the Papua New Guinea Campaign following 10-days of R&R at the American Red Cross Center located at the seaside City of Mackay on the northeast coast of Australia. The aircraft, a bomber converted to transport service, was operated by the 46th Troop Carrier Squadron of the 317th Troop Carrier Group which was a part of the U.S. Fifth Air Force.

I understand that today, COL Michael D. Henderson, Garrison Commander of Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall, Honorable Kim C. Beazley, Australian Ambassador to the United

States, and retired Fifth Air Force Commander, General Ralph E. Eberhart, USAF (Ret.) plan to place a wreath at the Bakers Creek Memorial to commemorate the 72nd Anniversary of the crash.

I applaud the military service members at JBM-HH and the members of the Bakers Creek Memorial Association for their continued efforts to help bring closure to the casualty families and a public remembrance of the forty American servicemen who perished at Bakers Creek in Australia during World War II.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DEDICATION OF CURRY COLLEGE'S SHELLEY I. HOON KEITH AND JOHN W. KEITH ALUMNI HOUSE

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dedication of the Shelley I. Hoon Keith and John W. Keith Alumni House at Curry College.

Curry College has, since its founding in 1879, been a beacon of higher education in Milton and Plymouth, Massachusetts. Curry College is known for pursuing a dynamic and diverse environment for its students. The College has focused its efforts to help students not just achieve successful careers but to be active and informed citizens. To that end, Curry College President Kenneth K. Quigley, Jr. is recognizing two of Curry College's most profound benefactors, Shelley Hoon Keith and John Keith, by dedicating the Alumni House in their names.

John, a longtime member of Curry College's Board of Directors, spends his time and generosity on philanthropic efforts such as the Anti-Defamation League, St. Mary's Center for Women and Children and B'nai B'rith among others. John's deepest commitment to non-profit interests is Curry College. He has been a driving force for the College's success over the last 15 years through his leadership on the board.

Shelley is a sought after not-for-profit advisor and leader in multiple charitable ventures. She too spends much of her energy working with many of the same organizations as John and has been honored with recognitions such as Bill Brett's Boston: Inspirational Women.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Shelley I. Hoon Keith and John W. Keith for all their efforts at Curry College and congratulating them on having the Alumni House dedicated to them.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose

of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 16, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED JUNE 17

- 9:30 a.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's final rule to regulate disposal of coal combustion residuals from electric utilities.
SD-406
- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine governing through goal setting, focusing on enhancing the economic and national security of America.
SD-342
- 10 a.m.
Committee on the Budget
To hold hearings to examine CBO's analysis of the Federal government's deepening fiscal challenges.
SD-608
- Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
SR-253
- Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on evaluating accreditation's role in ensuring quality.
SD-430
- Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to examine the economic exposure of Federal credit programs.
SH-216
- 2 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Gayle Smith, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.
SD-419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Carol Fortine Ochoa, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, General Services Administration.
SD-342

- 2:15 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine accessing capital in Indian Country.
SD-638

JUNE 18

- 9 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management
To hold hearings to examine the EPA's management of the renewable fuel standard program.
SD-342
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2016", and an original bill entitled "Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016".
SD-106
- Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine challenges to the future of highway funding.
SD-215

- 2 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Water and Power
To hold hearings to examine S. 593, to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage its infrastructure assets, S. 982, to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and to require the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to develop water planning instruments consistent with State law, S. 1305, to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir, S. 1365, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use designated funding to pay for construction of authorized rural water projects, S. 1291, to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska, S. 1552, to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and S. 1533, to authorize the

Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing.
SD-366

- 2:30 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH-219

JUNE 23

- 2 p.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety
To hold hearings to examine the impacts of EPA's proposed carbon regulations on energy costs for American businesses, rural communities and families, including S. 1324, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units.
SD-406

JUNE 24

- 2:15 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine demanding results to end Native youth suicides.
SD-628

JULY 7

- 10 a.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine highly pathogenic avian influenza, focusing on the impact on the United States poultry sector and protecting United States poultry flocks.
SR-328A

JULY 9

- 10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the back-end of the nuclear fuel cycle and related legislation, including S. 854, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste.
SD-366

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 16, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 16, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY HULTGREN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

RICHARD ALBERO'S 1,150-MILE WALK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man who has literally walked the walk in support of our Nation's wounded warriors.

Mr. Speaker, 65-year-old Richard Albero, a former Naval officer and math teacher from Dunedin, Florida, recently completed an 86-day, 1,150-mile walk from home plate at Steinbrenner Field in Tampa during a spring training game to home plate at Yankee Stadium in New York City. He did so to honor his fallen nephew. Richard's nephew, Gary, worked at the World Trade Center and lost his life in the 9/11 attacks.

In addition to honoring his nephew, Richard also chose to do something very special. He walked to raise money for the Wounded Warrior Project. His goal was to raise \$25,000.

During Richard's trek up the East Coast, which began on March 2, he went through six pairs of shoes. He suffered blisters on his feet and traveled over countless hills and endured the

many elements, yet Richard never gave up.

Very recently, just a few weeks ago, he completed his walk, arriving at Yankee Stadium to a cheering crowd. Along the way, Richard blew past his goal for raising money and raised \$55,000 for the Wounded Warrior Project.

Mr. Speaker, Richard's nephew would be most proud and the Members of this body should be most proud as well as we reflect on and remember those who lost their lives and those who pay tribute to them today, those like Richard Albero.

May God bless Mr. Albero. May God bless our men and women in uniform who protect us each and every day. And may God bless these United States.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous crisis facing America, but it is not one you hear much about on Capitol Hill. It is killing hundreds of people a year, injuring thousands more. It is crippling America's global standing, as we have fallen in the world ranking from number 1 down to 27 and falling further. It is having a profound effect on our global economic competitiveness, while costing American families hundreds of dollars a year in extra expenses.

Of course, it is complicating the lives of American business and families by losing millions of hours that otherwise could be put to productive work, at exercise, or with their families, and on the job.

If it were any other subject, there would be cries of outrage and alarm and calls for action. You would see a flurry of action here on Capitol Hill.

Sadly, this decline, this cost, this damage is the result of our very real infrastructure crisis, a crisis to which Congress has been indifferent at best and negligent at worse.

Despite countless examples of the crying need for infrastructure investment, Congress has been paralyzed, trying to pay for 2015 costs of infrastructure with 1993 dollars. Congress has not taken any systematic action since 1993, and the time has long since passed for action.

Thirty-three short-term extensions of transportation finance is not a substitute for action. No nation became

great building its infrastructure 9 months at a time.

To be fair, there are people on Capitol Hill who do care about this and have proposed action:

My friend and colleague PETER DEFazio, the ranking member on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, has proposed a barrel tax on petroleum. He has proposed a financial fee on transactions, both of which would go a long way toward solving this problem.

My Ways and Means colleagues JIM RENACCI and BILL PASCRELL have proposed a mechanism that would be a failsafe, that if Congress didn't act to fund infrastructure, the gas tax would be indexed and increased.

Our Maryland colleague JOHN DELANEY has identified vast sums of corporate money parked overseas that could be made available for infrastructure investment in the United States if it were returned for that purpose.

And I have proposed, along with two dozen of my colleagues, that we simply bite the bullet and do what Ronald Reagan did in 1992—raise the gas tax for the 1st time in 22 years.

When I introduced this proposal in this Congress, it was supported by the widest array of groups on any major contested issue on Capitol Hill. It was supported by the top echelons of business, of organized labor, of the building trades, construction companies, local government, transit, bicycles, truckers, AAA, all in alignment that Congress should step up and remedy this situation.

There are solutions. There are people who think about it. We need to have the same level of courage and urgency that has been shown by people at the State and local level where they don't have the luxury of living in a Capitol Hill bubble. They have to deal with the consequences, and they have stepped up, 19 States since 2012—in fact, 6 States already this year. Idaho, Utah, Iowa, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Georgia, deep red States, have all raised the gas tax in 2015.

I am pleased that tomorrow the Ways and Means Committee will have its first hearing on transportation finance in the 56 months since my Republican colleagues took over. It is no substitute for Congress rolling up its sleeves and acting, but it is an important start. And I hope it will signify a full-court press in that committee to finally get down to cases and solve this problem.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Neiman, one of his secretaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Guide the Members of this people's House with the spirit of understanding, which might lead them to their best judgment. We live in a world of human failure and broken promises; may they be tolerant of the faults of others because they are aware of their own shortcomings.

Bless all with a quiet respect for the diversity of opinions to be found here. Through honest dialogue and contemplative listening, may Your servants search all the avenues open to them to meet today's challenges with integrity and justice.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HOLDING THE PRESIDENT ACCOUNTABLE ON TRADE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House approved part of a legislative package on trade promotion authority, or TPA.

There have been many mischaracterizations of what TPA is. Every day I hear from constituents who want me to hold President Obama accountable. Well, TPA does just that by providing accountability to the President's trade negotiation efforts through enhanced congressional oversight and additional transparency. The allegations that TPA is something for President Obama is false.

It is important to recognize that more than 95 percent of the world's customers live beyond U.S. borders, and 1.2 million jobs in North Carolina rely on trade with them. Trade-related employment in North Carolina grew 3.8 times faster than total State employment from 2004 to 2013.

While I heard many different perspectives on TPA from my constituents, the argument from North Carolina families, farmers, and employers that negotiating these trade agreements is in the economic best interest of our State was a deciding factor for my vote in favor of TPA.

REBUILDING OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for Congress to come together and pass a bold, bipartisan plan to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure.

Right now, China is spending 10 times as a percentage of GDP what we are on infrastructure. They are making huge investments in roads, bridges, ports, and rail. Meanwhile, Congress has simply not acted to put us on a competitive path in this global economy.

Now, a lot of debate has occurred here in the last weeks and days about our position in global trade, and we should have a trade deal that protects American jobs.

Meanwhile, what are we doing about China outspending us on infrastructure, which makes us less competitive? How are we supposed to compete with them when we haven't done anything to deal with our crumbling roads and bridges that are essential to making our manufacturers competitive in delivering their products to market?

It is time for bold action, big action on infrastructure, like the development of a national infrastructure bank that would leverage public capital with private capital to rebuild our crumbling roads and bridges.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for action. There is bipartisan support for this. We need to bring a big infrastructure bill to the floor of the House.

MAJORITY OF PENNSYLVANIANS SUPPORT HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a recent poll conducted by Robert Morris University reveals that 57.1 percent of Pennsylvanians support natural gas production and hydraulic fracturing, with nearly half saying they would welcome the industry into their hometown. This poll comes just 2 weeks after the Environmental Protection Agency released a report indicating that fracking poses "no widespread systemic harm to drinking water."

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania is the third largest natural gas producer in the Nation and continues to drive record-breaking oil and natural gas production. The Marcellus shale, which extends through most of Pennsylvania, has grown from less than 2 billion cubic feet per day in 2007 to 16 billion in 2014 and has jolted Pennsylvania's economy.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Natural Gas Caucus, I will continue to explore and promote best practices so that we can highlight the safety and the positive impacts of natural gas.

MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate national Men's Health Week, I urge all Americans to take action to reduce health risks and prevent disease. It can be as simple as exercising, eating right, or setting up an appointment for a checkup.

I also rise as the CBC Health Braintrust chair to bring awareness to

the critical state of Black men's health and the need to expand educational opportunities and treatment options to reduce incidence of disease in communities of color.

Black men suffer disproportionately from many chronic and infectious diseases, many of which are preventable. Today, almost 40 percent of Black men are obese, which contributes to stroke, heart disease, and diabetes. In 2015, Black men were found to be twice as likely to die from prostate cancer as White men and have a higher incidence and death rate from colorectal cancer. Your skin color and ZIP Code shouldn't determine your health outcomes.

Together, through legislation and community engagement, we can reduce health inequities and provide a healthier and more prosperous life for all Americans.

PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, that will be considered on the floor this week.

One of the most fundamental flaws of what is known as the Affordable Care Act is trying to offset the trillion-dollar price tag by imposing an arbitrary 2.3 percent tax on lifesaving medical devices, such as pacemakers and heart valves. It actually discourages the type of innovation that will improve our healthcare system for people needing these devices.

Hindered with these new high costs, our small businesses are finding it increasingly difficult to innovate, curtailing medical advancements and often delaying the availability of new treatments and cures for patients. I personally visited a number of these companies and understand how important their work is to improving our healthcare system.

Taxing innovation is not a 21st century healthcare solution. This devastating tax is reported to have already caused a net loss of over 33,000 jobs.

American families and small businesses deserve better, and the House is committed to advancing commonsense ideas to ease the burdens of the President's healthcare law. H.R. 160 is one of those solutions.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of repealing this job- and innovation-killing tax that only limits options for those who really need these lifesaving devices.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we rally around the obvious in the need for criminal justice reform and, in essence, the rehabilitation of our criminal justice laws as we deal with the interaction of law enforcement and civilians, having a pathway for respect for both, one of the most forgotten aspects is dealing with the treatment of juveniles in the criminal justice system.

I intend, over the next couple of weeks, to introduce a series of legislative initiatives that address that form of the criminal justice system, which we find, as parents and family members, touches all juveniles.

One of the things that the bill recognizes is that a young person's brain is still developing into his or her early twenties, and that those who commit crimes before this point should be treated differently by the criminal justice system.

The purpose of this effort is to improve the treatment of young offenders within the Federal criminal justice system and to put them on a path toward successful reentry by providing options for the sentencing judges; a safety valve for young offenders which would, in essence, break through the mandatory minimum; an early release for young offenders; and, particularly, alternatives such as massive use of home arrest.

Our children are our future. They get on the wrong path. Let's not celebrate that wrong path and force them to live that wrong path. Let's save their lives.

AXING THE TAX

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the estimated 145 million Americans who are at risk of losing their employer-sponsored healthcare insurance due to an excise tax included in the President's healthcare law. Beginning in 2018, employers will be required to pay a 40 percent tax on their employees' healthcare plans due to ObamaCare.

I am already hearing from constituents back home who hear from their employers and employees alike that are preparing for this devastating tax by looking at increasing deductibles, reducing benefits, and shifting costs to consumers and property taxpayers alike. This tax is set to cost New Hampshire's largest city, Manchester, over \$5 million.

Americans simply can't afford another costly tax, and that is why I introduced H.R. 879, a bill to repeal the so-called Cadillac tax. As we prepare to vote on a series of healthcare bills this week, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this commonsense bill.

H.R. 879 is a win for employers. It is also a win for municipalities. And,

most importantly, it is a win for all those hard-working Americans who expected the President to keep his promise that, if you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

(Mrs. TORRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, in just 6 legislative days, the charter of the Export-Import Bank will expire.

The Ex-Im Bank has proven an important tool in expanding U.S. exports and creating American jobs. It has done that with bipartisan support at zero cost to the taxpayers.

I would like to mention two companies in particular that have received support from the Ex-Im Bank: Able Industrial Products in Ontario and Desiccare in Pomona. These aren't giant, faceless corporations. They are very small businesses that provide jobs for the Inland Empire residents.

The world economy is getting more competitive, and the Ex-Im Bank is helping to level the playing field for American companies. If my colleagues truly want to protect U.S. jobs and U.S. workers, we can't afford to let the Ex-Im Bank expire. It is time to allow a vote.

□ 1215

TRIBUTE TO DORELLA ANDERSON

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dorella Alexis Anderson, a resident of Riverside, California, who passed away last month.

For more than 40 years, Dorella worked at the Riverside Community Settlement Association, which provided a number of services for residents in the Eastside area of Riverside.

A lifetime member of the Riverside African American Historical Society, Dorella worked to preserve the rich African American history in Riverside. She worked on numerous charitable endeavors in Riverside, including Toys for Tots, and gave back to the community in countless ways.

Dorella was a wife, a mother, a grandmother, a great-grandmother, a sister, an aunt, and a friend. Her dedication toward our community cements her legacy as one of our greatest residents. She will be missed.

CARRY-ON FREEDOM ACT

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the International Air Transport Association recommended a new guideline

that would reduce the size of carry-on luggage. The new carry-on size limit is 21 percent smaller than the size currently permitted by most major domestic airlines.

Eight major international carriers have already adopted the new size limits, and the trade association is suggesting more airlines will be adopting it soon. If implemented by our domestic carriers, this will force consumers to spend more on checked baggage fees and/or purchase new luggage to meet this new guideline.

Enough is enough. Airline passengers are tired of getting squeezed by airlines, both physically and fiscally. The seats are smaller, the legroom is less, the prices are more, and the profits are more.

That is why I introduced the Carry-on Freedom Act. The bill would prohibit airlines who charge for checked baggage from reducing the size of carry-on baggage from the current size standards and would protect consumers from even more cost to travel. I urge my colleagues to stand up for consumers and pass the Carry-on Freedom Act.

PROSTATE CANCER IS A NATIONAL EPIDEMIC

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, prostate cancer is a national epidemic, the most common cancer in men. One in seven men will be diagnosed, with more than 220,000 new cases each year, and 28,000 men will die from prostate cancer this year. Prostate cancer, Mr. Speaker, disproportionately impacts African American men, who have the highest prostate cancer rates of any racial or ethnic group. Black men are twice as likely to be diagnosed with prostate cancer, nearly 2½ times as likely to die from that disease.

Last week, I introduced the National Prostate Cancer Plan Act along with Congressmen MIKE MCCAUL, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and WALTER JONES. The bill would establish the National Prostate Cancer Council and direct them to develop and implement a national strategic plan to accelerate the innovation of diagnostic tools to improve early detection and reduce unnecessary treatment.

Prostate cancer can strike anyone. Many of us have either been personally affected by this disease or have lost a loved one. Enactment of this bill would be a giant step forward in our battle to combat this treatable disease so that men can live longer and healthier.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, has been endorsed by the American Urological Association, American Medical Association, Prostate Cancer Foundation, ZERO, and PCRI.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort by cosponsoring H.R. 2730.

WOMAN ON THE TWENTY ACT

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken. I join over 1 million Americans who voted in an online poll conducted by Women on 20s, a nonprofit grassroots organization, to put a woman on the \$20 bill.

To celebrate the amazing achievements of women throughout our history, I introduced the legislation to Put a Woman on the Twenty Act, H.R. 2147, which would empower the Secretary of Treasury to put a woman on the face of a \$20 bill as soon as possible.

Since the first general circulation of paper currency in this country, no woman has ever held the honor of being featured on paper money, and I would say to Secretary Lew that you need look no further than the people's choice winner, Harriet Tubman, for inspiration. In her words, "Every great dream begins with a dreamer." In her dreams, she always had a vision. More than ever, my vision is a redesign of the \$20 bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and support putting a woman on the \$20 bill.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE GUAM MEN'S NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Guam men's national soccer team, Team Matao, as they lead group D in the second round of the FIFA World Cup Asian qualifiers. It was a David versus Goliath moment yesterday when Team Matao defeated India with a 2-1 victory. This follows Team Matao's 1-0 victory over Turkmenistan last week.

I congratulate Guam Football Association President Richard Lai, coach Gary White, and all of Team Matao on their great victory. Biba Guam.

HONORING DR. DENNIS GALLON ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for myself and on behalf of my colleague Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL to honor one of south Florida's most respected leaders in higher education.

After 18 years of service, our friend Dr. Dennis Gallon is retiring as president of Palm Beach State College. Under his watch, Palm Beach State College has become the eighth-largest producer of associate degree graduates in America. From expanding STEM

education programs coveted by local employers to creating an honors college for high-achieving students, Palm Beach State College flourished under Dr. Gallon's leadership.

Just last year, the United States Department of Education reported that Palm Beach State College offers the sixth-lowest tuition rates nationwide. Dr. Dennis Gallon's commitment to high-quality, affordable higher education is truly admirable, and his tenure as president of Palm Beach State College deserves our praise and gratitude.

Congresswoman FRANKEL, and I am sure Congressman HASTINGS, and I proudly thank him for his remarkable service.

RENEW THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are just 6 more working days before the Ex-Im Bank expires, and given the critical importance of this program, I thought it would be useful to provide a quick index of hard numbers showing what this would mean to the United States economy:

Sixty—the number 60. That is the approximate number of Ex-Im credit agencies that are competing with us around the world that are waiting for our Bank to expire so they can grab that American export business.

3,340. That is the number of small businesses that are supported right now by the Ex-Im Bank, helping them to export their goods and provide jobs.

164,000. That is the number of American jobs that are provided right now this year by the Ex-Im Bank that we would lose immediately.

1.3 million. That is the number of private sector jobs that have been created by the Bank since 2009, with no additional cost to the American taxpayer. In fact, it makes money to help us pay down our debt.

And, finally, zero. That is what we gain by killing our Bank. Zero. We don't get the revenue. We don't get the jobs. We don't get to export our goods. Let's renew it.

REMEMBERING DOMENIC D'AMBROSIO

(Mr. MOULTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the floor of the House with a heavy heart. This past weekend, the city of Lynn lost a dedicated public servant, a tireless local volunteer, and an inspiring advocate for the people of our community. Domenic D'Ambrosio, known by many as Dom, was loved by

many for his uncanny ability to connect with people. Whether they were old friends or someone he was meeting for the first time, Dom's compassion for others was contagious, encouraging all of us to be better members of our community.

At a time when public opinion of Congress is at an all-time low, Dom's belief in this institution and the power of the democratic process could not have been stronger. I thank him for bringing a reinvigorating energy to our Nation's political dialogue and for reminding us why we are so fortunate to have a free and democratic government, and why we should all take part in making it better.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Kelly, his family, and friends. The Sixth District of Massachusetts lost a true champion, but I know that his legacy will live on through our shared commitment to public service. Dom, you will be missed.

JUNE IS ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of June as Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. Approximately 340,000 Texans and 5.4 million Americans currently have Alzheimer's disease. One in nine Americans over 65 is projected to develop Alzheimer's, and it is the sixth-leading cause of death in the United States.

The rapidly growing number of older Americans will lead to a corresponding rapid growth in the prevalence of Alzheimer's disease. The devastating emotional and financial impact of this debilitating disease is known by too many. My mother-in-law battled this disease, so I know firsthand how difficult it can be for patients and their loved ones.

I strongly support efforts to advocate and raise awareness and robust funding for research to find treatments and cure for this disease. Congress has a real opportunity to dramatically impact the lives of millions of Americans by funding research and outreach programs for Alzheimer's.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the month of June as Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. Together we can help turn the world purple for Alzheimer's, and by doing so, promote care, support, and research of this terrible disease.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Republican leadership to stop blocking the will of the House and immediately call for a vote to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, set to expire June 30.

This May I hosted Fred Hochberg, chairman of the Ex-Im Bank, in my district to tour Innova Technologies, a leader in civil-structural engineering and one of 32 Nevada companies working with the Bank. At a time when our local economy was fighting to recover from the recession and unemployment was rampant, the Bank provided critical support that allowed Innova not just to survive but nearly double its workforce.

In 2014 alone, the Bank supported 164,000 jobs and reduced the Federal deficit by \$675 million. In Nevada, it helped increase our export value by \$165 million. Now is the time for a long-term reauthorization to renew, reenergize, and reform the Bank so it can continue supporting businesses and creating jobs in Nevada and across the country.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 55, REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ AND SYRIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider H. Con. Res. 55 in the House if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question, except for 2 hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by Representative ROYCE of California, Representative ENGEL of New York, and Representative MCGOVERN of Massachusetts or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 16, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representa-

tives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 16, 2015 at 11:02 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 565.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2596, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 315 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 315

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be

considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on the recorded vote ordered on the question of reconsideration of the vote on the question of concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314 may continue to be postponed through the legislative day of Thursday, July 30, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 315, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward today this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. This rule provides for a robust amendment debate on a wide variety of issues related to the authorization of funds for 16 intelligence agencies.

This rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. The Rules Committee met on this measure yesterday evening and heard testimony from both the chairman of the committee and the ranking member, in addition to receiving amendment testimony from multiple Members.

This rule brought forward by the committee is a structured rule. There were 29 amendments in total submitted to the Rules Committee. Of those 29, I am pleased that the full House will debate and vote on 16 of those amendments, over half that were submitted.

The majority of the amendments made in order are bipartisan, a fact demonstrating the unity of this body in advancing funds that will go directly to fighting against terrorism proliferation and weapons of mass destruction.

“To provide for the common defense” is a common phrase to us all, and one that clearly sets forth the more basic responsibility of our government, a responsibility that the members of the Rules Committee, the Intelligence Committee, and, yes, I believe the entire House do not take lightly.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and con-

trolled by the chair and the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, all Members were given the opportunity to review the classified annexes to the underlying legislation prior to Rules Committee consideration.

Members should also be aware that section 2 of the rule provides that the motion to reconsider the vote on Trade Adjustment Assistance, or title II of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314, may continue to be postponed through Thursday, July 30, 2015.

This postponement was necessary to allow House and Senate leadership, in addition to the President, sufficient time to consider legislative options related to this action on trade promotion authority and Trade Adjustment Assistance.

I am proud of the work undertaken by the Intelligence Committee to advance this vitally important legislation whose consideration is provided for by this rule.

There are a few key provisions that I want to ensure Members are aware of because I believe they speak to the overwhelming awareness the Intelligence Committee possesses of the responsibility of Congress to protect this Nation from terrorism, and also of our unwavering fidelity to the United States Constitution.

First, section 302 of the underlying legislation provides that the authorization of appropriations by this act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity that is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

Sections 303 and 304 require specific elements of the executive branch to provide Congress with timely notifying requirements on key intelligence activities. Congressional notification requirements generally remain a vitally important mechanism to ensure that Congress is able to conduct robust oversight.

Notification requirements specific to the intelligence community are even more essential, given the classified and delicate nature of the situations our intelligence agencies face every day.

The classification of documents and the decisionmaking factors that go into such classification have historically been an area of great interest and, at times, concerns by Members of this body and the citizens that we represent.

In response to the valid concerns and interest by Members and the public at large, in the Intelligence Committee's report on H.R. 2596, they specifically state that the committee “seeks to improve its visibility into the classification process and better understand how the intelligence community determines the classification level of especially sensitive reporting and analysis.”

In the underlying legislation, the committee carries out this goal by directing the Director of National Intelligence to provide, within 60 days of the enactment, a report to the congressional intelligence committees outlining each instance in the past 5 years that the Office of Director of National Intelligence or any other entity within the executive branch directed an element of the intelligence community to begin disseminating existing unclassified intelligence reporting or analysis through a compartment or subcompartment.

This requirement is just one of several additional reporting requirements in the legislation to serve to enhance Congress' role in and understanding of the classification process, again, emphasizing Congress' oversight role. The committee has done a good job in clarifying that.

The underlying legislation also directs the Central Intelligence Agency to provide the congressional intelligence committees with all intelligence reports based on the documents collected in the May 1, 2011, raid that killed Osama bin Laden.

We live in a dangerous world and face constant and evolving threats from terrorist groups like al Qaeda, Boko Haram, al Shabaab, and ISIS. These groups successfully use the Internet to anonymously build their resources, both human and financial.

The United States Government must maintain and enhance their ability to counter extremists online. By understanding how and where terrorist groups operate, we can more effectively fight for freedom at home and abroad. I am pleased to see strong provisions in the legislation that will further this goal.

These provisions that I have just spoken of are just a few examples of the thoughtful and difficult work the Intelligence Committee undertook to bring forward this legislation that authorizes critical national security functions while staying within the funding constraints of the Budget Control Act, or BCA.

I want to thank the Intelligence Committee and their staff for their hard work on the authorization measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman, my friend from Georgia, for yielding the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as well as provides that the motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the Trade Adjustment Assistance measure may continue to be postponed until the end of the legislative day on July 30.

First, I commend the efforts of Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for their effort in crafting a bill with largely bipartisan support that provides our Nation's intelligence community with the resources they need to keep us safe. Our national security relies on the continued strength of our intelligence community.

As we face ongoing security challenges both at home and abroad from threats such as ISIL, lone wolf attacks, the emergence of cybercrime, as well as the specter of unknown challenges that may be awaiting us, a strong intelligence apparatus is of the utmost importance.

This legislation will do much to meet those challenges. Specifically, this bill supports investments in cutting-edge technology like spy satellites, enhances our Nation's human intelligence capabilities, provides resources to safeguard valuable signals intelligence collection, and partners with our foreign allies to maximize the reach of our intelligence efforts.

This investment in our country's intelligence infrastructure comes at a critically important time. As you know, the Office of Personnel Management recently suffered a disastrous breach. Hackers were able to target OPM and gain access to personnel data, including employees' names, addresses, Social Security numbers, and numerous other personal details.

Perhaps most disturbing, OPM houses the applications and files submitted by those applying for security clearances, with data going back until 1985. These files were compromised as well, leading some experts to argue that the compromise of these files could have tremendous negative effects for our human intelligence gathering capabilities.

These cyber attacks represent a critical threat to our national security. We all love the convenience that technology provides us, but we must also be prepared to invest in technologies that will protect us from those who wish to sabotage our security in the virtual world. It is time for the OPM to implement and abide by best practices so that we never face a data breach like the one we saw last week.

To the extent that Congress will play a role in securing our virtual infrastructure, we should work as quickly as possible to ensure that our employees and our most sensitive material are not needlessly exposed to those who wish to do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, while I support the strong national security protections this authorization provides, I am extremely disappointed yet again in how my Republican colleagues have skirted the fiscal cuts imposed by sequestration in order to fund the things that they care about, while ignoring the effects such fool-headed cuts have on the vital domestic programs that they

don't seem to care about. We have people hurting all over this Nation because of this irresponsible and senseless policy of sequestration.

Republicans claim to be using this policy as an important tool to rein in out-of-control government spending; yet, when sequestration affects programs and areas of the budget they care about, they magically get around this dilemma by using accounting gimmicks.

That is just what they have done here in this measure. The majority has yet again used the overseas contingency operations account to evade sequestration spending caps.

Wouldn't it be nice if Republicans wanted to evade spending caps for the Department of Education so that we can get around sequestration and properly educate our children? Or if they could use accounting tricks to get around sequestration to fully fund and repair our crumbling infrastructure? Or if they were also inclined to use their budgetary magic to get around sequestration caps to properly fund critically important agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency so that our children and grandchildren can continue to have access to clean water and clean air?

Alas, all we get from the majority is more of the same budgetary double standard, using tricks to get around spending caps on things you like to spend money on and then cry, "sequester, sequester," on things you don't like to spend money on.

□ 1245

Let's stop pretending. That isn't a plan to rein in government spending. That is just spending taxpayer money on things you deem worthy of unfettered spending and ignoring programs, for political reasons, that you don't even like, even though such programs remain vital to our country's success.

Mr. Speaker, many on my side of the aisle have taken issue with the detention facility in Guantanamo Bay since day one; I certainly have. Once again, the Republicans look to continue the operation of this prison, when we should be working to bring about its orderly closure.

We are better than this prison. As a country dedicated to the rule of law, as a country that inspires people the world over to work for and even die for the establishment of democratic rule, we are better than this prison. This prison is an exercise in Kafkaesque justice, which has long worked to undermine our standing with our allies and helped terrorist organizations recruit more and more fighters.

Look, I don't think that anyone is arguing that, if we close the prison, then the myriad terrorist groups who use it as a recruiting tool will no longer have people joining their ranks, but it would be one less arrow in their quiver.

For that reason, we need to work together to close the prison as quickly as possible. In doing so, we will not jeopardize the safety of our country, but will act more fully to reflect our commitment to democracy and the rule of law.

We know and I know, having been in the judiciary, that our justice system is more than capable of handling the prosecution of terrorists, no matter where they are, including those held in Guantanamo Bay.

We have successfully tried Richard Reid, Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, Faisal Shahzad, and Dzhokhar Tsarnaev—the Boston bomber—and we have either sentenced them to death or life imprisonment in our most secure prisons.

At last night's Rules Committee meeting, my friends on the other side of the aisle decided to make a last-minute change to today's rule—or, I might add, to further pollute today's rule. That last-minute change allows for the postponement of the motion to reconsider TAA.

Over the course of my tenure in Congress, I voted to support thousands of pieces of legislation. In the 20-plus years that I have served in this body, I can think of only three votes which I deeply regret making, and one of those was in support of NAFTA.

In the years since, I have seen after NAFTA a decrease in American jobs, a rollback of critical environmental protections here and in Mexico, where I was promised that the environmental circumstances in the maquiladoras would be cleaned up and they were not and a stagnation of wages that has prevented the financial upward mobility of working class and middle class Americans and has ground poor Americans into poverty beyond belief.

If we are going to create trade policy that is worthy of future generations, then we must ensure that that policy strengthens, not weakens, labor rights. It must strengthen, not weaken, environmental protections. It must ensure other countries' responsibility to adhere to basic human rights. It must expand and strengthen our middle class, not squeeze hard-working Americans in favor of corporate interests.

The legislation included in this rule today is part of a trade package that does nothing to bolster these important priorities.

Finally, as I have stated time and again, I take issue with the manner in which these important measures are being considered. Legislation as important as the ones at hand deserve an open and transparent process where Members of both parties and both Houses of Congress may debate and offer amendments as they please.

This process, envisioned and designed by our Founding Fathers to serve as a safeguard to democracy, continues to be eroded by the majority's insistence

on grouping multiple, unrelated bills together under one rule and limiting the number of amendments that can be made in order, as well as the time available for debate.

There were amendments offered last night. For example, Congresswoman SPEIER offered whistleblower protection, not made in order. My colleague Representative SCHWEIKERT from Arizona and I offered a very sensible measure under the intelligence provision to allow for us, as a sense of Congress only, to say that we will participate with Tunisia's intelligence operation in a more pronounced manner—totally innocuous, but at the very same time, helping a country that may very well make the bridge to democracy and certainly has been an ally in intelligence—and a needed one, in light of the number of people that come up from north Africa through Tunisia and wind up fighting in the Middle East.

If we are truly to operate as the deliberative body the U.S. House of Representatives was created to function as, we must do more to ensure that our Nation's most critical pieces of legislation are afforded the time and consideration they rightly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida. One of the things that I, coming on to the Rules Committee, have found is really the vigorous debates that we do have—and the gentleman from Florida, we have had many of those, and that is a good place for it.

It is a good place for it also here on the floor to discuss what really, as was focused on very clearly, is a rule for a bill, and then there is a procedural issue that we are extending the TAA reconsideration until July 30. I am understanding what he is saying, but I do want to make Members clear that is what is happening.

We are working on the majority side for a process that is open. Sixteen amendments are going to be made in order, and they are going to be debated right here on the floor of this House and voted. I think that is what the Republican majority is focused on.

One of the things that came up—and I want it to be clear, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman brings up a point. It is about priorities. It is about priorities. When we are dealing with authorizations and spending bills, is what we are dealing with in the majority here, we have made it very clear, I believe, from the Republican majority standpoint, although I personally and others may have discussions on how we use overseas contingency funds, and those have been debated on this floor and should be continued to be debated on this floor.

However, one of the things that we are doing, and I believe, from our perspective, is we are putting priorities first—priorities for national defense; securing our national interest; and in light of this bill, making sure that our country is safe, abroad and here, from attacks from people who don't like us.

I don't buy the argument—and the debate on Guantanamo is a different issue—but the argument that if we closed it up, it takes away one recruiting piece. I am sorry. Boko Haram, al Qaeda, these others do not hate us only because of a prison; they just hate us because we are free. They hate us because we have a society that is open.

I understand the debate that we want to have, but let's make it crystal clear. There was no Guantanamo when they rammed planes into our World Trade Center. There was no Guantanamo at that time. They just don't like us. Let's make that very clear.

Funding is appropriate. We will debate those entirely upon this House and continue to. The Republicans will still look out for jobs and those working in the middle class, and those that are trying to find their families' priorities in their own economic sphere and looking at it in a country that is in debt and trying to make sure we make good fiscal decisions.

Our priorities are that we help businesses start, we encourage the creation of jobs, not a government strangulation of jobs, and that is what resources do.

With this bill, it is very focused, though. This is about our intelligence community. This is a rule that supports an authorization coming from a very difficult community that does a very difficult job. We are supporting a rule that funds those agencies so that it keeps us safe and does the things that keeps America free. That is the continued argument that we will continue to have.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the other debates that we want to have here, but let's be focused. This rule is about that. It is also about a policy decision or a procedural decision in this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the vote on Trade Adjustment Assistance failed in the House of Representatives last Friday by a 3-1 margin; yet this rule today would extend the revote on Trade Adjustment Assistance through the end of July. This is one more attempt to play games with the future of hard-working families.

American workers demand and they deserve respect. They deserve a living wage and the right not to have their jobs shipped overseas. That is what we are united in fighting for.

A vote for this rule is a vote for fast track. A vote for fast track is a vote against jobs and against wages.

United States trade policy has been failing American workers, failing American consumers and families for 20 years.

The U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement has already cost up to 75,000 jobs, and it was just passed 3 years ago. Up to 5 million jobs have been destroyed by currency manipulation; and a number of the signatories to this trade agreement, their policy is to manipulate their currency to have their goods sold at a lower price than American goods, putting American workers out of jobs and lowering their wages.

Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel Laureate in Economics, has written: "Inequality is not inevitable. It is a choice that we make with the rules that we create to structure our economy."

Trade policy is one of those choices. If we approve fast track, we throw away our ability, our constitutional authority to represent the people who sent us here in good faith. We throw away that ability to be able to fix the flaws in the trade agreement, like the Trans-Pacific Partnership, to the detriment of millions of American families.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Friday, this House sent a strong message to the Fast-Trackers: Not so fast.

Forty-eight hours ago, Republican leaders were telling the world that, at this moment, we would be voting to approve Fast Track; but now, the Fast-Trackers have become backtrackers, pushing back the vote.

The only reason that they seek this postponement in this rule of up to 6 weeks is that they do not have the votes to approve Fast Track today, and the only way they can get those votes today is to use this strange shenanigan of connecting it and cloaking it in a rule for the authorization of our intelligence agencies.

After Friday's Fast Track vote, one official said those who "vote against this Trade Adjustment Assistance are adding their names to the death certificate for [it]." Well, let's play it straight for a change. TAA is not authorized now. It expired last year. Its future depends, not upon this authorization, but upon an adequate level of funding.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, and many more have not been authorized for years, but they continue to operate perfectly well, based upon appropriated funds. This TAA argument is phony.

□ 1300

Really, it doesn't take much intelligence to see what is happening here. These Fast-Trackers are desperate, and this postponement vote for this extent, of this nature, is unprecedented in the history of this Congress. It has never happened before in American history that someone has asked to postpone a vote for up to 6 weeks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. And understand what that means. Understand that they are looking for the ideal time—morning, noon, or night—to muscle through a broken trade policy that a majority of this House and of the American people do not want.

This rule provides that the Speaker at any time of day can come with no notice, no debate, and say, we are voting to send this bill to the President's desk.

What really needs adjusting is not trade assistance but the no-compromise, no-amendment attitude on trade that gives us broken trade policies.

This vote wouldn't be so close if this process hadn't been so closed.

Reject this rule. Vote for democracy. Don't change the precedents of the House. Don't let this be muscled through.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, what is about to happen on this floor with this rule is a direct violation of the United States Constitution; for in the United States Constitution, it clearly says that the United States Congress shall have the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." And in this rule is a clear violation of that.

We already voted it down overwhelmingly 302–126, Republicans and Democrats. It was the foremost bipartisan vote in this 21st century, the very thing that the American people are crying for.

Now, why did Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson and James Madison all agree? Very strong, very independent minds. Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson could hardly bear to be in the same room with each other, but they agreed on this because they knew that every State had Representatives in Congress to look out for jobs that could be shipped overseas. This is the primary reason, ladies and gentlemen.

Look at every trade agreement. This country has lost over 2 million manufacturing jobs to China as a result of the China deal. Over 150,000 jobs to

Mexico. Yes, it created jobs—not in the United States. And what kind of jobs? These are jobs that impacted at the lower- and middle-income levels of our economy. It is the middle class that is the heart and the soul of America.

Let this Congress stand up and reject this rule.

We proved our mettle with that 302 vote. Congress, I am asking you, the American people are asking you: Do what Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson and James Madison asked us to do, and let it be the Congress that regulates commerce with foreign nations.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, intelligence is critical to our national security. It should not be besmirched by a controversial and unrelated procedural shenanigan, unprecedented in the annals of the House of Representatives.

In the words of the President of the United States, It is time to play it straight. TAA and TPA, that package was voted on. It was defeated. We are done. Play it straight.

Write new legislation. Put together a new package. Bring it to the floor of the House. See if it has a majority. That is playing it straight.

Instead, in an unprecedented move, a vote we took last week is being held in never-never land to be revoted on as late as the end of July. That is right. Early June votes tabulated in late July.

If you are against unprecedented shenanigans, vote "no" on the rule. If you are for playing it straight, vote "no" on the rule. If you are against TAA, vote "no" on the rule. If you are against TPA, if you are against fast track, vote "no" on the rule.

If you vote for an unprecedented procedural shenanigan, an unprecedented procedural mutation today, you can be sure it will be used against you and your district and your beliefs tomorrow. And if you are not against fast track, you should be because it gives an enormous gift to China, and we get nothing in return.

China's number one tactic for running up the largest trade surplus against us in history is currency manipulation. This deal that is put on the fast track enshrines the view that currency manipulation is just fine. Go to it. A giant gift to China.

In addition, the rules of origin provisions say that goods that the manufacturer admits are 50 or 60 percent made in China—which means actually 70 or 80 percent made in China—get fast-tracked into the United States.

Vote "no" on this procedural mutation.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just for a moment, let's focus back on the rule and the underlying bill and the procedural issue that has been discussed. It is out in the open. It was not snuck in or anything else. It has been there and has been discussed.

But also, I want to get back to the fact of the rule, itself, which is stand alone. We are going to be voting on an intelligence bill. We are going to have a debate on an intelligence bill.

And, among other things, I will give us a reminder of what this legislation does:

It sustains critical capabilities to fight terrorism and counter the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. That is a separate bill. This is what we are going to be discussing. It has funds to assist our efforts to recover unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities. It sustains activities in Afghanistan and Iraq to continue the fight against ISIS, al Qaeda, and the Taliban. It invests in the resiliency of our national security space architecture. It provides policy discretion on sensitive intelligence operations. It promotes intelligence integration and sharing through investment in intelligence communitywide information technology enterprises. It enhances investment in military intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft. It funds initiatives to thwart cyber attacks and insider threats. And it requires a report every 60 days on foreign fighters in Syria and Iraq.

This is the bill, the underlying bill that we are discussing. And I just wanted to make a reminder of that. As we have discussions on different parts of this rule, let's be reminded also that we are dealing with a stand-alone bill that we will work.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida for just a question.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, all of the things that the gentleman from Georgia said are in the measure are true. But does he also agree that it is unprecedented that we have included a measure to delay an already-voted-on rule? Never before has that been done.

Or to your knowledge, has it been?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, I think it is a fact that it is a part of this rule. The gentleman from Florida states it in whatever adjectival terms he wants to give. But it is in the rule. We have not made it secretive that it is part of this rule. And we can discuss either part.

I will just simply focus on the intelligence part.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman

from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding and for the astute question that he asked, which is one that I would like to follow up on.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Georgia that he is quite right. There are very serious and important components of the intelligence bill covered by this rule.

As many of us have experienced over the last couple of days, we are in and out of intelligence and security briefings because that is the era in which we live. And in most instances, Members draw their concern from the responsibility they have for protecting the American people.

I am on the Homeland Security Committee and have continued on that committee since the tragedy, the heinous act of 9/11, and before, when the select committee was in place. So I have no quarrel with some of the important elements of this legislation. But the gentleman from Georgia should recognize that this is an aberration.

There are two or three points that I would like to make:

First of all, we are long overdue for getting rid of the sequester. This joke was played on Members and the American people only because of the supercommittee—not because of any individual Members, but there was a supercommittee structure put in place, the time ran out, and they could not come to a budget conclusion. So this was the ultimate end. Members didn't vote on this. They voted on the supercommittee, and then this was the hatchet that fell when the supercommittee did not work. So sequester should be something that Speaker BOEHNER puts on the floor and immediately gets rid of.

And the reason why I say that is because I am going to talk about the shenanigans dealing with the trade bill. But what I am going to say is that the overseas contingency fund is being used to bolster up this bill, the intelligence bill. But I can't get those resources to be utilized for infrastructure or summer jobs or fixing the education system that we have responsibilities for or providing opportunities for young people to finish their education or criminal justice reform. So this is being 43 percent pumped up when used by funds that are not in the stream.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

The funding is not in the stream of funding that other appropriators have to utilize. That is wrong.

Then I might conclude on the shenanigans of the trade fix, if you will. I am for TAA, the Trade Adjustment As-

sistance. I want it to be voted on straight up or down, like many Members do, to provide for workers and not have, unfortunately, the addition that was added coming from the other body. So now we know that, whatever shenanigans that will come up, it probably won't be in the way that will help American workers.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be voted down because we need an opportunity to work on behalf of the American workers, to get rid of sequester, and to find a way to move this country forward.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should say to the membership of this body that if they vote against this rule, it doesn't mean that we would not have an intelligence authorization. It simply would mean that those of us—my friend from Georgia and myself—would have to go back to the Rules Committee and fashion a rule that does not include an unprecedented matter that should not be in this Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 in the first place.

And toward that end, among the things that were sought to be included, if we were going to include the TAA measure, then the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, proposed on behalf of the minority that we also include a vote on the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP, for the reason, one, TAA was overwhelmingly—3-1—defeated; TPP passed by a very thin margin.

So if we are going to twist arms and find methodologies to employ to try to change the minds of Members over a 6-week period of time, then perhaps it would be those of us who are opposed to the measure would have an opportunity to try to persuade some of those people who caused the thin margin of it to pass on TPP. We felt that was a fairness measure. At least if you were going to include it, that should have been included as well.

Before proceeding, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should learn how much time each side has at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 19½ minutes remaining.

□ 1315

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am waiting for one additional speaker, but perhaps I can engage in a colloquy with my colleague from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. You served both on the Intelligence Committee and on the

Rules Committee. There is reason to authorize intelligence, but am I correct it has nothing to do with this sneak attack to put in a postponement that has never been done in American history, where never has anyone sought to delay for 6 weeks the consideration of this bill that we are doing today; isn't that correct?

Mr. HASTINGS. I think you are absolutely correct, and it is unprecedented. At the very same time, as my friend from Georgia pointed out, they have done so transparently by putting it here, but that does not mean it would not be used at some point in the future.

Mr. DOGGETT. Does this rule provide any notice to Members of the House, or can this be entirely a surprise attack? Can they come out here on the floor at any time, perhaps when the floor is as empty as it is now, and give no notice to the Members of the House that they are about to move to send this bill to the President's desk, have absolutely no debate on that rule, but then have a vote here, perhaps a day when some Members are out on important business in their district, basically picking the best time because they are so desperate to force through a bill that they know a majority of this House does not support and that the American people don't support because it will just foist off on us a broken, failed trade policy that does not respect the interests of the American people? Is that what is happening here?

Mr. HASTINGS. That is certainly allowed. Anytime before July 30, the measure could be brought to the floor, and it could be brought to the floor without any notice to the membership because it is a motion to reconsider. It is a part of this particular rule sought by the Speaker of the House, I might add, and therefore it could be brought at any time under the aegis of the Speaker's authority.

Mr. DOGGETT. Was the gentleman present in the Rules Committee when every single constructive improvement to this fast-track bill was rejected by the Rules Committee—not with your vote, of course—but a majority of the Rules Committee said “no” to telling the Members of this Congress as much about this deal as the Vietnamese Politburo already knows, saying “no” to at least meeting the standards on the environment that the Bush administration agreed to, saying “no” to putting the foreign corporations on the same level as our American corporations and businesses so that foreign corporations wouldn't have an advantage to come in and attack health, safety, and environmental rules that might be established by the Congress or the State of Florida or a city like San Antonio or Austin? Because under this fast-track bill, we are headed toward jeopardizing those rules, those State laws, and those Federal laws that deal with the needs of the American family and letting these

foreign corporations circumvent them as they did in Canada, recently, to demand millions of dollars of taxpayer money for a decision locally to just prevent the expansion of a quarry. We can't have that happen. But the Rules Committee would not allow us to address those problems.

Mr. HASTINGS. Many of those measures in a 5½-hour, into-the-night session that the Rules Committee operated.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would urge that Members understand that we have already voted on this measure, and it was defeated, as I say, 3-1.

Robust funding for our intelligence infrastructure is clearly needed and, indeed, welcomed, but enough is enough. It is time for Republicans to stop squeezing important domestic programs through their arbitrary implementation of sequester. We must invest in education in this country; we must invest in our decaying infrastructure; we must invest in a clean environment; and we must invest in a strong middle class.

Republicans want to make investments in our intelligence community. Great. So do I. We all do. But at some point, we have to start asking: What is it that that community is protecting? Without investments in education, infrastructure, and our middle class, we risk undermining what makes this country so exceptional and worth protecting in the first place.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the discussion we have had over the last little bit. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida. Again, although we have some differences—those have been evident today—the rule provides for ample debate on the floor and the opportunity to debate and vote on up to 16 amendments offered by a largely bipartisan group of Members.

I look forward to those debates. I look forward to the debate on how best to provide tools for our intelligence community and to combat the dangerous threats that we face while still respecting both the constitutional and budgetary restraints. Those are things that sometimes, I think, in the midst of discussion today, got lost in that this is a separate vote that we are going to be voting on our intelligence bill. There is a procedural issue that is part of this that is, again, not snuck in. It has been posted; it has been online; and it is there for Members to see.

When we look at priorities, again, I think, for us, it goes back to, again, in the overall budgetary and authorization process, the Republican majority

stands for protecting our national interests, protecting and empowering the voters who actually send us here, not for growing and empowering an ever-encroaching Federal Government. This is what the budgets reflect. This is what the authorizations reflect. These are the priorities of the American people, and these are the priorities of the Republican majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 315 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 189, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

YEAS—236

Abraham	Donovan	Johnson (OH)
Aderholt	Duffy	Johnson, Sam
Allen	Duncan (SC)	Jolly
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Jordan
Ashford	Ellmers (NC)	Joyce
Babin	Emmer (MN)	Katko
Barletta	Farenthold	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Fincher	King (IA)
Benishek	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Kline
Bishop (MI)	Fleming	Knight
Bishop (UT)	Flores	Labrador
Black	Forbes	LaMalfa
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Blum	Fox	Lance
Bost	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Garrett	Long
Brat	Gibbs	Loudermilk
Bridenstine	Gibson	Love
Brooks (IN)	Goodlatte	Lucas
Buchanan	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Buck	Gowdy	Lummis
Bucshon	Granger	MacArthur
Burgess	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Calvert	Graves (LA)	Marino
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Carter (TX)	Griffith	McCaul
Chabot	Grothman	McClintock
Clawson (FL)	Guinta	McHenry
Coffman	Guthrie	McKinley
Cole	Hanna	McMorris
Collins (GA)	Hardy	Rodgers
Collins (NY)	Harper	McSally
Comstock	Harris	Meadows
Conaway	Hartzler	Meehan
Cook	Heck (NV)	Messer
Cooper	Hensarling	Mica
Costa	Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)
Costello (PA)	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (MI)
Cramer	Hill	Moolenaar
Crawford	Holding	Mooney (WV)
Crenshaw	Hudson	Mullin
Culberson	Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Curbelo (FL)	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Denham	Hunter	Newhouse
Dent	Hurd (TX)	Noem
DeSantis	Hurt (VA)	Nugent
DesJarlais	Issa	Nunes
Diaz-Balart	Jenkins (KS)	Olson
Dold	Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo

Palmer	Rouzer	Turner
Paulsen	Royce	Upton
Pearce	Russell	Valadao
Perry	Ryan (WI)	Wagner
Pittenger	Salmon	Walberg
Pitts	Sanford	Walden
Poe (TX)	Scalise	Walker
Poliquin	Schweikert	Walorski
Pompeo	Scott, Austin	Walters, Mimi
Price, Tom	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Ratcliffe	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Reichert	Shinkus	Wenstrup
Renacci	Shuster	Westerman
Ribble	Simpson	Westmoreland
Rice (SC)	Smith (MO)	Whitfield
Rigell	Smith (NE)	Williams
Roby	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Roe (TN)	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Rogers (AL)	Stefanik	Womack
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Woodall
Rohrabacher	Stivers	Yoder
Rokita	Stutzman	Yoho
Rooney (FL)	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry	Young (IA)
Roskam	Tiberi	Young (IN)
Ross	Tipton	Zeldin
Rothfus	Trott	Zinke

NAYS—189

Adams	Gallego	Napolitano
Aguilar	Garamendi	Neal
Amash	Gohmert	Nolan
Bass	Graham	Norcross
Beatty	Grayson	O'Rourke
Becerra	Green, Al	Pallone
Bera	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Beyer	Grijalva	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hahn	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hastings	Peters
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)	Peterson
F.	Higgins	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pocan
Brooks (AL)	Hinojosa	Polis
Brown (FL)	Honda	Posey
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bustos	Huffman	Quigley
Butterfield	Israel	Rangel
Capps	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jeffries	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Kaptur	Rush
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	T.
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cleaver	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott, David
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Conyers	Lawrence	Sinema
Courtney	Lee	Sires
Crowley	Levin	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Takai
DeFazio	Lofgren	Takano
DeGette	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Titus
DelBene	(NM)	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Lujan, Ben Ray	Torres
Deutch	(NM)	Tsongas
Dingell	Lynch	Van Hollen
Doggett	Maloney,	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn	Veasey
F.	Maloney, Sean	Vela
Duckworth	Massie	Velázquez
Edwards	Matsui	Visclosky
Ellison	McCollum	Walz
Engel	McDermott	Wasserman
Eshoo	McGovern	Schultz
Esty	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Meng	Welch
Foster	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Yarmuth
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	
Gabbard	Nadler	

NOT VOTING—8

Barton	Kelly (MS)	Sanchez, Loretta
Byrne	King (NY)	Sewell (AL)
Chaffetz	Reed	

□ 1356

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Meses. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and SINEMA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ASHFORD changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION
BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AND THE GOVERNMENT OF
THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA CONCERNING
PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR
ENERGY—MESSAGE
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-43)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the “Act”), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the “Agreement”). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the proposed Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the proposed Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by Title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), two classified annexes to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.)

The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of the Republic of Korea (ROK) with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A(w) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(w)), is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement contains all of the requirements established by section 123 a. of the Act. It provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with the ROK based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. It would permit the transfer of material, equipment (including reactors), components, information, and technology for nuclear research and nuclear power production. It would not permit the transfer of Restricted Data, and sensitive nuclear technology or technology or information that is not in the public domain concerning fabrication of nuclear fuel containing plutonium could only be transferred if specifically provided by an amendment to the proposed Agreement or a separate agreement. Any special fissionable material transferred could only be in the form of low enriched uranium, with two exceptions: small quantities of material for use as samples; or for other specified applications such as use in loading and operation of fast reactors or the conduct of fast reactor experiments. The proposed Agreement would also obligate the United States to endeavor to take such actions as may be necessary and feasible to ensure a reliable supply of low enriched uranium fuel to the ROK, similar to terms contained in other recent civil nuclear cooperation agreements.

The proposed Agreement would also establish a new standing High-Level Bilateral Commission (HLBC) to be led by the Deputy Secretary of Energy for the Government of the United States of America and the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Government of the ROK. The purpose of the HLBC is to facilitate peaceful nuclear and strategic cooperation between the parties and ongoing dialogue regarding areas of mutual interest in civil nuclear energy, including the civil nuclear fuel cycle.

The proposed Agreement will have an initial term of 20 years and would renew for one additional period of 5 years unless either party gives written notice at least 2 years prior to its expiration that it does not want to renew the proposed Agreement. The proposed Agreement also requires the parties to consult as soon as possible after the seventeenth anniversary of its entry into force to decide whether to pursue an extension of the proposed Agreement. In the event of termination of the proposed Agreement, key nonproliferation conditions and controls will continue in effect as long as any nuclear material, moderator material, byproduct material, equipment, or component subject to the proposed Agreement remains in the territory of the party concerned or under its jurisdiction or control anywhere, or until such time as the parties agree that, in the case of nuclear material or moderator material, such items are no longer usable for any nuclear activity relevant from the point of view of international safeguards or have become practically irrecoverable, or in the case of equipment, components, or byproduct material, such items are no longer usable for nuclear purposes.

The ROK has a strong track record on nonproliferation and its government has consistently reiterated its commitment to nonproliferation. The ROK is a party to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, has an International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards agreement and Additional Protocol in force, is a member of the four multilateral nonproliferation export control regimes (Missile Technology Control Regime, Wassenaar Arrangement, Australia Group, and Nuclear Suppliers Group, for which it served as Chair in 2003-2004 and is scheduled to do so again in 2015-2016), and is an active participant in the Proliferation Security Initiative. A more detailed discussion of the ROK's civil nuclear program and its nuclear nonproliferation policies and practices, including its nuclear export policies and practices, is provided in the NPAS and in two classified annexes to the NPAS submitted to you separately. As noted above, the Director of National Intelligence will provide an addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of the ROK with respect to nuclear-related matters.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested departments and agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the proposed Agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 16, 2015.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2596.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1406

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Intelligence Authorization Act is the annual blueprint for the work of the intelligence community and America's military intelligence efforts. The bill sets priorities for our critical intelligence efforts and the legal framework of guidance and oversight for those efforts. As you may recall, the House has

passed intelligence authorization bills with strong bipartisan support in the past several Congresses.

The ranking member, Mr. SCHIFF, and I worked in a bipartisan manner to draft this legislation in front of you today. Passing annual intelligence authorization legislation is the most effective way for Congress to exercise oversight over the executive branch and helps ensure that the country's intelligence agencies have the resources and authorities necessary to keep Americans safe. This legislation passed unanimously out of our committee.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, the bulk of the committee's recommendations each year are found in the classified annex of the bill, which has been available for Members to review since June 4. Among other initiatives, the bill provides authorization for critical national security functions, including fighting terrorism, countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, funding efforts to recover from unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities, and investing in the resiliency of our national security space architecture.

At an unclassified level, I can report that the annex for fiscal year 2016 authorizes funding that is slightly below the President's budget request level. Its funding levels are in line with the House-passed Defense Appropriations bill for the National Intelligence Program and with the National Defense Authorization Act for the Military Intelligence Program. Overall, this bill sustains today's intelligence capabilities and provides for future capabilities while staying within the funding constraints of the Budget Control Act and the budget resolution.

Mr. Chair, we are currently facing one of the most challenging global environments in our Nation's history. Nearly 14 years after the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. continues to hunt al Qaeda and its affiliates. We have taken the fight to the enemy and achieved tremendous success. But despite various strategies employed by two administrations to prevent the spread of radical Islam, that threat remains. The Arab Spring civil war in Syria and the emergence of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in places such as north Africa highlight only a few of the many events in the past several years that now define U.S. policy failures in the Middle East. In just over a year, ISIL has exploded from a largely localized force in Iraq to seriously challenge al Qaeda as the vanguard of global jihad.

Moreover, nation-states like Russia and China continue to expand their spheres of influence and diminish U.S. clout worldwide. Russia has taken advantage of indecisiveness in Europe and exploited uneven leadership in the U.S. to pressure Ukraine and its neighbors on core Russian interests. China

bullies its neighbors in the South and East China Sea and, if left unchecked, will likely exercise de facto control over maritime trade in its perceived territorial waters in the next decade. Meanwhile, North Korea and Iran continue to pose significant proliferation risks and remain strategic threats to the U.S. and its allies. State actors can bring a tremendous amount of resources to counter U.S. policy, placing an immense burden on the intelligence community to collect information on and to assess these activities carefully and accurately.

Perhaps more troubling, state and nonstate actors alike are developing new ways to project power, particularly in cyberspace. Cyber attacks are becoming so pervasive that network defenders are overwhelmed. Attackers seem to gain access to sensitive systems at will. The most recent attacks on the Office of Personnel Management servers, possibly one of the most significant national security incidents in the past decade, highlight the continued threat to our Nation's infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, in this year's intelligence authorization bill, the committee has taken a great deal of care in addressing the wide range of issues described above. This bill is an essential tool in supporting our Nation's efforts to tackle today's challenges while also directing the intelligence community to make strategic investments in the future. In particular, I believe that the bill goes a long way toward encouraging the intelligence community to make much-needed investments, such as recovering from unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities.

Additionally, this year's authorization bill comes on the heels of the committee's recent bipartisan successes on key national security issues, like reauthorizing important provisions related to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and overwhelmingly passing bipartisan legislation on cyber threat sharing information. I applaud Ranking Member SCHIFF for his help on these issues, and I look forward to working together in the future.

Finally, I want to thank all the Intelligence Committee staff on both sides of the aisle for their support drafting this bill. The committee staff spent countless hours assisting Members and finalizing the legislation.

In particular, I would like to recognize our Sandia National Labs fellow, Mr. Randy Smith. He has been with the committee for almost 2 years and will be leaving us soon to return to Sandia. He has been a tremendous asset to this committee, and I would like to thank him for all his hard work.

I would also like to thank the men and women of the intelligence community for all their efforts to continue to protect this Nation.

I look forward to passing this legislation.

Mr. Chair, the intelligence authorization act is the annual blueprint for the work of the intelligence community and America's military intelligence efforts. The bill sets the priorities for our critical intelligence efforts, and the legal framework of guidance and oversight for those efforts. As you may recall, the House has passed intelligence authorization bills with strong bipartisan support in the past several Congresses.

The Ranking Member, Mr. SCHIFF, and I worked in a bipartisan manner to draft the legislation in front of you today. Passing annual intelligence authorization legislation is the most effective way for Congress to exercise oversight over the executive branch and helps ensure that the country's intelligence agencies have the resources and authorities necessary to keep Americans safe. This legislation passed unanimously out of our Committee.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, the bulk of the Committee's recommendations each year are found in the classified annex to the bill, which has been available for Members to review since June 4th. Among other initiatives, the bill provides authorization for critical national security functions, including: fighting terrorism and countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, funding efforts to recover from unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities, and investing in the resiliency of our national security space architecture.

At an unclassified level, I can report that the annex for Fiscal Year 2016 authorizes funding that is slightly below the President's budget request level. Its funding levels are in line with the House-passed Defense Appropriations bill for the National Intelligence Program and with the National Defense Authorization Act for the Military Intelligence Program. Overall, this bill sustains today's intelligence capabilities and provides for future capabilities while staying within the funding constraints of the Budget Control Act and the Budget Resolution.

Mr. Chair, we are currently facing one of the most challenging global environments in our nation's history. Nearly 14 years after the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. continues to hunt al-Qa'ida and its affiliates. We have taken the fight to the enemy and achieved tremendous success, but despite various strategies employed by two administrations to prevent the spread of radical Islam, the threat remains. The Arab Spring, civil war in Syria, and the emergence of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in places such as Northern Africa highlight only a few of the many events in the past several years that now define U.S. policy failures in the Middle East. In just over a year, ISIL has exploded from a largely localized force in Iraq to seriously challenge al-Qa'ida as the vanguard of the global jihad.

Moreover, nation states like Russia and China continue to expand their spheres of influence and diminish U.S. clout worldwide. Russia has taken advantage of indecisiveness in Europe and exploited uneven leadership in the U.S. to pressure Ukraine and its neighbors on core Russian interests. China bullies its neighbors in the South and East China Sea, and if left unchecked, will likely exercise de facto control over maritime trade in its perceived territorial waters in the next decade. Meanwhile, North Korea and Iran continue to

pose significant proliferation risks and remain strategic threats to the U.S. and its allies. State actors can bring a tremendous amount of resources to counter U.S. policy, placing an immense burden on the Intelligence Community to collect information on, and assess, these activities carefully and accurately.

Perhaps more troubling, state and non-state actors alike are developing new ways to project power, particularly in cyberspace. Cyber attacks are becoming so pervasive that network defenders are overwhelmed; attackers seem to gain access to sensitive systems at will. The most recent attacks on the Office of Personnel Management servers—possibly one of the most significant national security incidents in the past decade—highlight the continued threat to our nation's infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, in this year's intelligence authorization bill, this Committee has taken a great deal of care in addressing the wide range of issues described above. This bill is an essential tool in supporting our nation's efforts to tackle today's challenges, while also directing the Intelligence Community to make strategic investments in the future. In particular, I believe that this bill goes a long way toward encouraging the Intelligence Community to make much-needed investments, such as recovering from unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities.

Additionally, this year's authorization bill comes on the heels of the Committee's recent bipartisan successes on key national security issues, including reauthorizing important provisions related to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and overwhelmingly passing bipartisan legislation on cyber threat information sharing. I applaud Ranking Member SCHIFF for his help on these issues and look forward to working together in the future.

Finally, I want to thank all the Intelligence Committee staff on both sides of the aisle for their support drafting this bill. The Committee staff spent countless hours assisting Members and finalizing the legislation. In particular, I would like to recognize our Sandia National Labs fellow, Randy Smith. He has been with the Committee for almost two years and will be leaving us soon to return to Sandia. He has been a tremendous asset to this Committee and I thank him for all his hard work. I would also like to thank the men and women of the Intelligence Community for all their efforts protecting this nation. I look forward to passing this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to say thank you to Chairman NUNES. This Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 is our third major piece of legislation together, and it once again demonstrates the fruits of our commitment to bipartisanship.

We also have our difference of opinion from time to time, and on this bill, we have some differences. But I know that as long as we continue to work together, there is no end to the good that we can accomplish.

Through our cyber bill and our surveillance reform bill, we have been

guided by two core principles: first, that national security is truly the security of the entire Nation and all Americans; second, that national security can and must coexist with privacy and civil liberties. I believe the bill today largely furthers these principles as well.

The IAA funds, equips, and sets the priorities for the U.S. intelligence community; and it is a crucial vehicle by which Congress provides oversight of the IC and ensures that U.S. intelligence professionals and intelligence programs have the funds and authorities they need to keep us safe, as well as our allies and partners.

As the annual IAA provides hundreds of pages of detailed guidance, strict authorizations, and precise limitations, it is also the single most important means by which Congress conducts its oversight of the intelligence community.

□ 1415

As in past years, this year's IAA is a carefully considered bill and the result of thoughtful oversight.

The Fiscal Year 2016 IAA funds the intelligence community at about 1 percent below the President's budget request and about 7 percent above last year's enacted budget level.

The bill makes cuts to less-effective programs, adds money to underfunded programs, and requires intelligence agencies to regularly inform Congress of their activities, ensuring funds are spent responsibly and lawfully.

Notably, the bill today holds, or "fences," significant amounts of money to make sure Congress' direction is followed to the letter and on time.

I want to highlight just a few particular aspects of the bill. It continues the committee's longstanding emphasis on counterintelligence and security reforms. It also continues to support our overhead architecture by funding our most critical space programs, investing in space protection and resiliency, preserving investments in cutting-edge technologies, and enhancing oversight of contracting and procurement practices.

It also promotes enhancements to our foreign partner capabilities, which are critical to multiplying the reach and impact of our own intelligence efforts. It enhances human intelligence, or HUMINT, capabilities, which are often the key to understanding and predicting global events.

It provides resources to safeguard vulnerable signals intelligence, or SIGINT, collection while enhancing oversight of these and other sources of intelligence. It emphasizes collection to monitor and ensure compliance with treaties and potential international agreements. It greatly enhances oversight of Defense special operation forces activities worldwide.

The bill also incorporates some excellent provisions championed by the Democratic members of the Intelligence Committee, as well as the Republican members.

In particular, I want to highlight Mr. HIMES' provision to enhance the quality of metrics we receive to enable more thorough oversight; Ms. SEWELL's multiple provisions to enhance diversity within the intelligence community; Mr. CARSON's provisions to better understand FBI resource allocation against domestic and foreign threats and the role of the FBI and DNI in countering violent extremism, particularly in minors; Ms. SPEIER's provision to provide greater human rights oversight of the IC's relationship with certain foreign partners; Mr. QUIGLEY's provision regarding intelligence support to Ukraine; and Mr. SWALWELL's provision to ensure that Department of Energy National Labs can work with State and local government recipients of homeland security grants.

All this said, while I believe the bill largely reflects sound choices, I am concerned that it uses the overseas contingency operations—or OCO—funding as a way to evade the sequestration levels mandated by the ill-conceived Budget Control Act.

Again, I largely support the funding levels and the programs which the IAA authorizes, but I cannot endorse how it has funded them. We need to be serious and thoughtful about the budget and undo sequestration—not just employ accounting tricks to evade its levels only for defense and national security-related items.

Even some domestic programs and agencies that contribute to our homeland security cannot qualify for OCO dollars, while vital programs like our children's education and our social services are left to languish.

Instead of arbitrary, across-the-board cuts, let's do what this bill does substantively: make cuts to some areas and add money to others in a deliberate, well thought out manner. It is time to forthrightly deal with sequestration for all of our national priorities, not just for defense.

I am also opposed to provisions in this bill which would tie the hands of the administration and prevent the orderly transfer of detainees from the detention center at Guantanamo Bay. These restrictions have never been included in prior versions of the IAA, and there is no reason to introduce them into the IAA process now.

The bill goes even further than restricting transfer of detainees to the United States and includes a new provision which restricts transfers to "combat zones," a term that is so broad as to include allies and partners such as Jordan.

As I have long said, keeping the Guantanamo prison serves as a recruitment tool for militants, undercuts our

relationships with our allies, and undermines our international standing.

With that said, the bill, as a whole, is largely a strong product, and I appreciate the close partnership we have enjoyed with the chairman in working on it. But, unfortunately, I cannot support the bill so long as it includes these Guantanamo restrictions and employs the OCO budget gimmick at the expense of our domestic spending priorities.

I look forward to a robust amendment process today, and I am committed to working with the chairman, the Senate, the administration, the other committees of jurisdiction, and all Members of Congress to make critical improvements to the bill as it moves forward, and to resolve the issues to keep alive the string of consecutive signed IAAs.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the chairman for his vital leadership on the Intelligence Committee.

I rise in support of this legislation providing the intelligence community the authorization needed to protect and defend the United States and support critical national security programs protecting Americans from nation states and Islamic terrorists.

In December, NSA Director Admiral Rogers warned that China has the capability of shutting down the U.S. electric grid through cyber attack. Homeland security Secretary Johnson has warned about the threat of attacks launched by sleeper cells in most of our States. ISIS continues to expand into new territory, while Americans are more at risk because President Obama has no strategy for defeating ISIS, whom he initially referred to as the JV team.

This is not the time to impede our intelligence efforts. America faces grave danger from those who wish to destroy our way of life. Please join me in full bipartisan support of the Intelligence Authorization Act. Let us be united in confronting the perilous threats of our adversaries.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend for yielding.

I want to say that I appreciate the bipartisan, hard work of Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF, but I want to bring to the House's attention recent reports that this bill makes drastic cuts in our so-called covert support to the moderate Syrian opposition.

A headline in the Saturday Washington Post read: "Secret CIA effort in

Syria faces large funding cut." If these reports are true, just as the moderate Syrian forces may be starting to make progress, especially in the south, then I am afraid we may be making a big mistake.

Unfortunately, most Members of the House don't know for certain if this legislation will reduce our support for the moderate opposition. Those funding decisions are made behind closed doors. And that is why I believe this bill is not the right place for us to be making decisions that have a major impact on our Syria strategy.

I have no doubt that Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF are determined to get the intelligence piece of our Syria response right, but this is not merely an intelligence issue, and our overall strategy in Syria goes far beyond what is included in any covert program. I believe we shouldn't be dealing with this problem in a piecemeal way.

As we have been doing in the Foreign Affairs Committee on a bipartisan basis, I urge my colleagues to take a step back, look at the big picture, and address our Syria policy in a way that makes sense and involves all the relevant players.

I am troubled if it is true that this bill makes drastic cuts in our so-called covert support to the moderate Syria opposition. And I commend the hard work of our chairman and ranking member.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would urge my colleague, the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, that we shouldn't always believe what is in the newspaper. There have been lots of different reports about lots of different things.

I would say that Mr. SCHIFF and I worked in a bipartisan manner to look at all programs across the spectrum of the 17 agencies. And we would be glad to spend some time with the gentleman from New York down in the committee spaces to raise the concerns that he brought up about a newspaper article. As I said, I think there are a lot of things that we read in the newspaper.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Intelligence Authorization Act is the vehicle by which we ensure that U.S. intelligence professionals and programs have the funds and the authorities that they need. It is the single most important means by which Congress can conduct its oversight. We need to pass this legislation, just as the committee has done over the last several years.

It is my hope that as the legislation moves forward, we will be able to dispose of the Guantanamo provisions—I will have an amendment to address that in a few minutes—and that we can also resolve the issues regarding the

overseas contingency account. I look forward to working with my colleague as the bill moves forward to address those issues.

I want to join the chairman in saluting the members of the intelligence community—the men and women who do such an extraordinary job for us each and every day. They have our sincerest gratitude and full appreciation for their dedication, their patriotism, and their unparalleled skills. I also want to thank again our chairman for his leadership, his commitment to bipartisanship, and his determination to do what is right. I want to thank our colleagues on the committee, who have done an extraordinary job in helping to put this bill together.

I also want to join the chairman in thanking our wonderful staff on our side of the aisle. I want to thank Carly Blake, Linda Cohen, Allison Getty, Robert Minehart, Amanda Rogers Thorpe, Rheanne Wirkkala, as well as Patrick Boland and our shared technical and security staff, including Kristin Jepson, Brandon Smith, and Kevin Klein. We have an extraordinary team on the committee. It is a great pleasure to serve and work with each and every one of them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the ranking member for his continued cooperation to work in a bipartisan fashion. As I think most Americans know, the threats continue to add up every day, and it is up to the men and women in the intelligence community to help keep us safe. I know the ranking member and I are committed to doing just that.

With that, I look forward to debate on the amendments and passage of the final underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, today I will vote against H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act for FY2016, because this bill continues the expansion of our intelligence community and includes harmful policy riders that will only serve to make America less safe, not more.

While large portions of the intelligence budget are classified, publicly available estimates are as high as \$80 billion a year. That's in addition to the more than \$580 billion we're set to spend on defense in the next 12 months. If today's bill moves forward, funding will again rise by nearly \$6 billion. Worse, it would do so by sidestepping Congressionally-imposed budget caps, while continuing to enforce these arbitrary rules for critical domestic programs, from education to medical research.

Efforts by the majority to undercut our president's ability to conduct foreign policy are nothing new, but for the first time this bill would put in place additional barriers to finally closing Guantanamo Bay, a recruiting tool available to terrorists so long as its doors remain open. It would also limit the types of information our intelligence community can share with our allies, a level of discretion best left to the President himself.

There are over 4.5 million federal employees and contractors with access to secret information, which is larger than the entire population of Los Angeles. I am concerned that the amount of information being reviewed by the intelligence community and number of people involved may actually be making us less safe.

Today's bill is a missed opportunity to re-evaluate methods of domestic surveillance, the growing size of the intelligence bureaucracy, and ending programs, like Guantanamo Bay, that only harm our national security, not help it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise to express my opposition to H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act of 2016. Though I have always appreciated the bipartisan spirit in which the Intelligence Committee members work to craft the annual authorization bill, and I acknowledge the many vital programs the bill support, I disagree with the way H.R. 2596 uses Overseas Contingency Operations funding and how it prevents the closure of the detainment facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. For those reasons, I cannot vote for the bill.

H.R. 2596 authorizes funding to support important research, information gathering and information sharing resources for decision makers at all levels of the federal government. The funding helps to maintain and support the intelligence infrastructure and it helps to strengthen our defenses against threats from around the world. This bill provides for cutting-edge counterintelligence technical analysis, cybersecurity, it protects Americans against the use of advanced weapons, and helps to arrest nuclear and other weapon proliferation threats. The funding in this bill is also the reason we were able to kill Nasir al Wuhayshi, al Qaida's number two leader.

However, the bill also continues Republican-led efforts to lock in sequestration and, as a result, fails to authorize sufficient funds for important intelligence community priorities. Instead, the bill uses OCO funding in ways that leaders of both parties have made clear are inappropriate. Just last year, House Republicans criticized the abuse of the OCO loophole in their budget report, stating that it "undermines the integrity of the budget process." Moreover, in following the strategy of the Republican budget, this legislation begins the process of locking in sequestration for non-defense programs, which will have a devastating impact on investments critical to the nation.

We need to get back to the table to have an honest debate about our budget and renegotiate the funding caps for both defense and nondefense. Only then will we be able to provide the necessary resources for our national security needs and to ensure we keep the nation's commitments to education, research, infrastructure, and other crucial drivers of economic prosperity.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and Ranking member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2596, the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016," for several reasons.

I opposed the rule because Section 2 of the rule permits the House leadership to continue

to be postponed through the legislative day of Thursday, July 30, 2015, further consideration of the motion to reconsider the vote by the House rejecting the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314, the "Trade Adjustment Act of 2015."

I do not believe it is appropriate to commingle in one rule subjects as complex, critical, and disparate as international trade policy, on the one hand, and authorization of Intelligence community programs and activities, on the other.

They should be considered separately, debated separately, and voted on separately.

Second, I also opposed the rule because the appropriations authorized by H.R. 2596 are predicated on a continuation of the draconian funding levels set by sequestration rather than more realistic and responsible limits to be negotiated and agreed to by the House and Senate.

I agree with President Obama that prior to consideration of appropriations or annual authorization bills, the House and Senate should first reach agreement on a fair and balanced budget framework that does not harm our economy or require draconian cuts to middle-class priorities.

When applied to national security information gathering, sequestration is harmful because it adversely affects the ability of the intelligence community to: provide strategic warning to decision-makers across all levels of government; improve collection technologies to exploit existing and future opportunities and increase resilience; provide cutting-edge technical analysis of counterintelligence, cyber, advanced weapons, and proliferation threats; to spur IC integration; and increase intelligence capacity by investing in critical information technologies.

Third, I oppose the bill because it uses funds intended for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) in a manner that is inappropriate.

By ignoring the pre-negotiated terms regarding war spending, H.R. 2596 seeks to take monies budgeted for war and defense and apply them to domestic defense while neglecting other vital non-defense priorities of the American people.

Specifically, the bill uses OCO funding to circumvent budget caps in defense and intelligence spending and ignores the long-term connection between national security and economic security and fails to account for vital national security functions carried out at non-defense agencies.

Finally Mr. Chair, I oppose H.R. 2596 on the merits because it contains a highly objectionable ban on the use of funds to transfer any Guantanamo detainee into the United States or construct or modify facilities in the United States to house detainees transferred from Guantanamo.

Also highly objectionable is the provision in the bill providing that nothing in the statute authorizing the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board should be construed to allow that Board to gain access to information the executive branch deems to be related to covert action.

Mr. Chair, in this digital information age the federal government has at its disposal a wealth of resources that enable it to record,

track, and monitor the daily activities of ordinary law abiding citizens.

The balance between liberty and security must be respected to preserve our way of life and the values that countless generations have fought to preserve.

This includes taking precautionary measures to ensure that their lives are safe from eminent danger and terrorist threats both domestically and abroad.

I have long supported effective legislation that seeks to do this such as the bipartisan USA FREEDOM Act, which imposes necessary limits on the bulk collection of telecommunication metadata on U.S. citizens by American intelligence agencies, including the National Security Agency.

Because I have long advocated greater diversity and inclusion in government contracting and procurement, I am pleased that H.R. 2596 includes section 334, which requires the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report to Congress regarding participation in contracting opportunities by women, minorities, veterans, and small businesses awarded by elements of the intelligence community for goods, equipment, tools, and services.

There are several other provisions in the bill that I support, including provisions: allowing the Department of Energy's national laboratories to compete for homeland security grants; ensuring better understanding of FBI resource allocation against domestic and foreign threats, and the role of the FBI and DNI in countering violent extremism, particularly among young people; promoting greater oversight of the Intelligence Community's relationships with certain foreign partners; and giving intelligence support to the Ukraine.

But, on balance, Mr. Chair, H.R. 2596 contains more objectionable than salutary provisions, and for that reason I cannot support the bill or the rule governing the terms of floor debate.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2596

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Classified schedule of authorizations.

Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.

Sec. 104. Intelligence Community Management Account.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.

Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Sec. 303. Prior congressional notification of initiations of certain new special access programs.

Sec. 304. Prior congressional notification of transfers of funds for certain intelligence activities.

Sec. 305. Designation of lead intelligence officer for tunnels.

Sec. 306. Clarification of authority of Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

Sec. 307. Reporting process required for tracking certain requests for country clearance.

Sec. 308. Prohibition on sharing of certain information in response to foreign government inquiries.

Sec. 309. National Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

Sec. 310. Intelligence community business system transformation.

Sec. 311. Inclusion of Inspector General of Intelligence Community in Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency.

Sec. 312. Authorities of the Inspector General for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Sec. 313. Provision of information and assistance to Inspector General of the Intelligence Community.

Sec. 314. Clarification relating to information access by Comptroller General.

Sec. 315. Use of homeland security grant funds in conjunction with Department of Energy national laboratories.

Sec. 316. Technical amendments relating to pay under title 5, United States Code.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

Sec. 321. Prohibition on use of funds for transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Sec. 322. Prohibition on use of funds to construct or modify facilities in United States to house detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Sec. 323. Prohibition on use of funds to transfer or release individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to combat zones.

Subtitle C—Reports

Sec. 331. Reports to Congress on individuals formerly detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Sec. 332. Reports on foreign fighters.

Sec. 333. Reports on prisoner population at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Sec. 334. Report on use of certain business concerns.

Sec. 335. Repeal of certain reporting requirements.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(a) **CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.**—The term “congressional intelligence committees” means—

(1) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(b) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

(1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) The Department of Defense.

(4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(5) The National Security Agency.

(6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

(7) The Coast Guard.

(8) The Department of State.

(9) The Department of the Treasury.

(10) The Department of Energy.

(11) The Department of Justice.

(12) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(13) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

(14) The National Reconnaissance Office.

(15) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

(16) The Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) **SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL LEVELS.**—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101 and, subject to section 103, the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 2016, for the conduct of the intelligence activities of the elements listed in paragraphs (1) through (16) of section 101, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill H.R. 2596 of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AVAILABILITY.**—The classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a) shall be made available to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the President.

(2) **DISTRIBUTION BY THE PRESIDENT.**—Subject to paragraph (3), the President shall provide for suitable distribution of the classified Schedule of Authorizations, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

(3) **LIMITS ON DISCLOSURE.**—The President shall not publicly disclose the classified Schedule of Authorizations or any portion of such Schedule except—

(A) as provided in section 601(a) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (50 U.S.C. 3306(a));

(B) to the extent necessary to implement the budget; or

(C) as otherwise required by law.

SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR INCREASES.**—The Director of National Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2016 by the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in

section 102(a) if the Director of National Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions, except that the number of personnel employed in excess of the number authorized under such section may not, for any element of the intelligence community, exceed 3 percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such schedule for such element.

(b) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish guidelines that govern, for each element of the intelligence community, the treatment under the personnel levels authorized under section 102(a), including any exemption from such personnel levels, of employment or assignment in—

(1) a student program, trainee program, or similar program;

(2) a reserve corps or as a reemployed annuitant; or

(3) details, joint duty, or long-term, full-time training.

(c) **NOTICE TO CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall notify the congressional intelligence committees in writing at least 15 days prior to each exercise of an authority described in subsection (a).

SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2016 the sum of \$501,850,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

(b) **AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.**—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence are authorized 785 positions as of September 30, 2016. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) **CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for the Community Management Account for fiscal year 2016 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.**—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2016, there are authorized such additional personnel for the Community Management Account as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a).

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2016 the sum of \$514,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Fed-

eral employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 303. PRIOR CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF INITIATIONS OF CERTAIN NEW SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAMS.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the intelligence community for fiscal year 2016 may be used to initiate any new special access program pertaining to any intelligence or intelligence-related activity or covert action unless the Director of National Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, submits to the congressional intelligence committees and the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, by not later than 30 days before initiating such a program, written notification of the intention to initiate the program.

(b) **WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of National Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, may waive subsection (a) with respect to the initiation of a new special access program if the Director or Secretary, as the case may be, determines that an emergency situation makes it impossible or impractical to provide the notice required under such subsection by the date that is 30 days before such initiation.

(2) **NOTICE.**—If the Director or Secretary issues a waiver under paragraph (1), the Director or Secretary, as the case may be, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees and the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, by not later than 48 hours after the initiation of the new special access program covered by the waiver, written notice of the waiver and a justification for the waiver, including a description of the emergency situation that necessitated the waiver.

(c) **SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “special access program” has the meaning given such term in Executive Order 13526 as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. PRIOR CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF TRANSFERS OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the intelligence community for fiscal year 2016 may be used to initiate a transfer of funds from the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund or the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund to be used for intelligence activities unless the Director of National Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, submits to the congressional intelligence committees, by not later than 30 days before initiating such a transfer, written notice of the transfer.

(b) **WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of National Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, may waive subsection (a) with respect to the initiation of a transfer of funds if the Director or Secretary, as the case may be, determines that an emergency situation makes it impossible or impractical to provide the notice required under such subsection by the date that is 30 days before such initiation.

(2) **NOTICE.**—If the Director or Secretary issues a waiver under paragraph (1), the Direc-

tor or Secretary, as the case may be, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, by not later than 48 hours after the initiation of the transfer of funds covered by the waiver, written notice of the waiver and a justification for the waiver, including a description of the emergency situation that necessitated the waiver.

SEC. 305. DESIGNATION OF LEAD INTELLIGENCE OFFICER FOR TUNNELS.

The Director of National Intelligence shall designate an official to manage the collection and analysis of intelligence regarding the tactical use of tunnels by state and nonstate actors.

SEC. 306. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.

Section 1061(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) **LIMITATIONS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the Board, or any agent thereof, to gain access to information that an executive branch agency deems related to covert action, as such term is defined in section 503(e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3093(e)).”

SEC. 307. REPORTING PROCESS REQUIRED FOR TRACKING CERTAIN REQUESTS FOR COUNTRY CLEARANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—By not later than September 30, 2016, the Director of National Intelligence shall establish a formal internal reporting process for tracking requests for country clearance submitted to overseas Director of National Intelligence representatives by departments and agencies of the United States. Such reporting process shall include a mechanism for tracking the department or agency that submits each such request and the date on which each such request is submitted.

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.**—By not later than December 31, 2016, the Director of National Intelligence shall brief the congressional intelligence committees on the progress of the Director in establishing the process required under subsection (a).

SEC. 308. PROHIBITION ON SHARING OF CERTAIN INFORMATION IN RESPONSE TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENT INQUIRIES.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for any element of the intelligence community may be used to respond to, share, or authorize the sharing of any non-public information related to intelligence activities carried out by the United States in response to a legislative or judicial inquiry from a foreign government into the intelligence activities of the United States.

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 30 days after an element of the intelligence community receives a legislative or judicial inquiry from a foreign government related to intelligence activities carried out by the United States, the element shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees written notification of the inquiry.

(c) **CLARIFICATION REGARDING COLLABORATION WITH FOREIGN PARTNERS.**—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not be construed as limiting routine intelligence activities with foreign partners, except in any case in which the central focus of the collaboration with the foreign partner is to obtain information for, or solicit a response to, a legislative or judicial inquiry from a foreign government related to intelligence activities carried out by the United States.

SEC. 309. NATIONAL CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE INTEGRATION CENTER.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 119B as section 119C; and

(2) by inserting after section 119A the following new section:

“SEC. 119B. CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE INTEGRATION CENTER.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is within the Office of the Director of National Intelligence a Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

“(b) **DIRECTOR.**—There is a Director of the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center, who shall be the head of the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center, and who shall be appointed by the Director of National Intelligence.

“(c) **PRIMARY MISSIONS.**—The Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center shall—

“(1) serve as the primary organization within the Federal Government for analyzing and integrating all intelligence possessed or acquired by the United States pertaining to cyber threats;

“(2) ensure that appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government have full access to and receive all-source intelligence support needed to execute the cyber threat intelligence activities of such agencies and to perform independent, alternative analyses;

“(3) disseminate cyber threat analysis to the President, the appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and the appropriate committees of Congress;

“(4) coordinate cyber threat intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

“(5) conduct strategic cyber threat intelligence planning for the Federal Government.

“(d) **LIMITATIONS.**—The Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center—

“(1) may not have more than 50 permanent positions;

“(2) in carrying out the primary missions of the Center described in subsection (c), may not augment staffing through detailees, assignees, or core contractor personnel or enter into any personal services contracts to exceed the limitation under paragraph (1); and

“(3) shall be located in a building owned or operated by an element of the intelligence community as of the date of the enactment of this section.”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.**—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended by section 102 of this title, is further amended by striking the item relating to section 119B and inserting the following new items:

“Sec. 119B. Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

“Sec. 119C. National intelligence centers.”.

SEC. 310. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION.

Section 506D of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3100) is amended to read as follows:

“INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION

“SEC. 506D. (a) **LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.**—(1) Subject to paragraph (3), no funds appropriated to any element of the intelligence community may be obligated for an intelligence community business system transformation that will have a total cost in excess of \$3,000,000 unless the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community makes a certification described in paragraph (2) with respect to such intelligence community business system transformation.

“(2) The certification described in this paragraph for an intelligence community business system transformation is a certification made by the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community that the intelligence community business system transformation—

“(A) complies with the enterprise architecture under subsection (b) and such other policies and

standards that the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community considers appropriate; or

“(B) is necessary—

“(i) to achieve a critical national security capability or address a critical requirement; or

“(ii) to prevent a significant adverse effect on a project that is needed to achieve an essential capability, taking into consideration any alternative solutions for preventing such adverse effect.

“(3) With respect to a fiscal year after fiscal year 2010, the amount referred to in paragraph (1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) shall be equal to the sum of—

“(A) the amount in effect under such paragraph (1) for the preceding fiscal year (determined after application of this paragraph), plus

“(B) such amount multiplied by the annual percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index (all items; U.S. city average) as of September of the previous fiscal year.

“(b) **ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEMS.**—(1) The Director of National Intelligence shall develop and implement an enterprise architecture to cover all intelligence community business systems, and the functions and activities supported by such business systems. The enterprise architecture shall be sufficiently defined to effectively guide, constrain, and permit implementation of interoperable intelligence community business system solutions, consistent with applicable policies and procedures established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(2) The enterprise architecture under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) An information infrastructure that will enable the intelligence community to—

“(i) comply with all Federal accounting, financial management, and reporting requirements;

“(ii) routinely produce timely, accurate, and reliable financial information for management purposes;

“(iii) integrate budget, accounting, and program information and systems; and

“(iv) provide for the measurement of performance, including the ability to produce timely, relevant, and reliable cost information.

“(B) Policies, procedures, data standards, and system interface requirements that apply uniformly throughout the intelligence community.

“(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall be responsible for the entire life cycle of an intelligence community business system transformation, including review, approval, and oversight of the planning, design, acquisition, deployment, operation, and maintenance of the business system transformation.

“(d) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEM INVESTMENT REVIEW.**—(1) The Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community shall establish and implement, not later than 60 days after October 7, 2010, an investment review process for the intelligence community business systems for which the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community is responsible.

“(2) The investment review process under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) meet the requirements of section 11312 of title 40, United States Code; and

“(B) specifically set forth the responsibilities of the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community under such review process.

“(3) The investment review process under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

“(A) Review and approval by an investment review board (consisting of appropriate representatives of the intelligence community) of

each intelligence community business system as an investment before the obligation of funds for such system.

“(B) Periodic review, but not less often than annually, of every intelligence community business system investment.

“(C) Thresholds for levels of review to ensure appropriate review of intelligence community business system investments depending on the scope, complexity, and cost of the system involved.

“(D) Procedures for making certifications in accordance with the requirements of subsection (a)(2).

“(e) **RELATION TO ANNUAL REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the requirements of section 8083 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–287; 118 Stat. 989), with regard to information technology systems (as defined in subsection (d) of such section).

“(f) **RELATIONSHIP TO DEFENSE BUSINESS ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE.**—Intelligence community business system transformations certified under this section shall be deemed to be in compliance with section 2222 of title 10, United States Code. Nothing in this section shall be construed to exempt funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for activities other than an intelligence community business system transformation from the requirements of such section 2222, to the extent that such requirements are otherwise applicable.

“(g) **RELATION TO CLINGER-COHEN ACT.**—(1) Executive agency responsibilities in chapter 113 of title 40, United States Code, for any intelligence community business system transformation shall be exercised jointly by—

“(A) the Director of National Intelligence and the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community; and

“(B) the head of the executive agency that contains the element of the intelligence community involved and the chief information officer of that executive agency.

“(2) The Director of National Intelligence and the head of the executive agency referred to in paragraph (1)(B) shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to carry out the requirements of this section in a manner that best meets the needs of the intelligence community and the executive agency.

“(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘enterprise architecture’ has the meaning given that term in section 3601(4) of title 44, United States Code.

“(2) The terms ‘information system’ and ‘information technology’ have the meanings given those terms in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

“(3) The term ‘intelligence community business system’ means an information system, including a national security system, that is operated by, for, or on behalf of an element of the intelligence community, including a financial system, mixed system, financial data feeder system, and the business infrastructure capabilities shared by the systems of the business enterprise architecture, including people, process, and technology, that build upon the core infrastructure used to support business activities, such as acquisition, financial management, logistics, strategic planning and budgeting, installations and environment, and human resource management.

“(4) The term ‘intelligence community business system transformation’ means—

“(A) the acquisition or development of a new intelligence community business system; or

“(B) any significant modification or enhancement of an existing intelligence community business system (other than necessary to maintain current services).

“(5) The term ‘national security system’ has the meaning given that term in section 3552(b) of title 44, United States Code.”.

SEC. 311. INCLUSION OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY IN COUNCIL OF INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY.

Section 11(b)(1)(B) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-452; 5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “the Office of the Director of National Intelligence” and inserting “the Intelligence Community”.

SEC. 312. AUTHORITIES OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

(a) INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE.—Paragraph (9) of section 17(e) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(e)(9)) is amended to read as follows:

“(9)(A) The Inspector General may request such information or assistance as may be necessary for carrying out the duties and responsibilities of the Inspector General provided by this section from any Federal, State, or local governmental agency or unit thereof.

“(B) Upon request of the Inspector General for information or assistance from a department or agency of the Federal Government, the head of the department or agency involved, insofar as practicable and not in contravention of any existing statutory restriction or regulation of such department or agency, shall furnish to the Inspector General, or to an authorized designee, such information or assistance.

“(C) Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to provide any new authority to the Central Intelligence Agency to conduct intelligence activity in the United States.

“(D) In this paragraph, the term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any territory or possession of the United States.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SELECTION OF EMPLOYEES.—Paragraph (7) of such section (50 U.S.C. 3517(e)(7)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” before “Subject to applicable law”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) Consistent with budgetary and personnel resources allocated by the Director, the Inspector General has final approval of—

“(i) the selection of internal and external candidates for employment with the Office of Inspector General; and

“(ii) all other personnel decisions concerning personnel permanently assigned to the Office of Inspector General, including selection and appointment to the Senior Intelligence Service, but excluding all security-based determinations that are not within the authority of a head of other Central Intelligence Agency offices.”.

SEC. 313. PROVISION OF INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE TO INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Section 103H(j)(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “any department, agency, or other element of the United States Government” and inserting “any Federal, State (as defined in section 804), or local governmental agency or unit thereof”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “from a department, agency, or element of the Federal Government” before “under subparagraph (A)”.

SEC. 314. CLARIFICATION RELATING TO INFORMATION ACCESS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.

Section 348(a) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-259; 124 Stat. 2700; 50 U.S.C. 3308) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) REQUESTS BY CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Consistent with the protection of

classified information, the directive issued under paragraph (1) shall not prohibit the Comptroller General from obtaining information necessary to carry out the following audits or reviews:

“(A) An audit or review carried out—

“(i) at the request of the congressional intelligence committees; or

“(ii) pursuant to—

“(I) an intelligence authorization Act;

“(II) a committee report or joint explanatory statement accompanying an intelligence authorization Act; or

“(III) a classified annex to a committee report or joint explanatory statement accompanying an intelligence authorization Act.

“(B) An audit or review pertaining to intelligence activities of the Department of Defense carried out—

“(i) at the request of the congressional defense committees (as defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code); or

“(ii) pursuant to a national defense authorization Act.”.

SEC. 315. USE OF HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT FUNDS IN CONJUNCTION WITH DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL LABORATORIES.

Section 2008(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “including by working in conjunction with a National Laboratory (as defined in section 2(3) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801(3)),” after “plans,”.

SEC. 316. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO PAY UNDER TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 5102(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (vii), by striking “or”;

(2) by inserting after clause (vii) the following new clause:

“(viii) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence;”; and

(3) in clause (x), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

SEC. 321. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to an element of the intelligence community may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other individual detained at Guantanamo (as such term is defined in section 322(c)).

SEC. 322. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT OR MODIFY FACILITIES IN UNITED STATES TO HOUSE DETAINEES TRANSFERRED FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to an element of the intelligence community may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at Guantanamo for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO DEFINED.—In this section, the term “individual

detained at Guantanamo” means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 323. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TRANSFER OR RELEASE INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO COMBAT ZONES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to an element of the intelligence community may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of any individual detained in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to a combat zone.

(b) COMBAT ZONE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “combat zone” means any area designated as a combat zone for purposes of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for which the income of a member of the Armed Forces was excluded during 2014, 2015, or 2016 by reason of the member’s service on active duty in such area.

Subtitle C—Reports

SEC. 331. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON INDIVIDUALS FORMERLY DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) ADDITIONAL MATTERS FOR INCLUSION IN REPORTS.—Subsection (c) of section 319 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111-32; 123 Stat. 1874; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is amended by adding after paragraph (5) the following new paragraphs:

“(6) A summary of all contact by any means of communication, including telecommunications, electronic or technical means, in person, written communications, or any other means of communication, regardless of content, between any individual formerly detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and any individual known or suspected to be associated with a foreign terrorist group.

“(7) A description of whether any of the contact described in the summary required by paragraph (6) included any information or discussion about hostilities against the United States or its allies or partners.

“(8) For each individual described in paragraph (4), the period of time between the date on which the individual was released or transferred from Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and the date on which it is confirmed that the individual is suspected or confirmed of reengaging in terrorist activities.

“(9) The average period of time described in paragraph (8) for all the individuals described in paragraph (4).”.

(b) FORM.—Subsection (a) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following: “The reports may be submitted in classified form.”.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to terminate, alter, modify, override, or otherwise affect any reporting of information required under section 319(c) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111-32; 123 Stat. 1874; 10 U.S.C. 801 note), as in effect immediately before the enactment of this section.

SEC. 332. REPORTS ON FOREIGN FIGHTERS.

(a) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

and every 60 days thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on foreign fighter flows to and from Syria and to and from Iraq. The Director shall define the term "foreign fighter" in such reports.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) The total number of foreign fighters who have traveled to Syria or Iraq since January 1, 2011, the total number of foreign fighters in Syria or Iraq as of the date of the submittal of the report, the total number of foreign fighters whose countries of origin have a visa waiver program described in section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187), the total number of foreign fighters who have left Syria or Iraq, the total number of female foreign fighters, and the total number of deceased foreign fighters.

(2) The total number of United States persons who have traveled or attempted to travel to Syria or Iraq since January 1, 2011, the total number of such persons who have arrived in Syria or Iraq since such date, and the total number of such persons who have returned to the United States from Syria or Iraq since such date.

(3) The total number of foreign fighters in Terrorist Identities Datamart Environment and the status of each such foreign fighter in that database, the number of such foreign fighters who are on a watchlist, and the number of such foreign fighters who are not on a watchlist.

(4) The total number of foreign fighters who have been processed with biometrics, including face images, fingerprints, and iris scans.

(5) Any programmatic updates to the foreign fighter report since the last report was issued, including updated analysis on foreign country cooperation, as well as actions taken, such as denying or revoking visas.

(6) A worldwide graphic that describes foreign fighters flows to and from Syria, with points of origin by country.

(c) **FORM.**—The reports submitted under subsection (a) may be submitted in classified form.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—The requirement to submit reports under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 333. REPORTS ON PRISONER POPULATION AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 30 days thereafter, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the Members of Congress specified in subsection (b) a report on the prisoner population at the detention facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(b) **SPECIFIED MEMBERS AND COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The Members of Congress specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) The majority leader and minority leader of the Senate.

(2) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(3) The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(4) The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(5) The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(6) The minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(7) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(8) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(9) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) The name and country of origin of each prisoner detained at the detention facility at United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of the date of such report.

(2) A current summary of the evidence, intelligence, and information used to justify the detention of each prisoner listed under paragraph (1) at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(3) A current accounting of all the measures taken to transfer each prisoner listed under paragraph (1) to the individual's country of citizenship or another country.

(4) A current description of the number of individuals released or transferred from detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, who are confirmed or suspected of returning to terrorist activities after such release or transfer.

(5) An assessment of any efforts by foreign terrorist organizations to recruit individuals released from detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(6) A summary of all contact by any means of communication, including telecommunications, electronic or technical means, in person, written communications, or any other means of communication, regardless of content, between any individual formerly detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and any individual known or suspected to be associated with a foreign terrorist group.

(7) A description of whether any of the contact described in the summary required by paragraph (6) included any information or discussion about hostilities against the United States or its allies or partners.

(8) For each individual described in paragraph (4), the period of time between the date on which the individual was released or transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and the date on which it is confirmed that the individual is suspected or confirmed of reengaging in terrorist activities.

(9) The average period of time described in paragraph (8) for all the individuals described in paragraph (4).

SEC. 334. REPORT ON USE OF CERTAIN BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence communities a report on the representation, as of the date of the report, of covered business concerns among the contractors that are awarded contracts by elements of the intelligence community for goods, equipment, tools, and services.

(b) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The representation of covered business concerns as described in subsection (a), including such representation by—

(A) each type of covered business concern; and

(B) each element of the intelligence community.

(2) If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director does not record and monitor the statistics required to carry out this section, a description of the actions taken by the Director to ensure that such statistics are recorded and monitored beginning in fiscal year 2016.

(3) The actions the Director plans to take during fiscal year 2016 to enhance the awarding of contracts to covered business concerns by elements of the intelligence community.

(c) **COVERED BUSINESS CONCERNS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term "covered business concerns" means the following:

(1) Minority-owned businesses.

(2) Women-owned businesses.

(3) Small disadvantaged businesses.

(4) Service-disabled veteran-owned businesses.

(5) Veteran-owned small businesses.

SEC. 335. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **QUADRENNIAL AUDIT OF POSITIONS REQUIRING SECURITY CLEARANCES.**—Section 506H of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3104) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively.

(b) **REPORTS ON ROLE OF ANALYSTS AT FBI AND FBI INFORMATION SHARING.**—Section 2001(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–458; 118 Stat. 3700; 28 U.S.C. 532 note) is amended by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

(c) **REPORT ON OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT BY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 102A(u) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024) is amended—

(A) by striking "(1) The Director" and inserting "The Director"; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (a) of section 507 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 3106(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (5); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (5).

(3) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (c)(1) of such section 507 is amended by striking "subsection (a)(1)" and inserting "subsection (a)".

(d) **REPORTS ON NUCLEAR ASPIRATIONS OF NON-STATE ENTITIES.**—Section 1055 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (50 U.S.C. 2371) is repealed.

(e) **REPORTS ON ESPIONAGE BY PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.**—Section 3151 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7383e) is repealed.

(f) **REPORTS ON SECURITY VULNERABILITIES OF NATIONAL LABORATORY COMPUTERS.**—Section 4508 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2659) is repealed.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–155. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–155.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, line 10, strike "The Director" and insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director"

Page 12, after line 13, insert the following:

(b) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than the date that is 10 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter until the date that is four years after

the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees and the congressional defense committees (as such term is defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code) a report describing—

(1) trends in the use of tunnels by foreign state and nonstate actors; and

(2) collaboration efforts between the United States and partner countries to address the use of tunnels by adversaries.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment with my very good friend from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and my very good friend from Florida (Ms. GRAHAM). This is a bipartisan amendment with respect to tunnels being used as a military tactic, technology, and strategy in asymmetric warfare.

Mr. Chairman, almost exactly a year ago, when war broke out in the Middle East and Hamas attacked Israel, I visited Israel and saw for myself the sophistication of the tunnels being dug from Gaza to Israel through which terrorists traveled. They went to the other side of the tunnels, popped up, and tried to kill innocent civilians.

These tunnels are not the tunnels that many of us characterize in our own minds. These tunnels are sophisticated. These are expressways underground. It is like the Queens-Midtown Tunnel going from Gaza to Israel. They are ventilated. They are lit. They are massive. They are deep. They are huge. They are impenetrable, and they are very difficult to detect.

Mr. Chairman, the FY16 Intelligence Authorization bill properly says that the Director of National Intelligence will designate an official to manage the collection and analysis of intelligence regarding the tactical use of tunnels by state and nonstate actors.

□ 1430

This bipartisan amendment simply asks for accountability. It requires a report from this new lead intelligence officer for tunnels describing the trends in the use of tunnels by foreign state and nonstate actors and collaborative efforts between the United States and partner nations to address the use of tunnels by our adversaries.

Mr. Chairman, I talked about tunnels in the Middle East, but in fact, these tunnels are dynamic force multipliers for our enemies and enemies of our allies around the world. They are used for terrorist attacks, but they are also used to smuggle arms and contraband.

We have learned that these tunnels are being used well beyond Israel. Korea is another example. Tunnels have been found in North Korea. Here

at home, more than 150 tunnels have been found since 2009.

Mr. Chairman, we have plenty of enemies today looking for ways to attack the United States and our interests around the globe. This bill recognizes these threats and, very wisely, creates a lead intelligence officer for tunnels.

This amendment simply encourages greater oversight by Congress. It allows Congress to make informed decisions on how and where to spend future funds in order to counter this threat and protect U.S. national security interests.

Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, these reports will help shape the efforts of the newly created position, making it clear that Congress expects accountability and transparency, and that is something that the American people require.

I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman STEVE ISRAEL and Congresswoman GWEN GRAHAM for working together with me on this bipartisan effort in the defense bills, as well as now in the Intelligence Authorization Act. I would also like to thank Chairman NUNES and his staff for working together with me on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, as Representative ISRAEL just described, there is a real and growing tunnel threat to American bases and embassies around the world, to our southern border, as well as to our ally Israel, both in Gaza, as well as Israel's northern border.

Language I offered in the base intelligence bill, combined with this amendment, will ensure that our intelligence community stays focused on this threat. There will be a dedicated person watching on this issue.

Going forward, partnership with Israel is the best way to address this growing threat. As we have seen with Iron Dome and other missile defense efforts, partnering with a vital ally like Israel enables both countries to learn quickly, while sharing costs and new technologies. It is a win-win situation for Israel and the U.S. and, hopefully, a loss situation for the bad guys.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my very good friend from Colorado for his bipartisan support of this bill.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida. (Ms. GRAHAM).

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Representative STEVE ISRAEL's amendment to the Intelligence Authorization Act to provide oversight for the joint U.S.-Israel antitunneling defense project.

The joint antitunneling project, which was added to the National Defense Authorization Act in an amendment sponsored by my good friend Representative LAMBORN and myself, will help our closest ally in the Middle East, Israel, protect its borders.

The terrorist group Hamas has spent years developing a complex network of tunnels under the Gaza Strip and Israel to smuggle weapons, kidnap Israelis, and launch mass murder attacks.

This project will develop new technology to detect and destroy these tunnels, and it will send a clear message to our allies and enemies alike. The United States is committed to protecting Israel and to rooting out and destroying the terrorists who wish to do her harm.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LAMBORN, and Ms. GRAHAM for this very important amendment and issue.

This will call for a report on our adversaries' use of tunnels and an update on our collaboration with international partners in ways to detect and defeat tunnels.

All of us remember the fear that set in, in much of southern Israel last summer, as Hamas militants used a complex network of tunnels to attack Israeli soldiers from the Gaza Strip. This was not the first use of tunnels by Hamas. Cross-border tunnels were used in the capture of IDF soldier Gilad Shalit in 2006.

In addition to using them against military targets, Israel has uncovered evidence that the tunnels are being prepared for large-scale attacks against Israeli civilians.

Tunnels are not just a problem for Israel. For decades, the North Korean military has also been digging tunnels under the DMZ to facilitate infiltration of South Korea.

According to press reports, four tunnels from the north have been found in all, although none since 1990. The South Korean Defense Ministry believes there may be 20 in all, and they could pose a mortal threat to Koreans and American service personnel in the region.

I strongly support the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, all that I can say is thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, after line 24, insert the following new subsection:

“(e) REPORTS.—Not later than 10 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter for three years, the Director of the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center shall submit a report to Congress that includes the following:

“(1) With respect to the year covered by the report, a detailed description of cyber threat trends, as compiled by the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

“(2) With respect to the year covered by the report, a detailed description of the coordination efforts by the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center between departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Homeland Security.

“(3) Recommendations for better collaboration between such departments and agencies of the Federal Government.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to continue my winning streak on the floor this morning.

I rise to offer an amendment with my distinguished friend and partner from New York (Mr. HANNA).

This bipartisan amendment addresses an issue that has concerned many of us for some time, and that is the fact that, when it comes to cyber defense and cyber war, many Federal agencies are doing something; it is just that they may not be aware of what each of them is doing. We need closer coordination and collaboration among all the Federal agencies and entities dealing with cyber war.

Mr. Chairman, we recently found out that the United States Office of Personnel Management suffered a cyber attack impacting millions of Federal workers. This attack, in my view, highlights a disconnect between agencies tasked to provide cyber defense, a foreign government hacking into a Federal government system, taking the records of millions of government employees, spanning the jurisdiction of several Federal agencies.

It is clear that there is an obvious need for greater collaboration between these agencies to create a credible de-

fense and, if needed, a deterrent to those wishing to attack through the cyber domain.

That is why I was very pleased in February of this year when the President directed the DNI to establish the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center, CTIIC. This bill very properly authorizes that position.

CTIIC will serve as the primary organization within the Federal Government for analyzing and integrating all intelligence possessed or acquired by the U.S. pertaining to cyber threats and coordinate cyber threat intelligence activities.

This bipartisan amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply ensures congressional oversight of CTIIC by requiring an annual report detailing three things: number one, cyber attack trends identified by the CTIIC; number two, an assessment of the collaborative efforts between the CTIIC and various Federal agencies tasked to defend this country against cyber attacks; and number three, recommendations for better collaboration between these agencies.

Mr. Chairman, we have entered a new era of warfare. Our networks are being attacked daily. We need to do a much better job of coordinating, collaborating, and cooperating at the Federal level. This amendment ensures oversight and accountability.

I want to thank my partner on this measure, Mr. HANNA, for his bipartisan assistance and support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, over the last several years, cyber attacks have become a pressing concern for the United States. The recent breach of the Office of Personnel Management has put the personal information of millions of current and former Federal employees, including many of the men and women of our intelligence community, at risk.

Every day, cyber thieves attack private companies, stealing credit card numbers, accessing medical records, leaking proprietary information, and publishing confidential emails, affecting tens of millions of Americans.

The intelligence community has worked to improve our cyber defenses by improving information sharing between the private sector and the Federal Government through the support of H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act.

While the Senate has yet to act on this bill, the legislation we consider today will help improve the Federal Government's ability to detect and defeat cyber attacks by creating the new Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

This thoughtful amendment by Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. HANNA will require that the Center produce a report on cyber threat trends and coordination on cyber threats between different government agencies.

I thank the gentlemen from New York for their work on this issue and urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman, and I thank him for his excellent amendment and support in the intelligence process.

With each passing day, we are learning more about the cyber breach at the Office of Personnel Management. The volume of personal information lost during these events is of tremendous concern. Mr. ISRAEL's amendment will help us better inform Congress on the effectiveness of the government's collaborative efforts to defend against future cyber events.

I thank my colleagues for their work on it, and I urge support of Mr. ISRAEL's amendment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman for his bipartisan leadership and the distinguished ranking member. I appreciate their support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 317. INCLUSION OF HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS IN GRANT PROGRAM TO ENHANCE RECRUITING OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WORKFORCE.

Section 1024 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, Hispanic-serving institutions, and” after “universities”; and

(B) in the subsection heading for such subsection, by striking “HISTORICALLY BLACK” and inserting “CERTAIN MINORITY-SERVING”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

“(5) HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term ‘Hispanic-serving institution’ has the meaning given that term in section 502(a)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a(a)(5)).”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, like many of my colleagues, I am focused on growing educational opportunities for young Hispanic Americans, particularly in the areas that will be so critical to our Nation's success in the years ahead.

Last month, the House approved a bipartisan amendment to the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act designed to increase opportunities for Latinos in the STEM fields.

The amendment I am offering today with my colleagues, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. CURBELO, builds upon that effort and would further expand opportunities for Hispanic students.

Our proposal would allow the Director of National Intelligence to offer grants to Hispanic-Serving Institutions of higher education for advanced foreign language education programs that are in the immediate interest of the intelligence community.

It would also promote study abroad and cultural immersion programs in those areas, which we all know are crucial to truly understanding the intricacies of other languages and other cultures. This is a time when we need to be encouraging more of our young people to enter careers aimed at making our Nation safer.

Of the nearly 2 million Latino students enrolled in college today, the majority attend Hispanic-Serving Institutions. With these targeted grants, HSIs would be able to help increase the ranks of Latinos going into the intelligence community, where they are underrepresented today.

This amendment would not only promote diversity in national security and intelligence communities, but it would also strengthen our youngest and fastest growing minority, Hispanic Americans.

We must ensure that these young people are prepared with the knowledge and skills that will contribute to our Nation's future strength, security, and global leadership because, when education is available to everyone, our entire Nation is a stronger nation.

I want to thank my colleagues who have worked with me on this issue, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. CURBELO, who have cosponsored this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. CURBELO for offering this amendment to include Hispanic-Serving Institutions in the grant program to improve recruitment efforts for the intelligence community.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

□ 1445

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this amendment and thank my colleague from New York for allowing me to join in leading on this important issue.

This amendment would allow the Director of National Intelligence to provide grants to Hispanic-Serving Institutions of higher education to offer advanced foreign language programs that are important to our intelligence community. These students, in addition to the traditional classroom setting, would also be able to travel and study abroad so they can gain a firsthand perspective of the culture in which they are immersing themselves.

Mr. Chairman, the study of Farsi, Middle Eastern, and South Asian dialects is of the utmost importance in developing our country's continued relationships abroad. I am proud to advocate for Hispanic-Serving Institutions, like Florida International University and Miami Dade College in my district, and will strive to provide them the opportunity to train their students so that they can go on to serve our country.

I am proud to be working with the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) to provide more opportunities for these young Hispanic students who want to serve their country and to provide our intelligence community this special tool to recruit those who could be useful in advancing the cause of building the relationships that are so critical to our intelligence services operating throughout the world.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida's comments on this bill and his support.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank my colleague from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for yielding and for his work on this amendment. I am very happy to support it.

Diversity and language skills are critical to national security. Together, they allow the intelligence community to reach its potential and expand its reach, its access, as well as its understanding.

This amendment would further both goals by providing better language-learning opportunities to students of Hispanic-Serving Institutions. I am

very proud to support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Again, I thank my friend from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) as well as my other colleagues who worked with him on this amendment. I urge passage.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his support of this amendment as well as the ranking member, Mr. SCHIFF, for his support of this amendment, and all the Members who have worked on this amendment.

I think the amendment speaks for itself. It is providing a great opportunity for a growing minority community within our country who want to serve our country in this capacity.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 35, after line 17, insert the following new subsection (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(c) ADDITIONAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report that includes—

(1) with respect to the travel of foreign fighters to and from Iraq and Syria, a description of the intelligence sharing relationships between the United States and member states of the European Union and member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(2) an analysis of the challenges impeding such intelligence sharing relationships.

Page 35, line 19, insert "and (c)" after "(a)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan amendment with the support of Homeland Security Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL and Representatives KATKO and LOUDERMILK to help Congress identify ways to improve intelligence sharing on the flow of foreign fighters around the world—with particular attention to their travel to and from Iraq and Syria.

Already, this legislation that we are considering today makes substantial strides in ensuring that intelligence surrounding the flow of foreign fighters is shared with Congress. These continuous reports will shed light on the

total number of attempted and successful fighters since the beginning of 2011.

My amendment would require the Director of National Intelligence to report to Congress on the intelligence community's progress in forging information-sharing agreements with foreign partners and help Congress identify the challenges impeding coordinated intelligence efforts.

Over 20,000 foreign fighters have traveled to join rebel and terrorist groups in Iraq and Syria, including ISIS and al Qaeda affiliates like al-Nusra. Their movements are proving increasingly difficult to track in our globalized world, particularly given the uneven or nonexistent tracking efforts from some of our foreign partners.

As the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade and as a member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, I have engaged on the issue of intelligence sharing from two perspectives—from our efforts to improve the intelligence community's coordination with State, local, and other Federal agencies and from our work to better improve our information-sharing practices with our overseas allies to prevent terrorist attacks and the flow of foreign fighters here at home.

While the intelligence community has made improvements to the processes of sharing pertinent information with the relevant Federal, State, and local agencies, there still exists a blind spot in our intelligence-gathering efforts on foreign fighters. That blind spot stems from the failure of some foreign governments to take common-sense information-sharing steps, and it has made the task of tracking foreign fighters even more challenging.

The inability or unwillingness of some foreign governments to pass along even the most basic information about these individuals represents a major risk to the safety of the American people.

An additional threat looms when some of these individuals return to their homelands from Iraq and Syria, battle-hardened and radicalized. Once back home, some can travel between international borders with relative ease, which makes tracking them a truly difficult feat.

This amendment will also provide insight into our current intelligence-sharing relationships and will give Congress the opportunity to highlight best practices while also revealing areas for improvement.

I thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for their cooperation.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL).

Mr. McCAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Keating-McCaul amendment in the Intelligence Authorization Act. If adopted, our amendment would require the Director of National Intelligence to report to Congress on the state of intelligence information sharing with overseas partners to help us identify security gaps so that we can improve international monitoring of foreign fighter travel both in and out of Syria and Iraq.

Islamist fanatics from more than 100 countries have traveled overseas to fight with groups like ISIS and al Qaeda. Thousands of the jihadists carry Western passports and can exploit security gaps in places like Europe to return to the West, where they can plot attacks against America and our allies.

Last month, I led a congressional delegation to the Middle East to investigate the flow of these foreign fighters. And while progress is being made, I am still troubled by intelligence and screening gaps, especially with our foreign partners. We need to make sure our allies not only share the identities of terrorists and foreign fighters with us but also with each other so that these extremists can be stopped before they cross our borders into the United States.

This amendment will provide Congress critical information needed to close these security gaps and improve intelligence information sharing to defend our homeland.

I applaud the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) for his hard work on the amendment and for his strong participation in our delegation overseas, where we learned quite a bit. It is not very often you can pass something you think can save American lives, and I think this is one of them. I thank the gentleman again.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of Homeland Security for his leadership on this issue. We really have established a very strong bipartisan effort, putting our national security first and realizing what holes there are in our system, in our security for our country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the work of my colleagues from Massachusetts and from Texas. This is a superb amendment that will help us track foreign fighters, and I am proud to support it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 41, line 8, strike "paragraphs (3) and (4)" and insert "paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the recent events involving the plan of radicalized individuals in Massachusetts to target law enforcement officials—police, in particular—underscore the truth that protecting America will require the efforts of local, State, and Federal law enforcement.

Since the Boston Marathon bombings, the FBI has made great efforts to improve their information-sharing efforts with the Joint Terrorism Task Force and other Federal agencies.

With my work and the work of my colleagues on the congressional investigation of the Boston Marathon bombings through the Homeland Security Committee, I can attest to the seriousness in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation has set out to improve their information-sharing practices.

However, the FBI's efforts to institutionalize sharing across law enforcement and intelligence are still a work in progress.

The current version of this bill eliminates the requirement for the FBI to report to Congress on their progress to implement information-sharing principles. This is a reporting requirement that has kept Congress aware of the FBI's information-sharing practices since 2004, and it has been vital to understand what works and what can be improved.

This amendment will reinstate that requirement, with the recognition that the FBI has more work to do on information sharing to better protect the American public.

These necessary reforms include re-executing FBI current memorandums of understanding with local partners, improving training and accessibility for the eGuardian platform, and formalizing methods for disseminating intelligence to relevant consumers up and downstream.

Without information on the progress the FBI is making in these reforms, Congress is hindered in taking the critical steps needed to protect the American public.

I would like to again thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts, who has been an

active and important voice on national security since he joined the Congress several years ago. In particular, he has worked to ensure that we maintain a strong focus on information sharing across agencies.

One of the key lessons we learned from 9/11 is the need to tear down stovepipes and to ensure that inappropriate barriers to information sharing across agencies never reappear.

The gentleman from Massachusetts' amendment seeks to maintain our vigilance on this issue and would require the FBI to report to Congress on its information-sharing progress.

As a fellow native Bostonian, I am very pleased to see my colleague do such great work. I want to thank him for his commitment to the issue. And I am very happy to support the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 321, 322, 323, and 331.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike the sections of the bill which would undermine the administration's ability to close the prison at Guantanamo by transferring the remaining detainees to the United States for further disposition of their cases or to third countries that agree to accept them, secure them, and monitor them.

I am grateful that my colleague from Washington, ADAM SMITH, ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, has joined me in urging the House to make this important change to the bill.

Every day that it remains open, the prison at Guantanamo Bay damages the United States. Because there are other, better options for the prosecution and detention of these inmates, we are not safer for Guantanamo's existence. In fact, it makes us more vulnerable by drawing new recruits to the jihad.

The Congress, the administration, and the military can work together to find a solution that protects our people even as we maintain our principles and devotion to the rule of law.

Under the provisions included in this bill, the administration would be barred from transferring Guantanamo detainees to a "war zone."

While I agree that it would be foolhardy to seek to send a detainee to Yemen while that country is immersed in civil war, the definition of "war zone" used here is derived from the U.S. Tax Code and is extremely broad, ruling out countries like Jordan, for example, that have either successfully resettled and monitored former detainees or demonstrated a genuine commitment to doing so.

These provisions also prevent the administration from transferring Guantanamo detainees to the United States for further proceedings under the military commissions process or for trial in an article III court.

□ 1500

The Department of Justice and our courts have proven themselves time and time again to be more than capable of handling the toughest terrorism cases and doing so in a way that ennobles us and sets an example to the world that a great nation can both safeguard its people and the rule of law.

As a practical matter, our civilian courts have proven much more adept at handling these cases than the military commissions process has. In fact, this past Friday, a three-judge panel of the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, one of the most important appellate courts in the Nation, further struck down the legality of commission charges, so narrowing the jurisdiction of the military commissions themselves that any utility as an alternative to article III courts has been called into further question.

And while Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and his fellow Guantanamo terrorists still await their date with justice, a host of others—including Richard Reid, the shoe bomber; and Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, the underwear bomber; and Faisal Shahzad, the Times Square bomber—have been tried, convicted, and sent to ADX Florence, the toughest prison in America. They are gone, and they are not coming back.

The inclusion of these provisions is the first time that restrictions related to Guantanamo have been included in the Intelligence Authorization Act, and I believe that alone sets an unfortunate precedent that could undermine what has been a largely bipartisan effort. These provisions are unnecessary and unwise, and they do not belong in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to reconsider these provisions, to trust in American justice, diplomacy, and the best military advice, and to give the administration a means to shutter a prison that both shames us and perpetuates the threat to the Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, although I appreciate the ranking member's concerns about these provisions, I do remain concerned that further releases from Guantanamo will threaten our national security.

Press reports now indicate that the administration intends to transfer up to 10 additional detainees this month. As the committee learned through its many briefings and hearings, the five detainees released to Qatar last May have participated in activities that threaten the United States and its allies and are counter to U.S. national security interests, not unlike their activities before they were detained. No intelligence community element should enable any future transfers that endanger national security.

Furthermore, I would note that these provisions are substantively identical to the provisions passed by the House Armed Services Committee as part of the National Defense Authorization Act. Mr. Chairman, 26 of the 27 Democrats on that committee voted to advance an NDAA that contained similar restrictions. The provisions in our bill will complement those restrictions, as well as the restrictions put forward in the defense appropriations bills for several years running and this committee's previous intelligence authorization bills. The ranking member may have forgotten, but in 2012, there were provisions similar to this one that were included in the legislation.

In sum, these provisions represent a strong and enduring consensus in Congress that Guantanamo should remain open and that detainees should not be transferred to the U.S. for any reason. As everyone here is aware, several detainees who have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and killed and wounded Americans. Putting detainees in U.S. prisons, as the administration originally proposed, would be disruptive and potentially disastrous. The threat is real, and Guantanamo is already equipped to handle the detention and military trial of these individuals, as appropriate.

For those reasons, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to urge support for this amendment. This is one of the few areas of disagreement between the chairman and myself. When we look at how we are progressing or the lack of more progress in our struggle against ISIS and al Qaeda in places like Syria and Iraq, we are often tempted to consider those that we take off the battlefield as a metric of our success—we have eliminated so many combatants

from the battlefield. But of course that number in isolation means very little. And the challenge is that with every one we take off the battlefield, there are new foreign fighters coming onto the battlefield.

The recruitment of those additional fighters uses a variety of images and issues to attract people to join the jihad. One of the issues that is continually used as recruiting propaganda is the presence of the detention center at Guantanamo Bay. This is a recruitment vehicle for the jihadis. It is a rallying cry for the jihadis.

The closure of this prison will not end the threat from ISIS or al Qaeda. There will be other efforts to recruit. But why give them this recruitment tool when there are other, better ways that these people can be incarcerated? Why give them this recruitment vehicle when there are ways that we can secure the people at Guantanamo Bay, prosecute the people at Guantanamo Bay, uphold our highest standards and the rule of law, and remove at least one part the jihadi social media and other propaganda campaign?

Mr. Chairman, I think it is in our national security interest to do so. I would urge support for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I know that the gentleman believes every word that he is saying. We have had robust debate in the Intelligence Committee behind closed doors, and we have had robust debate out in open session, and it is a debate I think that will always continue.

However, the concern remains from the majority Members of Congress that they would prefer to keep Guantanamo open because no one wants to bring those terrorists to the United States, to their backyard, to try them in their State or their county or their community.

So I respect the gentleman's concerns, and we will continue to debate those, but I will continue to oppose closing Guantanamo or having our intelligence community participate in the removal of detainees from Guantanamo.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. REPORT ON HIRING OF GRADUATES OF CYBER CORPS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM BY INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Director of the National Science Foundation, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the employment by the intelligence community of graduates of the Cyber Corps Scholarship Program. The report shall include the following:

(1) The number of graduates of the Cyber Corps Scholarship Program hired by each element of the intelligence community.

(2) A description of how each element of the intelligence community recruits graduates of the Cyber Corps Scholar Program.

(3) A description of any processes available to the intelligence community to expedite the hiring or processing of security clearances for graduates of the Cyber Corps Scholar Program.

(4) Recommendations by the Director to improve the hiring by the intelligence community of graduates of the Cyber Corps Scholarship Program, including any recommendations for legislative action to carry out such improvements.

(b) CYBER CORPS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Cyber Corps Scholarship Program” means the Federal Cyber Scholarship-for-Service Program under section 302 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7442).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as we debate this bill today, hackers across the world are trying furiously to break into our cyber networks, as we all know. And as we have seen in recent weeks, they are occasionally successful, and the consequences are grave. These cracks in our cyber defense put our security at risk. They also threaten American businesses and the privacy and credit of individuals across this country.

For the sake of our national security and our economy, we must work together to improve our cyber capabilities. This requires a stronger, more capable cyber workforce, which our bipartisan amendment will help facilitate.

The Federal CyberCorps Scholarship for Service program gives scholarships to students who study in the cybersecurity field. In exchange, those students commit to serving in government cybersecurity positions after graduation. Leaders within the intelligence

community and DOD have told us that they need to expand their workforce and want to hire graduates from this program. Unfortunately, outdated personnel rules and insufficient direct hire authority make it extremely difficult for them to do so. As a result, these students aren't able to fulfill their work commitment and we are unable to meet our workforce needs, and our cybersecurity suffers.

We believe Congress should help remove those obstacles and make it easier to bring those graduates into the cyber workforce. Our amendment starts that process by requiring a report back to us on how many CyberCorps graduates go to work for the intelligence community and how these agencies recruit them. This information will help us determine how to streamline the hiring process so we are capitalizing on the best cybersecurity talent available.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple, bipartisan amendment, but it will pay dividends to improve and expand our cyber workforce and strengthen our national security.

I would like to thank Congresswoman SEWELL from Alabama for her assistance in this amendment.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida and the gentlewoman from Alabama, both HPSCI colleagues, for their amendment, and I am happy to support it.

This amendment furthers two important goals: first, to ensure that academic programs that should serve as a resource to the government—in this case, the National Science Foundation's CyberCorps Scholarship for Service—actually do result in a good number of students choosing employment within the intelligence community; and second, to deepen the bench of our cyber defenders.

As a recent series of serious cyber breaches has demonstrated, it is an imperative for the protection of this Nation's workforce, privacy, and sensitive intelligence that we strengthen the IC's cyber cadre with our best and brightest. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a fine addition to the gentleman's and the gentlewoman's other initiatives already represented in the bill, particularly those that advance diversity in the intelligence community.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for their work. I urge support for this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this bipartisan, common sense amendment that seeks to streamline and strengthen our Intelligence Community's (IC) cyber workforce. I am pleased to join my fellow colleague, Rep. ROONEY, who shares my deeply held desire to help meet the incredible need to raise the number of professionals in the critically important field of cybersecurity.

The recent breach of OPM which compromised the personal information of nearly 4 million federal employees further illustrates our urgent and immediate need to make substantial improvements to our cyber databases and overall cyber infrastructure. Cyberattacks have become increasingly common, and state sponsored bad actors pose a serious threat to our national security. These types of attacks are one of the most urgent modern challenges to our nation. Our government must be poised to do more to prevent future attacks. We must position ourselves to curtail any threat, no matter how great or small.

In December 2011, the National Science and Technology Council, in cooperation with the National Science Foundation (NSF), advanced a broad, coordinated federal strategic plan to enhance cybersecurity research and education. As part of this plan, the NSF launched the CyberCorps Scholarship for Service (SFS) program. In an effort to bolster our federal workforce's capacity and advance the nation's economic prosperity and national security, this program provides funding for undergraduate and graduate level scholarships to students interested in cybersecurity. In return, scholarship recipients are required to work for a Federal, State, Local, or Tribal Government organization in a position related to cybersecurity for a period equal to the length of the scholarship. In essence, students receive a scholarship in exchange for their commitment to federal civil service. This program seeks to cultivate pipelines for applicants from undergraduate and graduate programs into federal careers focusing on combatting emerging cyber security threats.

Leaders within the Intelligence Community tell me, however, that outdated policies and onerous clearance procedures are inhibiting their ability to fill industry vacancies with young and diverse cybersecurity professionals.

Our amendment simply requires the Intelligence Community to report to Congress on how many CyberCorps graduates actually go to work for the IC and how IC agencies recruit these CyberCorps graduates. This information will help Congress determine how we can best improve the hiring process.

I strongly believe that Congress should be facilitating ways to help the Intelligence Community hire these critically important CyberCorps graduates and create a pipeline directly into our cyber workforce.

I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF DATA BREACH OF OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the data breach of the Office of Personnel Management disclosed in June 2015.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The effects, if any, of the data breach on the operations of the intelligence community abroad, including the types of operations, if any, that have been negatively affected or entirely suspended or terminated as a result of the data breach.

(2) An assessment of the effects of the data breach to each element of the intelligence community.

(3) An assessment of how foreign persons, groups, or countries may use the data collected by the data breach (particularly regarding information included in background investigations for security clearances), including with respect to—

(A) recruiting intelligence assets;

(B) influencing decision-making processes within the Federal Government, including regarding foreign policy decisions; and

(C) compromising employees of the Federal Government and friends and families of such employees for the purpose of gaining access to sensitive national security and economic information.

(4) An assessment of which departments or agencies of the Federal Government use the best practices to protect sensitive data, including a summary of any such best practices that were not used by the Office of Personnel Management.

(5) An assessment of the best practices used by the departments or agencies identified under paragraph (4) to identify and fix potential vulnerabilities in the systems of the department or agency.

(c) BRIEFING.—The Director of National Intelligence shall provide to the congressional intelligence committees an interim briefing on the report under subsection (a), including a discussion of proposals and options for responding to cyber attacks.

(d) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, recently, the Office of Personnel Management disclosed a massive security breach that may have exposed personal information of millions of current and former Federal

employees, including those who work in sensitive national security positions. Simply put, this cyber breach is unacceptable and breaks faith with those dedicated military and civilian personnel who commit their lives to keeping our country safe.

Although responsibility has not yet been officially confirmed, many observers believe that individuals in China, who may have been acting on orders of the Chinese Government, were responsible for hacking into OPM databases.

Two things are clear, Mr. Chairman. First, we must ensure this does not happen again; we must protect our Federal employees—our foreign service officers, State Department staff, members of the intelligence community, and many others. Second, we must make clear to the rest of the world that these attacks will not be tolerated and that there will be consequences.

Mr. Chairman, that is why my amendment takes the first of many critical steps to respond to this breach. My amendment starts the process of holding OPM accountable. It makes sure we leverage the best data security practices that our intelligence agencies use to protect sensitive personal information about our military and civilian personnel who work day in and day out to keep our country safe.

Finally, my amendment ensures that the United States Congress can play a constructive role in developing a meaningful, forceful response to cyber attacks—especially attacks aimed at our Nation's security. We must stop these attacks and protect those who commit their lives to our safety. This amendment is an important first step in doing just that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, the Intelligence Committee, I think, in a bipartisan manner, has the same concerns as the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We expect timely briefs on all major cyber attacks, but in this case, I agree, we need to require specific reporting and briefing on the impacts of the recent OPM breach. We need to learn far more about how hackers accessed the systems, what they obtained, and how we can prevent this from happening again. In addition, this will help us understand the impact to the intelligence community.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, our public and private networks are

not sufficiently secure, and they are a regular target for cyber attacks. We must do everything we can to shore them up, and we must do so now.

I want to thank my colleague for his work, and I urge support of his amendment.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. ASSESSMENT ON FUNDING OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an intelligence community assessment on the funding of political parties and nongovernmental organizations in former Soviet states and countries in Europe by the Russian Federation and the security and intelligence services of the Russian Federation since January 1, 2006. Such assessment shall include the following:

(1) The country involved, the entity funded, the security service involved, and the intended effect of the funding.

(2) An evaluation of such intended effects, including with respect to—

(A) undermining the political cohesion of the country involved;

(B) undermining the missile defense of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(C) undermining energy projects that could provide an alternative to Russian energy.

(b) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(1) The congressional intelligence communities.

(2) The Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(3) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

□ 1515

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan amendment requires the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report to Congress on the funding of political parties and NGOs in former

Soviet states by the Russian Federation and its associated security and intelligence services.

As Congress well knows, a resurgent Russia, led by President Vladimir Putin, is once again determined to destabilize the West and various Euro-Atlantic institutions such as NATO.

While we have seen the blatant use of military force both in Georgia and Ukraine, Russia has employed a variety of nontraditional methods to disrupt the West. These methods include the use of propaganda through state-owned media outlets such as Russia Today, manipulation of European natural gas markets, and the use of money to influence political parties and nongovernmental organizations throughout Europe.

In a recent New York Times article, authors Peter Baker and Steven Erlanger highlight a series of instances in which the Russian Federation covertly funneled money to political organizations in Europe in order to influence various decisionmakers and parties.

While their ultimate goal remains the fragmentation of institutions such as the EU and NATO, Russia hopes to achieve incremental victories like influencing the EU's upcoming decision on whether or not to renew sanctions against them.

As president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and chair of the Assembly's U.S. delegation, I have had the opportunity to meet frequently with my European counterparts to discuss this issue. In all instances, Assembly members continue to validate and echo the concerns discussed here today. Only through an increased understanding can we begin to effectively plan and combat President Putin and a resurging Russia.

I ask all of my colleagues to rise in support of this bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlemen from Ohio, Alabama, and New York for their amendment, which I am proud to support.

This amendment requires the Director of National Intelligence to provide an assessment on funding of political parties and NGOs in the former Soviet states and countries in Europe by the Russian Federation and its security and intelligence services.

Over the past few years, we have witnessed a number of highly visible, aggressive actions by Russia, particularly in Ukraine; but Moscow's efforts to destabilize its neighbors are also subtler and more nefarious. Russia is sponsoring and funding political parties to

groom the next generation of puppets which they can control from Moscow.

We must better understand what they are doing, even if what they are doing is very deep behind the scenes; so long as sources and methods are properly protected, I support this effort.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues for their work, and I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman well remembers, with the cold war, there was a time when the conflict between the United States and Russia was very tense. This amendment will help us bring to bear light on the actions of Russia so that we can make certain our policies reflect the new aggressiveness of the Russian Federation.

Mr. NUNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TURNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NUNES. I really appreciate the gentleman. He is one of the most involved Members of Congress with NATO, so I know that his concerns are valid. I, too, share those concerns and would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. FARR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. REPORT ON CONTINUOUS EVALUATION OF SECURITY CLEARANCES.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees and the congressional defense committees (as defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code) a report on the continuous evaluation of security clearances of employees, officers, and contractors of the intelligence community. The report shall include the following:

(1) The status of the continuous evaluation program of the intelligence community, including a timeline for the implementation of such program.

(2) A comparison of such program to the automated continuous evaluation system of the Department of Defense.

(3) Identification of any possible efficiencies that could be achieved by the intelligence community leveraging the automated continuous evaluation system of the Department of Defense.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise to offer an amendment which strengthens the process for granting security clearances to those working in the intelligence community through a continuous evaluation process.

This amendment directs the National Intelligence Director to provide the intelligence and defense committees a report on the status of its current efforts for continuous evaluation of security clearance holders, including a timeline for its rollout. The report will also provide a cost-benefit analysis of DNI's efforts to similar efforts that are being carried on in the Department of Defense.

We learned, after the tragic shooting in the Navy Yard in September 2013, the DOD should continuously evaluate these personnel, rather than do it once every 5 years.

Clearance starts by an initial vetting that determines a person's suitability and eligibility to have access to classified material by examining the person's past and making a judgment on future reliability. Now, once cleared, a continuous evaluation process is designed to examine a person's behavior to ensure its continued reliability.

Congress directed the DOD to create a process that would be a government-wide solution for continuous personnel security evaluations. This solution is called ACES, Automated Continuous Evaluation System.

Now, the Director of National Intelligence is also seeking its own capability for continuous evaluation. While I support the intelligence community's requirement, their efforts may be redundant.

DOD's system already has measurable successes. Their system is also flexible enough to be tailored to meet any specific requirements that the intelligence community may need.

My amendment simply assures that the DNI does not work towards a continuous evaluation system in a vacuum. By working together to share lessons learned or build a common evaluation system, the DNI and the DOD can build a better program that ensures our national security and uses taxpayer dollars effectively.

As we have all seen recently, the insider threat to our national security is real. We must continue to ensure that we remain secure by only granting security clearances to those who are suitable and reliable.

I ask for an "aye" vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my colleague, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman and my good friend from California for his amendment, which I am very happy to support.

An important role of Congress and of this bill is to ensure that our intelligence agencies protect sensitive information and protect taxpayer dollars.

This amendment supports both of these goals by requiring that the Office of the Director of National Intelligence report to Congress on its continuous evaluation process for security clearances and to compare those processes to those the Department of Defense uses. This comparative study will help identify places where we may be able to make improvements and save money.

I want to thank Mr. FARR for his amendment and his diligence.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114-155.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I offer that amendment at this time.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 336. REPORT ON STRATEGY, EFFORTS, AND RESOURCES TO DETECT, DETER, AND DEGRADE ISLAMIC STATE REVENUE MECHANISMS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the intelligence community should dedicate necessary resources to defeating the revenue mechanisms of the Islamic State.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the intelligence committees a report on the strategy, efforts, and resources of the intelligence community that are necessary to detect, deter, and degrade the revenue mechanisms of the Islamic State.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to say thank you to Mr. FITZPATRICK for cosponsoring this amendment and for his leadership as

the chairman of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing. Thank you also to Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for supporting this important amendment.

The purpose of the bipartisan Sinema-Fitzpatrick amendment is to choke off the Islamic State's revenue stream. Our amendment directs the intelligence community to detect, deter, and degrade Islamic State's revenue sources and to report on the strategy and resources needed for success.

The Islamic State is one of the world's most violent and dangerous terrorist groups. Its goals to build a caliphate in the Middle East and encourage attacks in Europe and the United States represent a new threat to our country and to global stability.

ISIL is also believed to be the richest terrorist organization in history, controlling a huge territory in Iraq and Syria containing significant oil resources. In 2014, the Islamic State generated approximately \$1 million per day through the sale of smuggled oil, extortion, and kidnapping for ransom.

U.S. strikes have reportedly diminished ISIL's oil revenues, but the breadth of this terrorist organization's funding sources represents a serious challenge to our national security.

A February report by the Financial Action Task Force estimated that ISIL now largely finances itself through extortion in the territory it controls, and another study places this extortion revenue at \$360 million per year. In Iraq, ISIL levies a 5 percent tax on all withdrawals from banks, and the organization also gains tens of millions of dollars from kidnapping on an annual basis.

To defeat ISIL and protect our country, we must cut off the Islamic State's diverse and substantial sources of revenue.

I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, and I thank my colleague Ms. SINEMA for her work on this important amendment and for her work as well on the task force established to investigate terrorism financing.

Today, the terror threat faced by our Nation and our intelligence community is more diverse and sophisticated than it has ever been before. Organizations

like Hezbollah, ISIS, and Boko Haram can no longer simply be considered terrorist groups.

They have grown into much more dangerous entities, ones with the abilities to self-finance their actions through means far beyond traditional methods, from illicit oil sales and human trafficking to regional taxation and antiquity dealing.

In order to effectively combat such evolved threats, U.S. policy must also evolve. As chair of the bipartisan Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, established by the Committee on Financial Services, I have worked with lawmakers and policy experts to guarantee the U.S. response to terror's new revenue streams are quickly and effectively choked out.

This amendment is important to ensure each level of our government, from Congress to the intelligence community, has identified the problem, as well as potential weaknesses, and is ready to address the threats that we face.

By both expressing the sense of Congress that our intelligence agencies must dedicate resources to eradicate terror revenue mechanisms, as well as report to relevant committees on their strategies, this amendment strengthens the underlying bill and Congress' understanding of our global response to terrorism.

The threat to freedom and democracy posed by the Islamic State and groups like it circles the globe, and the United States can ill afford to combat these enemies on the battlefield alone. Any strategy against terror groups worldwide must attack not only militarily, but at their funding source. Organizations, no matter how complex, cannot effectively function without requisite resources.

Mr. Chairman, our intelligence community is second to none, and I am certain that, together, we can formulate and carry out long-term solutions to combat terror financing.

I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue and Ms. SINEMA for offering this amendment.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, Ranking Member SCHIFF, and thank him for his leadership on national security issues.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for her amendment, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am proud to support it.

Behind ISIL's rapid and dangerous rise are its many sources of illicit funding. This amendment expresses the conviction of Congress that the intelligence community should dedicate resources to finding and eliminating those revenue sources and that the IC must report on its effort to do so.

Again, I want to thank both of my colleagues for their leadership on this

issue, and I urge strong support of their amendment.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTEMBER).

Mr. PITTEMBER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and congratulate Ms. SINEMA and Mr. FITZPATRICK, the chairman of the committee. This will help our terrorism task force efforts undermine the funding of ISIS.

Terrorism experts concur that ISIS is the most well-funded terrorist threat that we have ever faced. Through the illicit sale of stolen oil and antiquities, kidnapping for ransom, extortion, bank robberies, and usurious taxation, ISIS continues to amass tens of millions of dollars.

Stopping this flow of money to terrorists must be a top priority if we are to defeat ISIS. Unfortunately, earlier this month, the President admitted he does not have a comprehensive strategy to defeat ISIS.

This amendment will require the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress the current efforts they use to undermine the funding of ISIS, increasing our ability to ensure these efforts are a priority.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I will look forward to the continued bipartisan support of the Financial Services Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing.

□ 1530

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, as a member of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, I am working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to keep money out of the hands of terrorists and to find solutions like this amendment, which strengthens America's security.

Again, I would like to thank Mr. FITZPATRICK for his partnership and leadership on this issue. I also thank Chairman NUNES, Ranking Member SCHIFF, and Mr. PITTEMBER for their work on this important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:
SEC. 336. REPORT ON NATIONAL SECURITY CO-OPERATION BETWEEN UNITED STATES, INDIA, AND ISRAEL.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of

National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on possibilities for growing national security cooperation between the United States, India, and Israel.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I appreciate the support of my colleagues from California, Ohio, North Carolina, Arizona, and New York, who are coleaders on this effort. They are Mr. BERA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. HOLDING. I also thank the chairman and ranking member of the Intelligence Committee for their support of this amendment.

This amendment is about expanding the cooperation between the world's oldest democracy, the world's largest democracy, and a true democracy within the Middle East. That is the United States, India, and Israel. In recent years, the United States has expanded relations with Israel, as well as with India, in a number of areas.

We have also seen India and Israel work more and more together on a bilateral basis. Of course, that is because a lot of their interests overlap, but it is also because many of our values overlap.

There is so much that our three countries can be doing together in the realm of scientific cooperation, research, best practices, national security implementation, defense, and much, much more.

There is also a lot that we can learn from each other, whether it is about drip irrigation to build food supplies, desalinization to address water shortages, or refrigeration practices to prevent the kind of food spoilage that leads to hunger, not to mention how much potential there is in technological research and economic development.

This amendment, of course, just deals with a narrow portion of these areas because the underlying bill is limited to security issues, but it is a needed start.

I truly believe that the United States-India relationship has the potential to be the world's most important "big country" relationship in the 21st century. As our ties with India grow, it is important to see the India-Israel ties increasing as well.

Here in the United States, as a former co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian Americans, I have met with many members of the Indian American community, and I have consistently heard from visiting

members of India's Government that there is a genuine desire to expand relations between India and Israel now and in the future.

In fact, it has already been reported that, in the coming months, India's Prime Minister will become the first-ever Indian Prime Minister to travel to Israel. We are going to see the leader of what will be the world's most populous nation visiting and engaging with one of the smallest nations.

The sky is really the limit on this effort going forward, and that is why the amendment asks the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress a plan on how to grow the U.S.-India-Israel national security relationship. This is a real possibility, and I hope the DNI can identify a solid number of ways to work together even more in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, Mr. HOLDING was just here, but unfortunately, he got called away to another meeting because I know he worked closely with Mr. CROWLEY and others as chair of the India Caucus, and he wanted me to express his strong support for this amendment. I also urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, working with international partners is an essential element of the IC's mission to understand the global threat environment, as well as the political, social, and economic trends around the world.

For nearly 70 years, Israel has been a close friend and ally, as well as a vital source of intelligence about the world's most volatile region. In recent years, India, the world's largest democracy, has upgraded its bilateral relationships with both the United States and Israel. Given India's complex relationship with both Pakistan and China, exploring the potential for enhanced trilateral intelligence cooperation is very much in our interest.

Mr. CROWLEY's amendment to direct the DNI to report to Congress on the potential for intelligence sharing is timely, and I urge the House to support it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, again, let me thank Mr. NUNES, the chair of the committee, as well as the ranking member, Mr. SCHIFF, for their support of this valuable amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:
SEC. 336. CYBER ATTACK STANDARDS OF MEASUREMENT STUDY.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Secretary of Defense, shall carry out a study to determine appropriate standards that—

(1) can be used to measure the damage of cyber incidents for the purposes of determining the response to such incidents; and

(2) include a method for quantifying the damage caused to affected computers, systems, and devices.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) PRELIMINARY FINDINGS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall provide to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives the initial findings of the study required under subsection (a).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 360 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the complete findings of such study.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by paragraph (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for Chairman NUNES and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for their leadership on this important legislation.

I am particularly grateful that I was here to hear the presentation by Congressman JOE CROWLEY relative to promoting a better relationship with the world's largest democracy, India, by the world's oldest democracy, the United States.

He and I have served as the past co-chairs of the Caucus of India and In-

dian Americans, and I know of his commitment to promoting a better relationship between India and the United States.

Last week, the Office of Personnel Management revealed they were the targets of an extended cyber attack on Federal employee personnel records. These attacks stole personal data, such as Social Security numbers, financial information, and security clearance documents, putting the personal and financial security of our citizens at risk.

This cyber attack was not a novelty. Recently, we have seen a growing number of cyber attacks on government Web sites, national retailers, and small businesses. Indeed, according to Symantec, most businesses reported a completed or an attempted cyber attack in the last year, and 60 percent of those facing an attack were small- or medium-sized businesses. These cyber attacks are a sober reminder to Congress that all government agencies need to work together to better protect their public and private networks.

After each of these attacks, we have had a number of questions: Who is behind it? Is it an agent of a foreign government or a nonstate actor? How many records were affected? What kind of information was accessed?

As of now, we gather this information through various government agencies, and each uses a different measure to assess and quantify the damage of the attack, so we waste valuable time and resources when trying to piece together a response.

We need a clear, unified system of measurement for cyber attacks that can be used across all government agencies and military branches. By putting government agencies and branches of the military on the same page, we can have an effective and rapid response.

This amendment directs the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the FBI, and the Secretary of Defense, to conduct a study to define a method of measuring a cyber incident so we can determine an appropriate response.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, it is apparent that cyber is a new domain of warfare. This amendment is a critical first step in building a more comprehensive cyber defense system.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his important amendment.

There is a limit to how effective a defensive cyber strategy can be because, while we have to defend everything at all times, our adversaries get to attack everywhere and need to be successful only once, so we need to create a more effective deterrent, which this amendment will help further.

It would require that the Office of the Director of National Intelligence report to Congress on how we measure cyber attacks so that we can know how best to respond once we are attacked or to communicate in advance how we would respond if we were attacked. Measuring the scale and effects of cyber attacks is no easy task, especially as we must factor in second and third order effects.

I want to thank Mr. WILSON for his amendment. I am proud to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 336. REPORT ON WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING.

(a) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—Not later than 365 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional committees specified in subsection (b) a report on wildlife trafficking.

(b) **SPECIFIED MEMBERS AND COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The congressional committees specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(3) Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(4) Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(5) Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(6) Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(c) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) An assessment of the major source, transit, and destination countries for wildlife trafficking products or their derivatives and how such products or derivatives are trafficked.

(2) An assessment of the efforts of those countries identified as major source, transit, and destination countries to counter wildlife trafficking and to adhere to their international treaty obligations relating to endangered or threatened species.

(3) An assessment of critical vulnerabilities that can be used to counter wildlife trafficking.

(4) An assessment of the extent of involvement of designated foreign terrorist organi-

zations and transnational criminal organizations in wildlife trafficking.

(5) An assessment of key actors and facilitators, including government officials, that are supporting wildlife trafficking.

(6) An assessment of the annual net worth of wildlife trafficking globally and the financial flows that enables wildlife trafficking.

(7) An assessment of the impact of wildlife trafficking on key wildlife populations.

(8) An assessment of the effectiveness of efforts taken to date to counter wildlife trafficking.

(9) An assessment of the effectiveness of capacity-building efforts by the United States Government.

(10) An assessment of the impact of wildlife trafficking on the national security of the United States.

(11) An assessment of the level of coordination between United States intelligence and law enforcement agencies on intelligence related to wildlife trafficking, the capacity of those agencies to process and act on that intelligence effectively, existing barriers to effective coordination, and the degree to which relevant intelligence is shared with and acted upon by bilateral and multilateral law enforcement partners.

(12) An assessment of the gaps in intelligence capabilities to assess transnational wildlife trafficking networks and steps currently being taken, in line with the Implementation Plan to the National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking, to remedy such information gaps.

(d) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment, cosponsored by the ranking member on the Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee, Mr. KEATING from Massachusetts, requires the Director of National Intelligence to produce a report on wildlife trafficking, how terrorist organizations are involved, how they are making money off of wildlife trafficking, and the impact it has on U.S. national security.

During our Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee hearing on this very issue in February, we learned that rhinos and elephants are on the path to extinction.

For example, back in the seventies, there were approximately 65,000 rhinos in Africa. Since then, about 1,000 a year have been killed, and now, there are only 5,000 left in Africa. That is a 94 percent drop in those rhinos. There are only five white rhinos in the whole world.

Elephants are not faring much better. From 2002 to 2010, the elephant population across Africa dropped 66 percent. Back in the thirties and forties, Mr. Chairman, there were approximately 5 million African elephants. Now there are about a half a million African elephants.

One of the most famous was Satao in this photograph that was taken last year. He was, presumably, the oldest elephant that was in existence in Africa. He was killed last year for his tusks, which almost touched the ground. In fact, National Geographic, a year ago today, did an article on him and how he was killed for his tusks and how other elephants are being killed for their tusks. He was about 46 years old when he was killed for those tusks.

The reason that poaching seems to be on the increase over the last few years is that there is a low risk of apprehension, and it is easy to commit these crimes. Also, even when someone is captured, penalties for wildlife trafficking are far less than for drug trafficking.

Who uses these tusks? Who uses these rhino horns? The number one country in the world that is the consumer of the illegal ivory trade is China. Vietnam is the number one country in the world that uses the illegal trade of rhino horns. This is where these tusks and these rhino horns go, and it brings in a lot of money.

For example, a kilogram of rhino horns—if I remember my math correctly, that is 2.2 pounds—sells for \$60,000. So there is a lot more money involved in the sale of rhino horns and of elephant tusks than even of gold and platinum.

Overall, the illegal wildlife trade is about \$10 billion to \$20 billion a year. It should come as no surprise that terrorist organizations are also involved in this criminal enterprise, like al Qaeda's affiliate al Shabaab and like Joseph Kony's Lord's Resistance Army. They are cashing in on the illegal wildlife trafficking.

It is getting so bad that the poachers have become very sophisticated in the sense that they no longer just shoot elephants, for example, because that makes a noise, that warns them. They are even being poisoned. An elephant is poisoned, and the elephant dies.

Then, when people approach the elephant, they not only see the dead elephant, but they see other animals that were feeding on the carcass of the elephant, and they are all dead, too, so that the poachers can get those tusks. They have become very innovative.

□ 1545

Local park rangers are under-resourced; they are ill-equipped; and some of them are corrupt as well. So we can't fight what we don't know.

There is a lot about this issue—and terrorist involvement in wildlife trafficking—that is murky, so we need to find out, for example: How much money do terrorists get from wildlife trafficking? Who are the key facilitators of the trade? What government officials are complicit? What impact does this have on the U.S. national security?

This amendment requires the Director of National Intelligence to report to Congress on these and other questions. The better we understand the threat, the better we understand what is happening and how terrorists are involved in the illegal killing of rhinos and elephants, the more effective we can be against fighting those terrorists. And that is just the way it is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlemen from Texas and Massachusetts for their amendment, which I am proud to support.

The trafficking of wildlife by terrorist organizations is an important issue, not only because it threatens to wipe out elephants, rhinos, and tigers, but also because it could threaten our national security. The World Wildlife Fund estimates that the amount of money generated by wildlife trafficking trade reaches into the hundreds of millions of dollars, and much of this goes to fund terrorists, including The Lord's Resistance Army, al-Shabaab, and Boko Haram. That is money going into the coffers of those who every day seek to harm us and others.

We must put our intelligence professionals to the task. We must understand from beginning to end how terrorists acquire, transfer, and profit from wildlife trafficking. This is the first step to putting an end to it.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues for offering this amendment. I urge support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:
SEC. 336. REPORT ON TERRORIST USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional committees specified in subsection (b) a report that represents the coordinated assessment of the intelligence community on terrorist use of social media.

(b) **SPECIFIED MEMBERS AND COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The congressional committees specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(3) Committee on Judiciary of the Senate.

(4) Committee on Homeland and Government Affairs of the Senate.

(5) Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(6) Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(7) Committee on Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(8) Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(c) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) An assessment of what role social media plays in radicalization in the United States and elsewhere.

(2) An assessment of how terrorists and terrorist organizations are using social media, including trends.

(3) An assessment of the intelligence value of social media posts by terrorists and terrorist organizations.

(4) An assessment of the impact on the national security of the United States of the public availability of terrorist content on social media for fundraising, radicalization, and recruitment.

(d) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, terrorists' use of social media has exploded over the past several years. A recent study by The Brookings Institution found that ISIS had over 40,000 Twitter accounts. Terrorist groups from ISIS to the Taliban use social media platforms to recruit, to radicalize, to spread propaganda, and to raise money. I have seen fan pages for the Khorasan Group, an online press conference held on Twitter by the al Qaeda branch in Yemen, and we all remember al-Shabaab live tweeting the murder of 72 people in Kenya. All terrorist groups.

The benefits of social media are clear. Social media is easy to use, it is free, and it reaches huge audiences across the world. We need to better understand why terrorists' use of social media is effective and what impact it is having on the world.

This bipartisan amendment is cosponsored by the ranking member on our Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, Mr. KEATING from Massachusetts. This amendment requires the Director of National Intelligence to assess four parts of the social media problem: First, what role does social media play in radicalizing people in the United States and abroad?

The rise of the lone wolf terrorism in recent years has been fueled, in part,

by terrorists' use of social media. Just recently, in Garland, Texas, two individuals claiming ISIS connections were killed while they were attacking an assembly on free speech and peaceable assembly of religion. Evidence shows that they had some social connection, social media connection with ISIS. The Boston bombers made two pressure cooker bombs. The recipes for those bombs were published before the attack in al Qaeda's Inspire magazine. That magazine was released and promoted on social media.

Second, how exactly are terrorists using social media? Social media is constantly evolving, just like terrorists' use of social media platforms. Following online trends is an essential element in putting resources where they have the most impact. We need to make fast-paced improvements in this area as new trends and platforms emerge.

Third, what is the real intelligence value of terrorists' posts? In 2012, a number of my colleagues and I sent a letter to the FBI asking, What intelligence value is terrorists' use of social media? The FBI has not come up with an answer. We need a detailed understanding from the whole intelligence community on just how valuable the intelligence is that we are getting from terrorists' use of social media.

Finally, how does online fundraising, radicalization, and recruitment by terrorists impact U.S. national security? We know social media is a valuable tool to the terrorists just by how often they use it. Unfortunately, the United States is way behind on countering terrorists' use of social media, so we should do more. Terrorists like ISIS are out to destroy us. We have to fight to defeat them on every battlefield, and that includes in social media.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, social media, like any other form of communication, can be exploited by bad actors for nefarious purposes. While we are lucky to live in a time of remarkable innovation that brings us closer to one another no matter what our geographical distance may be, our adversaries use the same tools to spread hateful and dangerous messages across the globe.

I, therefore, support this amendment that calls on the intelligence community to provide Congress with greater information about how terrorist organizations use social media for fundraising, radicalization, and recruitment. Armed with that knowledge, we are more capable of stopping them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:
SEC. 336. REPORT ON UNITED STATES COUNTER-TERRORISM STRATEGY TO DISRUPT, DISMANTLE, AND DEFEAT ISIL, AL-QAEDA, AND THEIR AFFILIATED GROUPS, ASSOCIATED GROUPS, AND ADHERENTS.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a comprehensive report on the United States counterterrorism strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), al-Qaeda, and their affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(2) COORDINATION.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be prepared in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Defense, and the head of any other department or agency of the United States Government that has responsibility for activities directed at combating ISIL, al-Qaeda, and their affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(3) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include each of the following:

(A) A definition of—

(i) al-Qaeda core, including a list of which known individuals constitute al-Qaeda core;

(ii) ISIL, including a list of which known individuals constitute ISIL leadership;

(iii) an affiliated group of ISIL or al-Qaeda, including a list of which known groups constitute an affiliate group of ISIL or al-Qaeda;

(iv) an associated group of ISIL or al-Qaeda, including a list of which known groups constitute an associated group of ISIL or al-Qaeda;

(v) an adherent of ISIL or al-Qaeda, including a list of which known groups constitute an adherent of ISIL or al-Qaeda; and

(vi) a group aligned with ISIL or al-Qaeda, including a description of what actions a group takes or statements it makes that qualify it as a group aligned with ISIL or al-Qaeda.

(B) An assessment of the relationship between all identified ISIL or al-Qaeda affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents with ISIL leadership or al-Qaeda core.

(C) An assessment of the strengthening or weakening of ISIL or al-Qaeda, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents, from January 1, 2010, to the present, including a description of the metrics that are used to assess strengthening or weakening and an assessment of the relative increase or decrease in violent attacks attributed to such entities.

(D) An assessment of whether or not an individual can be a member of al-Qaeda core if

such individual is not located in Afghanistan or Pakistan.

(E) An assessment of whether or not an individual can be a member of al-Qaeda core as well as a member of an al-Qaeda affiliated group, associated group, or adherent.

(F) A definition of defeat of ISIL or core al-Qaeda.

(G) An assessment of the extent or coordination, command, and control between ISIL or core al-Qaeda and their affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents, specifically addressing each such entity.

(H) An assessment of the effectiveness of counterterrorism operations against ISIL or core al-Qaeda, their affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents, and whether such operations have had a sustained impact on the capabilities and effectiveness of ISIL or core al-Qaeda, their affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(4) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires a strategy to defeat ISIS and other like-minded groups. It is incredible that after 4 years of the rise of ISIS, we still have to talk about needing a strategy, but here we are.

Four years, Mr. Chairman, what is that? Well, in 4 years the United States mobilized the whole country and had to fight two wars—one in the Pacific and one in Europe—during World War II, and we were successful in protecting the United States, but here after 4 years of the rise of ISIS, we are not sure even what our strategy is.

One thing we do know: controlling land is a top priority for ISIS. Its own credibility is wrapped up in the idea of establishing a caliphate. Without land, ISIS has no caliphate. Without a caliphate, ISIS loses its legitimacy among its hardcore fighters. Controlling land is also how ISIS makes a lot of its money. See, ISIS extorts the people that it controls. It also taxes them. ISIS is still bringing in millions of dollars a day by other illegal activities.

The only way to stop that source of money is by taking back land that ISIS controls. Because ISIS is embedded in civilian populations, U.S. airstrikes are not enough to take the land back. The Iraqi Army is still too unprofessional to show that they are up to the job, and we have all seen ourselves how the

Iraqis have dropped American weapons and run. We have yet to give the Kurds the weapons they need to fight for themselves, and we don't expect the dictator Assad to get the job done.

The problem of ISIS is only getting bigger. Thousands of foreign fighters are still streaming into Iraq and Syria from other countries. Outside of Iraq and Syria, ISIS still has 10 networks, not including Iraq and Syria. There are three in Libya, two in Saudi Arabia, and one each in the Sinai, Nigeria, Yemen, Algeria, and one in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Saudi Arabia is known for its strong government control, but the ISIS affiliate in Saudi Arabia recently pulled off two successful suicide attack bombings in 2 weeks. Its affiliate in Yemen has taken advantage of the fall of the government to take over more land. The ISIS affiliate in Libya is running free in a lawless area throughout the same country that killed our Ambassador and three other Americans. All of ISIS' 10 networks are growing stronger, not weaker, by the day.

The President said last year that the United States would defeat and dismantle ISIS. Well, here we are a year later; we still do not have that strategy. That is at least according to the President himself last week when he was meeting with the world leaders at the G7 summit. He said: We do not yet have a complete strategy against ISIS.

This amendment requires the Director of National Intelligence to report to Congress within 6 months a complete strategy to defeat ISIS and other groups like it. The same amendment did pass unanimously last year with this committee's support. So I ask Members to support it once again this year and make it become the law of the land. Today's terrorists control more land than they have at anytime since World War II. We need a strategy; we need a plan; and we need it soon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, it is critical that the United States continue to refine and implement a comprehensive and aggressive strategy to counter ISIL, al Qaeda, and their affiliates, but that responsibility does not lie with the Director of National Intelligence. The DNI's job is to ensure that our national leadership, who do generate our counterterrorism strategy, have the timeliest, most germane, and detailed information to be sure our strategy will be successful.

Mr. POE's amendment misclassifies that responsibility and misconstrues the important role of the Director of National Intelligence. Our intelligence community must be free to collect and assess intelligence outside of the scope of political decisions to be sure their

analysis remains impartial and objective.

So, reluctantly, I must oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. The amendment does state that the Director of National Intelligence will work with other appropriate agencies.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard to fathom that this Nation does not have a plan to deal with ISIS. This amendment says Congress will move forward and expect and put into law that we will have a plan; we will have a strategy; and if the Director of National Intelligence is not an individual who is supposed to help form that plan, then I don't know who would be.

I would ask that this amendment be adopted.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, with respect to my colleague, we have a strategy with respect to defeating al Qaeda and ISIL, with respect to the war in Syria and Iraq. It is a comprehensive strategy and, frankly, it is a difficult strategy to implement. It is a strategy that involves cutting off terrorism financing. It is a strategy that involves cutting off the flow of foreign fighters into Syria and Iraq. It is a strategy that involves drying up the resources, the propaganda, the attacking of the recruitment mechanism of ISIS. It is a strategy that involves enlisting the support of our partners in the region and within the Islamic world to combat the perversion of their faith that is used to recruit people to this jihad. It is a strategy that is also military in character, that employs our air assets, that seeks to train and assist Iraqi forces. So we have a strategy. It is comprehensive, and it is tough.

While I recognize that there is frustration that many of my colleagues have that our strategy has thus far not borne more success—and I share that frustration—I have yet to hear any of my colleagues offer an alternative. It is one thing to bash the administration because you don't like the strategy; it is another to ignore the fact that we have a strategy or to propose improvements to it.

But the subject matter of this amendment is whether the top intelligence official in the country should be charged with the responsibility of developing the policy to defeat ISIS, and I think it is rather his responsibility to make sure that the policymakers in Congress and the administration have the very best intelligence to inform those decisions.

We see, frankly, this misunderstanding of the role of the intelligence community many times even in our committee when committee members will ask witnesses from the intelligence community to state policy positions on how they think certain poli-

cies should be implemented when that is really not their responsibility.

Here, much as I concur with the need to perfect our strategy, improve our strategy, and the execution of that strategy, I don't believe that this is something that we should lay at the feet of the Director of National Intelligence.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. POE of Texas. I don't have anything to say, believe it or not, Mr. Chairman, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) at 5 p.m.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2596.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1701

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 114-155 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 246, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 367]

AYES—176

Adams	DeLauro	Kennedy
Amash	DelBene	Kildee
Ashford	Deutch	Kilmer
Bass	Dingell	Kind
Beatty	Doggett	Kuster
Becerra	Doyle, Michael	Langevin
Bera	F.	Larsen (WA)
Beyer	Duckworth	Larson (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Lawrence
Blumenauer	Edwards	Lee
Bonamici	Ellison	Levin
Brady (PA)	Engel	Lewis
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Lieu, Ted
Bustos	Esty	Loebsack
Butterfield	Farr	Lofgren
Capps	Foster	Lowenthal
Capuano	Frankel (FL)	Lowe
Cárdenas	Fudge	Lujan Grisham
Carney	Gabbard	(NM)
Carson (IN)	Gallego	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cartwright	Garamendi	(NM)
Castor (FL)	Grayson	Lynch
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Maloney
Chu, Judy	Grijalva	Carolyn
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	Massie
Clark (MA)	Hahn	Matsui
Clarke (NY)	Hastings	McCollum
Clay	Heck (WA)	McDermott
Cleaver	Higgins	McGovern
Clyburn	Himes	McNerney
Cohen	Hinojosa	Meeks
Connolly	Honda	Meng
Conyers	Hoyer	Moore
Cooper	Huffman	Moulton
Costa	Israel	Murphy (FL)
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Crowley	Jeffries	Napolitano
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Neal
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Nolan
Davis, Danny	Jones	Norcross
DeFazio	Kaptur	O'Rourke
DeGette	Keating	Pallone
Delaney	Kelly (IL)	Pascarell

Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.

NOES—246

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishkek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert

Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)

Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Byrne
DeSaulnier

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Fattah
Griffith
Kelly (MS)
McHenry

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke
Sanchez, Loretta
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Welch

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1730

Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. POMPEO, WITTMAN, JOYCE, and DESANTIS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BEYER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Messrs. COHEN and MASSIE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 315, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. DINGELL. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Dingell moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2596 to the Select Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select) with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 29, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 317. PROTECTING UNITED STATES PERSONS WHO TRAVEL.

To maximize the security of United States civilian aviation, the Director of National Intelligence shall identify and share with all appropriate Federal departments and agencies, including the Transportation Security Administration—

(1) all information on new and constantly changing threats used by terrorists to evade airport screening operations; and

(2) updated terrorist watch list information for the purpose of properly vetting employees at commercial airports.

SEC. 318. PROTECTING PRIVATE PERSONAL INFORMATION FROM CYBER ATTACKS BY CHINA, RUSSIA, AND OTHER STATE-SPONSORED COMPUTER HACKERS.

The Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of each element of the intelligence community, shall prioritize efforts and dedicate sufficient resources to uncover and to foil attempts to steal the private personal information of United States persons, including Social Security numbers, dates of birth, employment information, and health records, insofar as—

(1) up to 4,000,000 records of Federal employees under the control of the Office of Personnel Management were stolen;

(2) the information of 80,000,000 Americans was compromised by the attacks on Anthem Health Insurance and CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield;

(3) the health records of more than 29,000,000 Americans were compromised in data breaches between 2010 and 2013; and

(4) the personnel records of millions of Federal employees were compromised by a series of recently discovered attacks against the Office of Personnel Management, including records related to the background investigations of current, former, and prospective Federal employees.

Mrs. DINGELL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, it is very timely that we are considering the intelligence authorization bill today, as there have been several troubling incidents in the last few weeks that require an immediate response by the Congress.

I know that Members on both sides of the aisle care deeply about airport security and cybersecurity, and we agree that Congress must do everything possible to keep the American people safe.

Last week, we learned that there were 73 people employed at airports across the country that should have

been disqualified for employment because they are on a terrorist watch list. The American people deserve the highest level of security at our airports, and, quite frankly, I believe for all of us the status quo is unacceptable.

While it is easy for us to blame the TSA for this lapse in security, it is shocking that the TSA does not have access and that the current policy does not authorize them to have access to the information that they need so that they can keep us safe, nor do other appropriate agencies.

As much as we agree that reforms are needed at TSA, we should all agree that they should have all the information they need to do their jobs. It is critical that our intelligence and security agencies are sharing information with each other because they have the same mission—keeping the American people safe.

This motion to recommit simply states that the Director of National Intelligence must provide all information on new and changing terrorist threats and the updated terrorist watch list information to TSA and to anybody else in the government that needs to have it.

In addition, to improve information sharing, I think everybody in this Chamber knows that we must address cybersecurity. Cyber attacks are becoming a routine event in the United States today, and it demands an immediate response and investigation. Americans deserve the peace of mind in knowing that their personal information is secure and not vulnerable to hacking by cyber criminals, yet there is a growing list of recent incidents that continues to put the privacy of everyday Americans, our constituents, at risk.

The recent breach of over 4 million records of Federal employees at the Office of Personnel Management and a hack of 80 million records at Anthem Health Insurance and CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield are just a few of the prominent examples of this growing threat. And who is paying the price? Working families.

For each cyber attack that you read about in the newspapers, there are many more that are going unreported or, worse, undetected. In fact, some security experts are concerned that China is now building a massive database with the personal information of many, many American citizens.

Furthermore, American companies are increasingly becoming targets of cyber attacks. With a recent report estimating that this is costing our economy more than \$445 billion, we simply cannot wait any longer to protect the privacy of everyday Americans from hackers and cyber criminals in Russia and China.

This motion to recommit simply requires the Director of National Intelligence to prioritize efforts to uncover

and foil attempts to steal the private, personal information of Americans. This is the least we can do to respond to the attacks on the privacy of the American people. Let's show the American people that Congress is listening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is nothing more than a poison pill designed to destroy the hard work that has gone into crafting this legislation.

This bill already does exactly what the motion to recommit proposes. It helps the Federal Government, including the patriotic men and women of our intelligence community, address the critical national security issues facing this country. As anyone who worked on it in the committee or took the time to come down and read the annex knows, this bill already funds intelligence community personnel who protect our networks.

While we stand here, the intelligence community is wrestling with some of the greatest national security threats in our country's history. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion to recommit and "yes" on final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 240, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 368]

AYES—183

Adams	Butterfield	Conyers
Agullar	Capps	Cooper
Ashford	Capuano	Costa
Bass	Cardenas	Courtney
Beatty	Carney	Crowley
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Bera	Cartwright	Cummings
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan	Clarke (NY)	Delaney
F.	Clay	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	DeBene
Brown (FL)	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	Deutch
Bustos	Connolly	Dingell

Doggett	Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)
Doyle, Michael	Lawrence	Richmond
F.	Lee	Roybal-Allard
Duckworth	Levin	Ruiz
Edwards	Lewis	Ruppersberger
Ellison	Lieu, Ted	Rush
Engel	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Eshoo	Loebback	Sánchez, Linda
Esty	Lofgren	T.
Farr	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Foster	Lowe	Schakowsky
Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham	Schiff
Fudge	(NM)	Schrader
Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott (VA)
Galleo	(NM)	Scott, David
Garamendi	Lynch	Serrano
Graham	Maloney,	Sherman
Grayson	Carolyn	Sinema
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Sires
Green, Gene	Matsui	Slaughter
Grijalva	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Gutiérrez	McDermott	Speier
Hahn	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Hastings	Meeks	Takai
Heck (WA)	Meng	Takano
Higgins	Moore	Thompson (CA)
Himes	Moulton	Thompson (MS)
Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)	Titus
Honda	Nadler	Tonko
Hoyer	Napolitano	Torres
Huffman	Neal	Tsongas
Israel	Nolan	Van Hollen
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Vargas
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Veasey
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Vela
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Velázquez
Kaptur	Payne	Visclosky
Keating	Pelosi	Walz
Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Kennedy	Peters	Schultz
Kildee	Peterson	Waters, Maxine
Kilmer	Pingree	Watson Coleman
Kind	Pocan	Welch
Kirkpatrick	Polis	Wilson (FL)
Kuster	Price (NC)	Yarmuth
Langevin	Quigley	
Larsen (WA)	Rangel	

NOES—240

Abraham	Davis, Rodney	Hice, Jody B.
Aderholt	Denham	Hill
Allen	Dent	Holding
Amash	DeSantis	Hudson
Amodei	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
Barletta	Dold	Hultgren
Barr	Donovan	Hunter
Barton	Duffy	Hurd (TX)
Benishek	Duncan (SC)	Hurt (VA)
Bilirakis	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Bishop (MI)	Ellmers (NC)	Jenkins (KS)
Bishop (UT)	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (WV)
Black	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Blackburn	Fincher	Johnson, Sam
Blum	Fitzpatrick	Jolly
Bost	Fleischmann	Jones
Boustany	Fleming	Jordan
Brady (TX)	Flores	Joyce
Brat	Forbes	Katko
Bridenstine	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (AL)	Fox	King (IA)
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Kinzing (IL)
Buck	Garrett	Kline
Bucshon	Gibbs	Knight
Burgess	Gohmert	Labrador
Calvert	Goodlatte	LaMalfa
Carter (GA)	Gosar	Lamborn
Carter (TX)	Gowdy	Lance
Chabot	Granger	Latta
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Clawson (FL)	Graves (LA)	Long
Coffman	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Cole	Griffith	Love
Collins (GA)	Grothman	Lucas
Collins (NY)	Guinta	Luetkemeyer
Comstock	Guthrie	Lummis
Conaway	Hanna	MacArthur
Cook	Hardy	Marchant
Costello (PA)	Harper	Marino
Cramer	Harris	Massie
Crawford	Hartzler	McCarthy
Crenshaw	Heck (NV)	McCauley
Culberson	Hensarling	McClintock
Curbelo (FL)	Herrera Beutler	McKinley

McMorris	Ribble	Stutzman	Donovan	Langevin	Rohrabacher	Kelly (IL)	Moulton	Scott (VA)
Rodgers	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)	Duckworth	Latta	Rokita	Kennedy	Mulvaney	Scott, David
McSally	Rigell	Thornberry	Duffy	Lipinski	Rooney (FL)	Kildee	Nadler	Serrano
Meadows	Roby	Tiberi	Elmers (NC)	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Kilmer	Napolitano	Sherman
Meehan	Roe (TN)	Tipton	Emmer (MN)	Long	Roskam	Kind	Neal	Sires
Messer	Rogers (AL)	Trott	Farenthold	Loudermilk	Ross	Labrador	Nolan	Slaughter
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Turner	Fincher	Love	Rothfus	Larsen (WA)	Nugent	Smith (WA)
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Upton	Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Rouzer	Larson (CT)	O'Rourke	Speier
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Valadao	Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Royce	Lawrence	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)
Moolenaar	Rooney (FL)	Wagner	Fleming	Lujan Grisham	Ruiz	Lee	Pascarell	Takai
Mooney (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg	Flores	(NM)	Ruppersberger	Levin	Payne	Takano
Mullin	Roskam	Walden	Forbes	MacArthur	Russell	Lewis	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Mulvaney	Ross	Walker	Fortenberry	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (WI)	Lieu, Ted	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Murphy (PA)	Rothfus	Walorski	Foxx	Marchant	Scalise	Loebach	Perry	Titus
Neugebauer	Rouzer	Walters, Mimi	Franks (AZ)	Marino	Schweikert	Lofgren	Pingree	Tonko
Newhouse	Royce	Weber (TX)	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy	Scott, Austin	Lowenthal	Pocan	Torres
Noem	Russell	Webster (FL)	Gibbs	McCauley	Sensenbrenner	Lowe	Polis	Tsongas
Nugent	Ryan (WI)	Westerman	Goodlatte	McClintock	Sessions	Lujan, Ben Ray	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Nunes	Salmon	Westmoreland	Gowdy	McKinley	Shimkus	(NM)	Quigley	Vargas
Olson	Sanford	Whitfield	Graham	McMorris	Shuster	Lummis	Rangel	Vela
Palazzo	Scalise	Williams	Granger	Rodgers	Simpson	Lynch	Richmond	Velázquez
Palmer	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)	Graves (GA)	McSally	Sinema	Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Wittman	Graves (LA)	Meadows	Smith (MO)	Carolyn	Rush	Wasserman
Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Womack	Graves (MO)	Meehan	Smith (NE)	Massie	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
Perry	Sessions	Woodall	Grothman	Messer	Smith (NJ)	Matsui	Salmon	Waters, Maxine
Pittenger	Shimkus	Yoder	Guinta	Mica	Smith (TX)	McCollum	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
Pitts	Shuster	Yoho	Guthrie	Miller (FL)	Stefanik	McDermott	T.	Wilson (FL)
Poe (TX)	Simpson	Young (AK)	Hanna	Miller (MI)	Stewart	McNerney	Sanford	Yarmuth
Poliquin	Smith (MO)	Young (IA)	Hardy	Moolenaar	Stivers	Meeks	Sarbanes	Yoho
Pompeo	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)	Harper	Mullin	Stutzman	Meng	Schakowsky	
Posey	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin	Hartzler	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (PA)	Mooney (WV)	Schiff	
Price, Tom	Smith (TX)	Zinke	Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)	Thornberry	Moore	Schrader	
Ratcliffe	Stefanik		Heck (WA)	Neugebauer	Tiberi			
Reichert	Stewart		Hensarling	Newhouse	Tipton			
Renacci	Stivers		Herrera Beutler	Noem	Trott	Aderholt		
			Hice, Jody B.	Norcross	Turner	Byrne	Kelly (MS)	Sanchez, Loretta
			Hill	Nunes	Upton	Fattah	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
			Holding	Olson	Valadao		McHenry	
			Hudson	Palazzo	Veasey			
			Huizenga (MI)	Palmer	Wagner			
			Hultgren	Paulsen	Walberg			
			Hunter	Pearce	Walden			
			Hurd (TX)	Peters	Walker			
			Hurt (VA)	Peterson	Walorski			
			Jenkins (KS)	Pittenger	Walters, Mimi			
			Jenkins (WV)	Pitts	Walz			
			Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)			
			Johnson, Sam	Poliquin	Webster (FL)			
			Jolly	Pompeo	Wenstrup			
			Joyce	Posey	Westerman			
			Katko	Price, Tom	Westmoreland			
			Keating	Ratcliffe	Whitfield			
			Kelly (PA)	Reed	Williams			
			King (IA)	Reichert	Wilson (SC)			
			King (NY)	Renacci	Wittman			
			Kinzing (IL)	Ribble	Womack			
			Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)	Woodall			
			Kline	Rice (SC)	Yoder			
			Knight	Rigell	Young (AK)			
			Kuster	Roby	Young (IA)			
			LaMalfa	Roe (TN)	Young (IN)			
			Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Zeldin			
			Lance	Rogers (KY)	Zinke			

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne	Kelly (MS)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Fattah	McHenry	
Gibson	Reed	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1746

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 178, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 369]

AYES—247

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)
Aguilar	Brat	Comstock
Allen	Bridenstine	Conaway
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Cook
Ashford	Brooks (IN)	Cooper
Babin	Brownley (CA)	Costa
Barletta	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Barr	Buck	Cramer
Barton	Bucshon	Crawford
Benishek	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bera	Bustos	Cuellar
Bilirakis	Calvert	Culberson
Bishop (GA)	Carter (GA)	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Delaney
Black	Chaffetz	Denham
Blackburn	Clay	Dent
Blum	Coffman	DeSantis
Bost	Cole	Diaz-Balart
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Dold

Adams	Conyers	Garamendi
Amash	Courtney	Garrett
Bass	Crowley	Gibson
Beatty	Cummings	Gohmert
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Gosar
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Grayson
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Green, Al
Bonamici	DeGette	Green, Gene
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeLauro	Griffith
Brady (PA)	DelBene	Grijalva
Brown (FL)	DeSaulnier	Gutiérrez
Butterfield	DesJarlais	Hahn
Capps	Deutch	Harris
Capuano	Dingell	Hastings
Cárdenas	Doggett	Higgins
Carney	Doyle, Michael F.	Himes
Carson (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Hinojosa
Cartwright	Duncan (TN)	Honda
Castor (FL)	Edwards	Hoyer
Castro (TX)	Ellison	Huelskamp
Chu, Judy	Engel	Huffman
Cicilline	Eshoo	Israel
Clark (MA)	Esty	Issa
Clarke (NY)	Farr	Jackson Lee
Clawson (FL)	Foster	Jeffries
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Johnson (GA)
Clyburn	Fudge	Johnson, E. B.
Cohen	Gabbard	Jones
Connolly	Galleo	Jordan
		Kaptur

NOES—178

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2596, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2596, to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to accurately reflect the actions of the House, including changing “line 17” to “line 11” in the instruction in amendment No. 3 by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NOT VOTING—8

Aderholt	Kelly (MS)	Sanchez, Loretta
Byrne	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Fattah	McHenry	

□ 1753

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, during the votes today I was inescapably detained and away handling important matters related to my District and the State of Alabama.

If I had been present, I would have voted: “no” on H. Res. 315; “no” on the Schiff/Smith (WA) Amendment to H.R. 2596; “yes” on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2596; and “no” on final passage of H.R. 2596.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1942

Mr. GUINTA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

HONORING TUCSON FIRE DEPARTMENT CAPTAIN DIANA BENSON

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tucson Fire Department Captain Diana Benson for her many years of service to the community upon her upcoming retirement.

Captain Benson was one of the first women in the Tucson Fire Department, the first career female firefighter, and the first female lead training officer. During her 25 years in the department, she has been a pioneer and role model.

Captain Benson served on the technical rescue team, a highly specialized crew responsible for conducting swift water, extrication, and rope rescues. She has been a reliable leader in the department who initiated numerous peer fitness programs and also served as a member of the Tucson Fire Honor Guard. She has been highly involved in Camp Fury and the cadet program, serving as a mentor to Tucson youth and opening doors to nontraditional careers, such as firefighting, for girls.

No doubt, Captain Benson's positive impact on the department and legacy of excellence lasting over two decades will be lasting. I wish her all the best in her upcoming retirement.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT DATA BREACH

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, in the past 2 weeks, we have learned that the data millions of Americans entrusted to the Office of Personnel Management have been taken as a result of a cybersecurity breach.

It did not have to happen this way. Since 2007, OPM's inspector general has documented repeated deficiencies in information security practices. Yet OPM's response has been glacial, and its systems remain antiquated. It was only after a security breach last year that OPM finally, in its 2016 budget request, asked for additional funds for the Office of Chief Information Officer. Well, it is about time.

The question we need to ask, though, is: Why did OPM underinvest in cyber-

security before that breach happened? While I would hope that we find a definitive answer during oversight hearings, there is one thing that certainly contributed to the problem. There was no one in charge of cybersecurity with both policy and budgetary authorities to compel action.

Even as we rely on agencies to be primarily responsible for protecting their networks, we lack a Federal cyber coordinator with budgetary authority to review agency spending and security plans. My Executive Cyberspace Coordination Act would remedy this by providing for a Senate-confirmed independent officer with the power to compel agency action.

Let's get this done.

CONGRATS TO CHANHASSEN HIGH SCHOOL BASEBALL

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chanhassen High School baseball team on winning the Minnesota State title last week with a 2-0 championship game victory.

The Storm rode the arm of Jack Schnettler in the finals as the senior tossed a complete game shutout to clinch the second State athletic title in the school's short history.

Chanhassen's two runs came courtesy of a Ty Denzer single in the third inning. In addition, fine work with the glove behind the Storm ace helped hold their opponents from Lakeville North at bay.

Madam Speaker, baseball is a game of skill and mental toughness, and it is clear that the players from Chanhassen have both. In addition to the time spent on the practice field, student athletes have to balance their work in the classroom and any family responsibilities they have as well. Their dedication and commitment is commendable.

Congratulations to the Chanhassen baseball team on their State title.

□ 1800

WORLD WAR II HONOR FLIGHT

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise to acknowledge and honor a group of World War II veterans from New Mexico who visited Washington, D.C., last week. They came to visit the memorials, their memorials, that are dedicated to honor their service and sacrifices.

We have about 5,000 World War II veterans in New Mexico, and I appreciate the efforts of the Williamson Foundation in supporting the veterans by organizing this week's Honor Flight.

While I am sure each veteran appreciated the opportunity to visit the memorials, I know many of them were just as impressed with the gratitude expressed by their fellow New Mexicans for their service. Huge crowds greeted them at the airport in Albuquerque. One veteran said he had never received a thank you before this trip.

New Mexicans played pivotal roles and sacrificed a lot during the war in Europe, north Africa, and the Pacific.

We must never forget what these and all veterans have done for our great Nation. I thank them for their service.

ACKNOWLEDGING THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF 2012 DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS PROGRAM

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the third anniversary of President Obama's 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, commonly known as DACA.

While the Nation desperately waits for House Republicans to move forward on immigration reform, the DACA program has provided temporary relief for hundreds of thousands of families to continue their studies and contribute to our economy. Since its enactment, more than 750,000 young people, including 88,000 Texans, have successfully applied for DACA.

Although I am disappointed with the recent court actions delaying President Obama's expansion of the DACA program, I remain hopeful that millions more immigrant families will one day be able to fully contribute to the prosperity of our country.

That is why, in my home district in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex, I will host a DACA-DAPA informational forum with Congressman LUIS GUTIÉRREZ on July 18 to help TX-33 residents prepare for immigration relief.

While President Obama's efforts to expand DACA and initiate DAPA programs are temporarily stalled in the courts, I am committed to fighting for immigrant families nationwide, so they can come out of the shadows and live the American Dream.

BETTER FUNDING AND SUPPORT FOR ALZHEIMER'S RESEARCH

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I stand here today to join my colleagues in a bipartisan call for action for better

funding and support for Alzheimer's research. The Alzheimer's Association of Greater Michigan, which is headquartered in my district, the 14th Congressional District of Michigan, supports more than 140,000 people and their families.

According to the Banner Alzheimer Institute, those numbers are going to increase unless treatments or cures are developed. The institute estimates the number of people 65 and older with Alzheimer's will nearly triple to 13.8 million, and the U.S. healthcare costs for Alzheimer's will skyrocket to \$1.1 trillion per year, with more than \$700 million coming out of Medicare and Medicaid.

It is time to treat Alzheimer's as the healthcare disaster that it has become. It is time to take this epidemic seriously. It is time to guard against the threat it poses to our families, our districts, healthcare system, and our Nation.

CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS STANLEY CUP DYNASTY

(Mr. LIPINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, last night, I wore my number 35 Tony Esposito Chicago Blackhawks jersey from the 1970s, and I watched what I could never have imagined in those days, a Chicago Blackhawks Stanley Cup dynasty; but thanks to the leadership of owner, Rocky Wirtz, and an amazing team put together by Stan Bowman and led by Coach Q, the Hawks won their third Stanley Cup in 6 years.

The core of Toews, Keith, Kane, Hossa, Seabrook, Hjalmarsson, and Sharp have been there for all three. This year, Duncan Keith was awarded the Conn Smythe MVP trophy, but this was truly a team effort.

Chicagoland thanks everyone in the organization for once again making us proud and bringing the Stanley Cup back to Chicago.

I can't wait for the parade. I can't wait to see the Stanley Cup again.

CONGRESS AND AMERICA OPPOSE FAST TRACK

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this afternoon, House Republican leaders used a trick to pass a new rule to revote the job-outsourcing, unfair, fast-track Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal. They buried the revote in the intelligence authorization.

Well, the Republican leadership wants to buy itself another month to make deals, trading favors and funding pet projects in this district or that dis-

trict, in exchange for a vote against the best interests of the American people, jobs in America with good wages.

Imagine Congress fast-tracking a bill to repair our roads, bridges, and harbors all across this country. Imagine a bill to be fast-tracked to renew the powers of the Export-Import Bank that actually increases exports and jobs in this country.

Instead, fast track is being rammed through Congress with House Republican leaders bending the rules and breaking regular order. Intelligence authorization bills should not be another name for secret fast-track life support.

No more delays. It is overtime for Congress to move on from fast track to a real fair trade deal that creates jobs and good wages in America for a change.

A TALE OF TWO ECONOMIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, across our country, we are seeing a tale of two economies, to where there are pockets of prosperity, but unfortunately, through many of our rural communities, we continue to see challenges.

For the first time since we have been keeping records, we are seeing more small businesses shut down than there are now business startups. Businesses across this country are suffering under the burden of \$2 trillion—\$2 trillion—in regulatory costs.

Why is this important? It is because we are seeing now the cost of a loaf of bread, the clothes that we buy for our children to be able to go back to school, and that gallon of milk costs more via taxation by regulation that is impacting our ability to create jobs.

When we move into my district in Colorado, composed of rural communities, 29 counties of Colorado's 64, 54,000 miles of the State of Colorado, many of our counties are still suffering in double-digit unemployment when it comes down to the real number.

Two counties that I would like to be able to address specifically this evening are being specifically challenged, Moffat County and Rio Blanco County, on the west slope of Colorado, one of the most beautiful places that anyone can visit.

Residing there and creating jobs is something called the Colowyo Mine, a coal mine. We encourage people to be able to come and see a coal mine with good technology, providing affordable electricity, providing jobs, and providing also clear blue skies with that technology. Those are currently being challenged.

There was a court ruling recently that came out, one that was in re-

sponse to a suit that was brought by an extreme environmental group that challenged the 2007 issuance of the Office of Surface Mining permit for the Colowyo Mine to be able to operate.

That is challenging now 200 jobs because the court has ruled that a new NEPA process, a supplemental process, must be performed within 120 days, an extremely short period of time.

Those 200 families, 200 families that are relying on that job to be able to provide for their children, to be able to support that community, are now feeling threatened by policies not only in terms of the NEPA process, but now by the ruling of the Court as well in response to a suit filed by this extreme environmental group.

Here is the real challenge that we face. We need the Secretary of the Interior to respond. These families' jobs cannot wait. Being able to put food on the table for their children cannot wait for this process to be able to play out.

We encourage the Secretary to deploy all necessary resources to be able to respond to that emergency NEPA process, to be able to get it done in that 120-day period of time, or to be able to also look at the propriety of challenging that ruling by going in and filing an appeal.

Are jobs and the economy important? They certainly are in my district. Those families that are relying on good-paying coal jobs, families that love where they live, love their environment, and support their community are now seeing their livelihoods, their future being challenged.

We encourage the Secretary, on behalf of American families, families in my district that are struggling to be able to succeed or to just be able to provide for themselves, to be able to respond in a timely manner, to be able to address this so that we can secure those jobs and secure affordable electricity as well.

Coal is often maligned, but we see that it can be done right—Craig, Colorado, blue skies and a coal-fired power plant. There is an opportunity for us to be able to create a win-win.

If you care about senior citizens that are on fixed incomes, if you care about young families right now that are struggling to be able to pay the bills and to be able to provide for their young children, we are seeing that taxation via regulation coming out of policy.

I think it is very important that we preserve the jobs. Let's work with all of the above. That has been embraced in my district. We have seen the opportunity to be able to create hydroelectric power, wind, solar, geothermal, also to responsibly develop oil, gas, oil shale, and coal.

Right now, the problem for the people in the Third District, specifically in Rio Blanco and Moffat Counties, is urgent. They are families that I have

talked to. I have looked in their eyes. They will do it responsibly. They want to be able to do it well, not only for the community, but for their families as well.

It is very important that we are also mindful that those jobs impact others. These are the families that support the local grocery store, the local hardware store; these are the families that provide for the health of that community.

Madam Speaker, we would call upon the Secretary of the Interior to respond to American families whose jobs are currently being threatened, deploy the necessary resources to be able to carry out that supplemental NEPA, get the job done in time to protect those jobs.

If that isn't possible, then go ahead and explore that proprietary notion of filing an appeal, to make sure that we get a stay and keep those jobs moving, because the message that my folks out of Craig, out of Rio Blanco County want to be able to communicate is their bills won't stop. Their children's needs will not be met unless we see a response out of the Department of the Interior to be able to stand up for good-paying coal jobs in western Colorado.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, for the next hour, we will be talking about an issue that really confronts every American family, an issue that has brought devastation, fear, and sadness to virtually every family in this Nation.

We are going to talk about dementia and Alzheimer's. We are going to talk about the way in which it literally tears families apart as their loved one's mind, recollections, and ability to handle their own affairs seems to dissipate.

□ 1815

This is an issue that currently confronts around 5 million Americans and their families. This is an issue that will grow exponentially over the next 25 to 30 years to the point where maybe 16 million American families are going to be affected by it.

It is also an issue that we can deal with. It is an issue that we can see the cost. Let me put up this chart here, and we will talk about the cost of Alzheimer's quickly.

It is a crisis that is growing rapidly, and it is resulting in extraordinary cost increases. If you look at 2015, on Medicare and Medicaid programs, the Federal Government will spend \$153 bil-

lion on Alzheimer's. In 2020, it will grow to \$182 billion. And then it is anticipated—as one of our colleagues spoke during a 1-minute speech—that by 2050, it will grow to over \$1 trillion. This is an issue for the Federal Government. It is an issue for every family.

Let me put up another little chart here that really displays what an investment by the American people can do. If you take a look at the reasons why people die most commonly in the United States—breast cancer, prostate cancer, heart disease, stroke, HIV—you will notice that in every one of these, we have seen a decline in the mortality from these illnesses.

Breast cancer declining just marginally. Prostate cancer, a significant decline of around 11 percent. Heart disease declined by 14 percent; stroke by 21; and HIV, while still prevalent and still common, the death rate is down by more than 50 percent.

This one over here is Alzheimer's disease; a 71 percent increase in the number of deaths due to Alzheimer's.

My mother-in-law is in this statistic. She spent the last 2 years of her life living with my wife, Patty, and I in our home. We cared for her at night. We, fortunately, were able to have someone come in to help us during the day. And that is really the story of most Alzheimer's now. You are either in a nursing home or you are cared for in the home.

So among those 5 million out there, there are families, like mine, that are caring as best they can in a very difficult situation. Ours, fortunately, was not so difficult. But, nonetheless, after two-plus years, my mother-in-law did die.

So what can we do about it?

I want to put up one more chart here, and then I want to turn to my colleagues. If you will remember on that chart I just put up, death rates are declining for cancer. There is a reason. And the reason is the annual expenditure for cancer research has been just under \$5.5 billion for the last few years. For HIV/AIDS, nearly \$3 billion of research annually. Cardiovascular, heart disease, over \$2 billion.

Alzheimer's, while the death rate climbs, we are spending just over \$566 million—not billion, million. So we shouldn't be surprised when we see this: declines in the cancer rates, deaths from cancer, stroke, heart disease, HIV. And then Alzheimer's.

Mr. Speaker, \$1 trillion will be spent in just 25 years on dealing with Alzheimer's, and some 16 million Americans will have that illness.

Now there is good news. The good news just happened today, and I want to commend my Republican colleague TOM COLE from Oklahoma, chairman of the Appropriations Health and Human Services Subcommittee, who moved to increase Alzheimer's research from \$566 million to almost \$900 million.

Go for it, TOM. You are the chairman of that subcommittee, and you are doing the right thing. You are doing the right thing by 5 million Americans who suffer from Alzheimer's today, and you are doing the right thing for their families.

And I think House has the opportunity also to stand with TOM COLE and to do the right thing by Americans, and that is, increase this research funding.

There are breakthroughs that are coming. If you read the articles, if you read the scientific journals, we are coming to an understanding of this very, very difficult disease for which there is no early detection, for which there is no cure, and for which there is only one exit, and that is death. So we can deal with this.

The 535 of us, the Representatives of those 5 million Americans with Alzheimer's and their families, we can do something. We can increase the funding for research.

Tonight I am joined by several of my colleagues.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) who carried legislation on this for years. She has been the co-chair of the Alzheimer's Caucus. If she will join us and share with us her work and what is happening from her perspective.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Thank you so very much.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from California, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, for yielding, and I commend him for organizing this Special Order on Alzheimer's disease in honor of the month of June, which is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month.

As the co-chair of the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease, I know how devastating this disease can be for our patients, families, and caregivers. I am proud to lead the task force along with my co-chairs, Congressman CHRIS SMITH, Congressman MICHAEL BURGESS, and Congressman CHAKA FATTAH.

Alzheimer's is a tragic disease which has no effective treatment, no means of prevention, and no method for slowing progression of the disease. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 5 million Americans were living with Alzheimer's disease in 2013. This number is expected to almost triple to 14 million by the year 2050.

The bipartisan supported National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease calls for a cure or an effective treatment for Alzheimer's by the year 2025. Reaching this goal will require a significant increase in Federal funding for Alzheimer's research.

I, therefore, introduced H.R. 237, a bipartisan resolution which calls for a significant increase in Alzheimer's research funding and declares that achieving the primary goal of the national plan—to prevent and effectively

treat Alzheimer's by 2025—is an urgent national priority. A similar resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine.

I also circulated a letter to the House Appropriations Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee requesting robust funding for Alzheimer's research at the National Institutes of Health in the coming fiscal year. The letter was signed by a bipartisan group of 63 Members of Congress. I was pleased to learn that the subcommittee recently proposed a \$300 million increase for Alzheimer's research.

As we pursue the goals of a cure for Alzheimer's, we must also do everything we can to assist the patients, families, and caregivers who are living with Alzheimer's every day. That is why I am introducing Alzheimer's Action Now, a set of bills that together will help Alzheimer's patients and their families; promote public awareness; and encourage voluntary contributions to research efforts. The various bills in the Alzheimer's Action Now address different challenges presented by Alzheimer's disease.

The Alzheimer's Caregiver Support Act authorizes grants to public and nonprofit organizations to expand training and support services for families and caregivers of Alzheimer's patients. With the majority of Alzheimer's patients living at home, under the care of family and friends, it is important that we ensure these caregivers have access to the training and resources they need to provide effective, compassionate care.

The Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program Reauthorization Act reauthorizes a Department of Justice program. It helps local communities and law enforcement officials quickly identify persons with Alzheimer's disease who wander away from their homes and reunite them with their families. This program saves law enforcement officials valuable time and allows them to focus on other security concerns. It also reduces injuries and deaths among Alzheimer's patients, and it brings peace of mind to their families.

Finally, the Alzheimer's Disease Semipostal Stamp Act requires the U.S. Postal Service to issue and sell a semipostal stamp, with the proceeds helping to fund Alzheimer's research at NIH. This bill will raise public awareness and encourage concerned individuals to get involved and to make voluntary contributions to Alzheimer's research efforts. The bill is modeled on the popular and successful Breast Cancer Research semipostal stamp.

Our Nation is at a crucial and critical crossroads. The situation requires decisive action to search for a cure and protect the millions of Americans currently living with Alzheimer's disease. Together, we must take every possible

action to improve treatments for Alzheimer's patients, support caregivers, raise public awareness, and invest in research to find a cure for this dreadful disease.

Once again, I can't say enough to thank JOHN GARAMENDI, my colleague from California, with whom I have worked for many, many years, for, again, organizing yet another night's Special Order to bring attention to Alzheimer's disease.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentlewoman from California who has been a leader in this disease and dealing with the problems of it for many, many years. And your work Ms. WATERS is paying off. The work that you have done organizing us, Members of Congress, to petition the subcommittee paid off—a 50 percent increase, a 50 percent increase, and I think it has got a good chance of staying in. This is really really good news and the rest of the legislation piece by piece we are going to get at this.

I would like now to turn the time over to our colleague from New York BRIAN HIGGINS. We have spoken on this issue before. Mr. HIGGINS, thank you so very much. If you will share your thoughts with us on this disease and what we might do to deal with it.

Mr. HIGGINS. I thank the gentleman from California and thank you for your leadership on this and so many issues that are of critical importance to our Nation and our future.

June is Alzheimer's Brain and Awareness month. It is the sixth-leading cause of death in this country. Over 5.3 million Americans are afflicted with Alzheimer's. By 2050, this number is expected to increase to 16 million. In my western New York community alone, 55,000 people have Alzheimer's or related dementia, and 165,000 people in our community are impacted directly or indirectly. Alzheimer's will cost the Nation \$226 billion this year. By the year 2050, these costs will rise to as high as \$1.1 trillion. Last year, Congress passed a law, the Alzheimer's Accountability Act, which created a bypass budget for Alzheimer's research. This will allow the National Institutes of Health to prepare a budget that will reach the estimated goal of funding effective prevention and treatment for Alzheimer's by 2025.

This year, I introduced with my colleagues ROSA DELAUNO and PETER KING the Accelerating Biomedical Research Act. Over the next 6 years, our legislation would provide an additional \$50 billion in funding to the National Institutes of Health above what is currently budgeted. We also established the House NIH Caucus to rally Members to develop a plan to increase the purchasing power of NIH.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, Congress should also pass the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, the

Advancing Research for Neurological Diseases Act.

Mr. GARAMENDI, again, thank you for your leadership. We obviously, as a Congress, have a long way to go. The origins of Alzheimer's disease are unknown, but its ends are absolutely certain, and it ends in losing your cognitive ability, your dignity, and then it takes your life. It is time that Congress, in a bipartisan effort, provide robust funding to Alzheimer's research to end this terrible, terrible disease for future generations.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HIGGINS, thank you so very much. Your points are absolutely on target.

This little chart here points out much of what you and Ms. WATERS were talking about, and that is the extraordinary expense. This is 2015. And we expect to spend \$153 billion of Federal tax money, Medicare and Medicaid, on treating Alzheimer's. Way over, that little tiny purple spot, is the \$566 million of research. It would be a little bigger if we were able to get that 300, but it is still going to pale in comparison to this. This is 261 times more money spent on treatment, which ultimately just enables the passage of time and leads to death because there is no effective treatment today. That is what we are spending on caring for people.

That number down there, and the efforts and the bills that have been introduced and the Alzheimer's Foundation and others that are working on this have an opportunity to change this entire dynamic around because we can find the solution to this.

I would like now to turn to my colleague, as part of what we often do here, we call it the "East-West Show," my colleague from the great State of New York, PAUL TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for bringing us together in this very Special Order as we discuss the impact of Alzheimer's upon the quality of life not only of the individual living with the disease, but on family members and loved ones that surround that individual. So much of the work that we do in this House, so much of the work done on the Hill here in Washington, needs to be guided by the moral compass.

Our budget priorities should reflect who we are as a people and the compassion that is required as we see these numbers continually grow—balloon—in terms of an impact on the budget. And that should challenge us to do all that we can to be not only compassionate, but to be effective when it comes to the fiscal impact of what is happening to far too many families across this country.

It is a known fact now that Alzheimer's is the most expensive disease in America. That should strike home. That should call upon our hearts and our minds to respond with dignity and

with effectiveness to the given issue at hand. Our efforts for Alzheimer's need to be enhanced. There is no mistaking it. This is the most expensive disease in America. It is impacting the budget here in Washington. Our national numbers are a challenge, and we need to address the budget not only in sound strategy for the present moment, but with preventative elements brought to bear.

So when we look at the most recent data—and those data are very telling—for 2014, the calendar year of 2014, the numbers are there, and it will remind us that \$214 billion was the need, the drawdown, for speaking to Alzheimer's, responding to the Alzheimer's situation. That is a large number that is only projected to grow exponentially. As more and more baby boomers ascend the age ladder, climb that ladder, we should only anticipate that doing what we are doing is not going to be enough, that research needs to take hold here.

We have the intellectual capacity as a nation. We have resources at our fingertips, and the priority here for providing the preventative elements of research are important. The President has offered an initiative with the study of the mind, the brain, that can provide several opportunities. It can release the information, the documentation, that is required to move forward to find a cure for this ever-growing disease.

Look at the stats. Representative GARAMENDI, when we look at the research moneys, for every \$100 invested in those individuals and families that are impacted by Alzheimer's, 25 cents is spent on research—for every \$100, 25 cents. That is a very minute amount of investment, investment that has an anticipated lucrative return, paying dividends for all of us to address a cure, a hope for individuals. This country requires our government to respond in full fashion so that public-private partnerships in research institutes like the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, are funded appropriately. Accordingly, with the data that have been assembled, knowing what needs to be done, we should go forward with those efforts.

Now, I am reminded, Representative GARAMENDI, routinely by families—and many women will draw that perspective for me, that of those who are living with Alzheimer's in this country, two-thirds—two-thirds—of the individuals living with Alzheimer's, or 3.2 million people, are women. This disease is impacting women in a disproportionate measure.

It is extracting from us all sorts of voluntary efforts that are required. Volunteers are responding as unpaid caregivers. We know the stats. The data are compelling: 15.5 million volunteers, caregivers, providing unpaid services, unpaid care, equaling 17.7 bil-

lion hours. These are staggering numbers, 15.5 million providing 17.7 billion. That amasses to \$220.2 billion in terms of services provided, unpaid services provided.

So it is not only costing the Federal Government money, projected to balloon heavily, but it is also extracting \$220 billion worth of unpaid services that are provided to individuals by loved ones, by those concerned in their community, for the struggles that these individuals and their family members are facing. So this behooves us to do much better than we are doing.

We are a compassionate society. We are unique. We have opportunities galore. I know what can happen. I have talked to our team in my district. Beth and the team from Alzheimer's Association of Northeast New York, they have done a tremendous job. I see what they do for respite care and what they are doing for services with the Alzheimer's Cafe, where people gather and cluster. They are given music therapy. There is an enhanced quality of life. It is with dignity that we respond. But more needs to be done, and there has to be that element that is provided out there that is speaking to prevention, that is speaking to a cure.

So, Representative GARAMENDI, there is much to be done.

I was lead Democrat on the Alzheimer's Accountability Act, which responded to the planning requirements that were earlier set up statutorily in this country. That act, the Alzheimer's Accountability Act, that passed successfully in both Houses and was signed into law by the President, requires that a professional judgment budget be put together. As was stated earlier on the floor, until 2025, there needs to be this commitment made for research for Alzheimer's and related diseases.

But we furthered the quality of that legislation, of that statute, by requiring professionals to project the numbers that are needed. That is a very important element. Clinicians and professionals in the medical community will tell us, they will advise what that number ought to be. That is speaking with integrity, with the veracity that is required, with the dignity, and with the compassion that is so much required for the Alzheimer's community.

So again, I thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for having that heart, for leading us in this Special Order so as to comprehend what we need to do here, to move that moral compass, to be there for those individuals, to be there for those unpaid caregivers, and to be there for the research community, but most importantly, to be there for the soul that is struggling with Alzheimer's or dementia-related diseases. We are at our best when we connect emotionally so that we can put together the programmatic response and the intellectual response that enable us

to provide that light at the end of the tunnel which is so important and so meaningful to the families that endure.

I thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, for more than 4 years now, you and I have stood on the floor on Special Order hour to talk about Make It In America, about the manufacturing system and about the jobs that we need to build, transportation infrastructure, and your passion for those subjects was so obvious. Your passion and your determination to deal with Alzheimer's and to find a cure, to find an understanding of what it is and how it affects the brain, and then also to reach out to the families that are caring for their loved ones really exceeds and mirrors the passion that you have for the working men and women of this Nation. I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the Alzheimer's Association. They organized a lobbying group through here very recently. They were wearing their purple ribbons, and they brought to us the stories, the individual stories that were of their families. I know that as I talked to my colleagues here on the floor and over in the Senate, I get the same thing from them: Yes, my mother, my aunt, my sister, my brother, they too have suffered from Alzheimer's, and they recently died, or they are in very serious condition.

So we find this illness touching every family. I have yet to find a family that I have talked to about Alzheimer's that didn't nod their head in understanding: Yes, we know what it is.

What Americans don't know is the information that you and my colleagues, MAXINE WATERS and BRIAN HIGGINS, brought to the floor today, and that is the facts, not only the impact that Alzheimer's has on the Federal budget—Medicare and Medicaid—the impact that it has on family budgets, on insurance, private insurance, but the impact that it has on families. You have made that clear.

I think that the work that has been done by Alzheimer's Association and related organizations—Medicare, Social Security, and support groups all across this Nation—is having an impact. When a budget for any specific program is increased by 50 percent in this era of sequestration, something has had an impact. Mr. COLE, as chairman of that, and Ms. WATERS, as the chairperson or the vice chair, co-chair of the Working Group on Alzheimer's, are having an impact.

We can find a solution here. We can understand. We can do the early diagnosis. It is pretty clear there are some breakthroughs that are occurring.

□ 1845

There are certain drugs out there that seem to work if you can intervene early in the process. What a change

that would be. What a change that would be for all families.

This is not just an issue of Alzheimer's, this is an issue of the brain. We have got the U.S. military, the Department of Defense, doing significant research on brain injuries, brain trauma, and illnesses resulting from the wars—from traumatic brain syndrome and related.

So if we pool together and we actually put into the Defense Authorization Act a paragraph that said: Research done by the Department of Defense on the brain, brain injuries, a way in which the brain works or doesn't work, they need to take that research and couple it with research that is taking place on dementia, on other kinds of neurological diseases, including Alzheimer's, and if we can pool all of these various research programs together and get them to share the information to fertilize each other's research, I think we are going to succeed.

That 2025 goal I think is too far out there. I see we are on the cusp of a breakthrough. And if we can push all of the research and focus it and, like a dart, hit the center of the target, I think we are going to be successful.

Mr. TONKO, would you like to join in here?

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Representative GARAMENDI, it only takes one visit, but there have been many visits that I have made to the centers, the day care center operations that are conducted for individuals and families who are living with Alzheimer's, and to witness and hear the hurt, the confusion, the pain that surrounds the individual. It is enough challenge to try and get this done in as quick a fashion as possible.

But if that doesn't move us, the economics on this. You know, we earlier talked about the \$214 billion impact in 1 year—some of our most recent data. Well, that is 1 in every 5 Medicare dollars. How much are we willing to have that take over the Medicare expenditures before we come to our senses to say, let's do more in research, let's do a preventive response? Does it need to grow that much more? Does the drain on Medicare, does the reflection of Alzheimer's-related Medicare expenditures need to be that much greater to bring us to a response? The challenges are there, the data are there. We need to move accordingly.

Now, earlier, I had expressed that two-thirds of the people living with Alzheimer's, the 3.2 million people, happen to be women. Well, 60 percent of the unpaid caregivers happen to be women. So there needs to be a response here to enable people to be addressed with a sense of compassion, with dignity brought into the equation. It is absolutely essential.

And when we talk about those caregivers and the \$220.2 billion that is the calculation for the volunteerism they

offer as caregivers, of that community of caregivers, they have been worn down physically. So the price tag for them is an additional \$9.3 billion in terms of response to their physical health care needs. This is a drain on families, on loved ones. It is an undignified outcome for far too many Alzheimer's patients who require our support, who have earned the respect of this body and Congress moving to provide for research opportunities.

Now, one other effort that I am making now in the aftermath of the Alzheimer's Accountability Act, that victory being behind us now, I have now served as the lead Democrat on the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, which would authorize Medicare investment in sound planning upon diagnosis of Alzheimer's so that individuals and their families who are so diagnosed can sit down and plan accordingly for their care, for their treatment, for their needs.

That is an important bit of quality that can be introduced for the individual and her or his family so that their life, already severely impacted by this outcome, can be as manageable as possible. And we are hopeful with some 183 cosponsors of a bipartisan nature who have come forward to say, Sign me up for the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act.

So isn't that what we are supposed to be? Aren't we those agents of hope? Do we walk away from this dilemma? Do we walk away from this need? Do we walk away from the struggle, the pain, the hurt, the confusion that people live with every waking hour of every day? Or do we respond in that all-American fashion and say, yeah, we have the intellectual capacity as a Nation; yes, we have the resources.

It is an order of prioritization. And that priority here needs to be a response, a full-fledged response, a compassionate response, a loving response coming from us as individuals and collectively as Congress to say, yes, we support these efforts that are required, that are possible. Do not deny the possibilities. Let us go forward and be those sound decisionmakers who understand that this issue, when addressed accordingly, with human compassion offered, with the humanization of this process, we are then offering a cost-effective outcome. A study of the brain initiative that the President has advanced should be supported.

These resources that are required for planning, for research, for services, for respite need to be funded accordingly. It is within our grasp, and it makes sense to do so.

So, Representative GARAMENDI, I thank you for leading us in this Special Order, which is absolutely key to public information exchange.

For those who may be viewing, I would suggest that you contact those of us who serve you in Washington and let us know that you want this to be a

priority. Tell us you believe in the research capacity of this country. Tell us you want to humanize that response, more deeply respond to the individuals and families that are so impacted.

When we hit so many people, when we see the millions who are living with this disease, we can't escape that impact falling upon us. Neighbors, family members, friends who we know are living with this disease require our attention, require our responsiveness.

So I thank you for leading us in what is a very valuable discussion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you for your leadership. Thank you for rounding up 180-plus Members of this House. On any issue that is tough, but then having them sign on to a piece of legislation that would advance the care that individuals receive and the support that families need.

The cure for Alzheimer's, all of those pieces of legislation, which Ms. WATERS talked about, those are all pieces of the puzzle. And they deal with—I am going to end with just two charts, so it is really where I started. This is a different version of one of the charts that deals with the costs that we are talking about. These are the total cost in the system. If you take a look at it, 2015, you are talking about a quarter of a billion dollars, just under \$226 billion, of which the great majority is Medicare and Medicaid, and then out-of-pocket and other payers, or the other insurance companies. It will rise each year until we get to 2050, which is not that far away. Thirty-five years out we will be well over \$1 trillion, of which we will bust the bank, the Medicare.

There is a lot of discussion around here about the deficit. The real factors in the deficit are this health care issue. That is where we are going to find the budget deficit.

But we have already seen through the Affordable Care Act that the projected increases for Medicare have substantially reduced over the last 4 years as the Affordable Care Act is providing early diagnosis of heart disease, diabetes, other kinds of long-term illnesses that are really where most of the expense in Medicare and Medicaid occur. And if we can get a grip on Alzheimer's, if we can find a way of delaying the onset of it, we are going to save tens and, indeed, hundreds of billions of dollars over the passage of time.

And the next step is the cure. So they think, the researchers, think they can find a way of delaying the onset. As they do that, they will also find a way of dealing with the disease itself. Then this awesome and horrific expense will be reduced.

There is one other chart.

Mr. TONKO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. That chart is very powerful. The trillions—with a T—will

really balloon our budget, and really it is undoable. It gets to a level where it will exhaust, it will overwhelm other areas of investment that are required.

But translate that from dollars into human suffering, pain, confusion, reduced quality of life. That is a calculus that needs to be made. If it is going to save us money and at the same time respond with that moral compass, why are we not doing that, why are we not responding?

So, to me, that is where we are at. When you see the unleashing of technology, of research, of the potential for progress to be made, it is there. It is documented from so many perspectives in work that is done by the National Institutes of Health and others. For many, they will say, well, leave it to the private sector. No, there is a track record up there for this country to have stepped up to the plate and made a difference, for vaccines and other sought-for outcomes that affected people in a positive way. They gave them hope.

Our government has a track record of having stepped up and invested in research where perhaps the private sector wouldn't go or where we have shaved some of the risk off of that demand for research in a public-private partnership. So it is there within our potential. We should not deny our loved ones, our constituents, our country the opportunity to advance the cause of research and to respond again with a sense of hope for those who are living with this within this darkness. We can and we must do better.

I am happy to work with individuals like Representative GARAMENDI to push to make a difference and to be there in a responsive manner, and I thank you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, you continually come back to the compassion and caregiving that I think each human being has somewhere in them. For us here in Congress, it is to express that in a meaningful way. That meaningful way is to make sure there is support for those families and individuals who have Alzheimer's, those who are caring for them, to make sure that the medical treatment, such as it is for this illness, is available, and to pursue vigorously the research that could and, I believe, will lead to a complete understanding of the illness. That is our task.

Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. And as we are concluding here, I was just bringing to mind one of the Alzheimer's town halls that we are required to conduct, and it told me a few things: that this disease is percolating lower and lower into the age demographics.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Yes, it is.

□ 1900

Mr. TONKO. So it may be—I am just guessing here—that it is more than just genetics. It may be environmental

in its impact or cause. Whatever it is, let's go for that cause.

At one of these townhalls, a contemporary of mine whom I have known for a long time, as I have known her husband for a long time, said: "My husband knows my voice, but he doesn't know my name."

How do we not say "yes" to research? How do we not say we want to do all that we can to make a difference?

When we do so, we are going to save our budget. We are going to save our budget a great number of consequences by being that powerful force that will do things academically, soundly, wisely, effectively, efficiently.

That is what this business is about, a thoughtful response, a heartfelt response that, by the way, is the budgetwise thing to do.

Let us respond as a government, as a nation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much.

Mr. Speaker, I think we will end there and simply say that this is not the last time that we will be speaking on this issue on the floor.

I would hope the next time that we speak on this issue that the House of Representatives will have increased the research budget by 50 percent, from \$566 million to close to \$900 million. That is a big leap. It is not sufficient. It is not what is necessary to really get at this disease, but this is one we can tackle. This is one we have to tackle for the strength of the American Government budget. It is one we have to tackle.

This is where you have been with this entire discussion, Mr. TONKO. This is about families. It is about individuals. It is about the suffering, the angst, and the fear that exists out there with this devastating disease. We can do this. We really can.

My message to the American people is one that you put out a few moments ago, Mr. TONKO. That is, for anybody who is watching out there, for anybody who is interested in the Federal deficit, for anybody who is interested in the quality of life of their families as they age and even before they age, talk to us.

Tell us that you want us to spend your tax money on solving this problem, on the research that will lead to the solution for what is now an unsolvable mystery.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 160, PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1190, PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Mr. GARAMENDI) from the

Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-157) on the resolution (H. Res. 319) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

OVERRULING THE HOUSE OF GOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTERMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this week, there will be important decisions made here on the House of Representatives' floor.

We are told, this month, the Supreme Court may well play God and overrule what has been considered to be the house of God, as given by Moses, for the dramatic amount of history, including up through the President's own statement that he believed marriage was just between a man and a woman.

When he was running for office, apparently, according to his campaign manager or whatever he is—whatever he was—he felt he wouldn't get elected if he said what he really believed.

Nonetheless, in 6½ years, we are told things have changed to the point we are now in a position to overrule what Moses said, which is that a man will leave his father and mother and a woman leave her home and the two will come together. That would be marriage—Moses, who is the only full-faced profile above us in the gallery, with the side profiles of all of the great lawgivers, the greatest lawgivers as they were thought to be years ago.

I will also note that, as I sat and listened to the Supreme Court's entertaining arguments on whether or not Texas could keep our monument dedicated to the Ten Commandments on our State campgrounds—and it was joined with a case from Kentucky on whether they could keep their Ten Commandments that were posted inside the door—and as they were arguing about whether or not the Ten Commandments could be attributed in that manner, I looked up on the marble wall to my right in the Supreme Court's chambers, and there was Moses, looking down with both tablets of the Ten Commandments, looking down—interesting, very interesting. It is the kind of mental gymnastics that have been played in the Supreme Court throughout its history.

We know Dred Scott was a dreadful decision, and there have been others that were poor. Sometimes, in being human, they get them right, and sometimes, they get them wrong; but there

is one thing that is very, very, very clear, and it is in the United States Code. It is United States law.

It is volume 28 of the United States Code, section 455, and section (a) is very clear: "Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall"—no room for question—"disqualify himself"—that is generic, meaning mankind; it could be male or female—"in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned."

That is the law, and the only way that we can remain a nation that believes in the rule of law is if the courts that decide whether a law can stand or must fall abide by the laws that apply to them. If the highest court in the United States blatantly violates the law and especially blatantly violates the law in deciding a case, then is it really law that they have made if they have violated the law to create it?

In knowing that the law is very clear, a United States Supreme Court Justice "shall disqualify him or herself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned." Then we must look next to see if there are any indications of partiality on the part of any of the Supreme Court Justices.

Here is an article that was published by foxnews.com back on September 1, 2013, and it reads the following: "Two months after the Supreme Court's landmark ruling to expand Federal recognition of same-sex marriages, striking down part of an anti-gay marriage law, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg officiated at a same-sex wedding."

"The officiating is believed to be a first for a member of the Nation's highest court."

"Ginsburg officiated Saturday at the marriage of Kennedy Center President Michael Kaiser and John Roberts, a government economist."

I was just out at the Kennedy Center this weekend—it may be the only weekend; I am here in Washington all year—and was delighted to be there. Apparently, if Michael Kaiser is still the president, he is doing what appears to be an excellent job there.

Further down in the article, it is quoting Justice Ginsburg, and it reads: "I think it will be one more statement that people who love each other and want to live together should be able to enjoy the blessings and the strife in the marriage relationship," Ginsburg told *The Washington Post* in an interview.

"It won't be long before there will be another performed by a Justice. She has another ceremony planned for September."

The last line—it is not the last of the article—but it reads: "Justices generally avoid taking stands on political issues."

The rest of the article goes on: "While hearing arguments in the case in March, Ginsburg argued for treating

marriages equally. The rights associated with marriage are pervasive, she said."

Anyway, it reads further down: "Before the Court heard arguments on the Defense of Marriage Act, Ginsburg told *The New Yorker* magazine in March that she had not performed a same-sex marriage and had not been asked. Justices do officiate at other weddings, though."

"I don't think anybody's asking us, because of these cases," she told the magazine. "No one in the gay rights movement wants to risk having any member of the Court be criticized or asked to recuse. So I think that's the reason no one has asked me."

"Asked whether she would perform such a wedding in the future, she said, 'Why not?'"

Apparently, the Associated Press also contributed to that report.

It doesn't sound as if it could be any more clear that Justice Ginsburg has a very solid opinion that gay marriage, same-sex marriage, same-sex weddings are constitutional, despite its being something that is reserved to the States and to the people under the 10th Amendment for decisions.

On September 22 of 2014, in *The Hill*, written by Peter Sullivan, an article reads: "Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan officiated a same-sex wedding on Sunday, a court spokeswoman told the Associated Press."

"The ceremony in Maryland for a former law clerk is the first same-sex wedding that Kagan has performed. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and retired Justice Sandra Day O'Connor have both performed same-sex weddings in the past."

"Gay marriage has been a divisive topic at the Supreme Court as it has been elsewhere in the country."

Further down, the article reads: "The Court could decide as early as this month whether to take up the issue again in the coming session, this time to consider a more sweeping ruling declaring a right to same-sex marriage across the country."

"Ginsburg said last week that, unless an appeals court allows a gay marriage ban to stand, 'there is no need for us to rush' on a Supreme Court ruling."

Clearly, Justice Kagan has made her feelings clear on same-sex marriage. There could not be a more clear, unequivocal statement that any just judge or Justice could ever make on the issue of same-sex marriage than to actually perform, officiate, in a same-sex wedding.

Here is a Newsmax article from May 18, 2015, by Greg Richter: "Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg sparked speculation on Sunday when she mentioned the Constitution while officiating a same-sex wedding."

Further down is a quote from Maureen Dowd, a columnist for *The New York Times*: "With a sly look and

special emphasis on the word 'Constitution,' Justice Ginsburg said that she was pronouncing the two men married by the powers vested in her by the Constitution of the United States, Dowd wrote."

□ 1915

Then it also says in the article, "Nevertheless, guests applauded loudly, Dowd said, and Ginsburg 'seemed delighted.'"

For Justice Ginsburg to state publicly that the Constitution of the United States gives her the power to officiate and unite a same-sex couple in marriage is an unequivocal, clear statement as to what she believes the Supreme Court should do in their decision. If there was ever any doubt—and there wasn't. Once she performed a same-sex wedding, there was no question about her feelings on the matter.

An article from *National Review* by Edward Whelan, February 19 of this year, the article, just a small part of it here: "At her Supreme Court confirmation hearing in 1993, Ruth Bader Ginsburg repeatedly explained that the judicial obligation of impartiality required that she give 'no hints, no forecasts, no previews' about how she might 'vote on questions the Supreme Court may be called upon to decide.'"

As she declared in her opening statement: "A judge sworn to decide impartially can offer no forecasts, no hints, for that would show not only disregard for the specifics of the particular case, it would display disdain for the entire judicial process." That was Ruth Bader Ginsburg in 1993. Apparently, she sees things a great deal differently now.

Further down in the article, Edward Whelan writes: "Human nature being what it is, it's not easy for a Justice to recuse in a closely divided case that she obviously cares passionately about. This is exactly the situation Justice Scalia faced a dozen years ago in the wake of his public comments criticizing a Ninth Circuit ruling against the Pledge of Allegiance. As *Slate's* Dahlia Lithwick wrote at the time, Scalia was 'intellectually honest enough to know that he slipped,' and he thus, 'recused himself from what would have been one of the most important church-state cases of his career.' His recusal meant that 'the Court may well split 4-4 on the case, in which case the Ninth Circuit's decision will stand for all the States in its jurisdiction.'"

We also have a quote from Justice Sonia Sotomayor: "I suspect even with us giving gay rights to marry, that there's some gay people who will choose not to, just as there's some heterosexual couples who choose not to marry. So we are not taking anybody's liberty away."

Justice Sotomayor has obviously stated her position very clearly on the issue of same-sex marriage.

This is an article from May 27, 2009, Lisa Keen from the Keen News Service. She says in an article: "Long-time gay legal activist Paula Ettelbrick said she met Sotomayor in about 1991 when they both served on then-New York Governor Mario Cuomo's Advisory Committee on Fighting Bias. 'Nobody wanted to talk to . . .'" and uses a slur for a homosexual "'person at that time,' said Ettelbrick, who represented Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund. 'She was the only one on the advisory committee who made a point to come over and introduce herself. She was totally interested in gay civil rights issues and supportive.'"

Evan Wolfson, head of the national Freedom to Marry organization said: "From everything I know, Judge Sotomayor is an outstanding choice, fair and aware, open, and judicious. I believe she has demonstrated the commitment to principles of equal protection and inclusion that defines a good nominee to the Supreme Court." Wolfson said the President "has made a strong and appealing nomination that should and will receive the support of those committed to equality for lesbians and gay men." The National LGBT Bar Association issued a statement saying it was pleased with the choice, noting that it represents "more diversity on the bench."

In view, actually, of her quote, it seems that she has clearly stated her position with regard to same-sex marriage. Anyway, the article further down said Kevin Cathcart, executive director of Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, said the organization was pleased that the nominee is a woman of color. "While women, people of color, and self-identified gay people continue to be woefully underrepresented in the Federal judiciary, Judge Sotomayor's nomination represents a step in the right direction," Cathcart said.

So, anyway, if those quotes are accurate, then certainly they would be supporting evidence of her quote that "I suspect even with us giving gay rights to marry . . ." she is already stating in this quote that she, not the Creator, not God, not almighty God, not the Constitution—"us giving," obviously the Supreme Court.

So, as Jefferson pointed out, you know, he trembles for the country when he realizes that God is just and his justice will not sleep forever. It is not the Supreme Court that gives rights. We get our rights, according to the Declaration of Independence, from our Creator, and they are embodied or supposed to have been embodied in the Constitution. And yes, it took a Civil War to ensure that the Constitution meant what it said, and it took an ordained Christian minister named King to push peacefully until such time as the Constitution was more thoroughly forced to mean what it said.

We are talking about marriage here. For anyone who is a Christian, that means they believe in Jesus Christ, they believe His teachings, they believe He is Savior, and they would have to believe when He quoted Moses, who said He was giving the law from God, and Jesus said: A man shall leave his father and mother, and a woman leave her home, and the two will become one flesh, and what God joined together, let no one put asunder. He put His stamp: this is marriage. It approved what Moses said was marriage, and in this Nation, throughout the Nation, until some said we have become smarter than we have ever been, once again defying Solomon's statement: There is nothing new under the Sun. This is not new. We are not more enlightened than other civilizations have been.

But if the Supreme Court in a majority decision destroys the constitutions of numerous States across this Nation, and the majority opinion has Justices who are violating Federal statute regarding what a judge shall do, then it would appear that their law would be no more valid than if someone here cast the deciding vote on legislation that becomes law, and it is determined that the deciding vote was cast by someone who was not legally a Member of Congress. There would be reason to say that is not a valid law. It did not pass the House of Representatives. And especially, if it turned out that, say, 20, 30, 40 percent of those casting the majority votes on a bill were disqualified at the time of the vote from casting a vote, that would not be a legitimate law.

I hope, and since I believe in prayer, I pray that those Justices who have made clear by their statements and their actions that they are disqualified, will do the lawful thing and recuse themselves. If they do not do that, they will be casting a ballot, casting a vote, and if that vote is the majority decision, and if that decision overturns massive law on marriage across the country, and by its statement says: We know more than Moses, we know more than Jesus, we are the U.S. Supreme Court, it certainly sounds like they will have produced an unlawful decision of the Supreme Court. I hope they will not put this Nation to such a constitutional crisis by violating the law to push through their legislative agenda, but we will see. Will they start a constitutional crisis by violating the law to push their legislative agenda through the Court? We will see. I hope and pray that they will follow the law and disqualify themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 5 p.m.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 565. An act to reduce the operations and maintenance costs associated with the Federal fleet by encouraging the use of remanufactured parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 17, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1842. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Fiscal Years 2011-2012 Report to Congress on the Family Violence Prevention and Services Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10404; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1843. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary (RIN: 1210-AB69) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1844. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary [CMS-9938-F] (RIN: 0938-AS54) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1845. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets and General Conformity Budgets for the Scranton/Wilkes-Barre 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Maintenance Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0652; FRL-9929-07-Region 3] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1846. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Di-n-butyl carbonate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0176; FRL-9928-63-OCSP] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1847. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revision to the

New York State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide [EPA-R02-OAR-2013-0192; FRL-9929-11-Region 2] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1848. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Charlotte-Rock Hill; Base Year Emissions Inventory and Emissions Statements Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0915; FRL-9928-88-Region 4] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1849. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sethoxydim; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0161; FRL-9928-20] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1850. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, and continued by the President each year, most recently on November 7, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) and 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1851. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report pursuant to Sec. 2(9) of the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Treaty with the United Kingdom Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation (Treaty Doc. 110-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2580. A bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 319. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board (Rept. 114-157). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2506. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings with an amendment (Rept. 114-158, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2507. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage;

with an amendment (Rept. 114-159, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2579. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the risk adjustment under the Medicare Advantage program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-160, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2581. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a 3-year demonstration program to test the use of value-based insurance design methodologies under eligible Medicare Advantage plans, to preserve Medicare beneficiary choice under Medicare Advantage, to revise the treatment under the Medicare program of infusion drugs furnished through durable medical equipment, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-161, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2506 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2507 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2579 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2581 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2788. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 2789. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify S corporation shareholder and preferred stock rules with respect to banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2790. A bill to provide for pay parity for civilian employees serving at joint military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 2791. A bill to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United

States for the benefit of certain Indian tribes in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 2792. A bill to require that any revision to, or establishment of, a national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard be made by statute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2793. A bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take appropriate actions to ensure that an alien who is unlawfully present in the United States, is in removal proceedings or has been ordered removed, and is required to register under the Act, is so registered, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2794. A bill to strengthen and unite communities through English literacy and civics education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 2795. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a study on the circumstances which may impact the effectiveness and availability of first responders before, during, or after a terrorist threat or event; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2796. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide grants to States for summer employment programs for youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2797. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to establish the Office of School Discipline Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 57. A joint resolution directing the President to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on or after August 7, 2014, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H. Res. 317. A resolution congratulating American Pharoah and owner Ahmed Zayat of Teaneck, New Jersey, for winning horse racing's Triple Crown; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H. Res. 318. A resolution condemning resolutions or policies calling for or instituting a boycott of Israeli academic institutions or scholars by institutions of higher learning and scholarly associations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. JONES):

H. Res. 320. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a grateful Nation honors and salutes Sons and Daughters in Touch on its 25th anniversary that is being celebrated on Father's Day, 2015, at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

55. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 68, urging the Congress of the United States to restore trade relations between the United States and Cuba in order to open the market to Louisiana rice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

56. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 66, urging the Congress of the United States to take action against illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing in Louisiana's sovereign waters by passing H.R. 774, the Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing Enforcement Act of 2015; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Art. I Sec. 8 cl. 1, under the "Power To lay and collect Taxes";

Amd. 16, under the "power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source

derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration"; and

Art. I Sec. 8 cl. 18, under the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 2792.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2793.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power "to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that Congress has the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof . . ."

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2794.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and

the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 57.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the Constitution (authorizing Congress to "make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces"). Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution authorizes Congress to "declare War." Congress did not declare war or authorize the use of military force for the current conflict in Iraq and Syria, and this resolution takes corrective action.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BOST, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 24: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 136: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 197: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 244: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 511: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 532: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 540: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 592: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 616: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 653: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 662: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 699: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 700: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 702: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 727: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 753: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 766: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 775: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SIRE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 828: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 845: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 846: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 868: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 885: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 915: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 916: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 928: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 985: Mr. BARR, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. YODER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 986: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MICA, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1054: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1057: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1062: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 1095: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1132: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1141: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1211: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1218: Mr. SCHIFF.

- H.R. 1233: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1283: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1288: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1300: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1301: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1309: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. CARTER of Texas.
H.R. 1310: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1331: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 1338: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOSAR, and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 1387: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 1424: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1462: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1478: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 1516: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1519: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1523: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1559: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1571: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1591: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1607: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1610: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 1613: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1624: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 1669: Mr. AMODEL.
H.R. 1686: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1692: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1726: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1736: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 1737: Mr. BABIN, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LAMBORN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1769: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUSH, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1785: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1804: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1854: Mr. ALLEN and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 1945: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1948: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1953: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1956: Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 1957: Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 1994: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2042: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 2046: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2061: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2102: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2123: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2141: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2142: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2147: Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2150: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2156: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2191: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2215: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2217: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2259: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2272: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2300: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2302: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2315: Mr. PEARCE and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 2342: Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 2371: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2400: Mr. BRAT and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2403: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2404: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 2405: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 2406: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 2460: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2466: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2493: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ZELDIN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2508: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 2513: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2514: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2517: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2520: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2521: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2530: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2531: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2551: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 2576: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2582: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2594: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2607: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2610: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2615: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 2630: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 2646: Mr. LANCE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2647: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 2650: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2658: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DENT, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2663: Mr. POCAN and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2689: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2694: Mr. NEAL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2710: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 2714: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2732: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2737: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2752: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2753: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2760: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2762: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2763: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 2767: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2770: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2773: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2776: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.J. Res. 22: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. RUIZ.
H.J. Res. 42: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.J. Res. 45: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.J. Res. 51: Mrs. DINGELL.
H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 28: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 54: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 210: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H. Res. 262: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Res. 263: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 294: Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 307: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Res. 310: Mr. COHEN, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

DELETION OF SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1942: Mr. HARRIS.

SENATE—Tuesday, June 16, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign Lord, Your Kingdom cannot be shaken. Thank You for inviting us to ask and receive, to seek and find, and to knock for doors to be open. Lord, forgive us when we forfeit our blessings because of our failure to ask. Remind us that we have not because we ask not. Inspire our Senators to harness prayer power continuously. May they follow Your admonition to pray without ceasing. Throughout this day, may they repeatedly ask You for wisdom and guidance. May their fervent prayers make a positive impact on the legislative process.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The majority leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 118, H.R. 2685.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 118, H.R. 2685, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Tom Cotton, Kelly Ayotte, Lindsey Graham, John McCain, John Thune, Jerry Moran, Richard C. Shelby, Daniel Coats, Jeff Flake, Rob Portman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later this afternoon, the Senate will decide whether to advance or filibuster the Defense authorization legislation which is before us. Senators will take a vote and Senators will make a choice. One option is for Senators to follow the bipartisan example of the House of Representatives and the Senate Armed Services Committee, both of which passed Defense authorization legislation with bipartisan backing.

It means reaching across the aisle to support the men and women who support us every single day. It means voting to transform bureaucratic waste into crucial investments for brave troops and their families, raises they have earned, quality-of-life programs they deserve, and the kind of medical care and mental health support they should expect when injured on the battlefield or haunted by memories at home.

It means ensuring our military has the tools it needs to help America navigate a treacherous world beset by an ever-growing array of challenges. It means advancing a bill that contains ideas and priorities from both parties and one that gives President Obama the exact level of funding authorization he asked for in his own budget request.

It also means endorsing the Senate's return to considering Defense authorization bills through the regular order, allowing real bipartisan debate and a real bipartisan amendment process as we have done this year, as opposed to the bad old days of ramming it through at the last minute. That is one option: voting for cloture, voting for a bipartisan bill that is good for our troops and our country.

But there is another option too: voting to filibuster, voting to raise the curtain on this truly bizarre filibuster summer, a strategy we hear Democratic leaders boasting about in the press. Democratic leaders are apparently so passionate—passionate—about dumping more cash into gargantuan

DC bureaucracies like the IRS that they now seem prepared to block and filibuster the benefits owed to our troops and their families or even—shut down the government altogether if they can't get their way.

As one newspaper reported this morning, "Democrats appear eager to return to shutdown politics." The minority leader seemed to put it plainly enough the other day: "We're headed for another shutdown," he said. But that can only happen if commonsense Democrats allow their party leaders to advance the shutdown-seeking filibuster summer gambit.

Today is every commonsense Democrat's chance to say, Enough. This is a bad strategy. Today is every commonsense Democrat's opportunity to help pull their party back from a senseless path of forcing endless filibusters and a shutdown no one wants but the hard left. That is what they want. Because here is what every Senator knows deep down: Voting to filibuster would mean allowing Democratic leaders to take from every soldier, every sailor, every marine, and every man and woman in the Air Force the pay raises they have earned, so Democratic leaders can use it as an ante in the game of shutdown roulette.

Voting to filibuster would mean allowing Democratic leaders to hold our military hostage at a time of unprecedented global threats as part of some partisan ploy to extract—extract—a few more bucks for Washington bureaucrats. I just cannot imagine serious-minded Democrats feeling comfortable going along with their leaders' plan. It is just too callous. It is just too extreme. So I hope they will not. I hope every one of my colleagues, no matter which party they are in, will stand together instead for bipartisanship, for regular order, for the idea that we should support the troops who support us.

I thank Chairman MCCAIN for all of his hard work to get us to this point. He did a marvelous job working across the aisle to craft a serious defense bill, with input and amendments from both sides. The Senate, our military, and our country stand to benefit immensely from his dedication. So I hope every Senator of good will will stand up and vote to advance this bipartisan bill later today.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have for many, many years—every Thursday, when we are in session, I have what I

call "Welcome to Washington." I look forward to those Thursday mornings at 8:30 visiting with people from Nevada, and there are guests and their friends who come from other places who want to visit with me. So I enjoy those very much.

Last Thursday, I had a young man named Nathaniel visit. He had been an intern for me. His family is from Nevada. His grandfather is a very famous man by the name of John Squire Drendel. John Squire Drendel is now 93 but a wonderful lawyer and just a good person. The reason I recognized Nathaniel—they came back to one of my "Welcome to Washingtons." I called him and I said: Hey, Nathaniel. Come on up here. I said: Let's show these folks some of your magic tricks. So that is what he would do. I would bring him in and he could do magic tricks. He is now going to law school. His magic tricks aren't as good as they used to be. He hasn't practiced very much.

What I have heard my friend the Republican leader talk about today—he is trying to do some magic tricks. It is not only on the Senate but the country. The Defense authorization bill is an important piece of legislation. We Democrats support our troops. No one can dispute that. We are just as patriotic as any Republican. My 46 Democrats are just as patriotic as the 54 Republicans. We support defense just as much as our Republican friends do. But we also support the rest of our country.

We support the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Justice Department. We support the U.S. marshals who are now out looking for those two killers who escaped from prison in New York. We support the Drug Enforcement Administration. We support the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Social Security, VA. I could go on and on.

To have a sound, secure homeland, we have to make sure we take care not only of the Pentagon's needs but the needs of the American people. My friend the Republican leader, as a little bit of his magic, always throws in the Internal Revenue Service, as if: Boy, we are doing great things. We are cutting the Internal Revenue Service. I am not here to throw bouquets to the Internal Revenue Service, but I am here to say it is an important part of our country.

I met with the head of the IRS maybe a couple of months ago now. He came and said: You know, we made it through tax season and we did a good job. But he said: During the time that people were trying to file their income tax returns, if someone had tried to call the Internal Revenue Service, they would not have gotten an answer. We did not have enough personnel to even answer the phones.

Is that what we want? Do we want people who call the IRS not to be able to have someone answer the phone? And a lot of that is happening now.

The Federal Government is being starved for resources. Why? Because of the Republican determination to try some magic. We know the Republicans are not really serious about the Defense bill. If they were, would they throw on this the Export-Import Bank—an amendment—and move to table their own amendment? Of course not. Some 165,000 people are working today because of the Export-Import Bank. It is an important function of our government.

But a large number of Republicans are trying to kill this program, indicating how unserious they are about doing something about it, by focusing on the Defense bill an amendment that they filed and moved to table their own amendment just so they could check the box: Well, we tried to do something on Export-Import Bank.

Cyber security. We are being hacked on a daily basis. They are not only hacking businesses, they are hacking our government—everything. To show how unserious the Republicans are about this issue, which we have been trying to do something as Democrats for years, the Republicans filed an amendment on this bill knowing the President has already said he is going to veto the bill.

I am so disappointed in how the Republicans are being very ungentle in trying to move forward on this legislation. The bill is going to be vetoed; the President said so.

The other thing that I think is important for the American public to understand and to make sure all of the Members of the Senate and their staff understand is that this is an authorization.

I can remember that as a boy in Nevada, in high school, I would see these big announcements—Senator Cannon and Senator Bible introduced this legislation. I wondered why nothing ever happened on it. It was because it was only to authorize. The important function of this government—and it has been since the beginning—is to have an Appropriations Committee. After something is authorized, it has to be funded.

So of course this authorization bill is important, and we believe it is important. But my friend the Republican leader is treating it—trying to perform some magic because he is really not serious about it for the reasons I have mentioned.

FOOD SAFETY

Mr. President, I have thought about this little girl for so many years, little Rylee, Rylee Gustafson. What a sweet, sweet spirit. I have thought about her so often. She was 9 years old. She ate a salad that almost killed her. There was spinach in that salad and E. coli in that spinach. She got so sick, she was hospitalized. Her kidneys began to fail. Her pancreas started to dysfunction. Before long, fluid swelled up in her brain, heart, and lungs.

All told, Rylee spent 34 days in the hospital. She was a 9-year-old. I wish that were the only time she was in the hospital, but it was not. I wish that were the only time she needed medical care, but it was not. Eventually, she "recovered," but the lasting effects on this little girl have been horrible. She developed diabetes because of the damage to her pancreas, and she now takes an insulin shot every day. She will need a kidney transplant before she turns 30; that is what the doctors have told her. As horrific as her account is, it is not unique. This little girl is now a teenager and still sick. Her growth was stunted.

Unfortunately for many Americans, falling ill from contaminated foods has become all too regular. According to the Centers for Disease Control, one in every six Americans gets sick from food every year. That is about 48 million Americans who become sick from food in this great country.

More than 3,000 people die every year from foodborne illness, and those who don't die can be forced to deal with a lifetime of health complications, just like Rylee. Yes, she is alive, but what horrible consequences followed her having a salad.

At a recent Senate hearing on this issue, a woman named Lauren Bush shared her experience with food contamination. Listen to an account that she shared of the ordeal.

During my junior year of college, my life suddenly and irrevocably changed when I almost died after eating a spinach salad.

What the doctors initially thought to be nothing more than a virus quickly escalated to a diagnosis of appendicitis. Through clenched teeth and unbearable pain, I argued with the doctors that something didn't feel right. It was like nothing I had ever felt before. They began to suspect that I was right when I quickly took a turn for the worse. I found myself in class one day and in a hospital bed the next.

I spent the next three weeks in and out of two hospitals, two emergency rooms, and three urgent-treatment facilities before I was well enough to go home and recover.

I had lost nearly 20 pounds, and went from being an otherwise young, healthy student to an emotional and physical disaster—all in less than one month's time.

I spent the next five months in recovery on continuous antibiotics and vitamins from the resulting complications. I almost lost my colon; and I lost my dignity when I was unable to feed and care for myself. I was fortunate enough to return to school the following spring, but it was several months before I could walk to class without stopping to take a breath. And in some ways, my body will never be the same.

Sadly, there are far too many Americans with stories similar to Rylee's and Lauren's. Take, for example, the recent listeria outbreak in two brands of some of the food products millions of Americans enjoy—ice cream and hummus. To date, the outbreak has claimed the lives of three people and sickened hundreds of others. One of the ice cream factories is closed as a result of this.

This is all the more tragic because each of these contaminations could have been prevented. The United States is the most advanced country in the world. We have the technology and the resources to ensure better food quality for people like Rylee.

We have made progress. In 2010, for a lot of reasons but not the least of which was Rylee, Congress passed the most sweeping reform of our Nation's food safety laws since the 1930s. The law shifted the focus of food safety laws from responding to contamination to preventing it. The FDA is working hard to implement this critical law. But the Food Safety Modernization Act cannot work if it doesn't have any money. Current funding levels don't provide the resources necessary to adequately fund programs to stop food contamination and create a system based on prevention.

It is that word again—"sequestration." This Agency has never recovered from the hit taken when the government was closed and then because of sequestration. By keeping sequestration in place, Republicans are hampering efforts to stamp out food borne illness.

Nobody should ever have to worry about dying from eating ice cream or being hospitalized after consuming hummus or spinach. Congress must act to strengthen the food safety of our country and the Food Safety Modernization Act, and we must do it now. Let's stop sequestration. Let's go ahead and authorize the bills, but, remember, we cannot fund them with funny money.

I can't imagine my Republican friends—and I have said before, my friend, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee—allowing this bill to go forward with this deficit spending that they call OCO. The Pentagon thinks it is wrong. All people who understand economics think it is wrong. Another \$39 billion in deficit spending is just wrong. We need to fund the military, and we need to fund the non-military—that is, nondefense programs—and we need to do it to make our homeland safer.

I hope that programs like this—Rylee has suffered so that we would do something—I hope that we will take care of her and people just like her and do something to fund these programs and prevent illnesses that are caused by food.

We need to act responsibly and raise the level of funding for these vital programs because for far too many Americans, this issue is a matter of life and death. All we need to do is ask Rylee and ask Lauren, and they will tell us.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute.

McCain amendment No. 1456 (to amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.

Cornyn amendment No. 1486 (to amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Vitter modified amendment No. 1473 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units.

Markey amendment No. 1645 (to amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Reed (for Blumenthal) modified amendment No. 1564 (to amendment No. 1463), to enhance protections accorded to service-members and their spouses.

McCain (for Paul) modified amendment No. 1543 (to amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

Reed (for Durbin) modified amendment No. 1559 (to amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.

Feinstein (for McCain) amendment No. 1889 (to amendment No. 1463), to reaffirm the prohibition on torture.

Fischer/Booker amendment No. 1825 (to amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

Lee amendment No. 1687 (to amendment No. 1473), to provide for the protection and recovery of the greater sage-grouse, the conservation of lesser prairie-chickens, and the removal of endangered species status for the American burying beetle.

McCain (for Ernst/Boxer) amendment No. 1549 (to amendment No. 1463), to provide for a temporary, emergency authorization of defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government.

Reed (for Gillibrand) amendment No. 1578 (to amendment No. 1463), to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Metal Theft Prevention Act, which was filed as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act. In a moment, I am going to ask unanimous consent to make this amendment pending, but first I wish to explain why this amendment is so important.

I have been working on this legislation for years. Senator SCHUMER is a cosponsor. In the past, I have had support for this bill as cosponsors in Senator HATCH, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, and Senator HOEVEN. Why has there been bipartisan support in the past for this bill? I think we all know that this is a public safety issue. Metal thieves have targeted labs, power stations, and gas lines, causing blackouts, service disruptions, and even dangerous explosions.

In September of 2013, four people were injured in an explosion at a University of California, Berkeley, electrical station. Officials blamed it on copper theft that occurred 2 hours before the explosion.

Georgia Power was having a huge problem with thieves targeting a substation that feeds the entire Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport, one of the busiest airports in the world. The airport was getting hit two to three times a week, and surveillance didn't lead to any arrests.

The crime has also hurt the dignity of our veterans. Last year in my home State of Minnesota, the metal thieves robbed dozens of veterans' graves, taking the brass rods that hold their symbol of service. It is a crime that is almost too callous to comprehend, but sadly this wasn't the first time. On Memorial Day in 2012—this is just in Minnesota—thieves stole more than 20 Bronze Star markers from veterans' graves in Isanti County. That is why this bill is supported by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, as well as major law enforcement organizations and business groups.

The bill is really quite simple. It will help combat the shameless crime across State lines by putting modest recordkeeping requirements on scrap metal dealers and recyclers in place. It will limit the value of cash transactions to \$100 and require sellers in certain cases to prove they actually own the metal.

All we are trying to do is stop scrap metal dealers from taking stolen metal. And the reason we can't just do it State by State is that a lot of States

are doing this but a lot of States aren't, and what the thieves are doing is crossing State lines, stealing the metal in one State and selling it in another.

This is an important bill, and it has been heavily lobbied against by the scrap metal dealer association.

The Democratic side of the aisle has cleared this bill. We are ready to go forward with this amendment. There are objections on the Republican side. But I think people better step back and realize, the next time there is a major explosion, the next time something happens like this, which is happening on a weekly basis across the country—that they understand we could have done something to prevent it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up my amendment No. 1555.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will object, I object on behalf of the Judiciary Committee. This would criminalize stealing metal. It makes it a Federal offense; therefore, the Judiciary properly has jurisdiction. It would also establish civil penalties enforceable by the Attorney General. It directs review of this crime by the Federal sentencing commission. It has no tie to the national security or the National Defense Authorization Act. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am disappointed that there is an objection to calling up this commonsense amendment that has so much support from veterans, law enforcement, and businesses. I have stood in front of small businesses all over my State, including with Senator HOEVEN in Fargo, a number of electric companies that have been repeatedly broken into.

I believe this does have national security implications because there is a provision in the bill about critical infrastructure and creating a felony-level crime when they are stealing from that critical infrastructure. And I believe it is very important that we debate and vote on this issue as part of the National Defense Authorization Act.

I will continue to work to get a vote on this amendment during this entire year. I worry that at some point we are going to have major damage to our infrastructure as a result of metal theft, and everyone will look back and wonder why we didn't listen to every major law enforcement group in our country or to every single business that has been affected or to the electric companies that are being broken into all the time or to our veterans groups, that just want their final resting places to be respected. Despite the lobby of the scrap metal dealers, I will not let this rest.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would point out to the Senator from Minnesota that we started on this legislation in the committee in May. We are now well into June—many weeks. We are 2 weeks into the consideration of this legislation, and the Senator from Minnesota comes to the floor with a compelling amendment.

I suggest the next time around the Senator from Minnesota raise the issue with the authorization committee and with others when the bill first comes to the floor rather than waiting 2 weeks before having a compelling interest in this very serious issue.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President—

Mr. MCCAIN. I still have the floor, I would say to the Senator from Minnesota. The rules of the Senate are that we usually don't like to be interrupted.

Mr. President, we are going to embark on the McCain-Feinstein amendment, which I understand is going to be voted on at 11:30; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I would like to note that I have been attempting to pass this legislation now for 3 years. Senator HATCH was my first cosponsor, then Senator GRAHAM, and then Senator HOEVEN. Every step of the way I have been stymied by the scrap metal dealer lobby.

I believe this is an important bill. It is a simple bill. It will greatly help because these thieves are crossing State lines with the stolen copper. I appreciate, obviously, Senator MCCAIN's viewpoint, being the manager of this bill on the floor, but I think the record should reflect that I have tried many times to get this amendment up on other bills and to work with the committee, but every single time I get stopped in my tracks by this lobby. At some point I would like to have a vote on this so that people can vote their heart and vote with their law enforcement or vote with the scrap metal dealers. They can decide.

For now, our side has cleared this amendment, and the Republicans are objecting to this.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time spent be equally divided while in a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS WIN STANLEY CUP

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are serious matters on the floor of the Senate involving the Defense authorization bill, and I just asked the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for 5 minutes to speak on an issue totally unrelated to it but one which is critically important to the future of America and critically important today to the city of Chicago, IL.

Last night, I stayed up late to watch the Chicago Blackhawks win the Stanley Cup. They were playing the Tampa Bay Lightning—an extraordinarily good team—and in the sixth game they won 2 to 1. That is three Stanley Cups in 6 years.

I can tell you that you can't visit Chicago, go to any street corner or anyplace without seeing evidence of loyalty to the Chicago Blackhawks. It is an incredible story of a storied franchise in the National Hockey League that has become a premier sports story in the great sports city of Chicago. And last night was so much fun for all of us to watch that victory.

Any child who has ever laced up an old pair of skates or put tape on a stick has thought about what happened last night. From Springfield, IL, to Saskatoon, from Moose Jaw to Miami, if you have spent any time at all around the game of hockey, you wonder what it must feel like to stand at the end of a very long season, after three long periods of total effort white-knuckled moments, before tens of thousands of elated fans, and hoist up the most storied trophy in all of sports—Lord Stanley's Cup. The goal of every team in the National Hockey League is to hoist up that cup at the end of the season.

I rise today to pay tribute to the players, coaches, staff, and fans of the Chicago Blackhawks, the 2015 Stanley Cup champions, whose season-long mantra of "One Goal" was realized last night at the United Center in Chicago.

Last night, the Blackhawks won their sixth Stanley Cup in franchise history and the third in the last 6

years, with the 2-to-0 victory over the Tampa Bay Lightning, a formidable team as well.

Fans at the Madhouse on Madison, as we call the United Center, witnessed Duncan Keith and Patrick Kane score show-stopping goals while goaltender Corey Crawford seemed incredible in his defense, stopping all of the 25 shots that he faced.

I congratulate especially owner Rocky Wirtz, head coach Joe Quenneville, who is known as Coach Q, "Captain Serious," Jonathan Toews, the Blackhawks front office, the players, and, most of all, the legions of Blackhawks fans as they celebrate another Stanley Cup Championship.

Those who know the history of this team, and those who have followed them for decades know that in the past 7 years there has been a transformation in the Blackhawks. With Rocky Wirtz taking over as the owner, this team went on television just at the moment when they were reaching this level of perfection, and they started winning over thousands of fans—not just across Chicago but across Illinois and the Midwest.

Blackhawks fans, I think, are the best fans in hockey, and you can understand if a lot of them are a little tired this morning. The Blackhawks began the playoffs with a remarkable double-overtime victory against the Nashville Predators, another excellent team. They were down 3 to 0 after the first period. The Hawks stormed back to tie the game and won on a Duncan Keith goal. That victory set the tone for a great run through the playoffs. A goal by Brent Seabrook in triple overtime in game 4 helped the Hawks defeat Nashville in six games.

A sweep of the Minnesota Wild followed, setting up a showdown with the Anaheim Ducks in the Western Conference Finals. The Hawks were behind in the series one game to none, 2 to 1, and 3 to 2, but they earned double- and triple-overtime victories on their way to winning in seven games, clinching a berth in the Stanley Cup Final.

The Hawks followed a familiar pattern in dropping games 1 and 3 of the final, but they took a 3-to-2 series lead into Monday night's Game 6 on home ice. It was another close contest as Kane's one-timer with 5:14 remaining marked the first time either team led by more than one goal in the entire series.

The time slowly ticked down until 22,424 fans at the United Center were finally able to erupt in celebration. It was a great night for Blackhawks fans and the culmination of a tremendous team effort.

Antoine Vermette, acquired at the trade deadline, scored two game-winning goals in the Stanley Cup Final. Goaltender Scott Darling stood tall in the net when his team needed him the most, in relief of Corey Crawford when

called upon against Nashville. Duncan Keith was an iron man, earning the Conn Smythe Trophy for playoff MVP, while logging more than 700 minutes of ice time in 23 games. Nicklas Hjalmarsson blocked shots left and right and seemed to be in the right place all the time.

I can't tell you how happy I am for those Blackhawks and for all of their amazing fans on their Stanley Cup championship. It has been a thrill to watch this team throughout the years, and I look forward to seeing President Obama host the Stanley Cup champion Blackhawks yet another time at the White House.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

MR. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have serious concerns with the language that was tacked on to the House FISA reform bill that passed the Senate, and at the end of my remarks I am going to offer a unanimous consent request. I say that because maybe other Members of the Senate would like to be heard or would like to maybe reject my unanimous consent request, and I want to give them the privilege of knowing I am doing this.

The language in the FISA bill made changes to the Federal criminal code to implement four important multilateral treaties relating to nuclear terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It is good that these treaties are finally being implemented. The Senate gave its advice and consent to these treaties back in 2008. In the years since then, however, the Senate leadership repeatedly failed to bring bills to the floor that would implement them.

The language which is now law omits a number of key provisions that were requested by both the Obama administration and the Bush administration. So I want my colleagues to know this has had support from both Republican and Democrat Presidents, in the present and in the past.

My amendment No. 1786 restores these provisions, which are important tools to combat the gravest of threats to our national security. I am happy to note that Senator WHITEHOUSE, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, has joined me in offering this amendment.

First, the amendment adds the authority for prosecutors to seek the death penalty for these newly created crimes in appropriate cases. Under the criminal code, similar crimes already carry the possibility of the death penalty. Singling out these new offenses under this treaty, which is intended to stop terrorists from threatening us with the world's most dangerous weapons, for lesser punishment simply makes no sense.

For example, section 2280 and 2281 of the code, which criminalizes various

acts of violence on the high seas, already provide for the possibility of the death penalty. So it is only logical that new sections 2280a and 2281a, which criminalize acts of terrorism on the high seas related to weapons of mass destruction, should as well. The newly created offenses of nuclear terrorism, now codified in section 2332i, should as well. In fact, I am hard pressed to think of an offense for which the death penalty might be more appropriate than nuclear terrorism.

Terrorists who kill Americans—especially nuclear terrorists—should be eligible for the death penalty. This shouldn't at all be controversial, and I think the support of both former President Bush and President Obama speaks to that point. Terrorists who kill Americans—especially nuclear terrorists—should be eligible for the death penalty. I can't repeat too often that this shouldn't be controversial.

Second, the amendment makes these newly created criminal offenses material support predicates. In other words, the amendment would provide the government the ability to prosecute those who finance or otherwise provide material support to these terrorists. Naturally, these are complex crimes that aren't committed by just one person. They involve entire networks that need to be stopped in their tracks. This provision will help do that by making sure that those who provide materiel support to terrorists don't escape justice.

Third, the amendment would add these offenses to the list of those crimes that are predicates for wiretap applications. As the law now stands, prosecutors can't request a traditional criminal wiretap against a terrorist suspected of breaking these new laws, but at the same time, they can get a wiretap to investigate a long list of less serious offenses. Again, this doesn't make sense. In fact, this is a dangerous omission. Our government needs the ability to listen in on calls of suspected nuclear terrorists. So this provision would permit prosecutors to request the authority to do so from a Federal judge.

Once again, I use the term "common sense." These are commonsense fixes, supported by both Republican and Democratic Presidents, fixing and harmonizing these recently created crimes with the rest of the criminal code, fixing and harmonizing these recently created crimes with the rest of the Criminal Code. They were requested by both the Obama and Bush administrations because they will help protect us from the catastrophe that could result from terrorists seeking to use the ultimate weapons against us. So I urge my colleagues to support Grassley-Whitehouse amendment No. 1786.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up and make pending Grassley-Whitehouse amendment No. 1786.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

First, the Senator is chairman of the committee which has jurisdiction for this particular amendment, so he has complete—in fact, more than complete—authority to bring it up in regular order and bring it forward to the floor. In addition, we have been advised by the Department of Justice that these provisions are not necessary, given the scope of existing law with respect to terrorists and with respect to anyone who conducts a terrorist act. Perhaps an example of that is the Boston bombing, where there is now someone condemned to death for terrorist activities—not involving a nuclear device, but I hardly think he would get any less of a sentence regardless of the device he used.

So for all these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I accept the good-faith effort to listen to my point of view, even though there is a rejection, but I would like 1 minute to react to the objection.

This amendment only does what both the Bush and Obama administrations asked Congress to do, to make clear that the death penalty could apply to any active nuclear terrorism. It is not enough that other criminal statutes might also apply to nuclear terrorists and might also carry the death penalty. It is quite the opposite; that terrorists who use guns and explosives to kill can face the death penalty means that nuclear terrorists certainly should as well. It does not take too much imagination to come up with a situation which, under current law, the death penalty might not clearly apply.

We are all aware of the threat of cyber terrorism. If a terrorist used a computer to take over a nuclear powerplant and caused a deadly nuclear meltdown, it is not clear that his crime would be eligible for the death penalty under any other Federal Criminal Code. We simply shouldn't accept this potential gap in the law which my amendment fixes.

So, once again, I am sorry there was an objection. I am not done with this. We will continue it in some other environment. I respect my colleagues, however, for objecting.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1889

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Congress has some unfinished business before it. When the President took office, he issued an Executive order banning torture. It is regrettable that such a step was even necessary for a country that has been a signatory to the Convention Against Torture since 1988, more than 25 years ago. But it was the right thing for the President to do and consistent with our values as Americans. In par-

ticular, the President ordered that all U.S. Government personnel and contractors must comply with the interrogation standards in the Army Field Manual and that the International Committee of the Red Cross should have notice of and access to detainees held by the U.S. Government.

Now it is time for Congress to adopt these same requirements—to enshrine them in law and ensure that America never again employs torture, no matter what the threat.

Senators MCCAIN and FEINSTEIN have offered an amendment that mirrors these requirements of the Executive order. It would require all government personnel and contractors, across all agencies and departments, to abide by the rules and regulations contained in the Army Field Manual. It also would ensure that the International Committee of the Red Cross, or ICRC, is provided access to all individuals detained by the United States.

These requirements have already been in place for 6 years, and this amendment is consistent with current practice. The Army Field Manual provides clear guidelines on acceptable and effective interrogation practices. It reinforces explicit prohibitions in existing law against torture and other cruel and inhumane treatment. It is relied upon by our military personnel when they conduct high-risk interrogations on the battlefield. There is no reason why these rules should not apply to all government personnel and contractors, in all places, and at all times.

This is a critically important amendment. We know from the historic report of the Senate Intelligence Committee that the CIA engaged in horrific acts of torture during the Bush administration. We must be unequivocal to the world and to ourselves that torture is wrong and that it is never permitted.

An Executive order is not enough. Congress must act. We must codify these safeguards into law. When it comes to our core values—the things that make our country great and that define America's place in the world—they do not change depending on the circumstances. The Convention Against Torture does not make exceptions. We must be clear that there are no instances when torture is acceptable.

I urge Senators to support the anti-torture amendment, and I commend Senators MCCAIN and FEINSTEIN for their enduring leadership on this issue. We must ensure that America never allows this to happen again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to speak out at a time when our world is on fire: Putin's Russia is on the march, invading a sovereign neighbor in a bid to rebuild the Soviet empire; China asserts its growing strength in aggressive

and provocative ways in the Pacific; Iran presses ahead in its efforts to develop nuclear weapons capability, a development that threatens to put the deadliest weapons known to man in the hands of a maniacal rogue state; the Islamic State continues to expand its barbaric reign of terror and endanger everything our brave men and women in uniform fought and died for long ago in Iraq; terrorist groups, including Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and Al-Shabab, use the refuge of failed states to plot attacks on our homeland; and, across the globe, our allies look to the United States to provide the leadership necessary to confront these threats to peace.

One of the foundational purposes of our Constitution was to establish a Federal Government to—in the words of the preamble—provide for the common defense. In facilitating this purpose, the Congress is charged with two particularly crucial duties: establishing the legal authority for our military to operate and funding our military's activities. For 53 years in a row, Congress has fulfilled these responsibilities with an annual National Defense Authorization Act and accompanying funding through the appropriations process. Despite the gridlock that has so often beset the legislative process in recent years, Congress has consistently risen to the call of its constitutional duty every year to authorize and appropriate on behalf of our brave men and women in uniform.

This year, our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee have lived up to the finest traditions of this body in crafting the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This bill provides for our national security needs across a wide variety of fronts, including programs to aid allies such as Ukraine and Iraq that face aggression, compensation for the men and women who put their lives on the line to defend our freedom, restructuring to improve readiness, authority to procure a wide range of new weapons systems such as the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter that are crucial to maintaining our defense capabilities, and acquisition reform to restore accountability to defense contracting and make the money we spend go further.

These aren't Republican or Democratic priorities, they are American priorities. They are concrete steps we need to take in order to ensure our safety and security for years to come, and they should earn the support of every single Senator.

The bill before us authorizes \$604 billion in spending for the Defense Department in the coming year. That is essentially the very same amount requested by President Obama himself. President Obama and our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee did not come up with that number out of thin air. In testimony before the Senate

Armed Services Committee this year, all four of the military service chiefs testified that American lives are being put at risk if we cap defense spending at the sequester levels. The amount proposed by President Obama and embraced by the Armed Services Committee is the amount that both Republican and Democratic, as well as non-partisan, experts believe is crucial to the Defense Department's ability to preserve our national security. Surely, such an approach on such a critical measure should win broad support from both parties.

Nevertheless, many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are threatening a filibuster of the bill over the amount of funding it authorizes. They are considering the prospect of defeating the National Defense Authorization Act for the first time in 53 years unless we agree to their demands to increase spending on domestic programs. Put another way, they are aiming to condition the ability of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines to defend our Nation on their demand for more funding for the wasteful Federal bureaucracy that already costs too much.

Let me be absolutely clear. To roll back what progress we have made in restoring fiscal discipline after years of profligate spending is seriously misguided, to do so by hijacking the Defense bill at a time of serious danger—when we face so many crises around the world—represents the height of irresponsibility, and to make such a “my way or the highway” demand as a condition of fulfilling one of the Senate's basic duties is unworthy of the great traditions of this body.

Many of us have worked toward various solutions to replace the sequester going forward. Republicans and Democrats alike have their preferred alternatives to the current funding arrangements. Nevertheless, we simply cannot shirk our duty to provide for the common defense in the present. Political reality demands that we reject partisan grandstanding in favor of working together on this must-pass bill.

Over the past 2 weeks, the majority leader and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee have led a debate on this bill that represents the Senate at its finest. We have considered the bill on time—a needed change from recent years that restores the Senate's proper voice in our national defense. We have held hours upon hours of debate on the floor, and we have held a fair and open amendment process for Members on both sides of the aisle.

As part of that open amendment process, the Senate considered an amendment from the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee that would condition the funding level on the domestic spending increases sought by our Democratic colleagues.

Despite my disagreements on the substance, I want to commend the

ranking member for his sincere advocacy and for his determination to put his plan before this body for an up-or-down vote. But as that vote result showed, a majority of this body strongly disagrees with the minority's preferred alternative. Having fully aired this issue and voted on it, it is time for the Senate to wrap up our debate and pass this bill. To exploit the supermajority threshold to demand a concession rejected by a majority of Senators on a bill of such vital importance to our national defense would represent a gross dereliction of duty and a tragically irresponsible choice.

I urge my friends in the minority: do not give in to the temptation of partisan grandstanding, do not let this become another exercise in political brinksmanship, do not place a desire to fight the majority over our shared duty to keep this country safe, and do not jeopardize our men and women in uniform to win concessions for yet more domestic spending.

Work with us. Embrace the funding levels the Obama administration believes are necessary to keep us safe and keep alive our proud tradition of placing national security ahead of partisan politics.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know there is important debate, but I wish to take a few minutes and talk about America losing one of its finest entrepreneurs and citizens.

REMEMBERING KIRK KERKORIAN

Mr. President, last night, at 10:30, my friend Kirk Kerkorian died. What a wonderful man. He was 98 years old, and when history books are written, they will say a lot about this good man.

I had the good fortune as a young lawyer to meet him. I didn't do any of his mergers and acquisitions and all the stock stuff. I didn't do any of that. But when we first met, he was a businessman with an airline called Trans International Airlines. I will talk about that in a minute, but it started out as one airplane.

I knew that Kirk was failing because he and I were supposed to go watch the Mayweather-Pacquiao fight, and he said he couldn't go. I knew then that his days were numbered, for lack of a better description.

I had kept in touch with him all these many years. As I said, I am not one to boast about all the great legal work I did for Kirk. I didn't do much. But I did do a lot of work for his brother, a man by the name of Nish Kerkorian, and Kirk never forgot all the work I did for his brother.

Kirk had two siblings: One woman who was a sweet, sweet lady, vibrant, named Rose, his sister Rose. She died not long ago. I called Kirk. It was really hard on him; he cried, and we shed a tear together.

He was born in 1917 in Fresno, CA. His parents were Armenian immigrants. He grew up at a very difficult time. He didn't graduate from the eighth grade. He became a prize fighter, became the Pacific amateur welterweight champion, and his name was “Rifle Right” Kerkorian.

His brother Nish, whom I talked about, was also a fighter and a boxer, and he fought a lot. Kirk didn't fight too much.

On the floor is one of ours—if not the hero we have in the Senate for military endeavors—the senior Senator from Arizona.

It is important to talk about Kirk Kerkorian for just a minute and about what he did for our country in the military, using that term broadly—“in the military.” He had learned to fly, while milking cows and looking after a woman's cattle, at an air strip near now what is Edwards Air Force Base. That is where he learned to fly, at a place called Happy Bottom Riding Club. That is where he learned to fly. He loved to fly. He got his pilot's license in just a few months, and he wanted to go into the military, but he couldn't at the time because we weren't in the war yet.

The British Royal Air Force was ferrying Canadian-built de Havilland Mosquitoes over the North Atlantic because England was desperate for help. The Nazis were after them, Hitler was sweeping Europe, and the submarines were sinking the ships trying to take supplies to England. So out of desperation, Canada, which was part of Great Britain at the time, decided they would help. The problem was that to fly those airplanes over the North Atlantic was really very, very difficult. They had two routes. One was 1,400 miles. The other was shorter but extremely more dangerous. Kirk Kerkorian agreed to take the one more dangerous. It was dangerous because the North Atlantic is very brutal. The wings would ice. But he got a lot of money for each flight—almost \$1,000 for each flight. He delivered 33 planes to England. Every one of those flights was a nightmare, but he did it.

He was truly an American patriot. There is a documentary on what he did—flying across the North Atlantic with some other gallant men who did that and helped preserve freedom in the world and take on the Nazis.

After the war, he had saved a lot of his money, and he bought a Cessna. It was expensive at the time—\$5,000. He worked in general aviation. He first visited Las Vegas in 1944. In 1947 he paid \$60,000 for the airline where I first met him. He was dealing with Trans International Airlines, which was a small air charter service that basically flew gamblers between L.A. and Las Vegas. He, of course, was a very frugal man. He operated the airline until 1968, when he sold it for \$104 million. He paid

\$60,000 for it and sold it for \$104 million. That was him. He was an entrepreneur.

He moved into Las Vegas quickly. He bought a piece of land across from the Flamingo Hotel for \$960,000. It was 80 acres. That is now where Caesars Palace is. He was originally the landlord for that property. He made \$9 million on that deal.

He then, shortly thereafter, paid \$5 million cash for an off-Strip property—the first one that had ever been done. That is something I was involved with. It was quite interesting. That transaction showed to me his absolute honesty. I have said publicly—I am not going into detail here—but I will end by saying that the lawyer with whom I worked, Bill Singleton, said: No, Kirk doesn't do business that way, and he walked out of the room. He wound up buying the property. That was where the International Hotel was built, and it was a very, very expensive property at the time. It was off-Strip. The first two people to appear in the showroom were Barbra Streisand and Elvis Presley, and that was the beginning of Kirk Kerkorian's ascension to power broker, to say the least, in Las Vegas.

He bought and sold MGM movies two different times. In the process, of course, he built the MGM hotel in Las Vegas. He was really an interesting, wonderful man. He is one of the personalities I will never forget, and my relationship with him is one of the special things in my life. I feel so fortunate to be able to talk on a personal basis about this man. He was one of a kind.

I am so disappointed. His No. 1 person, Tony Mandekik, called me and told me that Kirk had died. To be honest with you, the tears on the other side of the phone connection from Tony ended the conversation because he couldn't talk anymore. Now he is responsible, among others—but principally him—for disposing of this man's wealth.

He did not make all of his money in movies or hotels and casinos. He branched out. He made a number of fortunes. People would say: How does he know anything about the automobile industry? He wound up owning large chunks of General Motors. He was one of the chief players in Chrysler. He no longer made in those propositions millions of dollars but billions. He made about \$5 billion on this Chrysler Corporation deal, where people said: What a fool—why would he do that?

You know that deal.

Not too long ago, about 3 years ago, I met him for lunch in Los Angeles. I said: I have to get going. He pulled out of his pocket his watch.

Kirk, what is that?

He says: It is my watch.

It was a Timex with no band on it.

He said: It keeps perfect time.

He came to the Beverly Wilshire Hotel. He drove himself in a little

jeep—a jeep with the top partially down. That was him. He was a very private man. He rarely gave interviews. I mean, he rarely gave interviews. Even though he was one of the richest men in Los Angeles, he was probably one of the most private. He simply did not do things in public.

With all of the hotels that he owned—for those people who have a little bit of knowledge of Las Vegas, a lot of stuff is done with complimentary privileges. If you are a hotel owner, you get a lot of stuff for nothing—not Kirk Kerkorian. He would not take a comp for anything. Everything he paid for.

One of the last times we went to a fight, he also would not sit ringside. He always wanted to be up away from everybody.

In 2008 he was worth \$16 billion. I am not sure how much he was worth when he died. But he has given huge amounts of his wealth away. His job for Tony Mandekik and others was to give away the rest of his money.

It is a sad day for me and for the people who knew Kirk Kerkorian. He lived a good, full life. He has two daughters. He always went out of his way and paid his help well.

I wish I had the ability to articulate what a wonderful human being Kirk Kerkorian was. I will always remember him. When I talk to people who know something about business, I will always interject the name Kirk Kerkorian.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 1889

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California have 15 minutes and I have 10 minutes and that the vote be delayed until completion of the 15 minutes and the 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I thank the distinguished chairman for this time. I do not think I will take 15 minutes. We have worked it down.

I join Senator MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED—as well as Senator COLLINS and the other cosponsors, Senators LEAHY, PAUL, KING, FLAKE, HEINRICH, WHITEHOUSE, MIKULSKI, WYDEN, MURPHY, HIRONO, WARNER, BALDWIN, BROWN and MARKEY—in offering an amendment that will help ensure the United States never again carries out coercive and abusive interrogation techniques or indefinite secret detentions.

I am very pleased that the Senate will consider this amendment, and I urge an aye vote.

The amendment we are offering today is really very simple. It applies the authorizations and restrictions for interrogations in the Army Field Manual to the entire U.S. Government.

It extends what Congress did in 2005, by a vote of 90 to 9, with the Detainee Treatment Act—which I believe Senator MCCAIN authored—which banned the Department of Defense from using techniques not authorized by the Army Field Manual and also banned the government from using cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment or punishment.

The amendment also requires prompt access by the International Committee of the Red Cross to any detainee held by the U.S. Government.

Both of these provisions are consistent with United States policy for the past several years, but this amendment would codify these requirements into law.

President Obama banned the use of coercive and abusive interrogation techniques by Executive order in his first few days in office, actually on January 22, 2009.

That Executive order formally prohibits—as a matter of policy—the use of interrogation techniques not specifically authorized by the Army Field Manual on Human Intelligence Collector Operations.

This amendment places that restriction in law. It is long overdue.

The amendment also codifies another section of President Obama's January 2009 Executive order, requiring access by the International Committee of the Red Cross to all U.S. detainees in U.S. Government custody—access which has been historically granted by the United States and other law-abiding nations and is needed to fulfill our obligations under international law, such as the Geneva Conventions.

It is also important to understand that the policies in the 2009 Executive order are only guaranteed for as long as a future President agrees to leave them in place. This amendment would codify these two provisions into law.

Current law already bans torture, as well as cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.

However, this amendment is still necessary because interrogation techniques were able to be used, which were based on a deeply flawed legal theory, and those techniques, it was said, did not constitute “torture” or “cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment.”

These legal opinions could be written again.

In 2009, President Obama's Executive Order settled the issue as formal policy, and this amendment will codify a prohibition on a program that was already defunct at the end of the Bush administration.

CIA Director John Brennan has clearly stated that he agrees with the ban on interrogation techniques that are not in the Army Field Manual. Director Brennan wrote the following to the Intelligence Committee in 2013 about the President's 2009 Executive order:

I want to reaffirm what I said during my confirmation hearing: I agree with the President's decision, and, while I am the Director of the CIA, this program will not under any circumstances be reinitiated. I personally remain firm in my belief that enhanced interrogation techniques are not an appropriate method to obtain intelligence and that their use impairs our ability to continue to play a leadership role in the world.

Furthermore, it is important to point out that the Senate and the House both required the use of the Army Field Manual across the government in the fiscal year 2008 Intelligence authorization bill. Unfortunately, President Bush vetoed that legislation.

Whatever one may think about the CIA's former detention and interrogation program, we should all agree that there can be no turning back to the era of torture.

Interrogation techniques that would together constitute torture do not work. They corrode our moral standing, and ultimately they undermine any counterterrorism policies they are intended to support.

So before I close, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of letters and statements in support of this amendment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 9, 2015.

DEAR SENATOR: As retired generals and admirals who believe that American ideals are a national security asset, we urge you to support the amendment to the 2016 National Defense Authorization Act that solidifies the ban against torture and cruel treatment of detainees in U.S. custody.

While international and domestic law, including the 2005 Detainee Treatment Act, prohibit such cruelty, high-level officials in the Executive Branch still managed to evade congressional intent by using loophole lawyering to authorize torture and cruel treatment. We need to make sure this never happens again. The United States should have one standard for interrogating detainees that is effective, lawful, and humane.

The McCain-Feinstein amendment would ensure lawful, effective, and humane interrogations of individuals taken into custody by requiring all agencies and departments to comply with the time-tested requirements of the Army Field Manual ("Human Intelligence Collector Operations"). It would also codify existing Department of Defense (DOD) practice of guaranteeing timely notification and access to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) for detainees taken into custody—an important bulwark against abuse.

We strongly urge you to support this legislation to help move our country towards decisively rejecting the use of torture or cruel treatment against detainees held in our custody.

Thank you for your commitment to upholding our national security and American values.

Sincerely,

General Joseph Hoar, USMC (Ret.); General Charles Krulak, USMC (Ret.); General David M. Maddox, USA (Ret.); Lieutenant General John Castellaw, USMC (Ret.); Lieutenant General Robert G. Gard, Jr., USA (Ret.); Vice Ad-

miral Lee F. Gunn, USN (Ret.); Lieutenant General Claudia J. Kennedy, USA (Ret.); Lieutenant General Charles Otstott, USA (Ret.); Lieutenant General Norman R. Seip, USAF (Ret.); Vice Admiral Joe Sestak, USN (Ret.); Lieutenant General Harry E. Soyster, USA (Ret.); Lieutenant General Keith J. Stalder, USMC (Ret.); Rear Admiral Don Guter, JAGC, USN (Ret.); Rear Admiral John D. Hutson, JAGC, USN (Ret.); Major General J. Michael Myatt, USMC (Ret.); Major General William L. Nash, USA (Ret.); Major General Eric T. Olson, USA (Ret.); Major General Thomas J. Romig, USA (Ret.); Major General Walter L. Stewart, Jr., USA (Ret.); Major General Antonio M. Taguba, USA (Ret.); Brigadier General John Adams, USA (Ret.); Brigadier General Stephen A. Cheney, USMC (Ret.); Brigadier General James P. Cullen, USA (Ret.); Brigadier General Evelyn P. Foote, USA (Ret.); Brigadier General Gerald E. Galloway, USA (Ret.); Brigadier General Leif H. Hendrickson, USMC (Ret.); Brigadier General David R. Irvine, USA (Ret.); Brigadier General John H. Johns, USA (Ret.); Brigadier General Murray G. Sagsveen, USA (Ret.); Brigadier General Stephen N. Xenakis, USA (Ret.).

[From Peaceful Tomorrows, June 10, 2015]

SEPTEMBER 11TH FAMILIES SUPPORT THE
REINFORCEMENT OF BAN ON TORTURE
(Posted by Katharina)

As family members of those killed on September 11th we have strong opinions regarding torture. The use of enhanced interrogation techniques, or torture by another name, was wrongly justified by some as means to prevent another terrorist attack. Torture is never justified. September 11th Families for Peaceful Tomorrows applauds the legislation being offered by Senators McCain and Feinstein to reinforce the ban on torture. Any assertion of torture as effective must be repudiated. Any loophole suggesting torture as a justifiable means to security must be closed. Any ethical principle that finds torture morally permissible must be challenged.

American legislators must clearly and forcefully codify policy that rejects and criminalizes torture in all its forms. Only then will trust in the rule of law be restored, and the people of this nation truly safe.

JUNE 9, 2015.

DEAR SENATOR: As intelligence and interrogation professionals who have offered our collective voice opposing torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, we strongly encourage you to support the amendment to the 2016 National Defense Authorization Act that solidifies the ban against torture and cruel treatment of detainees in U.S. custody.

While international and domestic law, including the 2005 Detainee Treatment Act, prohibit such cruelty, sadly high-level officials in the Executive Branch exploited loopholes and still authorized torture and cruel treatment. The interrogation methods that have kept America safe for generations are sophisticated, humane, lawful, and produce reliable, actionable intelligence in any interrogation scenario. To promote a return to that respected level of professionalism, there must be a single well-defined standard of conduct—consistent with our values as a nation—across all U.S. agencies to govern the detention and interrogation of people anywhere in U.S. custody.

The amendment would ensure lawful, effective, and humane interrogations of individuals taken into custody by requiring all agencies and departments to comply with the time-tested requirements of the Army Field Manual ("Human Intelligence Collector Operations"). It would also require a review of the Army Field Manual to ensure that best practices and the most recent evidenced-based research on humane interrogation are incorporated. It would also codify existing Department of Defense (DOD) practice of guaranteeing timely notification and access to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) for detainees taken into custody—an important bulwark against abuse.

We strongly urge you to support this legislation to help move our country forward and reaffirm that there is no conflict between adhering to one of our nation's essential and founding values—respect for inherent human dignity—and our ability to obtain the intelligence we need to protect the nation.

Sincerely,

Frank Anderson, CIA (Ret.); Donald Canestraro, DEA (Ret.); Glenn Carle, CIA (Ret.); Jack Cloonan, CIA (Ret.); Barry Eisler, Formerly CIA; Eric Fair, Formerly U.S. Army; Mark Fallon, NCIS (Ret.); Charlton Howard, NCIS (Ret.); David Irvine, Brigadier General, U.S. Army (Ret.); Timothy James, NCIS (Ret.); Steve Kleinman, Colonel, USAFR (Ret.); Marcus Lewis, Formerly U.S. Army; Brittain Mallow, Colonel, USA (Ret.); Mike Marks, NCIS (Ret.); Robert McFadden, NCIS (Ret.); Charles Mink, Formerly U.S. Army; Joe Navarro, FBI (Ret.); Torin Nelson, Formerly U.S. Army; Carissa Pastuch, Formerly U.S. Army; William Quinn, Formerly U.S. Army; Ken Robinson, U.S. Army (Ret.); Rolince, Mike, FBI (Ret.); Ed Soyster, Lieutenant General, U.S. Army (Ret.).

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL

JUSTICE AND PEACE,

Washington, DC, June 10, 2015.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR, As deliberations over the FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act continue, I write to express support for an amendment offered by Senators John McCain and Dianne Feinstein that would prohibit all U.S. government agencies and their agents from using torture as an interrogation technique.

The amendment would:

Require all U.S. government agencies (including the CIA) to limit interrogation techniques to those set out in the Army Field Manual;

Require the Army Field Manual be updated regularly and remain available to the public to reflect best interrogation techniques designed to elicit statements without the use or threat of force; and

Require the International Committee of the Red Cross be given access to all detainees.

These provisions are ones that the Committee on International Justice and Peace of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops have long supported in trying to ban the practice of torture by the U.S. government.

The Army Field Manual 2-22.3 prescribes uniform standards for interrogating persons detained by the Department of Defense. A guiding principle of the Field Manual echoes the Golden Rule: "In attempting to determine if a contemplated approach or technique should be considered prohibited, and

therefore should not be included in an interrogation plan, consider . . . if the proposed approach technique were used by the enemy against one of your fellow soldiers, would you believe the soldier had been abused?" (5-76)

The McCain-Feinstein amendment seeks to ensure that Army Field Manual's standard is also the same standard used by other governmental agencies, including the CIA. Adhering to these standards and ensuring access by the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit detainees in international armed conflicts would make a substantial contribution to our nation's efforts to uphold our international obligations under the Geneva Conventions and the Convention Against Torture. The amendment would help restore the moral credibility of the United States.

In Catholic teaching, torture is an intrinsic evil that cannot be justified under any circumstances as it violates the dignity of the human person, both victim and perpetrator, and degrades any society that tolerates it. We urge all Senators to support the McCain-Feinstein amendment that would help to ensure that laws are enacted so that our government does not engage in torture ever again.

Sincerely yours,

MOST REVEREND OSCAR CANTÚ,
*Bishop of Las Cruces, Chair, Committee on
International Justice and Peace.*

PROTECTING U.S. SECURITY UPHOLDING AMERICAN VALUES

The United States detainee interrogation policy can live up to American values and, at the same time, protect our national security. This policy, supported by overwhelmingly bipartisan legislation in 2005, states: "No individual in the custody or under the physical control of the U.S. Government, regardless of nationality or physical location, shall be subject to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment." Such principles can be attained by following the U.S. Army Field Manual on Human Intelligence Collector Operations. We believe these lawful, humane, and effective techniques will produce actionable intelligence while adhering to our founding principles.

To ensure the integrity of this critical process, Congress should conduct effective, real-time oversight on America's intelligence communities. Failure to live up to these internal safeguards adversely affects the nation's security and damages America's reputation in the world.

Richard Armitage, Deputy Secretary of State, 2001-2005; Howard Berman, U.S. Congressman (D-CA), 1983-2013; David Boren, U.S. Senator (D-OK), 1979-1994, Governor of Oklahoma, 1975-1979; Harold Brown, Secretary of Defense, 1977-1981; David Durenberger, U.S. Senator (R-MN), 1978-1995; Lee Hamilton, U.S. Congressman (D-IN), 1965-1999; Gary Hart, U.S. Senator (D-CO), 1975-1987; Rita Hauser, Chair, International Peace Institute, 1992-Present; Carla Hills, U.S. Trade Representative, 1989-1993; Thomas Kean, Governor of New Jersey, 1982-1990, 9/11 Commission Chairman.

Richard C. Leone, Senior Fellow and former President of the Century Foundation; Carl Levin, U.S. Senator (D-MI), 1979-2015; Richard Lugar, U.S. Senator (R-IN), 1977-2013; Robert C. McFarlane, National Security Advisor, 1983-1985; Donald McHenry, Ambassador to the United Nations, 1979-1981; William

Perry, Secretary of Defense, 1994-1997; Charles Robb, U.S. Senator (D-VA), 1989-2001; Governor of Virginia, 1982-1986; Ken Salazar, Secretary of the Interior, 2009-2013, U.S. Senator (D-CO), 2005-2009; George Shultz, Secretary of State, 1982-1989; William H. Taft IV, Deputy Secretary of Defense, 1984-1989.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS, *Washington, DC, June 8, 2015.*

DEAR SENATOR: As you authorize FY16 appropriations for the Department of Defense, please approve language in an amendment to be offered by Senators McCain and Feinstein that would strengthen the prohibition of torture in U.S. law and apply the Army Field Manual interrogation policies and standards to all personnel and facilities operated or controlled by our government.

The National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) opposes the use of torture as a violation of basic human dignity that is incompatible with our beliefs in the sanctity of human life. The use of torture is also inconsistent with American values, undermines our moral standing in the world and may contribute to an environment in which captured U.S. personnel are subjected to torture.

The NAE's position is set forth in "An Evangelical Declaration Against Torture," available at <http://nae.net/an-evangelical-declaration-against-torture/>, and reaffirmed in a recent NAE statement (<http://nae.net/nae-affirms-u-s-army-prohibition-of-torture/>).

While the use of torture is currently prohibited across all government agencies by executive order, this fundamental principle must be enshrined in law, to ensure that no future President may authorize the use of torture.

We are grateful for your leadership and pray that God will guide you as you consider how best to defend our nation.

Sincerely,

LEITH ANDERSON,
President.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, *June 11, 2015.*

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS: As you consider amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act, please support the McCain-Feinstein amendment on torture. The amendment would prohibit torture by requiring the CIA and other agencies to follow the guidelines in the Army Field Manual when conducting interrogations, and by ensuring that the International Committee of the Red Cross is given access to all detainees. The amendment also provides a means to update the Field Manual to reflect the best legal, humane, and effective interrogation techniques.

As Christians we believe that all people are created in the image of God, endowed by our Creator with an inalienable dignity and worth. Torture is a deeply degrading violation of that image and to us it is never morally acceptable. As the most powerful country on earth, we should set an example for humane treatment of prisoners; we should never allow our nation's practices to be used to justify torture.

Passing the McCain-Feinstein amendment would strengthen the legal prohibition against torture and thereby prevent the CIA from ever resuming its torture program. Please support McCain-Feinstein and help

begin to put the CIA's brutal and degrading use of torture behind us.

Sincerely,

JIM WINKLER,
President and General Secretary.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION;
HUMAN RIGHTS; NATIONAL RELIGIOUS CAMPAIGN AGAINST TORTURE; THE CONSTITUTION PROJECT; PHYSICIANS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS; OPEN SOCIETY POLICY CENTER; THE CENTER FOR VICTIMS OF TORTURE

(For Immediate Release: June 9, 2015)

HUMAN RIGHTS GROUPS APPLAUD LEGISLATION REAFFIRMING U.S. PROHIBITION ON TORTURE

On Tuesday, June 9, 2015, Senators McCain, Feinstein, Reed, and Collins introduced legislation to make the U.S. Army Field Manual on Interrogations the standard for all U.S. government interrogations to make sure that the United States never uses torture again. Seven human rights and civil liberties organizations, including the ACLU, the Center for Victims of Torture, The Constitution Project, Human Rights First, the National Religious Campaign Against Torture, the Open Society Policy Center, and Physicians for Human Rights, announced their strong support for the legislation via the joint statement below.

WASHINGTON, DC.—We applaud Senators McCain, Feinstein, Reed and Collins for offering bipartisan legislation to ensure that the United States never uses torture again. Senator McCain's prior legislation (the Detainee Treatment Act) was approved by the Senate in 2005 with strong bipartisan support and was a positive game-changer by mandating among other things that interrogations conducted by all Department of Defense personnel had to follow the U.S. Army Field Manual on Interrogation (the Interrogation Manual). The McCain-Feinstein amendment extends and improves the Detainee Treatment Act by making the Interrogation Manual the standard for all U.S. government interrogations, and by mandating that the Manual be reviewed and updated regularly to insure that it reflects the very best evidence-based interrogation practices and complies with all U.S. legal obligations. The McCain-Feinstein amendment also requires that the International Committee of the Red Cross have access to every prisoner in U.S. custody no matter where or by whom they are held.

We believe that the CIA's "enhanced interrogation" techniques and "black sites" were clearly illegal under the law that existed on 9/11, under the 2005 Detainee Treatment Act and also under the relevant provisions of the 2006 Military Commissions Act. But the overwhelming evidence that has emerged of shocking brutality employed by the CIA notwithstanding these laws—including waterboarding, nudity, stress positions, sleep deprivation, forced rectal feeding, beatings and other abuses—demonstrates that additional protections are still essential. Had the McCain-Feinstein amendment been in place following the 9/11 attacks we believe it would have significantly bolstered other prohibitions on torture and made it far more difficult, if not impossible, for the CIA to establish and operate their torture program. Among other things, the Interrogation Manual explicitly prohibits waterboarding, forced nudity and other forms of torture employed by the CIA and it specifies that only interrogation methods that are expressly described in the Interrogation Manual are permitted. In addition, under the McCain-Feinstein legislation no prisoner could have been

hidden away at CIA “black sites” without access to the Red Cross.

More can and should be done to pursue accountability for past brutal and illegal interrogations and to improve the Interrogation Manual. But the McCain-Feinstein Amendment is a vital and welcome step toward ensuring that the United States never again uses torture.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and by doing so, we can recommit ourselves to the fundamental precept that the United States does not torture—without exception and without equivocation—and ensure that the mistakes of our past are never again repeated in the future.

I ask for a “yes” vote, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to, if they wish, disregard my statement with the exception of the statement by GEN David Petraeus. I don’t know of a military leader who is more respected in America and throughout the world than GEN David Petraeus. I don’t have to remind my colleagues that he was the commander of U.S. forces in Iraq and Afghanistan and Director of the CIA. He arguably has more experience dealing with foreign detainee issues across the U.S. Government than any other American. These are the words of GEN David Petraeus:

I strongly support the extension of the provisions of the U.S. Army Field Manual that currently govern the actions of the U.S. military to all U.S. Government personnel and contractors. Our Nation has paid a high price in recent decades for the information gained by the use of techniques beyond those in the field manual, and in my view, that price far outweighed the value of the information gained through the use of techniques beyond those in the manual.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the words of David Petraeus.

Here is a letter I received this month from former intelligence interrogation professionals, the U.S. military, the CIA, and the FBI. Here is an excerpt from the letter they sent to me this month:

As intelligence and interrogation professionals who have offered our collective voice opposing torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, we strongly encourage you to support the amendment. . . . The interrogation methods that have kept America safe for generations are sophisticated, humane, lawful and produce reliable, actionable intelligence in any interrogation scenario. To promote a return to that respected level of professionalism, there must be a single well-defined standard of conduct—consistent with our values as a na-

tion—across all U.S. agencies to govern the detention and interrogation of people anywhere in U.S. custody.

This is supported by some of our most experienced military leaders. They expressed their views in a letter I received this month, 30 of whom are retired, including a former Commandant of the Marine Corps, former commander of Centcom, former commander and chief of U.S. Army Europe—they wrote the following:

This amendment not only solidifies America’s stance against torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. It also ensures that interrogation methods used by all U.S. personnel are professional and reflect the government’s best practices. In that way, we not only ensure that these interrogations are humane and lawful, but also that they produce reliable intelligence on which we depend if we are to fight and win against the current terrorist threat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from those individuals dated June 9, 2015.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 9, 2015.

DEAR SENATOR: As intelligence and interrogation professionals who have offered our collective voice opposing torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, we strongly encourage you to support the amendment to the 2016 National Defense Authorization Act that solidifies the ban against torture and cruel treatment of detainees in U.S. custody.

While international and domestic law, including the 2005 Detainee Treatment Act, prohibit such cruelty, sadly high-level officials in the Executive Branch exploited loopholes and still authorized torture and cruel treatment. The interrogation methods that have kept America safe for generations are sophisticated, humane, lawful, and produce reliable, actionable intelligence in any interrogation scenario. To promote a return to that respected level of professionalism, there must be a single well-defined standard of conduct—consistent with our values as a nation—across all U.S. agencies to govern the detention and interrogation of people anywhere in U.S. custody.

The amendment would ensure lawful, effective, and humane interrogations of individuals taken into custody by requiring all agencies and departments to comply with the time-tested requirements of the Army Field Manual (“Human Intelligence Collector Operations”). It would also require a review of the Army Field Manual to ensure that best practices and the most recent evidenced-based research on humane interrogation are incorporated. It would also codify existing Department of Defense (DOD) practice of guaranteeing timely notification and access to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) for detainees taken into custody—an important bulwark against abuse.

We strongly urge you to support this legislation to help move our country forward and reaffirm that there is no conflict between adhering to one of our nation’s essential and founding values—respect for inherent human dignity—and our ability to obtain the intelligence we need to protect the nation.

Sincerely,

Frank Anderson, CIA (Ret.); Donald Canestraro, DEA (Ret.); Glenn Carle, CIA

(Ret.); Jack Cloonan, CIA (Ret.); Barry Eisler, Formerly CIA; Eric Fair, Formerly U.S. Army; Mark Fallon, NCIS (Ret.); Charlton Howard, NCIS (Ret.); David Irvine, Brigadier General, U.S. Army (Ret.); Timothy James, NCIS (Ret.); Steve Kleinman, Colonel, USAFR (Ret.); Marcus Lewis, Formerly U.S. Army; Brittain Mallow, Colonel, USA (Ret.); Mike Marks, NCIS (Ret.); Robert McFadden, NCIS (Ret.); Charles Mink, Formerly U.S. Army; Joe Navarro, FBI (Ret.); Torin Nelson, Formerly U.S. Army; Carissa Pastuch, Formerly U.S. Army; William Quinn, Formerly U.S. Army; Ken Robinson, U.S. Army (Ret.); Rolince, Mike, FBI (Ret.); Ed Soyster, Lieutenant General, U.S. Army (Ret.).

Mr. MCCAIN. In a letter this month, the National Association of Evangelicals wrote the following in support of this amendment:

While the use of torture is currently prohibited across all government agencies by executive order, this fundamental principle must be enshrined in law to ensure that no future President may authorize the use of torture.

Again, that is from the National Association of Evangelicals.

The Committee on International Justice and Peace at the United States Conference of the Catholic Bishops wrote the following in support of the amendment:

In Catholic teaching, torture is an intrinsic evil that cannot be justified under any circumstances as it violates the dignity of the human person, both victim and perpetrator, and degrades any society that tolerates it. We urge all Senators to support the McCain-Feinstein amendment that would help to ensure that laws are enacted so that our government does not engage in torture ever again.

I respect the dedication and services of those charged with protecting this country. For 14 years, America’s security professionals in the military, intelligence community, and beyond have lived every day with a dogged determination to protect their fellow Americans. But at the same time, we must continue to insist that the methods we employ in this fight for peace and freedom must always be as right and honorable as the goals and ideals we fight for.

I believe past interrogation policies compromised our values, stained our national honor, and did little practical good. I don’t believe we should have employed such practices in the past, and we should never permit them in the future. This amendment provides greater assurances that never again will the United States follow that dark path of sacrificing our values for our short-term security needs.

I also know that such practices don’t work. I know from personal experience that the abuse of prisoners does not produce good, reliable intelligence. Victims of torture will offer intentionally misleading information if they think their captors will believe it.

I firmly believe that all people, even captured enemies, possess basic human

rights which are protected by international standards often set by America's past leaders. Our enemies act without conscience. We must not. Let's reassert the contrary proposition that it is essential to our success in this war that we ask those who fight it for us to remember at all times that they are defending a sacred ideal of how nations should be governed and should remember this when they conduct their relations with others, even our enemies.

Those of us who give them this duty are obliged by history, by our Nation's highest ideals and the many terrible sacrifices made to protect them, and by our respect for human dignity to make clear that we need not risk our national honor to prevail in this or any war. We need only remember in the worst of times, through the chaos and terror of war, when facing cruelty, suffering, and loss, that we are always Americans and different, stronger, and better than those who would destroy us.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I stand as a very proud cosponsor, along with Senator McCAIN and Senator FEINSTEIN, on this amendment. I particularly wish to commend both Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator McCAIN because they have really been the leaders in this Senate and in this country in expressing our fundamental values when it comes to the techniques we employ for those we detain in combat zones. Both their words and personal example have set an extraordinary standard for us to respond to, and this amendment is typical of what they have done. It would codify the terms of President Obama's Executive order 13491 that applies to the Army Field Manual on interrogations not only for the U.S. military but also for the interrogation of detainees by other U.S. Government agencies.

What I think is so critical to this debate, this amendment, and the service of these two Senators is that the humane treatment standard we set for those who are in our custody also serves to protect our men and women if they fall into the hands of our opponents. We then can say with complete sincerity and complete fidelity that we demand our troops receive humane treatment when in the custody of hostile forces because that is what we do. When we deviate from that standard, we imperil the safety and lives of our men and women in uniform who may fall into hostile hands.

As we adhere to these standards, we are not only setting a very high bar for the treatment of those whom we may hold, but we are innately protecting the safety, health, welfare, and well-being of those who serve in the uniform of the United States, and for that reason in particular, I commend the spon-

sors of this amendment and urge all of my colleagues to support it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank both Senator McCAIN and Senator REED for their remarks. I particularly wish to thank Senator McCAIN, whose life experience, for me, has been a guidepost. I don't know anyone in this body who is more standup—and can sometimes be more stubborn, but this all comes into play as an important thing—and stands for the real, true, major issues this country faces.

I will never forget a conversation I had with him on the plane back from Guantanamo. When he spoke in the Kennedy Caucus Room and used the tap language he learned as a prisoner of war in Vietnam and to see this man, so many years since that time, tap out messages that were meant for prison mates in other cells with such speed and alacrity certainly indicated that this was a very deep impression which was made on his life. I think the fact that he has shared that with others, including me, is very important.

I want Senator McCAIN to know how much I appreciate his work on this and how grateful we are for his service to this country. He has unique courage and unique stamina, and maybe that is just all-American. Again, I thank the Senator from Arizona very much for his work, and the same for Senator REED, the ranking member on this committee. Senator REED is military-American through and through. Having his support has been terrific.

Again, I thank both of them very much. It was a pleasure to work with both of my colleagues, and I hope this passes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for her very kind words and her friendship and leadership. I hope that in return for all of this, she will send back all the water to Arizona that California has stolen from our State. My beloved former colleague, Senator Barry Goldwater, used to say that in Arizona, we had so little water that the trees chased the dogs, so we would like to get the water back from California, and I hope that can be part of the wonderful friendship we have enjoyed now for many years.

I thank the Senator from California.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1889, offered by the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Alexander	Franken	Murray
Ayotte	Gardner	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Paul
Bennet	Grassley	Perdue
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Heitkamp	Portman
Boozman	Heller	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johnson	Schatz
Capito	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Kirk	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cassidy	Leahy	Sullivan
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Thune
Corker	McCain	Tillis
Cruz	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	Menendez	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Enzi	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Flake	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—21

Barrasso	Ernst	McConnell
Blunt	Fischer	Risch
Coats	Graham	Roberts
Cochran	Hatch	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott
Cotton	Lankford	Sessions
Crapo	Lee	Vitter

NOT VOTING—1

Rubio

The amendment (No. 1889) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise for a special request. I just returned from a military trip overseas with four other Members just a matter of minutes ago to find out that the two amendments that I was trying to get pending—and I would really settle for just one of those two. I was not here when all of these UCs were made and the arrangements were put together between the parties.

So I ask the leader on the other side—or the handler on the other side, Senator JACK REED—if he would consider a waiver of his commitment to allow me to bring up one of these to get in the queue.

I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. To the Senator from Oklahoma, we have been trying to move forward on an equal basis in terms of pending amendments. At this juncture, I am not able to agree to make another amendment pending.

There is a possibility that we spoke about, briefly, of including these amendments in the manager's package

or, since it is germane, of trying to arrange for consideration after cloture, along with another germane amendment. So at this point I would not be prepared to—

Mr. INHOFE. Regaining the floor, I would only say to my good friend that as the second ranking member on the Armed Services Committee, I have talked about these for a long time. I tried to do them before I left for 4 days on business. Also, Senator MIKULSKI is my cosponsor on amendment No. 1728.

So I have to make a motion to lay the pending amendment aside for the purpose of consideration of amendment No. 1728.

Mr. REED. Have you made the motion?

Mr. INHOFE. I just did.

Mr. REED. I would object.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay the pending business aside for the purpose of considering the Inhofe-Mikulski commissary amendment No. 1728.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, at this time, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to make a comment, because first, this is something beyond anyone's control. No one could have controlled this. We had four Members who were gone. It couldn't be helped. We were on business.

I have 41 amendments, almost equally divided, Democrat and Republican, on an issue that is probably the most significant issue to the spouses of our kids who are over there, overseas. What it does is that it lets us do an assessment before we close any of the commissaries—not close them but privatize them, instead of privatizing them and then seeing how it works. I think we have a vast majority of people who do support that.

It is something that is offered on a bipartisan basis, and it is something that a lot of people—over 100 organizations are sponsoring this amendment—spoke very strongly in support of and consider this amendment to be the most significant amendment in the everyday lives of our troops. Anyone who travels overseas and travels to these various areas knows that when they go through a commissary, they see—particularly in areas where there are no other opportunities out there—that there is almost no competition. It is something like a club. It is something that the wives, the husbands, the families, and the kids do. They go to the commissary. Taking that away would be taking away a tradition.

Again, the bill doesn't state that it goes away, but it does temporarily privatize five major commissaries. Now, when that happens, you have started the ball rolling. And the bill also

states—and we discussed this in committee—that this gives us time to look and evaluate to see whether we want to privatize them.

So everyone who is on here as a cosponsor has made the statement: Why don't we find out first.

So that is all we want to do—instead of closing or transferring five and then finding out whether we did the right thing, go ahead and have the study and then go ahead and proceed however we think is in the best interest.

So it is a very serious amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 1578

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support my amendment No. 1578, the Military Justice Improvement Act, to ensure that survivors of military sexual assault have access to an unbiased, trained, military judicial system.

Last year, despite the support of 55 Senators, a coalition spanning the entire ideological spectrum, including both the majority and minority leader, our bill to create an independent military justice system free of inherent biases and conflicts of interest within the chain of command was filibustered by this body.

But as we said then: We will not walk away. The brave men and women in uniform who are defending this Nation deserve a vote. That is our duty. It is our oversight role. It is Congress's responsibility to act as if the brave survivors of sexual assault are our sons, our daughters, our husbands, our wives, who are being betrayed by the greatest military on Earth. We owe them that at the very least.

Over the last few years, Congress has forced the military to make many incremental changes to address this crisis. And after two decades of complete failure and lip service to zero tolerance, the military now says, essentially: Trust us this time; we have it.

They misrepresent data to claim that their mission is accomplished, but when you dig below the service of their top lines, you will find that the assault rate is exactly where it was in 2010—an average of 52 cases every single day—and 3 out of 4 servicemember survivors still don't think it is worth the risk of coming forward to report crimes committed against them.

Seventy-five percent don't trust the current system. One in seven victims was assaulted by someone in their chain of command. And in 60 percent of the cases, a supervisor or unit leader is responsible for either sexual harassment or sexual discrimination. This is not the climate our military deserves.

It is no surprise, then, that one in three survivors believes that reporting would hurt their career.

For those who do report, they are more likely than not to experience retaliation. Despite a much touted reform that made retaliation a crime, the DOD made zero progress on improving the 62-percent retaliation rate that we had in 2012.

According to a Human Rights Watch report, the DOD cannot provide a single example of serious disciplinary action taken against those who retaliated against a victim of sexual assault. A sexual assault survivor is 12 times more likely to suffer retaliation than to see their offender get convicted of a sex offense.

In my close review of 107 cases—from the largest domestic military bases and one from each service—in 2013, I found that nearly half of those who did move forward and report ended up dropping out of their cases. Survivors still have little faith in this system. Under any metric the system remains plagued with distrust and does not provide the fair and just process that our men and women in the military deserve.

Simply put, the military has not held up to the standard posed by General Dempsey 1 year ago when he said:

We are on the clock, if you will . . . the President said to us in December, you've got about a year to review this thing . . . and if we haven't been able to demonstrate we are making a difference, you know, then we deserve to be held to the scrutiny and standard.

I urge my colleagues to hold the military to that higher standard. Enough is enough with the spin, with the excuses, and the false promises.

Just yesterday I received a letter from a survivor of military sexual assault who is serving Active Duty. She says:

The reason I am writing on her behalf is because I fear she will be retaliated against for speaking out.

While the military is on the Hill lobbying Senators not to support the Military Justice Improvement Act (MJIA), I am asking you to take a stand with survivors and their families.

These military lobbyists have good intentions; however, I am doubtful any of them will represent my perspective.

I have experienced the anguish of a child who has been raped by another servicemember, a fellow brother-in-arms whom she should have been able to trust.

Please support the Military Justice Improvement Act, a commonsense law that significantly improves the military justice system. Our military sons and daughters who survive these heinous crimes carry high rates of post-traumatic stress disorder and suicide. I believe that if the MJIA is passed, it could save lives and will positively affect the lives of survivors, both victims and their families.

No one should have to worry about retaliation from their chain of command when they report these crimes. Retaliation happens so often that a majority of these assaults go unreported. Every military victim of sexual assault deserves due process, professional

treatment by a trained military individual, and equal opportunity to seek and receive justice.

Our military has promised improvement and has had adequate time in which to improve, but the numbers show that the military has failed to live up to its promise.

The Department of Defense has admitted that it made no progress since 2012. It is time for the chain of command to be removed from decision-making in sexual assault cases and replaced by those trained, non-biased military personnel, educated in the law and experienced in handling sexual assault cases.

Further, MJIA specifically carves out sexual assault and other serious crimes, with the remainder of military crimes being left in the chain of command.

Please hold the military to a higher standard by voting yes to an unbiased military system, promoted in MJIA.

We have to listen to our victims, our survivors, the men and women who give their lives to this country, who will sacrifice anything for this country. America's military, if they do these reforms, will have fewer dangerous criminals and far more heroes. The brave men and women we send to war to keep us safe deserve nothing less than a justice system equal to their sacrifice. By listening to the victims, we can deliver that.

I urge everyone here to listen to our brave survivors, support our bill, and do the right thing.

I would now like to yield the floor to one of the authors of the Military Justice Improvement Act, the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank Senator GILLIBRAND for her leadership in this area over a long period of time, and I add my voice to the support of her amendment. She has been a great leader on the issue. As you can see, she has a lot of passion in her dogged pursuit of justice.

Last year, when I spoke in favor of this measure, I made the point this was not a new issue that required further study or incremental reforms. We had been hearing promises for years and years that there would be zero tolerance and a real crackdown on military sexual assault. Last year, the National Defense Authorization Act included a lot of commonsense reforms, but it did not include any fundamental reform of the military justice system. We were told to give these new adjustments to the current system a chance to work and come back next year.

At the time, I made the point that we had already tried working within the current system to no avail. I am not one to advocate for major sweeping reform if less will address the problem, but what we have been doing has not worked.

Last year, after Congress passed the package of more modest reforms but not our Military Justice Improvement Act amendment, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, said: "We have been given about a year to demonstrate both that we will treat

this with the urgency it deserves and that we can turn the trend lines in a more positive direction." He made clear that if we didn't see real progress, he wouldn't stand in the way of more major reforms. Well, we have not seen significant movement.

In terms of the number of sexual assault cases and the shocking rate of retaliation against those who report, we simply don't see progress. That is probably because the current system is part of the problem. The fact that victims of sexual assault cannot turn to an independent system to get justice, combined with the very real fear of retaliation, acts as a terrible deterrent to reporting sexual assault. If sexual assault cases are not reported, they then cannot be prosecuted. If sexual assault isn't prosecuted, it leads to predators remaining in the military and a perception that this sort of activity is going to be tolerated.

By allowing this situation to continue, we are putting at risk the men and women who have volunteered to place their lives on the line. We are also seriously damaging military morale and readiness.

Taking prosecutions out of the hands of commanders and giving them to professional prosecutors who are independent of the chain of command will help ensure impartial justice for the men and women of our Armed Forces. This would in no way take away the ability of commanders to punish troops under their command for military infractions. Commanders also can and should be held accountable for the climate under their command, but the point here is the sexual assault is a law enforcement matter, not a military one.

This isn't some reform that came out of the blue either. We have an advisory committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense himself which came out in support of reforms. On September 27, 2013, the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services—which goes by the acronym DACOWITS—voted overwhelmingly in support of each of the components of the Military Justice Improvement Act amendment.

DACOWITS was created way back in 1951 by then-Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall. The committee is composed of civilian and retired military men and women who are appointed by the Secretary of Defense to provide advice and recommendations on matters and policies relating to the recruitment and retention, treatment, employment, integration, and well-being of highly qualified professional women in the Armed Forces. Historically, this committee's recommendations have been very instrumental in effecting changes to laws and policies pertaining to military women.

The bottom line is, this isn't some advocacy group or fly-by-night panel. It is a longstanding advisory com-

mittee handpicked by the Secretary of Defense and it supports the substance of our amendment to a tee.

We have tried reforming the current system and it didn't work. When we are talking about something as serious and life-altering as sexual assault, we cannot afford to wait any longer. So I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this amendment.

As we approach this from the outside, it gives me an opportunity to reiterate what I see so wrong in so many bureaucracies. We are always promised change, but as I have looked back over a couple or three decades of this problem of the culture of the various bureaucracies, nothing really happens from within. It has to happen from without. In this particular case of national defense being the No. 1 responsibility of the Federal Government, this change has to happen from without because it hasn't happened from within, regardless of the promises.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, last year we gathered here to debate this issue, and I think it is really important to point out that everyone in this body has the same heart when it comes to this issue; that is, that we want to make sure victims who are assaulted in our military are protected and supported, that the system is highly trained and professional, and that perpetrators have due process but also are put in prison if the system finds them guilty. This difference is an honest policy difference over which system would better accomplish those goals.

Now, we have agreed on so much, I think it is important to point out the work the Congress has done reforming sexual assault in the military. Last year, we had over 26 different provisions that were enacted into law. This year, we haven't stopped. We have 13 more provisions in this piece of legislation. There is simply a disagreement over which system would protect victims better.

There have been historic reforms, such as commanders having been stripped from their ability to overturn convictions. They are being held accountable under rigorous new standards and oversight. Every victim who reports now gets their own independent lawyer to protect their rights and fight for their interests. It is now a crime for any member to retaliate against a victim who reports a sexual assault. The "good soldier" defense has been removed, along with dozens and dozens more.

Yes, there were panels that looked at this issue, as the one just referenced by my colleague from Iowa—DACOWITS. They heard no testimony from expert witnesses. They heard a brief presentation by myself and Senator GILLIBRAND, but they didn't spend days on

it; whereas, the system's response panel, put in place by this Congress, spent weeks and weeks examining this and heard from dozens and dozens of witnesses from every side of the issue. By the way, this panel was made up of a majority of civilians—the majority of them women—and it voted overwhelmingly to reject an approach that removes commanders from their responsibility and their duties and, therefore, their accountability.

One of the members of this Commission, the woman who runs the victims center at the Department of Justice for the entire country, said: "I went into this thinking Senator GILLIBRAND's legislation made sense . . . but when you hear the facts, it doesn't hold up."

She was joined by the liberal icon—a feminist icon—Elizabeth Holtzman, who was the author of the rape shield statute in the Congress when she served as a Representative. She, too, spoke out, saying that once she understood the system and understood the facts, she agreed that keeping commanders accountable was crucial.

Now, have we seen progress? It is one thing to have anecdotal information, it is another to have a statistically valid survey. The same survey that shows retaliation is still a stubborn problem that we can't give up on also shows some very important data. So if you are going to argue retaliation is a continuing problem, you are relying on the very same survey that tells us the following: incidents are down—that is meaningful progress—dropping 29 percent just in the last 2 years. Reporting continues to go up, which was our stated goal as we began these reforms. Reports are up 70 percent from 2012. Back in 2012, only 1 in 10 victims were reporting. We have that down to one in four. That is not spin, that is fact. These victims are coming forward because they have renewed confidence they will have support, they will get good information, and that the system is not stacked against them.

Increased reporting occurred in all categories. The number of unrestricted reports are up, restricted reports are up, and, importantly, the number of reports that victims converted from restricted to unrestricted.

Furthermore, they went around the country and did focus groups with victims. This was RAND. This wasn't the military, this wasn't the Department of Justice, this was the RAND Corporation—well known for its ability to do statistical information—that went around the country and did focus groups—11 different focus groups—on different bases with just victims and asked victims to come forward and participate in the survey.

In that survey—and this is really important—82 percent agreed their unit commander supported them, 73 percent were satisfied with their unit commander's response, and 73 percent said

they would recommend others report if they were a victim of sexual assault.

And this is really important: The Gillibrand amendment does nothing to combat retaliation. The recent RAND survey found that the majority of reported retaliation does not come from commanders; it comes from peers. This is a cultural problem we have to get after, and certainly I would stand ready to work with Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator GRASSLEY, and all of my colleagues to look to see what we have to do to get at this peer-to-peer retaliation, which is the vast majority of what was reported.

Finally, the Gillibrand amendment actually weakens punishment for the crime of retaliation. By moving retaliation from article 92 to article 93 of the UCMJ, it would actually reduce the maximum punishment for this crime, and it, finally, prohibits the resources necessary to get at this problem. The amendment says we cannot add any additional resources to get after this.

Historic reforms have been made. They are working, based on data. Talking to dozens and dozens of prosecutors and untold victims, as a former sex crimes prosecutor who cares about nothing more than taking care of victims and making sure they have due process and are respected and deferred to, I must urge this body to reject the Gillibrand approach, which removes commanders from being held accountable where they must be held accountable.

Mr. President, I urge a "no" vote on the Gillibrand amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I wish to respond to the last point and the first point that my colleague made that somehow this reform makes commanders less responsible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that all time for debate has expired.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I ask unanimous consent to continue the debate for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, this statement that somehow commanders are removed from responsibility and that we are not keeping commanders responsible, that couldn't be further from the truth. Today, commanders are the only ones responsible for good order and discipline at every level. The unit commander is responsible for order and discipline. Every aspect of the chain of command is responsible. It is their jobs to train troops, to maintain good order and discipline, to prevent rapes and crimes from being committed under their command, and to punish retaliation. They have failed in that duty.

In this chain of command, 97 percent of commanders are responsible and do

not have the convening authority we would like to give to prosecutors—97 percent, their job doesn't change one iota.

So to say you are making commanders less responsible is a false statement that has no bearing. In fact, they are 100 percent responsible for good order and discipline, for training their troops, to prevent these rapes, and to prosecute retaliation. In 1 year—they have been on notice for years about this, 25 years, and we have this zero tolerance. They are super on notice now—in 1 year, not one prosecution of retaliation.

This guy can prosecute retaliation under article 15. This guy can do something about retaliation. This guy, this guy, this guy. Only 3 percent have the right to convening authority, and that 3 percent needs to be moved to someone who is actually a lawyer, who is trained, who knows how to weigh evidence and can make the right decision, and that is not what is happening today.

So right now this supervisor and unit leader—in 60 percent of the cases where there is alleged gender discrimination or sexual harassment, it is the unit leader. One in seven of the alleged rapists is one of these commanders—chain of command.

There is a perspective by a survivor that this chain of command "does not have my back." So I would like to give it to another chain of command—senior military prosecutors—to make this decision, so her perspective can be: Someone has my back. This chain of command may well be tainted for her if her unit commander is harassing her and her rapist is in the chain of command. We need to professionalize the system.

We are trying to make the military the best prosecutorial system in the world, and they can do this mission. We need to give them the tools, and having this current status quo—the status quo that has been in charge of no retaliation and no rape for 25 years—is failing. To have the same rate of retaliation we had 2 years ago when the commanders said: You must trust us to do this—every one of these commanders does not have convening authority, but every one of these commanders could have stopped retaliation.

When you say it is just peer-to-peer, it is dishonest. Thirty percent of the cases of retaliation are administrative, 30 percent of the cases are professional. Only a commander can administer administrative or professional retaliation.

This culture must change, and if Congress doesn't take their responsibility to hold the Department of Defense accountable, no one will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the fiscal year 2015 NDAA passed last year included 34 new provisions dealing with sexual assault. Commanders have barely had time to implement these provisions, let alone assess their effectiveness.

The fiscal year 2014 NDAA included more than 50 individual provisions, the most comprehensive set of changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice since 1968.

Cumulative, the last three NDAs included 71 sections of law containing more than 100 unique requirements, including 16 congressional reporting requirements. This year's bill builds on that progress with 12 military justice provisions, including every proposal that was offered by Senator GILLIBRAND during the committee's markup of this legislation.

It is true that sexual assaults have been reduced. That is a fact. That is a fact. So to somehow allege that nothing has been done—her proposal is rejected by literally every member of the military whom I know who has years of experience.

We cannot remove the commanding officer from the chain of command, and that is what Senator GILLIBRAND's amendment and effort has been—to remove the commanding officer from responsibility—and I will steadfastly oppose it.

I hope that at some point the Senator from New York would acknowledge that we took in this bill every provision that she offered during the markup of the legislation.

So with respect and appreciation for Senator GILLIBRAND's passion and for her dedication on this issue, I respectfully disagree and urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote on the substitute amendment No. 1463 be waived; further, that there be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to each vote in the 2:15 p.m. series.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:37 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 1549

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 1549, offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. McCAIN, for the Senator from Iowa, Mrs. ERNST.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Will the Chair notify me after 30 seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mrs. ERNST. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Colleagues, just a few brief points on this amendment.

We are just providing the administration the option to get arms directly to the Kurds. The Kurds currently are providing refuge to over 1.6 million refugees from Iraq and Syria. Many of them are ethnic and religious minorities, such as Christians.

The Peshmerga have shown the ability to be effective on the battlefield against ISIS. This Ernst-Boxer amendment is a companion bill to the one presented by Representatives ROYCE and ENGEL in the House.

I urge my colleague to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 30 seconds.

Mrs. ERNST. I yield to Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I am very proud to team up with the good Senator because this is a very modest amendment that just puts us in line with our colleagues: the United Kingdom, Germany, Turkey, Canada, France, Australia, and others who already are directly arming the Kurds.

Now, the President's policy that I absolutely support is we are going to take this fight to ISIS, but we are not going to have combat boots on the ground; we are going to help strategically with airstrikes.

These are the people who are taking it day after day—deaths and blood and wounds. The least we can do is support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I oppose the Ernst amendment. It would undermine what has been the fundamental policy of the United States going back into the last administration: a unified, sovereign Iraq. This amendment would send a signal to the Iraqis that we are supporting the Kurds directly, not supporting a unified, sovereign Iraq. That would complicate our efforts against ISIL. It would complicate our efforts in the region.

Also, it is the situation now where the effort is shifting into Anbar Province in the Sunni areas. We are supporting the Kurds. In fact, Prime Minister Barzani was here a few weeks ago and indicated that he was at least accepting of the arrangements, which I think were appropriate.

If this amendment passes, the perception will be that the United States is now not trying to unify or help the Iraqis unify but put a degree of separation between an autonomy, and that would be a mistake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the amendment.

Mrs. ERNST. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Peters
Booker	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Boxer	Heinrich	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Schatz
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Stabenow
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Vitter
Ernst	Moran	Wyden

NAYS—45

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Perdue
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Reid
Cantwell	Kaine	Sanders
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Sessions
Casey	Leahy	Shaheen
Cochran	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Corker	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1578

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to

a vote on amendment No. 1578, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, for the Senator from New York, Mrs. GILLIBRAND.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote yes on this strongly bipartisan amendment. The central question is simple—whether this Congress is doing everything we can to protect members of our military. The metric of success is not how many reforms we have passed; it is whether we have passed all of the reforms that are necessary to make the difference. If you think the assault rate that is exactly where it was in 2010 is unacceptable, then vote yes. Some 20,000 sexual assaults, rapes, and unwanted sexual contact in 1 year alone is unacceptable. If you think an average of 52 cases every single day is unacceptable, then vote yes. If you think it is unacceptable that three out of four servicemembers still don't feel it is worth the risk of reporting, then vote yes. If you think that zero progress on retaliation isn't good enough, then vote yes. If you think a sexual assault survivor being 12 times more likely to suffer retaliation than see their offender get convicted for a sex offense, then vote yes.

Let's do the right thing. Let's take action and stop the assaults, stop the retaliation, and build trust and professionalize our military justice system.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I strongly oppose this effort. If you care about our military commanders, listen to them. Every one of them opposes this. If my colleagues believe that the military legal community knows what they are talking about, listen to them. Every JAG of every service opposes this. A 29-percent decrease in sexual assault incidents, a 70-percent increase in reporting. Senator McCASKILL, Senator AYOTTE, Senator FISCHER, and many others, along with Senator REED—we have reformed the military justice system in an appropriate manner. But here is what we should never allow to happen:

Commander, last night there was an alleged rape in the barracks.

Oh, I don't care about that anymore; send that over to the lawyers.

Let's never let that happen. Never let a commander avoid responsibility for what happens in their unit. It is their job to make sure we have good order and discipline. Don't let them off the hook. Reinforce good commanders and fire bad ones. Do not disenfranchise the best military leadership in the history of the world. And that is exactly what this does. We will solve the sexual assault problem. We are not going to dismantle the infrastructure that has given us the finest military in the history of mankind. That is why every-

body who knows what they are talking about opposes this.

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 211 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Franken	Murkowski
Bennet	Gardner	Murphy
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Murray
Booker	Grassley	Paul
Boxer	Heinrich	Peters
Brown	Heitkamp	Reid
Cantwell	Heller	Sanders
Cardin	Hirono	Schatz
Casey	Kirk	Schumer
Collins	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Coons	Leahy	Stabenow
Cruz	Markey	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Vitter
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Enzi	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Moran	

NAYS—49

Alexander	Flake	Reed
Ayotte	Graham	Risch
Barrasso	Hatch	Roberts
Blunt	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Isakson	Scott
Capito	Johnson	Sessions
Carper	Kaine	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sullivan
Coats	Lankford	Tester
Cochran	Lee	Tillis
Corker	Manchin	Toomey
Cornyn	McCain	Warner
Cotton	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Crapo	Nelson	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—1

Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on amendment No. 1463, offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote on whether we will accept the budget gimmicks used by the Senate majority to pay for defense spending priorities, or reject those efforts in favor of a meaningful budget deal that protects both defense and discretionary spending. After more than 2 weeks of consideration, and votes on fewer than a dozen of the over 550 amendments that have been filed, I am disappointed by the majority leader's

decision to vote to cut off debate on the pending Defense authorization bill. This bill deserves thorough consideration. It has not received that.

Even worse, little progress has been made in approving amendments through managers' packages. Less than two dozen amendments have been approved by unanimous consent. Even in years when this bill has been most troubled, we have been able to clear noncontroversial amendments on both sides in significantly greater numbers, to improve the underlying authorization. But this year, that has not happened. So when asked if we should cut off debate, my answer is a clear "no." Debate over what should or should not be in this bill is not yet close to over.

It is too bad, because this bill includes many provisions that I support to promote our national interests, provide support to our military personnel, and reaffirm our commitment to partners abroad. As the bill's managers have both noted time and again, this Defense authorization bill increases readiness, keeps faith with servicemembers and their families, and invests in game-changing technology.

As in past years, however, I am concerned that this year's Defense authorization bill includes several ill-advised provisions that would make it even harder to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay. It imposes unnecessary new restrictions on transferring detainees to foreign countries—despite the steep cost of holding detainees at Guantanamo. And even though military commission proceedings still have barely gotten off the ground—14 years after September 11—it provides no realistic path for transferring detainees to the United States for trial in Article III courts. As long as the detention facility at Guantanamo remains open, it will continue to serve as a recruitment tool for terrorists and tarnish America's role as a champion of human rights. Closing Guantanamo is the morally and fiscally responsible thing to do, and I strongly oppose the provisions in this bill that needlessly restrict detainee transfers out of that facility.

But perhaps the biggest flaw of this bill is that it yet again relies on and expands the Overseas Contingency Operations fund to avoid sequestration caps. The intention of this fund, which I have repeatedly stated should be done away with, has been severely distorted since its inception. We cannot continue to put our national defense on a credit card while asking working families to take responsibility for these costs. I support eliminating sequestration and believe it never should have been put in place, but simply ignoring its cap for defense spending by putting it in this off-books account doesn't get us any closer to that reality. We need a real solution to rid ourselves of sequestration, not one that relies on gimmicks

while leaving military families, and low- and middle-class families, as well as our veterans, behind.

The Senate needs to fully consider this bill. The annual Defense authorization is an important bill. It is also a comprehensive bill that authorizes over \$½ trillion in defense spending, including pay and benefits, acquisition programs, and initiatives to protect our national security. It should be fully vetted before debate is ended. We owe it to the American people. I will oppose cloture on this substitute amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield back the time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the McCain amendment No. 1463 to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John McCain, Richard C. Shelby, Jeff Flake, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Jeff Sessions, Shelley Moore Capito, Lamar Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Joni Ernst, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Kelly Ayotte, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1463, offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, to H.R. 1735, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Blumenthal	Boxer
Ayotte	Blunt	Burr
Barrasso	Booker	Cantwell
Bennet	Boozman	Capito

Cardin	Heitkamp	Portman
Carper	Heller	Reed
Cassidy	Hirono	Risch
Coats	Hoeven	Roberts
Cochran	Inhofe	Rounds
Collins	Isakson	Sasse
Coons	Johnson	Schatz
Corker	Kaine	Schumer
Cornyn	King	Scott
Cotton	Kirk	Sessions
Crapo	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Daines	Lankford	Shelby
Donnelly	Lee	Stabenow
Durbin	McCain	Sullivan
Enzi	McCaskill	Tester
Ernst	McConnell	Thune
Feinstein	Menendez	Tillis
Fischer	Moran	Toomey
Flake	Murkowski	Udall
Gardner	Murphy	Vitter
Graham	Murray	Warner
Grassley	Nelson	Whitehouse
Hatch	Perdue	Wicker
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—15

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Paul
Brown	Leahy	Reid
Casey	Manchin	Sanders
Cruz	Markey	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Mikulski	Rubio
----------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 15.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 1456

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I call for the regular order with respect to the McCain amendment No. 1456.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1911 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1456

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I call up the Hatch amendment No. 1911, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 1911 to amendment No. 1456.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a report on the Department of Defense definition of and policy regarding software sustainment)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEFINITION OF AND POLICY REGARDING SOFTWARE SUSTAINMENT.

(a) REPORT ON ASSESSMENT OF DEFINITION AND POLICY.—Not later than March 15, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the

President pro tempore of the Senate a report setting forth an assessment, obtained by the Secretary for purposes of the report, on the definition used by the Department of Defense for and the policy of the Department regarding software maintenance, particularly with respect to the totality of the term “software sustainment” in the definition of “depot-level maintenance and repair” under section 2460 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall be conducted by a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), or another appropriate independent entity with expertise in matters described in subsection (a), selected by the Secretary for purposes of the assessment.

(c) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall address, with respect to software and weapon systems of the Department of Defense (including space systems), each of the following:

(A) Fiscal ramifications of current programs with regard to the size, scope, and cost of software to the program's overall budget, including embedded and support software, percentage of weapon systems' functionality controlled by software, and reliance on proprietary data, processes, and components.

(B) Legal status of the Department in regards to adhering to section 2464(a)(1) of such title with respect to ensuring a ready and controlled source of maintenance and sustainment on software for its weapon systems.

(C) Operational risks and reduction to materiel readiness of current Department weapon systems related to software costs, delays, re-work, integration and functional testing, defects, and documentation errors.

(D) Other matters as identified by the Secretary.

(2) ADDITIONAL MATTERS.—For each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall include review and analysis regarding sole-source contracts, range of competition, rights in technical data, public and private capabilities, integration lab initial costs and sustaining operations, and total obligation authority costs of software, disaggregated by armed service, for the Department.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide the independent entity described in subsection (b) with timely access to appropriate information, data, resources, and analysis so that the entity may conduct a thorough and independent assessment as required under such subsection.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vitter amendment No. 1473 be further modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as further modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit the retirement of Army combat units, and to provide an offset)

On page 38, line 12, insert after “FIGHTER AIRCRAFT” the following: “AND ARMY COMBAT UNITS”.

On page 43, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(e) MINIMUM NUMBER OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.—Section 3062 of title 10,

United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e)(1) Effective October 1, 2015, the Secretary of the Army shall maintain the following:

“(A) A total number of brigade combat teams for the regular and reserve components of the Army of not fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

“(B) A total number of brigade combat teams for the Army National Guard of not fewer than 28 brigade combat teams.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘brigade combat team’ means any unit that consists of—

“(A) an arms branch maneuver brigade;

“(B) its assigned support units; and

“(C) its assigned fire teams”.

(f) REDUCTION OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.—

(1) PRESERVATION OF TEAMS.—The Secretary of the Army shall give priority to maintaining 32 brigade combat teams for the Army as required by subsection (e)(1) of section 3062 of title 10 United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section), and shall carry out such priority as funding or appropriations become available to maintain such war fighting capability.

(2) REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (e)(1) of section 3062 of title 10 United States Code (as so amended), or paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary may, after October 1, 2015, reduce the number of brigade combat teams of the Army to fewer than 32 brigade combat teams, or reduce the number of brigade combat teams of the National Guard to fewer than 28 brigade combat teams, upon the latest of the following:

(A) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report required by paragraph (3).

(B) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the reduction of Army brigade combat teams will not increase the operational risk of meeting the National Defense Strategy.

(C) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(i) in the case of a reduction in the number of brigade combat teams of the Army to fewer than 32 brigade combat teams, funding or appropriations are not adequate to sustain 32 brigade combat teams for the regular Army; or

(ii) in the case of a reduction in the number of brigade combat teams of the Army National Guard to fewer than 28 brigade combat teams, funding or appropriations are not adequate to sustain 28 brigade combat teams for the National Guard.

(3) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(A) The rationale for any proposed reduction of the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as so amended), and an operational analysis of the total strength of the Army that demonstrates performance of the designated mission at an equal or greater level of effectiveness as the personnel of the Army so reduced.

(B) An assessment of the implications for the Army, the Army National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve of the force mix ratio of Army troop strengths and combat units after such reduction.

(C) Such other matters relating to the reduction of the total strength of the Army as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(g) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At least 90 days before the date on which the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, is reduced below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section), the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with (where applicable) the Director of the Army National Guard or Chief of the Army Reserve, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the reduction.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A list of each major combat unit of the Army that will remain after the reduction, organized by division and enumerated down to the brigade combat team-level or its equivalent, including for each such brigade combat team—

(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

(B) A list of each brigade combat team proposed for disestablishment, including for each such unit—

(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

(C) A list of each unit affected by a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B) and a description of how such unit is affected.

(D) For each military installation and unit listed under subparagraph (B)(ii), a description of changes, if any, to the designed operational capability (DOC) statement of the unit as a result of a proposed disestablishment.

(E) A description of any anticipated changes in manpower authorizations as a result of a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B).

(h) REPORT MANNING OF BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS AT ACHIEVEMENT OF ARMY ACTIVE END-STRENGTH.—Upon the achievement of the end strength for active duty personnel of the Army specified in section 401(1), the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the current manning of each brigade combat team of the Army.

(i) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section should be construed to supersede Army manning of brigade combat teams at designated levels.

(j) ANNUAL PAY INCREASES.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PAY INCREASES.—It is the sense of Congress that, if the President exercises the authority under section 1009(e) of title 37, United States Code, with respect to the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services—

(A) the adjustment in the rates of basic pay for each statutory pay system under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, should be 0.5 percentage points less than the percentage adjustment in the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; and

(B) the President should not adjust, under the authority under section 5303(b) of title 5, United States Code, the rates of basic pay for a statutory pay system by a percentage that is greater than the percentage described in subparagraph (A).

(2) ADJUSTMENT TO RATES OF PAY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.—

(A) STATUTORY PAY SYSTEMS.—The adjustment in rates of basic pay for employees under the statutory pay systems (as defined in section 5302 of title 5, United States Code)

that takes effect in 2016 under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, shall be a decrease of 1.0 percent, and such adjustments shall be effective as of the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2016.

(B) PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES.—The adjustment in rates of basic pay for the statutory pay systems that take place in 2016 under sections 5344 and 5348 of title 5, United States Code, shall be equal to the percentage decrease received by employees in the same location whose rates of basic pay are adjusted pursuant to the statutory pay systems under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and 5304 of title 5, United States Code. Prevailing rate employees at locations where there are no employees whose pay is decreased pursuant to sections 5303 and 5304 of title 5, United States Code, and prevailing rate employees described in section 5343(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code, shall be considered to be located in the pay locality designated as “Rest of US” pursuant to section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of this subparagraph.

(3) ADJUSTMENT TO RATES OF PAY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017.—

(A) STATUTORY PAY SYSTEMS.—The adjustment in rates of basic pay for employees under the statutory pay systems (as defined in section 5302 of title 5, United States Code) that takes effect in 2017 under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, shall be a decrease of 1.0 percent, and such adjustments shall be effective as of the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2017.

(B) PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES.—The adjustment in rates of basic pay for the statutory pay systems that take place in 2017 under sections 5344 and 5348 of title 5, United States Code, shall be equal to the percentage decrease received by employees in the same location whose rates of basic pay are adjusted pursuant to the statutory pay systems under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and 5304 of title 5, United States Code. Prevailing rate employees at locations where there are no employees whose pay is decreased pursuant to sections 5303 and 5304 of title 5, United States Code, and prevailing rate employees described in section 5343(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code, shall be considered to be located in the pay locality designated as “Rest of US” pursuant to section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of this subparagraph.

(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON USE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE.—It is the sense of Congress that amounts available to the Government by reason of the reductions in adjustments to rates of pay for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 by reason of paragraphs (2) and (3) should be used to sustain a total number of brigade combat teams for the regular and reserve components of the Army of not fewer than 32 brigade combat teams, and a total number of brigade combat teams for the Army National Guard of not fewer than 28 brigade combat teams, during fiscal years 2016 and 2017 as required by subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section).

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote in relation to the Vitter amendment at 5 p.m., with the time equally divided in the usual form and no second-degrees prior to the vote. I further ask that Senator LEE or his designee be recognized to withdraw his amendment

No. 1687 prior to the vote on the Vitter amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1687

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lee amendment No. 1687 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1889

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this morning I voted against the Feinstein-McCain amendment No. 1889 because I believe it represents shortsighted national security policy.

The central provision of this amendment would limit the interrogation of detainees by any U.S. Government employee or agent to techniques that are listed in the publicly available Army Field Manual on human intelligence collection (FM 2-22.3), essentially codifying a portion of Executive Order No. 13491, issued by President Obama on January 22, 2009. Due to the wide public availability of this manual, this policy enables our enemies to study and dissect the methods we use to try to elicit sensitive information from them, giving them the opportunity to train against these techniques and prepare for them.

Quite simply, the effect of this policy is to hand our entire interrogation playbook to groups such as the self-declared Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, "ISIL," Al Qaeda, and the Taliban, which is a profound mistake. Moreover, this limitation is unnecessary, because Congress has already taken action to prohibit interrogation or other treatment of detainees that is "cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment" by enacting the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005.

In the past, other interrogation techniques that were not publicly disclosed to our enemies, known as enhanced interrogation techniques, proved their worth in numerous instances. In the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, these enhanced techniques were deemed necessary for use with certain hardened Al Qaeda leaders and operatives who possessed valuable intelligence that could save American lives, including knowledge of planned attacks against our Nation. There is strong evidence to believe that EITs, in desperate situations, helped protect our country from terrorist attacks. In addition, intelligence obtained through these interrogations helped locate Osama bin Laden and enabled the operation to kill or capture him in Abbottabad, Pakistan, on May 2, 2011. The Obama administration cannot deny that intelligence gleaned through the use of enhanced techniques played a role in tracking down bin Laden.

In recent months, the threat of terrorism has been increasing in both intensity and complexity. The rise of the terrorist army of ISIL makes this a challenging time in the fight against terrorism. While it is clear that President Obama has no intention of authorizing the use of enhanced interrogation techniques while he is President, this amendment would unwisely and tightly restrict the tools available to future Presidents to protect this country. I cannot support such a policy.

WORKING ACROSS THE AISLE

Mr. President, for the past several weeks we have been debating the National Defense Authorization Act, which performs one of our most important and significant functions, which is to make sure the people who fight our Nation's wars have the resources they need in order to do the job and to keep the American people safe.

This bill that started in the Armed Services Committee passed out overwhelmingly, and that is because this is not or should not be a partisan issue. Our duty to protect our troops so they can protect us should be a no-brainer. You would think partisan politics would be the furthest thing from this debate.

I am glad the Senate has now taken a big step forward to help move this legislation along, but I have to admit there are some ominous signs on the horizon. Initially, Senate Democrats on the Armed Services Committee threatened to block this bill in the committee unless there was some deal cut on spending. That is troubling, although I am grateful that only four Democrats voted against this bill in the committee. Then there is some suggestion from the President of the United States that he might consider vetoing this legislation. Why? Because he disagrees with some of the content of this legislation? Well, no. The reason he threatened to veto it is because he

said we haven't agreed to his demands to increase spending—by the way, spending money we don't have, adding to our national debt.

It concerns me a great deal when something that should enjoy broad bipartisan support, such as our national defense, somehow becomes a potential hostage to take in the spending wars here in Washington, DC.

Now we have learned that the strategy among our Democratic friends is not to block this bill. Candidly, I think that is because they realized they didn't have the votes to do it, and it would have been a momentous decision if they had blocked it for some extraneous reason. But now we are told that the next bill we turn to, which will probably be the Defense appropriations bill—that our friends across the aisle are threatening to block that in another continuing effort to do what they call prepare for their filibuster summer.

The great thing about our friends across the aisle is that you don't have to wonder necessarily what they are planning to do; all you have to do is read the newspapers because they will tell you. There, Senator SCHUMER, one of the senior Democrats in leadership, said they plan to block every appropriations bill until they get a negotiated deal to raise spending limits that have been in effect since 2011.

Well, I have to think this is why the minority leader, the Senator from Nevada, initially when we were starting debate on this bill, suggested it would be a waste of time. I can't think of any other reason why he would say debating and voting on and passing the Defense authorization bill would be a waste of time unless there was some implicit threat there that it would never actually see the light of day.

But there has been a casualty along the way. You will remember that last Thursday we had a vote on a bill that would effect commonsense improvements in our cyber security at a time when more and more Americans are undergoing cyber attacks. Of course, these take different forms, but many nation states have active cyber attack efforts against our intellectual property—let's say the people who have labored long and hard and make big investments in weapons systems and airplanes and the like. Well, our adversaries are actively trying to steal the design information so they can copy that, of course at a much cheaper cost, and they can learn what the capabilities are of our weapons systems and our airplanes.

But other cyber attacks are more straightforward. It is just crime. It is stealing people's identity. It is stealing their money. It is stealing their resources. There are criminal networks all around the world that are actively engaged in trying to steal from the American people online.

So you would have thought that this amendment, dealing as it did with cyber security—that a good place to park this would have been on the Defense authorization bill, as important a role as cyber security plays in our national security. Of course, the purpose was to help the government and private businesses work together to protect Americans' personal information and their privacy, which is a pretty straightforward goal. Protecting the personal information of the American people is very important. And it was noncontroversial. This particular bill that was offered as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill passed out of the Senate Intelligence Committee 14 to 1. But since this is filibuster summer, the minority leader, Senator REID, decided the Democrats were going to vote as a group to block that amendment.

Not even 24 hours later, though—their timing could not have been worse—the need for this critical legislation became even more urgent. On Friday—1 day after the Democratic leader urged his colleagues to block this important cyber security measure—media reports began confirming that hackers had accessed government networks and obtained incredibly sensitive background information used for security clearances in a second breach to the personnel management systems. This information, which one former NSA official described as the crown jewels and a gold mine for foreign intelligence services, was reportedly stolen en masse and includes many personal details of job applicants. As a matter of fact, the people who actually applied for a security clearance, which is processed by the Office of Personnel Management, the people who fill out these forms fill out extensive background information, including birth dates, names, telephone numbers, and the like, but it also includes things such as passport information, Social Security numbers, private identification and background details, extensive information about background places of residence and addresses, and the names and contact information of close friends and family members. So you can see why there would be concern when state actors penetrate the network at the Office of Personnel Management to steal information about that background and security clearance process. This stolen information could be used not only against our intelligence officers and military officials but also their family and friends who may well now be exposed.

That same day, last Friday, it was reported that the first Office of Personnel Management data breach—a breach that was initially reported 2 weeks ago—actually compromised the records of as many as 14 million current and former government officials. That is more than three times the original estimate.

While our Nation's public servants were having their sensitive personal information stolen, the Democratic leader led nearly all of his colleagues to block sensible, bipartisan legislation which was focused on that specific threat and which would provide for greater information sharing between the private sector and government in order to address this very problem.

I am pleased to say that the minority leader was not able to convince all Democrats to block this legislation. In fact, seven Democratic members voted to promote security over partisanship. Good for them for joining us in doing that.

As I said before, but it is worth noting again, the American people have rejected this idea that the Senate and the Congress should do nothing. They did that last November during the election. They made crystal clear that they wanted their elected representatives, whether the House or the Senate, to come here to Washington on their behalf and to actually take steps to make their lives better and to work on their behalf, not to use this Chamber for partisan political games.

We have heard the accusations in the past. The Democratic leader has loudly and routinely criticized this side of the aisle for obstruction. But threatening to block all funding bills unless you get 100 percent of what you want, after spending money we don't have and while looking at an escalating debt in the tens of trillions of dollars, is, to me, the height of hypocrisy.

By pledging to filibuster upcoming appropriations bills, including the Defense appropriations bill, he and his Democratic colleagues have made their priorities very clear. They are willing to jeopardize the paychecks and the security of our men and women in uniform so they can give more taxpayer dollars to sprawling bureaucracies such as the IRS and the EPA. Unfortunately, the leadership on the other side of the aisle is using these very same troops who put their lives on the line every day to score a few partisan points and to leverage their insatiable appetite for tax dollars. There is never enough. There is never enough.

I don't know that everyone on that side of the aisle is comfortable with this strategy. I am somewhat encouraged in a strange sense of the word by the fact that seven Democrats refused to follow the Democratic leader down this path to blocking the cyber security legislation. To their credit, they voted on the merits of the legislation. But, unfortunately, not enough did in order for us to get it considered and voted on.

In light of this almost contemporaneous occurrence at the Office of Personnel Management and the recurring daily stories about how cyber attacks are stealing personal property, represent an intelligence threat, and are

stealing the money of the American people, I hope our colleagues will work with us to do what the American people elected us to do, which is to work together to move forward sensible, bipartisan legislation that is important to the country.

I hope our friends across the aisle will listen to the American people instead of their misguided leadership. Over the past few months under Republican majorities, this Chamber has demonstrated that we are willing to work across the aisle to get the Senate functioning again for the American people.

Do you know what? The irony is that our friends who are now in the minority who used to be in the majority—I think they kind of like it because they actually can offer amendments, they can get votes on amendments, and they can represent their constituents in this body, which they came here to do.

I hope we can keep the Senate working and avoid this filibuster summer that was touted in one of the newspapers just last week. I know the people of my State expect me to come up here and represent their interests, and I know all of our constituents expect us to do better by them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about an amendment I have to the Defense authorization legislation.

Americans who volunteer to defend our country deserve our utmost support and great credit for their uniquely honorable, difficult, and important service. We are a safe and free Nation because of their bravery and sacrifice. However, as we honor our troops and veterans, we have to remember they don't serve alone. Military families serve too. They make serious career and personal sacrifices on behalf of their loved ones so their loved ones can serve our country.

Anyone who has served in the military or has been married to a servicemember or even attended a military retirement ceremony—I actually come from a military family—understands that a successful military career depends on the support and sacrifice of those you love and those who are in your family. A career in the military frequently involves frequent moves and long separations for your spouse, which present unique challenges for military families.

The service and sacrifice of military families not only deserves recognition and respect, but military families are also a critical component of our military readiness. It is difficult for a mother, father, husband or wife serving in the military to focus on defending our Nation if they are worried about the well-being of their family at home. Perhaps that is why, in March of this

year, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Joseph Dunford, who has now been nominated to serve as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified that “a key element in our overall readiness is family readiness. The family members of our Marines are very much a part of the Marine Corps family. Their sacrifices and support are not taken for granted.”

However, it has come to our attention that the current laws and regulations fail to fully reflect the sacrifices of our military families or the importance of this issue to military readiness.

I wish to talk about a specific problem; that is, when a member of our military actually gets into criminal trouble. Yet their spouse and children have to suffer as a result of it.

Current law forces military juries to sometimes confront the undesirable dilemma of either supporting justice or supporting the military family—but not both. In these rare and tragic cases, a jury must choose either to impose a just sentence on a member of our military—which of course these cases are rare—who commits a crime, but if the jury imposes a just sentence, this could cause the retirement benefits that the family of the military member is counting on to be taken away, and so it leads to this choice of either giving a just or strong sentence and also punish the family who is an innocent bystander in all of this or give a weak and unjust sentence to spare the innocent family—but not both.

When a jury chooses a just sentence, an innocent family can be left with nothing, and that is wrong. Knowing this, some family members choose not to report a crime out of fear that coming forward will risk loss of benefits that a family member helped earn.

For these reasons, I am proud that the National Defense Authorization Act, as passed by the committee, does include an amendment that I introduced with Senator GILLIBRAND which could make transitional benefits available to innocent military family members when their retirement-eligible servicemember forfeits those benefits due to a court-martial.

I am also pleased that the Defense authorization legislation contains sense-of-Congress language that recognizes the valuable service of military families and emphasizes the view of the committee that military juries should not have to choose between a fair sentence and protecting military families. However, this doesn't go far enough. Our work isn't finished. We must do more to recognize the service of military families and to ensure a strong and fair military justice system.

I will briefly talk about the case of Rebecca Sinclair. Rebecca was married to a career Army officer who served with distinction. She married him

early in his career and supported him as he rose through the ranks to become General. She served alongside him for 27 years. He was at home for a total of 5 years between 2001 and 2012. She had been a single mother during those five combat deployments when he was serving our country.

She moved 17 times in 27 years. Her oldest son went to six schools by the time he was in sixth grade. Despite earning a bachelor's and master's degree, Rebecca's career had been severely limited by the constant moves.

She thought this sacrifice was worthy because she was doing it on behalf of her Nation and her family. Because she wasn't able to achieve her full earning potential, she was counting on the pay benefits and retirement plan she helped her husband earn over 27 years. But then, in 2012, she watched helplessly as all of this sacrifice, all of this effort, and all of this work hung in the balance. Unlike the vast majority of servicemembers who serve their whole career with honor, her husband was charged with 25 counts of misconduct, including: forcible sodomy, sexual assault, indecent conduct, making fraudulent claims against the government, and obstruction of justice.

Rebecca was totally innocent of this conduct. Her sons, who were 10 and 12 years old, were totally innocent. Yet her husband's actions threatened to leave her with no benefits and no security after 27 years of sacrifice, and if he were to be dismissed from the Army, Rebecca and her sons would be left with nothing.

During his sentencing hearing, Rebecca's husband begged the court to allow him to retire at a reduced rank so his family could collect the benefits which, in his words, “they have earned serving alongside me all these years.”

Rebecca also made a plea to the court for a sentence that would spare her family from being punished for her husband's actions. I think Rebecca sums it up well in the piece she wrote for the Washington Post in 2012:

For military wives, the options are bad and worse. Stay with an unfaithful husband and keep your family intact; or lose your husband, your family and the financial security that comes with a military salary, pension, health care and housing. Because we move so often, spouses lose years of career advancement. Some of us spend every other year as single parents. We are vulnerable emotionally and financially. Many stay silent out of necessity, not natural passivity.

It is time to fix these problems. Saying thank you to the military families is not enough. We must ensure that our laws and regulations reflect our gratitude to military families and the importance of what they do. They serve our country, too, and they have earned the benefits as well. It is not right for a military member to rely on his family to help earn retirement benefits and then have that individual commit misconduct and the family is punished too.

My amendment will fix this problem by recognizing that military families serve, too, remove disincentives to report misconduct, and put the sentencing process back in balance. Juries can choose a punishment to fit the crime without worry that an innocent family member will suffer as a result. My amendment has been endorsed by 10 veterans service organizations.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment that allows the military justice system to function properly and also makes sure that innocent family members do not suffer and that their service is recognized as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

PROTECTING INTERNET ACCESS FROM TAXATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to address events from the last several days, both of which have the potential to reshape the way the American people use the Internet for communication and commerce.

The first came last week when the other body voted on a bipartisan basis to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act. I wrote that law, which is commonly known as ITFA, along with former Congressman Chris Cox, in 1998. The Internet Tax Freedom Act is one of the most popular tax policies in the country, and I believe it is past time for the Senate to follow the House's lead and send a permanent extension to the President's desk.

The second important matter came up yesterday, when a bill called the Remote Transaction Parity Act was introduced in the other body. What this proposal offers is a brand-new national sales tax managed by a privatizing, tax-collecting bureaucracy that not a single voter in America has approved. I see this online tax hike as a major threat to the Internet that has flourished under the bipartisan Internet Tax Freedom Act.

I want to address both of these issues briefly today, beginning with the importance of the permanent Internet Tax Freedom law. Ever since Congress passed it, it has been an essential tool in helping the Internet grow unencumbered by discriminatory taxation. It prohibits the kind of discriminatory taxes that some in Congress are too fond of; the kind of taxes that I believe will hurt innovation and punish the millions of citizens and businesses that use and depend on the Internet each day.

The Internet Tax Freedom Act has saved families in Oregon and across America hundreds of dollars a year. That is because without the law, access to the Internet would likely be subject to the same level of punishing taxation that is currently imposed on cigarettes and alcohol. We already see that with wireless services not protected by the Internet Tax Freedom Act, and this

area does involve onerous taxes. Inflicting those taxes on Internet access is a burden the Senate absolutely should not heap on the American people.

Unfortunately, Congress has become too reliant on stop-and-go governing, so the Internet Tax Freedom Act has been extended several times on a temporary basis. Some Members in the Senate and House want to tie the Internet Tax Freedom Act, which saves people money, to a controversial proposal that will drive up the cost of using the Internet the way Americans do today, and that is where the second issue I would like to address comes in.

The House proposal, called the Remote Transaction Parity Act, has taken a variety of different forms over the years. An older version that died in Congress was called the Marketplace Fairness Act. The idea used to be to turn every business that operated online—big or small—into a tax collector for the thousands of tax jurisdictions across the country. With every new version of this online tax hike bill, we would see a new set of problems crop up. Now the proposal has become even bigger and more unwieldy. The new proposal coming from the other body would build an enormous, privatized, tax-collecting bureaucracy, and that new bureaucracy would take a big cut of every online sale before a single dime of sales tax gets distributed back to the States or local communities.

I will take a minute and talk about how this hurts my home State. My home State has no sales tax, but under this proposal, this murky tax-collecting middle man is going to get involved anytime somebody in Virginia, Michigan or California makes a purchase online from an Oregon company. This proposal would unfairly siphon money away from Oregon. Yet Oregonians will get nothing in return from these newly empowered national tax collectors. In effect, there would be a new national sales tax overseen by a privatized middle man, and that raises serious questions about whether taxpayer dollars should be going to a for-profit tax collector. It could put sensitive data about businesses and their customers into the crosshairs of hackers and criminals. That would be just about the biggest Federal intrusion into State commerce in a long time.

The online tax bill also creates a major new hurdle for small businesses that want to find consumers online. That would be a particularly harsh blow to companies in rural America, rural Oregon, and elsewhere. It would suddenly be a whole lot harder to compete with a retailer in a crowded city when the cost of doing business online takes a jump.

Finally, it takes a fundamentally tilted playing field against U.S. employers, and, in effect, makes those employers pay a national sales tax. It cre-

ates a fundamentally tilted playing field. The Internet spans national borders, but sellers from China, Canada, and Europe will not and cannot be subject to this tax, and under this approach, they will profit at the expense of the American consumer and American worker.

In my view, we have at hand now two radically different pieces of legislation. The first has been on the books now for well over a decade and has been hugely valuable in terms of innovation, choice, and consumers. That is the permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, in effect taking what we have had for over a decade and making it permanent. With the permanent approach, we lower costs for consumers and protect the Internet as a bulwark for free speech and commerce, promoting American companies and American ideals. So that is approach No. 1—making permanent legislation that has worked since 1998.

The second approach is the Remote Transaction Parity Act, which would raise costs for Americans, hurt small and rural businesses, and punish States such as Oregon that have kept taxes low.

In my view, it would be legislative malpractice to tie these two approaches together. The path forward for the U.S. Senate should be very clear; that is, to take the permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act that has sailed through the House and, with the ball in our court, pass it here. I believe that a permanent law protecting Internet access from taxation is long overdue, and the proposal for an online tax hike should not get in the way.

So I urge my colleagues to join me now in working for a bipartisan, permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, unencumbered by the kind of approach which has been introduced in the House and which creates a national sales tax. Let's reject that and move to pass a permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act as soon as possible.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. REED. Madam President, at 5 p.m. we will be voting on an amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. VITTER. The amendment would require the Secretary of the Army to maintain at least 32 brigade combat teams in the Regular and Reserve components of the Army and 28 brigade combat teams in the Army National Guard.

Effectively and deliberately, this amendment would prevent the Army from managing its own force structure, determining how many brigades it needs, how they are disposed in terms of Active, Reserve, and Regular forces. In addition, the way the amendment is paid for, to maintain these additional

brigades would be to mandate a 1-percent pay cut for all Federal civilian employees for 2016 and 2017—not a pay freeze, a pay cut.

The Army does not support this amendment. They need the flexibility to manage their forces to respond to the threats as they perceive them in the world, to determine where the forces are mechanized, whether they are located in the National Guard or whether they are located in the Regular force. As such, as the Army draws down—and it is on that trajectory because of many issues, some of them budgetary—they would have to totally reexamine their existing force structure and they would indeed have to, I think, sacrifice what they think is the most optimal force for a legislative mandate of an arbitrary number of brigades in place. This will create readiness problems because it is one thing to have brigades on paper; it is another to have brigades that are ready to deploy, fully trained, fully equipped, fully manned. That would complicate this process for the Army.

So for these reasons, when the amendment is presented at 5 p.m., I will be opposing the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in that opposition. I think the Army is the most capable to determine its force structure and not by legislative fiat.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, the Vitter amendment tries to enforce a minimum number of Army brigade combat teams. It seeks to direct the U.S. Army to maintain not fewer than 32 brigade combat teams in the Regular Army and 28 in the Army National Guard. The Secretary of the Army could not reduce these until he reports to Congress and certifies impacts on operational risk to the national defense strategy and insufficient funds or appropriations. The Secretary of the Army must also report rationale for any proposed reduction of total strength in the Regular Army, National Guard, and Army Reserves. This includes an operational analysis that shows continued mission performance given a reduction and an assessment of force-mix ratio among all of those organizations.

Additionally, the Secretary, with the Director of the Army, National Guard, or Chief of Army Reserve, must report to Congress at least 90 days before any possible reductions. The report must list remaining major combat units,

missions, unit assignments by installation, and proposed BCTs for disestablishment—on and on and on and on.

I say to the Senator from Louisiana, we don't do this. We don't tell the Army or the National Guard that they can only have a minimum of this or that and that they can't do certain things. The amendment requires the Army to report manning levels. In principle, I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. The world is less secure. We are facing many threats. We need an Army capable of securing our interests around the world. In fact, last week, decisions were made to deploy more forces to Iraq.

The amendment is bad policy. The Congress shouldn't attempt to manage forces. That is the job of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff. Our job is to authorize and fund. The key is giving Army leadership the flexibility to manage the total Army force given the planned drawdown. In fiscal year 2016, the Army end strength is being reduced and funding is planned to be adjusted accordingly.

The cost to maintain the total Army at 490,000 for 1 year is about \$2.4 billion. Of course, the Senator's amendment does not have any indication where that \$2.4 billion would come from.

If enacted, the amendment could result in a Regular Army of "tiered readiness." The Army would have a force of 490,000 with a budget for 475,000. We don't want a "hollow Army" as we had in the 1970s.

So I urge my colleague from Louisiana, the sponsor of this amendment, to devote his energies and efforts to the repeal of sequestration. That is what is forcing these decisions to be made by the Army, which, in my view and the view of our military leaders, is putting the lives of the men and women at greater risk.

Mr. VITTER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. I wish to finish my statement first, and I appreciate that.

So I oppose the amendment on the fact that we do not have the funding here to maintain the Army at the level that both he and I would prefer. If we do repeal sequestration, then there will be sufficient funding for maintaining the Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserves at the level the Senator from Louisiana strongly advocates and I also advocate.

I will be glad to respond to a question from the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. I thank the Senator for yielding. I would just ask whether the underlying bill doesn't do exactly the same sort of thing in other categories, such as minimum numbers of aircraft carriers in the Navy, such as minimum numbers of certain key equipment in the Air Force, which I agree with. But I don't see any difference between those provisions of the underlying bill and what this provision would con-

stitute with regard to a key element of Army brigade combat teams. That is the first question.

The second question is, Did the Senator know that in the resubmitted version of the amendment, there is a noncontroversial sense-of-the-Senate regarding an offset for this to be put forward?

Finally, I would certainly agree with the Senator about trying to fix the top-line numbers and the top-line situation with regard to sequestration, and, as I am sure he knows, I support that.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I respond to my friend to say that what we have authorized, as the Senator from Louisiana clearly described, is what the services have said they need to do their mission—and based on their requirements, not the view of what my requirements are. So I think the Senator's proposal is very different from what he described.

Again, there is sufficient funding for everything we have authorized in the bill. What this amendment is authorizing in the bill would require an additional \$2.4 billion to be authorized out of the budget that was set by the Budget Committee, which would then mean reductions in other areas, as I am sure the Senator appreciates, that we authorized to the budget numbers as a result of the Budget Committee's allocation for defense.

So I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his continued support of the men and women in the military, especially the bases in Louisiana as well as around the world. He is an advocate for the men and women who are serving, and I appreciate his continued dedication to their welfare and benefit. We just have an honest disagreement on whether this amendment is appropriate in our management of the armed services.

I thank the Senator. We have a disagreement on the amendment. We will vote on it, as he requested. He requested not having a tabling motion. He asked if we could consider his amendment, if we could have it not be a tabling motion, and I am glad to accommodate the Senator.

With that, I yield the floor, and I ask unanimous consent to start the vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1473, as further modified, offered by the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. VITTER.

Mr. VITTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 73, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Capito	Grassley	Risch
Cassidy	Heller	Scott
Corker	Hoeven	Sullivan
Cornyn	Isakson	Tillis
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Daines	Moran	

NAYS—73

Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boozman	Hirono	Rounds
Boxer	Inhofe	Sanders
Brown	Johnson	Sasse
Burr	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Kirk	Sessions
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Shelby
Coats	Manchin	Stabenow
Cochran	Markey	Tester
Collins	McCain	Thune
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Cotton	McConnell	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Mikulski	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	
Flake	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Rubio

The amendment (No. 1473), as further modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I seek recognition to speak for up to—I ask unanimous consent to withhold my motion at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

PAPAL ENCYCLICAL ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, on Thursday, Pope Francis will officially release a historic encyclical on the environment. An encyclical is a personal message from the Pope to Catholic bishops and the 1.2 billion Catholics around the world on a topic that he feels requires urgent attention. It is an opportunity for the Pope to bring together accumulated teachings in a

comprehensive way. This will be only Pope Francis's second papal missive, and it has garnered enough attention that the conservative Heartland Institute traveled to the Vatican this spring to respectfully inform the Pope that there is no global warming crisis.

Earlier this week, my colleague Senator INHOFE agreed with the Heartland Institute and told them that Pope Francis should "stay with his job and we'll stay with ours." Well, I disagree with Senator INHOFE. Pope Francis is doing his job, but it is Republicans in this Chamber who are not doing theirs.

To those critics who say that Pope Francis shouldn't be speaking out on this, I will give them a very simple history lesson. Pope Francis is not the first to speak out on climate change and environmental protection. He will join a chorus of previous pontiffs who drew attention to the crisis of climate change and its impact on people, especially the poor and the children of our planet.

In 1971, Pope Paul VI warned that human actions that harm nature may make the future intolerable. Pope John Paul II first raised the greenhouse effect as a moral issue in his landmark 1990 World Day of Peace message. Two decades later, Pope Benedict XVI shined a light on environmental refugees in his World Day of Peace message and committed the Vatican to going carbon neutral, including installing a massive solar panel energy system on one of the largest buildings in the Vatican.

As the leader of more than 1 billion Catholics around the world, many of whom are suffering from the worst consequences of global warming—disease, displacement, poverty—it is the Pope's responsibility to speak out on behalf of the people he leads. And that is exactly what he will be calling all of us to do.

The same people who want to deny Pope Francis's right to speak out on climate change are the same people who deny the science of it. But our understanding of human influence on climate change rests on 150 years of wide-ranging scientific observations and research, and it is informed by what we see today with our own eyes and measured by our own hands.

Here is the reality. Global temperatures are warming, glaciers are melting, sea levels are rising, extreme downpours and weather events are increasing, the ocean is becoming more acidic, and last year was the warmest year on record. Increasing temperatures increase the risk of bad air days, in turn increasing the risk of asthma attacks and worse for people with lung disease. We have a public health crisis.

We are already feeling the cost of climate disruption. The Government Accountability Office added climate change to its 2013 high-risk list and found that climate change "presents a significant financial risk to the Fed-

eral Government." GAO could just have easily said it presents a significant financial risk for all of America. But the United States is not tackling this climate change alone. Efforts are underway in countries all around the world. We are seeing academies of science in country after country all coming to the same conclusion.

What can we do here in the United States to answer the call of the Pope? Here is what we can do. We can make sure the wind and the solar tax credits do not expire. That is what is happening in this Congress. We can continue this incredible revolution in wind and solar and other renewable sources. That is going to die in this Congress unless we renew them.

We can ensure there is a dramatic increase that continues in the fuel economy standards of the vehicles we drive—the cars, the SUVs, the trucks—that dramatically reduces greenhouse gases. We can ensure when President Obama propounds his clean powerplant rules, which will reduce by 30 percent the amount of greenhouse gases going up into the atmosphere by the year 2030, that they are not repealed on the Senate Floor.

We are the greatest innovation country in the history of the world. Science and technology are the answer to our prayers. They are going to give our country the ability to give the leadership and hope to the rest of the world when we answer the prayer of Pope Francis. The poorest in the world are going to be those who are most adversely affected by the richest countries in the world.

We can, in fact, save all of creation by engaging in massive job creation—the new vehicles we drive, the new energy technologies we create, the new technologies that will reduce the amount of greenhouse gases going up from powerplants. We did it once with the Clean Air Act of 1990, and we can do it again.

So while Pope Francis preaches to the world, the world turns to us for leadership. We cannot preach temperance from a barstool. We cannot tell the rest of the world they should change their habits unless we take the leadership in creating the new technologies that we deploy here and then see deployed around the rest of the world.

We can transform the way energy is in fact produced across this entire planet within the 21st century. That is what the Pope is asking us to do—not to sacrifice but to innovate, not to give up but to invest in those technologies that will transform this planet.

President Kennedy called upon us in 1961 to put a man on the moon by investing in new metals and new propulsion technologies, so that we could ensure that the Soviet Union did not impose its communistic regime across the entire planet. We invented the new

technologies for peaceful purposes. And when our astronauts stepped foot on the moon, that American flag that flew was the return on investment of that generation. This generation of Americans is now being asked to make the same kind of commitment to a new generation of energy technologies that can reduce greenhouse gases dramatically, give leadership for the rest of the world, and answer the call from Pope Francis.

Those who say it is not Pope Francis's business to speak out on something that is obviously created by human beings and that can be solved by human beings are wrong. It is his place. He challenges us to put on the books of the laws of this country the kinds of standards that unleash the green energy revolution, that create jobs by the millions, while ensuring that we reduce the greenhouse gases going up and endangering the planet.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity to be recognized, and I say in conclusion that it is just an incredible moment when the Pope speaks on an issue of this importance. I am not saying action will be easy, but if we harness the ambition of the Moon landing, the scope of the Clean Air Act, and the moral imperative of Pope Francis's encyclical, we can leave the world a better place than we found it. We have the tools to do it. Now we need to forge the political will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from South Dakota.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this week the Senate will complete its work on the National Defense Authorization Act by holding a final vote. The National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important bills Congress considers each and every year. I think this will mark the 54th consecutive year in which Congress has passed a Defense authorization bill, recognizing its importance to America's national security interests.

The bill authorizes funding for our Nation's military and our national defense, ensuring that our soldiers get paid, their equipment and training is funded, and that our commanders have the resources they need to confront the threats that are facing our Nation.

In particular, this bill ensures our air men and women maintain readiness levels and receive the training they need to safely return home after protecting our national security abroad.

In my State of South Dakota, we are proud to host the 28th Bomb Wing at Ellsworth Air Force Base, one of our Nation's two B-1 bomber bases. The B-1s are a critical part of the U.S. bomber fleet, providing our military with critical long-range strike capabilities.

These bombers have the highest payload capacity, the fastest maximum speed, and the lowest cost per flying hour of any bomber in our fleet.

Bombers from the 28th Bomb Wing have played a key role in the armed conflicts the United States has engaged in over the past 20 years. Whatever the mission, from supporting NATO operations in Kosovo to conducting operations in Afghanistan, B-1s from Ellsworth have been in the thick of the action.

During Operation Odyssey Dawn, B-1s from Ellsworth launched from South Dakota flew halfway around the world to Libya, dropped their bombs, and returned home all in a single mission. This marked the first time in history that B-1s launched combat missions from the United States to strike targets overseas.

After 8 years of review, the Air Force and the Federal Aviation Administration recently finalized the expansion of the Powder River Training Complex, an airspace training range that serves as the primary training space for Ellsworth B-1s, as well as the B-52 bombers based at Minot Air Force Base in North Dakota.

The expanded training range will be the largest training airspace over the continental United States. It will save Ellsworth up to \$23 million a year by reducing the need for the B-1 bombers to commute for training to other States, such as Nevada and Utah. In an era of tighter budgets, measures such as this, which increase readiness while saving costs, are essential.

I was pleased to work with the Air Force and the FAA on this critical expansion, and I am hopeful our air men and women will be able to start using this range for large-force training exercises in the near future.

In addition to ensuring our military has the resources necessary to maintain our B-1 bombers, the bill authorizes full funding for one of the Air Force's top acquisition priorities—the Long Range Strike Bomber, which represents the future of our bomber fleet. This aircraft is scheduled to come on line by the mid-2020s and is just one of many acquisition priorities necessary to defend our Nation against future threats.

Our Nation's defense budget must consider not only the enemies we face today but also those we will face tomorrow.

In addition to the critical funding this bill authorizes, this year's bill is particularly important because it contains a number of reforms that will expand the resources available to our military men and women and strengthen our national security.

For starters, this bill tackles waste and inefficiency at the Department of Defense. It targets \$10 billion in unnecessary spending and redirects those funds to military priorities such as

funding for aircraft and weapons systems and modernization of Navy vessels.

The bill also implements sweeping reforms to the military's outdated acquisitions process by removing bureaucracy and expediting decision-making, which will significantly improve the military's ability to access the technology and the equipment it needs.

The act also implements a number of reforms to the Pentagon's administrative functions. Over the past decade, Army Headquarters staff has increased by 60 percent. Yet, in recent years, the Army has been cutting brigade combat teams. From 2001 to 2012, the Department of Defense's civilian workforce grew at five times the rate of our Active-Duty military personnel. There is something wrong with that picture. Prioritizing bureaucracy at the expense of our preparedness and our Active-Duty personnel is not an acceptable use of resources.

The Defense authorization bill we are considering changes the emphasis at the Department of Defense from administration to operations, which will help ensure that our military personnel receive the training they need and that they are ready to meet any threats that arise.

The bill also overhauls our military retirement system. The current military retirement system limits retirement benefits to soldiers who serve for 20 years or more—which doesn't apply, by the way, to 83 percent of those who have served, including many veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Defense bill replaces this system with a modern retirement system that would extend retirement benefits to 75 percent of our servicemembers.

This bill is the product of a bipartisan process, and it received bipartisan support in committee. I believe it came out of the Armed Services Committee by a vote of 20 to 6. This makes it particularly disappointing that the President is attempting to hijack this bill for political purposes.

Despite the fact that this legislation authorizes spending at the President's budget request—his budget request—of \$612 billion, the President is threatening to veto this legislation if Republicans don't agree to provide more funding for agencies such as the IRS and EPA, and he has tried to convince Democrats here in the Senate to abandon bipartisan efforts on this bill and back up a Presidential veto.

Holding up funding authorization for our troops is reckless, and it is irresponsible. And it is flat wrong for the President of the United States to attempt to hijack this bill not because he disagrees with the bill itself but because he wants to make sure his pet projects receive the funding he wants.

At this very moment, threats are multiplying around the world. Russian

aggression is on the rise. ISIS fighters are carving a trail of slaughter across the Middle East. Iran is working to acquire a nuclear weapon. Now more than ever, we cannot afford to be holding up funding for our military, especially for partisan political purposes.

Democrats and Republicans have had a chance to make their voices heard on this bill, and our joint efforts have resulted in strong, bipartisan legislation that will ensure that our military is prepared to meet the threats of the 21st century. The Senate should pass this bill this week and the President should sign it to make sure our troops have the equipment and the resources they need to do the most important thing we can do as a nation, and that is defend our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes and that Senator DURBIN be recognized following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENIOR HUNGER AND GAO REPORT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I want to touch on an issue that I think does not get the attention it deserves. My view is that a nation is judged not by how many billionaires and millionaires it has but by how it treats the most vulnerable people among us. If we look at the greatness of a nation in that respect, the sad truth is that the United States today does not get particularly high marks. That is true not only in the way we treat our children, but it is also true in the way we treat our seniors.

Yesterday, at my request, the Government Accountability Office—the GAO—released a new report that found that nearly 4 million seniors in our country are what they call food insecure. That means these seniors do not know where their next meal is coming from. What that means is that nearly 4 million American seniors may skip dinner tonight because they do not have enough money to buy food today.

Every day in my State of Vermont and around this country, millions of seniors have to juggle with their limited budgets their ability to buy food, their ability to buy medicine, or, in the wintertime, their ability to keep themselves warm in their homes. Those are not the choices seniors in this country should be forced to make.

There is a myth out there pushed by corporate and moneyed interests suggesting that seniors in this country are doing just great, that all seniors are

comfortably middle class. But those people who hold those views have not looked at the reality of life for many seniors in this country. The truth is—and this is really a shocking truth—that 20 percent of seniors in America live on an average income of \$7,600 a year. Between us, I don't know how anybody can live on \$7,600 a year, let alone older people who need more medicine and more health care.

The GAO recently found that more than half of all older American households have absolutely no retirement savings. So we are looking at families where people 55 or 60 have zero saved for retirement because for many years they have been working for wages that have been totally inadequate, preventing them from putting money into the bank.

Many seniors obviously have worked their whole lives. They have raised kids. But, sadly, many of them do not have the resources they need to live a secure retirement.

As I mentioned a moment ago, we have seniors in this country who are going hungry. The GAO report found that fewer than 10 percent of low-income seniors who needed a home-delivered meal in 2013 received one. In other words, what we have created here in Congress over the years are good and effective programs, such as the Meals on Wheels program, that provide nutritious food to the most vulnerable people in this country—seniors who cannot leave their homes; yet, what the GAO report discovered is that fewer than 10 percent of low-income seniors who needed a home-delivered meal in 2013 received one.

I have gone to many senior citizen locations around this country, and I know that many senior citizens enjoy coming out and getting a congregate meal. They go to senior centers, and they are able to socialize with their friends. They get a good and nutritious meal at a reasonable price. Unfortunately, fewer than 10 percent of low-income seniors who need a congregate meal receive one.

The need, in fact, is growing amongst seniors. GAO found that a higher percentage of low-income seniors are food insecure now—24 percent in 2013—than were in 2008, when the number was 19 percent. So the problem is becoming more acute. One in three low-income seniors aged 60 to 69 is food insecure; yet, fewer than 5 percent receive a meal at home and fewer than 5 percent receive a congregate meal in a senior center.

GAO found that seniors with a disability, minorities, and older adults living on less than \$10,000 a year were even more likely to be hungry. Overwhelmingly, those seniors are not getting the help they need.

The report also found that 16 million older adults from all income levels report difficulties with one or more daily

activity, such as shopping, bathing, or getting dressed. More than two-thirds of these seniors do not get the help they need.

Many of the programs designed to provide support to seniors—in terms of Meals on Wheels, in terms of the Congregate Meal Program, and in terms of a variety of other programs—are funded by the Older Americans Act. The Older Americans Act was first passed by Congress in 1965, which is the same year Medicare and Medicaid were passed. This year, all three programs are celebrating their 50th anniversary.

I requested this study to see how seniors have been faring in recent years. GAO reported that while the number of older adults in America has increased from 56 to 63 million Americans, the Older Americans Act funding provided to States has gone down since 2009. In other words, the need has gone up, but the funding has gone down. At current funding levels, less than two-tenths percent of Federal discretionary spending is going to achieve its original purpose.

Common sense tells us that putting money into prevention and keeping seniors healthy in the end run not only prevents human suffering, but it also saves us money. If a senior is malnourished, that senior is more likely to fall, break a hip, end up in the hospital, at huge expense for Medicaid and Medicare. It makes sense to me, it seems, that if we fund adequately this important program which keeps seniors healthy, independent, and out of hospitals and nursing homes—that is what we should be doing. That is why I sent a letter to my colleagues on the Senate Appropriations Committee calling for a 12-percent increase in funding for the Older Americans Act programs, such as the nutrition programs. Thirty-two colleagues joined me on that letter. I hope that when we receive the funding level for the Older Americans Act this year, we will see an increase on these important programs. We should not be giving more tax breaks to those who don't need them. Instead, we should be expanding nutrition programs and other services for seniors.

I also encourage my colleagues to support the bill reauthorizing the Older Americans Act, S. 192, and I look forward to working with the Presiding Officer to reauthorize and expand these critical programs for seniors.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HOLY GHOST UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Holy Ghost Ukrainian Catholic Church as it celebrates its 100th anniversary. Holy Ghost Ukrainian Church was founded in Akron, OH by a small group of faithful and passionate Ukrainian Christians.

In 1915, the Holy Ghost Ukrainian Catholic Church began when two organizations came together to create a place where Ukrainian immigrants could practice the beliefs and traditions they cherished in the new country they called home. The parish has grown and prospered over the years, and continues to flourish at its original location at 1866 Brown Street, offering a center for spiritual and cultural life to Akron and surrounding northeast Ohio communities.

On June 21, 2015, Father Vsevolod Schevchuk, "Father Sal", and parishioners will welcome honored guests His Beatitude Sviatoslav Sherchuk, Patriarch, and The Most Reverend Bohdan J. Danylo, Bishop, of the Ukrainian Catholic Church to their Hierarchical Divine Liturgy and celebration dinner. The congregation will join together on this day to celebrate the anniversary of the church, their Ukrainian cultural traditions, and all that this parish has meant to the community throughout the years.

With more than 50,000 Ukrainian Americans in Ohio, cultural and religious ties remain strong within the community and between Ohio and Ukraine. As cochair of the U.S. Senate Ukrainian Caucus, I have had the privilege of working with the Ukrainian community and know how strongly connected they remain with family and friends overseas. I am certain the continued engagement of Ukrainians in the United States is making a difference in the efforts for the independence of Ukraine. I join the members of the Holy Ghost parish and Ukrainians throughout the United States who continue to pray and work toward a peaceful resolution to the situation in Ukraine. I am proud to stand with Ukrainian Americans and the Ukrainian people as they further their resolve and commitment to maintaining a free and independent Ukraine.

Mr. President, I would like to personally extend my congratulations to Holy Ghost Ukrainian Catholic Church on 100 years of faith, service, and worship.

TRIBUTE TO PETER BLAIR

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, Peter Blair has been a highly valued and trusted member of my staff from the time I took office in 2011. He was part of the team that did the heavy lifting of getting the Senate office off the ground and was instrumental in establishing the systems, structure, and disciplines

necessary to support the Senate office and serve the people of Utah.

Peter has filled a wide range of roles and responsibilities in our office, from administrative duties to correspondence and constituent services, from strategic relationships and outreach to the vital role of handling our veterans' affairs. He has approached each of these with a firm commitment to excellence, an eye toward challenging the status quo, and a determination to deliver an experience that is meaningful and memorable.

Assigning something to Peter is not only to consider it done but to know that it will be done right. His commitment to serve the office at anytime, day or night, and in whatever way is needed is extraordinary. He has been vital to the office running on all cylinders. Late night votes, townhalls, serving constituents and veterans, and coordinating with the hardworking people who really make the Senate function, were all part of a day's work for Peter.

Peter has a unique and innovative way of looking at tasks, projects and long-term opportunities—one I wish more people in Washington would embrace. Peter is a servant leader—a street-smart and savvy servant, who understands strategy, structure, and discipline and is simply determined to deliver regardless of circumstances or setbacks.

Peter is a forever learner. His quest to find a better way to do things and his inner drive to make a difference has had an impact on every aspect of my office. He is a trusted colleague who is more concerned about getting things done and done right than he is about who gets credit. Ronald Reagan often made the comment, "There is no limit to what a man can do or where he can go if he doesn't mind who gets the credit." I would add that there is no limit to Peter's impact and where he can go in the future, because he doesn't care who gets the credit.

It has been a blessing for me, my family, and my staff to have Peter as a member of our team. Having Peter around, from the early days of my service in the Senate, has given me great confidence and peace of mind. Nothing has been better than knowing that the moment an assignment was given to Peter it had begun, would soon be done, and above all, be done right.

TRIBUTE TO RYAN MCKEON

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, Ryan McKeon has served as my chief advisor on economic policy for the past several years and has been an indispensable member of my staff. The old saying, "still water runs deep," is a good metaphor for Ryan. Many on Capitol Hill race about trying to call attention to themselves or create a torrent of activity to prove how smart or important

they are. Ryan, on the other hand, has a style that is indicative of the depth of his substance. He is concerned with properly informing, not impressing, and is less interested in entertaining than he is in engaging in deeper dialogue on issues that matter.

I have trusted Ryan's wisdom and keen insight on a wide range of policy issues and have always had complete confidence in his thorough briefings and recommendations. He has been the driving force behind an expanding and more meaningful economic policy reach from my office.

Ryan is very perceptive. His understanding of core disciplines, principles, and policies, as well as the nuances and subtleties of his issue areas, has been priceless. Ryan is aware of not only the principle and policy ramifications of congressional business but the likely results and down-stream effect of the decisions made. Ryan's stillness allows him to present information in a concise, clear manner that informs me of vital data and impact points while filtering out the noise and chatter typical of Washington, DC, debate.

Everyone in my office knows they can approach Ryan to have him run the numbers on any piece of legislation. He understands the big picture and regularly worked in tandem with our communications team to ensure our messaging was congruent with what we had introduced legislatively. Ryan has worked well with other offices, as well as with academics and highly specialized policy experts outside of my office. While so much of Ryan's work is centered in serious issues and tough topics, he also knows the value of some well placed humor, a wry comment, and a little levity.

Ryan is committed to adding value and making a difference. I greatly appreciate what he has done for me, for the people of Utah, and for our nation. There is a confidence that comes of stillness, a strength that comes from serenity, and quiet determination that comes from depth. Ryan McKeon runs deep, and I am confident his influence will continue to ripple and roll on in the years ahead.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CELEBRATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF HOXIE SCHOOL INTEGRATION

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the resilience, determination, and courage of the community of Hoxie, AR for its leadership in school desegregation and the foundation it laid for integration across the country.

This year, the community is celebrating the 60th anniversary of the first day of school for the African-American students who became known as the Hoxie 21.

This small northeast Arkansas community voluntarily integrated its schools in the summer of 1955 in response to the Supreme Court case *Brown v. Board of Education*. The reasoning for the school board and Superintendent Kunkel Edward Vance's decision was simple; integration was "morally right in the sight of God."

On July 11, 1955, African-American students made history in Hoxie and helped build the momentum for integration.

This unprecedented move began with a smooth transition, and the students were welcomed into the school. The news of a small town in the South desegregating peacefully caught the attention of *Life* magazine, and in its July 1955 issue the story captured the attention of the world. Unfortunately, the media attention brought with it an avalanche of negativity despite the positive and peaceful progression.

This action was unpopular in the South and while segregationists flooded the community in protest, families of the Hoxie 21 and school leaders stood their ground and with great faith persevered against the inequality.

The Hoxie School Board fought back by filing suit on the segregationists, charging the segregationists with trespassing on school property, threatening picket lines, organizing boycotts and intimidating school officials. Citizens of Hoxie of all races peacefully waited for a resolution, and with encouragement from the NAACP were able to stand up against the verbal and physical threats from the segregationists. Their patience and fortitude was soon rewarded. In September, the FBI became involved in the investigation. Two months later, Federal District Judge Thomas C. Trimble ruled that segregationists prevented integration in Hoxie, and issued a temporary restraining order against them. In December, a permanent ban against the segregationists was issued and later upheld by the Supreme Court, freeing the school of their influence. It was the first mediation in support of a school district trying to comply with *Brown v. Board of Education*—a momentous moment for the country and a victory for integration.

This decision was instrumental in desegregating the entire country and was a major victory for the 14th Amendment. This demonstrates that change only comes when people stand up for what is morally right.

I congratulate the town of Hoxie and the Hoxie 21 on this milestone. I am encouraged by your dedication to share this history and positive message. I thank the Hoxie 21 and the community for their bravery in the face of adversity. It is an honor to tell your story and educate people about your struggle. ●

REMEMBERING HAROLD E. WARD

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, when author Tom Brokaw called Americans who came of age during World War II the “greatest generation,” he had in mind remarkable people like Harold E. Ward, who passed away last week. Mr. Ward lived nearly six decades in Lee, NH, where neighbors knew him for his kindness and warm smile. But few knew that during his 94 years he bore witness to some of the most profound events and transformations of 20th and 21st century America.

In his teens, during the Great Depression, he experienced dire poverty and frequent hunger, enduring what he called “missed meal cramps.” As an African American, he endured the slights and segregation of Jim Crow, including when he joined the Navy 2 years before the United States entered World War II. Mr. Ward had graduated from trade school as a skilled electrician, but the few African Americans serving in the Navy were routinely assigned to menial positions such as stewards for ship officers. It was only later, after desegregation of the military, that he became a cook.

On Sunday morning, December 7, 1941, he was on duty aboard the USS *San Francisco* at Pearl Harbor. From his battle station, he witnessed the most devastating foreign attack ever carried out against our military on U.S. soil.

That was Harold Ward’s first taste of combat but far from the last. Eleven months later, serving in the Pacific during the Battle of Guadalcanal, he survived numerous wounds from shell fragments and watched a close friend die next to him. He was awarded the Purple Heart. But, referring to shrapnel permanently embedded in his legs, he later said, “I wear my medals on my body.” Recalling the prejudice he faced as a Black sailor, he told a local newspaper: “You look back on it, and despite the fact there was such a separation of people, all the blood ran red.”

Harold Ward served two decades in the Navy, retiring as first class petty officer commissary steward. He went on to use his culinary skills at restaurants in Exeter and Durham, NH, including his own restaurant, Harold’s Place, and also worked as a part-time police officer in Lee.

Mr. Ward was a 55-year member, past commander, and chaplain of American Legion Post 67 in Newmarket, NH, and a founding member and past commander of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 10676 in Lee. He lived to witness the end of legal segregation, the triumphs of the civil rights movement, and the election and reelection of an African-American President.

Across the decades, Mr. Ward was a gifted mentor to countless young people who crossed his path. Harold and his wife Virginia treated these young men and women as members of the

Ward family, giving them love, counsel, and a place to call home.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said, “Life’s most urgent and persistent question is: What are you doing for others?” Across his eventful life, Harold Ward answered that question in powerful ways, including service to his country, to his community, and to anyone he encountered who needed a helping hand or a wise word.

Harold was predeceased by his beloved wife Virginia and two sons, Bruce and Theodore. He is remembered with much love by daughters Linda and Harriet and son Michael. The Lee community is mourning his passing, as are countless people whose lives he touched. On behalf of the United States Senate and a grateful nation, I thank Harold Ward for his many years of dedicated service. May he rest in peace. •

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—PM 20

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the “Act”), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the “Agreement”). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and deter-

mination concerning the proposed Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the proposed Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by Title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), two classified annexes to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of the Republic of Korea (ROK) with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A(w) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(w)), is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement contains all of the requirements established by section 123 a. of the Act. It provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with the ROK based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. It would permit the transfer of material, equipment (including reactors), components, information, and technology for nuclear research and nuclear power production. It would not permit the transfer of Restricted Data, and sensitive nuclear technology or technology or information that is not in the public domain concerning fabrication of nuclear fuel containing plutonium could only be transferred if specifically provided by an amendment to the proposed Agreement or a separate agreement. Any special fissionable material transferred could only be in the form of low enriched uranium, with two exceptions: small quantities of material for use as samples; or for other specified applications such as use in loading and operation of fast reactors or the conduct of fast reactor experiments. The proposed Agreement would also obligate the United States to endeavor to take such actions as may be necessary and feasible to ensure a reliable supply of low enriched uranium fuel to the ROK, similar to terms contained in other recent civil nuclear cooperation agreements.

The proposed Agreement would also establish a new standing High-Level Bilateral Commission (HLBC) to be led by the Deputy Secretary of Energy for the Government of the United States of America and the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Government of the ROK. The purpose of the HLBC is to facilitate peaceful nuclear and strategic cooperation between the parties and ongoing dialogue regarding areas of mutual interest in civil nuclear energy, including the civil nuclear fuel cycle.

The proposed Agreement will have an initial term of 20 years and would renew for one additional period of 5 years unless either party gives written notice at least 2 years prior to its expiration that it does not want to renew the proposed Agreement. The proposed Agreement also requires the parties to consult as soon as possible after the seventeenth anniversary of its entry into force to decide whether to pursue an extension of the proposed Agreement. In the event of termination of the proposed Agreement, key non-proliferation conditions and controls will continue in effect as long as any nuclear material, moderator material, byproduct material, equipment, or component subject to the proposed Agreement remains in the territory of the party concerned or under its jurisdiction or control anywhere, or until such time as the parties agree that, in the case of nuclear material or moderator material, such items are no longer usable for any nuclear activity relevant from the point of view of international safeguards or have become practically irrecoverable, or in the case of equipment, components, or byproduct material, such items are no longer usable for nuclear purposes.

The ROK has a strong track record on nonproliferation and its government has consistently reiterated its commitment to nonproliferation. The ROK is a party to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, has an International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards agreement and Additional Protocol in force, is a member of the four multilateral nonproliferation export control regimes (Missile Technology Control Regime, Wassenaar Arrangement, Australia Group, and Nuclear Suppliers Group, for which it served as Chair in 2003-2004 and is scheduled to do so again in 2015-2016), and is an active participant in the Proliferation Security Initiative. A more detailed discussion of the ROK's civil nuclear program and its nuclear non-proliferation policies and practices, including its nuclear export policies and practices, is provided in the NPAS and in two classified annexes to the NPAS submitted to you separately. As noted above, the Director of National Intelligence will provide an addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of the ROK with respect to nuclear-related matters.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested departments and agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the proposed Agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 16, 2015.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:09 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 728. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 891. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building".

H.R. 1326. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office".

H.R. 1350. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building".

H.R. 2131. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center".

H.R. 2559. An act to designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 728. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 891. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at

141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1326. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1350. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2131. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2559. An act to designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1952. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Iran-Related Multilateral Sanctions Regime Efforts" covering the period August 7, 2014 to February 6, 2015; to the Committees on Foreign Relations; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; and Finance.

EC-1953. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Proceedings Before the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; Rules Relating to Suspension or Disbarment from Appearance and Practice" (RIN3038-AE21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1954. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Bruce E. Grooms, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1955. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1956. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-001); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1957. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Minimum Requirements for Appraisal Management Companies" (RIN1557-AD64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11,

2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1958. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cuban Assets Control Regulations; Terrorism List Governmental Sanctions Regulations" (31 CFR Parts 515 and 596) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1959. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting, pursuant to law, Bank's 2014 Management Report and statement on system of internal controls; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1960. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2014 management report and statement on the system of internal controls; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1961. A communication from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2014 management report and statement on system of internal controls; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1962. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement; Capital Adequacy of Board-Regulated Institutions; Bank Holding Companies; Savings and Loan Holding Companies." (RIN1700-AE30) (FRB Docket No. R-1509) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1963. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Substantial Business Activities" ((RIN1545-BM85) (TD 9720)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1964. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update of Pre-Approved Plan Revenue Procedure" (Rev. Proc. 2015-36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1965. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Segregation Rule Effective Date" ((RIN1545-BM17) (TD 9721)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1966. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Family Violence Prevention and Services Program for fiscal years 2011-2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1967. A communication from the Chairwoman of the Federal Trade Commission,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1968. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1969. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1970. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes in Requirements for Collective Trademarks and Service Marks, Collective Membership Marks, and Certification Marks" (RIN0651-AC89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1971. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1972. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-37. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President of the United States and Congress of the United States to require expansion of fish hatchery operations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE PAPER 933

Whereas, the Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*, is a salmon found in the north Atlantic Ocean and in rivers that flow into the north Atlantic Ocean, and the fish has historically been an important economic asset to the State of Maine; and

Whereas, the major rivers of the State once ran thick with salmon traveling upstream to spawn; and

Whereas, salmon populations have been reduced to nearly undetectable numbers in most rivers in Maine; and

Whereas, the Federal Government has designated the Atlantic salmon as an endangered species; and

Whereas, the Federal Government spends millions of dollars annually to restore the species with no significant success; and

Whereas, there are specific hatchery operations that can improve upon the current results; and

Whereas, a significant number of salmon originating in Maine are being harvested in a commercial fishery off the west coast of Greenland; and

Whereas, this fishery is a major obstacle to the restoration of salmon in Maine rivers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, on behalf of the people we represent, take this opportunity to respectfully request that the President and the United States Congress direct the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to expand hatchery operations to rivers in Maine by partnering with the State and with the many non-government organizations that are focused on restoring Atlantic salmon to their historic natal rivers; and be it further

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, urge that additional resources be made available to the United States State Department that would assist its efforts through the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization convention to help with the curtailment or suspension of the wild Atlantic salmon fishery off the west coast of Greenland; and be it further

Resolved, that suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-38. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan calling on the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to direct the Army Corps of Engineers to fully support efforts to determine the best long-term solution for preventing Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes and to move decisively to implement a solution; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 23

Whereas, The Great Lakes are one of our nation's great natural wonders. Bordering Michigan and seven other states, these inland seas contain nearly one-fifth of the world's surface fresh water. They support jobs in manufacturing, tourism, recreation, shipping, agriculture, science, engineering, energy, and mining throughout the region. The protection of the Great Lakes is essential to Michigan's state identity and economy as well as national economic growth; and

Whereas, Asian carp pose an imminent threat to the Great Lakes ecosystem and economy. Asian carp have successfully invaded the Mississippi River basin and now stand only 50 miles downstream from the Great Lakes. Asian carp can reproduce rapidly, consume large quantities of food, disrupt local ecosystems, out-compete native fish, and devastate recreational fishing and boating opportunities. There is general scientific consensus that Asian carp will be able to establish populations and thrive in areas of the Great Lakes. Once established, they will be difficult, if not impossible, to control or eradicate. Thus, the federal government has recognized Asian carp as "the most acute [aquatic invasive species] threat facing the Great Lakes today"; and

Whereas, A permanent, long-term solution must be identified and implemented to keep Asian carp out of the Great Lakes. While the

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study identified a number of solutions, it stopped short of determining the best option. Regional efforts to reach consensus on a solution, such as those of the Chicago Area Waterway System Advisory Committee, must be supported and recommendations seriously considered; and

Whereas, The best long-term solution will prevent Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes while preserving as much as possible the current uses of the Chicago area waterways. Although effective Asian carp prevention is paramount and should not be compromised, the value, impacts, and costs to the barge industry must also be taken into account; and

Whereas, Regardless of the means, immediate and decisive action is required to protect the Great Lakes. The status quo will not prevent irreparable harm. Asian carp could cause billions of dollars in lost revenues and thousands of lost jobs in the \$7 billion sports and commercial fishing industry and the \$9 billion recreational boating industry. In addition, damage done to the Great Lakes, rivers, and inland lakes by Asian carp would greatly harm our state's viability as an attractive vacation destination, thereby leading to decreased tourism revenue and jobs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we call on the Obama Administration and the Congress of the United States to direct the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to fully support efforts to determine the best long-term solution for preventing Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Obama Administration and Congress to provide sufficient funding that will ensure the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers moves decisively to implement a solution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-39. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation that authorizes the Army Corps of Engineers to implement measures at the Brandon Road lock and dam to prevent Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 25

Whereas, Asian carp are an imminent and serious threat to the health and economy of Michigan and the entire Great Lakes region. Only 50 miles downstream from Lake Michigan, this aquatic invasive species' voracious appetite would disrupt food webs, leaving inadequate food for more desirable species within the Great Lakes, and threatening the \$7-billion Great Lakes recreational and commercial fishing industry; and

Whereas, Current controls in the Chicago area are inadequate to prevent the movement of Asian carp and potential future aquatic invasive species (AIS) between the Great Lakes system and the Mississippi River system. A U.S. Army Corps of Engineer and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service study has demonstrated that the electrical barriers that provide the front line of protection against carp do not prevent the movement of all fish; and

Whereas, Control measures implemented at the Brandon Road lock and dam in Joliet,

Illinois, would reduce the risk of an Asian carp invasion while maintaining efficient navigation. Composed of representatives from government, industry, business, anglers, and conservation groups, the Chicago Area Waterway System Advisory Committee has recommended the deployment of innovative technologies and the reconfiguration of the locks in a newly-engineered channel at this key location. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has begun the scoping process for this project; and

Whereas, Moving forward with design, engineering, and construction of these measures would be a worthwhile short-term and longterm investment in the Great Lakes region. While negotiations continue on a permanent long-term solution, these measures would provide additional protection and be consistent with an eventual long-term solution. In addition, this project would serve as a valuable demonstration for technologies that could be implemented in other areas of the country; and

Whereas, There is a window of opportunity now to protect the Great Lakes, avoid irreparable harm to the system, and prevent decade upon decade of future management costs. Once established, Asian carp would be nearly impossible to eradicate and would join zebra mussels, sea lamprey, and other AIS that Great Lakes governments and businesses spend millions of dollars per year to control. The Brandon Road lock and dam project would be a solid first step in creating greater structural protections for the Great Lakes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to pass legislation that authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to implement measures at the Brandon Road lock and dam to prevent Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-40. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to pass legislation that establishes a national, uniform, and scientifically-based label program for genetically modified food; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 89

Whereas, Genetically modified organisms, or GMOs, have become increasingly prominent in today's grocery marketplace. In recent years, scientists have used genetic engineering techniques to modify the DNA of plants to make them resistant to certain pests, diseases, environmental conditions, and chemical treatments. GMOs help increase crop yields, constrain food prices, and vitally support Michigan's agriculture, food processing, and other industries. Commonly found in crops like corn, soybeans, cotton, and canola, 70 to 80 percent of the foods Americans eat today contain GMOs. In 2014, 100 percent of all sugar, 93 percent of all corn, and 91 percent of all soybeans grown in Michigan were produced using GMOs; and

Whereas, Despite the widespread use of GMOs, there is no federal GMO labeling standard. Absent these rules, some states and localities have developed their own proposals, leading to a patchwork of regulation that can be confusing and possibly misleading to consumers. Moreover, a maze of

GMO labeling regulations increases agriculture and food production costs, requiring food companies operating in Michigan to create separate supply chains in each state. Ultimately, this could significantly increase the average price consumers spend at grocery stores, which could average an extra \$500 per year according to a Cornell University study; and

Whereas, Federal legislation must be passed to avoid this patchwork of regulations and the costly ramifications it creates. Legislation like the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act H.R. 1599, sponsored by congressmen Pompeo and Butterfield, is a bipartisan solution needed to allow consumers to have access to accurate and consistent information on the products that contain GMOs. A USDA-administered certification and labeling program modeled after the USDA organic labeling program for non-GMO foods would ensure that labeling is nationwide, uniform, and scientifically-based: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge the Congress of the United States to pass legislation that establishes a national, uniform, and scientifically-based label program for genetically modified food; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-41. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania recognizing the month of May 2015 as "Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 101

Whereas, Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) is better known as Lou Gehrig's Disease; and

Whereas, ALS is a fatal neurodegenerative disease characterized by degeneration of cell bodies of the upper and lower motor neurons in the gray matter of the anterior horn of the spinal cord; and

Whereas, The initial symptom of ALS is weakness of the skeletal muscles, especially those of the extremities; and

Whereas, As ALS progresses, the patient experiences difficulty in swallowing, talking and breathing; and

Whereas, ALS eventually causes muscles to atrophy and the patient becomes a functional quadriplegic; and

Whereas, Patients with ALS typically remain alert and aware of their loss of motor functions and the inevitable outcome of continued deterioration and death; and

Whereas, ALS affects military veterans at twice the rate of the general population; and

Whereas, ALS occurs in adulthood, most commonly between 40 and 70 years of age, peaking at about 55 years of age, and affects both men and women without bias; and

Whereas, Annually, more than 5,000 new ALS patients are diagnosed throughout the nation; and

Whereas, In Pennsylvania, there are currently more than 1,000 individuals who have been formally diagnosed with ALS; and

Whereas, The \$350,000 in State funding the General Assembly appropriated for ALS support services in the General Appropriation Act of 2014 provided services to more than 900 constituents and substantial savings to the State budget and taxpayers; and

Whereas, The ALS Association reports that on average, patients diagnosed with

ALS only survive two to five years from the time of diagnosis; and

Whereas, ALS has no known cause, prevention or cure; and

Whereas, "Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month" increases the public's awareness of ALS patients' circumstances and acknowledges the terrible impact this disease has not only on patients but on their families as well and recognizes the research being done to eradicate this horrible disease: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of Pennsylvania designate the month of May 2015 as "Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM-42. A communication from a citizen of the State of Florida memorializing a resolution adopted by the City Council of Tampa supporting the re-establishment of a secure Cuban consulate being located in the City of Tampa, Florida, when relations between the United States and Cuba are appropriately normalized; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-43. A communication from a citizen of the State of Florida memorializing a resolution adopted by the City Council of Tampa supporting the President of the United States's actions to normalize cultural, humanitarian, economic, and diplomatic relations with Cuba; and urging that when relations between the United States and Cuba are appropriately normalized, the City of Tampa serve as the location for formalizing the re-establishment of diplomatic ties, which may then be referred to as "The Tampa Accord" between the United States and Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2578. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-66).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1578. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance taxpayer rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1579. A bill to enhance and integrate Native American tourism, empower Native American communities, increase coordination and collaboration between Federal tourism assets, and expand heritage and cultural

tourism opportunities in the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1580. A bill to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1581. A bill to foster market development of clean energy fueling facilities by steering infrastructure installation toward designated Clean Vehicle Corridors; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1582. A bill to establish pilot programs to encourage the use of shared equity mortgage modifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1583. A bill to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1584. A bill to repeal the renewable fuel standard; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1585. A bill to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue an order continuing a stay of a hydroelectric license for the Mahoney Lake hydroelectric project in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 1586. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit sewage dumping into the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1587. A bill to authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1588. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1589. A bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new, long-term job creation through the establishment of an Infrastructure Financing Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 298

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles

XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 366

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 740

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to improve the coordination and use of geospatial data.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to streamline the permit process for rail and transit infrastructure.

S. 776

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 776, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 786

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 786, a bill to provide paid and family medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 827

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 827, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications.

S. 877

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 877, a bill to establish a pilot grant program to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body-worn cameras for law enforcement officers.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Academy of Sciences to study the vehicle handling requirements proposed by the Commission for recreational off-highway vehicles and to prohibit the adoption of any such requirements until the completion of the study, and for other purposes.

S. 1046

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 1046, a bill to accelerate the adoption of smart building technologies in the private sector and key Federal agencies.

S. 1099

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1135

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 1190

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1438

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1438, a bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective contraception.

S. 1443

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1443, a bill to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes.

S. 1444

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1444, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax regarding the taxation of distilled spirits.

S. 1458

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1458, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of

1977 to ensure scientific transparency in the development of environmental regulations and for other purposes.

S. 1476

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1476, a bill to require States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding shooting incidents involving law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 1513

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1513, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1536

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1536, a bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes.

S. 1546

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1546, a bill to establish an export credit insurance program in the Small Business Administration.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1551, a bill to provide for certain requirements relating to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition.

S. 1557

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1557, a bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 200

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 200, a resolution wishing His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama a happy 80th birthday on July 6, 2015, and recognizing the outstanding contributions His Holiness has made to the promotion of nonviolence, human rights, interfaith dialogue, environmental awareness, and democracy.

S. RES. 201

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 201, a resolution designating June 19, 2015, as "Juneteenth Independence Day" in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which slavery legally came to an end in the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1473 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1549

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1549 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1703

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1703 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1704

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1704 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1847

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1847 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel

strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1883

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1883 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1889

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1889 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1889 proposed to H.R. 1735, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1889 proposed to H.R. 1735, *supra*.

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1889 proposed to H.R. 1735, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. WARNER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1889 proposed to H.R. 1735, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1889 proposed to H.R. 1735, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 1908

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1908 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1948

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1948 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe

military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1961

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1961 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1962

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1962 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2039

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2039 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1583. A bill to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that will speed the next phase of a renewable energy project in my home State of Alaska, that Congress effectively authorized 35 years ago.

Back in 1980, Congress in Section 1325 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, noted that the Kodiak Electric Association Inc., KEA, then wished to build a lake-tap hydroelectric project by taking water from Terror Lake, a high alpine lake, which was placed just inside the boundary line of Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge by the act. At the time KEA had wanted to build a 20 megawatt hydroelectric project inside the refuge to power the namesake community on Kodiak Island. Under the law, the Secretary of

the Interior was to approve the project and its expansion on a “case-by-case” basis—the law simply saying that nothing in the 1980 Act “shall be construed as necessarily prohibiting or mandating the construction” of the project. The Secretary the next year approved the power project, which started generation in the mid 1980’s. A third 10-megawatt turbine since was added to the project in 2012–13.

Kodiak Electric Association, a rural electric cooperative, is a leader in Alaska in promoting renewable energy. In 2014, 99.7 percent of its total electricity came from hydroelectric generation and from a Pillar Mountain wind turbine farm—the first community in Alaska to be nearly 100 percent supplied by renewable energy sources. But that designation will disappear if the next phase of the originally planned Terror Lake project is not constructed, since the utility will need to resume burning more diesel fuel to produce power if additional hydroelectric generation from the lake is not permitted. That will result in the burning of 2 million gallons of diesel fuel—in a typical year given current electricity load forecasts—that will emit 26,000 tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere annually.

The new expansion involves diverting five small streams located on Alaska State lands in the adjacent Upper Hidden Basin—streams branching off the East and West Upper Hidden Creeks—and allowing the water to flow into Terror Lake through an underground tunnel that will be drilled through the ridge line marking the boundary between State and refuge lands. The project, which will impact about 13 acres of refuge lands, 3 acres being made up by the tunnel itself, will have a single visible impact, some grading for a construction laydown area on the rocky slopes above the upper end of the lake, and the “natural” waterfall that will result from water entering the lake from the tunnel. The entire extent of the project involves drilling a 1.22 mile-long tunnel, about 2,150 feet by current estimates being on refuge lands, plus the diversion structure on the State’s creeks, a water pipeline to carry water from the East Creek over to the main diversion structure located on the West Creek, and a related access road.

The project should have no impact on the environment or wildlife, since the amount of water being diverted from the 4 square mile basin is so slight as to have no impact on fisheries at the mouth of the Kizhuyak River on the east side of Kodiak Island at Ugak Bay, into which the Hidden Basin Creeks flow. The project should not affect the wildlife along the shore of the steep, rocky lake. The project will not involve adding turbines or equipment to the existing Terror Lake powerhouse, as the project will not increase the

maximum amount of megawatt production, but simply increase the annual total production of electricity from the power project. Terror Lake in 2014, a normal water year, produced 134 gigawatt-hours of electricity. By the addition it should produce about 30 additional gigawatt-hours annually, about a 25 percent increase.

The project, besides allowing KEA to utilize clean, renewable energy, should also enhance the utility’s innovative wind-hydro integration system and further its micro-grid energy storage technology.

While this project should be able to proceed by seeking administrative approvals either because of its ANILCA inclusion or because of Title 11 of ANILCA, which governs future rights-of-way requests, I am introducing legislation seeking Congressional approval to speed up the start of construction on the power project. Without Congressional approval, the utility will need to fund two environmental impact statements, EIS’s, instead of one, covering the exact same issues, delaying the start of construction by years. With congressional approval, the project will still face the delay of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission conducting a single EIS as part of its hydro licensing amendment process. The project still will be subject to any conditions to protect fisheries or wildlife placed on the project by the USF&WS under Section 4(e) of the Federal Power Act. But it will have to clear only one such EIS process, sparing rate payers on Kodiak Island a doubling of the permitting expense.

This authorization will simply allow another phase of the Terror Lake project to be constructed, as it was envisioned nearly 40 years ago. In the 1978 feasibility plan, two years before passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, the Hidden Basin Creek diversion was clearly outlined. “This scheme is the most economical means of increasing the output of the development . . . and it can be built whenever the growth in power demand in Kodiak justifies it. Therefore, the scheme is included in the present report as a recommended future development,” said the Terror Lake hydro report in December 1978.

The project will permit additional clean, renewable energy to be generated for the inhabitants of Kodiak Island, but without any environmental or negative fishery or wildlife consequences. This bill, if approved by Congress this year, will produce that power more quickly and at less cost than will be involved should a lengthy, multiple administrative review take place. It is unfortunate, but in the past 35 years since passage of the Alaska lands act, no entity has ever completed the lengthy process and received a right-of-way permit under the bureaucratic process set up by Title 11 of

ANILCA. I hope that this project will not have to attempt to be the first to actually navigate the Title 11 right-of-way process in order to proceed.

I hope Congress will quickly approve this authorization so that more renewable electricity can flow to the citizens of Kodiak in the near future.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1585. A bill to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue an order continuing a stay of a hydroelectric license for the Mahoney Lake hydroelectric project in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation needed to provide additional options for how Ketchikan and parts of Southeast Alaska can receive additional clean, renewable electricity in the future. Today I am introducing legislation being requested by Cape Fox Native Corp. of Ketchikan, Alaska Power & Telephone Co., and the City of Saxman to extend a 2002 stay on the hydroelectric construction license for the Mahoney Lake project. This bill will effectively require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to grant another 10-year extension of the construction license for the project proposed northeast of downtown Ketchikan, in hopes that greater clarity will be obtained within the next decade on how to supply power to the region in the future.

Mahoney Lake was first proposed as a 9.6-megawatt, MW, lake-tap hydroelectric project in the early 1990s. By 2002 the sponsors had not received a power purchase agreement, PPA, and had exhausted the then allowed FERC extensions of their construction license. In June 2002 they asked former Alaska Senator Ted Stevens to win legislative approval of a stay so they wouldn’t lose the license. Effectively, they wanted the license expiration to be stayed until after completion of the then proposed Swan-Tyee electrical transmission intertie—in hopes that such completion would clarify future electrical needs in the community. That project has since been finished, triggering the potential end of the 2002 license stay.

The entities backing Mahoney Lake’s construction have spent more than \$4 million on engineering and environmental studies—money in jeopardy of being wasted, if the stay and a continuation of the construction license is not approved by Congress. For that and a host of other reasons, I am introducing this legislation to extend the construction license and normal additional license periods under FERC rules for this project.

Ketchikan, which recently received more clean, renewable energy with the completion of the Whitman Lake

hydroelectricity project, likely will need additional power within the next decade. Currently the Southeast Alaska Power Authority, SEAPA, is conducting a review of all potential power sources. As part of that study the authority is studying the merits of a host of projects, including construction of Mahoney Lake. The authority, for example, is considering whether to raise the height of the existing spillway of the Swan Lake project to hold more water and generate more power. The authority is considering whether to purchase power from two potential Metlakatla hydro projects: the 4MW Triangle Lake or the 4.6 MW Lower Todd Lake projects on Annette Island. And the authority is also checking the potential economics and costs, including transmission lines, of new projects throughout the area.

By this legislation I am simply trying to keep Mahoney Lake, which may be able to produce 41.6 gigawatts of additional power annually for the Ketchikan area, viable as a potential renewable energy project until that comprehensive review is finished in 2016 or perhaps in 2017.

The three entities that currently hold the license for Mahoney Lake have certainly spent more than enough on construction to meet FERC requirements that licensees show they are serious about progressing a project and aren't simply "stockpiling" hydroelectric permits/licenses. Cape Fox Native Corporation, especially, is deserving of an extension given its unique position under terms of the 1971 Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, ANCSA. Cape Fox was "distinctly disadvantaged" in its land selections under ANCSA because of Ketchikan land protections, the location of the Annette Island Indian reservation, and the then long-term timber contracts in the area owned at the time by the Ketchikan Pulp Corporation. All three issues prevented Cape Fox from selecting most of its lands inside its core selection areas. Arguably the Mahoney Lake hydro project site is the only valuable land that the corporation was allowed to select inside its core selection area, under the bill that settled aboriginal land claims in Alaska.

This legislation will not advantage Mahoney Lake over any other project that may be considered to provide low-cost hydroelectric power to the region. But its timely passage will level the playing field so that Mahoney Lake can be considered on the same economic grounds as all other future power projects in southern Southeast Alaska. I hope for the bill's swift passage in this Congress.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. Flake):

S. 1587. A bill to authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State of Iraq and

the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce in the Senate, with my colleague Senator Flake, the first bipartisan Authorization for Use of Military Force, AUMF, against ISIL. The United States launched military action against ISIL over 10 months ago on August 8, 2014. It is far past time for Congress to fulfill its duty by debating and determining whether or not it is in the nation's best interest to order United States troops to risk their lives in this mission and vote on an ISIL AUMF.

This bill authorizes the U.S. mission against ISIL for the purpose of protecting the lives of U.S. citizens and providing military support to regional partners in their battle to defeat ISIL. As stated by the authorization, the use of significant U.S. ground troops in combat against ISIL is not consistent with this purpose, except to protect lives of U.S. citizens from imminent threat. Other key provisions include a sunset after three years unless reauthorized; a repeal of the 2002 Iraq AUMF; and a clause that defines this authorization as the sole statutory authority for the war on ISIL, as opposed to the 2001 AUMF.

Thousands of members of the United States Armed Forces have been deployed to support military operations against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. As of June 2015, the United States has conducted over 3,500 airstrikes against ISIL and spent more than \$2,600,000,000 American taxpayer dollars on this war—a number that continues to rise by approximately \$9,000,000 per day. Tragically, members of the Armed Forces have been killed in Operation Inherent Resolve, and United States hostages have been killed by ISIL in barbaric ways.

However, while Congress has authorized appropriations for Operation Inherent Resolve and the training of anti-ISIL forces in Syria, it has yet to take formal action to approve this mission. Doing so is critical for reinforcing the leadership of the United States with our coalition partners and sending a strong message to our adversaries that the United States is united in the fight against ISIL and speaks with one voice in confronting ISIL.

President Obama submitted an authorization for use of military force against ISIL in February 2015. And still Congress has not undertaken its most solemn duty and responsibility under Article 1. The American public deserves this congressional debate to educate them about the national security interests at stake and the advisability of this war and Congress should do its job by formally voicing its support or disapproval of the mission against ISIL.

I am proud to join Senator Flake in introducing a bill to start this nec-

essary debate. As we saw with the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, it is possible to find bipartisan compromise on even the toughest of foreign policy issues and I challenge my colleagues to finally come together to do what is right for our troops and our nation.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2047. Mr. McCain submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1974 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2048. Mr. Johnson submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2049. Mr. Johnson submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2050. Mr. Menendez submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1859 submitted by Mr. Menendez and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2051. Mr. Casey (for himself and Mr. Inhofe) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2052. Mr. Boozman submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1669 submitted by Mr. Boozman (for himself, Mr. Donnelly, and Mr. Toomey) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2053. Mr. Barrasso (for himself and Mr. Enzi) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2044 submitted by Mr. Barrasso (for himself and Mr. Enzi) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2054. Mr. Inhofe submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2055. Ms. Baldwin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2042 submitted by Ms. Baldwin and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2056. Mr. Cardin (for himself and Mr. Corker) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2057. Mr. Sanders submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2047. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1974 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 13 through 20 and insert the following:

(5) implement a strategy to provide for the safe, secure, and permanent relocation of Camp Liberty residents that includes a relocation plan, including a detailed outline of the steps that would need to be taken by recipient countries, the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and Camp residents to relocate the residents to other countries;

SA 2048. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION.

It is the sense of Congress that the appointment of a Lead Inspector General for Operation Freedom's Sentinel by the Chair of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency pursuant to section 8L of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is not intended to limit or otherwise affect the authority and responsibilities of the Office of the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (commonly known as "SIGAR") as established by section 1229 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-81; 122 Stat. 378).

SA 2049. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NOMINATING A PERMANENT INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) There are 4 Presidentially-appointed Inspector General vacancies for which a nomination is not pending before the Senate.

(2) It is vital that Offices of Inspectors General remain independent.

(3) In the absence of a permanent Inspector General, an Office of Inspector General is run by an acting Inspector General who, no matter how qualified or well-intentioned, is not granted the same protections afforded to an Inspector General who is confirmed by the Senate, as the acting Inspector General—

(A) is not truly independent;

(B) may be removed by the head of the agency at any time;

(C) only serves temporarily and does not drive the policy of the Office; and

(D) is at a greater risk of compromising the work of the Office to appease the agency or the President.

(4) One of the current Presidentially-appointed Inspector General vacancies is the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs, which has been vacant since December 31, 2013.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should nominate a permanent Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2050. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1859 submitted by Mr. MENENDEZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning of page 1 of the amendment, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 2, line 21, and insert the following:

SEC. 1274. REPORT ON THE SECURITY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of ongoing military and security cooperation between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

(2) A discussion of potential steps for enhancing the bilateral security relationship between the United States and Cyprus, including steps to enhance the military and security capabilities of the Republic of Cyprus.

(3) An analysis of the effect on the bilateral security relationship of the United States policy to deny applications for licenses and other approvals for the export of defense articles and defense services to the armed forces of Cyprus.

(4) An analysis of the extent to which such United States policy is consistent with overall United States security and policy objectives in the region.

(5) An assessment of the potential impact of lifting such United States policy.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 2051. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 1533, add the following:

(f) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should increase efforts to combat the use by the terrorist group the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) of improvised explosive devices and the illicit smuggling of improvised explosive device precursor materials.

SA 2052. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1669 submitted by Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. TOOMEY) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1, strike line 2 and all that follows through page 2, line 13, and insert the following:

SEC. 1085. PROVISION OF STATUS UNDER LAW BY HONORING CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES AS VETERANS.

Any person who is entitled under chapter 1223 of title 10, United States Code, to retired pay for nonregular service or, but for age, would be entitled under such chapter to retired pay for nonregular service shall be honored as a veteran but shall not be entitled to any benefit by reason of this section.

SA 2053. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2044 submitted by Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. USE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD FOR SUPPORT OF CIVILIAN FIRE-FIGHTING ACTIVITIES.

The Secretary of Defense may authorize members and units of the National Guard performing duty under section 328(b), 502(f), or 709(a) of title 32, United States Code, or on active duty under title 10, United States Code, to support firefighting operations, missions, and activities, including aerial firefighting employment of the Mobile Airborne Firefighting System (MAFFS), undertaken in support of a request from the National Interagency Fire Center or another Federal agency.

SA 2054. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

REPORT AND ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PRIVATIZING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMMISSARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report assessing the viability of privatizing, in whole or in part, the Department of Defense commissary system. The report shall be so submitted to Congress before the development of any plans or pilot program to privatize defense commissaries or the defense commissary system.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A methodology for defining the total number and locations of commissaries.

(2) An evaluation of commissary use by location in the following beneficiary categories:

- (A) Pay grades E-1 through E-4.
- (B) Pay grades E-5 through E-7.
- (C) Pay grades E-8 and E-9.
- (D) Pay grades O-1 through O-3.
- (E) Pay grades O-4 through O-6.
- (F) Pay grades O-7 through O-10.
- (G) Military retirees.

(3) An evaluation of commissary use in locations outside the continental United States and in remote and isolated locations in the continental United States when compared with other locations.

(4) An evaluation of the cost of commissary operations during fiscal years 2009 through 2014.

(5) An assessment of potential savings and efficiencies to be achieved through implementation of some or all of recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

(6) A description and evaluation of the strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for pricing products sold at commissaries.

(7) A description and evaluation of the transportation strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for products sold at commissaries.

(8) A description and evaluation of the formula of the Defense Commissary Agency for calculating savings for its customers as a result of its pricing strategy.

(9) An evaluation of the average savings per household garnered by commissary use.

(10) A description and evaluation of the use of private contractors and vendors as part of the defense commissary system.

(11) An assessment of costs or savings, and potential impacts to patrons and the Government, of privatizing the defense commissary system, including potential increased use of Government assistance programs.

(12) A description and assessment of potential barriers to privatization of the defense commissary system.

(13) An assessment of the extent to which patron savings would remain after the privatization of the defense commissary system.

(14) An assessment of the impact of any recommended changes to the operation of the defense commissary system on commissary patrons, including morale and retention.

(15) An assessment of the actual interest of major grocery retailers in the management and operations of all, or part, of the existing defense commissary system.

(16) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on off-installation prices of similar products available in the system.

(17) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system, and conversion of the Defense Commissary Agency workforce to non-appropriated fund status, on employment of military family members, particularly with respect to pay, benefits, and job security.

(18) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on Exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation (MWR) quality-of-life programs.

(c) USE OF PREVIOUS STUDIES.—The Secretary shall consult previous studies and surveys on matters appropriate to the report required by subsection (a), including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) The January 2015 Final Report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

(2) The 2014 Military Family Lifestyle Survey Comprehensive Report.

(3) The 2013 Living Patterns Survey.

(4) The report required by section 634 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) on the management, food, and pricing options for the defense commissary system.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF REPORT.—Not later than May 1, 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth an assessment by the Comptroller General of the report required by subsection (a).

Section 652 of this act is null and void.

SA 2055. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2042 submitted by Ms. BALDWIN and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe

military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 15, insert “and makes a recommendation or otherwise suggests corrective action” after “General”.

SA 2056. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle H—Asia-Pacific Maritime Security

SEC. 1291. MARITIME SECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State is authorized, using funds transferred pursuant to subsection (b), to provide assistance for the purpose of increasing maritime security and domain awareness for countries in the Asia-Pacific region.

(2) DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided by the Secretary under this section shall be known as the “Maritime Security Capacity Building Program” (in this section referred to as the “Program”).

(3) CONSTRUCTION OF LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary may provide assistance under this section without regard to any other provision of law, other than section 620J of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378d).

(b) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may transfer, from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense by this Act, \$50,000,000 to the Secretary of State for the Program. Any amount so transferred shall be deposited in the “Foreign Military Finance” account for purposes of the Program.

(c) ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—In selecting countries in the Asia-Pacific region to which assistance is to be provided under the Program, the Secretary of State shall prioritize the provision of assistance to countries that will contribute to the achievement of following objectives:

(1) Retaining unhindered access to and use of international waterways in the Asia-Pacific region that are critical to ensuring the security and free flow of commerce and achieving United States national security objectives.

(2) Improving maritime domain awareness in the Asia-Pacific region.

(3) Countering piracy in the Asia-Pacific region.

(4) Disrupting illicit maritime trafficking activities and other forms of maritime trafficking activity in the Asia-Pacific that directly benefit organizations that have been determined to be a security threat to the United States.

(5) Enhancing the maritime capabilities of a country or regional organization to respond to emerging threats to maritime security in the Asia-Pacific region.

(d) PRIORITIES FOR ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out the purpose of the Program, the Secretary of State—

(1) shall place priority on assistance to enhance the maritime security capabilities of the military or security forces of countries in the Asia-Pacific region that have maritime missions and the government agencies responsible for such forces; and

(2) may provide assistance to a country in the Asia-Pacific region to enhance the capabilities of that country, or of a regional organization that includes that country, to conduct one or more of the following:

(A) Maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

(B) Littoral and port security.

(C) Coast guard operations.

(D) Command and control.

(E) Management and oversight of maritime activities.

(e) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress each year a report on the status of the provision of equipment, training, supplies or other services provided pursuant to the Program during the preceding year.

(f) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee of Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee of Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1292. REPORT ON PLANS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF FREEDOM OF OPERATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL WATERS AND AIRSPACE IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC MARITIME DOMAINS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, with the concurrence with the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report (in classified form) setting forth a plan, for each of the six-month, one-year, and three-year periods beginning on the date of such report, for Freedom of Navigation Assertions, Shows of Force, bilateral and multilateral military exercises, Port Calls, Training, and assistance intended to enhance the maritime capabilities, respond to emerging threats, and maintain freedom of operations in international waters and airspace in the Asia-Pacific maritime domains.

(b) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee of Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee of Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1293. SOUTH CHINA SEA INITIATIVE.

Notwithstanding any provision of section 1261, any assistance provided pursuant to subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(1) of that section, or training provided pursuant to subparagraph (B) of that subsection, shall be provided in manner consistent with current law.

SA 2057. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Depart-

ment of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1005. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUDIT AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PROCESSES.

(a) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall obtain from an entity independent of the Department of Defense selected by the Secretary for purposes of this section an assessment of the audit and financial management processes of the Department.

(2) **COMPOSITION OF ASSESSMENT TEAM.**—The assessment team used by the entity selected by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1) to conduct the assessment required pursuant to that paragraph shall be composed of individuals with extensive experience in audit and financial management of private sector and Federal agencies who are not currently participating in Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) activities for the Department or affiliated with organizations who are supporting such activities.

(3) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A comparison of the audit and financial management processes of the Department with the audit and financial management processes of other appropriate Federal agencies, and appropriate private sector entities, including the qualifications of officials responsible for audit oversight and compliance, for purposes of identifying best practices to be adopted by the Department for its audit and financial management processes.

(B) An analysis of the progress and investments made by the Department under its Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan, and a comparison of such progress and investment with the progress and investments made by other Federal agencies and appropriate private sector entities in audit and financial management processes, for purposes of determining the extent to which Department progress on financial management and audit readiness is consistent with results achieved by other appropriate Federal agencies and appropriate private sector entities.

(C) An identification of recommendations on policies and management and other activities that could be undertaken by the Department to enhance its audit and financial management processes in order to obtain and maintain clean audit opinions of its financial statement as effectively and efficiently as possible.

(4) **ACCESS TO INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the entity conducting the assessment required by paragraph (1) has access to all the information, data, and resources necessary to conduct the assessment in a timely manner.

(5) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall require the entity conducting the assessment required by paragraph (1) to submit to the Secretary and the congressional defense committees a report on the assessment by not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **TRANSMITTAL.**—Not later than 60 days after receiving the report described in sub-

section (a)(5), the Secretary shall transmit the report to Congress, together with the following:

(1) An analysis by the Secretary of the findings and recommendations of the report.

(2) A description of the response of the Department to such finding and recommendations.

(3) Such other matters with respect to the audit and financial management processes of the Department as the Secretary considers appropriate.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Achieving the Promise of Health Information Technology: What Can Providers and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Do To Improve the Electronic Health Record User Experience?”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Federal Real Property Reform: How Cutting Red Tape and Better Management Could Achieve Billions in Savings.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 16, 2015, at 2:45 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC, AND INTERNATIONAL CYBER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cyber Security be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 16, 2015, at 2:30

p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Strategic Implications of Trade Promotion and Capacity-Building in the Asia-Pacific Region."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that MAJ Rick Trimble, an Army fellow in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 17; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, and that the time be equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; lastly, that all time during morning business and the adjournment of the Senate count postclosure on the substitute amendment No. 1463.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there is a case pending before the U.S. Supreme Court that is being followed very closely. It is the case of King v. Burwell. It is a case that really is challenging one of the fundamental premises of the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act was passed 4 or 5 years ago here in the Senate and in the House and signed by President Obama. Because of it, over 11 million Americans have chosen or reenrolled in a health insurance plan, most with a tax subsidy that makes their coverage affordable. The subsidy is based on their income. In the private market, millions more now have access to ex-

panded coverage for preventive health services, such as mammograms or flu shots, without any cost sharing.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, a person no longer needs to stay in a job simply to carry health insurance or be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition. Because of this law, prescription drugs for seniors cost a lot less. There was a time not that long ago that if a member of your family—for instance, one of your children—had a history of diabetes or mental illness, they might find themselves in a position where the family couldn't afford to buy health insurance. But the new Affordable Care Act said: You cannot discriminate against a person or family because there is a preexisting health condition.

The reason that works, the reason why insurance companies can still get by covering people who are sick is that there is also a requirement that people carry health insurance. That means healthy people need to buy health insurance as well as those who are sick and worried about coverage in the future. That enlarges the pool and diminishes the cost to the applicant for health insurance who is suffering from a preexisting condition.

This month, the Supreme Court will make a decision in the case of King v. Burwell. The plaintiffs in this case have made an unusual argument. They claim that Congress intended to provide tax credits to help people buy health insurance only in insurance marketplaces established by each State but not in the Federal marketplace.

I was here during the debate. I was here when we passed the Affordable Care Act. I can tell you that absolutely no one made that argument that I heard on the floor of the Senate. Overwhelmingly, those who were in exchanges—in either State or Federal exchanges—were treated the same way when we calculated the cost and savings of the Affordable Care Act.

If Republicans get their way—and some of them are rooting for the Supreme Court to eliminate the subsidy—6.5 million people will lose their Federal tax subsidy for health insurance. According to the Urban Institute, premiums for people able to purchase insurance would increase by 35 percent. Now, \$12 billion in uncompensated care would be shifted to hospitals and Americans with employer-based insurance, making a ruling in favor of King in the Supreme Court a tax increase on everyone.

Here is how it works: If you have people—millions across the country—who have health insurance because of the Affordable Care Act and they lose their health insurance, they are still going to get sick. When they get sick, they will show up at a hospital. Nine times out of ten—maybe more—the hospital will treat them even if they can't pay.

Their expenses and costs will be passed on to someone else who comes to that hospital, someone with health insurance.

Ultimately, everyone who has health insurance is going to subsidize those who don't. I don't think that is a very fair or wise system. If the King v. Burwell decision goes the wrong way, it may move us toward that.

There are some in the other party who say they have an alternative plan to the Affordable Care Act. The House and the Senate Republicans have already voted to repeal subsidies for working families by voting to repeal the law. I lost track in the House; I think it is 57 times, 58 times they have voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They have come out with a plan that they say would restore the subsidies, but it eliminates the requirement that people carry insurance. It eliminates what is known as the individual mandate.

There were some who argued—and I am one of them—that the individual mandate is a question of personal responsibility. If you want to drive a car in my State of Illinois, you need automobile insurance. It isn't a question of you making a decision. The State requires it because if you are going to be in that automobile and if you get in an accident, the victim in the other car shouldn't have to bear the expense of damage to their car or personal injury, the person responsible for the accident should, and the only way that works is if everybody carries automobile insurance.

If you want to buy a home in my State and I think in almost every State, the mortgage company requires fire insurance. If a fire destroys that home, the mortgage company will get paid the proceeds and will not end up with an empty bag.

Similarly, when it comes to health insurance, the individual mandate says: We think everyone should buy health insurance. We will help those in low-income categories with subsidies because we think everyone should have health insurance. That is what is behind the individual mandate.

If you eliminate the individual mandate, you will be back in the situation where people seeking health insurance will be those who are the most vulnerable and sick, those with preexisting conditions. That makes it tough to create an insurance pool that makes sense when it comes to risk.

According to the American Academy of Actuaries, putting out a plan that eliminates the individual mandate will really be of no help. That bill would only delay the onset of higher insurance premiums and loss of coverage for millions of Americans. The Affordable Care Act puts families in charge of their care instead of insurance companies. It expands health care coverage, lowers health care cost, makes Medicare stronger, and lowers the deficit. I

don't know why there is opposition to any of those elements.

Before the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, 50 million Americans didn't have health insurance, while health care costs for working families and small businesses were increasing out of sight. The Affordable Care Act changed that, and 11 million people of the 50 million now have private health insurance. Millions more are now covered by Medicaid. And for the first time ever, insurance companies have to live up to their promise of being there when you really need them.

Many in the other party have argued that this is not the way to do it and that there should be a viable alternative. I would like them to meet a couple of people from my home State.

The Supreme Court could put in jeopardy health insurance coverage for Ariana Jimenez. Ariana lives in Chicago and works part time as a nursing assistant at a community health center. Ariana pays \$52 a month for her basic health insurance premium—\$52 a month. When asked what would happen to her coverage if the Supreme Court took away her tax credit, Ariana simply said: I wouldn't be able to afford it.

In Illinois, over 800,000 people—in my State of about 12.5 million, 13.5 million—800,000 people in Illinois now have health insurance through the marketplace created by the Affordable Care Act or through Medicaid, and 240,000 people purchased a plan through the Illinois marketplace with a subsidy. I might say that the only marketplace is a Federal marketplace. If the Supreme Court decides in favor of the plaintiffs, a quarter-million people in my home State will not be able to afford their health insurance.

What happens to everyone else? If the Court rules for King, the plaintiff in this lawsuit, consumers in the individual market in States such as Illinois who use the Federal marketplace would face premium increases of 47 percent—\$1,600 a year more that people would have to pay for health insurance.

A few years ago, Domingo Carino found out he had a health condition that required medication and he could not afford it. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act and help from the staff at the Asian Human Services Family Health Center in Chicago, Domingo found good health insurance. He pays \$11 a month. Domingo's plan not only allows him to afford his medication, but it also keeps him in a position where he has access to a primary care physician. According to Domingo, he can now live without worrying about how to afford his medication.

For Domingo and millions like him, tax credits provided by the Affordable Care Act are literally a lifesaver.

Over 54 million people benefit from Medicaid. Before the Affordable Care Act, two out of three people on Medicaid were pregnant women and chil-

dren. That is 36 million of our most vulnerable Americans. Medicaid also provides for people with disabilities. Before the Affordable Care Act, almost 3 million people were covered by Medicaid in Illinois, and more than half of the children born in our State were covered by Medicaid. Since the Affordable Care Act, another 530,000 people have signed up for Medicaid. That means that finally these people can get better from a condition they couldn't afford to treat. I call that a success.

It is interesting, too, that now that people on Medicaid can shop at different hospitals, traditional hospitals that serve the poor—there is one, Stroger Hospital, which used to be Cook County Hospital, in Chicago—have to change the way they do business. They are competitive now. They realize that Medicaid patients can go shopping at another hospital. The administrator at Stroger Hospital told the doctors and staff: Be on your toes. Provide better care. We are competing for business now. These Medicaid recipients can go to every hospital.

According to a recent Gallup poll, the uninsured rate has dropped 3½ percentage points from 2013 to 2014. In Illinois, the uninsured rate dropped 4½ percent during that same period.

The Affordable Care Act includes several changes meant to help slow the growth in health care costs. The CBO this week forecast lower private health insurance premiums. Health care spending per enrollee has slowed in the private insurance market and also in Medicare and Medicaid.

Instead of paying hospitals for the services they provide, because of the ACA, hospitals are paid to make people well. If their patients have to go back to the hospital, many of the hospitals are penalized for that. Despite climbing readmission rates since 2007, those rates started to fall with the Affordable Care Act. Hospitals are responding to the incentives in the Affordable Care Act and more of their patients are getting better and staying better.

The solvency of the Medicare Part A trust fund is now 13 years longer than it was prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act—which means it will be solvent for 13 more years—which the trustees in 2010 said had “substantially improved” the financial status of the trust fund.

The law also helps seniors with the cost of prescription drugs by closing the doughnut hole. There was that moment in time when seniors weren't covered by Medicare Part D and had to reach into their savings account. Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, people with Medicare in Illinois have saved over \$554 million on prescription drugs. We closed the doughnut hole with the Affordable Care Act. That is an average savings for each senior in Illinois of \$925. Those who want to abolish the Affordable Care Act have

some explaining to do to seniors who are pretty happy that they have a helping hand when it comes to paying for drugs.

It is my hope that the Supreme Court does the right thing and realizes Congress never intended to have tax subsidies go to only some Americans and not others. I have always said the Affordable Care Act is not a perfect law. As I have said several times on the floor of the Senate, the only perfect law was carried down a mountain by Senator Moses on clay tablets. Ever since, we have tried our best to put a law together that serves the purposes of our Nation. We do our best, but we can always improve it. The same thing is true for the Affordable Care Act.

I hope the time comes—and I hope the Supreme Court doesn't force this sooner rather than later—when we can have a constructive, bipartisan conversation about the Affordable Care Act. It is not a perfect law. It can be improved. There are parts of it on which I would gladly work with Republicans to change.

I have told my friends in the restaurant business that I know they are concerned about the number of hours employees have to work to be covered and how many employees work at the restaurant and so forth. All of those things can be and should be addressed. If they are addressed in a positive and constructive way, we can improve this law and make it serve the American people better. I think that is why we were elected.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:15 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 17, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

LINDA THOMAS-GREENFIELD, AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (AFRICAN AFFAIRS), TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 27, 2015, VICE JOHNNIE CARSON.

LINDA THOMAS-GREENFIELD, AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (AFRICAN AFFAIRS), TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 27, 2021. (REAPPOINTMENT)

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

JOHN MORTON, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION, VICE MIMI E. ALEMAYEHOU.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ENRIQUE J. GWIN

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING THE FATIMA
COMETS BASEBALL TEAM**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Fatima Comets Baseball team for their first place win in the 2015 Class 3 State Baseball Championship.

This team and their coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the Fatima Comets for a job well done.

IN HONOR OF THE 30TH ANNIVER-
SARY OF WAYNE BROTHERS IN-
CORPORATED**HON. RICHARD HUDSON**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Wayne Brothers Incorporated for thirty years of providing premiere site and concrete contracting to the Southeastern United States.

From their humble beginnings in 1985 to their regional footprint today, Wayne Brothers Incorporated has stood as a pillar of business excellence and community service in North Carolina's 8th Congressional District. Under the leadership of Keith Wayne, Bob Phillips, John Ashworth, Chad Hensley, Isaiah Wayne, and Daniel Wayne, Wayne Brothers Incorporated operates with a mission to provide their clients and shareholders the most specialized quality and value in the field of construction.

Most recently Wayne Brothers Incorporated won the 2015 Cabarrus County Small Business of the Year Award, the 2015 National Association of Women in Construction's Steel Toe Boot Award for Subcontractor of the Year of the Charlotte Chapter, and the 2015 Associated Builders in Construction's Excellence in Construction Eagle Award for National Excellence in Construction.

Even in the midst of such accolades, Wayne Brothers Incorporated remains consistent in its commitment to serve the community.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Wayne Brothers Incorporated for their pioneering spirit and demonstration of core American values. It is my pleasure to congratulate them for thirty years of excellence as a business and key figure in our community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of June 15, 2015, a series of votes was held. Had I been present for these roll call votes, I would have cast the following votes:

Roll Call 364—I vote "YEA."

Roll Call 365—I vote "YEA."

RECOGNIZING MR. RISHI PRASAD

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Rishi Prasad, of Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, for earning The Congressional Award Gold Medal.

Mr. Prasad has put in the necessary time and commitment to rightfully earn this award. Over the course of two years, he dedicated himself to his community by volunteering at a local hospital and refurbishing computers to be donated to others. He set personal development and physical fitness challenges for himself to become a more well-rounded individual. I commend his initiative and service to his community. It is an honor to represent this young man in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 7th district of Pennsylvania, I want to congratulate Mr. Rishi Prasad on his achievement and wish him the best of luck in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I missed a series of recorded votes on June 15. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on roll call vote No. 364 and roll call vote No. 365.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. GLENN D.
STEELE, JR. ON THE OCCASION
OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM
GEISINGER HEALTH SYSTEM**HON. LOU BARLETTA**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Dr. Glenn D. Steele, Jr. on the

occasion of his retirement. Dr. Steele is the President and Chief Executive Officer of Geisinger Health System, an integrated health services organization within my congressional district that is widely admired for its development of innovative care models and its advances in the use of electronic health records and telemedicine.

After receiving his bachelor's degree in history and literature from Harvard University, Dr. Steele went on to graduate with his medical degree from New York University School of Medicine and his PhD in microbiology from Lund University in Sweden. He has served as the Chairman of the American Board of Surgery, as well as the President and Chief Executive Officer of Deaconess Professional Practice Group.

An influential academic, Dr. Steele has contributed immensely to advances in the areas of gastrointestinal cancer, pre-cancer, and, most recently, healthcare delivery and financing. In fact, he is the author or co-author of more than 483 scientific and professional articles, an impressive feat in and of itself.

In 2001, Dr. Steele assumed his role as Chief Executive Officer of Geisinger Health System. Under his direction, the organization has grown from 7,000 employees to 23,500; all of whom provide valuable healthcare services to citizens both in my congressional district, the Commonwealth, and across the nation. Dr. Steele has also overseen Geisinger's growth and development into nine hospital campuses, two research centers, and a 467,000-member health plan. Combined, these entities leverage an estimated \$7.7 billion, revenue that has strongly impacted Pennsylvania's economy for the better.

Furthermore, national accolades have repeatedly been bestowed upon Geisinger for its work in integration, quality, and service—accomplishments that Dr. Steele has played an integral role in facilitating. Geisinger's patient care mission is second to none, and Dr. Steele has taken the organization one step further in developing a commitment to medical education, research, and community service.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Dr. Steele as he celebrates the culmination of an impressive, impactful career. Though his daily influence within Geisinger will be missed, his legacy will inevitably carry on. I hope that he finds this new chapter of his life to be as exciting as the last, and that he enjoys this occasion in the company of family and friends.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

RECOGNIZING THE BUFFALO CHORAL ARTS SOCIETY FOR ITS OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO THE BUFFALO COMMUNITY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor the Buffalo Choral Arts Society for its work in the Buffalo community. The Society has immeasurably enriched the lives of many in the Western New York area through its song and commitment to the arts.

Founded 50 years ago in 1966 by Robert F. Schulz, the Society has expanded to include a diverse group of over 100 singers drawn from within the Buffalo community. Led by conductor Marcia A. Giambone who enters her 27th season with the choir, the Buffalo Choral Arts Society sings a full schedule of concerts throughout the year breathing life into music as diverse as Bach, pop and Broadway for the enjoyment of its audience.

As ambassadors of Buffalo and Western New York as well as the United States of America as a whole, the Buffalo Choral Arts Society has travelled widely throughout both the nation and the world. Domestically they have performed in such esteemed venues as Carnegie Hall, the National Cathedral and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts as well as in local Buffalo treasures such as the Historic Riviera Theatre.

Whilst abroad, the Society has had the honor of performing as part of the 50th Anniversary of the D-Day Invasion at the American Cemetery and Memorial in Normandy, as well as having toured throughout Europe and Canada, participating in important cultural exchange while showcasing the American choral tradition to a wide international audience.

Voted "Best Vocal Ensemble" in each of the last four years in the Artvoice Best of Buffalo contest, the Buffalo Choral Arts Society continues to strive for excellence and to bring its sound to a wider audience. It will travel to New York City in early July to perform a series of concerts over the Independence Day weekend there.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize the Buffalo Choral Arts Society. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the Buffalo Choral Arts Society on an accomplished history of choral music, and to commend it for the exemplary work it has done to enrich the communities of Western New York.

HONORING MR. WILLIAM HYBL

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the most distinguished citizens in the history of Colorado Springs, Mr. William Hybl.

Bill has not only served Colorado Springs with his successful business and non-profit ca-

reers, he has served our nation and globally represented us as well. From his service in the United States Air Force, to his term as the President of the United States Olympic Committee, to his time representing us in the United Nations, and, particularly, to his distinguished tenure as the Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Public Diplomacy, Bill exemplifies the notion of selfless service for the betterment of our nation.

That's why I am delighted that Bill is being honored by the Japanese Government with the Imperial Decoration of the Order of the Rising Sun, Gold Rays with Neck Ribbon. This distinguished award is one of the highest honors that can be bestowed by the Japanese government and Bill has earned this distinction by cultivating a deep and meaningful bond with the Japanese people.

During his time as USOC President, Bill led Team USA in the 1998 Winter Olympics in Nagano, Japan. He also nurtures many diplomatic and cultural exchanges between Japan and Colorado. Among the greatest of these is the thriving Sister City relationship between Colorado Springs and Fujiyoshida.

For these reasons, among many others, I am honored to recognize Bill Hybl and join my fellow citizens in Colorado's Fifth Congressional District in congratulating him on this tremendous honor.

CONGRATULATING SARA RHINE OF THE ELDON HIGH SCHOOL LADY MUSTANGS

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Sara Rhine of the Eldon High School Lady Mustangs for her first place win in the 2015 Class 3 State High Jump Championship, giving her a total of ten state medals.

Sara won her fourth consecutive first place high jump title and finished third in the 100-meter hurdles and long jump. Sara and her coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Sara Rhine of the Eldon High Lady Mustangs for a job well done.

THE COMMENCEMENT OF DIRECT FLIGHTS BETWEEN HOUSTON'S GEORGE BUSH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AND TAIWAN'S TAOYUAN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a significant milestone

achievement, the commencement of direct flights between Houston's George Bush International Airport (IAH) and Taiwan's Taoyuan International Airport.

The arrival of EVA Airways Flight #52, which is scheduled to arrive at George Bush International Airport from Taipei on June 19, 2015, at 4:30 p.m., will mark the first direct flight from Taipei.

Houston and Taipei are sister cities, having begun a friendship in 1961 that has for more than 50 years provided mutual benefits in the areas of business, culture and education, as has brought significant direct foreign investment to Houston and Texas.

Taiwan is the United States' 10th largest trading partner and the United States is Taiwan's largest foreign investor.

Our people-to-people exchanges are flourishing, with over 20,000 Taiwanese students studying in the United States each year.

In 2012, the first year that Taiwan was eligible to participate in the Visa Waiver Program, travel from Taiwan to the United States increased 35 percent.

EVA Airway's direct flight between Houston and Taipei will facilitate continuous prosperity and cooperation between the U.S. and Taiwan.

As the airline also connects major cities in East and Southeast Asia, the direct flight service is expected to facilitate more business, tourism and leisure travel between not only Houston and Taipei but Houston and the entire region as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize and congratulate Houston's George Bush International Airport and EVA Airways on their bold, exciting, and mutually beneficial new venture of direct air travel between Houston and Taipei.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 365 severe weather unavoidably detained my flight in Chicago, Illinois and I was unable to make the vote series.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

IN RECOGNITION OF THE JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE OF NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Jewish Family Service of Northeastern Pennsylvania, which is celebrating 100 years of service to both the Jewish and broader community. Jewish Family Service is a human service organization which reflects the Jewish tradition of caring and compassion for all people in need. Through professional counseling, advocacy, and educational programming, their services enhance

and strengthen the quality of individual, family, and community life in Northeast Pennsylvania.

Established in August of 1915 as the Jewish Federation of Scranton, the organization sought to coordinate relief activities of all service organizations in the Jewish community. These efforts included philanthropic and charitable family services, fundraising, and coordination of medical and dental clinics.

Today, the Jewish Family Service provides a host of services to Northeast Pennsylvania, including mental health counseling, Holocaust survivors assistance, Kosher Meals on Wheels, older adult services, and the Mae S. Gelb Kosher Food Pantry. Additionally, the Jewish Family Service administers the Non-Sectarian DentalCare Center, an ongoing collaborative effort between JFS, the Scranton District Dental Society, and Fortis Institute Dental Hygiene Program to provide free dental care for eligible Lackawanna County residents.

It is a privilege to honor such a service-oriented institution. I hope that Jewish Family Service of Northeastern Pennsylvania will continue their good work as long as it is needed.

CONGRATULATING THE D.C. CHAPTER OF THE BLACK DATA PROCESSING ASSOCIATES (BDPA) ON ITS 37TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the District of Columbia chapter of the Black Data Processing Associates (BDPA) on its 37th anniversary of service to the residents of the District of Columbia and the national capital region.

Founded in May 1978 by Norman Mays, the D.C. chapter is the second chapter of BDPA formed, preceded only by the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania chapter, 1977. In 1979, BDPA was restructured as a national organization, and has 45 active chapters across the United States.

As the oldest and largest African American information technology (IT) organization, comprised of over 2,000 African-American IT professionals, as well as science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) college students, BDPA's vision is to be a powerful advocate for their interests within the global technology industry. Its mission is to be a global, member-focused technology organization that delivers programs and services for the professional well-being of its members.

BDPA continues to promote professional growth and technical development for young people and those entering into information and communication technology (ICT) in academia and corporate America. We also appreciate BDPA and its 45 chapters for continuing to provide ICT opportunities for STEM students and professionals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 37th anniversary of the D.C. chapter of the Black Data Processing Associates, in congratulating BDPA for its outstanding accomplishments

and commitment to the residents of the District of Columbia and around the country, and in welcoming those attending the BDPA Annual National Technology Conference and Career Fair, titled "Evolution of IT—Embracing the Digital Future," on August 18–22, 2015, at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 365, my flight was delayed due to weather.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 2015 on Roll Call #364 on H. Res. 233—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Iran should immediately release the three United States citizens that it holds, as well as provide all known information on any United States citizens that have disappeared within its borders—I am not recorded because a weather-related flight cancellation prevented me from being present for the vote. I am a cosponsor of this important resolution and believe it sends a critical message that if Iran truly wants to engage in constructive interaction with the world, it must release American prisoners. Had I been present, I would have voted AYE.

On June 15, 2015 on Roll Call #365 on H.R. 2559—to designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas—I am not recorded because a weather-related flight cancellation prevented me from being present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted AYE.

TRIBUTE TO KYLE TESTERMAN

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to honor a man whose service and personal fortitude brought great distinction to Tennessee and this Nation.

Kyle Testerman, a former two-term mayor and the youngest person ever elected to that office in my hometown of Knoxville, Tennessee, died recently after a long life filled with family, faith and service.

Mayor Testerman is one of the finest public servants I have ever known, and he was a longtime friend of my father and family.

As a young man, Mayor Testerman played basketball and tennis at the University of Ten-

nessee. As most people know, University of Tennessee athletics is one of the highest levels of sports in this Country.

In recognition of his love of tennis and accomplishments in public service, the City of Knoxville named the tennis complex in Tyson's Park in honor of Mayor Testerman.

Following college, he rose to Mayor after serving on the city council.

More people are moving to East Tennessee to live than almost any other part of the Country in large part because of the contributions Mayor Testerman made towards making the region one of the best places to live.

From rescuing the city's zoo from closure, establishing a cultural exchange center, and funding the first Mobile Meals program, to starting the Knoxville-hosted 1982 World's Fair and constructing TVA's headquarters, Kyle Testerman's legacy remains in every corner of the town he loved.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Kyle Testerman devoted his entire life to East Tennessee. I call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers his inspirational service and offer my deepest condolences to his family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following remarks regarding my absence from votes which occurred on June 15, 2015. I was delayed in arriving in Washington due to a flight cancellation from Columbia, South Carolina.

(1) H.R. 891—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building"—"aye".

(2) H.R. 1326—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office"—"aye".

(3) H.R. 1350—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building"—"aye".

(4) H.R. 728—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office"—"aye".

(5) H.R. 2131—To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center"—"aye".

(6) H.R. 2559—To designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas—"aye".

(7) H. Res. 233—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Iran should immediately release the three United States citizens that it holds, as well as provide all known information on any United States citizens that have disappeared within its borders—"aye".

HONORING WORLD WAR II VETERAN MR. CHARLES ROBERT "BOB" PROVINE, JR. ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JERRY McNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Charles Robert "Bob" Provine, Jr., upon the joyous occasion of his 90th birthday, which will be celebrated with his family, friends, and church family on June 25th in Antioch, California.

Born on June 25, 1925 in Redwood City, CA, Bob is a decorated World War II veteran with a remarkable life of service, both to his community and to our country. He moved to Antioch, CA as a toddler, where he remains to this day. Shortly before graduating from Antioch High School in 1943, Bob enlisted in the Army Air Corps. After receiving his Army training, he was sent to Camp Shanks. It was here that he boarded the RMS *Queen Elizabeth* for transport to the Port of Southampton, England. Upon arrival, he immediately boarded an Army Landing Ship, Tank to cross the English Channel to the LeHarve Replacement Depot, France. He left LeHarve on one of the famous "40's and 8's," the same French boxcars that a generation of American Soldiers had ridden in while in France during World War I. Upon arrival in Metz, France, he was assigned as a replacement to General George Patton's Third Army, and served in the 94th Infantry, 376th Infantry Regiment. During the war, Bob saw combat action in Germany and served in the occupation of Czechoslovakia and Germany. In recognition of his service to our nation Bob was awarded the Combat Infantry Badge and the Bronze Star.

Bob returned home to Antioch and married Alice "Corky" Christ. They were married for more than 30 years before Corky passed away in 1984. Bob and Corky adopted two daughters, Cathy Kolb and Linda Ward, who blessed them with four grandchildren: John C. Kolb, Alicia A. Kolb, Brandon J. Merenda, and Breanna M. Meierdiercks; and three great-grandchildren: John C. Kolb, Jr., Autumn Kolb, and Brandon M. Merenda. A fourth great-grandson from Breanna and Brian Meierdiercks is expected in October.

During his 90 years, Bob always worked to help others and to build his community. He watched Antioch grow from a small town of a few thousand residents to a city of more than 100,000. He has served his community well as a former volunteer firefighter, and for many years at the Antioch Historical Society where he enjoys telling stories about the "old days" in Antioch.

Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, I ask you to join me in honoring Bob Provine for his service to his community and our great nation, and in wishing him a happy birthday and best wishes for continued health and happiness.

RECOGNIZING STUDENTS ENTERING OUR ARMED FORCES

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to honor high school graduates from the Broome-Tioga Board of Cooperative Educational Services area who are entering the United States Armed Forces. These young men and women have made an admirable decision to defend our country. I join the Conklin Kiwanis Club in honoring them.

The Conklin Kiwanis Club will hold a special celebration to honor these graduating high school seniors. "The First to Say Thank You" event will take place on Wednesday, June 17, 2015 at Susquehanna Valley High School in Conklin.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to join me in honoring the following students entering the Army National Guard: Jason Kilts, Lansing; Tyler Miles, Union-Endicott; Jordan Abbott, Windsor; Devin Seeley, Windsor; Matthew Vroman, Windsor.

Honoring the students entering the United States Air Force: Mario Nacinovich, Allynwood Academy; Jonah Sterling, Chenango Forks; Jack Wandersee, Chittenango; Devon Santamaria, Deposit; Samuel Rigney, Jamesville-Dewitt; Tristan Richard, Newark Valley; Matthew Bowers, Newfield.

Honoring the students entering the United States Army: Kaylee Scott, Binghamton; Owen Garlough, Candor; Sara Clark, Chenango Forks; Bronx Gibson, Chenango Forks; Logan McDonald, Chenango Valley; Connor Plue, Deposit; Evaughn Stevens, Deposit; Kevin Desha, Hamilton; Peter Mutz, Harpursville; Timothy Himko, Johnson City; Johnathan Carlsson, Maine-Endwell; Crystal Tripp, Maine-Endwell; Jasmine Rosenberger, Newark Valley; Trevor Zandt, O'Neill; Dylan Hunt, Vestal; Jacob Love, Vestal; Sean Patterson, Vestal.

Honoring the students entering the United States Marines: Colin C. Button, Binghamton; Heather R. Roberts, Binghamton; Tyler Denny, Chenango Forks; Zachariah T. Jeavons, Chenango Forks; Noah E. Birdsall, Cortland; Thomas L. Foster, Cortland; Samuel L. Park, Dryden; Kristopher K. Card, Newark Valley; Damion M. Wilcox, Newark Valley; Elizabeth M. Wiggins, Susquehanna Valley; Michael C. Torres, Union-Endicott; Sheldan M. Clute, Whitney Point; Joseph M. Damico, Whitney Point; Maria E. Dewey, Whitney Point; Zachary T. Shearer, Whitney Point; Elijah R. Decker, Windsor; Tyler J. Frear, Windsor; Tyreik J. Pryor, Windsor.

Honoring the students entering the United States Navy: Nikolmi Tubbs, Cortland; Matthew Pettigrew, Lansing; Dane Saunders, Maine-Endwell; Jonathan Bullock, Windsor.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIMI WALTERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 364 I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye".

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP OF DR. WILLIAM S. BARNES

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. William S. Barnes, better known as Pastor Bill, for a lifetime of service and leadership. A graduate of Emory University with degrees in both business administration and theology, Pastor Bill has been an ordained minister in the Florida Conference of The United Methodist Church since 1974. Bill also received a Doctor of Divinity from Florida Southern College in 1995.

Bill was appointed Lead Pastor of St. Luke's United Methodist Church in Orlando in June of 1992. He held that position until July of 2014 when he was appointed Co-Lead Pastor as part of St. Luke's strategic leadership transition plan. Since 1992 St. Luke's has grown to be one of the largest and most influential congregations in the United Methodist denomination under Pastor Bill's leadership.

Throughout his career, Bill has served in rural, urban, and suburban churches, as well as Chaplain of Florida Southern College in Lakeland, Florida. Bill doesn't just preach, he leads by example. During his tenure in Orlando Bill has helped many communities by initiating dialogues on issues of race and bringing hope to economically disadvantaged areas through vocational training, housing assistance, and organizing food and shelter for the homeless. Bill was also one of the first ministers in Orlando to support non-discrimination ordinances offering protections to the LGBT community.

Bill is well known in Orlando for founding Shepherd's Hope a faith-based volunteer health care organization for the uninsured. It has expanded to five locations throughout Central Florida.

Pastor Bill was the recipient of the 2002 Social Entrepreneurship Award for his work with Shepherd's Hope, the Jefferson Award for American Public Service, the Manhattan Institute's Award for Social Entrepreneurship, and the Society of John Wesley's United Methodist Men Fellow. Bill Served on Bethune Cookman University's Board of Trustees from 2002 to 2011.

Bill is married to Kim, who teaches three-year-olds at St. Luke's Child Development Center and also designs her own line of custom jewelry. They have two children, Kristin and Meredith, a terrific son-in-law, Sean, and two grandsons, Brady and Mason.

I am honored to recognize Pastor Bill Barnes for his leadership and service to his community.

HONORING SONS AND DAUGHTERS IN TOUCH

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sons and Daughters in Touch (SDIT) on its 25th anniversary. The sons and daughters of servicemen and women who have died or gone missing in action while serving in the United States military are known as Gold Star children. Nearly 40 years after the end of the Vietnam War, many of their fathers and mothers are still unaccounted.

SDIT was founded by Tony Cordero, whose father died during the Vietnam War. Tony wanted to find others like him who had lost a parent in battle, and since its founding, SDIT has been dedicated to locating, uniting, and providing support to Gold Star children as well as other family members whose relatives have died or remain missing as a result of the Vietnam War. Prior to the founding of Sons and Daughters in Touch, in 1990, there was no organization to support those who lost their parents during the war. This organization currently represents an estimated 20,000 sons and daughters in the United States.

SDIT will be celebrating its 25th anniversary on Father's Day, Sunday June 21, at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC. The United States of America Vietnam War Commemoration will recognize Gold Star sons and daughters and their families who lost their loved ones during the war for their service and sacrifice. Representatives from all Gold Star families, including those from Korea, WWII and recent conflicts, will participate in the event.

As a nation, we must pay tribute to the generations of children whose parents suffered the ultimate sacrifice defending our nation. I ask my colleagues to stand here with me in upholding our shared responsibility to comfort and care for the loved ones and communities these servicemen and women left behind. I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring our nation's sons and daughters and the many contributions their parents have made for our country by supporting this resolution.

TRIBUTE TO CHERYL JOHNSON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Cheryl Johnson of Bedford, Iowa, on her retirement from the Bedford School. Ms. Johnson has been a dedicated public servant helping to educate the future of Iowa—its students.

Ms. Johnson has worked at the Bedford School for 15 years, spending three of those

years in the elementary school and 12 with the Secondary School. During her tenure at Bedford she has worked diligently to support her community. She performed many different roles and enjoyed being able to watch her four older grandchildren graduate from Bedford.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent dedicated public servants like Cheryl Johnson from the great state of Iowa in the United States Congress. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on reaching this important milestone, and wishing her continued success for years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 364 and 365. I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on roll call 364 and yea on roll call 365.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, on roll call nos. 364 and 365 I was unavoidably detained due to weather and flight delays. Had I been present, I would have voted aye and aye.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR. COLEMAN HATTON

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual, Mr. Coleman Hatton, of Clark County, Kentucky, for his distinguished military service during World War II. Mr. Hatton, a part of the greatest generation, served our nation in the United States Army.

Mr. Hatton left the comforts of home and family on December 26th, 1942, when he was twenty years old. He served as a Tech-4 in Company D, 23rd Battalion for twenty nine months. His service was in Central Europe, primarily in France, England, and Germany.

Mr. Hatton served as a light tank crewman and was a driver. The light tank crew's job was to find the enemy and then draw fire for the big tanks. Mr. Hatton drove the lead tank directly behind the unit commander. He and his fellow crewmen took turns sleeping in the tanks while on guard duty. They went without hot meals for days at a time, ate C-rations, and sometimes visited nearby farms for eggs when they felt safe from enemy fire. Like many of his fellow soldiers, Hatton witnessed the horrors of war. He saw tanks get hit resulting in fires that killed all inside. He recovered bodies of dead American soldiers and some of

these bodies had been desecrated by wild animals. He saw a Colonel's head get blown off. Hatton served our country admirably and bravely.

Mr. Hatton survived his service and returned home February 14, 1946. He and his late wife were married for sixty six years. He has six children, fourteen grandchildren, twenty great grandchildren, and three great great grandchildren.

The bravery of Mr. Hatton and his fellow men and women of the United States Army is heroic. Because of the courage of individuals from Clark County and from all across our great nation, our freedoms have been saved for our generation and for future generations. He is truly an outstanding American, a patriot, and a hero to us all.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE STATE CHAMPIONS IN BOYS' SOCCER FROM IOWA'S FIRST DISTRICT

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Iowa state championship boys' soccer teams from my district. The champions from each of Iowa's three soccer classes claimed their titles over the weekend on "Championship Saturday" at James W. Cownie Soccer Park in Des Moines, Iowa, and all of these schools are located in my district.

The Dyersville Beckman Blazers capped an undefeated 18-0 season with a 1-0 victory over Gilbert High School in the class 1A final. Senior Billy Hoffman scored the game winning goal in double overtime to secure the school's first boys' soccer state title in Beckman's history.

The Cedar Rapids Xavier Saints bested Central DeWitt 1-0 in double overtime to capture the school's seventh class 2A title and fourth boys' soccer title in five seasons. Luke Dunball netted the game winner to cap a 17-2 season for the Saints.

Lastly, the Marion Linn-Mar Lions shut out Ankeny Centennial High School 2-0. An "own goal" off a free kick by junior Alexy Boehm and goal by sophomore Leroy Enzugusi proved enough to secure the school's first state championship in boys' soccer. The Lions finished the season 20-3.

I congratulate all the players and coaches including head coaches Mirek Laskowski of Beckman High School, Amir Hadzic of Xavier High School, and Corey Brinkmeyer of Linn-Mar High School. I look forward to seeing continued success both on and off the field from these student athletes next season.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 11 and 12, 2015, I was absent from

Congress to attend a family event in California and was unable to cast my votes on Roll Call votes #345 through 363. Had I been present:

Roll Call #345—Concurring in the Senate Amendments with an Amendment to H.R. 1295—Trade Preferences Extension Act, I would have voted AYE.

Roll Call #346 Schiff Amendment—Prohibits the use of funds after March 31, 2016 for Operation Inherent Resolve in the absence of a law enacted by Congress that specifically authorizes the use of military force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant I would have voted AYE.

Roll Call #347 Lee Amendment #1—Prohibits the use of funds pursuant to the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) after December 31, 2015 I would have voted AYE.

Roll Call #348 Lee Amendment #2—Prohibits the use of funds pursuant to the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) against Iraq I would have voted AYE.

Roll Call #349 Sablan Amendment—Prohibits the use of funds to establish any live-fire range, training course, or maneuver area within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, in contravention of certain law and United States Code I would have voted AYE.

Roll Call #350 Gosar Amendment #1—Prohibits the use of funds to be expended by the Department of the Navy to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, any search or rescue units from the Marine Corps I would have voted NO.

Roll Call #351 Johnson (GA) Amendment #1—Prohibits the use of funds to transfer a flash-bang grenade to federal and state law enforcement agencies under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code I would have voted NO.

Roll Call #352 Gosar Amendment #2—Prohibits the use of funds to procure any Army Aircrew Combat Uniforms I would have voted NO.

Roll Call #353 Johnson (GA) Amendment #2—Prohibits the use of funds to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle to federal and state law enforcement agencies under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code I would have voted NO.

Roll Call #354 Ellison Amendment—Prohibits the use of funds for contractors who have violated certain wage requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act I would have voted AYE.

Roll Call #355 Smith (MO) Amendment—Prohibits the use of funds to provide legal defense counsel for any foreign detainee held at the U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba I would have voted NO.

Roll Call #356 Massie Amendment—Prohibits the use of funds to query certain communications collected under Sec. 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978. It also prohibits funds from being used by the National Security Agency (NSA) and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to mandate or request that a person alter its product or service to permit electronic surveillance of any user of that product of service I would have voted AYE.

Roll Call #357 Democratic Motion to Re-commit H.R. 2685 I would have voted AYE.

Roll Call #358 Final Passage of H.R. 2685—Department of Defense Appropriations Act I would have voted NO.

Roll Call #359 Adoption of the Rule I would have voted NO.

Roll Call #360 On Approving the Journal I would have voted NO.

Roll Call #361 Concurring in portion of Senate Amdt comprising title II (except section 212) I would have voted NO.

Roll Call #362 Concurring in portion of senate amendment preceding title II I would have voted NO.

Roll Call #363 Concurring in Senate amendments with amendment I would have voted NO.

HONORING MS. ALICE ADRIENNE SPEARMAN

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Ms. Alice Adrienne Spearman, former School Board Member for the Oakland Unified School District, OUSD. Known throughout the Bay Area as a passionate advocate for children, Ms. Spearman has left an undeniable mark in our community. With her passing on May 26, 2015, we look to honor her extraordinary life work and the lives she touched throughout her career.

Ms. Spearman, a proud Oakland native, was born on November 7, 1951. She graduated from Castlemont High School in 1969 and later attended California State University, CSU, East Bay and CSU San Jose where she earned an Associate's Degree. While attending CSU San Jose, Ms. Spearman followed in her mother's footsteps and became a proud member of Delta Sigma Theta, Sorority Incorporated.

Upon receiving her Associates Degree, Ms. Spearman decided to pursue a career in health services and obtained her Registered Nursing, RN, License. She worked as an RN with the Department of Veterans Affairs for a decade before retiring in 1980.

Ms. Spearman's love for education grew from her mother, who worked as a teacher and school principal. When Spearman's daughters attended her alma mater, Castlemont, she founded a parental patrol group to offer student behavioral assistance. She also hosted a television talk show on Soul Beat Television Network where she frequently discussed issues affecting students attending Oakland public schools.

In 2004, Ms. Spearman was elected to serve the East Oakland community as a School Board Member for the Oakland Unified School District, where she served tirelessly until 2012 and in a variety of positions; including Board President and Vice President. It was here that she continued her work advocating for quality education while always championing the need for resources for Oakland students. Ms. Spearman also worked to ensure Oakland residents were given priority for construction jobs within the Oakland Unified School District.

Ms. Spearman was the mother of two daughters: Kiisha Jackson and Leilani Spearman; and, a proud grandmother of four:

Tanisha Barker, Jocelyn Barker, Kii'era Smith, and Jahkari Clyde Lee Smith.

I will always remember Alice's determination, her optimism, and love for children. Her larger than life spirit will live forever and will continue to give us hope for the future. I will be forever grateful for her wise counsel and friendship.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes the legacy of Ms. Alice Adrienne Spearman. Ms. Spearman's contributions have truly impacted countless lives throughout the Bay Area. I join all of Ms. Spearman's loved ones in celebrating her incredible life and offer my most sincere condolences.

NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH MONTH

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate National Men's Health Month a time to focus attention and heighten awareness of preventable health problems affecting men and boys and encourage early detection and treatment.

Men's Health Month is celebrated across the country with screenings, health fairs, media appearances, and other health education and outreach activities.

The National Men's Health Network has encouraged the development of thousands of health awareness activities as corporations, hospital systems, clinics, faith-based communities, the public sector, and others use the month of June to highlight their services and reach out to men and their families.

In my district of Houston, Texas, this information has led to the increase in men being conscious about their risk factors for prostate cancer and other diseases.

The University of Houston has an entire clinic specializing in men's health for the Houston community to collect information and receive treatment; this clinic provides educational and specialized services that encourage men of all ages and ethnicities to implement positive lifestyle changes.

I encourage all men, young and older, and their families, to develop positive and proactive attitudes toward health and wellness, engage in preventive behaviors, lead healthy lifestyles, and seek timely medical advice and care.

Prostate cancer is the most common cancer in men, afflicting 1 out of every 11 American men and killing 34,000 men every year.

In the past 6 years, the death rate for prostate cancer has grown at almost twice the death rate of breast cancer.

The American Cancer Society estimates for 2015 the number of new cases for prostate cancer to be 220,800, and the number of deaths to be 27,540 from prostate cancer.

For African-American men, the rate of affliction is even worse; African-American men have the highest incidence of prostate cancer in the world.

These are not just statistics, each of these numbers represent a father, brother, son, uncle, or cousin who has been affected and passed away from this treatable disease.

Mr. Speaker, much progress has been made in the past 21 years with improvements in the health and well-being of men and boys, with a dramatic improvement in life expectancy and surprising drops in key mortality indicators.

There has been a steep drop among males in overall mortality, and corresponding improvements in the mortality rates for cancer and cardiovascular diseases.

Our goal this month should be to raise awareness about men's health in our communities and to rededicate ourselves to providing support for our men by further educating ourselves and our communities on men's health and effects.

Recognizing and preventing men's health problems is not just an issue of concern to me because it impacts wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters.

Mr. Speaker, as a Congresswoman, wife, mother and now grandmother, I can personally attest to the importance of heightening the awareness of preventable health problems as well as encouraging the early detection of disease that affect our young men's lives.

Men's health is truly a family issue.

SUPPORTING THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House considered legislation that reauthorizes the United States' efforts to engage and assist the economies of sub-Saharan Africa. I stand in support of these objectives, as well as the efforts and programs that encourage development and improve economic relations between our nation and that region.

Because trade preferences programs between the U.S. and other economies can promote economic development and foster investment, I am pleased that many African countries already join in these initiatives. It is important that long-term certainty is provided for the businesses and workers that have taken advantage of U.S. trade programs and development efforts. In addition, the United States should also be prepared to engage with and support the sustainable growth of those economies that are currently ineligible for and not participating in current preferences programs.

Although the Democratic Republic of Congo, DRC, is among those sub-Saharan African nations that are not at the moment eligible for trade preferences, I understand that after a long-fought civil war, the Congolese are working hard to revive their economy. While the challenges facing the DRC are considerable, there are many ways that the U.S. can work with the government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to reduce poverty, increase stability, strengthen the rule of law, improve workers' rights, and support the establishment of a market-based economy that will allow the Congolese people to grow their economy. These important steps can help nations pro-

mote exports and investments that foster economic development elopment in partnership with the United States.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to maintain engagement and support for the growth of the economies of sub-Saharan Africa. It is my hope that African countries continue their involvement, and that those currently outside of the program take steps to initiate participation, such as meeting eligibility standards. I am pleased that the U.S. will continue to partner with the people and countries of sub-Saharan Africa to grow economies, reduce poverty, and share prosperity.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 15, 2015, I was absent from the House due to a flight cancellation and a delay to my secondary flight plans. Due to my absence, I did not record any votes for the day. I would like to reflect how I would have voted had I been present for legislative business.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on Roll Call 364 and Roll Call 365.

IN HONOR OF THE FAIRFAX CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON THEIR 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Fairfax Chamber of Commerce on 90 years of successfully promoting business throughout the entire Northern Virginia region. By clearly and effectively voicing the priorities and concerns of the business community to our local, state, and national leaders, the Chamber has helped make Fairfax a great place to have a business and thrive. Led by President and CEO Jim Corcoran and his dedicated staff, as well as a very engaging board of directors, the Fairfax Chamber of Commerce is the gold standard for what a local Chamber of Commerce should be, encouraging business leaders and advocates to come together to promote and share ideas that will inevitably help foster a healthy economy. TIME magazine has called Fairfax County "one of the great economic success stories of our time." A George Mason University Center for Regional Analysis study estimated the gross county product, or market value of the goods and services produced in Fairfax County—at nearly \$91 billion. The Fairfax Chamber of Commerce has served the community with great distinction and achievement over the last 90 years. I am honored to represent the Fairfax Chamber of Commerce in Congress, and hope that their next 90 years may be even more successful and prosperous.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH BIRTHDAY OF DR. JEAN G. CHAMPOMMIER

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Jean G. Champommier on the celebration of his 75th birthday, and on his distinguished career of making our communities healthier and our children safer. As a Public Health Commissioner for Los Angeles County, as a community leader and a businessman, as an educator, as a social worker, and as a family therapist, Dr. Champommier has been a prominent part of the continuing fight to make Southern California a better place to live and raise a family.

Since 1983, Dr. Champommier has been the President and CEO of Alma Family Services in East Los Angeles. He oversees a diverse and multidisciplinary staff of 170 people, spread out across 13 locations, 22 schools, and seven health facilities. Alma offers multilingual and multigenerational community-based services for families. These services include behavioral health support, substance abuse services, help for individuals with intellectual and developmental special needs, preschool services, and clinical support for at-risk youth.

Dr. Champommier's work at Alma is in keeping with his life's work. For more than fifty years, he has worked to advance behavioral health and child welfare through community-based efforts. In the 1960s, with the help of funds from the Office of Equal Opportunity, he played a key role in developing family counseling services in low-income parts of Ventura County. These services were an early local version of efforts to prevent child abuse and neglect. In the 1970s, he served as Chief of Social Services for a behavioral health clinic in Lincoln Heights, which set up new behavioral health services at local schools.

Dr. Champommier has also been a leader on our campuses and in our classrooms. He has taught about child welfare and community organization at UC Santa Barbara, Cal State Northridge, and Cal State L.A. He has served as a social work field instructor at USC and UCLA. And he has coordinated conferences on farm labor issues and Latino youth empowerment at UC Santa Barbara Extension.

It is little wonder that Dr. Champommier's work has earned him federal, state, and county commendations. I am pleased to add my voice to this chorus of congratulations. I thank Dr. Champommier for his many years of exemplary dedication to the families and children of my 40th Congressional District and beyond. I hope he will celebrate a very happy 75th birthday this Saturday, June 20th, with his beautiful wife—and my good friend—Dr. Marie S. Torres, and their extended family and friends.

CONGRATULATING CRAIG HOWARD
ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Craig Howard on the completion of a successful career with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Howard has dedicated his career to serving our veterans. During his 37 years with the Department of Veterans Affairs, he has worked tirelessly to ensure that veterans receive the medical care they need and deserve.

Mr. Howard has served as Director for the Canandaigua VA Medical Center since 2005. His leadership was instrumental in establishing the Center of Excellence for Suicide Prevention and PTSD, the Veterans Crisis Line, the National Homeless Call Center, and the National Caregiver Support Line. These resources and services have had a profoundly positive impact on the lives of our local veterans.

During his tenure as Director, the Canandaigua VA Medical Center has ranked highly in both patient and employee satisfaction. Mr. Howard leaves behind a strong legacy of service and leadership: his work has left a lasting imprint on our community.

I thank Mr. Howard for his years of dedicated service to our veterans and wish him the very best in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 364 severe weather unavoidably detained my flight in Chicago, Illinois and I was unable to make the vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

TRIBUTE TO HEIDI VANDERHOLM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Heidi Vanderholm of Stanton, Iowa for receiving a \$2,500 grant from Iowa Communications Alliance to attend Central College.

The Iowa Communications Alliance offers this grant scholarship to high school seniors as well as students already enrolled in technical schools, colleges, and universities who receive service from a telecommunications provider that is a member of the Iowa Communications Alliance. This honor was awarded to Heidi in order to help her achieve her dreams of earning a college education.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent future leaders like Heidi Vanderholm from the great state of Iowa in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in congratulating

her for receiving this prestigious award. I wish her the best of luck in her studies and future career.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 364, flight was delayed due to weather. Had I been present, I would have voted "Aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 2015, I was unavoidably detained in my district due to weather and missed recorded votes #364–365. Had I been present, on Roll Call #364, H. Res. 233—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Iran should immediately release the three United States citizens that it holds, as well as provide all known information on any United States citizens that have disappeared within its borders, I would have voted YEA; and on Roll Call #365, H.R. 2559—To designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas, I would have voted YEA.

SENATE—Wednesday, June 17, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord of our lives, whose commands we cherish and in whose service we find joy, thank You for the gift of this day. Inspire our lawmakers to fill the waiting hours with labor that will open doors of new possibilities for our Nation and world. Lord, stir their hearts to seize today's opportunities to do Your will on Earth, repairing yesterday's wrongs and grasping tomorrow's promises. Enlighten their hearts with the knowledge of Your love, as they strive to make this world a better place. Use them to provide cheer to sad hearts, faith to doubting hearts, and courage to fearful hearts.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it was heartening to see so many Democrats joining us yesterday in advancing a good Defense authorization bill by a very large bipartisan margin. It now puts the Senate on the path to bring the bill to final passage tomorrow. Once that happens, the Senate will have taken a significant step by doing right for the men and women who risk everything to protect us. It is certainly good news, but it is not the end of the story either, because while the Defense authorization bill makes promises to our troops, it is the Defense appropriations bill that actually fulfills those promises.

That is the bill we will consider next. I would expect everyone who votes for the Defense authorization bill would

also want to support moving to Defense appropriations because I am sure every Democratic colleague who just voted to make promises to our troops will want to help us actually fulfill those promises by voting for the Defense appropriations bill as well.

They might look to the example Democrats just set in the House of Representatives last week. House Democrats appear to understand just how cynical it would have been to make promises and then not fund them, which is why we saw dozens join Republicans to pass Defense appropriations. House Democrats must have known their constituents wouldn't fall for an "I was for the troops before I was against them" argument. House Democrats also must have seen how heartless it would have been to deny funding for America's heroes as part of some ridiculous filibuster summer plan to extract more cash for giant bureaucracies such as the IRS.

I have to think Senate Democrats would see things the same way. Judging by what we just saw last week in the Senate Appropriations Committee, there is no reason to think otherwise. Democrats and Republicans came together in the Appropriations Committee to pass the Defense appropriations bill we are about to consider by a huge margin of 27 to 3. Not only did every single Democrat support this bill in committee, but Democrats had some pretty supportive things to say about it too.

One Democratic friend called the appropriations bill "a key investment in our national security" that funds "a number of Hawaii's defense needs." Another Democrat noted it would fund a program that is one of her "top priorities." Here is what another Democrat said of the bill: "It will directly protect and grow Connecticut's defense manufacturing industry and the hundreds of thousands of jobs it supports across our State." He went on to say it will "implement a well-deserved pay raise for our troops who put their lives on the line each and every day." He concluded by saying it is a "victory for Connecticut."

A victory for Connecticut—now there is a rousing endorsement of the bill we will vote on tomorrow. It is no wonder each of these Democratic colleagues voted to endorse the appropriations bill. It is good news for our troops and their families. It is good news for our country. These Democratic friends must not want to see a "victory for Connecticut" squashed or one of their "top priorities" sacrificed for the sake of some ploy to funnel a few more dollars to Washington's big bureaucracies.

They must think this filibuster summer idea their party leaders hatched isn't good for America's national security or for job security in their own States. They must know you can't take credit for promises made in a defense authorization bill if you then vote against the appropriations bill that would fund them.

I hope Senators in both parties would join together once more to bring the Defense authorization bill over the goal line tomorrow and then begin debate on the inseparable appropriations bill too.

If Senators want to amend that appropriations bill or strike a rider, then they should vote with us to get on the legislation so we can consider these amendments or those motions to strike. If Senators want to try to increase or reduce the level of funding in that bill, the only way they will have a chance to try doing that is if they vote with us to get on the bill in the first place.

So bring us your ideas. Bring them on out. Let's debate them. Whether you have a proposal to boost the helicopter industry in Connecticut or a plan to repair naval vessels, amphibious and surface ships in places such as California, Washington, Hawaii, and Virginia, the only way to ensure ideas like these are considered is by voting to open debate on the appropriations bill, and the only way to ensure they will not be heard at all—at all—is by voting to filibuster. That wouldn't be good for anyone.

So let's not kill the opportunity to even have those debates because here is what we know: The young men and women of our volunteer force don't need a summer packed full of Democratic filibusters, and they certainly don't need a Democratic shutdown surprise in the fall. All they ask for are the weapons, the training, and the skills they need to prevail on the battlefield. We can give it to them. We are almost there.

Democrats already joined Republicans to make a promise to the troops, and with just a little more good bipartisan work we will see Democrats join with Republicans to fulfill those promises. I have to think they will because failing to do so would mean making empty promises to both constituents and our troops.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION AND SEQUESTRATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend the Republican leader throws the word "filibuster" around. He has a right to do that because he is an expert. He has led in this Senate more filibusters than all previous leaders put together. As the Republican leader, he has engineered about 300 filibusters, stopping basically everything—certainly slowing down everything on the President's agenda. It was a plan he was a part of and he certainly lived up to that.

The 46 Democrats over here are just as patriotic as the 54 Republicans over there. We care about the troops just as much as the Republicans over there, but we also believe that when my friend the Republican leader throws around terms such as "vast bureaucracy," that we want to fund a vast bureaucracy, I don't think we should start talking about bureaucracies. The Pentagon is a pretty good bureaucracy in itself. I admire very much the Secretary of Defense. He does the best job he can. Our Secretary of Defense does not agree with the Republicans as to how the troops should be funded.

My friend the Republican leader knows the legislation before this body is going to be vetoed by the President. He said so. He put it in writing. The President said that on appropriations bills, if they are at the level of sequestration, he will veto those also. So this little magic game I mentioned yesterday that the Republican leader has engineered, saying we are going to take care of defense, and with the vast bureaucracy, we don't care what happens to them—well, in this "vast bureaucracy" are things such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Homeland Security Secretariat, which is important for protecting our homeland, making sure airports are safe, making sure our borders are protected. That is the vast bureaucracy he is talking about.

So we Democrats want to make sure there is equality. We believe in funding defense, and we are going to do everything we can. There has been no better example of that than the ranking member of the subcommittee dealing with defense, the senior Senator from Illinois. Senator DURBIN has worked so hard to be fair—fair to Democrats and fair to Republicans—and I am confident he will continue to do that.

I am also confident he cares about the other agencies we are so concerned about, not only the few I have mentioned. To have a secure nation takes more than bombs and bullets. Having a secure nation is also making sure we have a good education system, a good transportation system, a good program to maintain research for health.

The most famous organization in the history of the world for investigating disease is the National Institutes of Health. We know what sequestration did to them once, and they are about to

do it again, if this little magic game the Republican leader is engineering goes on. It will be cut like everybody else. It is not defense.

The one fact Senator MCCONNELL fails to mention is the fact that it is all borrowed money—\$100 billion, approximately—to get what he wants done in the Defense bill. It is borrowed money in the so-called overseas contingency fund.

We are going to do what we think is appropriate for the country.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this month we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the creation of the Eisenhower Interstate Highway System. The Interstate Highway System was one of the signature accomplishments of the entire 20th century. If there was ever a list of the seven wonders of the United States, our Nation's highway system would be on that list.

Consider the sheer size and complexity of our transportation system. The Interstate Highway System encompasses 50,000 miles of highways, bridges, and tunnels, and that doesn't count the railways. It connects East and West, North and South. A person can drive from Boston directly to Seattle, 3,020 miles, or from Laredo, TX, to Duluth, MN, 1,831 miles, all on the Interstate Highway System. The Federal Interstate Highway System serves all 50 States and the District of Columbia.

The Interstate Highway System is a central nervous system of our Nation's economy, creating vital corridors for goods and services for American commerce. In every community in our Nation, from our largest cities and our large metropolitan areas to the small rural communities that have just a few people—and I mean a few people—our interstate highways bear the name of Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose vision of a connected America resulted in the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

How did this good man, Dwight Eisenhower, come up with this idea? Well, he was ordered, as a young officer in the Army, to bring a military contingent across the United States during World War I. It was awful. He never forgot that. There was no Federal highway system. There were barely highways. There were barely roads.

With his experience as Allied commander of troops in World War II, he came back from that recognizing how important moving goods and services for the military around Europe was, and how he had tried that in the United States and it did not work. But he was going to change that. That is what he did. President Eisenhower, a Republican, understood that the interstate highway complex was an investment

worth making. He realized the money spent on roads and bridges creates jobs—lots of jobs. President Eisenhower, with all of his military experience and background, understood that an interstate system was important to our national security.

My friend talks about the security of our troops. Of course they are important. We so admire these men and women who protect us. But to have a safe and secure Nation, we also have to have things such as a good highway system.

My friend the Republican leader fails to mention that. It is part of our national security needs, as evidenced by Dwight Eisenhower. I wonder what President Eisenhower would think of today's Republican Party and its lack of concern for the Interstate Highway System. I believe he would be greatly disappointed. Just a few weeks from now, as the month of July comes to a close, funding for the Federal highway program will be gone. It will expire. But you would not know that congressional Republicans are watching the same movie the American people are watching. Republicans in Congress have refused to work with us in making an adequate, long-term investment in our country's surface transportation system.

Instead, the Republicans see the Federal highway program and trust fund as some sort of a hot potato. Stay away from it. It should never be dealt with and only be kicked down the road, leaving millions of jobs behind. Even with the looming deadline, Republicans are showing no haste in forming a plan to address our Nation's crumbling roads, railroads, bridges, and transit systems.

We have one of the most unique makeups in one of our committees that this body has ever seen. We have one of the most liberal Members of the Senate, BARBARA BOXER, and her counterpart is one of the most conservative Members of this body, JIM INHOFE from Oklahoma. They know the importance. These two divergent political spectrums know that we have to do something about the highway system. They are going to put out a bill. They are going to authorize it. Then we need to figure out a way to fund that.

Republicans don't seem interested in that. Even with its looming deadline, Republicans are showing no haste in forming a plan or to develop one for this system that we have to do something about. Congressional Republicans see no urgency to schedule hearings, to mark up a bill, to take testimony in other ways or to make the highway trust fund solvent. With every day that passes, our Federal highway trust fund inches closer and closer to insolvency.

It is clear we will need to get to that reauthorization of the highway program either this week or next week. But we won't. Look at the schedule. It

means we are left with July. Looking at the Senate calendar for July, assuming that the Republican leader will continue to keep the Senate out of session on Fridays, we will have, in reality, 15 days to reauthorize the Federal highway system—15 days. Fifteen session days is precious little time, especially when Republicans don't feel any urgency to solve this problem. Of course, we all know how this is going to play out. This is straight out of the Republican's playbook—the manufactured crisis playbook.

They have written the book, and they are adding chapters to it every week of this Congress. Republicans will drag their feet until the very last minute, refusing to work with us on a long-term solution to our Nation's infrastructure woes. Then, when the deadline is imminent, the Republican leader will offer yet another short-term extension to stave off another disaster of his own making.

This is and should be unacceptable to everyone here. We already have had 33 Republican short-term fixes. We do not need a 34th. But that is where we are headed. That is too bad. What we do need is a Republican Party that sees the value of a robust, long-term investment in our Nation's highways. We need a Republican Party that sees what President Eisenhower saw 50 years ago—half a century—that investing in our infrastructure is a shot in the arm to our economy.

There are hundreds of thousands of shovel-ready jobs just waiting for Congress to act. On the other hand, failing to meet our country's infrastructure needs will be catastrophic. The American Society of Civil Engineers predicts that our economy would lose \$1 trillion unless we invest in surface transportation—\$1 trillion. Let's not forget the safety implications of sitting on our hands. Half of our roads are in poor condition. Tens of thousands of bridges across the country are structurally deficient. Railroads are without important, lifesaving braking systems. They need to be refurbished and some parts of them reinvented. Doing nothing is not and should not be an option.

The Republican leader should change course and abandon his policy of governing by crisis. We can get started on a long-term, bipartisan reauthorization of the Federal highway program today. All we need is for Republican Members of Congress and their leaders to focus on American jobs and the traveling American public's safety. They have not done that. This is too bad.

Mr. President, there are a number of Senators on the floor.

Will the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, with the time equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The Senator from Michigan.

MICHIGAN PRODUCTIVITY AND INNOVATION

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I am truly blessed to represent the people of Michigan in the Senate. My State was carved out in one era by the ice age and again 200 years ago by the Congress. It is comprised of more than just two beautiful peninsulas bordered by four Great Lakes.

Since our Nation's founding, Michigan has been at the frontier of America, helping to build a stronger and more secure country. The Northwest Ordinance, affirmed by the very first Congress, created the midwestern region from which the Michigan Territory would be born. In the 19th century, pioneers moved to what was then the western frontier to settle in Michigan and its neighboring States.

The Peters family was among them. My family made the long journey from New York and settled in Rochester, MI, in the early 1840s. They were among the earliest pioneers to settle in my State. From that time on, generations of Michiganders pioneered a State devoted to great public education. While the Northwest Ordinance made primary education a priority and stated that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged" in the new territory, higher education also had a place that made our State great very early. Twenty years before the founding of the State of Michigan, the University of Michigan was founded, one of the first public universities in the country. Later, Michigan State University would become one of the pioneer land grant universities. While the two schools may be rivals on the gridiron, they have long complimented each other to the benefit of our State.

Today, Michigan is home to 93 universities, colleges, and community colleges. Michigan grew rapidly as migrants from across the country and immigrants from around the world were drawn to our supplies of timber, ore, arable land, and abundant fresh water. As a new century dawned across America, Michigan continued to grow with the advent of industrialization and mass manufacturing, from mining and forestry at the western tip of the Upper Peninsula to the booming auto factories of Detroit. Michigan embodied the growing optimism, opportunity, and prosperity that would be America's crowning achievement in the 20th century.

Michigan factories would turn into the great arsenal of democracy, building the armadas that would defeat tyranny, win the Second World War, and, in the process, create America's middle class. During World War II, my father, Herb Peters, was a proud soldier in Eisenhower's Army, helping free France from Nazi occupation. It was there that he would meet my mother, Madeleine Vignier, a beautiful young French woman. They were married and raised me and my two sisters, Gigi and Jackie, in a typical middle-class home. A few years ago, with my late father, I joined the Sons of the American Revolution. My forefather, William Garrett, was a member of the Virginia militia and served alongside General George Washington at Valley Forge.

My great-grandfather, Julian Peters, served with the Michigan infantry during the Civil War. I am proud to follow earlier generations of patriots who served their country and were prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of freedom and liberty. But like millions of Americans, I am also the son of an immigrant. America's shores were new to my mother, but they provided an incredible expanse of opportunity that people across the globe continue to dream of. My mother worked long hours as a nurse's aide and fought for a better workplace for herself and her coworkers, helping to organize her workplace and later serving as a union steward.

Michigan's strong labor movement and our manufacturing sector helped build economic opportunities for millions of Americans. Standing together to call for fair wages, safer workplaces, and better hours, Michigan workers and their families helped build the middle class and make the American dream a reality for many. I am honored to embody such a uniquely American experience—the descendant of an American Revolutionary War soldier and the son of a foreign-born naturalized citizen—and to carry on these rich traditions that continue to make our Nation proud, diverse, and strong.

But while my story is uniquely American, it is not so different from nearly 10 million Michiganders of varied backgrounds who have come together to make our State an extraordinary, special place. Michigan is unique in that we are the only State made up of two peninsulas. Separated for thousands of years by waterways carved by retreating glaciers, our peninsulas permanently united with Michigan statehood and finally connected with the opening of the Mackinac Bridge almost 60 years ago.

The Mackinac Bridge is one of the longest suspension bridges in the world. It remains an engineering marvel to this day and a symbol of how Michiganders can come together to accomplish great things. Financed with an innovative public-private bond

structure, over 10,000 workers contributed to this 5-mile span, implementing the vision and planning of 350 engineers. In our State, it is simply known as "The Bridge." Its construction unleashed economic growth for our State, increasing tourism in the Upper Peninsula and providing a new avenue for goods to be hauled south while agricultural products and manufactured goods flowed north.

As Michigan and our Nation transition to a 21st-century economy, we would do well to draw on the engineering know-how, skilled workforce, and boldness to invest in transformative infrastructure that made the Mackinac Bridge possible. Michigan's products move and feed the Nation. We invented the modern automobile, advanced manufacturing, and America's middle class.

We are the second most agriculturally diverse State in the Nation. Our blueberries, apples, cherries, and sugar beets are just a few of the 300 crops we grow and ship across the country and the world. Our incredible farmers, growers, and producers use Michigan's unique climate and resources to feed people across our country and around the world.

Whether we are talking about our State, our Nation or our successful industries, we cannot rest on our laurels. We are in constant competition. The coming decades will see rapid growth abroad, but I know our Nation will continue to lead the world with our ability to innovate and efficiently align capital and talent to maximize the strengths of our workforce.

Today's small business in Grand Rapids or a start-up in Detroit can access consumers across the world. I know that Michigan will be at the cutting edge of this new global economy. Michigan is at the forefront of developing the transformative technologies that will remake America and help our country sustain its stature and prominence.

Southeast Michigan has more engineers per capita than any State in the country, which is one of the reasons Detroit is home to the first field patent office outside of Washington, DC. Our automakers, parts suppliers, and advanced manufacturers are constantly innovating—and not just generations of new goods but also intellectual property. If you can make it, we can find a way to make it faster, lighter, more efficient, safer, and more affordable.

Incremental innovation meaningfully improves lives, but as a nation we must keep working toward the next big thing. Investments in education and basic scientific research are the downpayment on our future. It is particularly critical that we continue these investments at a time when our country faces so many unique challenges.

Growing income inequality is a threat to our middle class, our economy, and our democracy. While

globalization is opening new markets for American goods, it is also hollowing out the mid-level jobs that are the foundation of the American middle class. Without a strong middle class we cannot have a strong economy, and without a strong middle class we simply cannot have a strong democracy.

There are many ideas about how to deal with these challenges, but history has taught us that increased productivity is the No. 1 driver of economic progress and, in my view, the key to American greatness. Economic historians tell us that after hundreds of years of zero economic growth, groundbreaking innovations changed the face of commerce.

In the mid-1700s came the cotton gin, steam engine, and railroads, followed by more breakthroughs in the 1800s, electricity, the internal combustion engine, and even indoor plumbing. Before indoor plumbing, a recent study estimated the average housewife spent nearly 150 hours per year walking back and forth to gather 3.5 tons of water for her family to cook, clean, and drink. The technology of indoor plumbing alone unleashed enormous gains in productivity.

Today, we have tablets and smartphones and social media, but if we are going to solve the tough challenges facing the middle-class families and all those who aspire to be in the middle class, we will need to unleash even more productivity and more innovation. We will need to discover the next big thing, and I don't know what that next big thing will be, but I do know the Federal Government must continue investing in the seed corn of basic research and development.

From the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams at Michigan State to Wayne State's bio research facility, to the University of Michigan's extensive joint projects with NASA, our State's universities are leading the way in research.

The research being conducted at our universities is also creating jobs in Michigan as these transformative technologies are commercialized. Students are not just inventing new technologies, they are also inventing their own jobs and companies.

For example, using technology developed at the University of Michigan for NASA to measure electric fields resulting from dust storms blowing across Mars, a startup spun off of these efforts is now creating jobs on Earth to help an electric company monitor their utility lines.

Innovation is creating new industries in Michigan and is also revolutionizing many of our existing industries. Advanced sensors, robotics, and big data will allow precision agriculture that boosts productivity and conserves natural resources.

One industry that has always meant jobs for Michigan is, of course, the

automobile industry. We are on the verge of an automotive technological revolution that will allow vehicles to communicate their location, speed, and other data electronically with each other and our transportation infrastructure as well.

Research by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates this technology can reduce accidents by 80 percent, save fuel, and cut congestion at a time when Americans spend an estimated 5 vacation days a year stuck in traffic jams.

When more than 30,000 Americans are killed in accidents on our roads and highways every year, the advancements of this kind of technology will literally save thousands of lives.

This means active crash-avoidance technology that stops accidents before they happen, and before long, autonomous vehicles that drive themselves. This is truly revolutionary technology packaged with horsepower and torque, my favorite part of the car.

But the Federal Government has to do its part to develop and protect this technology. One of my top priorities, as a new member of the Senate commerce committee, is to ensure that vehicles have the wireless spectrum they need to communicate with each other and to make our roads safer.

As manufacturing and technology merge, Michigan is prepared to lead the way. What were once separate industries are now merging into complements in a battle for the future that America must win.

Federal investment in research and development is just that, an investment that has paid off many times over. Investment in research supports the new technologies and industries of the future, drives job creation, and provides technologies critical to our national security.

Necessary Federal investment in infrastructure and innovation is only possible if those of us in Congress take our job seriously as stewards of taxpayer dollars and look for places to avoid unnecessary wasteful spending.

We also will not be able to accomplish anything without embracing pragmatism and bipartisanship. We cannot focus on whether ideas come from a Republican or from a Democrat. We need to focus only on whether the idea has merit and is good for the country. This is why I have spent my first 5 months in office the way I intend to spend the rest of my career in public service, reaching across the aisle to find common ground and the practical solutions that will make our government work better, drive innovation and competitiveness, and keep Michigan and America safe and strong.

I have introduced legislation with Senator GARDNER from Colorado to increase oversight of duplicative spending and force Congress to act on deficit reduction.

I worked with Senator ERNST from Iowa to introduce legislation to extend a tax credit for small businesses that support their activated military reservist employees.

Senator LANKFORD of Oklahoma and I worked on a bill that would ensure Federal agencies use remanufactured auto parts when maintaining their fleets, an idea that will save natural resources and taxpayer dollars while supporting our country's remanufactured parts industry. Just 2 days ago, this bill unanimously passed the Senate.

I worked with Senator RISCH from Idaho to move legislation through the small business committee to extend and preserve the Small Business Administration's 7(a) Loan Program, so our Nation's small businesses can access the capital they need to grow and create jobs.

Senator CORNYN, Senator GRAHAM, and I introduced legislation to create a bipartisan commission to examine our Nation's judicial system from the top to the bottom and to make sure it is working for all Americans.

Senator SULLIVAN and I worked together to introduce a bill to cut excise taxes for small craft distillers, a growth industry in Michigan, Alaska, and America.

I am also proud to say the legislation I introduced with Senator CASSIDY of Louisiana to provide training for medical professionals to identify victims of human trafficking was also signed into law after it passed the Senate as part of a larger effort to combat human trafficking.

I was sent to the Senate to represent the people of Michigan, and they want Congress to work together in a bipartisan way to solve the challenges facing our country. We must focus more on what we have in common and less on our differences. We should work on ideas that are good for our country and good for our States. I have worked to be a practical problem solver in my first few months, and it is what I intend to do in the years ahead.

There is much to be done, and I will work tirelessly for the people of Michigan. My weeks in Washington, unfortunately, keep me apart from my wife Colleen and my children, Madeleine, Alana, and Gary, Jr., but their love and steadfast support is with me each and every day. Colleen was raised by her parents Raul and Kathy Ochoa in Oakland County—like me—and together we share a passion for public service. I am so pleased Colleen and Madeleine are here with me today in the Senate Gallery.

On the Senate floor, we are standing on the shoulders of giants. This includes our Nation's Founding Fathers and more recent predecessors. My staff and I recently moved into the Hart Senate Office Building, named after Senator Phil Hart from Michigan, a

man rightfully known as the "Conscience of the Senate" and a role model for all of us.

I could not be happier that my office will be right around the corner from my close friend, mentor, colleague, and respected leader in the Senate Senator DEBBIE STABENOW, and I am honored that DEBBIE has joined me on the Senate floor for this speech.

Of course, I am deeply honored to succeed Senator Carl Levin, another one of my mentors and a man who defined what it means to be a public servant. The careers of Senators Levin, Hart, Riegle, Griffin, and other Michiganders who preceded me provided the foundation on which I hope to build our shared future and create the best Michigan possible—not only the kind of Michigan we want to live in but the kind of Michigan our children and grandchildren will want to spend their lives in, a Michigan that is a magnet for migration and unbridled opportunity for families and small businesses, and a State that will lead the world in innovation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate and Michiganders across the State to make a better future for all of us a reality. Together, we will continue to build a State and a country that embody the opportunity, the possibility, and the promise that has made our country a shining beacon for so many around the globe.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Democratic leader.

CONGRATULATING SENATOR PETERS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute to express my appreciation to the junior Senator from Michigan in his maiden speech. It was terrific. It was delivered so well, and that is what Michigan is all about. We appreciate it very, very much.

He has big shoes to fill, those of Carl Levin. We all know what a giant he was in the Senate. From Senator Levin to Senator STABENOW, they have both said: GARY PETERS can do it. I am impressed with him very much. He is a team player. He is willing to do the hard lifting. I appreciate that very much. He mentioned Senator Levin, of course, whom we all admired so very much. Also, I wish to take a minute to talk about his partner in the Senate today, DEBBIE STABENOW. As he mentioned, she is a part of Senate leadership. She is there because she deserves it. There is no one who works harder than DEBBIE STABENOW. And if there were a work ethic role model for my friend GARY PETERS to follow, DEBBIE STABENOW is the perfect person.

So I thank the junior Senator from Michigan for being who he is. We have

come to know who he is in 6 months, and we like him very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I am very deeply appreciative of our leader's comments. Thank you very much.

I just wish to add my words of pride in the fact that we have such a wonderful Senator now coming to the Senate and the fact that he is fighting so hard for Michigan and already doing a wonderful job.

I am so pleased he is my partner, and it was a wonderful speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Michigan for his opening speech in the Senate. My State of Illinois is separated from his State of Michigan by another State and a Great Lake, but we have many things in common.

People of Chicago and Illinois, many of them, spend a lot of money in the State of Michigan and particularly in western Michigan. We love the Senator's State. It is a beautiful State. Many of us vacation there and get to know the people.

We have so much in common as midwesterners, looking at the world from our vantage point, smack dab in the middle of this country, and bringing to the conversation in the Senate many of the values that have guided our lives and inspired our families. I listened carefully and thought it is amazing that we have such parallel backgrounds—a father who can trace his family roots back to the Revolutionary War and, in both cases, mothers who were immigrants to this country. So being a first-generation American, I am sure the Senator feels as I do, a special honor, standing on the floor of the Senate, representing a State as great as Michigan—or Illinois.

I wish to say my colleague's background in the House of Representatives prepared him well for this challenge. Although he follows one of the greats in the history of the Senate, Carl Levin, he brings to this job an extraordinary talent and a great partnership with Senator STABENOW. Already, the two of them have been in contact with me about Michigan's needs as they relate to our Department of Defense—and it is a significant investment which Michigan has made over the years in keeping America strong, one we want to continue for many generations to come.

I am pleased Senator PETER's family was here to be part of this official opening of his service in the Senate, and I certainly look forward to working with him for many years to come.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this morning the majority leader and the

Republican leader Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor to speak to us about the challenge we are going to face, as soon as this week, when it comes to the Department of Defense. This is a department I have paid special attention to over the last several years during the time I chaired the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and now serve as ranking member or vice chairman of that same subcommittee.

First, I salute the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Defense Subcommittee, THAD COCHRAN of Mississippi. It has been a joy to work with him. He is a professional. He is a kind and gentle man and fair in every respect. I told him on the floor yesterday what I have said publicly in my caucus luncheon, the Democratic caucus luncheon. I am fortunate to have a partner in this effort from the Republican side who is so good to work with.

But we face a real serious challenge this week, and we have to decide as a nation what we are going to do about it. Most people, if you ask them on a final exam what does sequestration mean, they would basically throw up their hands and say: It sounds like something out of Washington. It doesn't mean much to me.

Sequestration is the penalty we face if we don't hit certain budget spending numbers, and that penalty is virtually mindless. Here is what it says: We will make across-the-board cuts in spending. Think about that in your own family life. If you were looking at the budget for your family and had some misfortune—a paycheck didn't come in—you would have to gauge priorities. While sitting at the kitchen table, you might say: What do we have to pay this month? Well, we have to pay the mortgage or we will be foreclosed upon. We better pay the light bill or they will turn off the electricity. So what can we cut back on? We are going to spend less at the grocery store.

Families make those decisions—many of them—on a weekly or monthly basis. But sequestration says we will cut across the board. We will take a 5-percent cut off the mortgage, off the utility bill, and off the groceries. It doesn't make sense, does it? But we did it. We did it for 2 years, and it was devastating.

We cut across the board when it came to medical research, for goodness' sakes. Here we were trying to find cures for cancer and heart disease and diabetes and Alzheimer's, and we said we are going to make a 5-percent cut across the board. It made no sense whatsoever, nor did it make sense for the Department of Defense. They said: How in the world can we prepare for America's defense with across-the-board cuts? We are supposed to be recruiting and training the very best men and women to serve our Nation. They need to be ready for combat. We have to make them battle-ready so

they will win any battle they are sent to and come home safe. We have to decide what equipment to purchase. We have to decide how to invest in long-term investments in technology and equipment so that we never come in second in any battle. Yet you are going to give us an across-the-board cut, Congress? Stop it. Stop sequestration.

That is what this debate is about.

What we have now is a proposal from the Republican side of the aisle to stop sequestration—across-the-board cuts—in only one Agency: the Department of Defense. I think that is a good thing, to stop it, but it certainly isn't a balanced approach.

We have a lot of other things we do as a government that are important to the people of this country. We finance the education of young people who want to go to college. We do it with Pell grants and we do it with government loans. If we make across-the-board cuts there, we will create hardships and lack of opportunity for a lot of young people in America. When it comes to education, sequestration makes no sense.

When it comes to health care, it certainly makes no sense. We have obligations that we have entered into when it comes to our veterans and their health care. Are we going to make across-the-board cuts when it comes to veterans' health care? God forbid. We promised those men and women that if they would serve our country, we would stand by them when they came home.

Sequestration is a mindless cut when it comes to education and health care and medical research, as I mentioned earlier. So Democrats are saying to Republicans: Here we are on June 17, and our fiscal year ends on October 1. Let's not wait until the last minute to sit down and work out this problem. But what we hear from the other side of the aisle is this: We are not going to do it. We are just going to ignore it.

That is the problem in Washington when you don't face challenges squarely, honestly, on a bipartisan basis.

So here is what is likely to occur this week. We are going to vote for an authorization bill on the Department of Defense. Some of us will oppose the way it is being funded, but others will vote for it. Then we will come to the Defense appropriations bill, and I think what you will find is a unified effort on the Democratic side to say to the Republicans: Now is the time to sit down, not just on this appropriations bill but all the appropriations bills. Let's come up with an answer and solution to sequestration.

I heard the Republican leader say: Well, this is an indication that the Democrats are not committed to the defense of America. I couldn't disagree more because, you see, when we look at those who agree with us on the need for a different approach to budgeting, they include our Secretary of Defense, Ash

Carter, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey. These are the men who have been assigned the responsibility of leading this great military and keeping America safe, and they say this budget process which the Republican leader endorses is not a good one for the safety of America.

So let's do the right thing for the men and women in uniform, for our country, and for all the agencies of government. Let's sit down and solve this budget challenge now before it reaches the last minute in a crisis. Let's do it in June rather than in September, October, November, or December. Let's do it calmly, on a bipartisan basis, and engage the President as well as our colleagues from both sides of the aisle in Congress. That is the responsible, bipartisan, honest way to face the problem. I hope the Republican leader will join us in that effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

THE BUDGET

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I just want to commend our leader from Illinois for bringing up what is so critically important, which is the entire budget of the country. It is important that we get it right in supporting the authorization in front of us.

I understand the defense of our country is much more than just the Department of Defense. As a border State in Michigan, border security, which is not in the Defense appropriations bill, is incredibly important, as is cyber security, which we are hearing more and more about; the frontline of our men and women, the first responders, police officers, firefighters—who do we think actually answers the call in a community when there is some kind of local challenge or a terrorist attack; airport security—I could go on and on. These are all things that are not in the appropriations bill for the Department of Defense.

Unfortunately, without a bipartisan agreement to continue what was a very positive 2-year agreement put together that has been called the Ryan-Murray agreement to be able to balance out all the security needs as well as the economic security needs of our country—without that, it is a mistake to begin the appropriations process one bill at a time.

So from my perspective, on behalf of the people of Michigan, whatever appropriations bill comes up next, no matter what it is, we should not begin that process until we have a bipartisan agreement, as we had for the last 2 years, so that no part of our national security is hurt or the economic security for the future of our country. Until we do that—and we can do that; we have done it before—we should not

begin the appropriations process on a piecemeal basis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last week, President Obama spoke at a meeting of the Catholic Health Association, and he told the association that his health care law, as he said, "worked out better than some of us anticipated."

Well, I can tell you that the President's health care law has worked out much worse—much worse—than the American people expected. It has worked out much worse than the President promised it was going to work. Hard-working families all across the country are suffering under the President's complicated, confusing, and costly health care law.

The new Senator from Michigan just gave his maiden speech this morning, and I welcome him to the Senate. The senior Senator from Michigan just spoke on the floor. Last week, she also spoke on the floor and talked about the millions of Americans who need subsidies to help cover the cost of these outrageously expensive ObamaCare mandates. Well, ObamaCare hurts many of the people in her home State of Michigan.

This insurance is going to get a lot more expensive for the people of Michigan next year. The Obama administration released new numbers recently showing how much more people are going to have to pay for their ObamaCare plans next year. There is one company in Michigan that has requested a rate increase of 38 percent. There are more than 20,000 people in Michigan who get their ObamaCare insurance from this company today. These people are looking at the prospect of their insurance costing 38 percent more next year. Other families in Michigan are facing rate hikes of 11 percent or 17 percent or 37 percent, depending on the specific plan they are in.

And it is not just happening in Michigan. In Washington State, one company says its premiums next year will be 19 percent higher. There are more than 7,000 people in Washington State who get their insurance from that company. Another company says it is raising its rates 9.6 percent. People in Washington are facing much higher insurance premiums, and they will still have the narrow networks that so many Americans have to deal with because of ObamaCare. When I say "narrow network," I mean fewer choices of hospitals, fewer choices of doctors to take care of them—limited choices, plus paying more.

So how big of a problem is it? Well, the Wall Street Journal had an article

about these people the other day. On Friday, June 12, the headline was "Surprises in Health-Law Bills." The article says: "Out-of-network charges often aren't flagged before treatment." They call it medical bill shock.

This is under the President's health care law—medical bill shock; surprises in health-law bills. The article tells the story of Angela Giboney from Mill Creek, WA—Washington State. She has insurance through the State ObamaCare exchange. She has ObamaCare, make no mistake about it. When she went to have a mammogram, it turned out the place that did the screening was outside her network, so she got a bill for \$932. President Obama promised that people would pay less under the health care law. Instead, people all across the country are getting stuck with surprise bills because of these narrow networks. And in spite of that, their premiums are going to jump again next year.

Some Democrats say that people shouldn't worry about these dramatic premium increases because the average increase—this is what the Democrats say—in some places won't be that high. Well, there is a new study that looked at the rate requests in eight different States for next year. It says that in those eight States, premiums for the silver plan in the ObamaCare exchange will only go up by, on average, 6 percent. The study says that in Connecticut, the average silver plan is only going to raise premiums 4 percent. It says if you shop around—if you shop around—you might be able to find a new plan next year that will go up by less than your current plan is going up.

So they are saying that across the board they are going up. The question is, How much are they going up? And if you shop around, you might be able to find a place they are not going up quite as much as they are with your current plan.

Is that what President Obama promised the American people? Did he promise the American people the rates would only go up 6 percent? No, that is not what he promised. He said rates would go down by \$2,500 per family, per year.

Did President Obama say your rates will go up a little less if you are willing to change plans every year? No. He said if you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance. That is what the President said.

Did the President promise that maybe your rates won't go up by quite as much if you are willing to accept a narrow network of providers? Did he say you should change your doctor every year by switching from plan to plan? No, of course not. He said if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.

I want to make another point about this new study. It is only talking about the average increases across all the

plans offered in eight States. Even if the average premium is only going up 6 percent in those eight States, a lot of people are going to end up paying much more.

There are families in Connecticut who may have to pay 16 percent more next year. That is how much more one company in Connecticut wants to charge almost 26,000 people who buy the ObamaCare plans today. Does the President think these families are happy that the average increase is only 4 percent when they get an increase of 16 percent? Is that what the President means when he says his health care law is working better than he anticipated—and he said it just last week—because there are a lot of people in Connecticut who say it is not working and it is working much worse than they anticipated.

People have been writing to the State insurance department in Connecticut, and they are angry. They are angry with the President and alarmed at the ObamaCare price hikes. One person wrote that their insurance company is requesting a rate increase of 14.3 percent in Connecticut. For Democrats who say the average may be only 4 percent, some people will be paying over 14 percent more next year. The person asks: Does the average worker get a 14-percent salary increase? That is not what the people of Michigan, Washington, Connecticut or anywhere else thought they were going to get when Democrats called the law the Affordable Care Act.

Sometime in the next couple of weeks the Supreme Court is going to decide whether it is legal for President Obama to spend some of the billions of taxpayer dollars that he has been spending on the health care law. Now, the decision could affect more than 6 million Americans. Republicans have been watching this case very closely. We have been working on ideas to protect these people and to protect all Americans from the damages caused by the President's health care law.

If the Court rules against the President, then Republicans will be ready to sit down with Democrats to improve health care in America. We will take the opportunity to protect the people from ObamaCare's broken promises and to provide freedom to the people who are trapped in Washington-mandated health care. It will be up to the President and Democrats in Congress whether they want to join us or if they want to continue to insist that this law is working better than they anticipated. I hope they will work with us—work with us—on reforms that the American people need, want, and deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, a physician himself, not just for his good remarks today but for his litany of good remarks throughout the debate on the Affordable Care Act.

For 6 years he has been an outspoken voice for what is right for the American people and what the American people want, which is affordable, quality health care. I appreciate his contribution, not just to the debate today but to the debate we have had in the past and the one we are about to have in the future. He is right that we must come together—Republicans and Democrats alike—and make sure that the broken promises of the Affordable Care Act are fixed; that affordable, accessible, quality health care is available to the American people; that it is deliverable by private industry and by private and competitive free enterprise system; and that government mandates that force prices up and quality down go away. So I thank the Senator for his contribution and all the great work he does.

He is not quite as old as I am, but he might like the movie I like, “Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid.” There is a great line in “Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid” where they are sitting in a cave after having robbed a bank. Butch looks over at Sundance and says: “Boy, I just love it when a plan comes together.”

Well, 6 years later, as we look back on the Affordable Care Act, the plan is unravelling. It is costing the American people more. Health care is less accessible. Deductibles are higher. It is time that we fix it and that we fix it right.

If the King v. Burwell case is decided—as it will be in the next few weeks—we have an obligation to keep the first promise the President did not keep. Do you remember? President Obama said: If you like your insurance, you can keep it? If Burwell loses and if King wins and the Court rules that the subsidies are illegal, approximately 9.5 million Americans who have gotten insurance and have it through subsidies through the Affordable Care Act would be threatened to lose their insurance immediately upon its decision. We can't let that happen. We have to see that we build a bridge from where we are today to a future of better health care, more accessible health care, and more affordable health care.

So we must remember as Republicans, who have so often criticized the President for that remark that if you like your health care you can keep it, to make sure that we don't become an unwitting accomplice in this decision if King wins, by, first and foremost, assuring the 9.5 million who have coverage that we will work to see that you can keep your coverage and that you have a bridge to a better, more com-

petitive, more affordable health care system. It is important for us to remember that.

No. 2, it is important for us to remember that we can't recreate a system that the President created in terms of paying for the health care. Have you ever thought about how the Affordable Care Act is paid for? It is paid for in the following ways: higher copayments, less benefits, and higher premiums. But even worse, there is a revenue system that actually punishes free enterprise, an 85-percent medical loss-ratio mandate which cut out every private sector insurance salesperson who sold medical plans to the American people, because when you take 85 percent as the maximum loss ratio, then you only have 15 percent for administration. There is nothing left to compensate someone for selling the policy.

No. 3, when we were short \$19 billion, the President decided to create the HIT tax. What is the HIT tax? It is an arbitrary tax against small and medium-sized group medical companies, charging them not only on their premiums, not only on their revenues but on their percentage of market share. Where in the world has the government ever decided to take market share as an indicator of how much you pay? It makes no sense unless you were trying to find dollars to make sense. And the President did it. I can go over litany after litany after litany.

The medical device tax on orthopedists deals with devices in everything that they do. The medical device tax is not a tax on net profit on medical devices. It is a 2.3 percent surcharge on the gross revenues of the device manufacturer.

I tell the story about my visit to South Africa 2 years ago. I got a call from our Governor. He said: You are in Johannesburg, South Africa. Would you go to the chamber of commerce there and visit with a Georgia company from Kennesaw, GA, a small medical device manufacturer that is selling their products. Just tell them thank you for their business.

I said sure. I went by that evening for a reception, found the gentleman from Kennesaw, and said: Thank you so much for doing your business in Georgia.

He said: Oh, I have moved.

I said: Oh, I am sorry. The Governor's office called me.

He said: Well, I just announced that I am moving this week. They don't know it yet.

I said: Where are you moving?

He said: Madrid.

I said: Madrid, Spain?

He said: Yes.

I said: Why?

He said: Because the medical device tax is making it impossible for me to do what I need to do in terms of innovation, in terms of marketing, and in terms of distribution.

So it was an ill-conceived act with the best of intentions but the worst of results. How bad? It is just like what Senator BARRASSO said a minute ago.

In Georgia, one plan is going up 38 percent—one plan. That is the highest we know of—not 4, not 10, not 17 but 38 percent. There are 10,796 Georgians who have that plan who now have the alternative of going to find something else or paying 38 percent more. I don't know about everybody else, but wages aren't growing by 38 percent, and opportunity is not growing by 38 percent. But the cost of your health care, which you want to have, goes up 38 percent and you have to find a way to pay it. What does that do? It hurts the economy, it hurts family, and it hurts the American people.

So as we look at the results of what is going to happen with King v. Burwell, if King is ruled in favor of and the courts throw out the subsidies on the Affordable Care Act, we need, first of all, to do no harm. We need to make sure that nobody arbitrarily, immediately loses the insurance that they planned on. We need to keep the promise President Obama made and never kept. That is No. 1.

No. 2, we need to get everybody in the same room—Republicans and Democrats alike, providers and beneficiaries alike. Let's build a health care system for the 21st century for America that rewards the best health care system in the world by allowing it to innovate, by encouraging it to compete, and not making arbitrary decisions on cost and taxation that drive people out of the marketplace and out of business.

I am at that age where I care about my health care. I enjoy my health care. I like the policy I have. It costs me a lot more than it did before the Affordable Care Act. Health insurance is important. But there is a limit to what I can absorb. There is a limit to what the American people can absorb, and there is a limit to what government can do to try to fit a square peg in a round hole. I learned in Boy Scouts that doesn't work.

The Affordable Care Act is a square peg that for 6 years we have tried to fit in a round hole, and it doesn't fit. It is time that we rounded that peg, took into consideration the American people, the taxpayers, the patients, and the physicians and did what is right for the American people.

Don't break our promises. Let's keep our promises. Let's allow them to have the choice of insurance policies that, once they buy them, they can keep and a system that doesn't mandate increases but instead encourages competition, quality, and makes sure it is health care the American people want, is accessible, affordable, available, and delivered in a competitive, free enterprise market by the private sector.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

NATIONAL DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I wish to speak about several amendments I have submitted to the Defense authorization bill currently before the Senate.

First, I wish to commend Chairman MCCAIN in his first mission as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. The bill before us bears his imprint and that of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and it addresses the growing challenges facing our military.

This legislation came out of committee in a bipartisan way and came to the floor with the opportunity for every Member of the Senate to offer amendments to this bill. It was an open amendment process, something we have been doing this year that hasn't been done previously under the leadership of the now minority. Unfortunately, that effort was blocked by the minority, and we now are where we are.

I have introduced amendments that will hopefully be carried now in a manager's package with the support of Senator MCCAIN and others here. I just want to describe what those were.

First of all, let me say that despite the efforts of the minority to block our progress on this bill, perhaps one of the most essential things the Senate and the Congress does in any year is to provide for the common defense by passing authorization and appropriations for our military so that they have the policy and the authority and the resources to be able to conduct their efforts, both defending us here at home and dealing with issues overseas.

The bill is a lifesaver and a nation defender, and it is not—to quote the minority leader—“a waste of time.” How could anyone come to this floor and simply say that discussing, debating, and passing legislation that protects our country and provides support for our military is a waste of time? It just defies credulity and has us all scratching our heads.

Nevertheless, we proceeded, and we go forward because, thankfully, under the majority leadership of Senator MCCONNELL and the leadership of Senator MCCAIN as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, we are moving forward with this bill.

The personnel, platforms, and programs in this bill could very well save the lives of our military personnel deployed on the frontlines of freedom around the globe, and it is necessary that we go forward. That brings me to the rationale behind the first amendment that I have introduced.

Last week, President Obama admitted to the Nation and to the world that he still does not have “a complete

strategy” to deal with ISIS. A year ago this month, the terrorist organization Islamic State proclaimed itself as a worldwide caliphate, claiming control of territory in Syria and Iraq. ISIS quickly has become the largest, best organized, best financed, and most ambitious terrorist organization in history—not to mention the most brutal terrorist organization that we have ever seen.

The previous Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff described the threat arising from ISIS in apocalyptic terms—as well they should. The unspeakable depravities committed by ISIS are enough to evoke images of death's pale horse.

ISIS has used sophisticated and successful Internet and media outreach tools to attract tens of thousands of radical Islamists to join its fight in Syria, Iraq, and beyond. They have captured and control major population centers in Iraq, including Mosul, Fallujah, and Ramadi. They have secured their bases of operations in Syria and expanded the territory ISIS controls throughout Syria, threatening to dominate any successor state emerging from the Syrian civil war. In the meantime, ISIS has also expanded its influence and secured allegiance from co-operating terrorist organizations in Yemen, Libya, Nigeria, Niger, Chad, and Cameroon.

Yet early last year, the President compared ISIS to a junior varsity. Some junior varsity—it looks more like something that rises to the level of a major, major threat to the nations of the world—not just in the Middle East but to the nations of the world. But why call it a junior varsity?

Then, following the terrorist group's dramatic expansion, later the President admitted acknowledged the threat but admitted that “we don't have a strategy yet” to confront ISIS. Eventually, though, the President did come up with a plan that included two main elements: training moderate volunteers—not American volunteers but Iraqi volunteers—to fight ISIS in Syria and training and equipping the Iraqi Defense Forces to fight ISIS in Iraq.

The first part of this plan has produced no fighters after a year of talk and has just begun to train the first cohort of 400 volunteers, whose training is to be complete in another year or so. Even then, they will be equipped to assume only defensive missions in Syria, according to the Pentagon. That is the U.S. portion. The Iraqi portion deals with training that I will be talking about here in just a moment.

How could this severely limited strategy be even remotely responsive to ISIS, to the means and the threat ISIS poses? How is it that ISIS manages to recruit, transport, train, deploy, and effectively fight tens of thousands of radical men and women, while we are spending 2 years finding and

training just 400 in our program in Syria?

In Iraq, 10 years and billions of dollars spent creating defense forces has produced nothing capable of standing up to the ISIS fanatics.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said earlier this month that Iraqi forces “did not have a will to fight” when confronting a vastly inferior—vastly inferior—“Islamic State” force in this particular battle. They just melted away in Mosul and Ramadi, said the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Those who had spent months, if not years, and spent very significant amounts of money on training simply melted away because they did not have the will to fight.

The President's intention to train and equip the Iraqi forces to confront the Islamic State has failed to produce an effective fighting force that is adequately led and sufficiently equipped. That is the only conclusion we can come to after months and years and extraordinary expenditures of dollars to try to deal with the ISIS threat.

The other major component of the President's strategy is airstrikes. Airpower, when used as part of an integrated grand strategy, can play an essential role. In this case, there is no integrated larger strategy, and therefore airpower is limited in terms of what it can do.

The administration's airstrikes have been much less effective in dealing with the ISIS threat than anticipated. They have not halted ISIS's advances in the region.

In the words of retired Air Force General David Deptula, a key architect of the air campaign in Operation Desert Storm:

Air power has to be applied like a thunderstorm, not a drizzle. In the campaign against the Islamic State, we are averaging 12 strike sorties per day. During Operation Desert Storm in Iraq and Kuwait, the average was 1.241.

Airpower, when properly utilized in concert with troops to support the effort, can bring battlefield success. However, the Obama administration has failed to provide the proper number of well-trained American spotters on the ground in Iraq designating targets. If you do not have forces in position to target the exact target, airpower becomes random and not nearly as effective as it should be. And that has not been authorized by the President as a means of dealing with this issue; therefore, the limits that have been placed on the use of airpower have left us in a situation where it is much less effective than it could be.

It has now been over a year since ISIS was widely acknowledged as a major threat to our national security. When asked just last week what is and is not working in the fight against ISIS, the President stated once again that we still do not have “a complete

strategy" to confront ISIS. Instead, he blamed the Pentagon and the Iraqis for not finalizing a plan. Yet the President says we still do not have a complete strategy to address this threat. How is that possible?

As the Wall Street Journal put it in its June 11 editorial, "The fundamental problem with Mr. Obama's strategy is that he is so determined to show that the U.S. isn't returning to war in Iraq that he isn't doing enough to win the war we are fighting."

In the meantime, the White House announced that we would be sending another 450 troops to Iraq to train Sunni tribal fighters. I understand that this really means little more than 50 actual trainers, the rest of this small cohort to provide security for themselves. So we are down to about 50 trainers, and that is the next step in dealing with a threat that far expands the need to do much more.

We must insist that President Obama immediately produce a complete, detailed, and realistic plan to confront, degrade, and defeat the Islamic State. This plan must include realistic, well-substantiated estimates of timeframes, resources required, expected allies, and anticipated obstacles. Also, it must include clear definitions of milestones and metrics of success. Most importantly, the plan must include clear accountability. I have introduced an amendment to the Defense authorization bill that will require just that—a serious, credible, complete strategy for addressing the threat posed by ISIS.

President Obama has shown a tendency to blame others—the Pentagon or allies or Sunnis or the Iraqi Government or Congress—for his own failures of leadership in this effort; therefore, we must demand a coherent, realistic plan so the American people can properly apportion the credit for success or the blame for failure where it belongs.

Let me briefly talk about a couple of other amendments I have introduced, and I am hopeful we can include these two amendments in the managers' package.

Amendment No. 1705 addresses the Department of Defense's present policy of not allowing Active-Duty flag and general officers to visit our friends in Taiwan. Instead, the DOD relies on retired flag and general officers—retired officers to visit Taiwan in what can only be seen as appeasing Communist China.

It is difficult for military officials in both Taiwan and the United States to discuss contingency responses when Active-Duty U.S. generals and flag officers are not able to meet regularly with their Taiwanese counterparts. Without visiting Taiwan, they are not able to familiarize themselves with Taiwan's command centers, terrain, and operational capabilities.

Active-Duty U.S. generals and flag officers have to be able to visit Taiwan

and see its military in action in order to gain a better understanding of Taiwan's armed forces and the weapons they require for self-defense.

In the event of an emergency, such as humanitarian assistance or a disaster relief mission, senior officers from Taiwan and the United States will have little, if any, experience working together to save the lives of thousands of Taiwanese citizens and Americans living abroad in Taiwan.

My amendment would simply state that the Department of Defense should undertake a program of senior military officer exchanges with Taiwan. Note that this amendment does not require such exchanges. I do not believe in tying the military's hands in this sort of matter, but I do believe it is important that the Senate go on record as concerned about the current policy of refusing to allow such exchanges. The armed forces of Taiwan are a very valuable partner of the U.S. military. These visits by our generals and admirals will encourage Taiwan to make increased investments in their national defense, especially in light of the belligerent behavior demonstrated by the Chinese.

I understand that there is bipartisan agreement on this amendment, and I hope and trust that we can include this measure in any upcoming managers' package.

Finally, I have offered amendment No. 1877, which would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit to both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees a report detailing the potential impacts to the industrial base if the July 2017 start date for the refueling and complex overhaul of the USS George Washington is delayed by 6 months, 1 year, or 2 years.

As we learned last year when the administration briefly considered postponing the scheduled overhaul of the USS George Washington, such delays only drive up costs because of the uncertainty they create among the industrial base. I hope to avoid a repeat of that mistake by requiring the Navy to report on the true costs of any delay.

I hope the Senate will agree to this amendment.

Once again, I thank Senator MCCAIN for his leadership on the Defense authorization bill, and I hope the Senate will act to pass this critically important bill without delay. This is one of the most essential bills this Congress takes up each year, and to deter this for any political reason simply is not acceptable when our troops' lives and safety are at risk. They are there to defend us. They need our support, and they need it now.

I yield floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute.

McCain amendment No. 1456 (to amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.

Cornyn amendment No. 1486 (to amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Markey amendment No. 1645 (to amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Reed (for Blumenthal) modified amendment No. 1564 (to amendment No. 1463), to enhance protections accorded to service-members and their spouses.

McCain (for Paul) modified amendment No. 1543 (to amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

Reed (for Durbin) modified amendment No. 1559 (to amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.

Fischer/Booker amendment No. 1825 (to amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

McCain (for Hatch) amendment No. 1911 (to amendment No. 1456), to require a report on the Department of Defense definition of and policy regarding software sustainment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to tell my colleagues that I think we are winding down here. We have several other issues to address, but I think it is very possible that we could see the end here for final passage of the bill. There are still some issues that need to be resolved, but I am grateful for the progress all of my colleagues have made on both sides of the aisle.

I would like to call up and speak briefly on McCain amendment No. 1482. This amendment would prohibit the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department from funding or conducting medical research or development projects unless the Secretary determines that the research or project is designed to protect, enhance, or restore the health and safety of

members of the Armed Forces through phases of deployment, combat, medical recovery, and rehabilitation.

I will not seek a vote on this amendment, but I will say that it is an issue which must be addressed if we are going to spend American tax dollars on defending this Nation, the security, and the men and women who are serving.

What I am going to show my colleagues is what happens with almost any bad deal around here, and that is the incredible increase in congressionally directed spending on medical research which is on the Department of Defense authorization bill—not on the Health and Human Services appropriations but on Defense. When we are cutting defense, when we are experiencing all the bad results of sequestration, we continue to grow to nearly \$1 billion in medical research that has nothing to do with defense.

I am all for medical research. I am all in. The National Institutes of Health is doing great things. I am all for it. But when we take it out of defense spending rather than what it should be taken out of, which is Health and Human Services, then I object to that.

I am aware of the outcry that has taken place at these various organizations which are dedicated to improving the health of Americans, and so therefore of course I am not subjecting it to a vote. But it is outrageous that this has gone up to nearly \$1 billion in spending that is taken out of the Department of Defense.

My friends, what it is, is the Willie Sutton syndrome. When the famous bank robber Willie Sutton was asked why he robbed banks, he said, "Because that's where the money is."

So this medical research, which has nothing to do with defense, comes out of the Department of Defense. It is wrong, and it needs to stop, as every scarce dollar that is earmarked for defense must go to the defense of this Nation.

I know what the response is going to be: Oh my God, MCCAIN, you want to take money away from—fill in the blank. No, I am not asking to take money from any medical research; I am asking that it be put where it belongs, and that is not in the Department of Defense. It is not about disputing the great value of much of the medical research Congress and America's taxpayers make possible. I will match my record on support for medical research with anyone's. Any person who has reached my advanced age likely has some firsthand experience with the miracles of modern medicine and gratitude for all who support it. Much of the medical research for which Congress appropriates money each year helps to extend and improve the lives of many Americans. This amendment is not about the value of medical research or whether Congress should support it.

Immediately I will hear the response waiting now: Oh, MCCAIN, you want to cut very beneficial research that helps the lives of Americans. No. No, I do not. I want it appropriated from the appropriate appropriations bill, not from defense.

This amendment is absolutely about what departments and agencies of our government should be funding what kinds of medical research and specifically what the proper role of the Department of Defense is in this work.

Over the past 20 years, Congress has added billions of dollars to the Department of Defense's medical research portfolio for disease research that has nothing to do with defense. Since 1992, Congress has appropriated almost \$10 billion for medical research in the Department of Defense's Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs, and only about \$2.4 billion of that \$10 billion was for research that could be considered in any way relevant to the military.

To be sure, the Department of Defense has a proper and vital role to play in medical research that benefits the unique work of our men and women in uniform in areas such as prosthetics, traumatic brain injury, and spinal cord injury, among others. However, through years of congressionally directed spending, the DOD medical research program has been used to fund research on breast cancer, prostate cancer, lung cancer, genetic disorders such as muscular dystrophy, and even mad cow disease.

In other words, over the last 2 decades, in a time of war and fiscal challenge, even despite sequestration, Congress has appropriated \$7.3 billion for medical research that is totally unrelated to the military—money that the Department of Defense did not request and our military did not need.

This graph right behind me shows the explosive growth that has occurred in this program since 1992. At that time, in 1992, Congress had funded one research project for breast cancer. Over time, that has now grown to 30 separate medical research projects funded by the Congress. Funding has increased by almost 4,000 percent, from \$25 million in 1992 to almost \$1 billion last year. I will repeat that for the benefit of my colleagues. Spending on medical research at DOD—nearly 75 percent of which has nothing to do with the military—has grown 4,000 percent since 1992. Even the late Senator from Alaska, Ted Stevens, under whose leadership the original funding for breast cancer was added, reversed course in 2006 because the money would be "going to medical research instead of the needs of the military."

During the floor debate on the annual Defense appropriations bill, Senator Stevens had this to say:

We could not have any more money going out of the Defense bill to take care of med-

ical research when medical research is basically a function of the NIH. . . . It is not our business. I confess, I am the one who made the first mistake years ago. I am the one who suggested that we include some money for breast cancer research. It was languishing at the time. . . . Since that time it has grown to \$750 million . . . in the last bill we had, dealing with medical research that had nothing to do with the Department of Defense.

My friends, when Senator Ted Stevens is saying that a congressionally directed spending program has gotten out of hand, we know there is a problem. Yet, despite the urgings of Senator Stevens in 2006, the problem has only gotten worse since then. Last year alone Congress appropriated \$971.6 million for medical research programs that the Department of Defense did not request in its budget. More than \$280 million of that money was appropriated for cancer research in the defense budget while six other Federal agencies spent more than \$50 billion on cancer research in fiscal year 2015.

I will put that in perspective. For the amount of money that Congress appropriated for medical research last year at the Department of Defense—again, most of which had nothing to do with the military and which the Department did not request—we could have bought 12 F-18 Superhornets, 2 littoral combat ships or roughly 1 Army brigade combat team.

My friends, in these days of sequestration, that is not acceptable. Once again, I am sure every Member of this body agrees that this research is vitally important to Americans suffering from these diseases, to the families and friends who care for them, and to all of those who know the pain and grief of losing a loved one. But this research should not be funded by the Department of Defense. It belongs in civilian departments and agencies of our government.

Appropriating money in this way only harms our national security by reducing the funding available for military-relevant medical research that helps protect service men and women on the battlefield and for military capabilities they desperately need to perform their missions. Furthermore, this kind of misguided spending only puts decisionmaking about medical research in the hands of lobbyists and politicians instead of medical experts where it belongs.

So I say to my colleagues, what I had proposed and will not seek a vote on—because the result is very clear—is a commonsense amendment. It focuses the Department's research efforts on medical research that will lead to life-saving advancements in battlefield medicine and new therapies for recovery and rehabilitation of servicemembers wounded both physically and mentally on the battlefield. It could finally begin the long overdue process of shifting the hundreds of millions of dollars

of nonmilitary medical research spending out of the Department of Defense and into the appropriate civilian departments and agencies of our government. That is a change that needs to start now, and I hope my colleagues, especially my friends on the Appropriations Committee, will make that happen.

I want to point out again that we started in fiscal year 1992 with \$25 million. We are now up to nearly \$1 trillion, and I am sure that the appropriators have an equal or like amount that they are proposing.

I see that my colleague from Illinois is here on the floor, and I know he will defend with vigor, passion, love, and every emotion he has what we are doing because of those who are suffering from illnesses such as breast cancer and all of the other terrible things that afflict our society. I say to my friends who will come to the floor in a high dudgeon over what I am proposing: I am not saying that we should cut any of these programs—not a single one. We should probably increase them. But let's put them where they belong, and that is not in the Department of Defense.

While I have the floor, I want to talk about some other issues. Former Secretary of Defense Bob Gates said in an interview over the weekend:

What it feels like to me is really what the President said last week, which was a lack of strategy. Just adding a few hundred troops doing more of the same I think is not likely to make much of a difference. . . . We should have had a strategy a year ago. . . . And we have to be willing, if we think ISIS is truly a threat to the United States and to our interests, we have to be willing to put Americans at risk. That's just a fact of life. . . . [I]f the mission [President Obama] has set for the military is to degrade and destroy ISIS, the rules of engagement that he has imposed on them prevent them from achieving that mission.

I don't know anyone who is more respected by both sides of the aisle and served Presidents of both parties in key administrative positions than Secretary of Defense Bob Gates. Quite often, I and my friend from South Carolina, Senator GRAHAM, are accused of being biased and partisan and attacking the President and his strategies in a partisan fashion. I will remind my colleagues that in 2006 Senator GRAHAM and I called for the resignation of the Secretary of Defense, who was then in a Republican administration. In 2006, we said: We are losing the war. In 2006, I had a spirited argument with then-General Dempsey—who was in charge of training the Iraqis and assured me everything was going fine—when I was showing him the facts when things were going to hell in a handbasket. So to somehow accuse me, Senator GRAHAM, and others of making these comments about a feckless and without-foundation foreign policy that is allowing ISIS to succeed does not bear scrutiny.

I agree with former Secretary of Defense Bob Gates when he says: "What it feels like to me is really what the President said last week, which was a lack of a strategy." There is a lack of a strategy.

I want to tell my colleagues that we will be having hearings when we get through with this bill, and we will try to figure out what the Congress and the American people should know about what is happening in the world, not just in the Middle East.

Facts are stubborn things. The fact is we can knock off an ISIS or Al Qaeda leader, and we can trumpet that as a great victory and thank God that it has happened. But to think that really has a significant, long-term impact on the ability of ISIS, Al Qaeda, and other terrorist organizations to not reconstitute and continue their success, with occasional setbacks—which they are achieving and spreading that poison throughout the Middle East and the latest being Libya, aided and abetted in many cases by the Iranians—is obviously a fact that cannot be denied.

For example USA Today reports: "Death of al-Qaeda leader may benefit Islamic State."

The U.S. missile strike that killed al-Qaeda's No. 2 leader is another in a string of devastating blows to the terrorist group's old-guard leadership that might inadvertently help a more brutal terror group: the Islamic State, analysts said.

The Washington Post Editorial Board writes today: "A dangerous mission in Libya requires a firm approach."

The Washington Post editorial board, not known as a rightwing periodical, writes:

It's good those two militants have been taken off the battlefield, but their elimination will not remedy the growing crises in Libya and Yemen. In that respect, the operations are another example of the limited benefits of President Obama's narrow approach to counterterrorism.

The New York Times reports today: "As Vladimir Putin Talks More Missiles and Might, Cost Tells Another Story."

Reuters reports today: "China gives more details on South China Sea facilities."

This is very disturbing. I say to my colleagues and all of us—whether we are members of the Intelligence Committee or members of the Armed Services Committee—that we must address this issue of cyber security.

My friends, we just went through a long back-and-forth debate and discussion over whether we should restrict the kinds of telephone information and whether it be shared or not shared and who should store it and all of that. Meanwhile, the Wall Street Journal reported on Friday: "Hackers Likely Stole Security-Clearance Information During Breach of Government Agencies."

Hackers who raided the U.S. government's personnel office gained access to secret back-

ground investigations conducted on current and former employees, senior administration officials said Friday—an ominous development in the recent threat of federal data, one of the largest in history.

The Washington Post editorial board writes today: "A pathetic breach of responsibility on cybersecurity."

[T]he breach of Office of Personnel Management networks this year . . . represents a failure of stewardship and a serious external threat.

After the OPM suffered a cyberintrusion in 2014, its director, Katherine Archuleta, asked Congress in February for \$26 million in additional funding for cybersecurity. She said the agency stores more personally identifiable information than almost any other in the government, including banking data for more than 2 million people and background investigations for more than 30 million, among them individuals being considered for military enlistment, federal job appointments and employment by federal contractors. "It is imperative," Ms. Archuleta wrote, that . . . "threats to identity theft, financial espionage, etc., are real, dynamic and must be averted." They were not averted.

In April, the new breach was uncovered. Intruders had stolen the names, Social Security numbers, pay history, health records and other data of some 4.2 million current and former federal workers.

It seems to us that just slamming doors and building more firewalls may be an insufficient response to an assault of this magnitude. An essential aspect of deterrence is the credible threat of retaliation.

Why do I quote from that? It is because every time we ask a question as to what the policy is, whether it is strictly defensive against a cyber attack or whether offensive in order to prevent one, the policy has "not been determined."

I say we have to address this issue. First of all, we have to have an administration policy or that policy somehow may be developed in the Congress, which is not the right way to do it, obviously.

So I intend to work with Senator BURR, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator REED, and others in holding hearings and figuring out what we need to do because this is a serious threat in many respects that we have faced in recent times.

Finally, I wish to mention this: "Former CIA Chief Says Government Data Breach Could Help China Recruit Spies."

Retired Gen. Michael Hayden, who once led the National Security Agency and later the Central Intelligence Agency, said the threat of millions of U.S. Government personnel records could allow China to recruit U.S. officials as spies.

The general said:

This is a tremendously big deal. My deepest emotion is embarrassment.

He said the personnel records were a "legitimate foreign intelligence target."

He continued:

To grab the equivalent in the Chinese system, I would not have thought twice. I would

not have asked permission . . . This is not "shame on China." This is "shame on us" for not protecting that kind of information.

So I urge my colleagues to understand that this new issue of cyber security is an area which the United States of America, in the view of many experts, does not have a significant advantage. It is an area where, in some respects, we may even be at a disadvantage, if we look at the extraordinary events that have taken place in the issue of cyber security. The latest information, of course, of 4 million people has to get our attention. It has to get the attention of the administration. We need to work together. I stand ready—and I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do as well—to sit down and come up with some policies and then implement those policies into ways of combating this new form of warfare we call cyber.

Again, I anticipate the comments of my friend from Illinois who will vigorously defend all of the research that is done in medical research. I wish to point out, again, that I am not in opposition to one single dime of any kind of medical research. I say it is coming out of the wrong place. We cannot make a logical argument that this belongs in the Department of Defense. Some of it does, and I have pointed that out. The majority of it belongs with other agencies.

When we are facing sequestration and when we are cutting our national security to the bone, according to our military leaders who have said that continued sequestration puts the lives of the men and women who are serving in the military in danger, we cannot afford another \$1 billion to be spent on medical research. We want the money spent on medical research. We want it spent from the right place.

I look forward to addressing the remaining amendments with my colleague and friend from Rhode Island. Hopefully, we can wrap up the Defense authorization bill sometime very soon. Then we can move on to conference and then bring the bill back after the conference to the floor of the Senate so we can carry out our first and most urgent responsibility; that is, the security of the Nation and men and women who defend it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that the Senator from Arizona, although we are of opposite political faith, has been my friend and colleague for a long time—since we first were elected together in a class in the House of Representatives. Our friendship and relationship has had its peaks and valleys. I hope we are at a peak at this moment. I will concede, before I say a word about his amendment, that I have no question in my mind, nor should anyone, about the

commitment of the Senator from Arizona to the men and women who show extraordinary courage in battling for the United States of America in our military. The Senator's own personal life is a testament to his dedication to the U.S. military. I know he has brought that dedication to his service as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and in bringing this authorization bill to the floor.

Secondly, I don't question his commitment to medical research either. As he said, when we reach a certain stage in life, we may value it more because we realize our own vulnerabilities and the vulnerabilities of those we love. So what I am about to say is not a reflection of his commitment to the military nor his commitment to basic medical research, but I do question this amendment, which Senator MCCAIN has said he will not offer but has filed, and I have been prepared for several days now to debate.

Here is the question: Should we have within the Department of Defense a medical research capacity? I think yes, and I think for obvious reasons—because there are certain challenges to the men and women who serve in our military and to their families which relate to their military service.

Secondly, if we are going to have such a military research program, should politicians and lobbyists, as the Senator said, be able to pick the diseases and pick the research? No, of course not. That is why this appropriations bill, which we will consider later this week, and this authorization bill address a situation where this is done by competitive grant. In other words, if we have researchers at some hospital who are researching a medical condition important to our military, we have to compete for it. It is not automatic. The decision is not made by Senators or Congressmen. It is made by medical professionals about which research makes a difference. So I think medical research is important to our military. Politicians shouldn't pick and choose those researchers and those research grants; it ought to be done by professionals.

Third, this undertaking in the Department of Defense is substantial. It is about \$1.8 billion for all of the different medical research. In perspective, the funding for the National Institutes of Health is about \$30 billion. This is relatively small.

Dr. Francis Collins heads up the NIH and I went to him and I said: Doctor, I am working on this defense medical research bill; I want to make sure we don't waste a penny. I don't want to duplicate anything you are doing at NIH.

He said: Trust me, we will not. We coordinate everything we do. What they do is complementary to our work and what we do is complimentary to their work. We are not wasting a penny.

So I think those three things are an important starting point in this debate. Medical research is important to national defense. Politicians have no role in choosing who is going to do the medical research. Also, whatever we do is going to be coordinated with medical research at leading agencies such as the National Institutes of Health.

There are a lot of items on this list of research that I think very few people would ever quarrel with. Should we have a joint warfighter medical account in research? Should we have orthotics and prosthetics research for those who have lost a limb in military service? How about a military burn research unit, wound care research, military dental research—all of these topics relate to actual service.

The only specifics which the Senator from Arizona raised, questioning why the Department of Defense would get involved in research, I would like to address. One item he specified is breast cancer. It is true the second largest undertaking for breast cancer research in America takes place at the Department of Defense. It started there—and I will be honest—I remember why. It started there because the funding through the National Institutes of Health was not reliable or predictable, and the Department of Defense made a commitment: We will make our commitment to breast cancer research.

Is there a reason it would be in the Department of Defense? Even though the Senator from Arizona has raised questions about it, I wish to call his attention to the following: In 2013, researchers in the Department of Defense developed a vaccine that promises to protect women against a recurrence of breast cancer. Breast cancer is a disease diagnosed in female troops at a rate 20 percent to 40 percent higher than the civilian population. I am a liberal arts lawyer, so I don't know why. Can I figure out why more women in our military are diagnosed with breast cancer than women in our civilian population? I don't know the answer to that, but I want to know the answer to that. I want to know if there is something—anything—environmental or otherwise that our troops, and particularly women in the military, are exposed to that makes them more likely to come down with a diagnosis of breast cancer. Is that a legitimate question at the Department of Defense? It is obvious it is.

How good are these researchers if we put several billion dollars into breast cancer research in the Department of Defense? The researchers recently completed a 10-year study of this vaccine known as E75, tested on more than 100 female soldiers recovering from breast cancer and they had a similar test group of civilian women. The research is happening within the Cancer Vaccine

Development Program, an Army research network studying vaccines' potential to fight breast, ovarian, uterine, and prostate cancers.

Researchers indicated that in trials, the vaccine cut the risk in half that a woman's breast cancer will return—in half. Is it worth it? Is it worth it for us, through the Department of Defense, to put money into breast cancer research when female troops have a rate of breast cancer diagnosis 20 to 40 percent higher, when these researchers are finding a vaccine which in trials is cutting the recurrence of breast cancer in half compared to other populations? It seems very obvious to me.

This is not the first time the defense researchers in breast cancer have done extraordinary things. In 1993, defense researchers developed Herceptin, now FDA approved, and one of the most widely used drugs to fight breast cancer—developed at the Department of Defense. Do we want to take the research decisions away from the researchers?

The amendment which the Senator from Arizona offers would give the Secretary of Defense the last word as to whether we do this research. Now, I have known Secretaries of Defense, and they are talented individuals, but when it comes to making medical decisions about medical research, I don't think any of them are qualified to do that. Let's leave it in the hands of the professionals, not in the hands of politicians, not in the hands of political appointees, and not in the hands of bureaucrats.

Let me also say this: When we look at the list of diseases that are studied at the Department of Defense, some of them may sound odd. Lou Gehrig's disease—ALS—why would we include that on a list for Department of Defense research? Let me explain. Men and women who have served in the U.S. military are 60 percent more likely than civilians to develop Lou Gehrig's disease—men and women who serve in the military. Gulf war veterans are twice as likely as the general population to develop Lou Gehrig's disease. Should we invest money for medical research in the Department of Defense for Lou Gehrig's disease? And then should we ask the basic question, Why? Why would it be more likely that one would develop Lou Gehrig's disease if one served in the U.S. military or if one was in the Gulf war? Those are legitimate medical questions that relate to our military. For the Senator to offer an amendment to take out any of that type of research, I think that is the wrong thing to do.

We don't have to speak about traumatic brain injury. Everybody knows what has happened. We have seen the returning veterans—roadside bombs—what they have gone through. Between 48,000 and 169,000—169,000—military servicemembers who have served and

are serving in Iraq and in Afghanistan have developed post-traumatic epilepsy—head injuries. Post-traumatic epilepsy is a form of epilepsy resulting from traumatic brain injury. I put a provision in here for competitive grants on epilepsy and seizures for this reason: \$7.5 million—we have 169,000 who are dealing with these traumatic brain injuries and dealing with seizures and epilepsy afterward. Is this a legitimate area of Department of Defense medical research? Absolutely. We cannot ignore the reality of what our troops have gone through and what they need when they come home. To cut out this research would be a mistake.

Let me also say, in 2013 alone, 100,000 servicemembers sought treatment for seizures at our veterans hospitals. It is a serious, serious problem.

I could go through every single element I have here of medical research at the Department of Defense. I hope the examples I have given illustrate that men and women who serve our country face medical challenges which the ordinary civilian population may not face. I think we have a special obligation to them to engage in the research that can make their lives whole again and give them a chance to come back from our military and have a happy and full life, which we promised them. We said: If you will hold up your hand and give an oath to America that you will risk your life for our country, we will stand by you when you come home, and that includes more than a GI bill to go to school. It is more than a place to live. It is even more than basic medical care. It involves medical research.

The final point I wish to make is this. This Senator will never apologize for trying to come up with more money for medical research. Never. Once every 67 seconds in America someone is diagnosed with Alzheimer's in America. When my staff told me that, I said you have to be wrong. They are not. It is once every 67 seconds. We spent \$200 billion in Medicare and Medicaid on Alzheimer's patients last year, not to mention the devastating costs to individual families who have someone they love suffering from this disease.

We don't have an Alzheimer's provision. Well, we have a small Alzheimer's provision in this particular medical research bill. Am I going to stand here to apologize for putting \$12 million in Alzheimer's research? I will tell you, if we could delay the onset of Alzheimer's by 1 month, by 2 months, by 6 months, God willing, if we could find a cure, we would more than pay for this medical research over and over and over again. We would spare people from the pain and suffering they go through with this disease and spare their families as well. When it comes to medical research, I will never stand and apologize for putting money into medical research.

Every one of us has someone we love in our family facing a terrible, threatening, scary diagnosis and praying to God that there has been some area of research that may find a cure or a surgery. That is what this is about.

I am glad the Senator has withdrawn his amendment. I repeat what I said at the outset. I will never ever question his commitment to our members in uniform and our veterans, nor will I question his commitment to medical research, but I will be sending him information that I think demonstrates what we are doing here has a direct impact on military families and military veterans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three pages of organizations that support my effort to stop this amendment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROUPS OPPOSING THE MCCAIN AMENDMENT
TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN TYPES OF MEDICAL
RESEARCH PROGRAMS AT DOD

(June 16, 2015)

INDIVIDUAL LETTERS/GRASSROOTS ACTIVATION

The Arc; The Tuberous Sclerosis Alliance; National Breast Cancer Coalition; The American Urological Association (AUA); Alzheimer's Association; Arthritis Foundation; Easter Seals.

DEFENSE HEALTH RESEARCH CONSORTIUM SIGN-
ON LETTER/GRASSROOTS

ALS Association; American Association for Dental Research; American Association of Clinical Urologists; American Cancer Society; Cancer Action Network; American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; American Dental Association; American Gastroenterological Association; American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; American Society for Reproductive Medicine; American Urological Association; Aplastic Anemia & MDS International Foundation; Arthritis Foundation; Autism Speaks; Bladder Cancer Action Network; Breast Cancer Fund.

Children's Tumor Foundation; Colon Cancer Alliance; Crohn's and Colitis Foundation of America; Cure HHT; Debbie's Dream Foundation; Curing Stomach Cancer; Digestive Disease National Coalition; Epilepsy Foundation; Fight Colorectal Cancer; FORCE: Facing Our Risk of Cancer Empowered; Foundation to Eradicate Duchenne; GBS/CIPD Foundation International; International Myeloma Foundation; Kidney Cancer Association; LAM Foundation; Littlest Tumor Foundation; Living Beyond Breast Cancer; Lung Cancer Alliance.

Lupus Research Institute; Lymphoma Research Foundation; Malecare Cancer Support; Melanoma Research Foundation; Men's Health Network; Muscular Dystrophy Association; National Alliance of State Prostate Cancer Coalitions; National Autism Association; National Multiple Sclerosis Society; Neurofibromatosis Network; Ovarian Cancer National Alliance; Pancreatic Cancer Action Network; Parent Project Muscular Dystrophy; Parkinson's Action Network; Phelan-McDermid Syndrome Foundation.

Preventing Colorectal Cancer; Prostate Cancer Foundation; Prostate Health Education Network; Pulmonary Hypertension Association; Research!America; Scleroderma Foundation; Sleep Research Society; Society

of Gastroenterology Nurses and Associates; Society of Gynecologic Oncology; Society for Women's Health Research; Sturge-Weber Foundation; Susan G. Komen; Tuberous Sclerosis Alliance; Us TOO International Prostate Cancer Education and Support Network; Veterans for Common Sense; Veterans Health Council; Vietnam Veterans of America; ZERO-The End of Prostate Cancer.

OVARIAN CANCER COMMUNITY LETTER

Ovarian Cancer National Alliance; Ovarian Cancer Research Fund; Foundation for Women's Cancer; #gynscm Community; Arkansas Ovarian Cancer Coalition; Bluegrass Ovarian Cancer Support Inc.; Bright Pink; CancerDancer; Capital Ovarian Cancer Organization, Inc.; Caring Together, Inc.; Celma Mastry Ovarian Cancer Foundation; Colorado Ovarian Cancer Alliance; Feel Teal Club; FORCE: Facing Our Risk of Cancer Empowered; Georgia Ovarian Cancer Alliance.

GRACE'S Gynecologic Cancer Support; Help Keep a Sister Alive; HERA Women's Cancer Foundation; Hope for Heather; Kaleidoscope of Hope of New Jersey; Life of Teal, Inc.; Lilies of the Valley; Lydia's Legacy; Michigan Ovarian Cancer Alliance; Minnesota Ovarian Cancer Alliance; NormaLeah Ovarian Cancer Foundation; Oasis of Southern California; Ovacom USA; Ovar'Coming Together; Ovarian & Breast Cancer Alliance; Ovarian and Gynecologic Cancer Coalition/Rhonda's Club; Ovarian Awareness of Kentucky.

Ovarian Cancer 101; Ovarian Cancer Alliance of Arizona; Ovarian Cancer Alliance of California; Ovarian Cancer Alliance of Greater Cincinnati; Ovarian Cancer Alliance of Ohio; Ovarian Cancer Alliance of Oregon and SW Washington; Ovarian Cancer Alliance of San Diego; Ovarian Cancer Coalition of California; Ovarian Cancer Education and Research Network (OCERN); Ovarian Cancer Orange County Alliance; Perspectives Association; Sandy Rollman Ovarian Cancer Foundation; SHARE.

Sherie Hildreth Ovarian Cancer Foundation; South Carolina Ovarian Cancer Foundation; Sue DiNapoli Ovarian Cancer Society; Susan Poorman Blackie Ovarian Cancer Foundation; Teal Diva; Teal Tea Foundation; Teal Toes; Tell Every Amazing Lady About Ovarian Cancer (T.E.A.L.); The Betty Allen Ovarian Cancer Foundation; The Judith Liebenenthal Robinson Ovarian Cancer Foundation (Judy's Mission); The Rose Mary Flanagan Ovarian Cancer Foundation; Turn the Towns Teal; Utah Ovarian Cancer Alliance; Wisconsin Ovarian Cancer Alliance; WNY Ovarian Cancer Project; Women's and Girls Cancer Alliance; You'll Never Walk Alone.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I, too, would like to speak on this National Defense Authorization Act and observe that we just, I think, had a very important exchange between the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the Senator from Illinois. They disagree on an amendment that will actually not be voted on, but I was struck by the remarks of the Senator from Illinois and would observe to my colleagues that he has made a compelling case in favor of the bill, which I appreciate, and in favor of the proposition that the President of

the United States should, in fact, sign this bill. So I appreciate my colleague from Illinois pointing that out, and I hope people at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and in the Oval Office even, are listening to this stirring defense of the legislation from the Senator from Illinois.

We are indeed moving in the right direction on this bill. I came to the floor last week to talk about the importance of this act. I reminded my colleagues at the time that this has always been a bipartisan matter. For some 53 years, this Senate, with people who have come long before me, has supported this particular bill on a bipartisan basis, and that is as it should be.

I also disagreed strongly in my remarks last week with the remarks of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nevada, who said that taking up this bill was a waste of time because the President had stated his intention to veto the bill. I made the point at that time that the success of our Nation's premier Defense bill can never be a waste of time. Taking care of the troops, taking care of the men and women who have stepped forward as volunteers, can never be considered a waste of time. I really think that more and more of our colleagues are coming around to that conclusion.

We have made so much progress in the weeks we have been dealing with this. I would remind my colleagues that we started off in the Armed Services Committee with a complete partisan divide. It was troubling at the time, but we have recovered from that. When we began consideration of this bill in the Senate Armed Services Committee, we were told that every Republican would vote aye and every Democrat would vote no. That was definitely a concern to those who obviously know that this has to be bipartisan, that national security has to be something that has the support from both sides of the aisle.

As we worked through the process, as the distinguished ranking member the Senator from Rhode Island worked with the chairman of the committee Senator MCCAIN, we gained more and more support for this legislation in committee. At the end of the day, only four Members of the entire committee voted no. So the vote was 22 in favor and only 4 opposed in the committee—again, moving in the right direction.

We got to the floor last week, and we heard the statement that this is a waste of time. I think we are moving away from that. Indeed, yesterday we voted on cloture on the bill. I have in my hand a very encouraging vote tally of 83 Senators in favor of this bill on this motion for cloture. There were 83 in favor and only 15 opposed.

At the beginning of my brief remarks, I would just say it is encouraging to me that both at the committee level and also on the Senate

floor, we are getting to where the Senate has always been on this bipartisan issue, and we certainly need to. We need to authorize the best tools available for our troops, the best training available for our troops, and our veterans, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois just pointed out, are in need of the support this bill gives them. In addition, our veterans are ready for much needed reforms to improve retirement and to improve military benefits.

Of course, we live in a very unstable and insecure world. We need this bill to meet the threats that are out there. We wish they weren't there. I wish things were better in Iraq. I wish our hard-fought gains had not been tossed away by our precipitous withdrawal, but, in fact, the situation has worsened in Iraq, and we need this bill to protect our interests there. We face old Cold War tensions with the reasserting of an aggressive Russia, in the form of President Vladimir Putin, increasingly intent on restoring the Soviet Empire. We face other realities: cyber terrorism, the nuclear ambitions of Iran, which we heard so much about recently, and we need to reaffirm that the United States has a capable and strong U.S. defense.

Let me for a brief few moments come home to my home State of Mississippi and say why people in my State feel so strongly about this. Of course, we have military bases from north to south in Mississippi. Our own Mississippians, as in all of our States, have stepped forward and are volunteering and serving capably. We also manufacture so many things in my State of Mississippi that are important for national security. We make unmanned aerial vehicles in Mississippi. Some of the finest ships in the world are made on the gulf coast of Mississippi. Helicopters, radars, and other electronic war technology, all of these are manufactured in my home State. So for people in Mississippi, I think the talk of this bill—these weeks on the floor—being a waste of time does not ring true.

A few examples: In my hometown of Tupelo, MS, this bill recognizes the importance of the Army's Apache helicopters and the Tupelo Army Aviation Support Facility. At Columbus Air Force Base, where over 2,000 personnel serve, this bill and the Defense appropriations bill, which the Senator from Maryland may speak about in a few moments—these pieces of legislation allow our student pilots to have adequate training and adequate flying training hours.

In Starkville, MS, the authorization and appropriations bills are integral to completing the Army Reserve Center for equipping and training military personnel. Along the gulf coast, these Defense bills—the authorization and the appropriations bills—would support a new Army National Guard aviation

depot at the Gulfport-Biloxi Airport, as well as the continued mission of over 11,000 Americans who work at Keesler Air Force Base. I am proud of these, and I am proud of what they do for our overall national defense of the United States.

Mississippi is just one of many States to take part in this. Simply put, the future of our defense should not be put in jeopardy because of disagreements about unrealistic domestic funding issues. We can get to those issues, but defending the United States of America is something only the Federal Government can do. We can't devolve national defense down to the States. We have to do it in this building, in this body, on this floor of the Senate. Besides, it is well worth saying and reminding my colleagues that this bill gives the President every penny he has requested for national defense. It meets the \$612 billion requested by President Obama in his budget. So it really should not be partisan at all.

I will go back to what the Senator from Illinois said. He made a stirring defense of this legislation, I think one that should be listened to by the President of the United States. He should listen to the fact that we had an 83-to-15 vote on cloture, and we had a 22-to-4 vote in the Appropriations Committee.

We have had a few partisan flareups along the course of this legislation, but I think as we get to the end of the day, I am more and more encouraged about the prospect of this bill. I think we can pass it tomorrow with an overwhelming vote, which shows we are voting for it not as Republicans, not as Democrats but as Americans, because we want to defend the vital national interests of the United States of America.

Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you very much.

Mr. President, standing here listening to the debate and discussion by colleagues on both sides of the aisle really makes the point that many of us are saying. We need a new budget agreement. We have people—I think we all agree on both sides of the aisle that we need to defend America. There is no doubt about that. In order to do that, we need to look at national security both in its funding for the Department of Defense, but we also need to be looking at what are the components to national security. Many of the key agencies that are not in the Department of Defense are also important to the national security.

Yet, at the same time, we have defense with this budget gimmick, and that is what it is. It is a budget gimmick to avoid the caps we have on spending on both defense and discre-

tionary spending. What this bill is, is a gimmick to have the money through something called OCO, which was meant to be a specific expense for overseas contingency funds. It was meant to deal with specific wars. Now it has been plussed-up by several millions and millions of dollars to avoid the budget caps.

This isn't a budget debate here. I will be saying more about it on the floor. But I just want to say to my colleagues, think about national security. Yes, we do need a strong national defense and we do need to support our troops and we do need to support our military families. We do need to support our troops. We do need to support our military families. That is what I am going to be elaborating on in a minute. But we also have to look at the other aspects.

First of all, you need a State Department. Part of national security is diplomacy. You need a State Department.

Second, in the State Department, you need Embassy security. If you don't want another Benghazi, you must put money in the Federal budget to make sure we have Embassy security. You have to fund the State Department. That is in discretionary funding.

You do not like the cyber attacks? We are going to have meetings, and we are going to hold hearings, and—hoorah—all of the things we should have been doing 3 to 5 years ago but were stopped on this Senate floor because of concerns of the chamber of commerce that we would overregulate.

We have a Department of Homeland Security. It needs to be funded. It is in discretionary spending.

You want to have a cyber security workforce? Yes. They need to be trained at our great colleges and universities. We need a Department of Education with the Pell Grants and so on to be able to help our people get the jobs for the 21st century so they can do the type of work we are talking about we need them to do here.

I could go through other agencies.

I am not here to stand up for government agencies. I am here to stand up for America. I am here to say: Yes, we do need national security. We need to fund the Department of Defense, but we need to fund those other agencies and programs that are integral to national security. That is why I think we need a new budget agreement along the lines of Ryan-Murray, and we need to end the sequester.

I hope—and I call upon leadership on both sides of the aisle but particularly on the other side of the aisle: Let's get to it now, sooner rather than later.

I am the vice chair of the Appropriations Committee and am working very closely with my esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi, on trying to bring bills to the floor, but we simply have to come up with a new agreement.

So we will go through a lot of parliamentary motions and commotion, but I am not so sure we are going to get the locomotion we need to look out for America. We cannot let our military be hollowed out. We cannot let our country be hollowed out. We need to really move ahead with this new agreement, and a perfect example is why I come to the floor.

All through this debate, I have heard that the most important tool to a strong military is the military themselves, the military and their families. Consistent through all, from both sides of the aisle, is that we must look out for our troops. Well, I could not agree with that more. Yet, what is it that we know in this bill, tucked away, is really an erosion of one of the key earned benefits our military and their families and the retirees have—commissaries. Commissaries.

Commissaries have been around since the 19th century. They have been around since 1826. Military families have been able to shop at networks of stores that provide modestly priced goods—primarily groceries—to military families and to retirees. There are 246 of them, many in our own country, many overseas, many in our country where they are only place our military can go. There are those in some other countries where they are not even looked upon and welcomed in some of these countries, even though we are there.

So what is in this bill? Two things: One, let's privatize the commissaries; the other is, let's cut their budget by \$322 million.

I am for saving money by eliminating Pentagon waste, but I will tell you that no money is wasted at a commissary. In fact, just the opposite happens. The commissaries are the most popular earned benefit the military has.

Also, this is not Senator BARB talking; this is coming from the military themselves. If you listen to the National Military and Veterans Alliance, they say this: Commissary and exchanges are a vital part of pay and compensation. The military community greatly value these benefits. The proposed cuts would dismantle the commissary benefit relied upon by shortening hours and raising prices.

When we look at commissaries, we know that people shop there, they save money, and at the same time they are also a major source of employment.

What I want to do is work with my colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma, a member of the Armed Services Committee, Senator JIM INHOFE. It is his amendment. We want to prevent the commissary privatization pilot program. I also have an additional amendment. I would like to restore the \$322 million in cuts to commissaries. We have an offset to be able to pay for it as well. The benefits of the commissaries are significant. That is why I

want these two amendments to be offered. They feed our troops, they help military families stretch their budgets, and they provide jobs to military spouses and to military children old enough to work and military retirees.

The military families tell me they get significant savings—sometimes as much as 30 percent—on their bill. For a family of four, that could be \$4,500 per year. As I said, 60 percent of the commissary workers are spouses or retirees at these commissaries.

DOD says we want commissaries to be more self-sustaining. They have proposed cuts of more than \$1 billion through 2020. They are talking about, in fiscal year 2016, cutting \$322 million. Next year, they want to cut \$1 billion. And they also want to look at how to privatize.

Joining with my colleague from Oklahoma, the distinguished senior Senator, JIM INHOFE—he has legislation to deal with the privatization. In this bill that is pending, they implement this commissary pilot plan. Well, we have heard that before. I think it is a plane without a pilot. But we do not even know if it is a good option. It was made up by Pentagon bean counters, Pentagon bean slicers who were told: Find savings. So they went after the commissaries.

Well, the Senator from Oklahoma and I want to require the DOD and GAO to study the impact of privatization before a plan can be implemented. In other words, before you privatize, why don't you study the impact? The Senator from Oklahoma is proposing that this study be due in September so that we would be able to act appropriately in our appropriations. I support him in his amendment.

I also am looking for support in the cuts to commissaries. Right now, proposed in both the authorization and then they tried it in our appropriations bill, is a cut in the appropriations by \$322 million. This means hours would be cut, so instead of operating 7 days a week, they would be open 5. It would raise prices in many instances by as much as 25 percent. In far-flung places such as Hawaii or Alaska, prices could even go up by as much as 50 percent because of the formula being used.

This is just not right. Of all of the places that we could save money, let's not go after commissaries. Let's not go after commissaries. They help military families and retirees stretch their budgets. For many of our young military, particularly the enlisted, the commissary is the place where they learn how to stretch their dollar. At the same time, it provides employment to military spouses, in some instances military children, and also to retirees.

What is the problem here? We cannot get votes on our amendments. We cannot get a vote on the privatization issue proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma, and I cannot get a vote on

my amendment to restore the \$322 million.

I know the leadership is now meeting on how to wrap up this bill. Well, I don't want to wrap up this bill. I think that what we need to do is to be able to vote on these two amendments.

We have had all kinds of amendments. We had one on the sage-grouse. I know the sage-grouse is a protected species. As an appropriator, I had to deal with this as a rider on the appropriations bills. So I am not against the sage-grouse. I am not against talking about the sage-grouse. But why, with all of the problems facing America, do we need a sage-grouse amendment on defense when I cannot get a vote on protecting commissaries, protecting an earned benefit of our military, helping them stretch their dollar, and making sure some of them have a chance to work on a military base? Why can't I get an amendment? Why can't the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma get a vote on his amendment that would call for a halt to the privatization pilot until we get a study from GAO on impact? So you can stand up for the sage-grouse, but I will tell you that I am standing up for military families.

I urge the leadership at the highest level and the leadership moving this authorization to give Inhofe-Mikulski privatization of commissaries a vote and give me a chance to offer my amendment. Let the Senate decide. Let's not have me stopped and stymied because of parliamentary procedure.

You might say—and to everybody listening—well, BARBARA, you are pretty outspoken. You are not shy. Why can't you offer your amendment?

Under the rules of the body we are now operating under, I have to get consent. That means all 99 other Senators should not object to me offering an amendment. Well, I am stuck. So what I need is for the leadership to give me the consent to at least have my amendment discussed and debated in the light of day. I want to hear their justification why they have to go after commissaries. Let's stand united. Let's get a new budget agreement. Let me offer our amendment.

We should not be fighting with each other over these things. Instead of going after commissaries, let's go after the bad guys in the world and let's do it in a united way.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today to mark the third anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, which was this week. Since 2012, the program the President implemented, which has been known as DACA, has offered temporary relief from deportation to immigrants who arrived in the United States as young children. It has helped almost 665,000

young people since June of 2012, including more than 10,000 in Virginia. The DACA Program announced by the President has allowed young people to contribute to our communities, live without constant fear of deportation, keep families together, and provide economic and educational opportunities for these young recipients.

I want to thank President Obama and the administration because DACA has provided relief to thousands of youngsters who seek only to pursue opportunity, provide for their families, and contribute to the only place they have ever known as home—the United States.

Immigrants are not the only ones who benefit. DACA enforces the universal reputation of this country that we are proud of, that we value our immigrant heritage and we embrace and celebrate their contributions to American history, industry, and culture. This is a value which is something we feel very deeply in Virginia. We feel it more every day.

When I was born in 1958, 1 out of 100 Virginians had been born in another country. Today, in 2015, one out of nine Virginians was born in another country. That period coincides with the moving of the Virginia economy from bottom quarter per capita income to top quarter. Immigration and the contributions of immigrants to our State have been tremendously positive.

More than 10,000 youngsters in Virginia have benefited by DACA. We are 13th among all States. Let me just tell you two quick stories.

Hareth Andrade exemplifies what DACA recipients, if given the opportunity, can give back to their communities. Hareth arrived in the United States from Bolivia, brought by adults. She arrived without her parents. She excelled in school. She attended Washington-Lee High School right here in Arlington. She took advanced placement and international baccalaureate classes.

During a campus visit as she graduated, she learned for the first time that her undocumented status would be a barrier to earning a college education. But instead of giving up on her dream, she organized with other students to form DREAMers of Virginia, an organization that has led efforts to provide students access to instate tuition and college admission for kids just like her.

After the President announced the DACA Program in June of 2012, Hareth became a recipient, and she has since transferred from community college to Trinity Washington University, where she expects to graduate with a degree in international affairs next year.

Another student, Jung Bin Cho, also has seen doors open to him because of DACA, doors to educational opportunities such as the fine institution of Virginia Tech, where he now attends. Cho

arrived in the United States with his parents from South Korea when he was 7 years old. He attended elementary school and graduated high school in Springfield, VA, where he played on the defensive line for the football team.

His dream—a lot of Virginians have this dream—was attending Virginia Tech, and he gained admission to the school. But at the same time he first realized that his undocumented status eliminated him from in-state tuition or any financial aid. Because he couldn't afford it, he attended community college and worked two jobs to support himself. But following DACA and the decision last year to grant in-state tuition to young Virginians—a decision for which I applaud our Governor and general assembly—Cho reapplied to Virginia Tech, won admission, and he now is able to attend Virginia Tech, where he will pursue a degree in business and hopefully participate in this great expansion of the Virginia economy that so many of our immigrants have been proud to lead.

For young people such as Hareth and Cho, DACA makes sense. Both came here as young children. They didn't come here on their own volition; they were brought here. They only know Virginia as home, and they seek to study, work, and build a life in this country. As proud Virginians, they want to return the opportunities afforded to them by using their talents to improve their communities and making it a better place for everybody.

In addition to the humanitarian aspect, as you heard, these talented students are the kinds of people who accelerate our economy. DACA is good for our economy, too. So I strongly support its continuation, but I also wish to encourage my colleagues—and I think we all agree, Democrat, Republican, Independent—we all agree this program is best not by Executive order but by legislation.

We are now almost exactly 2 years from the date when the Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform on this floor in June of 2013. For 2 years, after a strong bipartisan effort, we have waited for action—any action—by the House, not just taking up our bill but doing their own bill and then, in a conference, finding a compromise, which we can do.

It is time that the House act. It is time that the Senate and the House sit down together and do comprehensive immigration reform. We can give DREAMers and millions of other families who continue to live in the shadows an earned pathway to citizenship. It is time to pass that reform. It is in the best traditions of our Nation and in the best value traditions of my Commonwealth that we do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority whip.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, after the Senate concludes its work on the Defense authorization bill tomorrow—a very important part of our responsibility—we will then move to consider the Defense Appropriations Act. This actually is the legislation that will pay the bills for the Department of Defense and make sure our men and women in uniform get the resources they need in order to do their job, not to mention their pay, which is why it is so disturbing to see the leadership of our minority in the Senate announce in the papers here in Washington that they are going to begin what they call a filibuster summer. In other words, they are going to use the power they have as the minority to block important funding bills, beginning with the bill that pays for our national security, in what can only be called a cheap political stunt.

Why they have decided to do that on this important Defense appropriations bill is, frankly, beyond me. I think I understand what their general point is, which is they don't think the Federal Government spends enough money, and so they want to spend more money, and they have no concern whatsoever for the fact that under this administration, we have raised the national debt by trillions of dollars, making sure that my generation will not end up having to pay that money back, but the next generation will unless we meet our responsibilities.

So for them to pull this kind of political stunt and say “You know what, we are not spending enough money, we are not incurring enough debt, and so we are going to force a filibuster on the Defense appropriations bill” in order to extort more spending, more debt, more irresponsibility—the bill our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are pledging to filibuster is not controversial in itself because it would, as I said, provide for our military and would help our troops maintain their status as the greatest military in the world. It also includes simple initiatives that make a lot of sense and serve our troops well, such as giving the men and women who wear the uniform a modest pay raise. Yet the Democratic leader still plans to block this legislation and stymie this Chamber's efforts to fund our troops.

We saw a little glimpse of this last week when Senate Democrats, with the exception of seven, blocked us moving an amendment to deal with cyber security. We saw that their timing could not have been worse because, of course, then it was announced that millions of records at the Office of Personnel Management had been hacked by the Chinese Government and some of the most sensitive security clearance background records were now in their hands—a dramatic act of counterintelligence and espionage.

Then, when we offered an amendment to the Defense authorization bill that would deal with cyber security, would allow more information sharing, would allow lawsuit protection for those who shared information in order to protect the privacy and the information of American citizens, it was blocked by all but seven Democrats on the other side.

So while I have been by and large encouraged by this new Congress and what we have been able to accomplish together in a bipartisan way, I think there are some very troubling signs on the horizon, starting with this ill-considered idea of filibuster summer, throwing a temper tantrum until you can get more money that we don't have to spend on your pet projects. But I think their decision to hold Defense appropriations bill hostage is just inexcusable. This is the essential funding for our military, for national security.

I should point out, as my colleagues across the aisle use this bill as leverage to spend more taxpayer dollars on things like the IRS, not long ago they vocally opposed the obstructionist tactics they are now employing. Here are the words of the Democratic leader, Senator HARRY REID, in 2013. He said: “It's time to get back to setting fiscal policy through the regular order . . . rather than through hostage taking.” I agreed with his comments then, and I wish he would act consistently with those words today.

The American people aren't served well by these kinds of manufactured crises and threats to cut off funding for our troops. And that is why the new Republican Senate, under Majority Leader MCCONNELL, has prioritized and restored the kind of regular order that Senator REID talked about in 2013. Finally, the Congress and the Senate are actually getting back to work on a bipartisan basis.

As I have said, we have had some signs of progress. I know Majority Leader MCCONNELL likes to quote Woody Hayes from Ohio State when he talks about the nature of the progress we have made. He said: “Three yards and a cloud of dust.” I like to think of it more as a baseball analogy of singles and an occasional double. But you get the basic point. We are actually beginning to make some progress, and that is why I find so troubling these signs of filibuster summer and this announcement by our Democratic friends.

We have done our best after this last election, after the American people entrusted us with the majority of the House and the Senate, to deliver on our promises. We have held more rollcall votes on amendments in the past 5 months than the minority leader, as the Democratic leader, allowed in the entire year when they were under control—more rollcall votes on amendments in the last 5 months than Democrats allowed in an entire year when they were in control.

The truth is that our Democratic colleagues, I think, like it better, too, because not only was the minority—Republicans—shut out when Senator REID was majority leader, he shut out Members of his own party, the majority party. Now, how you explain that back home, I am not too clear.

But it is not only Senator REID who has made this commitment to restoring regular order and eschewing this idea of hostage taking, which now they are talking about doing.

Here are the comments of one other member of their Senate leadership, the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY. In 2013, she said the American people had no patience for “politicians holding the economy and the Federal Government hostage to extract concessions or score political points.”

I agree with her, and I agreed with Senator REID in 2013, but these are the exact same Democratic leaders who are now today threatening the same sort of hostage taking they condemned in 2013.

Well, I like to point out that the legislation we are considering, the Defense appropriations bill, is not a partisan bill. In fact, it was voted out of committee last week by a vote of 27 to 3. This is not a partisan bill, so why they should decide to hold this hostage is beyond me.

All but three Democrats supported the defense spending measure in committee last week. But, unfortunately—and defying logic—some Democrats have publicly admitted to supporting the text of the bill while vowing to do everything they could to keep it from advancing on the floor of the Senate.

Just one example is the junior Senator from Connecticut, who hailed the bill’s passage—this is the Defense appropriations bill in committee—through the committee as a “victory for Connecticut”—I am sure there was a press release to go along with that back home—only to go on and say he would go along with the ill-fated strategy to vote no to actually block the bill from being considered on the floor.

The American people are very smart, and they can identify hypocrisy when they see it. When a Senator says, “I am going to vote for the bill in committee, but I am going to vote against it on the floor because that is what my leadership tells me I have to do in order to extract more spending and impose more debt on the American people in future generations,” the American people get it once it is pointed out to them.

So this is all about gamesmanship. This is not about responsible legislating, and it is not why the American people sent us here.

I can only hope, being the optimist that I am, that our colleagues on the other side will reconsider this stated strategy of filibuster summer. What a mistake that is. What an unsustainable position when they have to go home

over the Fourth of July and tell the veterans, tell the Active-Duty military in their State: Yes, I voted to kill the bill that would pay your salary and provide you the tools you need in order to succeed in your commitment to keeping America safe.

I just don’t know how you sustain that position.

So I would encourage our colleagues from across the aisle to remember that filibuster summer is a bad idea and that it is not good for the American people. It irresponsibly signals to our troops that some Members of the Senate are not fully behind them.

So let’s continue to working productively. We have done it on hard pieces of legislation, most recently on the trade legislation we passed out of the Senate with a strong bipartisan vote. Let’s continue to work together productively in a way that serves the American people and not resort to the sort of political maneuvers that I don’t think reflect well on us and on the Senate as an institution but, more fundamentally, undermine the men and women who wear the uniform of the U.S. military.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to acknowledge the third anniversary of the Deferred Action For Childhood Arrivals—the DACA Program—as many of my colleagues have over the past few days.

The DACA Program was created because our government faced an impractical mandate to deport hundreds of thousands of undocumented children who pose no risk to society. Congress, thus far, has been unable to solve the problem. Despite the very good bipartisan efforts that occurred in this body back in 2013, we have been unable to pass any meaningful immigration reform. Why? Well, a group from the far right in the House of Representatives oppose immigration reform at all costs and have sort of tied Speaker BOEHNER into knots so he can’t bring anything to the floor.

So 3 years ago, with no choice, President Obama moved forward on his own to shield children who were brought to this country through no fault of their own. They were brought by their parents when they were very young, most of them; children who have lived here for many years and know no other country as their own, children who are in our school system and dreaming of getting a college degree in America.

The President created DACA, a temporary program modeled on the DREAM Act, which is a vital component of comprehensive immigration reform. As I said, we couldn’t get immigration reform, unfortunately. That would have been the best way to go, and I am still hopeful that will happen at some point in time. But doing what the President did was the humane and practical thing to do because the House couldn’t do anything. What choice was there? Leave these kids here through no fault of their own in total limbo? That was not the right thing to do. So we hope this is a policy Congress will implement into law at some point, but right now, of course, as I mentioned, the House is hog-tied.

In the 3 short years since its inception, the DACA Program has deferred deportations for over one-half million young DREAMers. In New York, nearly 34,000 have been approved for DACA. Of those 34,000, there is a girl named Kirssy Martinez from New York City. Kirssy came to our country from the Dominican Republic in 2002, and she attended high school in New York City.

After graduating, Kirssy lived in the shadows, working small jobs here and there as a waitress, a babysitter, whatever she could do to make ends meet. She was a good student coming out of high school. She even had a few scholarship offers but couldn’t attend college because she didn’t have a green card and, moreover, she didn’t have the means to afford a college education.

In 2012, Kirssy was one of the first to sign up for DACA. With her new temporary legal status, she was able to enroll in Bronx Community College. She got loans to pay for her first semester. She had to drop out once the loans ran out. She scraped together more funding from TheDream.US scholarship that provides tuition assistance to DREAMers at CUNY schools.

Now Kirssy is 26 years old. I met her at her graduation at Bronx Community College. She was coaledictorian of her class with a perfect 4.0 average.

These are the kinds of kids we are talking about. They want to be Americans. They want to get out of the shadows. They want to live productive, full lives. They do not want a handout. They want to be able to be on their own. That is what Kirssy did. I met her, and I was so proud of her.

Kirssy has realized a DREAMers dream because of both her hard work and the President’s DACA Program, which helped bring her out of the shadows. There are many more in New York and around the country just like her.

The sad truth is that instead of harnessing the potential and the contributions these young people could make, instead of welcoming them as full-fledged members of our society, the Republican majority in the House of Representatives voted to repeal the DACA

Program. With these votes, House Republicans have made it clear they want to deport these DREAMers.

Many of the DREAMers have a sibling who may have been born in the United States and is a citizen of the United States or a parent who may have a green card. House Republicans have no qualms about tearing these families apart. They have no qualms what it could cost us as a nation to lose these young people.

If you look at the workforce in America, it is different than Europe in that we do have enough young people who want to work to help support those who are in retirement or on disability—but not if our House Republicans have their way.

In my home State of New York, DREAMers like Kirssy are doing amazing things. They are studying medicine, they are working at startup tech companies and more. If Republicans in the House have their way, these talented people would be putting their skills to use to compete against us rather than working to make America stronger.

Like the millions who came here before them—like the ancestors of our Presiding Officer and my ancestors—they came here because they want to be Americans, not because they want to get a benefit, not because they want to be a leach on society. They want to be a full-fledged, productive member of society. Somehow these folks in the House—and I don't even know if they know who these kids are—want to stop that from happening.

As we recognize this anniversary, we should remember the real human stories behind the DACA Program and think how our Nation could be made better by sensible immigration reform now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing June as National Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. Every 67 seconds someone in our country develops Alzheimer's disease. It is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States. Yet it is the only disease in the top 10 that cannot yet be prevented, cured or slowed.

Of the 5.3 million Americans with Alzheimer's disease, 5.1 million are 65 and older, accounting for 96 percent of the diagnosed population. By 2050, the number of people 65 and older with Alzheimer's disease may nearly triple from 5.1 million to an estimated 13.8 million Americans. The disease will

take the lives of an estimated 700,000 seniors in the United States this year, and that number is rapidly rising.

While deaths from other major causes have decreased in this country, deaths from Alzheimer's disease have increased significantly. Between 2000 and 2013, deaths attributed to Alzheimer's disease increased 71 percent, while deaths attributed to heart disease, the No. 1 cause of death in the United States, decreased by 14 percent.

This devastating disease is also one of our country's most expensive diseases. Nearly one in every five Medicare dollars is spent on people with Alzheimer's and other dementias. Unless something is done, by 2050 it will be \$1 out of every \$3. We cannot afford to overlook Alzheimer's disease. Both the human cost and the cost to our health care system are simply too great. We must invest more in research to develop treatments to prevent or delay the progression of Alzheimer's disease and ultimately to find a cure.

Of all the statistics and data regarding Alzheimer's disease, perhaps the most upsetting is the immense gap between the amount we spend on Alzheimer's research and the cost of caring for those with Alzheimer's disease.

In 2014, the total cost of Alzheimer's was \$214 billion, including \$150 billion to Medicare and Medicaid. During that same year, the National Institutes of Health invested only one-quarter of 1 percent of that amount—\$566 million—in Alzheimer's research. This year, cancer research will be allocated an estimated \$5.4 billion in Federal funds and heart disease will get \$1.2 billion, while Alzheimer's and other dementias will receive a fraction of that, at \$586 million. Simply put, it is imperative we provide NIH with robust and sustained funding, which will allow it to support Alzheimer's research that is so desperately needed.

Let me make it clear. I strongly support the research dollars going into cancer and would like to see more funds put into it. I strongly support the amount of funds we are putting into heart disease and would like to see more funds put in. I know there is bipartisan support in this Congress to increase the pie that NIH has—the funds NIH has—because we understand it advances the humanitarian need in our country to find the answers to cures for diseases but also creates good jobs. We need to dramatically increase the amount of resources that we make available for Alzheimer's research.

We must also support innovative, evidence-based models to address the needs of those currently living with Alzheimer's disease and their family caregivers. I am proud to tell you about the Maximizing Independence at Home—or MIND at Home Program—developed at Johns Hopkins in my home State of Maryland.

In the MIND at Home Program, an interdisciplinary team provides home-

based assessments, care coordination and support to individuals with Alzheimer's disease and other dementias, allowing them to remain in their homes longer, improving their quality of life, and supporting their family caregivers.

During an 18-month pilot project, the MIND at Home Program helped participants stay safely in their homes for an average of 9½ months longer than would have been otherwise possible, while also improving their quality of life.

We have an opportunity to improve the lives of millions of Americans suffering from Alzheimer's, and the lives of their family members, by building on the success of programs such as MIND at Home. This June, in honor of National Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month, let us pledge to provide robust, sustained funding for NIH, so it can support much needed research on this devastating disease, and let us pledge to support innovative programs such as MIND at Home to improve the quality of life of those currently living with Alzheimer's and their family caregivers.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, today is my 103rd time coming to the floor to ask my colleagues to wake up to the urgent problem of climate change.

Pretty much everyone is telling us climate change is a problem. First of all, there are the scientists, virtually every major scientific society and agency. Then there are our military and national security leaders, leading American companies, doctors, and faith leaders who are all telling us this is a problem and asking us to wake up.

The American people understand climate change is real. Nearly 80 percent think that doing nothing to reduce future warming will cause a very serious or somewhat serious problem for the United States. Two-thirds of Americans, including half of Republicans, favor government action to reduce global warming, and two-thirds, including half of Republicans, would be more likely to vote for a candidate who campaigns on fighting climate change.

I have visited with voters in early primary States, with people in Iowa, in New Hampshire, and in South Carolina—business owners, teachers, community leaders, and elected officials. There will be no avoiding this issue in the 2016 election.

So we might expect Republican Presidential hopefuls to present to the voters their plans for climate action. We

might expect the Republican candidates to address this problem in an honest and straightforward manner. But we would be wrong.

Republican Presidential candidates who venerate our military turn deaf when that military warns of climate change's national security dangers. Republican Presidential candidates who are conspicuously religious ignore Pope Francis and other religious leaders when they warn of the fundamental indecency of not addressing climate change. Republican Presidential candidates who seek to represent our corporate elite ignore those corporations' own business case for addressing climate change. And Republican candidates who root boisterously for their home State university sport teams ignore the climate change warnings of scientists and researchers at those very same universities. The Republican Presidential primary is a festival of climate denial, with candidates competing to tie themselves in knots to avoid acknowledging carbon pollution.

A few even subscribe to the big hoax theory. One candidate wrote in his book that climate science is based on "doctored data" and that "it's all one contrived phony mess that is falling apart under its own weight." Another even claims to know who is behind the hoax. He said: "The concept of global warming was created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing noncompetitive." Wow, he got to the bottom of that. "This very expensive global warming"—I will delete the word since this is the Senate floor—"has got to stop. Our planet is freezing," the same candidate wrote last winter.

Then there is the "who knows" caucus. One Republican hopeful seems to think we don't really know one way or the other. "We may be warming, we may be cooling," he says. Another has said that people who are concerned about climate change "don't like to look at the actual facts and data." Now there is a really perverse piece of rhetoric, because what do the actual facts and data show? The data show that the amount of carbon in the Earth's atmosphere has risen dramatically, since the onset of the industrial revolution just over a century ago, to the highest levels mankind has ever experienced and the highest levels Earth has experienced in at least 800,000 years. It is a fact of basic science that carbon dioxide traps heat and alters the climate. That has been known since the days of President Abraham Lincoln. The data match and show decades of increase in global temperature. The scientists we pay to know these things say that warming of the climate is "unequivocal." The ocean is warming. Sea levels are rising. Ocean water is growing more acidic. We measure all of that. It is not theory. Those are the facts.

At least two candidates, by the way, have compared those who accept the

established science of climate change to people who believe the Earth is flat. That is particularly rich when we consider that NASA scientists are among the strongest and most articulate proponents of the science of climate change. Do we really think that NASA scientists believe the world is flat? Do we think the scientists who launched a rover through space, landed it safely on the surface of Mars, and are now driving it around are confused about the circular nature of the Earth?

Then there is the "always changing" crowd. One Republican Presidential hopeful says:

[T]he climate is changing. I don't think the science is clear on what percentage is manmade. . . . And for the people to say the science is decided on this is just really arrogant.

Actually, it is just really factual.

"[T]here's never been a moment where the climate is not changing," another candidate observed. "The question is: What percent of that is . . . due to human activity?"

Well, the links of climate change to human activity are something that scientists have studied extraordinarily closely. According to the leading scientific body on climate change, the best estimate is that pretty much all of the recent rise was due to human activity. The lead scientific organization says greenhouse gas emissions, along with human activity, "are extremely likely to have been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century." And, by the way, "extremely likely" is defined in that document as 95 to 100 percent certainty.

So this gaggle of Republican Presidential hopefuls is willing to take the "worse than 1 in 20" bet that human activity is not the dominant cause of recent climate change. Or, as another Republican candidate put it, "the conclusions you make from that are not conclusive"—whatever that means.

Then, of course, there is this: "I'm not a scientist." At least three of the declared Republican candidates have used that line. Imagine if Congress answered other policy questions that way. What is your position on abortion? Oh, I am not a gynecologist. What should we do about health care? Oh, I am not a medical doctor.

We are not expected to be experts. We are expected to listen to the experts and to make conscientious, informed, and prudent decisions—and, oh, are we failing that test.

There are even Republican candidates for President who in this American century would abdicate American leadership on the climate crisis. "Is there anything the United States can do about it?" one of the Republican candidates asked. "Clearly, no"—reducing greenhouse gas emissions "will have zero impact," he said, on climate change. Another candidate said: "A single nation acting alone can make no

difference at all." I would love to hear Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt conversing about whether America can make a difference.

Last week the senior Senator from Oklahoma, whose skepticism about climate change is well documented, was the keynote speaker at the climate denial conference of a creepy outfit called the Heartland Institute. Here is what he told them—and by the way, when I say "creepy," they are the group that put up a billboard comparing climate scientists to the Unabomber—pretty responsible stuff. "If you look at the Republican candidates," he assured the attendees at that forum, "they're all denying this stuff, with the exception of LINDSEY GRAHAM. . . . They're all with the people in this room"—quite a room to want to be with.

I am glad that our colleague from South Carolina, Senator GRAHAM, has called for reducing carbon pollution with smart probusiness policies. He has lit a path for other Republican colleagues to follow, and he is not the only one on this path. Prominent conservative thinkers and former administration officials from Nixon, Reagan, and both Bush administrations have voiced support for putting a fee on carbon emissions. Prominent conservatives and libertarians think that we can put a price on carbon, relieve taxes on profits and work, and come out economically for the better. Even setting aside the environmental and climate benefit, just economically, that is a win.

So I offered a carbon fee bill last week with our colleague Senator SCHATZ, what one conservative called an "olive limb"—doing better than just an olive branch—to conservatives who are ready to address this problem.

So LINDSEY GRAHAM has articulated one path. There is a different, darker path. It is the path of obedience to fossil fuel interests. The fossil fuel companies, their super PAC allies, and their front groups swing a heavy financial club, and they want to herd Republican candidates down the darker path. Americans for Prosperity, part of the Koch brothers-backed political machine, plans on spending \$900 million in the 2016 election cycle—\$900 million. Its president, Tim Phillips, threatened publicly that any Republican candidate in the 2016 Presidential campaign who supported climate action "would be at a severe disadvantage in the Republican nomination process." Gee, what might candidates conclude from that? And that is just one part of the fossil fuel political machine.

So I ask myself: Why are there all of those preposterous statements by the Republican Presidential candidates? The only conclusion I can reach is to signal that very obedience. We are now at the stage in the Republican Presidential primary where candidates caper

and grovel before the fossil fuel industry's political machine, hoping they will be the chosen beneficiaries of fossil fuel election spending. Remember that there is \$900 million from just one group. It looks like that earns the industry a lot of groveling and capering.

Eventually, the Republican Party is going to have to find its true voice on climate change. It can't continue indefinitely as the political arm of the fossil fuel industry in an environment in which 80 percent of Americans want climate action and a majority of young Republicans think that climate denial is ignorant, out of touch or crazy, according to the words they selected in the poll. Ultimately, the Republican Party is going to have to find its true voice. Until then, America is presented the unseemly spectacle of Republican Presidential candidates fighting to have the best position on climate change that money can buy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor again to speak about Iran as we count down to the deadline for an agreement about Iran's illusive-ness when it comes to the military dimensions of their program and how they respond to that in any agreement. The truth, as it has always been, is illusive, and it remains so.

Yesterday, Secretary of State Kerry said—in response to a question about whether Iran's atomic work by the Iranian military would have to be resolved before sanctions would be lifted—that we are not fixated on Iran specifically accounting for what they did at one point or another. What we are concerned about is going forward.

Given Iran's history of deception, I am very concerned about what they did “at one point or another.”

In an Iran task force memo on verification, it says that “until Iran provides a full accounting of its past and present possible military dimension activities, the international community cannot have confidence that it knows either how far Iran is along the path to nuclear weapons or that Iran's nuclear weapons activities have effectively ceased.”

David Albright—who has appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and whom I called many times when I was the chairman and still do—is the founder of the Institute for Science and International Security. Mr. Albright said the Secretary's re-

marks were “very worrisome.” He said that they reflect what he sees as the administration's long practice of offering concessions to Iran. He said: “Whenever confronted with Iranian intransigence. . . . It's going to be hard for a lot of people to support this deal if they give in on past military dimensions.”

He also said:

Addressing the International Atomic Energy Administration's concerns about the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear programs is fundamental to any long-term agreement. . . . An agreement that sidesteps the military issues would risk being unverifiable. Moreover, the world would not be so concerned if Iran had never conducted weaponization activities aimed at building a nuclear weapon.

Speaking of the possible military dimensions of Iran's program, the former Deputy Director General of the International Atomic Energy Administration, Olli Heinonen, said:

Without addressing those questions . . . the IAEA Secretariat will not be able to come to a conclusion that all nuclear material in Iran is in peaceful use, which is essential in building confidence of the international community over Iran's nuclear program. A comprehensive deal—that would include uranium enrichment—can only be reached if uncertainties over Iran's military nuclear capability are credibly addressed. . . . That should be an unambiguous condition to achieving a final accord that is meaningful in safeguards terms.

Now, this is the former Deputy Director General of the International Atomic Energy Administration, whom we hear overwhelmingly under the proposed agreements saying this is the entity that will be responsible for the verification of any potential agreement.

Well, his experience says that without understanding the weaponization elements of Iran's program, you can't fully be able to do that. He also warned that outsiders really can have no idea where and how fast the mullahs could build a nuclear weapon unless they know what Iranian engineers have done in the past.

As to Secretary Kerry's assertion yesterday that we know what their program was—and he said it, as I read it, almost as unequivocal that we know what their program was. Well, I get concerned when I read the former Director of the CIA, Gen. Michael Hayden, who has said not addressing the possible military dimensions “creates an increased burden on verification if I don't have high confidence in where the Iranians actually are, not such as fissile material development, but in their weaponization program. . . . we do have intelligence estimates, but they remain estimates.”

They remain estimates.

[F]or a country that says “that's not our objective,” they refuse to come clean on their past. . . . How can we know their intent, how can we know their capacity for breakout or sneak out, without high confidence in where it is they are right now?

He also said in reference to Secretary Kerry's remarks:

I'd like to see the DNI or any intelligence office repeat that word for me. They won't. What he is saying is that we don't care how far they've gotten with weaponization. We're betting the farm on our ability to limit the production of fissile material. He's pretending we have perfect knowledge about something that was an incredibly tough intelligence target while I was director and I see nothing that has made it any easier.

This is the former Director of the CIA, supposedly where we have all of this knowledge. This is his expression of what we have or don't have. Clearly, basically what he is saying is we have estimates, but they are just that, estimates.

I am very concerned when the Secretary of State says that we are prepared to ease sanctions on Iran without fully understanding how far Iran progressed on its secret nuclear weapons program. It has been a fundamental question from the very beginning of these negotiations. It was made very clear in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and other venues where Members asked about would Iran have to come clean on its possible dimensions of its militarization of its weapons program and would that have to be upfront. That was always an understanding, almost like a red line. Now that seems to be erased.

It has been a fundamental question to which we need—not just want—a full and verifiable answer. This is not just about Iran making some admission. That is beyond. I think the world has acted the way it has acted with the sanctions from the U.N. Security Council and elsewhere because it knows Iran was pursuing weaponization of its nuclear program. It is just that we don't know how far they got in that process, and how far they got in that process is important to know as we are determining the other elements of any agreement, particularly with breakout. That has been the case as long as I have been working to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state.

Now, the Secretary of State says we are prepared to ease economic sanctions without a full and comprehensive answer to that question. He says Iran's past suspected nuclear activities need to be “addressed.” That is all, simply addressed—not specifically answered but only addressed. According to the New York Times article that I read, he made it clear that sanctions could be lifted—they could be lifted—before definitively resolving concerns of the International Atomic Energy Agency about Iran's past nuclear research and the extent of the military dimensions of that research.

That is simply unacceptable, in my view, and it should be unacceptable to everyone in this Chamber.

You know, the New York Times article goes on to say:

Those favoring full disclosure of what diplomats have delicately called the “possible military dimensions” of Iranian nuclear research say that the West will never know how long it would take Iran to manufacture a weapon—if it ever developed or obtained bomb-grade uranium or plutonium—unless there is a full picture of its success in suspected experiments to design the detonation systems for a weapon and learn how to shrink it to fit atop a missile.

That is exactly what I believe, and I came to the floor recently and had a map that described where the possible reach of Iran’s present missile technology exists, and it is most of the gulf, into parts of Eastern Europe, Turkey, Egypt, and of course our ally, the State of Israel. So its reach today, under missile capacity—and something they continue to perfect—is incredibly significant.

For a decade since obtaining data from an Iranian scientist from a laptop that was spirited out of the country, the CIA and Israel have devoted enormous energy to understanding the scope and success of the program.

Failing to require disclosure, they argue, would also undercut the atomic agency—a quiet signal to other countries that they, too, could be given a pass.

That is quoted from the Times article. Those are exactly my continuing concerns, and I think they are concerns of a very large universe of people who have been following these developments. I need to know the answer to those questions before I can support any lifting of sanctions against Iran that I have fought for, authored, and that this Senate has unanimously supported.

So I am going to conclude, but I will be back to point out the unfolding problems with dealing with the mullahs in Tehran and what it means to the national security of the United States and to our allies in the Middle East and to the stability of the region and to what I am increasingly concerned is the moving of goal posts that move increasingly in the direction of Iran.

I remember when we started off this conversation—these negotiations—Iraq’s plutonium reactor, we were told they will dismantle it or we will destroy it. Well, this agreement allows Iraq to continue—reconfigured somewhat, but it can be reconfigured back. The President himself has said there was no need for Fordow, built deeply under a mountain, an enrichment facility.

Now, if you want a peaceful nuclear civilian program, you don’t go deep into a mountain to ultimately do enrichment, but that is what the Iranians did. The President himself said that was an unnecessary facility. We were told it was going to be closed. Well, it is going to stay open—reconfigured to produce less uranium and supposedly with safeguards, but it is going to stay open. The point is, with regard to the

weaponization elements, Iran has for a decade—a decade—worked against the U.N. Security Council resolution that said it had to come clean on this question. So for a decade they haven’t done it.

When you have the leverage, why wouldn’t you seek to achieve it now, so you know and can calculate the rest of your agreement? That, too, seems to be lost in the shifting sands of these negotiations. This is of deep concern to me, and I can only hope we will end up at a better deal than that which is being unfolded as we speak.

Every time I listen to another element of what I thought was a critical element of any deal, that critical element seems to be oddly moving in the direction of what Iran wants it to be and not what we in the international community should want to see. That is my concern, and I will continue to come to the floor to report on it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, the facts are undeniable. Climate change is real. It is caused by humans. It is happening now and it is solvable.

One solution to climate change is putting a fair price on carbon pollution. Last week, Senator WHITEHOUSE and I introduced a bill, S. 1548, to do just that and to return all of the revenue to American families and businesses.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership on this bill, but we want a Republican dance partner. We want conservative leadership on this great challenge of our time.

Climate change increases the severity and frequency of storms and natural disasters. This is not only a humanitarian problem but also an economic issue. A heat wave in Texas in 2011, for example, caused \$5 billion in livestock and crop losses. Climate change makes events like this 20 times more likely to occur today than in the 1960s. Climate change’s impact on the economy is particularly damaging because it creates so much uncertainty.

There is a role for the government here. The administration is doing everything it can to reduce carbon pollution within the statutory constraints of the Clean Air Act, but it will not get us to the reductions we need. Congress needs to step in and legislate to get the

reductions we need to make sure we are protecting low-income and working families and growing our economy.

Regulations like the Clean Power Plan and market mechanisms such as a price on carbon are not mutually exclusive; in fact, they work together. They are mutually reinforcing. If powerplants reduce emissions under the Clean Power Plan, they will pay less in carbon fees. Market mechanisms for reducing pollution work.

In the 1990s, President George H.W. Bush used cap and trade to reduce emissions from sulfur dioxide in order to combat acid rain. The program was successful in slashing emissions, which not only meant healthier lakes and waterways but healthier communities. The health benefits for humans linked to lower sulfur dioxide emissions were estimated at \$50 billion annually by 2010.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHATZ. Yes, I will be pleased to yield to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator, and I welcome his remarks. We are in a space in the Senate where there are some people who still say climate change isn’t happening, even though, as the Senator and I know, 98, 99 percent of the scientists in this country say it is obvious.

I am also so pleased my friend is here today because he is talking about cap and trade, and that leads us into my question. I will ask two questions.

One question I have for the Senator from Hawaii is how he feels about the Pope and the encyclical, where the Pope is basically stating it the way it is, and it needs to be heard by everyone. I wonder how my friend responded to that. Also, I wanted to make sure my friend knew in California we have a cap-and-trade program, and I thought it was so good that you reminded people that this was a creation by a Republican President dealing with acid rain and it was so successful and the public health benefits so outweighed the costs.

So I wanted to make sure my friend was aware we had this cap-and-trade system in California that is working well. We balanced our budget in large part because of this, and businesses like it. They liked the certainty of it. Also, will the Senator respond to the issue of the Pope entering into this debate.

Mr. SCHATZ. I thank the Senator from California.

Through the Chair, I will answer the first question.

First, when it comes to the Pope’s encyclical, it seems to me that he is displaying the moral leadership that is going to be necessary in all sectors—in the private sector, in the public sector, among Democrats, Republicans, Independents. People across the planet are starting to understand the magnitude of the climate challenge.

One of the reasons I have been coming to the floor so frequently is not to lambaste the other party, but rather to encourage that there be conservative leadership in this space. There is certainly progressive leadership in this space. There is increasingly corporate leadership. There is leadership in the Department of Defense, in the scientific community. But what we really need is for conservatives to step up and to acknowledge the reality of this problem and propose their own set of solutions.

They may disagree with a carbon fee or a cap-and-trade program or the President's Clean Power Plan. But let's have that debate out in the open. Come down and beat up on our bill or beat up on the President's proposal. That is fine. But we need to have this great debate in this great Chamber because this is one of the greatest challenges of our time.

To the Senator's second question, talking a little bit about how cap and trade has worked in California but also how market-based mechanisms have worked all over North America and across the planet, the Senator is right. There is a cap-and-trade program in California, and the economy has continued to improve. The State's fiscal situation has continued to improve.

We have the Hawaii Clean Energy Initiative. We have tripled clean energy in a very short period of time, all while unemployment has gone down. In 2008, British Columbia became the first and only jurisdiction in North America with an economy-wide price on carbon emissions. Seven years later, evidence shows that even going it alone, British Columbia was able to reduce petroleum consumption more than the rest of Canada and without any negative impact on growth.

So the Senator from California is right. We can do this and grow our economy. But we are going to need bipartisan leadership. Market mechanisms are one of the most straightforward solutions to climate change. They have growing support across the ideological spectrum. The carbon fee in our bill is predictable. It can start right away. There is no new government program to administer or to run and no need for complex financial transactions or trading.

It is simple and relatively easy to administer, and it gets the reductions that we need: an estimated 40 percent of greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2030. The bill, importantly, is revenue neutral. The original carbon fee legislation poured back the new revenue into a bunch of goodies that I liked in terms of dealing with the challenge of climate change. But we understand that if we are going to get Republican support, this needs to be revenue neutral or close to it, and we need to use the revenue to ameliorate the challenges that are going to occur as

we transition into a clean energy economy.

It also lowers corporate tax rates, which will make our Tax Code more competitive with other countries. But reducing carbon emissions and growing our economy ought to go hand in hand. This bill lays out a clear framework for how to accomplish that. Climate change demands leadership from both progressives and conservatives. A price on carbon is a market-based solution that can appeal to people of multiple ideologies but share a common goal of solving one of the great challenges of our time.

In the tradition of Margaret Thatcher and Barry Goldwater, we need conservatives to embrace their own market-based solutions to our climate challenge. There is nothing conservative about ignoring the collective knowledge of the scientific establishment. There is nothing conservative about ignoring the warnings from our Department of Defense. There is nothing conservative about shirking our responsibility for global leadership. There is nothing conservative about conducting a dangerous experiment on the only planet that we have.

So we have no desire for this to continue to be an issue where only one party is on the floor talking about it. Let's have the argument about what the right solution set ought to be. But let's have it out in the open, and let's have it together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

EPA WATER RULE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, the EPA recently released its final water rule, claiming much greater power for the administration to oversee the land use decisions of homeowners, small businesses, and family farms throughout our country. This mandate is full of problems, and the American people are being sold a false bill of goods.

Just look at the potential impact to my home State of Arkansas. As you can see, the entire State will come under this jurisdiction. The red on this map, compiled by Agriculture's Waters of the United States Mapping Initiative, highlights the extent to which this EPA rule would impact Arkansas. As you can see, the Obama administration wants to give bureaucrats in Washington control of almost all of the water in Arkansas. They are deceiving the American people in order to justify this power grab. First, they imply that unless Washington is in control, water is simply not protected.

This is not true. Clean water protection involves our local communities. Private land owners, conservation districts, States, and local communities protect non-Federal waters all of the time. Second, the Agency claims this rule is designed to protect drinking water.

Again, this is an attempt to scare the American people. It is dishonest.

We all want to protect our water resources, and clean drinking water is certainly a priority. I support the Safe Drinking Water Act. For more than 40 years the Safe Drinking Water Act has encouraged Federal-State cooperation in improving safe drinking water. That work has made tremendous progress, which we can all be proud of. This law has been strongly supported by both Republicans and Democrats. It has been reauthorized and extended by Republican-controlled Congresses, and it will continue to improve safe drinking water whether or not this Federal power grab continues.

This administration says one thing about safe drinking water, and then it does another. For example, in 2013 and 2014, the Obama administration cut funding for the Safe Drinking Water Grant Program. This program, which is a Federal-State partnership, does far more to protect safe drinking water than anything in the EPA's new power grab.

Third, we hear rhetoric about rivers catching on fire and toxic pollution. Once again, this is an attempt to scare the American people. Major rivers will continue to receive Federal and State protection just as they have for decades. Isolated non-navigable waters will continue to be protected by State and local efforts as they are now. Let's not forget that farmers and landowners care about clean water.

Northeast Arkansas farmer Joe Christian told the Jonesboro Sun after the EPA finalized the rule: I am not going to do something detrimental to the land I work and live on.

There is no greater environmentalist than a farmer. For the past year, Arkansas farmers and ranchers have shared with me their concerns over this EPA overreach. I want to share some of the comments that I recently received. Fred in Trumann wrote:

Like every other person in America, I favor clean water. However, there appears to be a grab for power or control related to water. I fail to see how a low spot in a field or yard or ditch that I create on my own land should be included. We are being overregulated by Washington—please continue to limit intrusion into our lives where none is needed.

Rodney in Lonsdale sent me an email saying:

The EPA doesn't need to be monitoring my pond and streams, telling me what to do or how to use them. This is an overreach.

These frustrations are the result of an agency that often abuses its authority, creating unnecessary and costly mandates. It is not just Arkansans. Across the country, people are sounding the alarm on this power grab.

"Extreme" and "unlawful" are two words the American Farm Bureau used to describe the rule. An analysis of the finalized rule by the organization determined that the ambiguity of the

rule will give the Agency “broad discretion to identify waters and to limit the scope of most of the exclusions.” The good news is that we have a bipartisan agreement that this EPA rule is a problem.

After EPA finalized this rule, the Wall Street Journal published an editorial calling this rule by EPA an “amphibious attack” and urged Congress to overturn the rule and force “Members to show whose side they’re on—the average landowners or the Washington water police.”

That is why I joined the Senate’s efforts to protect property owners and keep Washington’s hands off of private lands. The Federal Water Quality Protection Act safeguards Americans from this overreach. It sends EPA back to the drawing board to craft a proposal that encourages true cooperation. It will keep the hands of Washington’s politicians out of the decisions that have been made in the States and local communities for generations.

Under this modest, bipartisan legislation, the EPA will be able to protect Federal waters without expanding its power. I appreciate Senator BARRASSO, the bill’s author, for his continued leadership in holding EPA accountable. Last week, my colleagues and I who serve on the Environment and Public Works Committee moved this legislation forward. This is a step in the right direction to protecting the rights of landowners while protecting our Nation’s waters.

I look forward to supporting this commonsense legislation on the Senate floor and encouraging my colleagues to do the same. Congress must build on the progress that we have made toward better water quality. We can do this best by protecting the role of States, local communities, and private citizens to be a part of the process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TRANSITION TO INDEPENDENCE ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a bill I will be introducing, the Transition to Independence Act.

The bill is a Medicaid demonstration program that will give incentives to States to achieve more integrated employment for people with disabilities.

The Federal Government funds a hodge podge of programs that provide supports for people with disabilities.

However, the largest of all programs providing supports for people with disabilities, the Medicaid program, could do much more to drive better outcomes.

The Medicaid program provides critical supports for people with disabilities including primary health care and home and community-based care.

This bill is unique in that it uses the resources of the Medicaid program to drive better outcomes for people with disabilities.

Our public policy encourages people with disabilities to participate in soci-

ety, to live in the community and to have integrated employment.

But what does the government do to encourage that outcome?

What does government do to insure that all people with disabilities have the opportunity to achieve their maximum participation?

I would argue, not enough.

The program that is the largest funder of supports for people with disabilities is Medicaid.

Unfortunately, Medicaid funding to States is in no way tied to producing better outcomes.

Now I know we cannot just snap our fingers and make it so.

The Federal Government cannot just order the States to do better.

The Federal Government needs to provide States the right incentives to achieve better outcomes.

That is the goal of the Transition to Independence Act.

This bill creates a 5-year, 10-state Medicaid demonstration program.

States participating in the demonstration program will receive Medicaid bonus payments for meeting achievement targets for individual integrated employment.

Simply stated, as States move people with disabilities to integrated settings, they get more money.

States can also achieve additional funding for agreeing to give up new congregate placements.

States can achieve additional funding for ending vocation rehabilitation for congregate settings.

States can achieve additional funding for taking actions that will grow the workforce serving people with disabilities.

Finally, States can achieve additional funding for taking steps to improve interagency collaboration.

Too much of disability policy occurs in isolated silos where people in charge of policy don’t talk to each other.

There is health services, long-term supports, housing, education and workforce training, and transportation available to people with disabilities all run by people who aren’t working together to maximize the outcome for the individual.

Now it is legitimate to ask: why can’t States take these policy steps today?

They can take some actions of course.

But they have a significant financial incentive not to take these actions.

It will take a significant investment of resources for a State to achieve better outcomes for people with disabilities.

If a State wants to improve outcomes, it needs to invest in providing the supports necessary to help people with disabilities participate more fully in the community.

In the end, moving people with disabilities from more expensive con-

gregate settings to more self-sufficient, integrated settings is better for the individual and ultimately better for the taxpayer because it will require less intensive, less expensive supports.

But under Medicaid, when a State makes that investment, it has to give half or more of the savings achieved back to the Federal Government.

Again, that is a serious disincentive for the States.

Basically, the bonuses I am proposing in this bill allow the States to keep the savings they achieve.

It is my intention that this bill be essentially budget neutral to the Federal taxpayer while giving States a real incentive to achieve better outcomes.

We can build better supports for people with disabilities.

The term often used is a “lifespan benefit.”

I believe that creation of a lifespan benefit, where people with disabilities receive coordinated, multidisciplinary support to achieve the maximum functional outcomes possible begins with the Medicaid program.

It is my intention to prove that through this demonstration bill.

I have talked to scores of people with disabilities and their families and they want to work a real job that pays a fair wage.

Agencies that provide these services are committed to helping them find real jobs.

It is time to change Medicaid incentives to encourage and reward that.

Last week, a constituent of mine from Dubuque, Rose Carroll, visited my office with the Autistic Self Advocacy Network.

Rose is currently in college working on a degree in math.

All Rose wants is to know that she will have the supports available to her when she needs them so that she can do all she can to participate in her community.

That is exactly what this bill intends to do.

It will demonstrate that States, when given the right incentives, will do all they can to make sure Rose has those supports.

Back home, my friend Chris Sparks is the Executive Director of Exceptional Persons Incorporated in Waterloo, IA.

Chris and his staff go out into the community every day to provide direct support services for people with disabilities.

These workers provide a necessary service in order to assist people with significant intellectual and developmental disabilities to have jobs in their community.

But it is a struggle every day for Chris to find workers, to train them and retain them.

This bill will provide States the incentives to grow the workforce to make it easier for people like Chris

Sparks to go out and provide services that allow individuals with disabilities to achieve independence.

The bill I introduce today has the support of the American Association of People with Disabilities, the American Association on Health and Disability, Autism Speaks, the Autistic Self Advocacy Network, the Muscular Dystrophy Association, the National Adult Day Services Association, the National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services, the National Association of States United for Aging and Disabilities, and the National Down Syndrome Congress.

The bill also has the support of the American Network of Community Options and Resources including Iowa members: Christian Opportunity Center, Hope Haven, Opportunity Village, Hills & Dales, New Hope Village, and Exceptional Persons Incorporated.

In their advisory role to Congress, the National Council on Disability provided technical assistance on the bill.

This is an opportunity for us to say that outcomes matter, for us to further a conversation about setting the goal of maximum participation and using all our tools to meet it.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and others to move this legislation forward in the months to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, are we in the parliamentary procedure to proceed to speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

PAPAL ENCYCLICAL ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, tomorrow, Pope Francis will release a papal encyclical on the environment. It is basically a letter to all Catholics about high-priority issues, and he has chosen the environment.

Some might think the Pope is straying outside of his expertise by discussing environmental issues and climate change as the expected encyclical is revealed, but the Pope actually has more of a scientific background than many Members of Congress because the Pope was trained as a chemist before he entered seminary. And, as we have seen over the course of his first 2 years as head of the Catholic Church, Pope Francis is particularly committed to addressing issues that affect the poor.

According to recent news reports, the Pope's encyclical will emphasize the moral imperative that we as a global community face in addressing climate change. He calls every person across all faiths to come together to address the global deterioration of our common home. This stewardship case is a shared common truth for all people—the faith community and all.

Many of us have spoken on this floor about climate change and the resulting sea level rise. The President has spo-

ken about it numerous times recently, and he visited the Florida Everglades in my State recently and made a similar case for the urgent need to take action on climate change and sea level rise.

Taking care of treasured places such as the Everglades isn't just about conservation, it is about survival.

Millions of people in South Florida depend on the Everglades as the source, as that water flows south from upper central Florida and recharges the aquifers. It is a vital source of drinking water. It is a vital source no one can live without. But drinking water wells in South Florida are already being compromised by saltwater intrusion through the porous limestone foundation of our State.

We had a hearing of our commerce committee in Miami Beach, which is ground zero. A NASA scientist testified that over the last 40 years, measurements—not forecasts, not projections; measurements—over the last 40 years, the sea level has risen 8 inches in South Florida.

What happens when that rises—and, of course, that starts to inundate the porous limestone, which holds the freshwater, which supports the foundation of the peninsula of Florida. You can't do as the Dutch have done—build a dike around it—because the water will seep right underneath your dike into the porous limestone.

So we need to take a hard look at what can be done—and do it soon—to get ready for the impacts of climate change in the future, to stop pumping carbon dioxide, which is the main greenhouse gas, into the atmosphere.

There are a lot of good ideas out there that could protect communities from climate change, and there are a lot of good ideas out there that could help folks pay their bills. For example, my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, has proposed a plan to place a carbon fee or a dollar fee per ton of carbon emissions and then use that money to lower everybody's tax rate, both corporate and individual. Let it be revenue neutral. It is a fee on carbon, and the marketplace will then kick in, making it less desirable to put those greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, particularly carbon dioxide.

In the last Congress, Senator BOXER proposed a similar idea of setting a carbon pollution fee. Her bill would have directed that new revenue toward helping communities adopt climate resiliency measures as well as providing a monthly rebate to U.S. households.

Well, maybe we don't have the magic formula yet, but we ought to be able to agree that lowering tax rates for businesses and individuals would be a good thing. But if you are going to do that, you have to have the revenue to pay for it. In other words, you have to have the revenue to replace the revenue that is there now if you lower the tax rates.

If you set a price on carbon emissions, it could generate anywhere from \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion over a decade. That revenue can put money back into the pockets of hard-working people by virtue of lowering their tax rates.

Some people might think this is a political issue that Big Business is unanimously opposed to. When I first heard it, that is what I thought would be the case. But, lo and behold, that is not the case. On June 1, six major oil and gas companies, including Shell, signed a joint letter to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in support of establishing a carbon pricing system. What these giant corporations understand is that something must be done to reduce carbon emissions, and if they do not pursue a carbon fee or something like it, they are going to face what they do not want to face, which is EPA regulation and lawsuits and additional public scrutiny over their contribution to pollution.

In their letter, these CEOs write: "As major companies from the oil and gas sector, we recognize both the importance of climate challenge and the importance of energy to human life and well-being."

If these corporate giants can acknowledge the seriousness and urgency of climate change, then it just doesn't make sense that we can't get over this political hangup about a fee—call it a tax—on carbon and address it here in the Senate.

Many of my colleagues are concerned and frustrated, especially if they live in a State like mine where the sea level is rising. The mayor of Miami Beach cut a TV campaign advertisement in a kayak at seasonal high tide on Alton Road in Miami Beach. Is it any wonder we feel like the canary in the coal mine? So we are sounding the alarm and echoing the warning of scientists, echoing the warning of faith leaders—now the Pope is going to speak tomorrow in his encyclical—and we are echoing the warnings of Americans who are already experiencing real consequences of what is happening with the climate. The State of Florida is the literal canary in the coal mine. The State of Florida is ground zero for all of this that is happening.

This year is going to mark 10 years since Hurricane Katrina, and just last month experts at CBO estimated that with climate change, hurricane damage will skyrocket over the next 60 years. Why? Because as the Earth heats up—when the Sun rays reflect off the Earth and reflect back into space, if the greenhouse gases are there, they act as a shield, and that traps the heat. Where does 90 percent of the heat go? It goes into the world's oceans. The hotter the water, the more fuel for a more ferocious hurricane. Floods, droughts, heat waves, sea level rise, wildfires, melting sea ice—these are costly and deadly consequences.

Regardless of what it takes—the science, the economics, the corporate executives, the moral imperative, and the Pope—we must call attention to the problem. Let's not suffer the same fate as other canaries in the coal mines. I encourage all of our colleagues to look at this issue anew. Look at it with an eye toward confronting the challenge and being good stewards of Earth's bounty that we are all blessed to have.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak a few moments as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I have had three chances to say congratulations to the San Francisco Giants when they won the World Series over the last 5 years, and I didn't do it. Last night, the Golden State Warriors won the NBA Finals, and I want to remedy the error of my ways and come and offer the heartiest congratulations to a truly great basketball team.

This team had a remarkable season. Their regular season of 67 and 15 was the sixth best in the history of the NBA, and they went 16 and 5 in the playoffs. But their dominance wasn't built on brute force; it was built on finesse, strategy, and teamwork.

Steph Curry was a real superstar, offering flashes of brilliance all season. I had the occasion to meet him and have a picture taken with him, and as I stood against this tall American and put my arm around his waist, I realized how slender he was. I subsequently learned they are trying to get him to eat 6,000 calories a day—I guess to meet LeBron James. It was quite a matchup, and I was delighted to be able to watch these games. After a scary fall in game 4 against the Rockets, Steph came back in game 5 to lead the Warriors in scoring, boosting them into the finals.

Last year, when I met them at a Warriors' practice, I saw a little bit about the team. And one player I hadn't met was a gentleman by the name of Andre Iguodala, who really came alive against the Cavaliers in the finals. After playing off the bench the first three games, he started the final three and was the defensive spark the Warriors needed.

Now, no one can stop LeBron James, and as I watched the series, I really marveled at this man because he was a very intelligent player. Once he charged toward that basket, there were very few who could stop him. It was an amazing performance.

All season long, Klay Thompson was an offensive dynamo, stepping up when the team needed him most. And of

course Draymond Green, Harrison Barnes, and others.

And what a season for a brand new rookie coach Steve Kerr. He spent his whole life in basketball but has only a handful of months as coach under his belt. He took an undersized team with little playoff experience all the way. It was a dream come true.

I would also like to congratulate the Warriors owners, Joe Lacob and Peter Guber, as well as the team's president, Rick Welts. I have had the privilege of meeting these three people. Oakland can be very proud of them. They are building a new arena in San Francisco, so the whole Bay Area will have an opportunity to participate in this team's glory. These gentlemen bought the team 4 years ago. And in that short time, they have guided what was a moribund franchise into the best team in the league. So they rightly should be thanked for their accomplishment.

Finally, to my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Ohio, ROB PORTMAN, I offer my condolences, and I look forward to collecting on our wager, which Mr. President, is some Ohio beer. I trust it is going to be good beer, and I look forward to drinking it and hopefully being able to tell him that there will be another time, and his team can only but rise in glory as well.

Finally, to the Warriors, I look forward to continued greatness, both in Oakland and across the bay in San Francisco. Their first title since 1975 really brought the city of Oakland together and made them proud. I say to them, thank you for some wonderful memories.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Virginia, I be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about the changing nature of our economy. I come to talk about a part of our economy that I don't think most folks in this Chamber understand. It goes by many names. It is called the sharing economy, the on-demand economy, the

gig economy, the 1099 economy. There is a lot of discussion, actually, in some circles about exactly what to call this changing nature of our economy, but there is no dispute that it represents a new dynamic and growing part of our American economy.

It used to be that when you were introduced to someone, one of the first questions asked was, Where do you work? Today, particularly for the 80-plus million millennials who make up the largest age cohort in our society, the more appropriate question to ask is, What are you working on? That is because the American workforce is increasingly made up of freelancers, independent contractors, and the self-employed. Yet Washington mostly has remained on the sidelines as our economy, the workforce, and the workplace have undergone what may be the most dramatic transformation literally in decades.

By my count, as folks announced yesterday, almost 25 people are running for President in 2016. Frankly, I find it remarkable that none of them in either party are even talking about these fundamental changes in how, when, and where Americans are currently working because, whether by economic necessity or by choice, one-third or more of the American workers now find themselves piecing together two, three, or more on-demand opportunities to make a living. As I said earlier, it is called the sharing economy, the on-demand economy, or the gig economy. It includes, as I mentioned earlier as well, a lot of young and—at least they think so—invincible millennials, 80 million-strong, who began entering the workforce in the year 2000 and afterward.

The good news about this generation is it is the best educated, the most diverse and tolerant, the most technologically adept, and the most comfortable with disruptive change of any generation America has seen. And that is good. Most millennials grew up in the glow of a computer monitor. Since childhood, most have maintained an online identity and network in real time with friends. Members of this generation can, if they choose, graduate from a college or university without ever stepping foot on its campus. Armed with a tablet or smart phone, they can successfully work for an employer without ever sitting at a desk from 9 to 5. But it is not just the millennials who are pushing the envelope in how, when, and where people work. It also includes many middle-aged professionals, unexpectedly downsized at midcareer. It includes baby boomers—folks from my generation and a number of my college classmates—who have been hit with a premature end to what they thought before the recession was a solid career. Frankly, it also includes a lot of folks for whom working multiple jobs at the

same time is nothing new. They call it survival, and it hasn't gotten any easier. Yet, here in Washington, too few policymakers are thinking creatively about ways to provide more Americans with more footholds into this new world of on-demand or freelance work.

In addition, today we have a whole set of new online platforms, companies that didn't even exist 5 years ago, such as Airbnb, Uber, TaskRabbit, and Etsy. Think about Airbnb alone—it already has more rooms available than Marriott. These platforms match supply and demand for things people never even thought about monetizing before—a room, a ride, a specific skill, even the whole notion of free time. But many of the business models in this on-demand economy are built upon the premise that workers are independent contractors, not employees. This means that employers can end the relationship at any time. Much of the work is project-based. Contracts and clients can dry up, and it is tougher to create new ones without an office to go to. It also means employers do not have to pay costs or contribute to health insurance or retirement. They also particularly don't pay a share of unemployment or workers' compensation.

The whole notion of the social safety net and social contract between the employer and the worker has totally changed. If we think back to my parents' generation 40 years ago—I think about my father. He didn't make a lot of money but knew that he would get benefits, that when he retired, he would get a pension. That changed in my generation, the baby boomers. You didn't work for the same place. You moved around to a few different jobs. We moved into what I would call the 401(k) generation, defined benefits. We moved to defined contribution.

The fact is, today these on-demand workers, even if they are doing relatively well, exist on a high wire with no social safety net beneath them. That may work for many of them when times are going well—until the day they aren't. That is why ultimately, when things go wrong for this new gig economy, workers without any safety net, without any unemployment, without any workmen's comp, could fall and ultimately end up on the taxpayers' dime.

That is why Washington needs to catch up and start asking some tough policy questions—but also with the recognition that with the growth in this part of the economy, Washington can't impose a solution.

First, the biggest challenge may be this fundamental change in the employer-employee relationship. Are there other options for providing a safety net of basic benefits for workers who are not connected to a traditional full-time employer? Who should administer it? Should it be opt-in or opt-out? We could look to the health care ex-

changes as a public-private model now—in many cases—that they largely appear to be working. Could we think about an unemployment or workmen's comp exchange that workers and employers could work with?

We might borrow the idea of the hour bank used by the traditional trade unions for 60 years. A carpenter would move from one contractor to another, committing a little bit of resources, the employer committing resources, but it was administered by a trusted third party.

Other countries—primarily in the EU—are experimenting with worker-administered pools. Freelancers put in a certain amount of income based on the income they would need to replace if they got sick or injured, and they collect it if they are sidelined for more than a month.

Part of a solution might even be consumer-driven. What if customers could designate a portion of their payments to Uber or Airbnb into a designated fund that helps support workers—a social insurance fund? There may be other public-private models out there, and they deserve a look, too.

Second, this is too important to leave to the courts. While litigation is underway about whether on-demand workers are independent contractors or employees, we cannot and must not leave this to the courts alone. We learned just today of a ruling from California labor regulators—a ruling that is expected to be challenged. California labor regulators have determined that Uber drivers are to be considered employees and not independent contractors. This ruling demonstrates yet again why Federal policymakers need to reexamine the whole notion of 20th-century definitions and employment classifications when we are thinking about a 21st-century workforce.

As I mentioned, as many as one-third of American workers are participating in some aspect of this on-demand economy. We have a responsibility to provide clarity and predictability instead of allowing inconsistency as these issues are litigated on a case-by-case, State-by-State basis.

Third, the Federal Government needs to become much more nimble. Frankly, folks on both sides of the aisle would acknowledge that the Federal Government operates at less than dial-up speed. We need better data about how many people are a part of the gig and sharing economies.

At the request of Senators MURRAY and GILLIBRAND, the GAO reported last month that the Department of Labor has not been tasked with a deep-dive on workforce data in more than 10 years. Better data would tell us a lot about who is working in this sharing economy and what characteristics they share. Better data would result in better policy.

As Federal policymakers, we also need to recommit to extending broadband to underserved and unserved regions. You can't be linked in if you don't have a link.

In addition, we should streamline the hodgepodge of Federal programs we have set up to support innovators and entrepreneurs. These programs are scattered across dozens of Federal agencies, and they exist in a budgetary cycle of feast or famine.

We cannot ignore the opportunity costs of this generation's combined \$1.2 trillion in student debt. It is limiting options, opportunities, and economic mobility for an entire generation.

Finally, this millennial generation is beginning to fuel a tremendous shift in one of the most traditional anchors of America's economy, and we need to, quite honestly, recognize and respond to it. Younger Americans are making it clear that in many cases they prefer sharing and renting over ownership.

I was talking to Brad Chesky, the CEO of Airbnb, the other day. As I mentioned, Airbnb already provides more rooms than Marriott, and this is a company that didn't even exist 5 years ago. The CEO offered this comparison: His parents' generation—my generation—defined the idea of success in America as owning a nice house, having two cars, putting your kids through college, and maybe, just maybe, if you did well, getting a little house at the beach or on the lake. But he says the hallmarks of success for this millennial generation are much more different. Younger people want control of their data and online reputations. They don't necessarily aspire to own things such as cars or houses; they want to collect cool experiences, which they can best document and share online.

I ask all my colleagues, the next time you are at a townhall, ask your audience: Would you rather have a home mortgage deduction or a direct credit against your student debt? It doesn't matter what the age group is, 90 percent overall will say: Give me that credit on my student debt rather than on a home mortgage deduction.

Think about this. As policymakers, this generational move away from ownership and toward sharing and renting could have huge impacts for every level of government. That is because we currently use our Tax Code to reward ownership of everything from homes, to vehicles, to factories. Property taxes are how State and local governments pay for public schools, public health, and public safety. If we have an economy increasingly built on sharing and renting and not ownership, that could have tremendous ramifications.

I mentioned that 5 years ago no one had even heard of Airbnb or Uber. And while we don't know what the disruptive technology of tomorrow might look like, we know developments such

as driverless cars, same-day drone deliveries, and 3-D printing are right around the corner. Some version is here to stay. As policymakers, we need to ask the right questions, discuss the appropriate rules of the road, and know when we need to get out of the way. Instead of trying to make this new economy look like the old, Washington should encourage more of this innovation, and we need to work to create more opportunities and more upward economic mobility for everybody.

I, for one, look forward to continuing this discussion today and in the weeks to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1911, AS MODIFIED

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the filing deadline in rule XXII, it be in order for me to offer a modification to the pending Hatch amendment No. 1911 with the text that is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I am aware that the Senator from Oklahoma feels very strongly about this amendment. We discussed it and voted on it in the committee. At that time, I told the Senator from Oklahoma—who is my friend, for many years—that I would do what I could to see that he got a vote before the entire Senate. I am in disagreement with his amendment, but I want to respect his right to offer it. So—and I appreciate less than you know his tenacity—Mr. President, I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To study the impact of commissary privatization prior to initiating a pilot program and to require a report on the Department of Defense definition of and policy regarding software sustainment)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT AND ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PRIVATIZING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMMISSARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report assessing the viability of privatizing, in whole or in part, the Department of Defense commissary system. The report shall be so submitted to Congress before the development of any plans or pilot program to privatize defense commissaries or the defense commissary system.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A methodology for defining the total number and locations of commissaries.

(2) An evaluation of commissary use by location in the following beneficiary categories:

(A) Pay grades E-1 through E-4.

(B) Pay grades E-5 through E-7.

(C) Pay grades E-8 and E-9.

(D) Pay grades O-1 through O-3.

(E) Pay grades O-4 through O-6.

(F) Pay grades O-7 through O-10.

(G) Military retirees.

(3) An evaluation of commissary use in locations outside the continental United States and in remote and isolated locations in the continental United States when compared with other locations.

(4) An evaluation of the cost of commissary operations during fiscal years 2009 through 2014.

(5) An assessment of potential savings and efficiencies to be achieved through implementation of some or all of recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

(6) A description and evaluation of the strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for pricing products sold at commissaries.

(7) A description and evaluation of the transportation strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for products sold at commissaries.

(8) A description and evaluation of the formula of the Defense Commissary Agency for calculating savings for its customers as a result of its pricing strategy.

(9) An evaluation of the average savings per household garnered by commissary use.

(10) A description and evaluation of the use of private contractors and vendors as part of the defense commissary system.

(11) An assessment of costs or savings, and potential impacts to patrons and the Government, of privatizing the defense commissary system, including potential increased use of Government assistance programs.

(12) A description and assessment of potential barriers to privatization of the defense commissary system.

(13) An assessment of the extent to which patron savings would remain after the privatization of the defense commissary system.

(14) An assessment of the impact of any recommended changes to the operation of the defense commissary system on commissary patrons, including morale and retention.

(15) An assessment of the actual interest of major grocery retailers in the management and operations of all, or part, of the existing defense commissary system.

(16) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on off-installation prices of similar products available in the system.

(17) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system, and conversion of the Defense Commissary Agency workforce to non-appropriated fund status, on employment of military family members, particularly with respect to pay, benefits, and job security.

(18) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on Exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation (MWR) quality-of-life programs.

(c) USE OF PREVIOUS STUDIES.—The Secretary shall consult previous studies and surveys on matters appropriate to the report required by subsection (a), including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) The January 2015 Final Report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

(2) The 2014 Military Family Lifestyle Survey Comprehensive Report.

(3) The 2013 Living Patterns Survey.

(4) The report required by section 634 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) on the management, food, and pricing options for the defense commissary system.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF REPORT.—Not later than May 1, 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth an assessment by the Comptroller General of the report required by subsection (a).

SEC. _____. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEFINITION OF AND POLICY REGARDING SOFTWARE SUSTAINMENT.

(a) REPORT ON ASSESSMENT OF DEFINITION AND POLICY.—Not later than March 15, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the President pro tempore of the Senate a report setting forth an assessment, obtained by the Secretary for purposes of the report, on the definition used by the Department of Defense for and the policy of the Department regarding software maintenance, particularly with respect to the totality of the term “software sustainment” in the definition of “depot-level maintenance and repair” under section 2460 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall be conducted by a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), or another appropriate independent entity with expertise in matters described in subsection (a), selected by the Secretary for purposes of the assessment.

(c) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall address, with respect to software and weapon systems of the Department of Defense (including space systems), each of the following:

(A) Fiscal ramifications of current programs with regard to the size, scope, and cost of software to the program’s overall budget, including embedded and support software, percentage of weapon systems’ functionality controlled by software, and reliance on proprietary data, processes, and components.

(B) Legal status of the Department in regards to adhering to section 2464(a)(1) of such title with respect to ensuring a ready and controlled source of maintenance and sustainment on software for its weapon systems.

(C) Operational risks and reduction to materiel readiness of current Department weapon systems related to software costs, delays,

re-work, integration and functional testing, defects, and documentation errors.

(D) Other matters as identified by the Secretary.

(2) ADDITIONAL MATTERS.—For each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall include review and analysis regarding sole-source contracts, range of competition, rights in technical data, public and private capabilities, integration lab initial costs and sustaining operations, and total obligation authority costs of software, disaggregated by armed service, for the Department.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide the independent entity described in subsection (b) with timely access to appropriate information, data, resources, and analysis so that the entity may conduct a thorough and independent assessment as required under such subsection.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, there is one last comment I wish to make. This is something that doesn't happen on the Senate floor. But the Senator from Arizona is indeed a very good friend. We disagree on this amendment. We will have a chance to have a vote on it. But the fact that he did make a commitment that I would have the vote is very meaningful to me, and he did keep his word, and I thank him very much. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to inform the body that I had a very good conversation with Secretary Kerry just a few minutes ago. Many of you may have been following the news. There was a statement attributed to Secretary Kerry that the possible military dimension of the Iranian nuclear program was no longer a priority in terms of reconciling what they have been doing in a military fashion with their nuclear program. Some of the words were to the effect that there will be no mea culpa required.

I just got off the phone with him, and he indicated to me that possible military dimensions of the program in terms of the Iranian past behavior are very much on the table and essential to any agreement.

April 8, 2015, here is what Secretary Kerry said. When asked in April if Iran must disclose past military-related nuclear activities as part of an agreement, Secretary Kerry said: They have

to do it. It will be done. If there is going to be a deal, it will be done.

Secretary Kerry reaffirmed to me that statement. I appreciate his calling me. I want the body to understand that a good deal with Iran would be a blessing. A bad deal would be a nightmare. The IAEA has not had access to the sites they need in terms of evaluating the possible military dimensions of the Iranian program and have not been allowed to go to Parchin, where we suspect that high explosive detonation was being tested as part of their nuclear weapons ambition.

There are three things that the IAEA wants to look at before it can pass judgment over how far the Iranian nuclear program has gone down the military road. I can't imagine any deal that does not fully and completely answer every question about possible military dimensions of the Iranian nuclear program, because if you don't understand what they have done in the past, you don't know where you are in terms of going forward, and you can't have a meaningful inspection regime until you understand what they try to do in terms of our military dimension.

I really do appreciate Secretary Kerry calling me. The one thing we learned about the Iranians and their nuclear program is that they cannot be trusted. They have lied, and they have cheated at every turn. There can be no wiggle room when it comes to the Iranians and a nuclear deal. Anytime, anywhere inspections are absolutely a must. Understanding their possible military dimensions is an absolute ingredient along with others.

I am glad to have received this phone call from Secretary Kerry. But all of us need to be aware of whom we are dealing with when it comes to the Iranians and get every i dotted and every t crossed before you would even entertain a deal with the Iranians.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. Absolutely.

Mr. MCCAIN. Is it my understanding from the Senator's statement that Secretary Kerry is now saying that was not an accurate quote of his—

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. MCCAIN. That it was not urgent that the previous activities concerning the development of nuclear weapons would be absolutely required?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. He indicated that the statement that was attributed to him was taken out of context, and he reaffirmed to me on the phone that possible military dimensions are an essential part of the deal, as he indicated on April 8, 2015. I think he is issuing a statement or his office is right now. I think it is important for the body to understand that Secretary Kerry wants to clear up the record. I applaud him for that.

I hope we can get a deal we all can live with. But at the end of the day,

you have to remember who we are dealing with in terms of the Iranians. They have lied. They have cheated. When it comes to the military dimensions of their program, it is essential we know every detail before we can move forward with confidence.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I ask additionally this: Did the Senator from South Carolina have an opportunity to ask Secretary Kerry about the latest information concerning Iranians who are now supplying weapons to the Taliban—the same Taliban that has killed many hundreds of Americans and wounded thousands of others? In other words, did you have a chance to ask the Secretary why we are pursuing this agreement while the Iranians' latest activity is supplying arms to the Taliban to kill Americans; the support of the Shiite militias in Iraq; the support of the Houthis in other countries, including Yemen; the support of the Iranians for Hezbollah in Lebanon, which in Syria is killing off the Free Syrian Army forces that we are supporting; and the continued development by Iran of a nuclear warhead and the vehicle with which to deliver it? I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina had the chance to ask the Secretary of State about those events and situations that exist in the Middle East today.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I did not. We talked specifically about his statements. But I understand the concern of the Senator from Arizona about the idea of doing an agreement with the Iranians that would give them money to fund what I think has been a very destructive war machine.

From my point of view, we need to look at the Iranian behavior holistically and understand the consequences of flooding this administration with cash—the Iranian administration with cash—given the fact that what they are doing today is using whatever resources they have under sanctions to destabilize the Mideast. I doubt if any additional funds, if sanctions were relieved, would go to build hospitals or roads. I think they would go into the activity you just described. But this conversation was limited to the statement attributed to him yesterday. I think all of us should be very attuned to what is going on with these negotiations, as it is the most important decision any administration will make probably in modern history. The consequences of a bad deal are enormous. You could start a nuclear arms race in the Mideast. At the end of the day, the behavior of the Iranians, apart from their nuclear ambitions, is at best disturbing and should be, in my view, part of any negotiating package.

But we are where we are, and I am glad to hear from the Secretary himself that possible military dimensions have to be fully explored and understood before you move forward with an agreement.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the time until 4 p.m. today be equally divided between the managers or their designees; that at 4 p.m. all post-cloture time be expired; further, that if cloture is invoked on H.R. 1735, that the time count as if it was invoked at 10 p.m. tonight and that the mandatory quorum call with respect to this cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREE STREET YOUTH

Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I come to the Senate floor with some good news from my home State of Maine. World Refugee Day is this Saturday, and I would like to highlight an organization that sprung up spontaneously in one of our Maine cities that is really making a difference in the lives of young people, particularly young refugees from Somalia, Sudan, and other African countries, helping them to expand their own horizons.

As the roots of our refugee and immigrant population continue to grow stronger in Maine and in the process strengthen our communities, a group called Tree Street Youth is helping to nurture that growth one student at a time. I have visited the Tree Street Youth, and it is an amazing program.

Maine's history, like the rest of America, is inexorably linked to immigration. With the exception of our native tribes, we are all from somewhere else originally. It began with European immigrants from England, Scotland, and Ireland. People with French heritage came down from Canada, and Swedes settled in northern Aroostook County in Maine. African Americans

were brought here against their will, but they became part of the stock of this country. For years, immigrants in Maine found work in mills, farms, and fields, and now their descendants are our leaders—business leaders, political leaders, our neighbors, our friends, and our family.

Just as previous waves of immigrants have come to Maine in search of a better life for themselves and their children, newer immigrants—including refugees, asylees, and asylum seekers from Somalia, South Sudan, and several central African countries—are making new homes in Maine and making Maine more diverse, more dynamic, and a better place in the process.

I think it is important to point out that these refugees are people we have, in effect, invited to come to this country because the conditions in their former countries were so unstable or because they feared persecution. These people are not illegal immigrants. They are people, and they are not illegal aliens. They are people here under a legal process. They are looking for a new start, and they are willing to work hard, as we learned in Maine. But anyone who finds themselves in an entirely new and unfamiliar situation—in a situation where they may not be familiar with the language—can always use some help and support, and groups such as the Tree Street Youth in Lewiston are so important and can have such a huge impact because they smooth the transition and help promote cooperation and understanding within the community and particularly the transition of young people.

This remarkable organization was founded in 2011 by two former Bates College students located in the city of Lewiston—Julia Sleeper and Kim Sullivan. They recognized the need for such a group—for such a facility. Tree Street Youth is dedicated to supporting young people in the Lewiston-Auburn area through academics, the arts, and athletics. The organization, which originally grew out of a simple after-school homework help program, now provides local youth with a safe space to promote healthy physical, social, emotional, and academic development.

Through its flourishing arts, college prep, and job-training programs, Tree Street is not only giving young people the tools, support, and confidence they need to succeed, but it is also helping to bring all students from all backgrounds in the city of Lewiston together.

Tree Street Youth has proven to be a tremendous resource in Lewiston and Auburn, particularly for young people from immigrant families. The support services and sense of community that is provided there empowers these young people to be independent and productive members of society. While integrating into the community can be

difficult for recent immigrants, refugees, and their families, the Tree Street experience helps to connect young people to their peers and to the community as a whole. This is a two-way street of understanding that helps bring our communities together.

For example, Tree Street Youth had an annual banquet this past May, and it was, I am told, a fun and emotional event and a showcase that allowed the Tree Street students to share some of their talents with the Lewiston-Auburn community. I am told that after students gave a variety of inspiring poetry readings, dance, and other performances about their experiences, it was hard to find a dry eye in the house. That really speaks to the life-changing power that this organization has brought to our community.

Just as Tree Street Youth improves young lives, these young people can in turn improve Maine and America. We need motivated, talented, and creative people from all backgrounds if we are going to keep pace with the rest of the world. We need students like Muna Muhammad, whom I met here just a few weeks ago when she represented Maine in the Senate Youth Leadership Program. Muna, whose family is from Somalia, is the president of her class at Lewiston High School, serves as a student representative on the Lewiston school committee, is involved in her school's speech, mock trial, and civil rights teams, and has a long list of other accomplishments. They highlight her remarkable leadership qualities, which radiate when you meet her.

This is what America is all about. It is about families from around the world finding a new start, bringing with them new perspectives, new ideas, and new hope for the future. It is the mainspring of the American experience. It is about a melting pot of peoples, cultures, and ideas that create a tapestry that is much stronger than any single thread.

Welcoming new people and cultures hasn't always been easy, and it is not easy. Sometimes our differences are more immediately apparent than our similarities, but over the years, immigrants and refugees have proven to be an irreplaceable part—the essential part—of who America is.

This wonderful organization started spontaneously in one of our great cities of Maine. Tree Street Youth has proven that support and community engagement can help ease that transition and create a brighter future for those students, for Maine, and for our entire country. That is good news for Maine and good news for the United States.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PORTS ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the PORTS Act, legislation I have introduced to protect the American economy from crippling labor disputes at our seaports. Somebody asked why a Senator from Colorado was interested in legislation dealing with the work stoppage or slowdown that occurred on our ports on the west coast. Well, I will tell you why.

I was contacted by numerous businesses and people that had their entire furniture lines taken out of their furniture stores. I talked to ranchers who had to face threats of a \$1 billion ag export market. I talked to onion growers who watched as their domestic commodity prices crashed due to the port slowdown. I watched as stories were written in newspapers about apple growers in Washington unable to export apples so they dumped apples just to rot in the fields in Washington State.

Trade through U.S. seaports is critical. We have been spending weeks on this floor and the floor of the House talking about the Trans-Pacific Partnership and talking about the importance of trade promotion authority, and none of that is possible without an active, successful port system in this country.

According to the American Association of Port Authorities, U.S. ports support 23 million jobs, and the value of related economic activity accounts for 26 percent of our national gross domestic product.

Contract negotiations and related labor disputes at our ports clog up these vital arteries and lead to delays, higher costs, and lost business for industries throughout our country. Strikes, lockouts, and slowdowns may have been business as usual for labor unions in the past, but an increasingly global economy means that the collateral damage done to American workers and businesses has increased exponentially.

The U.S. economy recently endured a 9-month labor dispute that affected all 29 of our west coast ports. The resulting logistical nightmare caused delays, higher costs, and lost businesses for industries in Colorado and throughout the United States. Ships full of cargo were anchored off our coast waiting for longshoremen to do their job on unloading international goods and loading American-made products for shipment to markets across the world. In Los Angeles and Long Beach alone, dozens of container ships sat anchored and idle.

After 9 months and huge financial costs to our national economy, the parties reached an agreement in February to allow cargo to begin moving normally through the west coast ports again. Four months later, we are fi-

nally seeing that congestion beginning to ease, but it has taken this long.

Many economists, including the Federal Reserve Board of Governors cited the labor dispute as a primary cause of the 0.7-percent decline in GDP in the first quarter of 2015. That means 29 west coast ports were primarily responsible for a 0.7-percent decline in GDP.

Agricultural exports, including apples, hay, and Christmas trees lost export opportunities to overseas customers because they couldn't get products to market. Meat and poultry companies lost sales and faced port charges in excess of \$30 million per week. Retail shipments were delayed from reaching store shelves, and some stores resorted to expensive air freight to stock goods. Manufacturers waiting on shipments had to shut down production lines and risked losing contracts with foreign customers.

Colorado supplies Asia with over \$500 million in beef products through the west coast ports, which accounts for about 23 percent of Colorado's total exports and 57 percent of Colorado's international exports. These and other meat and poultry exporters saw many of their products spoil as shipments were turned away at the port gates.

Grain, machine parts, coal, fishing supplies, furniture, fresh produce, and pliable metals are all products of Colorado, and all were damaged by the labor dispute.

Our exporters' relationships with Asian customers disintegrated as their orders were caught in the bottleneck. And storefronts lost customers because products took months to reach show floors.

When Congress enacted Taft-Hartley nearly 70 years ago, Congress decided the health and reputation of the greatest economy in the world should not be used as leverage in labor contract negotiations.

The opening statement of the act explains that Congress intended to minimize "industrial strife which interferes with the normal flow of commerce." That means current law had provided a remedy, but unfortunately the administration did not use it.

Under that very provision of Taft-Hartley, when a labor dispute threatens the national economy, the President is empowered to use the Federal courts to seek an injunction to end labor practices causing widespread disruptions. With 70 years of case law backing it up, this is a tried-and-true process that ensures that the self-interests and greed of a few does not impact the livelihoods of the many.

Yet, when the west coast ports dispute threatened businesses and entire industries in States across the country, the President refused to act. For months, the Federal Executive decided not to exercise his authority under Taft-Hartley, depriving the country of critical dispute resolution powers.

Legislation I have introduced, known as the PORTS Act, prevents this kind of economic disruption. It would discourage disruptions at U.S. ports by strengthening and expanding the well-known Taft-Hartley process.

As we saw recently, the President of the United States may not be willing to adequately protect the economic rights and interests of American citizens. The PORTS Act would solve this by granting State Governors Taft-Hartley powers currently reserved for the President.

A Governor from any State would have the opportunity to form a board of inquiry and start the Taft-Hartley process whenever a port labor dispute is causing economic harm. Once the board reports back, any Governor can petition Federal courts to enjoin slowdowns, strikes or lockouts at ports in their State.

The act would also explicitly include slowdowns as a trigger for Taft-Hartley powers, preventing the President or Governors from using legal ambiguity to excuse an action. As a result, this legislation would give a stronger voice to local leaders by allowing those who are most affected by disruptions—local community leaders, business, employees, and consumers—to apply pressure on their Governors rather than trying to mobilize a national campaign to convince the President to act.

In just 5 years, the labor contracts at both the east coast and the west coast ports will expire, possibly leading to labor disputes on both ends of the country. When the health of the national economy is threatened, the Federal Government has a duty to act, but it is clear the current Taft-Hartley powers depend too heavily on who controls the Presidency.

It is critical that we have the necessary tools in place to prevent another debilitating crisis. So I urge my fellow colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation. Countless retail organizations, individual businesses, and people across this country recognize the need to avoid in 5 years simultaneous slowdowns or shutdowns on the east and west coasts—what we just went through.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, people across the country are eagerly anticipating the Supreme Court's decision in *King v. Burwell* and for good reason. This case will likely determine once

and for all whether the Obama administration violated its own law when it opted to issue health insurance tax subsidies to those who purchased insurance on federally run exchanges.

Many have argued that this decision by the Supreme Court will determine the fate of the so-called Affordable Care Act. While that argument may be a little dramatic, it isn't far off.

I have my own views on how the Court should rule in this case. Indeed, I have made it abundantly clear that in my view, the statute unambiguously limits the availability of premium tax subsidies to insurance plans purchased on State-run exchanges. I have also stated numerous times my belief that the Obama administration overstepped its authority and broke its own law when it offered subsidies to patients on exchanges established by the Federal Government.

However, as we all await the outcome of the case, we need to be clear on one point. Regardless of how the Court rules in *King v. Burwell*, ObamaCare will continue to inflict harm on patients and taxpayers until it is repealed and replaced with sensible, patient-centered reform.

Last week, President Obama reiterated that he had no alternative plan in place in the event that the Supreme Court rules against the administration in this case. On top of that, he flipantly stated that "Congress could fix this whole thing with a one-sentence provision."

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The problems with ObamaCare are so fundamental and convoluted that the idea that the entire law could be fixed in one sentence borders on laughable.

The President and his allies in Congress have gotten pretty good at cherry-picking favorable data points in order to claim that ObamaCare is working, but the overall numbers do not lie. Earlier this month, the administration announced proposed rate hikes of 10 percent or more for health insurance plans that enroll more than 6 million people in 41 States. This is just the latest premium hike patients and consumers have seen under ObamaCare, despite the fact that the authors of the law—including the President himself—promised it would bring costs down.

The failure to reduce costs isn't the only broken promise we have seen with ObamaCare. Millions of Americans have lost their insurance plans and their doctors due to the overly burdensome mandates embedded in the law. Many of these same people were forced to navigate a failed Web site that jeopardized their private information. Others were forced to purchase plans that included coverage they didn't need or want.

As a result of this misguided law, many hard-working taxpayers received

incorrect tax documents relating to their premium subsidies, followed by a surprise tax bill. Just yesterday, the Department of Health and Human Services Office of the Inspector General issued a report noting that the administration did not have systems in place to ensure that ObamaCare credits that went out last year were accurate. This vulnerability may be leading to untold billions in fraud, waste, and abuse.

I could go on. The problems and hardships associated with ObamaCare have been well documented, and none of them can be solved with a one-sentence bill.

Millions of Americans have already suffered under ObamaCare, and if over the next few weeks the Supreme Court confirms that the administration broke the law by offering subsidies on Federal exchanges, millions more will face the negative consequences of this poorly drafted statute. In fact, a study published today by Avalere shows that these consumers could face annual premium contribution increases of \$3,300 in 2015.

Fortunately, Republicans in Congress have a transition plan to protect these patients. Indeed, there is a wide consensus that should the Court rule against the government in *King v. Burwell*, we need to act to protect Americans from further suffering at the hands of ObamaCare's broken promises.

Toward that end, I support a transition plan that provides temporary financial assistance to those who would lose subsidies as a result of the Court's decision, to help them to keep their insurance if they want it.

At the same time, the transition plan should peel back ObamaCare's burdensome mandates, give individuals more flexibility to purchase coverage that meets their needs, and give States the ability to develop policies to better serve their citizens.

This temporary transition should build a bridge that gets us away from ObamaCare and puts us on a path toward lasting, patient-centered reform. Of course, this ultimate goal will have to wait until a new administration is in place—one that is actually willing to work with Congress to address the actual needs of patients and taxpayers.

Despite the claims of uninformed critics, Republicans in Congress have been working for months to ensure that a transition plan will be ready when the Court delivers its ruling. And, make no mistake, we will do our best to be ready.

At the same time, Republicans in both Chambers have worked together to put forward substantive and workable alternatives that would permanently replace the President's health care law with reforms that increase patient choice and reduce the role of the Federal Government in health care.

I am a coauthor of one such plan called the Patient CARE Act. I, along with Chairman ALEXANDER and Congressman UPTON in the House, released the latest version of this plan earlier this year. The plan has gotten high marks from a number of analysts and publications.

So while it is a common refrain by supporters of ObamaCare that chaos will ensue if the Court rules against the government in *King v. Burwell*, the facts tell a much different story. Republicans in Congress will be ready to respond quickly and decisively to any possible outcome.

Now, let's be clear. None of us knows how the Court is going to rule in this case. I have heard analyses and predictions that vary across the board. But no matter how this particular case turns out, we know for certain that ObamaCare has been a dismal failure for American patients and hard-working taxpayers. This entire case is yet another reminder of how, more than 5 years after it was signed, this bill continues to cause problems. No matter how the Court rules in *King v. Burwell*, we need to chart a different course on health care for the American people.

Let's face it. One reason we would set up a timeframe in case the Supreme Court rules against Secretary Burwell and the administration is that we need to set up a timeline where we can work on these matters and hopefully bring a national consensus to bear. Only so will we be able to resolve the problems that will be found—that are there—if we don't do what is right. So it is going to take some time. That is why we suggest that there should be time leading well into the next administration to be able to work on this to accomplish these matters and, during that time, make sure nobody is hurt because of the decision of *King v. Burwell* should it go against the government.

This is one of the great problems of our time, and there is no simple answer, but we know we can't continue under the current law of ObamaCare as it is written. If we do, we are just going to continue to go down a sinkhole of expenditures, debts, doctors leaving their profession, and an inability to provide the health care that so glowingly was spoken of by this administration.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. HATCH. I am glad to withhold.

Mr. INHOFE. First of all, let me say the senior Senator from Utah is doing a yeoman's job of exposing some of the fraudulent things we have been involved in for ObamaCare over this period of time, and I applaud him for that.

AMENDMENT NO. 1911, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Earlier today, I made a motion that was incomplete, and I wish to correct it, having to do with a drafting error.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Hatch amendment No. 1911 be further modified to address a drafting error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as further modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT AND ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PRIVATIZING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMMISSARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report assessing the viability of privatizing, in whole or in part, the Department of Defense commissary system. The report shall be so submitted to Congress before the development of any plans or pilot program to privatize defense commissaries or the defense commissary system.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A methodology for defining the total number and locations of commissaries.

(2) An evaluation of commissary use by location in the following beneficiary categories:

- (A) Pay grades E-1 through E-4.
- (B) Pay grades E-5 through E-7.
- (C) Pay grades E-8 and E-9.
- (D) Pay grades O-1 through O-3.
- (E) Pay grades O-4 through O-6.
- (F) Pay grades O-7 through O-10.
- (G) Military retirees.

(3) An evaluation of commissary use in locations outside the continental United States and in remote and isolated locations in the continental United States when compared with other locations.

(4) An evaluation of the cost of commissary operations during fiscal years 2009 through 2014.

(5) An assessment of potential savings and efficiencies to be achieved through implementation of some or all of recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

(6) A description and evaluation of the strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for pricing products sold at commissaries.

(7) A description and evaluation of the transportation strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for products sold at commissaries.

(8) A description and evaluation of the formula of the Defense Commissary Agency for calculating savings for its customers as a result of its pricing strategy.

(9) An evaluation of the average savings per household garnered by commissary use.

(10) A description and evaluation of the use of private contractors and vendors as part of the defense commissary system.

(11) An assessment of costs or savings, and potential impacts to patrons and the Government, of privatizing the defense commissary system, including potential increased use of Government assistance programs.

(12) A description and assessment of potential barriers to privatization of the defense commissary system.

(13) An assessment of the extent to which patron savings would remain after the privatization of the defense commissary system.

(14) An assessment of the impact of any recommended changes to the operation of

the defense commissary system on commissary patrons, including morale and retention.

(15) An assessment of the actual interest of major grocery retailers in the management and operations of all, or part, of the existing defense commissary system.

(16) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on off-installation prices of similar products available in the system.

(17) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system, and conversion of the Defense Commissary Agency workforce to non-appropriated fund status, on employment of military family members, particularly with respect to pay, benefits, and job security.

(18) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on Exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation (MWR) quality-of-life programs.

(c) USE OF PREVIOUS STUDIES.—The Secretary shall consult previous studies and surveys on matters appropriate to the report required by subsection (a), including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) The January 2015 Final Report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

(2) The 2014 Military Family Lifestyle Survey Comprehensive Report.

(3) The 2013 Living Patterns Survey.

(4) The report required by section 634 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) on the management, food, and pricing options for the defense commissary system.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF REPORT.—Not later than May 1, 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth an assessment by the Comptroller General of the report required by subsection (a). Section 652 of the Act shall be null and void.

SEC. _____. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEFINITION OF AND POLICY REGARDING SOFTWARE SUSTAINMENT.

(a) REPORT ON ASSESSMENT OF DEFINITION AND POLICY.—Not later than March 15, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the President pro tempore of the Senate a report setting forth an assessment, obtained by the Secretary for purposes of the report, on the definition used by the Department of Defense for and the policy of the Department regarding software maintenance, particularly with respect to the totality of the term “software sustainment” in the definition of “depot-level maintenance and repair” under section 2460 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall be conducted by a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), or another appropriate independent entity with expertise in matters described in subsection (a), selected by the Secretary for purposes of the assessment.

(c) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall address, with respect to software and weapon systems of the Department of Defense (including space systems), each of the following:

(A) Fiscal ramifications of current programs with regard to the size, scope, and cost of software to the program’s overall budget, including embedded and support software, percentage of weapon systems’

functionality controlled by software, and reliance on proprietary data, processes, and components.

(B) Legal status of the Department in regards to adhering to section 2464(a)(1) of such title with respect to ensuring a ready and controlled source of maintenance and sustainment on software for its weapon systems.

(C) Operational risks and reduction to materiel readiness of current Department weapon systems related to software costs, delays, re-work, integration and functional testing, defects, and documentation errors.

(D) Other matters as identified by the Secretary.

(2) ADDITIONAL MATTERS.—For each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall include review and analysis regarding sole-source contracts, range of competition, rights in technical data, public and private capabilities, integration lab initial costs and sustaining operations, and total obligation authority costs of software, disaggregated by armed service, for the Department.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide the independent entity described in subsection (b) with timely access to appropriate information, data, resources, and analysis so that the entity may conduct a thorough and independent assessment as required under such subsection.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, shortly we will have a vote. I would like to say a few words about the legislation before we do. How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. About 13 minutes remains.

Mr. MCCAIN. I say to my colleagues, this Defense Authorization Act is a reform bill. I repeat: It is a reform bill—a reform bill that will enable our military to rise to the challenges of a more dangerous world both today and in the future. It tackles acquisition reform, military retirement reform, personnel reform, headquarters and management reform.

We identified \$10 billion of excess and unnecessary spending from the President’s budget request. We are reinvesting it in military capabilities for our warfighters and reforms that can yield long-term savings for the Department of Defense. We did all of this while upholding our commitments to our servicemembers, retirees, and their families.

On acquisition reform, we put the services back into the acquisition process, created new mechanisms to ensure accountability for results, streamlined regulation, and opened up the defense

acquisition process to our Nation's innovators.

On military reform, we modernized and improved our military retirement system. Today, 83 percent of servicemembers leave the service with no retirement assets or benefits. Under this new plan, 75 percent of servicemembers would get benefits. This reform, over time, is estimated to save \$15 billion per year in the outyears.

On management reform, we ensure that the Department of Defense and the military services are using precious defense dollars to fulfill their missions and defend the Nation, not expand their bloated staffs. Targeted reductions in headquarters and administrative staff in this legislation—which is a 7.5-percent mandated reduction per year, up to a 30-percent reduction in the size of headquarters and administrative staff—will generate \$1.7 billion in savings just for fiscal year 2016.

With these savings and billions more identified throughout the bill, we accelerated shipbuilding, added an upgraded fighter aircraft, invested in key modernization priorities across the services, and met our commanders' most urgent needs. As adversaries threaten our military technological advantage, the bill looks to the future and invests in new breakthrough technologies, including directed energy and unmanned combat aircraft.

The legislation is a reflection of the growing threats we face in the world. The legislation authorizes nearly \$3.8 billion in support for Afghan security forces as they continue to defend their country in the gains of the last decade against our common enemies. The legislation authorizes the provision of defensive lethal assistance to Ukraine to help it build combat capability and defend its sovereign territory. It supports the efforts by Lebanon and Jordan to secure their borders against ISIL. It creates a new initiative to help Southeast Asian nations build maritime domain awareness capabilities to address growing sovereignty challenges in the South China Sea.

This is an ambitious piece of legislation, but in the times we live in, that is exactly what we need.

Henry Kissinger told our committee earlier this year that our Nation faces the most diverse and complex array of crises since the end of World War II. Rising to these challenges requires bold reform to our national defense. This legislation represents a strong first step in that direction.

As I said, this is a reform bill. This is an authorizing bill. This brings about much needed reforms. I cannot go to the people of Arizona and justify defense spending when there is a \$2.4 billion cost overrun on an aircraft carrier, when there are a number of weapons systems which billions of dollars have been invested in and which have never become reality. That system has to be reformed. That is what this bill does.

We have to reform our military retirement system. We allow people, after just 2 years of service, to contribute to their own retirement. Today, they have to wait 20 years in order to do that.

We upgrade fighter aircraft.

We tell the defense industry that they cannot have those cost overruns. If there are cost overruns, the service chiefs have to personally sign that they know of, are aware of, and are taking action to prevent further cost overruns.

So there is a lot in this legislation. It is an authorizing legislation. That is why it disturbs me a great deal to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying they want to vote against it because of OCO. That is not sufficient reason in these times. If they want to fight against OCO, the place to do it—the overseas contingency operation money which brings up authorizing spending to the same level that the President has requested—if they want to do that, then let's have that fight in another arena. But let's not take away from the men and women who are serving in this military the equipment and the training and the leadership that is demanded in the world as it is today—in the words of Henry Kissinger, more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of World War II.

So I urge all of my colleagues to restate their commitment to the defense of this Nation by voting in favor of this legislation and cloture prior to that. I urge my colleagues—all of them—to understand that we can fight about this funding situation, the need to repeal sequestration—sequestration is destroying our military's capability to defend this Nation. Every uniformed service leader who appeared before the Armed Services Committee said that with sequestration, we are putting the lives of the men and women in uniform at greater risk. We should not do that. We ask young men and women to volunteer for the military, and yet we here in Congress won't take action to keep them from being placed in greater danger. That is an abrogation of our responsibility. This bill does not fix all that, but it certainly is a major step in the right direction.

Almost all of this legislation was done on a bipartisan basis. There were literally—there were some small disagreements, but overall the committee together.

Now, at the behest of their leadership and perhaps the President of the United States, they are so torqued up about OCO that they may vote against this legislation's passage, and that, my friends, is an abrogation of their responsibility to the men and women who are serving this country. If they choose to vote against this legislation on the grounds that they are opposed to the funding mechanism used to do

so, then they have their priorities upside down, and I intend to tell the American people about it because I believe that we are not serving the men and women who are serving this country to the best of their ability and not receiving the support they need and deserve from the Senate of the United States of America.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1911, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am speaking on an amendment that the Senate will be voting on shortly, the Inhofe-Mikulski amendment. Really, the amendment was led by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE. This is really about commissaries.

We are here ready to vote on the Department of Defense authorization. We want to stand up for our troops. One of the most important things we can do is to stand up for their families.

Senator INHOFE and I are deeply concerned that DOD has the misguided viewpoint that shrinking or eliminating or privatizing the commissaries will save money for the U.S. Department of Defense. We do not even know what the impact of that will be. Senator INHOFE, with my encouragement and support, wants to have an amendment that would actually look at the impact of privatization and a private program to do so. So I want my side of the aisle to know we stand shoulder to shoulder on this. The Senator from Oklahoma has done an outstanding job as always in standing up for the troops and their very important benefits.

I note that he is on the floor. I ask that when the rollcall is called, we support the Inhofe-Mikulski amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for a couple of minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, I wish to say to the Senator from Maryland how much I appreciate the fact that we are reaching across the aisle and doing something that is right for the kids who are out there risking their lives for us.

I make it a habit to go to the areas of combat with regularity, as do other members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and I always get a chance to really talk with and get to know them. You learn a lot more by talking to the kids in the mess hall there than you do by going to the committee hearings here in the United States.

One of the things they have a real love for, as I am sure the Senator from Maryland suggested to you, is the commissary. In some areas that are remote, there is no competition. There aren't any Wal-marts around; there is just a commissary. And there is almost a fraternal belief and feeling, as people go around—particularly, the spouses will meet there. They will do their shopping there. It is something that is very serious to them.

There is language in this bill that says that they will take an experiment in some five different areas that have large commissaries, go ahead and privatize those, and then after that takes place, do an assessment as to whether they should be privatized.

This amendment is very simple. It merely says: Let's do the assessment first. Why go ahead and close these commissaries if we find that is something that we should not, in fact, do?

We have so many interests. First of all, we have—as I am sure the Senator from Maryland mentioned—we have some 25 cosponsors already. This is without real effort. We also have some 41 organizations supporting this bill.

I see that the time is up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield to the Chair.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1911, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Hatch amendment No. 1911, as further modified.

The amendment (No. 1911), as further modified, was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1456

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to McCain amendment No. 1456.

The amendment (No. 1456) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to make a point of order against all the pending nongermane amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1564, AS MODIFIED; 1825; 1559, AS MODIFIED; 1543, AS MODIFIED; 1645; AND 1486

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I make a point of order that the following amendments are not germane: amendments Nos. 1564, 1825, 1559, 1543, 1645, and 1486.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained, and the amendments fall.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1463, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 1463, as amended.

The amendment (No. 1463), as amended, was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John McCain, Richard C. Shelby, Jeff Flake, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Jeff Sessions, Shelley Moore Capito, Lamar Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Joni Ernst, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Kelly Ayotte, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Alexander	Collins	Hatch
Ayotte	Coons	Heinrich
Barrasso	Corker	Heitkamp
Bennet	Cornyn	Heller
Blumenthal	Cotton	Hirono
Blunt	Crapo	Hoeven
Booker	Daines	Inhofe
Boozman	Donnelly	Isakson
Boxer	Durbin	Johnson
Burr	Enzi	Kaine
Cantwell	Ernst	King
Capito	Feinstein	Kirk
Cardin	Fischer	Klobuchar
Carper	Flake	Lankford
Cassidy	Gardner	McCain
Coats	Graham	McCaskill
Cochran	Grassley	McConnell

Menendez	Reed	Stabenow
Mikulski	Risch	Sullivan
Moran	Roberts	Tester
Murkowski	Rounds	Thune
Murphy	Sasse	Tillis
Murray	Schatz	Toomey
Nelson	Schumer	Udall
Paul	Scott	Vitter
Perdue	Sessions	Warner
Peters	Shaheen	Whitehouse
Portman	Shelby	Wicker

NAYS—14

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reid
Brown	Leahy	Sanders
Casey	Manchin	Warren
Cruz	Markey	Wyden
Franken	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—2

Lee Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 84, the nays are 14.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Kansas.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE YOUTH TOUR

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise this evening in support of more than 1,700 high school students who happen to be in our Nation's capital, in fact, this week. They are part of the Electric Cooperative Youth Tour. During this year's tour, students will participate in leadership training and gain firsthand insight into the legislative process.

Those electric cooperatives that sponsor these kids coming to Washington, DC, from my State, yours, and every other State across the country, are more than just poles and wires. They are about people and communities. Recognizing that youth are the future of those communities is what the rural electric cooperative program is all about—sending 51 students to Washington, DC, for 51 straight years, so future leaders can have a front-row seat to American Government.

What would rural communities look like without power? That is pretty difficult to imagine. Think about the power of electric cooperatives. Sure, our local electric co-ops keep the lights on, but, as I say, they do much more than that. Co-ops are not-for-profits and owned by their members. They recognize the need to invest in future generations. Co-ops give back to the communities they serve, and the Youth Tour is proof of that.

Each year, I enjoy taking time to visit with Kansans who are part of the Youth Tour because they are among the most energetic, engaging, and respectful young men and women I see

throughout the year in Washington, DC. It is always valuable for us to have folks from our home States come and visit us, but it is especially pleasing to have these young men and women visit us. In my view, it is a program that has figured out how to find the best and brightest and those with the greatest interest and find a way for them to come to Washington, DC, and see our Nation's Capitol and hopefully inspire them to continue their interest in government and politics throughout their lives.

Youth Tour alumni have gone on to become university presidents, Fortune 500 CEOs, Members of Congress, and built lifelong friendships. In fact, just last week I had Jacob Helm in my office. He is from Norcatur, KS, a small town along the Colorado-Nebraska part of our State. Jacob is an individual I nominated to attend the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, and he just graduated. He is now engaged to a fellow Youth Tour alumna, Michelle Peschel of Axtell, KS, which is on the other side of the State—Nebraska more than the Missouri part of our State. Both Jacob and Michelle grew up in communities of fewer than 500 people, and I am proud to see them giving back to their State and their country. They became engaged as a result of meeting each other on a Youth Tour back when they were in high school and will soon be married.

My own interest in public service stemmed from a summer internship from my Congressman when I was in college, and I am hopeful that visits like these that the rural electric co-operatives provide for these young men and women—these visits to Washington, DC—will inspire these young people to get involved and work to improve their hometowns, our State, and our Nation.

Each of these 1,700 Youth Tour students should be commended for being in Washington, DC, this week, just as our co-ops should be commended for realizing the need to invest in our future leaders.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT GENERAL NOEL T. "TOM" JONES

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, in a few short weeks an inspirational military leader will retire after serving his country proudly for over 35 years. Today I recognize and commend Air Force Lt. Gen. Noel T. "Tom" Jones for his exceptional leadership and service over those 35 years, most recently as the vice commander of U.S. Air Forces in Europe, Ramstein Air Base, Germany.

Born to Margaret and Lem Jones, General Jones was no stranger to military service. His father was an F-4 fighter pilot in the U.S. Air Force and retired after 23 years as a lieutenant

colonel. His older brother, Lem Jones, Jr., served in the U.S. Army and retired as a major. The second oldest son, Ron Jones, served as an enlisted member in the U.S. Air Force for 6 years. Finally, General Jones' younger brother, James "Rev" Jones, recently retired as a major general after a distinguished career as an Air Force fighter pilot as well. In fact, at one point in time, all four Jones boys were serving in the military at the same time. All told, General Jones moved around to nine different States or countries before even entering college.

With a calling to serve and fly like his father, General Jones was commissioned in 1980 following graduation from the U.S. Air Force Academy with a bachelor of science degree in political science. He completed undergraduate pilot training in 1981 and began a long career flying the F-16 Fighting Falcon under the call sign "Honez." During his career, he served as an instructor pilot and operations officer as well as holding numerous operational command positions.

An outstanding leader throughout his distinguished career, General Jones' service has spanned the country with assignments in 12 States and across the world with tours at Torrejon Air Base, Spain, Kunsan Air Base, South Korea, Baghdad, Iraq, and Ramstein Air Base, Germany. He has commanded a fighter squadron, operations group, and a fighter wing. Additionally, General Jones commanded the 332nd Expeditionary Wing at Ahmed Al Jaber Air Base, Kuwait, during Operation Iraqi Freedom and served for a year in Iraq as the director of strategic plans and assessment for U.S. Forces-Iraq.

General Jones has also held staff assignments at North American Aerospace Defense Command, Air Combat Command, and the National Security Agency. Prior to his current assignment, he was the director, operational capability requirements, deputy chief of staff for operations, plans and requirements, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, DC. In his current capacity, General Jones serves as the vice commander, U.S. Air Forces in Europe, the air component to U.S. European Command and U.S. Africa Command. The major command is responsible for providing full-spectrum warfighting capabilities to the combatant commanders throughout the entire area of responsibility, which encompasses 104 countries in Europe, Africa, Asia and the Middle East, the Arctic and Atlantic Oceans, and possesses more than a quarter of the world's population and more than a quarter of the world's gross domestic product.

General Jones is a command pilot with more than 3,500 flying hours, including combat sorties over Iraq in operations Southern Watch, Desert Fox and Iraqi Freedom. His military decorations include the Air Force Distinguished

Service Medal, Defense Superior Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, and Bronze Star Medal, among many others.

Mr. President, Lt. Gen. Tom "Honez" Jones epitomizes the Air Force core values of integrity, service, and excellence, and has dedicated his life to serving our Nation. I am proud to say he plans to retire with the rest of the extended Jones Family in Coshatta, LA. Today I join my colleagues in honoring his admirable service to our Nation and all the airmen, sailors, soldiers, marines, and civilians, who have served alongside him. We offer our heartfelt appreciation to Tom, his wife Debbie, and their children, Tommy and Danielle, and a hearty congratulation on his retirement from the U.S. Air Force.

RECOGNIZING KATHY MERCHANT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Kathy Merchant, a friend and an accomplished community leader in Greater Cincinnati over the past nearly two decades, on the occasion of her receiving the 2015 Northern Kentucky University Lincoln Award.

Kathy Merchant's professional accomplishments are noteworthy, having served as the president/CEO of the Greater Cincinnati Foundation, GCF, from 1997 until her retirement in May 2015. Prior to joining GCF, Ms. Merchant was director of the Pew Charitable Trusts' Neighborhood Preservation Initiative and a partner in the consulting firm Holt, Wexler & Merchant.

Recognized as a national leader in her field, Ms. Merchant serves on the board of the Boston-based Center for Effective Philanthropy and in 2012 joined the national board of the New York-based Local Initiatives Support Corporation.

Ms. Merchant has served on a number of nonprofit boards, including the National Center for Arts and Technology, Cincinnati USA Chamber, Council on Foundations, Community Foundations of America/GivingNet, Ohio Grantmakers Forum, and the SC Ministry Foundation.

An advocate for the underserved, Ms. Merchant chaired the Strive Partnership's cradle-to-career initiative in Cincinnati—2009 to 2013—where she continues to serve as a member of the executive committee and as an advisor to the national Strive Network.

Ms. Merchant has earned many professional awards, including the YWCA Career Woman of Achievement, 2005; Ohio Philanthropy, 2006; Girl Scouts Woman of Distinction, 2009; Council on Foundations' Distinguished Grantmaker, 2011; Kentucky Commonwealth, 2012; WE Celebrate Woman of the Year—Nonprofit, 2012; and the Cincinnati Public Relations Society of

America's Blacksmiths CEO Communicator of the Year, 2013. She was also named a "Top 50 Power and Influence" leader by *The NonProfit Times*, 2008.

I would like to congratulate Kathy Merchant on the many contributions she has made to the Greater Cincinnati community and beyond.

RECOGNIZING BOSMA ENTERPRISES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize Bosma Enterprises on the 100th anniversary of its founding. I commend Bosma for remaining steadfast in its mission to decrease the unemployment rate among those who are blind or visually impaired.

Since its founding, Bosma Enterprises has provided employment opportunities and rehabilitation to visually impaired Hoosiers throughout our State. Originally a public institution created by the Indiana State Legislature in 1915, the Board of Industrial Aid for the Blind was renamed after Charles E. Bosma, an advocate for the blind and visually impaired citizens of Indiana. Indiana State Representative and Speaker of the Indiana House Brian C. Bosma has served as a founding director since 1988 when the organization was granted not-for-profit status. Since then, Bosma has grown tremendously. A little more than 15 years ago, Bosma secured a major contract allowing it to package and distribute gloves to hospitals under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Bosma then expanded their contract with the Department of Veteran Affairs and began to package and distribute surgical gloves, creating even more jobs.

Bosma Enterprises has grown into a business with more than 200 employees, 85 of whom are blind or visually impaired, making this the largest employer of individuals with visual disabilities in the State of Indiana. Bosma relocated to the northwest side of Indianapolis 10 years ago, where it doubled in size with increased production, training rooms, and rehabilitation services. Recently, Bosma added a second location for production, warehousing, and office space. As the only service of its kind and magnitude in the State, Bosma Enterprises continues to make a difference in the daily lives of visually disabled Hoosiers.

Today, I commend the efforts of Bosma Enterprises as it prepares for its future, and the futures of the visually impaired Hoosiers it seeks to help. Innovation and diversification have allowed Bosma to grow, provide services to more and more people, and create jobs throughout Indiana. It stands as a shining example of the hard work and service of Hoosiers. I wish Bosma Enterprises continued success towards its noble vision: a future in which the

blind and visually impaired will have equal opportunities in every aspect of their lives.

On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I would like to congratulate Bosma Enterprises on 100 years of success. This organization embodies the Hoosier spirit and improves the lives of visually impaired Hoosiers across the State. Bosma has a proven track record of being an advocate and reliable employer for our visually impaired Hoosiers. We are proud that Bosma calls Indiana home.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GENE PETERSON

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Gene Peterson, a native of Culbertson, MT, and an award-winning broadcast anchor. Over this past weekend, Mr. Peterson was inducted into the Montana Broadcasters Hall of Fame for contributing more than 50 years of service to the broadcasting industry in our State.

A graduate of the Brown Institute in Minneapolis, MN, Mr. Peterson moved with his wife and two daughters to Missoula in 1962, where he began working at a modest radio station that he then transformed into a thriving radio group of five stations.

Mr. Peterson has also undertaken a great deal of public service, for which he has been honored in many ways. He has served the city of Missoula as president of the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, president of the Montana Broadcasters Association, Grizzly Scholarship Association, St. Patrick Hospital Advisory Board, YMCA, and the University of Montana President's Advisory Board. Among his awards for his careers in both broadcasting and public service are Businessman of the Year, the Hugh O'Brien Lifetime Achievement, and Sportsman of the Year.

Mr. Peterson has made a difference in his years of community service and contributions to our State's economy. I join Montanans today in honoring him for his years of service to our State.●

RECOGNIZING THE MINNESOTA ORCHESTRA ON ITS VISIT TO CUBA

• Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the Minnesota Orchestra and its music director, Osmo Vänskä, for the ensemble's recent visit to Cuba—the first major American orchestra to do so since President Obama announced efforts to normalize our Nation's relationship with Cuba. The Minnesota Orchestra last visited Cuba in 1930, when it was known as the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra.

For more than a century, the Minnesota Orchestra has demonstrated a deep commitment to innovation and

diversity, and this visit is just the latest example. During its whirlwind visit, the orchestra won the hearts and minds of music lovers across the island nation. The performances were met with applause and acclaim, and they illustrated the importance of strengthening the cultural bonds between our countries and our people. In Cuba, there is a real eagerness for the person-to-person contact that has been blocked for decades. This trip signified real steps towards forming those crucial relationships—proving that music is a language that reaches beyond cultural, political, and geographical barriers to unite us all. I commend the Minnesota Orchestra for its willingness and initiative to take part in this historic cultural moment.

Since its inception in 1903, the Minnesota Orchestra has promoted new ideas, new connections, and new music. Under Mr. Vänskä's leadership, this orchestra has risen in the ranks to become one of the top symphonic ensembles in America, and I am proud that it calls Minnesota home. The orchestra has become a visionary leader in the world of symphonic and classical music, stretching beyond what other ensembles imagine is possible, in order to achieve excellence in its field.

I hope my colleagues will join me as I commend the Minnesota Orchestra, its Musical Director Osmo Vänskä and all of the talented musicians and dedicated staff on this historic tour of Cuba, and for more than a century of performing and producing beautiful music enjoyed not just in Minnesota but around the world.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2596. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2596. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Commerce,

Science, and Transportation, and referred as indicated:

S. 1519. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 to address slowdowns, strikes, and lock-outs occurring at ports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 697. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1590. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide protections against pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1591. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 1592. A bill to clarify the description of certain Federal land under the Northern Arizona Land Exchange and Verde River Basin Partnership Act of 2005 to include additional land in the Kaibab National Forest; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 1593. A bill to eliminate the offsetting accounts that are currently available for use by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1594. A bill to improve the Federal flight deck officers program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1595. A bill to describe the authority under which Federal entities may use mobile aerial-view devices to surveil, protect individual and collective privacy against warrantless governmental intrusion through the use of mobile aerial-view devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1596. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2082 Stringtown Road in Grove City, Ohio, as the "Specialist Joseph W. Riley Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1597. A bill to enhance patient engagement in the medical product development process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. SASSE):

S. 1598. A bill to prevent discriminatory treatment of any person on the basis of views held with respect to marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1599. A bill to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1600. A bill to extend Privacy Act remedies to citizens of certified states, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1601. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and tribal governments and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1602. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow certain hospitals in Puerto Rico to qualify for incentives for adoption and meaningful use of certified EHR Technology under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. JOHN-SON, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1603. A bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. Res. 203. A resolution designating June 20, 2015, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 134

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 134, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes.

S. 142

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 142, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 356, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to safeguard data stored abroad from improper government access, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 598

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, and for other purposes.

S. 613

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 676

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 676, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent tax-related identity theft and tax fraud, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 959

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 959, a bill to establish a tax credit for on-site apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes.

S. 979

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 979, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1434

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1434, a bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish an energy storage portfolio standard, and for other purposes.

S. 1519

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1519, a bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 to address slowdowns, strikes, and lock-outs occurring at ports in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1580

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1580, a bill to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates.

S. 1588

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

BROWN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1588, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 1911

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1911 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1961

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1961 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1962

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1962 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2011

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2011 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2016

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2016 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy,

to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2023

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2023 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 1592. A bill to clarify the description of certain Federal land under the Northern Arizona Land Exchange and Verde River Basin Partnership Act of 2005 to include additional land in the Kaibab National Forest; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor legislation introduced by my colleague, Senator JEFF FLAKE, that would fix a mapping error involving the transfer of Forest Service land to Young Life's Lost Canyon Camp in northern Arizona.

The bill, S. 1592, would amend the Northern Arizona Land Exchange and Verde River Basin Partnership Act of 2005, P.L. 109-110, to clarify that Congress intended that Young Life could purchase at fair market value a full 237.5 acres of national forest land in the Kaibab National Forest as Congress intended. The Forest Service says there is an error in the Forest Service map referenced in the 2005 Act that has omitted about 25 acres from the land conveyance. This error appears to be preventing the Forest Service and Young Life from finalizing the transfer. Each year, nearly 5,000 young campers spend their summer at the Lost Canyon Camp, and this land conveyance is needed to expand the camp and create a buffer zone around the camp. I urge my colleagues to pass this clarifying legislation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1595. A bill to describe the authority under which Federal entities may use mobile aerial-view devices to surveil, protect individual and collective privacy against warrantless governmental intrusion through the use of mobile aerial-view devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to further protect American's privacy, while providing clear guidance for Federal

law enforcement for information collection using the newest technologies. I am sure my colleagues recall recent reports, from just a few weeks ago, detailing the FBI's use of secret planes to spy on people in dozens of cities without a warrant. These reports troubled both my colleagues and me, and left unclear exactly when the government thinks it is okay to surveil people from the air. As I have stressed many times before, the American public deserves to know the laws that the government relies on to surveil people, and the limits of those laws. And that's what this bill sets out to do.

Now, drafting legislation in an area where technology is advancing rapidly and so many policy issues intersect, is a very difficult task. But I am confident that the Protecting Individuals From Mass Aerial Surveillance Act of 2015 reflects feedback from several stakeholders, experts and civil liberties groups, and provides the government the tools it needs to keep us safe without sacrificing our civil liberties.

This bill would generally prohibit federal aerial surveillance without a warrant, but with several exceptions. It would allow the government to aerially surveil to protect people from disasters, terrorist attacks, entry of illegal substances at national borders, and other emergency situations. In addition, it would allow for government agencies to survey wildlife and conduct research by use of aerial vehicles, in order to ensure that habitats are preserved and environmental risks are assessed properly.

This bill also would prohibit the government from identifying people that happen to appear in aerial surveillance, unless it has probable cause to believe those people have committed specific crimes. All information gathered in violation of the bill would be barred admission as evidence in any court of law, and the bill would also prohibit private operators of aerial vehicles from being proxies for unlawful government surveillance.

I want to stress that we cannot stand to wait much longer to pass sensible limits on a type of surveillance whose technical capabilities are advancing rapidly. With the proliferation of drones in US airspace, and the numbers expected to increase by the thousands in the following few years, there is a real concern that the law has not been keeping up with technical advancements. And drones are not the only concern—use of planes and helicopters equipped with modern surveillance equipment make the technological landscape an incredibly dynamic one. That's why this bill today would remain technology neutral and apply to both manned and unmanned aerial vehicles.

To my fellow colleagues, I strongly believe that this bill strikes the proper balance between allowing for aerial

surveillance and protecting individual privacy. I am glad to have received help and feedback from the Center for Democracy and Technology, SOAR Oregon—a leading voice in Oregon's UAV industry, the Small UAV Coalition, the Electronic Frontier Foundation, the ACLU, and other experts. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill and offering their feedback. At this time, I would like to ask that this statement be entered into the RECORD.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1599. A bill to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am joining again with Senator GRASSLEY in introducing the Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act, legislation that will provide protections to employees who come forward and disclose to law enforcement agencies price fixing and other criminal antitrust behavior that harms consumers. This bill includes changes that we made in the Judiciary Committee last Congress, which enabled it to pass the Senate unanimously. Senator GRASSLEY and I have long worked together on protecting whistleblowers, and this legislation continues those efforts.

Whistleblowers are often instrumental in alerting the public, Congress, and law enforcement agencies to wrongdoing in a variety of areas. These individuals take risks in stepping forward and deserve to be protected from retaliation. Congress should encourage employees with information about criminal antitrust activity to report this information. The Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act does exactly that by offering meaningful protection to those who blow the whistle on illegal behavior such as price fixing.

This legislation is modeled on whistleblower protections that Senator GRASSLEY and I authored as part of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. The protections are narrowly tailored and do not provide whistleblowers with an economic incentive to bring forth false claims. Last Congress, we made modest changes to the bill in the Judiciary Committee to improve the definition of a covered individual and clarify that protections only apply to employees reporting criminal violations. The protections in this bill build on recommendations from key stakeholders in a 2011 Government Accountability Office report to Congress.

The antitrust laws offer critical protections for consumers that promote free enterprise. By extending whistleblower protections to this area of the law, this bipartisan bill will help to ensure that criminal antitrust violations do not go unreported. This bill passed the Senate unanimously last Congress. I urge the Senate to pass it again.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 203—DESIGNATING JUNE 20, 2015, AS “AMERICAN EAGLE DAY” AND CELEBRATING THE RECOVERY AND RESTORATION OF THE BALD EAGLE, THE NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 203

Whereas the bald eagle was chosen as the central image of the Great Seal of the United States on June 20, 1782, by the Founding Fathers at the Congress of the Confederation;

Whereas the bald eagle is widely known as the living national symbol of the United States and for many generations has represented values such as—

- (1) freedom;
- (2) democracy;
- (3) courage;
- (4) strength;
- (5) spirit;
- (6) independence;
- (7) justice; and
- (8) excellence;

Whereas the bald eagle is unique only to North America and cannot be found naturally in any other part of the world, which was one of the primary reasons the Founding Fathers selected the bald eagle to symbolize the Government of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image used in the official logos of many branches and departments of the Government, including—

- (1) the Office of the President;
- (2) Congress;
- (3) the Supreme Court;
- (4) the Department of Defense;
- (5) the Department of the Treasury;
- (6) the Department of Justice;
- (7) the Department of State;
- (8) the Department of Commerce;
- (9) the Department of Homeland Security;
- (10) the Department of Veterans Affairs;
- (11) the Department of Labor;
- (12) the Department of Health and Human Services;
- (13) the Department of Energy;
- (14) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
- (15) the Central Intelligence Agency; and
- (16) the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of—

- (1) the spirit of freedom; and
- (2) the sovereignty of the United States;

Whereas the image and symbolism of the bald eagle has played a significant role in art, music, literature, architecture, commerce, education, and culture in the United States, and on United States stamps, currency, and coinage;

Whereas the bald eagle was once endangered and facing possible extinction in the lower 48 States, but has made a gradual and encouraging comeback to the lands, waterways, and skies of the United States;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the national bird of the United States is an endangered species success story and an inspirational example to other wildlife, environmental, and natural resource conservation efforts worldwide;

Whereas, in 1940, noting that the species was “threatened with extinction”, Congress

passed the Bald Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), which prohibited killing, selling, or possessing the species, and a 1962 amendment expanded protection to the golden eagle, thereby establishing the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act;

Whereas, by 1963, there were only an estimated 417 nesting pairs of bald eagles remaining in the lower 48 States, with loss of habitat, poaching, and the use of pesticides and other environmental contaminants contributing to the near demise of the national bird of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle was officially declared an endangered species in 1967 under the Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-669; 80 Stat. 926) in all areas of the United States south of the 40th parallel due to the dramatic decline in the population of the bald eagle in the lower 48 States;

Whereas the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) was signed into law in 1973, and, in 1978, the bald eagle was listed as “endangered” throughout the lower 48 states, except in Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, where it was designated as “threatened”;

Whereas, in July 1995, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service announced that bald eagles in the lower 48 States had recovered to the point where populations of bald eagles previously considered “endangered” were now considered “threatened”;

Whereas bald eagles residing in the lower 48 States rebounded to about 11,000 pairs by 2007;

Whereas the United States Department of Interior and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service removed the bald eagle from Endangered Species Act protection on June 28, 2007, but the species continues to be protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940 (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), and the Lacey Act of 1900 and the amendments thereto (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.);

Whereas the trained, educational bald eagle “Challenger” of the American Eagle Foundation in Pigeon Forge, Tennessee, was invited by the United States Department of the Interior to perform a free-flight demonstration during the official bald eagle delisting ceremony held at the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, DC;

Whereas experts and population growth charts estimate that the bald eagle population could reach 15,000 pairs by 2015, even though a physical count has not been conducted by State and Federal wildlife agencies since 2007;

Whereas caring and concerned agencies, corporations, organizations, and people of the United States representing the Federal, State, and private sectors passionately and resourcefully banded together, determined to save and protect the national bird of the United States;

Whereas the recovery of the bald eagle population in the United States was largely accomplished due to dedicated and vigilant efforts of Federal and State wildlife agencies and non-profit organizations, such as the American Eagle Foundation, through public education, captive breeding and release programs, hacking and release programs, and the translocation of bald eagles from places in the United States with dense bald eagle populations to suitable locations in the lower 48 States which had suffered a decrease in bald eagle populations;

Whereas various non-profit organizations, such as the Southeastern Raptor Center at Auburn University in the State of Alabama,

contribute to the continuing recovery of the bald eagle through rehabilitation and educational efforts;

Whereas the bald eagle might have been lost permanently if not for dedicated conservation efforts, and strict protection laws like the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, and the Lacey Act; and

Whereas the sustained recovery of the bald eagle population will require the continuation of recovery, management, education, and public awareness programs to ensure that the population numbers and habitat of the bald eagle will remain healthy and secure for generations to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 20, 2015, as “American Eagle Day”;

(2) applauds the issuance of bald eagle commemorative coins by the Secretary of the Treasury as a way to generate critical funds for the protection of the bald eagle; and

(3) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate and develop educational tools for use in the public schools of the United States; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2058. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2059. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2058. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 599, after line 21, add the following:

(g) ENHANCED SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a)(1) of such section, as amended by subsection (b)(1) of this section, is further amended by inserting after “activities described in paragraph (2)” the following: “, to support the security cooperation objectives of the United States,”.

(h) PROCEDURES.—Such section, as amended by subsections (b) through (f) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall designate a director for each State and territory to be responsible for the coordination of activities under a program established under subsection (a) for such State or territory and reporting on activities under the program.”.

(i) ANNUAL REPORT.—Paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (h)(1) of this section, is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by inserting “or other government organizations” after “and security forces”;

(2) in clause (iv), by adding at the end before the period the following: “and country”;

(3) in clause (v), by striking “training” and inserting “activities”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) An assessment of the extent to which the activities conducted during the previous year met the objectives described in clause (v).”.

SA 2059. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1628. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MILITARY INFORMATION SUPPORT OPERATIONS.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) military information support operations are an important component of Department of Defense communications efforts and provide commanders with a valuable tool to shape the operational environment; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense should develop creative and agile concepts, technologies, and strategies to more effectively counter and degrade the ability of state and non-state adversaries to persuade, inspire, and recruit using both traditional and emerging forms of communication and information related-capabilities.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled “Oversight of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 17, 2015, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Environmental Protection Agency’s Final Rule to Regulate Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 17, 2015, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Nominations.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Evaluating Accreditation’s Role in Ensuring Quality.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 17, 2015, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Governing Through Goal Setting: Enhancing the Economic and National Security of America.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 17, 2015, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 17, 2015, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Accessing Capital in Indian Country.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 203, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 203) designating June 20, 2015, as “American Eagle Day” and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 203) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S. 1519

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1519 be discharged from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and be referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2015

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 18; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, and that the time be equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half; lastly, that all time during morning business and the adjournment of the Senate count postcloture on H.R. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, if there
is no further business to come before

the Senate, I ask unanimous consent
that it stand adjourned under the pre-
vious order.

There being no objection, the Senate,
at 5:05 p.m., adjourned until Thursday,
June 18, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 17, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 17, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BLAKE FARENTHOLD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

END IMMIGRANT FAMILY DETENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, you are in the presence of greatness. No, not me, but I am flattered if that was your first thought. Rather, I speak of my excellent grandson, who has come to Washington and to the floor of the House of Representatives to see his grandpa at work.

Tonight, Luisito, who is 12, will be my escort, along with his grandma, at the annual White House picnic for Members of Congress and their families. It would take way more than the allotted 5 minutes to enumerate all of the reasons for this grandfather's pride, so let me just say I am looking forward to showing him off at tonight's gathering.

But more than tonight's picnic, what I am really looking forward to is Father's Day. This Sunday, in Chicago, along with Luisito, my grandson, I will be with his dad and my daughters, who always make the old man feel loved.

And this Father's Day, I will be especially thankful for being allowed to

have my family around me, because on Monday, I will be visiting with hundreds of children who cannot be with their dads.

On Monday, I will be joining seven of my colleagues in San Antonio to visit the two largest family detention facilities in the country. Karnes and Dilley are where moms and their children are being kept behind bars awaiting resolution of their immigration cases seeking asylum.

Remember a year ago when tens of thousands of children and young people were fleeing violence in three countries in Central America? The Republicans thought that these children would bring this country to its knees, and anti-immigration groups organized mobs to protest and keep children out of detention facilities in their communities. Do you remember that?

Well, many mothers with small children were also fleeing to the U.S. last year, and they are still being held in detention facilities, which are operated by private prison companies in Texas and Pennsylvania. They are detained for the completely lawful act of seeking asylum. My colleagues and I are going to see firsthand what is going on.

The minority whip, Mr. HOYER, and two of my closest allies on the family detention issue, Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, both of California, are going, and we will be hosted by our colleague from Texas, Mr. CASTRO, as we visit the two facilities.

I am sure that Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel, and even private companies who are contracted to run the facilities and profit from the incarceration of other people, are trying their best to make the conditions of detention for these moms and kids as humane as they can.

But, you see, that misses the point. We shouldn't be holding vulnerable women and children in detention. We have mothers and small children living in jail-like facilities with uncertain futures, limited access to legal counsel, and this has been going on for some time, for almost a year for some of them. Even with schools and laundry and TVs, they are still being held behind fences.

Moms still have to explain to the youngest children that, no, in fact, they do not know when they can leave or whether they will be deported back to the violent countries they fled after months in detention.

Children who face trauma, gangs, murder, and sexual assault in their neighborhoods were forced to leave

alone or in groups or with a parent. They faced all sorts of dangers—smugglers and predators—on the journey to northern Mexico, where we know assault, robbery, and rape are commonplace. Then they crossed the U.S. border, often with the guidance of additional smugglers and criminals, and, following the process in the U.S. law, presented themselves to authorities to request asylum.

Now, because we have not put money into our immigration court system and, by the way, because we have not created ways for people to come here with visas instead of smugglers, we are all paying a higher price to house and feed moms and kids when much cheaper monitoring and supervision options are available. Why? The government feels that imprisoning these children and moms, even in relatively humane conditions, will be a deterrent to others.

But 136 House Democrats, including all 8 Members traveling to Texas on Monday, have asked the Secretary of Homeland Security to end the practice of holding moms and children in detention when there are other ways to get the job done.

The children are paying the highest cost. It doesn't take a developmental expert to know that weeks and months in detention in prison-like conditions, having already lived through weeks and months and years of desperation, are not conducive to good child development.

But with my Republican friends, it is usually not the human cost that matters. So let me break it down another way.

At \$343 per person per day, we are spending \$125,000 per detainee per year—\$125,000. But the alternatives to detention we could be using cost about \$5.50 a day, or about \$2,000 a year. That is cost savings logic that even in Washington we can understand.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of how you feel about the funding and regardless of how you feel about immigration or policy issues, Central America, or any other issues, you cannot lose sight of the fact that we are talking about children.

As a father, I will not be able to look at those children without seeing my grandson, and they are probably a lot like your children and grandchildren, too. I am going to Texas for myself to see these women and children we are holding, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

PAHRUMP VA CLINIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, we live in America, a nation conceived in liberty and consecrated by the service and sacrifice of our military men and women.

Veterans throughout the country depend on our integrity to keep our promises. We promise to care for their health after they come home from battle; and yet, too often, we delay making good on the promise.

Specifically, why have veterans of Pahrump, Nevada, had the promise of a new clinic dangled over their heads for years? Construction was finally approved nearly 1 year ago, and the ground remains unbroken.

Later today, the VA is holding a town hall in Pahrump. My staff will be there to hear the latest updates. I hope they will finally have something to tell the veterans there other than what they have shared with me.

Something is very wrong with the VA right now. My advocacy for the veterans of my district, especially those who need better and more accessible health care now, will not cease.

Let's not leave our veterans with more unmet promises. We can do better for the more than 8,000 veterans of Nye County, Nevada.

STOP MESSING AROUND WITH FAILED TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, 44 days—44 days—that is when the highway trust fund runs dry.

Now, this isn't a surprise. We have been kicking the can down the road for awhile. The Republicans have been in charge for 4½ years. And today, the Ways and Means Committee is, rather begrudgingly, holding its first hearing on the issue of the highway trust fund. However, they have already foreclosed the options.

The chairman and the Republican leadership have said: We can't do user fees the way Dwight David Eisenhower and Ronald Reagan did. That is off the table. We are going to come up with some other creative or phony way to pay for these investments.

And they pretty much have said they are going to try to kick the can down the road until the end of December.

Well, those sorts of patches won't deal with the massive pothole that we have with our infrastructure in this country: 140,000 bridges need repair or replacement; 40 percent of the service of the National Highway System is degraded to the point where you have to dig it up and put in a new roadbed, not just pave it over a little bit; \$86 billion backlog to bring our transit system just up to a state of good repair—not to

build out more options to get people out of congestion and traffic, just to bring the existing system up to a state of repair. It is so bad that in the Nation's Capital they are unnecessarily killing people because of a system that is outmoded, obsolete, and defective.

But we are the United States of America. We can't afford to invest, according to Republicans. They don't distinguish between investment and spending, unless it is the Pentagon, where spending is good. But rebuilding American infrastructure, they can't find the money for that.

Luckily, there is furious, furious activity going on now. The President went to the baseball game last week for the first time in 7 years. He showed up at the House baseball game. He came to the Democratic Caucus last week. He sent three secretaries here. He is inviting groups down to the White House, bringing them down by motorcade. He is on the phone with JOHN BOEHNER, his former archenemy. They are furiously, furiously at work.

Unfortunately, what they are scheming over is how to undo what we did last week, blocking the last worst trade agreement that America will ever have, saying: We want a new paradigm on trade. No more failed trade policies for this country. It is not working, to just rebuild or build upon the massive profits of multinational corporations, hoping some of it might trickle down.

Actually, it has just led to job exports because they can get 30-cent-an-hour labor in Vietnam. They desperately want this agreement. And Malaysia, hey, the House stripped out the minor restrictions on human trafficking so that U.S. companies could feel free to go to Malaysia.

So they are furiously plotting what way they can trick us or somehow overcome 85 percent of the Democrats in the House caucus here and a number of Republicans who have concerns about these failed trade deals.

Now, just think—just think—if Speaker BOEHNER, President Obama, and corporate America assembled, were just working to help us find a solution to our crumbling infrastructure, because it is certainly important to everybody in this country. If we found that solution, if we moved forward with a long-term bill, we could, instead of having to argue over assistance for workers who are going to lose their jobs because of this trade agreement, we could be hiring hundreds of thousands of Americans, and not just construction workers. This would involve manufacturing. For transit, it involves high tech. It involves small business. It involves minority business enterprises. It involves family-wage jobs where people can make a living, not getting retrained to go to McDonald's because their job was sent to Asia or Mexico or someplace else.

We have a tremendous opportunity. Stop messing around with these failed trade agreements, and let's put our heads together and figure out how to pay for a long-term transportation bill and get this country moving again.

LGBT PRIDE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, June is national LGBT Pride Month, and so I rise today to honor and recognize the determination, advocacy, contributions, and talents of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans.

I was 15 years old, a high school student in a small town, when I gave my first gay rights speech. I did not know in 1975 that I would one day have the opportunity to be here on the floor of the House of Representatives to support equal rights, but I did know that it is wrong to discriminate against fellow Americans because of who they love.

And I think I knew on some level that my brother Jamie was gay. I was, and still remain, committed to stand with those who fight bigotry, discrimination, and violence against those who love another.

And looking back, I am so deeply thankful to stand here today and to celebrate the remarkable progress we have made in recent years. That progress is due to the tireless determination and enduring struggle of LGBT Americans and allies, like my brother Jamie and my mother, Mitzi Henderson.

□ 1015

Don't Ask, Don't Tell is a thing of the past, and it no longer forces our men and women in uniform to choose between serving this Nation and being open about who they are and who they love. Marriage equality is now a reality in 37 States and in Washington, D.C. That covers 70 percent of all Americans. During LGBT Pride Month, we celebrate the progress we have made, but we also recommit to the continued fight for full equality.

Congress needs to pass the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, ENDA, to ensure that no one is fired because of one's gender identity or sexual orientation. Congress needs to pass the SAME Act, which I had the honor of helping to introduce, to ensure that all couples can receive the Social Security benefits that they have earned. Congress needs to pass the Respect for Marriage Act so that all couples are treated with equality and fairness no matter where they live or who they love.

At this very moment, the pursuit of national marriage equality continues. The Supreme Court is currently considering a case that affords the Court a

rare opportunity, the opportunity to make history while advancing justice. The Court may and—I hope—will rule that the Constitution's guarantee of the right to marry extends to same-sex couples throughout the United States.

No matter how the Court rules in the days ahead, I know we still have a long road ahead to advance equal rights for all Americans, but I also know we will prevail. We will prevail because we will continue to have those courageous conversations one at a time. We will prevail because we advocate for something far more powerful than politics; we advocate for love.

I am honored to join with Americans across this great country to celebrate national LGBT Pride Month and to stand with those who stand up every day to defend the right of all Americans to be proud of who they are, to be proud of who they love, and to proudly work together for the ongoing cause of true equality under the law.

KIPP GENERATIONS COLLEGIATE GRADUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise today in honor of the graduates from the KIPP Generations Collegiate High School, KGC, in Houston, Texas. KIPP is a charter school that partners with our Houston area public school system.

Last Sunday, I was honored to speak at their commencement ceremony. I have followed the success of KIPP students for 20 years. From their beginnings in elementary school, Mike Feinberg and his excellent staff have taught thousands of children in Texas. KGC's main focus is to build a rigorous learning environment to better equip its students for college.

This school has upheld its mission by empowering its graduates to take ownership of their education by approaching learning with curiosity, with a sense of responsibility, and by putting their knowledge into action in the service of others. Hailing under the motto of "We Lift as We Climb," KGC is truly a model of success for the entire country.

KGC's values of hope, empowerment, grit, and citizenship are tools that every student needs to succeed in the 21st century. Because of this learning environment, every graduate from this program has been accepted into a college or a university. KGC continues to perform well above the State in district averages.

I would like to congratulate the students, the parents, the teachers, and the administrators for their success now and in the future.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

The following proceedings were held before the House convened for morning-hour debate:

UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS 2015 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Jim Walsh, vice president of Former Members of Congress Association, at 8:06 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Lord God of history, we thank You for this day when former Members return to Congress to continue, in a less official manner, their service to our Nation and to this noble institution.

May their presence here bring a moment of pause where current Members consider the profiles they now form for future generations of Americans.

May all former Members be rewarded for their contributions to this constitutional Republic and continue to work and pray that the goodness and justice of this beloved country be proclaimed to the nations.

Bless all former Members who have died since last year's meeting, 30 in all. May their families and their constituents be comforted during a time of mourning and forever know our gratitude for the sacrifices made in service to the House.

Finally, bless those here gathered that they might bring joy and hope to the present age in supportive companionship to one another. Together, we call upon Your holy name now and forever.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Jim Walsh led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. WALSH. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. I was glad to be here with Jim Walsh.

I looked at the list. As I look around—I am not sure this is accurate—but I saw in the list there are about, I would say, 30 names on this list, and I think there are only two on the list, although that may be not accurate, with whom I have not served. Ron, you are one of them, and I think Lou Frey. Where is Lou?

Mr. FREY. Over here.

Mr. HOYER. The two of you, I think, are the only two former Members with whom I have not served.

And, unfortunately, I never served with Speaker Michel. I served with Mi-

nority Leader Michel, but I wish I had served with Speaker Michel, one of the great Americans with whom I have served.

I think Bob Michel is the quintessential example of what a Member of Congress ought to be: civil, committed to his party and to his principles, but committed above all to his country and to his family.

Bob, it was an honor to serve with you, and it is an honor to be your friend. Thank you very much for your service.

To all of you who made this institution what it is today and those of us who are continuing to make it what it ought to be, we are not doing that job very well, for the most part. Although, I will say this, that Speaker BOEHNER is trying to make that happen and, to the extent that we work together, we do. But it is harder and harder, as you know, because the ideological differences between the parties have become more substantial than they were, certainly when I came here in 1981.

Jim Blanchard and I served on the Financial Services Committee together. It was then the Banking Committee. But we are trying to work together to do what is best for our country. I think the country believes its board of directors is not working nearly as well as it ought to.

I want to thank all of you for staying engaged and for continuing to send the message to your colleagues, your friends, your neighbors who have great respect for you. And you have something that very few people have. You know, there are only about a little short of 11,000 of us who have served in this House of Representatives since the founding of the Republic, which is an amazingly small number in a country that is now 320 million, give or take, people.

So it was a wonderful, wonderful honor for us to be elected here. As you know, we can't be appointed to the House of Representatives.

And as I look around this room on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, so many people with whom I worked very, very closely, positively and productively in the Congress of the United States, it is always a privilege to welcome you back. And, of course, so many of you—Ron Sarasin is a permanent fixture, of course. We see Ron through his activity on the historic society working here on a very regular basis to make sure that Americans understand the history and the importance of their Capitol. Ron, thank you very much for that service and that leadership.

Mr. Chris Shays is coming into the Chamber. Hi, Chris. Good to see you.

Mr. SHAYS. We haven't voted yet, have we?

Mr. HOYER. Now, there are some of you I need—and I am not sure that I would get all of you—but we haven't voted yet.

I want to thank all of you for staying involved, staying true to the responsibility the people gave you; and when you no longer had that responsibility, in terms of being an elected Member of this body, you continued your fidelity to what this body means, particularly this body. I think all of us are very proud that we served, as we all say, in the people's House.

This was the House that was designed to be most responsive to the passions and the fears and the aspirations and the hopes, the good and the bad, of the American people, where every 2 years we had to re-up. And I think that will never change. It will never change, first of all, because it was a good theory. And, secondly, it will never change because the Senators don't want to give us a free shot at them. So, you know, you have got the principle and then the practical combined in that way.

But I always enjoy being with you, saying hello to you. Certainly my office, which is, as you know, just one floor down here in the Capitol, if we can do anything for any of you at any point of time, if you need a place to hang your jacket or make a telephone call or we have got a conference room that is vacant from time to time, you can use that. It was a privilege and an honor to serve with all of you and to continue to be your friends. God bless you. Thank you very much.

Let me pay special honor to my Maryland colleague, Bev Byron. Jim Moran, I think, and John may be the most recent new Members of the former Members. Maybe some of the rest of you, I think. But Bev Byron and Mike McIntyre.

Bev Byron and I started out—well, she may have been there 1 or 2 years before I was there. But in 1962, we started in the Young Democrats together. Now, she wants me to sit down. She is saying “now you are going to meddling.” We love you, Bev. I love you. Thank you.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Whip, on behalf of all of my colleagues here in the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, let me say thank you for your loyalty to this group. You always come year after year. You share your wisdom. You give us a sense of what is happening, and you connect us, the former Members, with the current. And it is a great value to all of us. Thank you.

I now call upon the distinguished president of the association, Barbara Kennelly, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Jim.

I was pleased to represent Connecticut for 17 years.

Mr. WALSH. Pardon me.

Ms. KENNELLY. All those little States up there.

And thank you, Leader HOYER, for being with us this morning. I can al-

ways know where your seniority is because I was one behind you, and you were fortunate and you stayed.

Anyway, we begin this meeting, and I thank everybody who is here with us this morning as we begin this wonderful day of former Members.

We are back in this revered Chamber, which we all loved and worked in and had really such an honor to be here, and it is an honor to be here again today to present the 45th annual report of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress.

I will be joined by some of our colleagues in reporting on the activities and projects of our organization since our last report, which was last July. Wait until you see how far we have come even since last year.

I first would like the Clerk to call the roll.

Mr. Blanchard of Michigan
 Ms. Buerkle of New York
 Mr. Bustamante of Texas
 Ms. Byron of Maryland
 Mr. Carnahan of Missouri
 Mr. Carr of Michigan
 Mr. Clement of Tennessee
 Ms. Dahlkemper of Pennsylvania
 Mr. Edwards of Texas
 Mr. Frey of Florida
 Mr. Frost of Texas
 Mr. Gingrey of Georgia
 Mr. Hertel of Michigan
 Mr. Hughes of New Jersey
 Ms. Kennelly of Connecticut
 Mr. Kolbe of Arizona
 Mr. Konnyu of California
 Mr. Lancaster of North Carolina
 Mr. Lungren of California
 Mr. McIntyre of North Carolina
 Mr. Mezvinsky of Iowa
 Mr. Moore of Kansas
 Mr. Moran of Virginia
 Ms. Morella of Maryland
 Mr. Sarasin of Connecticut
 Mr. Sarpalius of Texas
 Mr. Shays of Connecticut
 Mr. Skaggs of Colorado
 Mr. Stearns of Florida
 Mr. Sundquist of Tennessee
 Mr. Tanner of Tennessee
 Mr. Tierney of Massachusetts
 Mr. Turner of Texas
 Mr. Walsh of New York.

Mr. WALSH. The Chair announces that 34 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you all for joining us today.

Our association was chartered by Congress, and one requirement of that charter is for us to report once a year to Congress about our activities. Wait until you see how many activities that we have.

Many of you have joined us for several years on this occasion, and there will be numerous programs and projects with which by now many of you have become very familiar. This is a sign of our association's stability and purpose.

We are extremely proud of our 45-year history, of creating lasting and

purposeful programs to teach about Congress and representative government, and of our ability to take long-standing projects and to expand them and to improve them. We will report on our program in just a minute.

During our annual meeting today, we will honor two of our colleagues with well-deserved recognition. In a few minutes, we will celebrate Lou Frey's accomplishments with our Lifetime Achievement Award. And later today, during a luncheon in his honor, we will bestow the 2015 Distinguished Service Award to our dear friend, Amo Houghton. I certainly hope all of you in attendance and those coming later can join us for the luncheon since Amo has been an inspiration and a mentor to so many of us.

While the ceremony is not going to take place right now, I do want to read into the RECORD the inscription of the plaque Amo Houghton will receive today:

The 2015 Distinguished Service Award is presented by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress to Congressman Amo Houghton.

Congressman Houghton of New York is known for his civility, intellect, and compassion. Amo valiantly served our country as a United States Marine and for 18 years as a Member of Congress. While serving in Congress, Amo was relied upon by both Republican and Democratic Members for his keen mind, unassuming nature, and unquestioned integrity to help find solutions when others only saw impasse.

He set the standard for good citizenship and a commitment to the common good and continues to do so in his support of educational and philanthropic endeavors. He is a voice of reason that continues to resonate with all of those who care deeply about Congress and the ideals of representative democracy. His colleagues from both sides of the aisle salute him as a distinguished and dedicated public servant.

Washington, D.C.

Please do join us this afternoon because I think the luncheon is going to be absolutely wonderful, and I hope you all can attend. I know there are others that couldn't be with us this morning that will be with us this noon-time.

Now, back to our report. Our association is bipartisan. It was founded in 1970 and chartered by Congress in 1983. The purpose of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress is to promote public service and strengthen democracy, abroad and in the United States.

About 600 former Members, Senators and Representatives, belong to this association. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents are united in this organization in their desire to teach about Congress and the importance of representative democracy.

We are proud to have been chartered by Congress, and we are just as proud to take no funding from Congress. All the activities which we are about to describe are financed via membership

dues, program-specific grants, sponsors, or via our fundraising dinner that you are going to hear about very shortly.

Our finances are sound, our projects fully funded, and our most recent audit by an outside accountant confirmed that we are running our association in a fiscally sound, responsible, and transparent manner.

It has been another successful, active, and rewarding year. We have continued our work of serving as a liaison between the current Congress and legislatures overseas. We have created partnerships with highly respected institutions in the area of democracy building and election monitoring. We have developed new projects and are expanding others. We, again, have sent dozens of bipartisan teams of former Members of Congress to teach about public service and representative democracy at universities and high schools both in the United States and abroad.

Our most important domestic undertaking is teaching America's next generation about their government and responsibility of citizenship. After our report here in the Chamber this morning, we will inaugurate a new association project aimed at bringing civic education back to public school classrooms. The focus on civics has been ingrained in our association's DNA for over 30 years, most prominently as a part of our Congress to Campus program.

I will yield to my good friend, David Skaggs of Colorado, who for a number of years, when our association was not able to administer this program on its own, stepped up to the plate and not only kept Congress to Campus going, but expanded it significantly.

David.

Mr. SKAGGS. Thank you very much, Barbara.

I appreciate the opportunity to report on the Congress to Campus program. Although I have been affiliated with it for a long time, I want to recognize the co-chairs of the program who couldn't be with us this morning, Larry LaRocco of Idaho and Jack Buechner of Missouri. They have done a terrific job over the years in moving this program along.

This program, as many of us have participated in it well know, sends bipartisan teams of former Members to colleges and universities across the country and around the world. It engages our Members from all over the country in educating the next generation of leaders about the institution of Congress, the duties and responsibilities that we have as Members, and most importantly, the value of public service.

Since our visits always involve a bipartisan team, they demonstrate, I think, pretty well that political debate can and should be respectful, dynamic, and courteous.

Former Members volunteer their time leading classes, meeting with student leaders, meeting with community organizations, joining with student government meetings—all manner of activities on campus. The schools are encouraged to offer the program to the entire campus community to demonstrate how we do our work in the Congress.

I have gone on many of these trips, most recently this spring with our former colleague Pete Smith of Vermont, on a visit to Evergreen State College in Washington State. I was again reminded of how valuable these programs are, and I learned a great deal from exchanges with Pete during the course of that visit.

Speaking to the students renews our hope, I think, in the future of our country, and I hope and believe that Members will get as much out of this as the students do.

We are delighted to report this year that we added some new schools to the program, as well as returning to many of our old favorites. During the last academic year, we visited over 25 schools, including Abilene Christian, Boston University, Palm Beach State, Tufts University, the U.S. Naval Academy, and Washington State University, to name just a few. Over 40 former Members participated, including several former Members who just left office last January, so it is great to get them involved very quickly.

I want to thank everyone who made a visit and, most of all, those that have donated their time pro bono to this very important program of the association. I think Members will tell you that it gives them an opportunity in a very meaningful way to continue their public service.

I hope all our colleagues, particularly those who may not yet have participated in the program, will consider making a visit. It is an opportunity to renew old friendships or make new ones. Maybe, if you can't make a visit yourself, you can put us in touch with your former alma mater or a school in your old district so that we can take the program there. Sharon Witiw, who is seated to my left, runs the program for the association and can provide all the information you may need.

We especially want to recognize our continued relationship with the Stennis Center for Public Service and its associate director, Brother Roger. The folks at the Stennis Center have been a fantastic partner in keeping the program on track, both logistically and financially.

We have expanded the program internationally. There were two delegations to the U.K. in the past year for weeklong visits with hundreds of British students. Members participated even in townhall meetings in Britain. I hate to think of how much more fun that is than townhall meetings here.

It is reported that these visits have been one of the highlights of the students' semesters, and we want to thank Philip Davies with the British Library in London for all he does to make the program work over there.

We have also incorporated Congress-to-Campus-like activities in a number of other international programs, including the Congressional Study Group on Germany. With the support of the German Embassy here in Washington, we were able to have a weeklong Congress and Bundestag to Campus program where former Members joined with members of the Bundestag and met with students from dozens of universities in the northeast.

Last fall, a new program was piloted using technology to reach a new constituency. Thanks to an in-kind grant from iCohere, we had three 90-minute Congress to Campus webinar sessions to an audience of community colleges across the Nation.

The webinar platform allowed students from all over the country to participate and ask questions of the bipartisan panels of former Members. We are currently adapting the webinar platform to also serve high school government classes around the country and hope to have that program up and running this fall. Please consider participating in one of these programs that do not necessarily involve the 3-day commitment of a campus visit.

The association has also continued to support the People to People program, which brings hundreds of high school students to the Capitol to learn about leadership and American Government. Several times over the past year, former Members have keynoted those sessions, and we have heard that many staffers on the Hill were first inspired into public service through their People to People experience.

Thanks to everyone who has helped make this program the hallmark program of the association. An informed and engaged citizenry is absolutely essential if our democracy is going to work, and this program really contributes to that end.

Thank you very much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, David. Thank you for all you have done for one of our most successful programs.

I can remember I got excited when I heard about these programs, and I really wanted to be part of it. At one time, Nancy Johnson and I went to Annapolis, and I wondered if Annapolis students would be so interested in two women of age spending 2½ days with them.

We had the best times, absolutely; and I really urge you to go. Nancy and I were always friendly, but it really gives you a chance to spend 2½ days with someone from the other party who you might have known or you might not have known, and you will enjoy it.

We have another new project, and the purpose of the Common Ground Project is to involve citizens in a dialogue about the issues of the day and have a vigorous debate that doesn't shy away from being partisan but, at the same time, manages to be productive.

To give you more background on this Common Ground Project, I invite my colleague from New York, former Member Ann Marie Buerkle, to share her report.

Ann Marie.

Ms. BUERKLE. Thank you very much, Barbara, Mr. Speaker.

One of the many joys of being active with this remarkable, effective association is that it brings together Republicans and Democrats in our many programs, whether it is a part of our board of directors, during our annual meeting and charitable government tournament, for panel discussions, as well as other presentations. All that this association does is bipartisan. Our board is divided evenly between Republicans and Democrats, and our leadership rotates between the two parties.

Currently, our Congress, indeed, our country, is going through a period of polarization and partisanship. While we don't leave our political beliefs at the door when participating in association activities, we pride ourselves in creating an environment where an across-the-aisle dialogue is not only possible, but also the norm. We have institutionalized this approach in a program that we call the Common Ground Project.

The purpose of the Common Ground Project is to create venues and events where a bipartisan approach can involve the public in a dialogue on the issues of the day. Some of our long-standing programs, most importantly the Congress to Campus program we just heard about, already fit neatly into the goals of the Common Ground Project. There are other additional undertakings that were specifically created to further this project.

We are extremely proud of our partnership with the National Archives, which, since 2010, has brought dozens of former Members—again, from both sides of the aisle—together with the public for panel discussions for a productive as well as a respectful dialogue. I have been privileged to participate in a number of our Common Ground Project activities, including Congress to Campus, as well as the National Archives panel series. I believe these dialogues are incredibly important.

Since our last report to Congress, we continue to offer the public a number of opportunities to participate in conversations about the issues that concern our Nation. At the National Archives, former Members held discussions about the midterm elections, our current electoral system, and some of the issues that have caused this cur-

rent partisan divide. Other public forums included presentations on money in politics, foreign affairs and international trade issues, the U.S. Constitution, and the accomplishments of women in leadership.

As David Skaggs reported earlier, the Congress to Campus program included, for the first time, a number of webinars that reached a very specific audience, in this case, community college students, and gave them an opportunity to interact online with our bipartisan panels of former Members of Congress. After some introductory remarks, most of the webinar time was committed to giving the students an opportunity to ask questions online. We were thrilled with the positive response to this new initiative and believe that this concept will translate into furthering the goals of the Common Ground Project.

Using modern technology, we can effectively reach audiences all across the United States of America to engage with them in a meaningful dialogue. This is a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate the great benefit that comes from differing opinions being aired, discussed, and dissected in order to find that common ground.

We will explore, over the next year, additional ways to make use of webinars as a means of bringing the public together with our former Member teams. Our initial plan includes reaching out to high school audiences, in addition to college students. The program could then be expanded to include other constituencies who would be gathered in front of the computer, again, to participate in a webinar. This would allow us to include, among others, the VFW, chambers of commerce, and many groups who may not have access to an in-person discussion.

There are quite a number of other activities that contribute to our Common Ground Project. Unfortunately, the list is too long this morning to include them all here. It is our association's most important undertaking to re-engage the public in a political discourse that is productive, respectful, and yields solutions rather than sound bites.

We, as former Members, can contribute greatly towards a better understanding of how the important issues of our day play out on Capitol Hill, and I view it as one of the responsibilities that comes with the privilege of having served in Congress. We have an opportunity to bridge the political gap and show the American people that we can have deeply held convictions and still have discussions and debates that find not only the common ground, but also seek solutions.

Thank you so much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Ann Marie. And thank you very much for being willing to be active in our association and do a number of things for us.

Ann Marie was on the panel. As you know, we have a very close relationship with the Archives. And we, our organization and the Archives, had a panel 2 days after election. And this shows that we really can be bipartisan. There were various views that came forth in that discussion, but it was absolutely wonderful. We had a full audience. And it just shows that bipartisanism can work, even 2 days after election. Some of us were happy, and some of us weren't.

Another example of how powerful and productive bipartisanism can be is our annual Congressional Golf Tournament. It is chaired by our past president, Dennis Hertel of Michigan, and by fellow board member Ken Kramer of Colorado.

I will now yield the floor to Dennis Hertel to give us a brief report about our charitable golf tournament.

Dennis.

Mr. HERTEL. Thank you, Barbara. I am still more comfortable over here.

Congratulations, Barbara, on this great turnout today. And the annual dinner, what a great success it was, better than ever. You and Jim Walsh have done just fantastic and what you have accomplished for the association.

Eight years ago, we took a 35-year-old tradition, our annual golf tournament, which pits Republicans against Democrats, and gave it a new and much bigger mission. We converted it into a charitable golf tournament to aid severely wounded vets returning from the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan. Our beneficiaries—Warfighter Sports, a program of Disabled Sports USA, and Tee It Up for the Troops—use golf and other sports to help our wounded veterans readjust to life after sustaining severe injuries. They involve the entire family in the sport, and they provide equipment and training.

Our seventh annual event was held last year on July 28 at the Army Navy Country Club. And we have had more Congressmen, active Members, attend our tournament than all of these other golf tournaments that you hear about in Washington, D.C. There might be more in Washington, D.C., than any other place in the country as far as fundraisers, but we have more Members turn out for our cause.

All together, these tournaments have raised over a half million dollars for these outstanding programs. During each of our past tournaments, we have had several dozen current and former Members from both sides of the aisle come together to support our wounded troops that day and throughout the year; and they have met with dozens of wounded warriors, many of whom play in our foursomes. Some double amputees included in their numbers have hit further and straighter than a lot of our members—certainly me. It is an incredibly humbling, rewarding, and

memorable experience to spend a day in the presence of these inspiring men and women.

I want to thank everyone in the association, particularly Sharon Witiw, as well as Ken Kramer, our tournament's co-chair. Sharon just does a tremendous job week in and week out working on this all year long, and Ken has just been the mainstay of the program.

Equally important, I am happy to report we have again secured the leadership of two of our most outstanding current Members who are co-chairs to help us lead this effort: Congressman JIMMY DUNCAN of Tennessee and Congressman GENE GREEN of Texas. So some co-chairmen that many of us have served with have just been tremendous in opening up their offices and staff and working with us all the time.

GENE replaces our past Democratic co-chair, Mike McIntyre of North Carolina.

Mike, please stand up. We want to thank you so much for your hard work as co-chair.

Mike really put us up on the map and got us higher as far as Members' participation, and it has really made a great difference. And JIMMY DUNCAN and GENE GREEN, we just can't thank them enough for what they have been doing and their constant encouragement of Members to come and play with us.

That brings me to the point of our former Members. We are having, for the first time in the last few tournaments, more current Members play in the golf tournament than former Members when we are sponsoring it. So I hope that the great turnout today is an indication of having more people come to our golf tournament. Even if you don't want to play golf, just come and enjoy the day with our veterans. It is so convenient. It is right here at Army Navy. Don't worry about your skill level, you know. It is an honor for us to help such an incredibly deserving group in this small way.

The next tournament will be July 27. We call it "The Members" tournament. But unlike the Masters, you don't need to play at the pro level to have a successful and enjoyable day. All you have to do is show up and help raise some money. I want to stress that, while this event is called a tournament, no one should be worried about their score or their skill level to participate. I am certainly an example of that.

This event is 100 percent about helping wounded warriors. Nobody cares what your handicap is. Your individual score is not kept because we have a scramble format, which I am very much in favor of; so, you know, they don't really know how you did. But if you hit one good, they can use it, including a putt.

So both current and former Members give it their time and attention. If you

only play golf once a year, this should be the day you do it.

So I want to thank all of you so much for all the help. And if you can play or if you can bring us a new sponsor, please let us know.

Thanks very much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Dennis, for this report.

We are so honored that we can play a small role in the rehabilitation of these amazing men and women. And as a golfer, I can tell you it doesn't matter if your handicap is 10 or if your handicap is 27; and I have been both places. And I promise you, in a scramble, no matter what Marty Russo does, he doesn't always win.

In addition to the domestic programs we have just described, our association also has a very active and far-reaching international focus. We conduct programs focused on Europe and Asia; we bring current Members of Congress together with their peers in legislatures overseas; and we work with the Department of State to talk about representative democracy in our office with audiences abroad. To me, this is becoming one of the most important programs.

As I remember, when I first became active in Association of Former Members, you really did not see many sitting Members of Congress. It was our association. We have expanded this, and as a result, a number of Members take part in our organizations that do go abroad and do study things abroad.

The other day, the German Marshall Fund had put out a new report, and Pete put together a get-together. I was so impressed. We had scholars about Germany. We had a very interesting audience as well as the German Marshall Fund there.

But what really impressed me was the number of Members—and this was one of the busiest days when they were doing the trade legislation—the Members that were attending; and even when they had to go out, they came back. My feeling is, if we get this new business of having present Members be active in our association, that means they will know our association before they are former Members.

Psychologically, this is very good because they bring very new information, but not only that, we are not trying to get them to be Members. After they have left or lost, they know about us. I think this will be very healthy for the organization.

One of our most valued partners in these undertakings is the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians. Our friendship with our colleagues in Ottawa goes back to 1987 when a group of former parliamentarians came and visited with us to learn about our association and our projects and used the lessons learned to create their own association in Canada.

For almost 30 years, we have been friends and partners and we are hon-

ored to have as our guest today David Daubney, a former member of the Canadian Parliament and an officer of our sister organization.

Welcome, David, if you are here this morning. Thank you, David. We are so pleased you can be with us.

I have not had the opportunity, and former Members have asked me to go up to Ottawa to join in their big event, like our dinner, and I got into the airport in Ottawa, and that is the day that they had a very sad bomb scare.

Very fortunately, I didn't get out of the airport because if I had, I wouldn't have gotten home for a couple of days because the airport was locked down. I was sorry I couldn't be there. I thank you for the good times we have had in the past year with the Canadian delegation. You are going to hear more about that.

Via the former Members association, I have met with numerous groups of legislators from emerging democracies who have come to Washington for a better understanding of our representative government and our form of democracy. These conversations and meetings are always two-way streets. I have to say that I learn as much, if not more, from our visitors than they do from me.

Just last month, our association hosted at our offices a large group of young professionals from ASEAN, countries including Vietnam and Indonesia, and we had a great dialogue about running for office and serving our constituency.

Our association also has a long-standing partnership with a great NGO Legacy International, bringing young professionals from the Middle East and north Africa to the United States. Our most recent group just completed their 6 weeks in Washington. They stay 6 weeks.

The group is composed of young professionals from Morocco and Tunisia. Most of these visitors work in the NGO sector in their countries, and they come to the United States to learn about the interaction between government and nongovernmental sectors.

I would like to take this moment to thank former Congresswoman Bev Byron because she has been very, very generous in opening up her house to students for dinner, and it is much appreciated by the association.

The goal of this program is to seek a better understanding between cultures and establish an avenue of dialogue between nations. It is a unique opportunity to create a constructive political and cultural discourse between the United States and north Africa. I am very proud that our association is part of this vital dialogue.

In addition to hosting visiting delegations, our association organizes former Member delegations to travel overseas and engage students, government officials, NGOs, and corporate

representatives. You have already heard about the Congress to Campus programs and the very international component that it has.

We brought the program to numerous universities in countries such as Turkey, the United Kingdom, other overseas delegations; we call them ExDELS. We have traveled to countries where a dialogue is often difficult, but nonetheless incredibly important—for example, China, a country to which we have now sent seven ExDELS over the past 4 years.

In addition to these former Member international programs, our association supports Congress' international outreach in a meaningful, productive, and bipartisan way via our congressional study groups. These are all programs that involve current Members of Congress, and I now invite my good friend and my predecessor, and I thank Connie for helping me begin my presidency, and I enjoyed her presidency, Connie Morella.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you very much, Barbara. I just want to say it has been great working side by side with you for the 2 years when you were vice president, and you are doing a great job. It is nice to continue to be involved with all the wonderful programs that the former Members offer.

I appreciate the opportunity to briefly speak to you about the work of Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Japan, Turkey, and Europe. They are flagship international programs of the former Members of Congress for over three decades. The study groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges for current Members of Congress and their senior staff, and they serve as educational forums and invaluable tools for international dialogue with the goal of creating better understanding and cooperation between the United States and its most important strategic and economic partners.

Each study group has a membership roster of between 75 and 125 Members of Congress, current Members of Congress, and is led by a bipartisan, bicameral pair of co-chairs. I want to acknowledge the service of all of our co-chairs for their hard work and dedication to these critical programs, and I hope they are watching.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany is led by Senator JEFF SESSIONS, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN, Representative CHARLIE DENT, and Representative TED DEUTCH.

The Congressional Study Group on Japan is led by Senator MAZIE HIRONO, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, Representative DIANA DEGETTE, and Representative BILLY LONG.

The Congressional Study Group on Turkey is led by Representative GERRY CONNOLLY and Representative ED WHITFIELD.

The Congressional Study Group on Europe is led by Senator JOHN BOOZMAN, Senator CHRIS MURPHY, Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY, and Representative PETER WELCH.

Our co-chairs are true leaders, who not only serve in their role at official study group events, but are also called on by various embassies and countless outside organizations to speak on panels, attend roundtables, and meet with visiting delegations.

The study group model focuses on high-level dialogue on pressing issues surrounding security, energy, trade questions, and financial questions that affect our key bilateral and multilateral relationships with our partners abroad.

Programming celebrates active discussion among all participants, avoiding lengthy speeches or formal presentations, in order to create the kind of atmosphere that promotes personal connections. We believe that the network of peers created via our programs have acted to renew and expand areas of mutual cooperation.

The congressional study groups are not the only program dedicated to this mission, but they are unique in their year-round outreach to Capitol Hill. Unlike other formats, we provide long-lasting staff support and maintain a well-respected reputation as independent and nonadvocacy.

As a result, our network attracts a large, diverse groups of legislators and policymakers who are committed to international dialogue more broadly and don't have to shy away from our programming lest they be asked to support a particular policy position. What is most important for us is that they join the discussion.

A few highlights from the discussion in the last 12 months include the 31st Annual Congress-Bundestag Seminar hosted by Representative CHARLIE DENT in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District in September 2014; the 32nd Annual Congress-Bundestag Seminar hosted by our German counterparts in Berlin, Dresden, and Leipzig in May 2015; the 2nd Annual Congressional Member Study Group tour to Japan in February 2015; three senior congressional staff study tours to Germany in partnership with the Embassy of Germany; one senior congressional staff study tour to Japan, which visited Tokyo, Fukushima, and Hiroshima; and 21 high-level roundtables here in Washington, D.C.

That is quite a list of very important meetings and study groups and trips. The work of the congressional study groups is complemented by our diplomatic advisory council. Initially focused on European nations, the diplomatic advisory council is now comprised of four dozen ambassadors from six continents who advise and participate in our programming.

Their interest and commitment to multilateral dialogue is a valued addi-

tion to the congressional study groups and provides a valuable outreach beyond our four core study groups.

In the past year, we have also formed the congressional staff advisory council. As former Members of Congress, we know the value of good staff. I always say my rod and my staff, they comforted me and prepared the papers for me in the presence of my constituents.

The staff advisory council formally recognizes the mutually beneficial relationships we have in offices across Capitol Hill. We are very grateful for the staff who participate in and support our programming, as we are for the Members of Congress.

Finally, I want to thank the institutions, foundations, and companies which support our mission. We would like to give particular thanks to Admiral Dennis Blair, Ms. Junko Chano of Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, and Dr. Karen Donfried and Ms. Maia Comeau of the German Marshall Fund for their support as our international funders of the congressional study groups in 2015.

The congressional study groups are also grateful for the support of the international business community here in Washington, D.C., represented by each study group's business advisory council. I am going to briefly mention the companies of the 2015 business advisory council because they are the supporters. We do not get any money from Congress, and so it is those people who care very much about the work of the former Members' international programs.

They are Allianz, All Nippon Airways, Airbus Group, B. Braun Medical, Central Japan Railway Company, Cheniere Energy, Daimler, Deutsche Telekom, DHL, Fresenius, Hitachi, Honda, Lufthansa German Airlines, Marubeni America Corporation, Mitsubishi Corporation, Mitsui, Representative of German Industry and Trade, Sojitz, Toyota Motor North America, United Parcel Service, and Volkswagen of America.

Because of their support, our activities not only help to build vital bilateral relationships between legislatures, but also build bipartisan relationships within our own Congress. Mutual understanding and shared experiences among legislators are crucial to solving pressing problems, whether at home or abroad.

As former Members of Congress, we are proud to bring the important services provided by the congressional study groups to our colleagues still in office, and we are very proud to play an active role in our continued international outreach.

Thank you very much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Connie.

In addition to these substantive and issue-specific international projects, our association also offers its members the opportunity to participate in group

travel where our staff puts together the logistics and participating members assume all the costs. These trips are unique because they combine a tourist experience with more formal meetings that involve current and former government officials in the country we are visiting.

I will now yield to my good friend from North Carolina, Martin Lancaster, to report on his combined delegation.

Mr. LANCASTER. Thank you, Barbara.

For the 2014 fall study group, a contingent of former Members visited the beaches of Normandy, as well as World War I battlefields in northern France and Belgium. The trip was to commemorate those troops who gave their lives during World War I and World War II on the 100th and 70th anniversaries of those horrible wars. The group of former Members and their spouses were privileged to share this moving experience with a group of former members from the Canadian Parliament and their spouses. This was our first and what we hope will be many joint study tours with our friends to the north.

At the opening reception in Paris, the two groups of former legislators first learned how their nations' sacrifices had a direct impact on the lives of Europeans when a friend of a former Member recounted her story of how her family was liberated by the Allies during the war.

After gathering in Paris, the group traveled to Normandy, first to Juno Beach, where the Canadian military landed for the D-Day invasion. It was an incredible experience to explore a German bunker and to walk the beaches where young Canadian soldiers landed 70 years ago. The following day the group spent a day on the Utah and Omaha beaches in the sands where the U.S. military landed, and we were humbled by the staggering number of losses reflected in the cemetery for the American soldiers.

The former Members held a moving wreath-laying ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and spent quite some time walking around the grounds and reflecting on the sacrifices made by so many.

While in the Normandy region, our group was treated to the hospitality of Count Denis de Kergorlay of Canisy at his chateau, which has been in his family's possession since the 11th century. The Count has been a friend and partner of our association for over 10 years, and many of you have had a chance to meet him during our Statesmanship Awards Dinners where, since 2004, he so generously has offered a four-night stay at this magnificent chateau at auction for our fundraising. I certainly want to thank him on behalf of the association for his many years of support and friendship.

Staying at Chateau de Canisy is like stepping back in time. This welcoming and memorable location provided a warm atmosphere for the national borders and the party affiliations within our international group to completely fade away. Each evening during dinner, conversations revealed our shared experiences as legislators and the moving common history of World War I and World War II. One special night, Count de Kergorlay treated us to a musical performance at the chateau thoroughly enjoyed by all who attended and hailed as one of the highlights of the trip.

The final two days of the trip were spent in northern France and Belgium, and the focus pivoted toward World War I. En route, we stopped briefly at the Normandy Museum in Cannes. A brief detour was made to Hallu, a small village in northern France where the recent discovery of the identity of several World War I soldiers in the backyard of a home there revealed they were from the same regiment as the president of the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians, Leo Duguay, who was traveling with us. The group gathered in the home's backyard for a moving wreath-laying ceremony and flag presentation. Afterwards, the group was entertained at the mayor's office in Hallu.

Upon arriving in northern France, the group visited Vimy Ridge and the Canadian National Vimy Ridge Memorial, where we toured the trenches and learned about the pivotal battle that occurred in 1917 when the Canadians lost more soldiers than any battle in their history.

We also spent a few hours visiting the interactive Flanders Field Museum in Ypres, Belgium, which is an incredibly marvelous educational experience. The last event of the trip was participating in a ceremony in the town of Ypres at the Menin Memorial Gate to the Missing, where every night at 8 p.m. for the last 100 years, the road is closed and buglers sound "The Last Post" in memory of those whose graves are unknown. This was followed by a wreath-laying ceremony by a number of organizations, including our own. What a breathtaking way to conclude our travels.

This fall we are planning to travel to Havana, Cuba, for our study tour. There is such interest by our membership in this destination that we will offer a second trip in January. While our Canadian friends cannot join us in October, we would love to partner with them again maybe for the one in January because it was a great pleasure to get to know them and to form these friendships across the border.

Thank you, Barbara.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Martin. The experience you had in Normandy with our friends from Canada certainly was extraordinary, and I have heard all about it. I am sorry I had to miss it, but I am signed up for the Cuba trip.

All of the programs you have heard about clearly require funding, and we have been very successful in growing our fundraising capabilities along with our programming. The most impactful single fundraising mechanism we have created is the Annual Statesmanship Awards Dinner. In March of this year, we hosted our 18th dinner. And just like the preceding 17, it was chaired by our good friend, Lou Frey of Florida. Lou was supported by a number of other co-chairs, including me, former Members Dennis Hertel, Martin Frost, and our association CEO, Pete Weichlein. I would like to invite Lou Frey to report on the highly successful 18th Statesmanship Awards Dinner, and I think you realize that Lou has been chairman of all of the 18 dinners we have had.

Lou Frey.

Mr. FREY. Barbara, thank you for all of the hard work you have put in. We have had many, many people working on this. This is an absolute great way to explain to your kids in terms of doing something. If you are going to do it, make sure you are going to be able to carry it through because this started with an idea of raising maybe \$100,000, if that. We had no other source, we were going basically broke over a period of time. The idea, though, grew on its own. Not because of me. It didn't grow because of me, but it grew because each and every one of you, we are all winners. We are all people who succeeded in the toughest market going, and it has been just a wonderful thing to see how it has grown and how many people are now involved in it.

I just messed up someone's long, hard work in terms of what I said. But, Pete, you never thought I would stick to the script. No, I knew you wouldn't think that.

The last dinner, we had over 500 tickets sold. We raised more money than any of the preceding 17 dinners. It was just incredible. We had wonderful people up on the stage. We have decided to go ahead and present the next dinner under a theme of Salute to Service where we have different people involved in this process like we did the last time, like with Bob Dole's, and that will be the next one.

The highlight of the evening, I think, came when they had the debate or discussion, but the evening is a wonderful way to showcase our association and recognize outstanding public service. That is the whole basis of the dinner. If it makes it, we are in great shape. If it blows it, we are in bad shape. It is pretty black and white. We have a good base. I am looking forward to doing it. I would like to say and put it on the record, this is not Federal money. This is not government money. This is our money that we are using. It is money that is reaching out where nobody can criticize it. It came admittedly from an idea that I had to start with, and it is an idea that has really worked.

I think I ought to give you a little information about next year's dinner. I know we are looking at the clock, but I have more information about next year's dinner that you ought to know about. Again, it will be at the Mellon Auditorium on Constitution Avenue. What a great place to have a meeting, and we are going to do it there again. The theme of the 2016 dinner will be to honor individuals and entities who are actively supporting our men and women in uniform. Most all of us are involved in that. I am involved in Florida with a particular golf tournament that puts money back in through the program by playing golf. Dennis Hertel was here and talked about the tremendous job he is doing. Remember, we are raising this money. It is our money. That is the money that is going in.

The 19th dinner will be a different experience for me because it will be the first one in 19 years where I can actually sit back and relax. It has been my special pleasure to work for the last 18 years to make this annual dinner the great success it has become. I have been able to enjoy a recent event, taking the family to Montana for awhile and spending time with kids whose names I now recognize, and one of them is here today. The dinner is an important event, and obviously we are not going to let the association down. I am not walking away, but 18 years, in all fairness, I have put some time in.

What we are doing in the event, and part of the event, is allowing the association to get the money we need so the association can fill all these great programs. But again, let me say again just in case you haven't heard me, if we don't raise the money with nongovernmental money, we are broke. Okay, just so we are all on the same page. Moving forward, I am going to do what I can while I am still able to do, and we have a great team. We have a great bunch of people working on it. It is nice to think they need me, but they really don't need me. In one sense, we're all part of it, however. We are turning over a machine that is really well oiled and can work well, a machine that knows how to do it, and it knows when to call out to people when something isn't going quite as well as it should. But that never happens with this.

Basically, I just want to also say that I can't tell you what an incredible feeling of involvement, of joy, of sorrow, continuing feeling that my life is better because of each and every one of you who I have been able to work with and we all have been trying to work with. We are doing God's work. We are putting back into what we have in this country. We will never put back 100 percent, but it really is part of it. So when we come to the 19th dinner, we have somebody rooting like heck for you on the sideline. But it is going to take people continuing to be involved.

Thank you, thank you, thank you again.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Lou.

I can't even imagine chairing 18 dinners. But I will say I might not miss Lou Frey's calls when he tells me I haven't done a good enough job.

But Lou, you are not leaving us. In recognition of your 18 years chairing the Statesmanship Awards Dinner, and in recognition of your service on our board of directors for almost two decades, and in recognition of the great contributions you made to the organization as its president, the board of directors and the members of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress wish to bestow upon you our Lifetime Achievement Award.

There is no plaque large enough to hold all of the accolades you deserve based upon your service to this country, first in our military, then in Congress, and currently leading the charge to restore civic education in our Nation's classrooms. Your initiative on behalf of civic education is the foundation upon which we are basing a new association program, the Lou Frey Forum on Civic Engagement, which will translate the tremendous strides you have achieved in Florida into a nationwide effort utilizing our former Members network across the country.

I, therefore, cannot overstate how appreciative the leadership and membership of our organization are for all you have done for us, particularly as chairman of the Statesmanship Awards Dinner for 18 years. This Lifetime Achievement Award is one way we wish to recognize your tremendous service.

Also, we want to tell you there is going to be a Lou Frey Civics Scholarship, which will benefit a student at Winter Park High School, just a couple miles from your home. For the next 3 years, a graduating student who has taken AP civics and is accepted at a community college or university will receive a \$1,000 scholarship in your name to help defray his or her college costs.

Lou, this Lifetime Achievement Award is highly deserved, and the plaque reads as follows:

This Lifetime Achievement Award is bestowed upon the Honorable Lou Frey, Jr., for his exemplary and inspiring service to his country as well as to the United States Association of Former Members of Congress. Lou Frey's public service began in the United States Navy in 1955 and culminated in a political career that spanned over three decades. He represented his Florida constituents with dedication, integrity, and dynamism. His optimism and can-do attitude never diminished in his post-congressional career, and transformed our association during his years as president, board member, and Statesmanship Awards Dinner chairman. For his lifetime of bringing about positive change, his friends and colleagues from both sides of the political aisle salute him.

Thank you, Lou.

Mr. FREY. Some of my family is here, and I want to thank them.

I am especially pleased to have my good friend and former chief of staff, Oscar Juarez, and his wife, Nancy, here representing those who made our congressional office a happy and productive place to work.

It really was. What a great opportunity.

Ms. KENNELLY. I also want to thank the many partners and supporters that made this possible. We are truly lucky to have this assembled group of corporations and foundations that believe in our work.

Also, I would be remiss if I did not thank the other members of our association's executive board: our vice president, Jim Walsh; treasurer, Martin Frost; secretary, Mary Bono; and our past president, Connie Morella. You have all made this association a stronger and better organization than it was ever before. I thank you for your time and energy. To administer all of these programs takes a staff of dedicated and enthusiastic professionals.

I am going to quickly mention them. They are wonderful.

Sean Pavlik is part of the international team and runs our Congressional Study Group on Japan. Unfortunately, we are losing Sean. He is pursuing an MBA at the University of Michigan, and we wish him the best.

Rachel Haas is our CEO's right-hand person, runs the entire office, makes sure that our money is spent appropriately and wisely, and played a huge role in making our Statesmanship Awards Dinner such a beautiful and memorable event.

Andrew Shoenig, our associate director of international programs, started out as an intern with us about 4 years ago and now is the linchpin in our incredibly successful program focusing on Germany, the EU, and all of the Ambassadors who participate in our Diplomatic Advisory Council.

Sharon Witiw, our domestic program director, oversees the smooth operations of projects such as the Congress to Campus program. She also is the one who keeps our membership updated through our Web site, email notifications, and the year-end newsletter.

Sabine Schleidt is our managing director, who spends most of her time on the current Member international programs, but also a lot of hours on implementing the strategic vision and fundraising goals.

And Peter Weichlein.

Peter, you are, to me, the most outstanding chief executive officer.

Peter has been with our association for 16 years. I am old enough for anything, but I am old enough to remember before Peter, and this organization has come so, so far. He keeps his enthusiasm. His staff is not that large. It is amazing that they can have all these programs and all these success. Peter is wonderful to work with.

Like many of you, I have been on many boards. In fact, for the last 9

years, I ran a board and had to report to a board of directors. Peter is exceptional. He keeps the board happy; he keeps the staff happy; and he never stops working. We are, indeed, fortunate to have Peter as our chief executive officer.

Also, every year at our annual meeting, we ask the membership to elect new officers and board members. I therefore will now read the names of the candidates for board members and officers. They are all running unopposed. I ask for a single "yea" or "nay" as I present to you the list of candidates as a slate.

For the association's board of directors:

Dave Camp of Michigan
Jim Coyne of Pennsylvania
Barbara Kennelly of Connecticut
Ken Kramer of Colorado
Ray LaHood of Illinois
Jim Matheson of Utah
Jim Moran of Virginia
Jim Slattery of Kansas
Karen Thurman of Florida.

All in favor of electing these former Members to our board of directors, please say, "aye." Any opposed? Hearing none, the board has been elected.

Next, we will elect our executive committee. As president, I serve 2 years. I have already done 1 and will end my term in 2016. However, the other three elected members of the executive board are up for reelection for a 1-year term.

The candidates are:

Jim Walsh of New York for vice president

Martin Frost of Texas for treasurer
Mary Bono of California for secretary.

All in favor of electing these three former Members of our executive committee, please say, "yea." Any opposed? Hearing no opposition, the slate has been elected by this membership.

The executive board is completed by Connie Morella, who is an unelected officer in her capacity as immediate past president.

Now it is my sad duty to inform the Congress of those former and current Members who have passed away since our last report in July. I ask all of you, including the visitors in the gallery, to rise as I read the names. At the end of the list, we will pay our respect to their memory with a moment of silence. We honor these men and women for their service to our country. They are:

Donald Albosta of Michigan
Bruce Alger of Texas
Herman Badillo of New York
Edward Brooke of Massachusetts
M. Caldwell Butler of Virginia
Thomas Cass Ballenger of North Carolina
Don H. Clausen of California
Phil Crane of Illinois
Lane Evans of Illinois
Bill Frenzel of Minnesota

Robert Griffin of Michigan
George Hansen of Idaho
Herbert Harris of Virginia
Jim Jeffords of Vermont
Robert W. Kastenmeier of Wisconsin
John Krebs of California
Arch A. Moore, Jr., of West Virginia
John M. Murphy of New York
John T. Myers of Indiana
Alan Nunnelee of Mississippi
Peter Peyser of New York
Marge Roukema of New Jersey
Fernando J. St. Germain of Rhode Island

Robert Tiernan of Rhode Island
James A. Traficant of Ohio
Jim Wright of Texas
C.W. Bill Young of Florida

Please observe a moment of silence.

That concludes the 45th report to Congress by the United States Association of Former Members of Congress. We thank the Congress, the Speaker, and the minority leader for giving us the opportunity to return to this revered Chamber and to report on our association's activities. We look forward to another active and productive year.

Thank you.

Mr. WALSH. The Chair again wishes to thank all former Members of the House for their presence and this continuing commitment to this high calling of public service.

Before terminating the proceedings, the Chair would like to invite those former Members who did not respond when the roll was called to give their names to the Reading Clerk for inclusion on the roll.

This concludes our meeting today. We stand adjourned.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:
Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We strive to be one Nation, indivisible, constant in vigilance, and seeking liberty and justice for all. Because we are too weak to find total accomplishment in these things, we place our trust in You. Help us to be a virtuous people, responsible for upholding the sound principles that brought our country into being.

May law and order not only be words echoing in the halls of government and the courts of this land but words describing how all Americans live out their citizenship and ownership of the commonwealth of our great Nation.

Bless the Members of this people's House, who have been entrusted by their constituents to usher an ever

greater future into existence in our land. May they model for all Americans class, openness, and honesty in the work they do.

May everything done here this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

REPEAL MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for bipartisan legislation before the House, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015, to permanently repeal the onerous medical device tax.

This medical device tax has condemned our manufacturers of medical devices in the United States to less competition and being less competitive throughout the world. These manufacturers are now competing with one arm tied behind their backs because of this onerous tax. It has had serious consequences across this great land for companies—job losses, jobs moving overseas, less innovation, and fewer products coming to market.

This morning was another great example of that because I got word that the largest medical manufacturer in my district, Welch Allyn, was just bought out. Those jobs are now in jeopardy, hundreds and hundreds of well-paying jobs. They did this strictly because they couldn't compete at their size because of all of the things that were against them, including the medical device tax.

There is no question that the medical device tax played a role in their having to sell, and there is no question that the medical device tax has now put

hundreds of well-paying jobs in jeopardy in central New York.

I ask my colleagues to join me in repealing this onerous tax.

SONS AND DAUGHTERS IN TOUCH

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Sons and Daughters In Touch, an organization which supports and connects children whose parents were killed in battle, called Gold Star Children.

Sons and Daughters In Touch was founded by my friend Tony Cordero, who lost his father in Vietnam when he was just 2 years old. This past Monday, I laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery and visited the grave of Tony's father, William.

Thousands of families rely on Sons and Daughters In Touch to help them through the process of healing and to honor the memory of their moms and dads. Sons and Daughters In Touch will celebrate its 25th anniversary this Father's Day, with a remembrance at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

We have a shared responsibility to care for the children whose parents have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country. I have introduced a resolution in honor of Sons and Daughters In Touch, recognizing the importance of this organization and the strength of the families it represents.

MARRIAGE

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, with the Supreme Court about to rule on the legal definition of marriage, I rise in support of States like Pennsylvania that have defined marriage as between a man and a woman.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was founded on religious tolerance by William Penn. In Europe, whoever was most popular and powerful in a given place and time tried to force minorities to violate their beliefs, and that was why so many different groups of people came to America and particularly to Pennsylvania, religious minorities such as the Quakers, the Amish, the Mennonites, the Moravians, and others.

Philadelphia has the most synagogues per capita of any city in the United States. Pittsburgh and Harrisburg also have significant Jewish populations. Pennsylvania continues the tradition of respecting each other, even when they disagree.

We hear a lot of talk about diversity these days, but many of those same people who tell us they want diversity are also trying to force their views on

others by law. States that, through the democratic process, have defined marriage should not be overridden by five Federal unelected judges.

FUND THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, globally, the National Institutes of Health works to protect against bioterrorist attacks and disease outbreaks. Domestically, its groundbreaking research provides treatments and cures for devastating diseases, such as Alzheimer's and cancer; and the more than 400,000 jobs provided through the National Institutes of Health bolster our economy.

However, when we account for inflation, funding for the National Institutes of Health peaked in 2003. This budgetary reality has forced the NIH to administer fewer competitive research grants, to admit fewer new patients to its clinical trials, and to ultimately fall behind in scientific discoveries.

Mr. Speaker, America cannot afford to continue to underfund the National Institutes of Health. This is why I started the House NIH Caucus with Representatives ROSA DELAURO and PETER KING. I urge my colleagues to join us as we work together to develop a plan to increase the purchasing power of the National Institutes of Health. The time to act is now.

MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

(Mr. MULLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, men don't usually like to talk about their health, but the well-being of every man in the United States is an important topic.

Mr. Speaker, this week is National Men's Health Week, a time when we have the opportunity to have a serious conversation about our health.

Despite advances in medical technology and research, men continue to live an average of 5 years less than women. Even more, men are less likely than women to seek preventative care. As a co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Men's Health Caucus, I am also committed to teaching our youth the importance of eating right and getting exercise.

As we celebrate this week, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all husbands, brothers, fathers, sons, uncles—and we may even need to have a talk with ourselves—to make sure that we are taking the steps to stay healthy.

IRAN SANCTIONS

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about one of the greatest security threats that our Nation and world face today, the threat of a nuclear Iran.

I greatly respect all of the hard work that the White House, the State Department, and the Department of Energy have put forth in developing the framework for a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action on Iran's nuclear program, and I strongly urge them to continue these negotiations over the coming weeks. It is vitally important that the U.S. employ every means of diplomatic persuasion at their disposal in order to reach a peaceful resolution that prevents Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I would also like to encourage all of the negotiating partners to ensure that a final agreement includes the following: unfettered inspections and a verification system, the disclosure of Iran's past military actions in pursuing a nuclear weapon, gradual sanctions relief that progresses only as Iran meets its obligations under the agreement, long-term nuclear weapons prevention, and the dismantlement of current nuclear infrastructure.

This agreement represents a turning point towards peace in the security of Israel, of the U.S., and of the world. Let's make sure we seize this historic opportunity.

LACROIX: FRANCO AMERICAN OF THE YEAR

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an individual from Manchester, New Hampshire, who has been named Franco American of the Year.

Gerald Cardinal Lacroix was born in Quebec but moved to New Hampshire while still a young boy. Lacroix attended Catholic schools in Manchester, and he continued his studies at Saint Anselm College before receiving degrees in theology from Laval University in Quebec.

In 1975, he entered religious life by joining the Pius X Secular Institute. Ordained a priest in 1988, Father Lacroix served as a missionary in Colombia. He then returned to North America and was elected as director general of the institute.

Consecrated as a bishop in 2009, Lacroix began his service as an auxiliary bishop of the Archdiocese of Quebec. Two years later, he succeeded as archbishop of Quebec and primate of Canada, receiving his pallium from Pope Benedict XVI. Most recently, Pope Francis elevated Lacroix to the College of Cardinals, appointing him a cardinal-priest in Rome.

This is a tremendous accomplishment. On behalf of the Granite State,

we are all proud of Cardinal Lacroix's accomplishments. He is truly worthy of the title "Franco American of the Year."

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, in 2 weeks, at a time when every American has anxiety about the economy and is wondering how he is going to make ends meet, in 2 weeks, the Export-Import Bank, absent action by this Congress, will be allowed to expire and cost this country and our economy hundreds of thousands of jobs.

For the RECORD, let me read a comment by the President:

Exports create and sustain jobs for millions of American workers and contribute to the growth and strength of the United States' economy. The Export-Import Bank contributes in a significant way to our Nation's export sales.

That is a comment from the President, President Ronald Reagan.

This is not an ideological debate between thoughtful participants in the legislative process. There are extreme voices for ideological purposes on the far right that oppose the Export-Import Bank and its work, but a majority of this Congress and a majority of the American people would like to see it reauthorized.

We were sent here to do the people's work, and I think it is long past time for the majority of Congress to have its voice heard and for the majority of the American people to have its interests represented.

We should reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and save hundreds of thousands of American jobs.

REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD

(Mr. GIBBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will consider legislation to repeal another burdensome part of ObamaCare, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, also known as IPAB.

IPAB is tasked with finding ways to curb spending in Medicare, but in reality, it will ration care and cut services. While Medicare continues to eat up more of the budget and is in need of commonsense reforms, relying on a group of unelected bureaucrats is the absolute wrong thing to do.

Any reforms we make to health care should focus on three core ideas. One, strengthen the relationship between the doctor and the patient so they can work together to make healthcare decisions—what we don't need is a bureaucrat from Washington creating a

wall between a patient and his physician; two, to drive down costs, we have to focus on market-oriented reforms, like making coverage portable across State lines and removing the individual and employer mandates; three, finally, we have to incentivize the use of health savings accounts to pay for routine and preventative care.

Repealing the IPAB is an important step in reining in an out-of-control bureaucracy, controlling the ballooning costs of health care, and returning healthcare decisions to patients and their doctors.

□ 1215

JUNE IS ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, the strength of our communities depends on the health and well-being of our families. Unfortunately, millions of families across our Nation, including thousands in Arizona, are impacted by Alzheimer's and dementia.

June is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. It is my hope that we can come together—Republicans and Democrats—and commit to give researchers the resources they need to combat Alzheimer's and other diseases, but also to make sure patients and families have the care and support they need.

Policies like paid leave, caregiver support, workforce training, and long-term care options must be expanded if we truly want to make a difference in the fight against Alzheimer's. These policies are especially important for women and communities of color. Hispanics are 1.5 times as likely to have Alzheimer's as their White counterparts, and African Americans are twice as likely.

Studies have also demonstrated that socioeconomic factors play a role in the disparities of Alzheimer's. This is completely unacceptable. Mr. Speaker, in America your health and the health of your family should not depend on your income or your ZIP Code.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure all American families—including those affected by Alzheimer's and dementia—have access to the support and care they deserve.

PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today in support of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015. What this will do is repeal the device tax.

Now, the device tax, the medical device tax, was a misplaced and disastrous tax that was put in as an ObamaCare mandate. What it will do is tax the medical device industry and those who utilize those components.

This is an industry that doesn't need to be taxed. It employs more than 400,000 workers nationwide and generates \$25 billion in payroll. In my State of Tennessee, there are 10,000 individuals who work in this industry, and the Manhattan Institute estimates that unless we repeal this tax and get it off the books now, we will lose 1,000 of those jobs. That is a 10 percent reduction in a component, a part of the economy that generates good paying jobs, 40 percent higher than other manufacturing jobs.

I ask my colleagues to join me. Let's repeal the medical device tax.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance of continuing the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, otherwise known as DACA. This week marks the third anniversary of this action, DACA, an initiative that brings hundreds of thousands of aspiring, young Americans who were brought to the U.S. as children, through no fault of their own, out of the shadows.

These individuals want to work hard for a chance at the American Dream without fear of being torn away from their families. They want to be productive and contributing members of society. This program has allowed a segment of our population who are already a part of the American fabric to keep using their talents to move our country forward. They are an integral part of our society already.

The bottom line is: we need a long-term fix for our broken immigration system. We need comprehensive immigration reform and an act of Congress, which is the only way we can currently fix this failing system.

Now is the time for bipartisan, humane, permanent, comprehensive immigration reform. It is time we take action.

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE IS A VITAL PROGRAM

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for Medicare Advantage. Fifteen million Americans choose Medicare Advantage. Medicare Advantage has been successful for

its enrollees. I stand with those seniors, including many in my district, who support this program. Medicare Advantage ought to be touted. Its focus on preventative medicine means healthier seniors and less healthcare spending.

Today and tomorrow, the House will consider a number of bills to strengthen Medicare, and in particular Medicare Advantage. I have 180,000 seniors in my district, and I know these pieces of legislation are important to them.

Traditional Medicare and Medicare Advantage are vital programs for our seniors, and I am hopeful we will see a strong bipartisan vote on all these bills. It is time to come together and support successful programs that harness the power of the free market.

DACA HAS GIVEN A LIFELINE TO DREAMERS

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 3-year anniversary of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, also called DACA. Roughly 800,000 DREAMers across the country are able to work and go to school because of DACA. All these aspiring Americans want is to be able to contribute meaningfully to our society, and DACA has given them a lifeline to do that.

I want to mark this occasion by sharing two stories of DREAMers in my district whose lives DACA has transformed. Johana Mejias is a young woman who came to the U.S. from Venezuela. She grew up in Boulder and attended CU, where she was an exceptional student. During high school, she wasn't able to participate in leadership conferences because of difficulty traveling within the U.S., and after college her lack of status initially prevented her from sitting for the medical school exam and participating in medical internships. Luckily DACA provided relief for Johana, and I am proud to say that she is currently in medical school.

Marco Dorado is another young man in my district who attended CU. Marco came to the U.S. when he was 2 years old. DACA has provided a lifeline to Marco, enabling him to attend college and earn a degree in finance. He also served in student government as a tri-executive and president of external affairs.

DACA has been a catalyst for so many aspiring Americans, but only Congress can fix our broken immigration system. I call on us to do so.

JUNE IS NATIONAL GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as National Great Outdoors Month. As an Eagle Scout and a scoutmaster, I know firsthand why we must all work to strengthen conservation programs and other policies to protect our environment.

As a scoutmaster, I teach Boy Scouts the principle of leaving areas better than when we found them. That is why this week I will be introducing the Great Lakes Water Protection Act to ban sewage dumping in the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes Water Protection Act is a commonsense, bipartisan solution to fulfill this pledge with one of our country's greatest natural resources. This resource holds 95 percent of the country's fresh surface water and provides drinking water to over 30 million people.

Mr. Speaker, I care deeply about protecting our environment and ensuring the well-being of our Great Lakes and its ecosystem. Preserving our environment should not be a partisan issue. In fact, it is not a partisan issue.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this important initiative that is already endorsed by the Sierra Club, the National Wildlife Federation, and more, so that we can preserve our outdoors for generations to come.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF LEROY KING

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal sadness that I rise today to pay my final tribute to San Francisco's much beloved LeRoy King, who died on June 12 at the age of 91. A distinguished labor and civil rights African American leader, King's passion for justice and commitment to equality improved the lives of working men and women in San Francisco and throughout the country. From inviting Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to speak in San Francisco in 1967 to his casting my electoral college vote in 2008 for President Barack Obama as the first African American President of the United States, LeRoy King was more than a witness to historic progress; he made history.

During World War II, King served with courage and honor in the Army and dedicated his entire life to preserving and strengthening the great democracy he fought to protect. Even in his 80s, in the tradition of great American leaders, he was arrested for an act of civil disobedience on behalf of hotel and restaurant workers.

King served as northern regional director of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union, ILWU, for more than 30 years. It was important to him to overturn a discriminatory system

that elected only Whites to union office, and he helped create a fully inclusive, integrated workforce. King organized with legendary labor leader Harry Bridges, was a staunch supporter of civil rights champion Cesar Chavez, was a supporter of Reverend Martin Luther King, and in 2009 he was honored with the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Award for promoting peace and advancing social and economic justice by embodying Dr. King's inclusive leadership and nonviolent participation.

Mr. King, whether it was for ending discrimination and promoting affordable housing to community development to jazz, he has been honored. His accomplishments are memorialized in locations throughout San Francisco. My revised remarks, for the RECORD, will go more into that.

It has been a great privilege for me to know such a deeply principled and exemplary human being and to call him friend. I will miss him. My family, my husband and my daughter Christine, my entire family will miss him terribly.

I hope it is a comfort to his daughters, Rebecca King Morrow and Carolyn King Samoa; his son, LeRoy King Jr.; his grandchildren, and great grandchildren that so many San Franciscans, indeed beyond San Francisco, and other people loved and admired LeRoy King, and they share their tremendous loss.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal sadness that I rise to pay final tribute to San Francisco's much beloved LeRoy King, who died on June 12th at the age of 91. A distinguished labor and civil rights leader, King's passion for justice and commitment to equality improved the lives of working women and men in San Francisco and throughout the country.

From inviting Dr. Martin L. King, Jr. to speak in San Francisco in 1967 to his casting my electoral college vote in 2008 for Barack Obama as the first African American President of the United States, LeRoy King was more than a witness to historic progress, he made history.

During World War II, King served with courage and honor in the Army—and dedicated his entire life to preserving and strengthening the great democracy he fought to protect. Even in his 80s, in the tradition of great American leaders, he was arrested for an act of civil disobedience on behalf of hotel and restaurant workers.

King served as Northern Regional Director of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) for more than 30 years. King became a member of ILWU Local 6 in 1946, one of the first African Americans to serve in the local leadership. In the 1950s he led a coalition of members to overturn a discriminatory system that elected only whites to union office and helped create a fully inclusive, integrated workforce. Mr. King sought to create a world where others could live free of discrimination, bigotry and injustice.

King organized with legendary labor leader Harry Bridges and was a staunch supporter of

civil rights champion Cesar Chavez. In 2009 the National Education Association honored King with the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Award for promoting peace and advancing social and economic justice by embodying King's inclusive leadership and nonviolent philosophy.

Mr. King served on the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission for more than 30 years where he fought to preserve the African American and Japanese American heritage of the Fillmore District. His efforts helped lay a foundation for a more inclusive, more welcoming home for all San Franciscans.

King was instrumental in the creation of the St. Francis Square Cooperative Housing development, which opened in 1963 in the Fillmore District and was a national model of racially integrated housing for working families. King and his family lived there from the time it opened until he died.

King's accomplishments are memorialized in locations around San Francisco. The City's 108-year old carousel at Yerba Buena Gardens was renamed the LeRoy King Carousel, an homage to one of the many sites King helped shape while serving on the Redevelopment Commission. A bronze bust of King at the Jazz Heritage Center in San Francisco's Fillmore District honors his work preserving the neighborhood's African American and Japanese American heritage.

It has been a great privilege for me to know such a deeply principled and exemplary human being and to call him my friend.

I hope it is a comfort to his daughters Rebecca King Morrow and Carolyn King Samoa, his son LeRoy King Jr. and his grandchildren and great grandchildren, that so many San Franciscans who loved and admired LeRoy share their tremendous loss.

WE MUST DEFEAT BOKO HARAM

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the threat of Boko Haram and ISIS is real. Remember, they are now one. The threat is great; the threat is imminent.

Just yesterday, a New York City college student was arrested for plotting to attack the city in the name of the Islamic State. Last week, a high school student from suburban Virginia pled guilty to conspiring to provide material support to the Islamic State. Federal authorities said the Virginia case was a chilling reminder of Islamic State's pervasive online presence and ability to woo American youth.

How long before we hear headlines about American teenagers pledging allegiance to Boko Haram? Remember, they are now one. How long before we hear about attacks on American soil made in the name of Boko Haram?

We must do all that we can to defeat Boko Haram and break its unholy alliance with ISIS. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H. Res. 147, as amended, to defeat Boko Haram, and remember to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls, #joinrepwilson.

WE MUST REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK NOW

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank. Since 2009, the Export-Import Bank has created or sustained 1.3 million private sector jobs, many of which are small businesses. In my district alone, from 2007 to 2014, more than 28 companies, 800 jobs, and more than \$123 million in exports were supported by the Export-Import Bank. In addition to creating jobs, the Export-Import Bank is self-sustaining. At the end of this month, the Bank's charter will expire, hampering growth of small business exports.

Foreign companies are supporting their own like never before, Mr. Speaker. In stores across America, that is evident. It is time for our foreign competitors to see more "made in America." Our American companies deserve a fair chance at success. We must reauthorize the Export-Import Bank now.

CELEBRATING THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the third anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, otherwise known as the DACA program. Today is also another day of mourning Congress' failure to pass comprehensive immigration reform. DACA is working; 640,000 DREAMers are already part of our American fabric and are contributing to our economy every day thanks to DACA.

In fact, this summer two DACA beneficiaries are interning in my office—Monica moved from Jalisco, Mexico, when she was 7. Her father was deported, but she worked hard and will graduate this fall from Cal State University Northridge with a degree in political science. DACA allowed her to get her driver's license so she could work to pay for her education.

Stephanie was born in Mexico City, moved to Santa Barbara when she was 10, and is pursuing a degree in political science at the University of California Los Angeles, UCLA, and is researching the economic impact of DACA. Thanks to DACA, every day DREAMers like Monica and Stephanie help drive our Nation's economy forward.

□ 1230

CONGRATULATIONS TO VIRGIN ISLAND GRADUATES

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate not only the stu-

dents, but the community of the Virgin Islands on so many graduates of our high schools these last weeks. While I have not been able to be there in body for some of the graduations, I am there in spirit and in heart.

The Giffit Hill School, AZ Academy, Good Hope Country Day, St. Croix Central High School, St. Croix Educational Complex, St. Croix Seventh-day Adventist School, St. Joseph High School, Antilles School, All Saints Cathedral School, Charlotte Amalie High School, Church of God Academy, Ivanna Eudora Kean High School, Sts. Peter and Paul Cathedral School, Seventh-day Adventist High School, the Virgin Island Montessori School and Peter Gruber International Academy, and the Wesleyan Academy.

Students, you know that you are our future, we love you, that you represent the best of us all as a community, and that we expect great things for you. You are entering a world at war, a nation with challenges and conflicts, and our islands in crisis. But we know that, with your passion for learning, discipline, and an ability take risks, we are in great hands.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS PROGRAM

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the former Members program be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the proceedings have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 160, PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1190, PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 319 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 319

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be

considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 319 provides for a rule to consider two separate bills, which will address two of the most flawed and ill-conceived provisions contained within the so-called Affordable Care Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate on H.R. 160 dealing with the repeal of the medical device tax, equally divided between the majority and minority on the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as the standard motion to recommit provided for the minority.

The rule further provides for 1 hour of debate on H.R. 1190, which would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board. This is equally divided between the majority and minority of both the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Further, the rule provides that the Pitts amendment, which will cover the cost of repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board

by using the Affordable Care Act's prevention fund, a slush fund for the Secretary, which has been used to pay for everything from urban gardening to lobbying for higher cigarette taxes, be added to the bill. As with H.R. 160, the standard motion to recommit is also provided to the minority on H.R. 1190.

It is well documented that many provisions contained within the Affordable Care Act will have negative consequences on patients, both in access to care and in affordability. Yet two provisions have been so universally criticized that, on a large bipartisan nature, their repeal was called for almost immediately after the passage of the Affordable Care Act in 2010. One such provision was the tax contained within the bill on medical device manufacturers.

It seems illogical that within a piece of legislation that was purported to make medical care more accessible to all Americans, the Federal Government would want to tax the very providers of medical innovation that creates the devices to improve the delivery of health care. Nevertheless, the President and then-Majority Leader HARRY REID in the Senate included this provision in order to pay for part of the astronomical price tag that accompanied this massive bill.

This tax is an unfair burden that actually increases the cost that consumers will pay at the doctor's office. The tax has also been cited by dozens of medical device manufacturers who have or are considering moving their operations overseas so that they can continue to innovate without the heavy burden of the Internal Revenue Service stifling their growth. This tax slows the creation of new techniques, slows the creation of new devices, all of which could make the delivery of medicine more efficient. It also puts at risk the jobs associated with the creation of those devices.

And lest anyone think that we are merely talking about the largest and most expensive pieces of technology found within a hospital, such as the MRI or the CAT scanner and surgical equipment, let's be clear that this tax covers every piece of medical equipment from those large machines to the smallest of items, including the syringes that are used to deliver lifesaving antibiotics and vaccines. In my own district, I have met with a number of constituents, including the owner of Retractable Technologies, which makes those very syringes, and have been shown firsthand how this tax is creating a burden on the growth of his company.

The medical device tax has led to the elimination of thousands of good-paying jobs, and repealing it would be the first step in bringing those jobs back to stem the loss of future jobs within an industry that is vital to the country in helping to mitigate the rising cost of

health care due to other burdensome provisions within the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, plain and simple, this is a tax on business, a tax on small business, a tax on consumers, a tax on innovation. To date, 33,000 jobs have been lost in the medical device industry since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, and it is projected that well over 100,000 additional jobs are on the chopping block.

Actually, who could be surprised about this? Excise taxes, which this tax is, are meant to lead to a reduction in the consumption of the good being taxed. We place an excise tax on cigarettes to discourage their use, making it burdensome to afford a smoking habit. Did the President and HARRY REID intend to make it more burdensome to use more efficient medical devices?

Of course, not only is this burdensome tax ill-conceived as a concept, it was ill-conceived in a practical sense as well. Last year, a Treasury inspector general audit found that the Internal Revenue Service issued 217 erroneous penalties to device companies in a 6-month period. We have all seen how poorly much of the Affordable Care Act was written. One need only to look at the most recent Supreme Court cases for that determination. But how difficult is it to write a clear-cut tax provision? Apparently, for HARRY REID, it is quite difficult.

H.R. 160 has bipartisan and bicameral support and currently has 282 cosponsors. In fact, 18 Democrats in this body sent a letter to Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI calling for the timely passage of this bill. Republican leadership in the House heard their requests and the calls from many other Members of this body and is moving this bill in a responsible way to put Americans back to work and lower the cost of health care for all.

The second bill contained in today's rule, H.R. 1190, repeals one of the most poorly thought-out ideas ever to come out of Congress, and that is really quite impressive considering the many disquieting ideas that have originated in the Pelosi-led House of Representatives. The Independent Payment Advisory Board is an unelected, unaccountable board dedicated to set up within the Affordable Care Act for the sole purpose to cut Medicare payments to providers if Medicare targets within the bill are not met.

Let's be very clear about this. President Obama, Majority Leader HARRY REID, Speaker NANCY PELOSI created a board of unelected officials in order to ration Medicare, to cut Medicare, and every Democrat who supported the Affordable Care Act voted in favor of this Board.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board is a regulatory board composed

of 15 health professionals appointed by the President. There is no requirement that any of these professionals have ever actually practiced medicine a day in their lives, and we are well aware that this President prefers academics to those who have real-world experience.

The Board's stated responsibility is to develop proposals to reduce the growth of Medicare spending. What does that mean? It means seniors will face cuts to their health care with no recourse if they don't agree with what the Board proposes.

Former Office of Management and Budget Director Peter Orszag, the President's top budget adviser, called the Independent Payment Advisory Board the single biggest yielding of power to an independent entity since the creation of the Federal Reserve. Think about that. Let that sink in. The Independent Payment Advisory Board has been given the authority to do for Medicare policy what the Fed is able to do with monetary policy. That should be terrifying to every American.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board is set to recommend cuts, amounting to one-half of 1 percent of Medicare spending, and then the number rises until it hits 1½ percent. It makes these cuts by reducing the rates that Medicare pays for medical procedures and drugs, which means the Independent Payment Advisory Board can only make cuts to providers' reimbursements. Instead of being allowed to make real lasting structural reforms that could actually help the solvency of Medicare, this Board's approach to saving money is one of the clumsiest, most bureaucratic ways of achieving this goal.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board has massive structural and constitutional defects in its design. If Congress fails to act on the Board's recommendations, they automatically go into effect. And even if the Congress did pass a bill countering the Board's cuts to Medicare, the President can simply veto the bill. And the judiciary—and how this passes constitutional muster, I seriously question—specifically the judiciary, is forbidden to review the Independent Payment Advisory Board's recommendations.

For these and many other reasons, over 500 organizations have urged Congress to get rid of this thing—repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board—including the American Medical Association, the American College of Surgeons, and the Veterans Health Council.

Repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board would protect seniors' access to Medicare, encourage us to do real Medicare reforms, and put an end to the constitutionally questionable Board of unelected bureaucrats—right now under the President's healthcare law—the very decisions that they are

empowered to make changes to Medicare.

All Americans will benefit from the repeal of this draconian idea. It is a clumsy way that then-majority Democrats were able to buck their responsibility at addressing cost concerns over entitlements. Government by bureaucrats instead of government by the people, government by bureaucrats instead of government by representatives, it is no way to run this country. And yet that is how then-Majority Leader HARRY REID and then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI preferred that we operate.

□ 1245

The Independent Payment Advisory Board's design undermines seniors' access to Medicare and the health care that they need and have paid for throughout their working lives.

This Board should have been repealed years ago, but so long as HARRY REID was majority leader in the Senate, the Independent Payment Advisory Board continued to live. Last year's election created a sea change over in the other body, changed the majority leader in the Senate, and now, the American people may finally see their government begin to work for them yet once again.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to the rule which, once again, deprives Members of this body the opportunity to debate amendments that will improve the underlying legislation.

I rise in opposition to this body's misguided priorities. Again, the American people are seeing Congress rehash the same tired debates. How many references were there to people that were Speakers of this House, that were Senate majority leaders, to healthcare reform, which has already withstood several elections and is the law of the land?

What we have before us today are two more bills that repeal part of the Affordable Care Act. We have now considered over 60 bills to repeal, defund, or dismantle the Affordable Care Act, rather than improve and build upon it.

With all the work that remains to be done, we could be debating legislation to renew our expiring highway trust fund and repair our crumbling roads and bridges.

We could take up legislation to renew the charter of the Import-Export Bank, and we will be offering that soon on the previous question.

We could consider a bill to repair our broken immigration system or help the millions of Americans who are living below the poverty line, even though they work two jobs and it is increas-

ingly hard to support their families; or we could take on the critical matter of climate change and confront the fact that it has contributed to one of the worst droughts in our Nation's history.

But, oh, no, it is more important to have the 61st and 62nd repeal of parts of the Affordable Care Act, rather than move forward with a future-oriented agenda for the American people.

Now, let's get into some of the specifics of the underlying legislation. The most recent estimate by the Congressional Budget Office found that a total of 27 million people will gain access to healthcare coverage through the Affordable Care Act over the next 10 years, who otherwise would not have had coverage.

That is to say nothing of the additional millions of Americans who benefit from the Affordable Care Act by having coverage for preexisting conditions for the first time in their lives, are no longer subject to lifetime caps that could leave them bankrupt if they get a serious illness, or people that are able to stay as young adults up to age 26 on their parents' plan.

Constituents from all areas of my district have shared stories of their success using our State's health exchange, Connect for Health Colorado, and described how the Affordable Care Act's coverage provided by the ACA has improved their lives.

I have heard from constituents like Morgan, from Nederland, Colorado, who used the exchange to enroll in the exact same plan she had before the Affordable Care Act, but her premiums decreased, and the services that were covered expanded—more value for her money.

Or Donna, who recently moved to Boulder, Colorado—Donna is an outdoor enthusiast, like so many in my district, but was afraid to make her way to the mountains until she had secured healthcare coverage.

Through Connect for Health Colorado and the premium tax credits she has access to under the Affordable Care Act, she is now enrolled in a comprehensive medical and dental plan that ensures she won't become bankrupt if she sustains an injury.

These are far from isolated cases. In my home State of Colorado, 16.5 percent of people lacked health insurance before ACA. According to a recent study of the Kaiser Family Foundation, that figure has dropped to 9 percent by last year.

The success is not limited to my State. According to a Gallup poll released in April, the percentage of Americans lacking health care nationwide has dropped by more than a third since the marketplace opened at the end of 2013, from 18 percent to under 12 percent.

The Affordable Care Act is working; instead of continuing in that vein, once again, the Republican Congress is seeking to repeal various parts of that law,

rather than move forward and improve it.

The first of today's two bills, the so-called Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, doesn't protect anyone's access to anything. The Advisory Board it seeks to repeal, which has been vilified and completely mischaracterized in the past, is actually something far more mundane and important to the processes of Medicare.

It is a board of advisers who make nonbinding recommendations to Congress about how we can reduce healthcare costs and strengthen Medicare solvency over the long term, without sacrificing the quality of care, something that all of us, as cost-conscious Members of Congress, should be interested in seeing.

Now, we can debate all day the exact composition of the Board or which committees in Congress should have jurisdiction over its recommendations. Those are valid considerations—or, instead, we can discuss repealing the Board in its entirety, which is what we are talking about here today. This Advisory Board will provide critical advice to help Congress reduce the cost of providing health care.

Now, interestingly enough, this amendment pays for the \$7 billion cost of eliminating this Board by slashing nearly \$9 billion in funding from the prevention and public health fund. This fund is used for vital preventative health programs, like childhood vaccines, helping people quit smoking, stroke prevention, and maternal wellness. The cornerstone of health savings is preventative medicine.

In fact, I cosponsor a bill with my friend, Mr. BURGESS, who is managing the bill on the other side, that would allow the Congressional Budget Office to account for the long-term savings of preventative health initiatives when it scores legislation.

If Mr. BURGESS' own bill were to become law, and I hope it does, it would show that the so-called way that we are paying for this repeal is illusory. Eliminating the preventative health-care program actually can cost money in the long run. Under the congressional scoring model that we both support, it would likely not even register as a cost saving, or if it did, it would be much less than the \$9 billion.

The second bill being considered, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, aims to do something that many of us on both sides support, repealing the Affordable Care Act's excise tax on medical devices. The medical device tax is one of the measures originally included by the Senate in the Affordable Care Act to fund the badly needed consumer protections and benefits that form the core of the bill.

Now, again, it is easy to support tax cuts. This body has put before us many, tax cut after tax cut after tax cut that are unfunded. The whole discussion

about how you can afford to cut taxes is how you pay for it. What government waste do you cut? What other taxes or income do you use to offset the cost of these tax cuts?

Of course, we don't want to slow the pace of progress with unnecessary costs and burdens, and we want to make sure that medical device manufacturers have every incentive to increase their research and development and not pass these costs along to consumers.

Unfortunately, even though I, along with ALMA ADAMS from North Carolina and MATT CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania, offered an amendment in the Rules Committee that would have paid for repealing the medical device tax using a commonsense approach that wouldn't suppress economic growth, our amendment was not allowed to even be discussed here on the floor of the House.

Not only would our amendment to pay for the medical device repeal have avoided adding nearly \$30 billion to our deficit, as this bill would do before us today, but it also would have helped bring balance to our Nation's energy sector by stopping the government from choosing winners and losers in energy and lessen our dependence on fossil fuels.

Unfortunately, under this rule, we don't get a vote or debate on the floor. We are left with two bad choices. We can, of course, leave in place a tax that many of us want to remove; or we can add \$25 billion to our deficit. Neither of those are the right answers for the American people or for medical device companies or the consumers who use medical device products.

The American people deserve better. If we defeat this rule, an open process will allow Republicans and Democrats to offer real, constructive, better ideas of how to improve upon these two pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a member of our Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, in Indiana, the medical device industry employs over 20,000 Hoosiers in over 300 medical device companies. These are good-paying jobs that pay 56 percent more than the average wage.

As Indiana Governor Mike Pence recently put it in a letter to our delegation: "This industry is vital to Indiana's economy and the health and well-being of people across the Nation and the world."

Unfortunately, this critical industry is living under the shadow of a job-killing tax put in place to pay for the Affordable Care Act. In fact, companies in Indiana have already halted research projects and plans for expansion.

The medical device tax is crippling innovation of lifesaving products like

the ones I used as a surgeon, and it is putting patients and jobs at risk. This is about patients, at the end of the day, and their access to health care.

We have had broad bipartisan support for repeal of the medical device tax in both Chambers before. It is time to put an end to this onerous tax once and for all.

I also support an IPAB repeal. As a physician, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for the consideration of legislation that would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado, as well as Leader PELOSI and Whip HOYER, for their unyielding support for thousands of American jobs and businesses.

I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question in order to force a vote on legislation sponsored by myself, Mr. HECK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HOYER, and 186 other Democrats that will renew and reform the Export-Import Bank's charter for the long term.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has just 5 days to act before the Export-Import Bank shuts down. We are in the eleventh hour, and despite a recent bipartisan vote in the Senate and broad support across the aisle in this House, we are still fighting to keep this engine of job creation and economic growth alive.

It is interesting to note that, contrary to most of the disagreements that take place in this Chamber, in the debate over the Export-Import Bank, the facts remain undisputed.

Over the past 5 years, it is estimated that the Bank has created or sustained more than 1.3 million private sector jobs, 164,000 in the past year alone. In 2014, the Bank returned more than \$674 million back to the American taxpayers, an amount totaling \$6.9 billion over the past two decades.

Democrats, Republicans, business, and labor all understand the important role that the Export-Import Bank plays in our economy. Presidents, ranging from Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush to Bill Clinton, have been outspoken in their support for the Bank's ability to create and sustain American jobs and keep our businesses competitive.

Ex-Im levels the playing field with countries like China, Russia, and countless others, all of which have their own version of the Bank supporting American competitors.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are coming to the floor today to implore our numerous Republican colleagues who support the Export-Import Bank, starting

with Speaker BOEHNER, to stand up for jobs, businesses, and American competitiveness by standing up to the extremists who want to close the Bank.

Let's send a strong message to America's manufacturers, businesses, and workers, that we are committed to preserving an institution that, for decades, has helped this Nation create jobs and grow the economy.

I would urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a valued member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act. Last August, I held two 21st Century Cures roundtables in my district in the Tampa Bay area.

The second roundtable featured healthcare providers. One participant was Lisa Novorska, CFO of Rochester Electro-Medical. Rochester Electro-Medical is a medical device manufacturer in my district, and it is a small business.

The medical device tax, originally included in the President's healthcare law, is devastating to these small businesses. Eighty percent of the device manufacturers in Florida have less than 25 employees. In total, Florida has 662 device manufacturers, and one-third of them are in the Tampa Bay area, as I said, in the area that I represent in the Congress.

This bill has over 280 bipartisan cosponsors. Voting for this rule and bill should be easy, despite the administration's veto threat. Let's support device manufacturers and give them the flexibility to innovate and help our constituents.

□ 1300

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we might, indeed, get to H.R. 1031, the Promoting U.S. Jobs through Exports Act of 2015.

H.R. 1031—which, as it has been indicated, reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank—is a deficit-cutting, job-creating machine. And why is it important that we get to it? Because, indeed, the character of the Bank expires in 5 legislative days.

Last week, I was at home and had occasion to be channel surfing, and I came across, inarguably, one of the top 10 movies in all of the history of American cinema, "Blazing Saddles." And there is this wonderful scene where the actor, Cleavon Little, rides into town,

and he is not met very favorably by the townsfolks. They all pull their guns on him. And in response, he pulls his revolver, and he puts it to his head, and he says, Stop, stop, or I will shoot myself.

Well, of course, what he was doing, given the situation, was completely turning logic on its ear and confusing everybody in his presence. And that is how I feel about this.

Those who want to end the Export-Import Bank purport to be in favor of cutting the deficit. But the Export-Import Bank has reduced the Federal deficit by \$6 billion over the last 20 years. Those who want to terminate the Export-Import Bank say they are in favor of faster economic growth. But the Export-Import Bank supported 164,000 jobs just last year alone in virtually every congressional district in this great land.

Make no mistake, if the Bank expires, we will lose jobs; and we will lose jobs immediately here and there and everywhere.

And stop and think about that. What is more important than a job? It is the means by which we provide for ourselves. We are self-sufficient.

Is anyone suggesting we have too many jobs? Is anybody suggesting that work isn't worthwhile?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I will never forget when former Vice President Mondale once said, You want to know how important work is in this society? Stop, ask yourself what is the first thing you ask somebody when you meet them. "What do you do?"

Work is important. Jobs are important. The Export-Import Bank creates jobs. Vote "no" on the previous question. Reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. We have 5 legislative days to go.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee, who handles our rules and legislation so effectively on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bills. When the Democrat-controlled Congress rammed the so-called Affordable Care Act through this Chamber, I joined my Republican colleagues in expressing our grave concerns over the effects of the law's tax increases. Specifically, we warned that the excise tax on medical devices would hinder innovation as well as restrict growth and job creation in an industry that has improved the quality of life for millions around the world.

And just as we cautioned, this tax on devices that restore mobility, keep hearts in rhythm, and help doctors di-

agnose life-threatening diseases earlier than ever before has cost us local jobs and reduced research capabilities.

Cook Medical is a privately owned company, with facilities around the world. It employs about 500 people in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, where the company focuses on endoscopic and urological medicine.

Since the medical device tax was levied in 2013, Cook Medical has paid roughly \$13 million annually. As a result, the company has pulled back on capital improvements as well as research and development investments. They have also considered moving manufacturing capacity outside the United States.

Scott Sewell, vice president of technology acquisition and development for the company's Winston-Salem office, recently told the Triad Business Journal that if the medical tax device is repealed, they would look at expanding operations in North Carolina with a new plant in Winston-Salem.

I would like to submit for the RECORD this May 1 article from the Triad Business Journal.

[From Triad Business Journal, May 1, 2015]
DEVICE TAX THWARTS EXPANSION IN WINSTON-SALEM

(By Owen Covington)

The push to repeal an Affordable Care Act tax on the sale of medical devices appears to be gaining steam with a prominent device manufacturer with a strong Triad presence recently lobbying Congress for action.

In written testimony to a Senate committee this month, Cook Medical Board Chairman Stephen Ferguson said the company has had to pull back on capital improvements and R&D investments because of the tax. Cook is also considering moving manufacturing capacity outside the country.

"Make no mistake about it: We want to develop and manufacture our devices in the U.S., but this tax is preventing this growth in this country," Ferguson wrote.

I caught up with Scott Sewell, vice president of technology acquisition and development at Cook Medical's Winston-Salem operation, where the focus is on endoscopy and urological medicine.

Just for further explanation, the tax is a 2.3 percent levy on the sale of many medical devices that's expected to generate \$29 billion during its first 10 years.

Proponents have argued that increased health insurance coverage will mean more sales for these companies, which also have the option of passing that increase along to consumers rather than absorbing it themselves.

Sewell said that since the tax was levied in 2013, Cook Medical has paid roughly \$13 million annually. That accounts for only a portion of Cook's overall sales, since it isn't paid on the roughly 60 percent of Cook's products that are sold abroad.

Both Sewell and Ferguson said that uptick in sales hasn't occurred, and the company has generally been unable to pass along the cost of the tax to consumers, which are typically very cost-conscious hospitals. That's meant pulling back on plans to expand in Winston-Salem and elsewhere, Sewell said.

"I think if the device tax were repealed, in the next couple of years, we would probably be looking at a new plant in Winston-Salem," he said.

Cook's arguments are grabbing the attention of more in Congress. That said, advocates of the tax say claims like those of Cook are overblown.

"A manufacturer can't avoid the tax by shifting production abroad, doesn't pay the tax for devices it produces here but sells abroad, and suffers no competitive disadvantage from foreign producers, who also have to pay the tax for devices that they sell here," wrote Chad Stone, chief economist of the left-leaning Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, in U.S. News & World Report.

Ms. FOXX. It is clear that ObamaCare's medical device tax has directly and negatively impacted the people who live in North Carolina's Fifth District, as well as people around the country and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this tax must be repealed, and its harmful effects undone.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the previous question in order to make in order a vote to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

For Americans, the Export-Import Bank means jobs. It means economic growth. Failing to reauthorize Ex-Im threatens American jobs, threatens American businesses, threatens our economy.

Supporting Ex-Im used to be a bipartisan issue. Just read a little history: Dwight Eisenhower supported it. Ronald Reagan supported it. If you want a more recent example, George W. Bush supported it.

This never has been a partisan issue until just recently, where even the House leadership—the Speaker, I think, supports it—has now been captured by a small group of very far right-leaning ideologues to whom, apparently, much is owed because we can't get a floor vote on a piece of legislation supported by a majority of the House of Representatives that helps American business and helps American workers. What is wrong with this picture? This makes no sense whatsoever.

The Export-Import Bank is an essential part of a growing economy, and particularly in supporting American businesses to grow their exports and put Americans to work.

In my home State alone, 228 companies, \$11 billion in export value, are at risk if we don't reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, and we have 5 days to do it. But we could do it in 5 minutes if we defeat the previous question, bring to the floor of the House legislation, H.R. 1031, that would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank through 2022.

Let's let the will of the American people and, frankly, the will of a majority of the United States Congress, be manifest in our policy. A majority of Congress supports the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. Bring a vote to the floor of the House. Let's

put America to work, support American business, support American workers, and support the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, previously it was brought up about the prevention fund, which was being used as one of the off-sets for the repeal of the Independent Payment Advisory Board. And I just wanted to give the Congress a sense of some of the activities that have been funded under the Secretary's so-called prevention fund.

How about pickle ball? I didn't even know what that was. I had to Google it after that came to light in our committee. Massage therapy, kickboxing, kayaking, and Zumba—a separate grant was given for that. A grant for signage for bike lanes. A grant to promote free pet neutering. A grant for urban gardening. A grant to lobby for a soda tax in New York, block construction of job-creating fast food small businesses, and another grant to boost bike clubs.

These are the types of activities that are being funded in the prevention fund, not actual activities that would result in the prevention of disease. This is a good use of these dollars, and I urge adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), the ranking member on the Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the clock is ticking on the global competitiveness of U.S. workers, and the GOP has yet—has yet—has yet to put to a vote the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

The Export-Import Bank levels the playing field globally for U.S. businesses to compete with subsidized foreign competitors. Our U.S. exporters and workers will pay the price if this majority, this Republican Congress fails to reauthorize the Bank. My Milwaukee exporters will pay the price if this Republican Congress fails to reauthorize the Bank.

Yes, deals will still be made with the other 60 or so credit agencies around the world, but they will be done without U.S.-made goods and services.

You know, it is so ironic that we have all kinds of deals being cut to get partnership trade agreements with these 12 different Pacific countries so we could export jobs to other places in the world. But there are no deals being made so that we can export U.S.-made goods and services to other parts of the world. That is probably why we have such a huge trade deficit.

With the leadership of Ranking Member WATERS, Representatives HECK of Washington, HOYER, and I, we have introduced H.R. 1031, the Promoting U.S. Jobs Through Exports Act. It makes

targeted and prudent reforms to the Bank that enhance its mission, including promoting additional small business participation, greater transparency, and improved governance.

Defeat the previous question. Bring the Export-Import Bank deal to the floor. The American people deserve an opportunity to work.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

First, with regard to the comments of the gentleman from Texas on the preventative health fund, I want to give a few examples of the important ways that fund helps reduce health care costs. For instance, expenditures on hospitals promoting breast-feeding, on breast and cervical cancer early awareness and diagnosis.

So, I mean, again, the fund community initiative that support breast-feeding mothers has a demonstrable effect in reducing the incidence of disease in infants and promotes better health.

With regard to early identification: breast cancer screenings, outreach through State, territorial, and tribal health organizations, chronic disease self-management—again, making sure that people have better compliance with their regime that can reduce health care costs.

So there are a lot of items in there that I am confident, if our bill were to pass—the bill that I cosponsor with the gentleman from Texas—clearly that \$9 billion in savings is illusory. Now whether that will come back as a net-positive program or not, under the new CBO scoring, we will just need to pass our bill to see. But it wouldn't be \$9 billion. Again, maybe it would be \$3 billion in savings. Maybe it would be \$1 billion. Again, maybe it would be a negative amount because these preventative expenditures could very well save more than they cost because if you can get an early diagnosis around breast and cervical cancer, not only does it lead to a better outcome for the patient but saves a lot more money, as does making sure that people are able to successfully manage their chronic diseases and not wind up in emergency rooms at a very high cost.

We have before us—no bones about it—two more partial repeals of the Affordable Care Act.

So far this year, the Republicans have brought to the floor \$586 billion in unpaid-for tax extenders and special interest tax expenditures. Those bills have blown through the sequestration caps, all while continuing to cut funding for education programs, violence

prevention initiatives, and medical research.

This bill adds another \$25 billion to that \$586 billion. Again, everybody likes to have their cake and eat it too. But unfortunately budgets have to work, and numbers have to add up.

□ 1315

That is why I was particularly disappointed that the Rules Committee didn't allow my amendment that would have simply paid for the medical device tax repeal to come forward. Instead, the Republicans are insisting on adding \$25 billion on top of the \$586 billion in expenditures that they are blowing through the deficit with and increasing the size of the deficit by half a trillion dollars.

This bill also provides for consideration of a bill that cuts \$9 billion from the preventative health initiatives to repeal an advisory board. Again, I would argue that we won't know if that is truly paid for or not until our other bill passes, and I hope that we can bring forward the bill I share with Mr. BURGESS to allow for the proper scoring of that.

So I am ready to say that I don't know if it is paid for or not. I suspect it is not. I suspect that it might cost us more money in the long run to repeal the important expenditures around breast and cervical cancer early diagnosis and chronic disease self-management, but the only way to know that for sure would be to change the way that the CBO scores the bills to allow for preventative measures to show the savings that are reasonably estimated by experts absent any particular bias.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a lot of interest in reforming the Advisory Board, and I think that is a valid conversation to have: What should its priorities be? What should the reporting process be? What should the membership be composed of? But repealing it and adding costs and preventing simple, cost-saving recommendations from even coming to Congress, how does that make sense? And how does that further the goal of providing high-quality health care to the American people at the lowest cost possible?

We also shouldn't be taking funding away for programs that help Americans prevent injuries or illness in order to pay for the repeal of an advisory board that makes nonbinding recommendations to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for this rule is yet another vote for misplaced priorities, for increasing the Federal deficit, and for passing policies that are at odds with the needs of the American people and constitute the 62nd time that this body has chosen to repeal part of the Affordable Care Act rather than move forward with a future-oriented agenda to help the American people. This is a vote to add billions of dollars to our deficit at the expense of the

basic healthcare needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this body can do better. If we defeat this rule, we might have an opportunity to do something about the deficit, to do something about it by going back and getting a rule that if this body chooses to proceed with repealing the medical device tax allows a commonsense way for that to be paid for. If we repeal this rule, we can go back and look at improving the advisory panel rather than repealing it in its entirety, making sure that, if there are costs associated with that, that they are paid for in a real way rather than a way that is illusory.

Mr. Speaker, if we repeal this rule, we can go back and bring forward Mr. BURGESS' and my bill that would allow proper scoring around preventative health care. That would allow a proper discussion on whether this way of paying for a repeal of the advisory panel is even a real way of paying for anything or not.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot about the Affordable Care Act here on the floor of this House, and one of the reasons we have talked a lot about it is because, very famously, it was passed before we read it. We had to pass it to find out what was in it. Let me just talk about a couple of those things because I think they are germane to our discussion today.

This is June 17. Around the country, many Members' offices are being contacted by groups asking why Congress itself isn't following the law that Congress passed. I am referring specifically to section 1312(d) in the bill. It says:

Members of Congress in the exchange requirement notwithstanding any other provision in law, after the effective date of this subtitle, the only health plans that the Federal Government may make available to Members of Congress shall be health plans that are, number one, created under this act, or two, offered through an exchange established into this act. The term "Member of Congress" means any Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate.

The fact of the matter is most people don't follow the law. I did, Mr. Speaker, and I think it was important to follow the law. I bought my health care in the individual market, in healthcare.gov, started October 1 of 2013. You may remember that night.

That was the night the fiscal year ended and the famous government shutdown began. I began early that morning in trying to sign up for the Affordable Care Act because I knew, as a Member of Congress, we were supposed to sign up through healthcare.gov, an unsubsidized policy in the individual market. So I performed as indicated.

It took 3½ months for the check to clear the bank. It was one of the most uncomfortable, god-awful experiences I have ever been through in my life. What is the final result? I have a bronze plan in the individual market in healthcare.gov, the Federal fallback provision in the State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, that plan cost \$560 a month the first year that I was enrolled, and then it went up 24 percent the next year. It is now up to \$700 a month for me for an individual. These are after-tax dollars. Do you know the worst part, Mr. Speaker? The worst part is that the deductible is \$6,000.

Now, some people have asked me, they say: Well, gee, are you worried about the fact that the networks are so narrow on these plans that you can't see your doctor?

I honestly don't know. I don't know if my doctor is included on the plan. I haven't looked because I ain't going. At a \$6,000 deductible, someone will have to drag me in the backdoor by the time I am dying.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is we have created a whole subset of individuals in this country who are functionally uninsured because the cost of their care is so high. Had Members of Congress followed the law, they would be as aware of that as our constituents are.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of two bills that begin to right some of the many wrongs included in the Affordable Care Act: H.R. 160, repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board charged with cutting Medicare; and H.R. 1190, repealing the medical device tax. These are two steps that the House can take this week to help lower the rising costs of health care created under the President's healthcare law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule before us and the passage of the two important pieces of legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 319 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority

member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ AND SYRIA

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 16, 2015, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 55) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on or after August 7, 2014, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and Syria, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 16, 2015, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 55

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ AND SYRIA.

Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress directs the President to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on or after August 7, 2014, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and Syria—

(1) by no later than the end of the period of 30 days beginning on the day on which this concurrent resolution is adopted; or

(2) if the President determines that it is not safe to remove such United States Armed Forces before the end of that period, by no later than December 31, 2015, or such earlier date as the President determines that the Armed Forces can safely be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 2 hours equally divided among and controlled by Representative ROYCE of California, Representative ENGEL of New York, and Representative MCGOVERN of Massachusetts or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) each will control 40 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to submit statements or extraneous materials for the RECORD on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 55. But while I am opposed to this resolution, I do want to commend its author, Mr. MCGOVERN, for his constant and principled attention to the issue of U.S. military engagement in Iraq and Syria and the role of Congress in making this decision. These are some of the most important and challenging issues that we face and that we struggle with as an institution.

I know the gentleman from Massachusetts is frustrated. I have listened to him on the floor of the House. In many ways, I share his frustrations. ISIS is making too many gains. Critical cities have fallen. But this resolution, I believe, would take us in the opposite direction of where U.S. policy should be.

If the United States were to remove all of our forces from the theater, as this resolution calls for, ISIS would surely grow stronger. ISIS would surely accelerate on a process of decimating all in its path, placing women under brutal oppression and, I have no doubt, further strengthening their position and further threatening our European allies and even the U.S. homeland. More battlefield victories would support ISIS propaganda, which would support its recruitment, which would make it more deadly by the day.

Mr. Speaker, no one is eager for this commitment, but ISIS is on the march; and this radical jihadist group is taking more territory, more weapons, and more resources, threatening the government in Baghdad and, indeed,

threatening to destabilize this entire critical region.

Now, H. Con. Res. 55 calls for the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from the fight against ISIS, halting all U.S. strikes against the terrorist group in Iraq and Syria. It would also leave ISIS unchecked—not only unchecked by U.S. airpower, but it would allow this brutal terrorist group, as I say, to gain strength, to destabilize the critical region, and to create a safe haven from which ISIS can plot attacks against the United States.

□ 1330

H. Con. Res. 55 has nothing to do with authorizing the use of military force against ISIS but would unilaterally withdraw U.S. forces from the fight.

Last year, debating another Iraq measure offered by Mr. MCGOVERN, I said: “Never has a terrorist organization itself controlled such a large, resource-rich safe haven as ISIS does today. Never has a terrorist organization possessed the heavy weaponry, the cash, the personnel that ISIS does today, which includes thousands of Western passport holders.”

Well, unfortunately, it is worse today. Just weeks ago, Ramadi, a city only 75 miles from Iraq’s capital, was overrun by ISIS and by its suicide bombers who led that first wave.

ISIS’s goals are very clear: wreck every person opposing it, establish a caliphate, and then fight to expand it. ISIS has unleashed a campaign of brutal and depraved violence, not only against Shia Muslims and fellow Sunnis who do not share their radical beliefs, but against vulnerable religious and ethnic minorities. As one witness testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee the other day: “We cherish ethnic and religious diversity. ISIS hates it.” And they hate in some of the most brutal ways possible.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans may not realize that Iraq and Syria are home to dozens of ethnic and religious minorities, with ancient cultures with very deep roots. These communities—Assyrian and Chaldean Christians, Yazidis, Alawites, and many others—are under mortal threat in their ancestral homelands.

The mass execution of men, the enslavement of women and young girls as concubines, and the destruction of religious sites is part of the ISIS effort to destroy these communities. Their plan is to make it as if those societies never existed, those religions in that area never existed. In fact, ISIS maintains a special battalion—they call it the “demolition battalion”—charged with obliterating religious and historic sites and artifacts that it considers heretical.

And ISIS has used the “virtual caliphate” on the Internet to recruit foreign fighters at an unprecedented rate.

Some 20,000 of their fighters are, in fact, from offshore, are foreign fighters drawn to the area from some 90 countries. Those are the numbers that now are swelling its ranks. According to intelligence estimates, this includes at least 150 Americans that we know of.

Yet over the last 10 or so months, the administration has put forth a reluctant and half-hearted and ineffective effort to assist our partners there on the ground. I think we all recognize that this is up to the Iraqi Government to fight to win this. We understand that. They are in the lead. But they desperately need help. And I am not prepared to say that we shouldn’t be providing any military support to the Kurds strung along a 180-mile, or several hundred mile, front, with 180,000 soldiers. Thirty percent of those Kurdish soldiers are female. And those young women are down there with small arms trying to hold off ISIS fighters along that line. I am not prepared to say that we should not be providing any military support for those Kurds or for the Iraqi forces and any air support whatsoever. That is what this resolution does.

It didn’t have to be this dire. Well over a year ago, when ISIS was building its force in the desert in Syria, it wasn’t bombed and devastated when it could have been. It should have been. Many called for an effort at that point to have an air campaign by the U.S. and our partners to pummel ISIS as it moved across the desert in these long columns and begin the process to take city after city. It came out of Syria. First it headed to Fallujah, and there was a call to use air power to suppress and use ISIS then. That step was not taken. And for 14 separate cities, city after city, all the way to Mosul, we watched every time the request be made for air power, and that was turned down.

Well, we are where we are now. And, frankly, the air campaign by the U.S. and our partners isn’t pummeling the enemy now, as it should. Daily airstrikes against the Islamic State are one-sixth of what they were in the first campaign against the Taliban back in 2001. U.S. Special Forces should be authorized to call in airstrikes. Most Americans would be puzzled to learn that Canadian Special Forces are doing this, but we are not.

Pilots complain of having their hands tied. It has been estimated that three-quarters of U.S. aircraft return to base without discharging their weapons because of overly restrictive rules of engagement that don’t allow them to engage ISIS. As one observer notes, with just “piecemeal attacks, the Obama administration has been systematically squandering our air power advantage.” I think that is right.

Adding to the problem, the regional forces on the ground that these airstrikes are supposed to be supporting

are badly undersupplied. After 10 months of fighting, there are still too many reports that the Kurdish Peshmerga, our allies, are outgunned on the front lines against ISIS. I have met with their foreign minister three times now as he has made this case. Again, 30 percent of his battalions, Kurdish battalions, are female battalions, and they can’t obtain the anti-tank weapons, the artillery, the mortars to use against ISIS in this battle.

While U.S. forces have been training some Iraqis, that has been done way behind the front lines. Rather than pairing up with smaller units and deploying with them to push them to the front—and that is, by the way, a technique that has proven effective in Afghanistan and Iraq in the past—this has not been done. U.S. advisers are unable to bolster Iraqi units when they come under attack or to call in airstrikes by U.S. planes. We don’t have the capacity to do that. And that limitation tragically helped Ramadi fall.

Mr. Speaker, our friends and allies and partners in this region of the world are in serious trouble from the threat of ISIS. They need our help. Employing our air power like we should, getting those weapons to the front lines that are needed by the Kurds, putting more U.S. Special Forces into place, would help turn this around.

But that is not at all what this measure calls for. As I say, it is quite the opposite. It calls for the President to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on August 7 or after.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has held many hearings on ISIS and instability in the region. We haven’t heard any witnesses make the case that complete withdrawal is what is needed.

What would happen to Iraq, what would happen to Jordan, what would happen to civilians in the theater? I think we can all agree that situation would compound.

This is the question in front of us today: Do we pull the modest number of our modest presence out of this theater and see ISIS run wild across the Iraqi desert with no help from the United States? I don’t think so.

There is no military-only answer to the ISIS challenge. The Iraqi Government must do far more to reconcile with Sunnis, building confidence and empowering them to take on ISIS. ISIS must be attacked financially, and its propaganda must be relentlessly challenged. And Arab leaders need to lead. But just as there is no military-only answer, there is no answer without a military component of helping the Kurds and helping those who are fighting ISIS. And, right now, the U.S. role, as much as we may regret it, is needed desperately.

Mr. Speaker, in the national security interest of the United States, I ask all Members to oppose H. Con. Res. 55.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 55.

Let me first say that I believe Congress needs to do its job and pass an AUMF, which is the Authorization for Use of Military Force. We should have acted on this months ago. So this is the right message. But, with only the highest respect to my colleague from Massachusetts, I believe that withdrawal by a date certain at this time is the wrong policy.

This measure would direct the President to remove all U.S. Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria since August 7, 2014, except those needed to protect American diplomatic facilities and personnel. That is no way to defeat ISIS or to help the people of Iraq and Syria. I cannot vote for a policy I do not support. However, I share the frustration voiced by Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, and many others.

I have said time and time again that Congress should pass a new AUMF. We owe it to the American people, we should do our job, and we owe it to our men and women in uniform. Congressional inaction on an AUMF is inexcusable. Congress has had months to consider the President's language, and it is well past time we act.

Right now, the administration is using the resolution we passed after September 11, 2001, as the legal justification to fight ISIS. This is deeply problematic.

First of all, the 2001 AUMF has none of the limits many of us are seeking. The American people have no stomach for another large-scale, open-ended commitment of American troops in the Middle East. It was our disastrous intervention in Iraq last decade that set the stage for the rise of ISIS in the first place. This is a new challenge, and we need new parameters to define our mission and our goals.

At the same time, using a 2001 authorization for a 2015 conflict sets a terrible precedent. What happens in 5 years when the next administration does the same thing and 5 years after that and 5 years after that? We didn't vote for perpetual war, and we need a new AUMF.

We cannot allow that outcome. With a new AUMF, I hope it will be a bipartisan effort. I hope it will be the hallmark of our work on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I commend my friend, Mr. McGovern, for taking a stand on this issue, and we are in agreement that the United States must avoid another failed open-ended war in the Middle East. But there is a role for the United States in this region, and we should not just vote to withdraw. I believe that would be cutting off our nose to spite our face.

The United States has already made a difference by supporting the Iraqis

and the Syrians who are fighting ISIS. It is a difficult fight, but I don't think we can walk away.

With American leadership, we were able to prevent a wholesale slaughter of Yazidi people. With American help, our Iraqi partners were able to maintain control of the Mosul Dam, which, if breached by ISIS, could have resulted in the death and displacement of up to 2 million people. With American assistance, the Iraqi Security Forces and the moderate Syrian opposition are taking back territory, too slowly, but they are taking back territory, particularly in the south.

The Foreign Affairs Committee just had a hearing earlier this morning and we saw horrific situations of children being gassed in Syria. There is no good side in Syria. We have got to somehow let the Free Syrian Army or the rebels, the well-vetted moderate rebels, we have got to help them, and that is why I believe there is still a role for us to play. A precipitous withdrawal by turning our heads away because we are fed up and disgusted, I think, is not the right move.

So this fight is far from over, and the United States has a critical role to play. We need an authorization that defines a role for the United States, a limited role, and that is the measure I will support.

I, again, do want to thank Mr. MCGOVERN for bringing this issue to the floor. He is a thoughtful, effective colleague. And while I appreciate his resolution, I commend him for focusing this Congress on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 55, which comes before the House today under the provisions of the War Powers resolution. Along with my colleagues WALTER JONES and BARBARA LEE, we introduced this bipartisan bill to force a debate on how Congress has failed to carry out its constitutional duty to authorize our military engagement in Iraq and Syria.

Last August, the President authorized airstrikes against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. For over 10 months, the United States has been engaged in hostilities in Iraq and Syria without debating an authorization for this war.

On February 11 of this year, over 4 months ago, the President sent to Congress the text for an Authorization for Use of Military Force on combating the Islamic State in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere; yet Congress has failed to act on that AUMF or to bring an alternative to the House floor, even though we continue to authorize and appropriate money for sustained military operations in those countries.

This is unacceptable. This House appears to have no problem sending our uniformed men and women into harm's way. It appears to have no problem spending billions of dollars for the arms, equipment, and airpower to carry out these wars, but it just can't bring itself to step up to the plate and take responsibility for these wars.

Our servicemen and -women are brave and dedicated. Congress, however, is guilty of moral cowardice. The Republican leadership of this House whines and complains from the sidelines, and all the while, it shirks its constitutional duties to bring an AUMF to the floor of this House, debate it, and vote on it.

This resolution requires the President to withdraw U.S. troops from Iraq and Syria within 30 days or no later than the end of this year, December 31, 2015. If this House approves this resolution, Congress would still have 6 months in which to do the right thing and bring an AUMF before the House and Senate for debate and action—6 months.

Either Congress needs to live up to its responsibilities and authorize this war, or by its continuing neglect and indifference, our troops should be withdrawn and should come home. It is that simple.

Two weeks ago, General John Allen, the U.S. envoy for the U.S.-led coalition that is fighting ISIL, said that this fight may take "a generation or more." According to the Pentagon, we have spent more than \$2.74 billion in the fight against the Islamic State. That is roughly \$9.1 million each and every day. We have approximately 3,500 boots on the ground, and that number is rising.

If we are going to invest a generation or more of our blood and our treasure in this war and if we are going to continue to tell our Armed Forces that we expect them to fight and die in these wars, it seems to me the least we can do is stand up and vote to authorize these wars or we should end them.

We owe that to the American people. We owe that to our troops and their families. We owe that to the oath of office that each of us took to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear all kinds of crazy today about this resolution. Some Members will say that it demands the withdrawal of our troops in 30 days. That is true if you only read half of a sentence in the bill. The other half makes clear that the President has until the end of the year to withdraw our troops.

Some Members will claim that this resolution will undercut our troops while they are carrying out bombing campaigns and training Iraqi and Syrian soldiers under dangerous conditions. They will claim it will deny the Iraqis and the Kurds our critical support in the fight against the brutal terror and threat of ISIS. They will claim

that it will leave ISIS unchecked by U.S. airpower and allow them to overrun the region.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that it is precisely these threats and these challenges that make this debate so urgent. With such compelling issues at hand, how can Congress stand by and do nothing? How can Congress not have this debate and vote on an authorization for this war?

By setting a clear deadline Congress cannot ignore, this resolution provides a strong guarantee that Congress will finally do its job, that Congress will honor its duty to our troops and to all Americans by debating and voting on an authorization for this war. Our troops deserve a Congress that has the courage to stand with them.

I see the courage and sacrifice of our uniformed men and women, but I see nothing but cowardice from the leadership in this House. If they believe we should send our military forces to Iraq and Syria to fight ISIS and possibly die over there, then, for heaven's sake, we should do our duty—we should do our job—and bring an AUMF to the House floor, debate it, and take some responsibility for this war.

That is all this resolution is trying to do. Give the leadership of this House a deadline that even it can't ignore. Either enact an AUMF over the next 6 months or withdraw our forces from Iraq and Syria, one or the other.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Again, the resolution before us today has nothing to do with an Authorization for Use of Military Force; it is a withdrawal resolution. I don't want to leave some of the oversimplified Authorization for Use of Military Force rhetoric here unaddressed.

The real question that the proponents are begging is: What should the United States be doing to combat ISIS? The answer with regard to today's resolution would be nothing and that we should withdraw from combating the ISIS threat. That would be irresponsible and dangerous.

I don't disagree that the current state of the legal authorities the President is using against ISIS is less than ideal from our institution's perspective, but that does not equal illegal and unconstitutional. I say this as someone who is deeply concerned about the President's weak and unstrategic response to the ISIS threat.

The President has short-circuited this debate by claiming complete authority under prior statutes to use our Armed Forces against ISIS. His administration has made the case that ISIS, which was previously known as al Qaeda in Iraq, "has been an enemy of the United States within the scope of the 2001 authorization—continuously—since at least 2004." He has made the case that ISIS grew out of al Qaeda in

Iraq and, in point of fact, that that is where ISIS came from.

No AUMF we could draft could give the President more operational authority than he already claims. Indeed, the draft text he sent asks us to constrain the authority that he already has and complicating, by the way, the effort to reach consensus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just last week, this body considered a Defense Appropriations amendment that would have used Congress' constitutional power of the purse to force the AUMF issue, cutting off funding if Congress does not enact an ISIS-specific AUMF within the next year. That proposal failed in this institution.

The reality is that Congress has made decisions that amount to, in a practical view, disagreeing with the authors of this resolution. Allowing the President to use current force authorities against ISIS is preferable to refusing to confront the threat ISIS poses to our national security altogether.

Now, I will continue to work with Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL and all of our colleagues to see if we can find a way forward on a revised and updated authorization that is focused on the vicious and growing threat posed by ISIS. That is what we need to be working on together.

Merely acting without a credible way forward is foolhardy. It is not brave. A divisive and unsuccessful AUMF process would be perceived by our allies, our partners, and our enemies as a vote of no confidence in the fight against ISIS, resulting in a significant blow to the national security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who chairs the Armed Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, while I respect my colleague who offered this amendment, I oppose this resolution and urge my colleagues to vote in opposition.

This unwise resolution would call for the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from the fight against ISIL and leave this growing evil to continue to expand, terrorizing millions.

This resolution would do more than halt all U.S. strikes against the terrorist group in Iraq and Syria, removing the approximately 3,500 U.S. trainers from Iraq; it would unwisely deny the Kurdish Peshmerga critical support to fight against the brutal and barbaric terrorist group, leaving them alone to stop this threat.

This resolution would leave ISIL unchecked by U.S. airpower and allow the vicious terrorist group to gain strength

as it would further destabilize the region by threatening allies, such as Jordan, and create a largely uncontested safe haven from which ISIL could plot attacks against the United States.

It would allow the continued brutality of a group that beheads innocents, including Americans, that forces women and children into sexual slavery, that destroys religious heritage sites, and that targets Christians and others.

This resolution has nothing to do with authorizing the use of military force against ISIL; instead, this resolution simply unilaterally withdraws our U.S. forces from fighting back against this evil.

I urge opposition to this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, again, let me say that what we have here, as well-intentioned as I know it is, is a unilateral withdrawal, clean and simple. I understand the frustration, but this is like cutting off your nose to spite your face. I think we need to be very, very careful before we do these things unilaterally.

It is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my good friend ELIOT ENGEL from New York, the distinguished ranking member of the full committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank my friend ED ROYCE, the chairman of the full committee. They are both distinguished men, and I echo their sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to the measure offered by my friend from my home State of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, whose sincerity can never be questioned in this body.

I understand the purpose underlying this legislation, and I identify with the frustration that it expresses as, I think, do all of us.

Proponents of the measure want Congress to debate and vote on the use of military force in Iraq and Syria, and so do I. Proponents of this measure believe that Congress has failed to perform its constitutional duty by not taking up the Authorization for Use of Military Force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and so do I.

In fact, I believe the failure to debate an AUMF against ISIL is a continuation of a sad but 60-year pattern of Congress' abrogating one of its most fundamental constitutional roles and responsibilities. For an institution that constantly laments its subjugation at the hands of the executive branch, the retreat from its constitutional responsibility on this matter, frankly, is jaw-dropping.

It is time Congress makes crystal clear to the administration, to our allies, to our constituents, and to our military families the circumstances

and parameters under which we would, once again, authorize engagement for our men and women in uniform in this tumultuous region of the world or, for that matter, anywhere; but one cannot endorse the tactic of this measure.

This is constructed to be a sort of sword of Damocles that threatens us, Congress, with the automatic withdrawal of our forces in the region in order to force congressional action with an AUMF.

Congress should not heed such a message, nor should it cater to such a sword hanging over its head in order to do its job. An ill-defined mission with no clear mandate and conflicting objectives is hardly a formula for a military or a political victory.

We should welcome a robust and transparent debate on the matter of an AUMF but not at any cost on the battlefield itself—a withdrawal, as this resolution proposes, mandated irrespective of battlefield reality, of battlefield progress lately against ISIS, a withdrawal mandated irrespective of our commitments to the Kurds or, for that matter, to the Iraqi Government itself.

□ 1400

That would be irresponsible and unworthy of a great power, however noble the underlying cause is. We have responsibilities on the ground.

This resolution was drafted, as they say in Latin, *ceteris paribus*—all other things being equal. That is to say, in a perfect world. We don't live in a perfect world. Our engagements are what they are. Our commitments are what they are.

I don't share the distinguished chairman's criticism of this administration. It is a murky region to begin with. Our leverage is limited; our choices are dark and complicated. But we are making progress in the region as we speak. To simply ignore all of that and insist we withdraw, in my view, would be irresponsible and unworthy of this great Nation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say to my colleagues, while I appreciate their thoughtful statements, this resolution that we are debating here today would have no standing if there were an AUMF. We wouldn't even be allowed to bring this to the floor.

I guess my question is: What do we have to do? What do Members of this House, both Democrats and Republicans, have to do to force the leadership here to bring to the floor an AUMF so we can do our job? That is all we are asking for. And, yes, this is a blunt instrument to do it, but I don't know what else it will take to force this issue. I think we owe it to our servicemen and -women to have this debate and to have this vote.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), a cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. JONES. I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for the time.

Mr. Speaker, as many people have said today, even those who are for the resolution and against the resolution, we have a constitutional duty. That duty is to debate. I want to quote James Madison, to put the context on what we are trying to say today: "The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature." Not the executive branch, but the legislature.

The frustration that we have felt goes back to August of 2014, when JIM MCGOVERN and BARBARA LEE and WALTER JONES wrote asking the Speaker of the House to allow us to have a debate. That is why Mr. MCGOVERN, BARBARA LEE, and I have put this resolution in today, to force a debate. We wouldn't be talking about the Middle East if it weren't for this resolution.

In September, I sent my own letter to Speaker BOEHNER and asked for a full debate on an Authorization for Use of Military Force in the region. None of these letters have been answered. None of them. Last September, Speaker BOEHNER told *The New York Times* that he wanted to wait until 2015 to bring an AUMF to the floor of the House for a debate and a vote to avoid bringing it up during a lame duck session. Okay, I can accept that, that makes good sense. It does.

In December, Speaker BOEHNER said the House Republicans would work with the President to get an AUMF request approved if the President sent one to Congress. As Mr. MCGOVERN just said, he did send us one in February. Most people—Democrat and Republican—didn't particularly like what was in the AUMF, but at least it was the vehicle for the debate. But then in February when the Speaker of the House received it, he didn't do anything with it. Nothing has happened.

As has been said by speakers before me, last month JIM MCGOVERN, BARBARA LEE, and I sent another letter to the Speaker of the House asking for a debate. Nothing happened. That is the reason this resolution is on the floor. It is because, as Madison said: House, do your job. He didn't say: Executive branch, do your job. He said the legislative branch. That is us. We need to do this on behalf of the Constitution and on behalf of our young men and women in uniform who will give their life for this country.

As has been said before me, it has been 314 days since President Obama started launching airstrikes and putting troops in Iraq and Syria without receiving the authorization by Congress. According to the Pentagon, we have spent over \$9 billion a day fighting ISIS, for a total of \$2.7 billion. Isn't

this another reason that we should be debating the Middle East and our role in the Middle East? I think so.

Let me repeat James Madison: "The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I bring these pictures to the floor of those who give their life for this country. This is a flag-draped coffin being pulled off a transport plane in Dover, Delaware, and it is time that we meet our obligation and debate this issue of war because we are not doing our job. We owe it to the American people, to the Constitution, and to those who wear the uniform.

I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for the time.

THE CONSTITUTION PROJECT,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. JIM MCGOVERN,
House of Representatives,
Hon. WALTER JONES,
House of Representatives,
Hon. BARBARA LEE,
House of Representatives,

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES MCGOVERN, JONES AND LEE: We write to applaud you for your efforts to compel Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility to decide on war. For ten months President Obama has prosecuted the war against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) under a specious legal claim that Congress authorized it fourteen years ago. Congress has done no such thing. It is high time that Members weighed in.

We take no position on grave policy choices about whether to continue to use military force against ISIL, and if so how. But Congress must. The Framers vested the war power in the legislative branch precisely because they believed that young Americans should only be put in harm's way when the people, through their representatives' collective judgment, approved it.

We know this is the most difficult issue that Members face. It is also your most important responsibility. If Congress agrees that U.S. service men and women should be engaged in battle, it is Members' constitutional duty to say so. If Congress disagrees, those men and women should come home. What Congress cannot do is continue to avoid the question. We support H. Con. Res. 55 because it would force this long-overdue debate and vote.

Please do not hesitate to contact us, via Scott Roehm at The Constitution Project, with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

MICKEY EDWARDS,
Vice President, Aspen Institute; former Member of Congress (R-OK) and Chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee; co-chair The Constitution Project War Powers Committee

LOUIS FISHER,
Specialist in Constitutional Law, Law Library of Congress (ret.); Scholar in Residence, The Constitution Project
 VIRGINIA SLOAN,
President, The Constitution Project.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership, along with Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL.

I am in opposition to H. Con. Res. 55, which would withdraw U.S. forces currently deployed to Iraq and Syria, which are providing regional stability to protect American families. Sadly, this resolution will undermine America's current campaign to fight terrorists overseas. It would end our air campaign in Iraq and Syria, stop our training and equipping of Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga and Sunni tribal forces, as well as moderate Syrian opposition forces, and abandon our commitment to our partners in the region.

The resolution would promote ISIS/Daesh's momentum, create safe havens for terrorists to attack American families, and increase the Tehran regime's influence of a murderous ideology that declares: Death to America, death to Israel. It would allow Daesh to become an even bigger threat to American families, as we have seen with attacks from New York to Boston. Retreating will create safe havens to enable more attacks on American families. We must remember September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Unilateral withdrawal will not stop the war, as our enemies will continue their attacks.

The resolution does not consider the situation on the ground in Iraq or Syria or the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Indeed, this morning, Chairman Martin Dempsey said that withdrawing the troops would be a mistake and put America at greater risk.

As the grateful dad of two sons who have served in Iraq, I would prefer a clear strategy of victory for our mission in Iraq and Syria. We should not abandon the efforts of peace through strength. I want to work with Members across the aisle to develop a better approach. It is my hope we will take steps to accomplish this.

While Operation Inherent Resolve has shortcomings, it is the only course of action that takes steps toward stopping jihadist extremists overseas. I am opposed to House Concurrent Resolution 55 and urge my colleagues to vote against it as well.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), a rising star on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I thank the ranking member and also the chair of our committee. I also want to thank the sponsor and author of this resolution, Mr. MCGOVERN. Thanks to him, we finally have a chance to discuss and debate this issue right here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, before I entered this body, when I was a State legislator and a candidate, I noticed back last August-September, as the ISIS/Daesh movement was growing in Iraq and Syria and other parts of the Middle East, the British Parliament rushed back to London to debate a war resolution. I was deeply disappointed, as an American citizen, and, quite frankly, shocked that the United States Congress did not do exactly the same thing; to come here and outline and debate the parameters by which we would authorize the President to wage war against this evil and barbaric threat. Unfortunately, that did not happen.

Several months ago—I think it might have been back in January—President Obama did submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am proudly a member, an Authorization for Use of Military Force. Unfortunately, that AUMF, somewhat predictably, got attacked by some on the right as insufficient in some areas; and, frankly, got attacked by some on the left as insufficient in other areas. Both sides had legitimate discussions and concerns.

What went wrong after that is that we didn't actually have that discussion or debate right here on the House floor. It was too easy for Members of this body to just say: This is too difficult; we are going to let the President handle it, and we are going to shirk our responsibility. That is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. I do not support the resolution that is in front of us and will not be voting for it. I think an outright withdrawal of troops within the next 6 weeks would be a terrible mistake and is not the approach that we should take, but I do believe it is about time we do our duty and responsibility and have this discussion and debate. It is about time we, the Congress of the United States, on a bipartisan basis, come up with an actionable plan to fight and defeat ISIS, one that is consistent with our values and at the same time one that does not inadvertently commit us to 5 and 10 years down the road responsibilities that we do not envision today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who believes Congress ought to do its job and pass an AUMF.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE, I thought the House

would be screaming at the opportunity to justify sending young men and women to a part of the world that we believe is of danger to the entire community.

I am so amazed that people are saying that this resolution calls for the immediate withdrawal of our troops. I don't read it that way because I don't know of anything that justifies them being there, and this could be screaming for a reason why the administration and Members of Congress want these troops there.

I have no clue as to why people believe that these people, who have been fighting each other for thousands of years, are a threat to my Nation's national security. I don't know of any of my constituents that go to sleep at night worried about ISIS invading their jobless community.

I do know—because I am old enough to remember—that when the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor, immediately President Roosevelt called the Congress to declare war, and America, with pride, came out to support our Nation and our President.

Now, I don't see the connection between ISIS and being struck by Japanese and Germans, but I know one thing: When an American dies, when they lose their lives, when we send them overseas, when they come back wounded or deranged, we have an obligation in this body to justify why we have done it.

I may be wrong, but the reason I think we run away from this responsibility is because we don't really feel the pain of the people we are sending all over the world and exposing them to losing their lives. Why don't we feel it? Don't we say, "Thank you for your service"? Do we thank the people who don't come back? Do we explain and go to the funerals that I go to as to why they were there? Do we explain that the President of the United States and the Members of this House believe it is important for them to be there? All you have to do is come here, declare war, or justify why the security of the United States is being threatened, and I then will be prepared to send somebody else's kids to fight this war to protect the rest of our country. We don't have a draft. We don't pay for the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1415

Mr. RANGEL. I conclude by saying that, when issues are serious enough for us to draft other people's kids, when they are serious enough for us to say that we are not going to borrow money from Communist China to pay for these wars, then I can be convinced, even if I disagree, that when this Congress and this President believes my

country is being threatened, you count me in.

Until such time, we are waiting to hear about the threat to our national security so that we can make up our minds.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, only in Congress do you have a resolution presented to deauthorize the use of force because you want to authorize the use of force.

It is, quite frankly, pretty insulting that you would present a proposal to this body to withdraw troops and then accuse the other side of having moral cowardice for opposing the resolution.

There needs to be more mention of the President's strategy to defeat ISIS—or lack thereof. We have a duty here in Congress to set our troops up to succeed, not to fail.

There has been a lot of debate with regard to the Authorization for Use of Military Force. I am proud to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Chairman ROYCE has had multiple hearings discussing the Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Secretary Kerry was before the committee. He was asked: "Does this authorization authorize offensive action?"

He said: "No."

There was a five-paragraph letter since—with the authorization request—talking about the need to use Special Forces. We can't get a straight answer from this administration as to whether or not he is referring to ours.

Yes, we have a duty to set our troops up to succeed, and not fail. We had a Marine general in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee. When asked whether or not the general in charge of our troops overseas in Iraq has the ability to authorize the mission to take out Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi or capture actionable intelligence, he read a paragraph that simply said that that general can make a recommendation.

What is further insulting is just how many people don't even know the name of that two-star general. Not only does he not have the flexibility and resources he needs to accomplish the mission from the administration that is in charge right now, led by the Commander in Chief, my constituents—Americans—don't even know that gentleman's name.

Yes, there has been a lot of debate. We have a need to protect our troops. That is why I oppose this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just reiterate that I agree that Congress should do its job and pass a new AUMF. The question is: Is this the best way to do it? We ought to pass the right AUMF, not just any AUMF, and we are told we should force the issue.

I had a friend who used to say: "Be careful what you wish for." If we pass this resolution, it is more than possible the Republican leadership will force through language that we on this side of the aisle cannot accept, something that does not have the limits the Democrats are seeking, or worse, just ratify the administration's argument that the 2001 AUMF applies to ISIL.

We need to pass an AUMF, I agree, but we need to pass the right AUMF, even if that means we can't do it within 6 months. I hope we can get together and do that—and we should—and that is why I think this debate is good; but I think passing any AUMF is like buying a pig in a poke, and I am not ready to go down that line.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we should have passed an AUMF before we got into this latest war. We have been at it for 10 months. We are asking Congress to do its job in the next 6 months. How much longer do we want?

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I think some words from James Madison are instructive to this debate. He said:

In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war and peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department. Beside the objection to such a mixture of heterogeneous powers, the trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man . . . War is in fact the true nurse of executive aggrandizement. In war, a physical force is to be created; and it is the executive which is to direct it. In war, the public treasures are to be unlocked; and it is the executive hand which is to dispense them.

Hence, it has grown into an axiom that the executive is the department of power most distinguished by its propensity to war; hence, it is the practice of all States, in proportion as they are free, to disarm this propensity of its influence.

That was a warning that he gave us. Unfortunately, after being in this conflict for several years without an authorization from Congress, we have devolved into the dystopian condition that he warned us about.

I don't think anybody in this body seeks to weaken our powers or give them to the President. What we are debating here is when to have the Authorization for Use of Military Force or a declaration of war. The time to have that was 2 years ago. It was years ago, before the President acted.

To the people who are against this resolution, I say you could be right. You might be right. If this resolution fails, I hope you are right, that this resolution wasn't necessary, and we do assert our constitutional prerogative, our responsibility, and have that debate and therefore instruct the President on the reasons for this engagement and what his directives are.

I just want to remind my colleagues this is a strategy, this is a parliamen-

tary tactic that is necessary to force the debate, and let's have the debate.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, like the author of this resolution, am concerned about our troops that have been in Iraq and Afghanistan for a long time.

In my office, I have photographs of the 37 Texans with connections to my district who have been killed in Iraq or Afghanistan, of all races, both sexes, and all branches of the service. Here we are, years later, and we are still there.

I am also concerned about this group ISIS. The question is: Is ISIS a national security threat to the United States? I believe that it is. They are doing things to other people that we haven't seen in world history since the barbarians, and they are doing things much worse than even the barbarians did.

ISIS wants to establish a caliphate in the Middle East. It wants to kill us in the United States. They have made that clear.

If ISIS is a national security threat to the U.S., which I believe it is, then let's have a plan to defeat them, a plan now. Why are we waiting years to make this decision? Have the debate on the House floor: Are they a national security threat? If yes, go after them; if not, then do something else. Meanwhile, people of all nations are dying.

I believe that ISIS will continue as long as there is not someone to stop them. It is in our national security interest to defeat them. The United States needs to have a plan. People of all nations are dying. We need to make a decision.

We need to make a decision as soon as possible, and we need to pick a horse and ride it, and we need to do it now. This bill is not the answer to doing that. Passing this legislation weakens us and weakens our national security. I oppose it.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this debate is personal to me. I watched my son Ben, then a proud United States marine, being sent off to two wars, Afghanistan and Iraq. My family was blessed; he returned safely.

Both sides of the aisle know the price of the battle: too many killed, too many deeply scarred, too many lives of loved ones disrupted, trillions of dollars spent, and the reputation of our country at stake—sometimes for good reasons and sometimes in tragic error.

I will agree with those who say that, when terror strikes in the world, it is our concern and it does require our

leadership. There are times when we must risk brave lives to save many more. With that said, when I came to Washington, I vowed not to send anyone else's son or daughter in harm's way unless I understood the mission and the end game, too.

We owe this to all our children. That is why I urge my colleagues to take the time to deliberate and debate on the use of force against the terrorists who threaten the security of our country and our allies. Congress has no greater responsibility.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution is clear: Congress, and Congress alone, shall have the power to declare war.

Make no mistake, the current campaign against ISIS is a war.

Mr. Speaker, our esteemed colleague from Texas made a very cogent argument about why we need clarity. The inability to have a clear plan is based upon the fact that Congress has not yet articulated an authorization to use force that would lay out the parameters and the extent of what we would expect the President to do.

The President says he has the authorization under the 2001 and 2002 authorizations. Ambiguity, clearly, is present. I disagree with the President on those as an authorization. I have argued for more than 10 months that our military operations against ISIS need their own authorization.

The President did his part. He submitted a draft to us in February. Since then, we have had a few committee hearings, but no real action. Leadership in both Houses has refused to schedule votes on this issue, either in committee or on the floor. That is unacceptable.

We have already run up significant costs, \$2.7 billion on operations to continue the fight against ISIS in Iraq and Syria. We have begun delivering \$1.7 billion of weapons. More importantly, we have lost 7 servicemembers already.

This has to change. This resolution is to force us, the Congress, to uphold our constitutional duty to debate and vote on the authorization for the use of force in Iraq and Syria. I have no doubt that if this resolution passes, an appropriate authorization to use force will be passed, and we will have clarity as to the scope and conduct of this war.

I thank my colleagues for introducing this legislation.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the resolution in front of us today.

If passed, the pressure we the United States have been able to apply against

ISIS would be stopped, and our allies in the region would be left out in the cold.

There is no doubt about the true wickedness of ISIS in both Iraq and Syria. Their twisted views and thirst for blood have spread instability in the Middle East, leaving a wake of destruction.

The United States, along with our partners, has struggled to beat back ISIS' advances, and the adoption of this resolution would effectively end our operations against ISIS, thus creating a direct threat to our national security and our interests.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is misguided and unwise, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution brought to the floor by my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN.

No one disputes the horrific nature of the activities being described today and the sickening violence in this region of the world. No one disputes they must be defeated. The question is: What is the best strategy to defeat them and what authorization is required to accomplish this objective?

This is exactly the purpose of a full, thoughtful debate on the use of military force.

□ 1430

My constituents expect Congress to do its job, and we have failed for 4 months to act on the President's draft for the Authorization for Use of Military Force.

There is no more serious duty that we have than the declaration of war, and I thank my friend from Massachusetts for taking an action intended to force the House to perform its constitutional responsibility and debate the use of military force in Iraq and Syria. This resolution is our only vehicle to force the House to do what it has failed to do.

Over the past 14 years, the United States has lost more than 6,000 heroes who served our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the possibility that we could continue to commit more brave American men and women in uniform to a conflict without carefully considering, seriously debating, and properly authorizing that use of military force.

Allowing this military action to continue without a real public debate is failing our most solemn responsibility as Members of Congress. This is the only way that we will ultimately develop and implement a successful strategy—a rigorous debate in full public view.

We absolutely must ensure that any additional involvement in any way has

clearly defined goals and objectives, is properly limited in scope, and is fully explained to and supported by the American people. That is what Mr. MCGOVERN's resolution attempts to do, to force this House over the next several months to undertake its constitutional responsibility to debate, to carefully consider, and to ultimately authorize the use of military force. We should not shirk this responsibility.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for giving us the opportunity to make our voices heard. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this hour, this minute, this second is actually a gift to the American people. I thank the proponents of this resolution because it recognizes, first and above all, that this little document, the Constitution, albeit small, creates mountains of responsibility on behalf of the American people.

This moment, this minute, this second we are giving the American people their due and their respect, and that is to acknowledge that there must be a full debate on sending our treasure continuously to Iraq and Syria. There is no divide between us on the vileness of ISIS and all of the terrorist groups and the willingness of the American people to be empathetic, sympathetic, and helping the Iraqis and Syrians and those who are suffering and those who are bleeding.

But the question has to be, after 6,000 wounded, hundreds who have been killed particularly in my State, and thousands more across the Nation, we have to find the pathway where all of us know what we are doing.

This is an important resolution. We need the debate, and we need to understand that our soldiers need to be protected and ultimately brought home.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 55, directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on or after August 7, 2014, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and Syria.

This resolution provides a procedural mechanism for Congress to do its job.

Specifically, the resolution gives the House leadership 6 months to take up an AUMF, debate it and vote up or vote it down.

This time frame allows the President the opportunity to revise the AUMF to state his objectives and goals for consideration by Congress.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations, I stand in strong support of our country's armed forces' might and our valiant soldiers and armed personnel who have fought to protect our country.

I also stand with the American people and taxpayers, who have placed their trust in the President and his Administration through war and peace.

After all, not too long ago, he was one of us grappling with the war logic we were presented by the prior administration.

President Obama inherited this war, along with a problematic economy and we applaud all his good faith efforts to do "damage control" to fix a problem he did not create as it relates to ending war and facilitating a better economy for the American people.

I recognize that it is not an easy feat to fix our problematic war policies under enormous pressure from both sides of the aisle.

We recognize that the President has been thoughtful, deliberative and judicious about our presence in Iraq and Syria.

We appreciate the threat to the United States posed by the current instability in the Middle East, especially with events in the recent past: the Arab Spring, ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

We have spent nearly trillions of dollars in wars against ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

Let me be clear the threat of ISIS and terrorism is clear.

That is why we need to have a full clear and comprehensive debate on what the plan is.

We have six months to do it and thus we can be thoughtful and deliberate about it.

To keep our homeland safe, we must be able to defeat and destroy ISIS.

Over 7,000 fallen heroes have sacrificed their lives to protect our country and help facilitate democracy in Iraq and Syria.

Their devotion to our country is remarkable and inspiring.

The Islamic State, also known as ISIS is gobbling up land in Iraq and Syria.

In 2007, I introduced H.R. 930, the "Military Success in Iraq and Diplomatic Surge for Political and National Reconciliation in Iraq Act of 2007" (MSIA).

Among other things, H.R. 930, would require a diplomatic full-court press designed to engage all six of Iraq's neighbors—Iran, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait—more constructively in stabilizing Iraq. These countries are already involved in a bilateral, self-interested and disorganized way.

The MSIA Act would ensure that never again will the American people or the Congress be bamboozled into rubber-stamping an ill-advised, ill-planned, preemptive war.

In the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas alone, more than 300 Texans have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country.

Indeed, more than 3,000 Texans have been wounded.

The cost of war is brutal on our communities.

In my state, of the over 3,000 lives that have been lost, I can assure you that thousands more lives are affected.

To date, the war in Iraq alone has claimed the lives of over 4,000 brave servicemen and women. More than 30,000 Americans have been wounded, many suffering the most horrific injuries.

The mothers, fathers, wives, brothers, sisters, children, cousins, aunts, uncles and friends of those of our fallen soldiers are affected.

How do they manage?

How do they cope after losing their loved ones?

How does a mother deal with the reality of burying her son or daughter?

How does a father mourn the loss of his adult child, whose bright future carried a lot of his aspirations for a better and safer America?

That is just the human cost.

We are grateful to various U.S. agencies and non-profit organizations like the wounded warriors organizations that are helping these brave men and women attempt to put the pieces together.

We made the point that it was essential for this and prior Administrations to develop "a plan" for any war we sought to embark upon.

Yes, we understand that the Armed Forces of the United States is unparalleled on the battlefield and would decisively defeat Iraq's forces and remove Saddam Hussein, which in fact we did.

But the existential question was what do we do next?

This resolution allows time for the President to come up with a plan for Congress to look at and consider.

Just consider these facts. Since the war began in Iraq and Syria:

In addition to our American casualties, hundreds of thousands of Iraqi and Syrian civilians have been killed.

About 13.6 million people, equivalent to the population of London, have been displaced by the conflicts in Syria and Iraq, and many are without food or shelter according to the UNHCR.

More than a trillion dollars has been expended on both wars;

On the operations against ISIS, it is estimated that we are spending as much as \$22 billion a year.

Could this money be put to better use? Well, consider the following:

How about fully funding the last week's Trade Adjustment Bill we voted on to protect over 280,000 American workers displaced by U.S. involvement in global trade;

A well funded TAA is designed to help train American workers displaced into new career paths so that they are able to make a living and support their families;

Programs funded by the TAA provide a path for employment growth and opportunity through aid to U.S. workers who have lost their jobs as a result of foreign trade;

The TAA provide our trade-affected workers with opportunities to obtain the skills, resources, and support they need to become re-employed;

According to the DOL, over 5 percent of Americans are still looking for work and are unemployed or underemployed;

That means 1.5 million Americans are struggling financially;

This translates to millions of families.

Should we not be working to improve the livelihood of Americans?

Mr. Speaker, opponents of the resolution before us contend that it gives comfort to the enemy and undermines the President's strategy for success in war in Iraq and Syria.

What we need is a solid strategy that is supported by the Administration, Congress and the American people.

This starts with a plan put forth by the President and debated and approved by the Congress.

This is why we should afford the President the opportunity to come up with this plan.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, exiles and militia leaders have found their way into Iraq and Syria in the likes of ISIS and are now a menace to peace loving people everywhere.

Peace, security, and the protection of lives is and should be our priority.

That is why I strongly and proudly support our magnificent, heroic, and selfless service men and women.

That is why I strongly support H. Con. Res. 55 which provides a procedural mechanism for Congress to do its job, by giving House leadership 6 months to take up an AUMF, debate it and vote up or vote it down.

I urge all members to support the resolution before the House.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, who also served in the U.S. Air Force in Iraq and Afghanistan and was one of the earliest voices calling for airstrikes against ISIS.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue for, unfortunately, the long time that we have been having to deal with this.

I am surprised. We watch the news. We see what is happening overseas and from afar, and we see the human tragedy occurring; yet we are here debating an isolationism resolution to withdraw all military actions from the Middle East at a time when we see utter human tragedies. This is not the time, in fact, to halt military operations.

I would like to speak out quickly on an issue that I think underlines this whole debate. There are some that believe that if our foreign policy were simply nicer, if our foreign policy were more accommodating or less focused on military power, then the world and, more importantly, our enemies would suddenly view America in a much different light, or that the problems that we are facing today, we wouldn't be facing them at all. This is a view of pacifism or disengagement in the world, and it represents at best a naive world view, and I think it is certainly an illusion.

Ironically, as we debate the merits of this resolution, we have a case study in the illusion of pacifism or disengagement. The President laid down a red line against Bashar al-Assad in Syria, and, in fact, the Russians supposedly gave the President an off-ramp in which he was able to exit and allow Bashar al-Assad to simply give up his chemical weapons.

When we saw that nicer new engagement by the United States, we did not see a peaceful Bashar al-Assad emerge realizing that he had simply misunderstood the United States. We saw the same brutal dictator that murdered his

own people continued to be brutal and murderous.

Before we withdrew troops completely from Iraq, many implored the President to leave a residual force. We didn't do it, and we have now the next iteration of al Qaeda, named ISIS. Now, that may be a bit of an oversimplification, but it is, in essence, what we see.

I think it is fine to have a debate about AUMF in this Chamber, and we should. What the President gave us was an AUMF that not only limited his ability to fight ISIS, but limited the ability of the next President of the United States to fight and destroy ISIS. I personally won't be a party to tying the President's hands.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Iraq just a few months ago, and I saw the human tragedy that occurred. I stood in the U.N. refugee camp and had a little girl come up to me and explain through a translator how her parents were killed by ISIS and how she ran away fleeing for security, and I realized the important role that the United States of America plays, the unfortunate burden that we must bear for world security.

Mr. Speaker, we either stand up and fight ISIS now, or we sit on our knees and cower before them later.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable that we have not debated in committee and on the floor of this House an AUMF and a foreign policy designed to fit current circumstances, designed to fit an Assad regime that has killed nearly 200,000 of his own people, designed to fit ISIS, which either is or isn't a part or a former part of al Qaeda. Instead, we operate under a resolution passed in the wake of the attacks in 2001.

The resolution before us I do not think is the answer to the fact that Congress has not debated a new AUMF.

The reason I rise to oppose it is because I urge Members to read it. It says that all forces must be withdrawn in 30 days unless there is some threat to their security. It says that it ends all deployment, but it is not clear how it applies to Air Force operations or Naval air operations. Presumably, we would stop all bombing under all circumstances.

How does it apply to the rights of the President under current law to deploy our forces for 60 to 90 days if there would be some further outrage from the Assad regime?

We need a new resolution that does Congress' best job to deal with the current circumstances. What we don't need is the idea that blaming Obama for everything constitutes a foreign policy strategy.

The fact is that it was the Bush administration that installed and left al-

Maliki in power. It is al-Maliki that expelled all our forces and would not allow a residual force. Would we have gone to war with the Iraqi Army under al-Maliki if he expelled our forces? I have yet to hear that suggested by the blame Obama side.

The fact is that we cannot leave our forces in a country that will not sign a status of forces agreement with us.

The great problem with Iraq today is what al-Maliki did to that country, and the person who installed al-Maliki was the former President of the United States, President George W. Bush.

So I look forward, first, to the defeat of this resolution but, second, to consideration of a new AUMF that focuses on whether we will do anything about Assad or only go after ISIS, whether we will use ground forces, which I oppose, or just use our Air Forces. That debate needs to start in our committee, but this resolution is not an answer.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I don't appreciate this resolution being mischaracterized. The troops don't have to be withdrawn for 6 months, and the point of this resolution is to force this House to do its job and pass an AUMF. If my colleagues are so upset that we haven't debated and voted on an AUMF, they ought to support this resolution because it is the only way we are going to force the leadership in this House to do its job.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, this is the best way I can think of of supporting our servicemembers and their families in this time of war, because I can think of no greater way to support them, to ensure that we have a strategy with defined, achievable goals when we are going to put their lives on the line. Today, I don't know that we have that.

Do we have a partner in Iraq that has the will to fight? Do we have the resources necessary across two different battlefields in Iraq and Syria to achieve the President's goal of degrading, defeating, and destroying ISIS? Do we have a strategy that is worthy of the loss of even one American servicemember's life?

I think all of those questions are worthy of discussion and debate, a debate that would hopefully lead to an intelligent use of military force with that defined strategy.

This, Mr. Speaker, I believe, is our way of supporting soldiers and their families. It is also a way that the American people can hold us accountable by making the most important, awesome decision that a Member of Congress can, which is to put an American servicemember in harm's way.

I want to make sure that we can source the judgment and wisdom of the people that we represent. I, for one, if we have that debate and have that vote, will go back to my community. I

will talk to veterans who have served in our wars. I will talk to the parents of future servicemembers whose children's lives will be put on the line, some which will be lost, some which will be changed forever. I think that is the minimum responsibility that we must meet.

I wish that an AUMF were brought to the floor in some other way, but today this is the only way to get there. For that reason, I will support this.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), a member of the Armed Services and the Veterans' Affairs Committees.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I just came from an Armed Services Committee meeting where the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs both agreed that under no circumstances should this House consider this resolution at this time, which is conceivably an immediate withdrawal of our troops from Iraq and Syria. This causes, they discussed, an immediate risk to our homeland and our allies.

We would not be here today debating this issue if the Commander in Chief had articulated a strategy to the American people. We would not be debating this concept.

Even so, Mr. Chairman, this is dangerous for America, and this is not the way to go on a plan for an immediate withdrawal with our allies and with our homeland being at risk.

The world is watching today. The world has watched for the last several years our lack of a foreign policy plan, but today the world is watching to see if this U.S. House is going to stand together in a bipartisan manner and reject this resolution and stand together for the safety that we were sworn to stand together and uphold, which is the safety of the United States of America.

I ask my colleagues to reject this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

□ 1445

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to characterize the resolution. I want to read it.

It requires the President of the United States to remove all of our forces, except those needed to protect our diplomatic facilities—and here are the words—“by no later than the end of the period of 30 days beginning on the day on which this concurrent resolution is adopted.”

Now, that certainly applies to all our naval forces and all our air forces. But then it goes on to say, if the President determines that it is not safe to remove forces, he can have an additional period up to the end of the year. That assumes that our ground forces cannot be withdrawn within a 30-day period.

Our forces are mobile. They are capable. They are currently behind the

front lines. And they can, indeed, leave within 30 days. So clause 2 is applicable only to a military that is engaged in combat or is immobile. Our military is neither.

Clause 1: “30 days beginning on the day on which this concurrent resolution is adopted.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I urge my colleagues to read the resolution because basically what it does, it gives the President up through the end of the year, if he so chooses. I mean, that is what the resolution says. And I would hope that in 6 months we could come together and pass an AUMF. I would hope that all my colleagues—who are complaining here that we don’t have an AUMF—would actually come together in the next 6 months to do something because it hasn’t happened in the first 10 months. We can point fingers all we want, but it is not getting done.

And this is a way to force this Congress to do its job. It is that simple.

This is not about walking away from the conflict in the Middle East. This is about making sure that the men and women who serve in the United States Congress live up to our constitutional responsibilities and do our job.

I am sorry that so many people think that is a radical idea, but we haven’t done our job. And I think it is a disservice to the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces, and it is a disservice to our duty as Members of Congress.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, one of the great failures of this Congress in our time has been the abdication of our responsibility, which could not be more clearly defined by our Founders, for declarations of war and, subsequently, resolutions authorizing the use of force.

Clearly, the time is long overdue for this Congress to step up and assume its responsibility for these declarations, these seemingly endless wars of choice that are so costly in blood and in treasure. It is time that this Congress step up and have that debate on whether or not it is in our interest to continue our involvement in these wars. We need to be presented with a rationale. We need to be presented with a strategy. Or, in fact, it is time to put an end to them and to bring our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues, we owe it to our taxpayers, who have spent trillions of dollars in these ventures. We owe it to our Founders, who knew and understood the importance of having the Congress make these decisions—not executives. And we owe it to our troops.

It is time to have that resolution debated and decided here, or it is time to bring the troops home, Mr. Speaker.

As Judge POE would say, “And that is just the way it is.”

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), one of the co-authors of this resolution.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Congressman MCGOVERN for yielding and for his tireless effort and leadership. Also, I am proud to join with Congressman WALTER JONES and, again, Mr. MCGOVERN on this bipartisan resolution.

This resolution calls only for the withdrawal of U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq and Syria by the end of the year absent, mind you—absent—the passage of an Authorization for Use of Military Force against ISIS.

However, this resolution is also about reclaiming a fundamental constitutional responsibility: the constitutionally protected right of Congress to debate and determine whether and when this country enters into war.

For the last 10 months, our Nation has been fighting yet another war in the Middle East, a war that Congress has yet to authorize or even to debate. We have been patient, and we have given the House leadership plenty of time to develop a strategy to bring up an authorization.

When this war began, Congressman MCGOVERN and I wrote to the Speaker, calling for an immediate debate and vote. Nothing happened. Then at the beginning of this Congress, the Speaker said that the President had to send to Congress an authorization. More than 4 months ago, the President did just that. Once again, nothing happened.

In the 10 months since the war began, we have had no real debate and certainly no vote. This is outrageous.

Now, let me be clear about what we are trying to do with this resolution. This is not about making a political point. This is about forcing Congress to take up an Authorization for Use of Military Force by the end of the year and to follow through on its constitutional responsibility. It is about making us do our job. It is unfortunate that we have to do that.

The timeline included in this bill gives the leadership of the House 6 months to bring forward an AUMF, but the clock is ticking.

Just last week, the President announced he authorized the deployment of 450 more American troops to train and assist Iraqi forces in the fight against ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, this is textbook mission creep.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to say, enough is enough. After more than a decade of wars in the Middle East, thousands of U.S. lives and billions of

dollars lost, the need for Congress to reclaim its war-making powers is more critical than ever.

Members of Congress are sent to Washington, D.C., to make hard decisions, but in the case of war, Congress, instead, has chosen to duck its responsibilities.

And let me just say, the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force—which is a blank check for endless war—has been cited as the authorization for the ongoing war against ISIS. That is why, of course, I voted against it 14 years ago and have introduced legislation every Congress to repeal this blank check for endless war.

Keeping this authorization on the books indefinitely without repealing or replacing it has allowed Congress to avoid its constitutional responsibility to bring up an authorization against ISIS.

From what I remember, we only had 1 hour of debate in 2001. At least, Mr. Speaker, we have 2 hours now to debate whether or not to debate an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Congress must have a role in how we do our work and what we are required to do, and that is exactly what this resolution is about. Many of us agree that a robust debate and a vote is necessary, long overdue, and must take place.

During the full committee markup last week of the Defense Appropriations bill, I offered a sense of Congress amendment that simply reaffirmed that Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force against ISIS. This amendment was adopted with the support of six Republicans on the committee.

While we may all not agree on what an AUMF should look like, we know there is bipartisan agreement around the need for Congress to debate on a specific AUMF.

We need to do our job. We know full well there is no military solution in Iraq or Syria, for that matter, and that any lasting solution must be settled in the region among warring factions.

The American people deserve to know the costs and the consequences of this new war, and Members of Congress should represent their constituents by saying “yes” or “no.”

This resolution is a procedural mechanism. It is unfortunate, again, that we have to do this to make us live up to our constitutional job and duty in the matters of war and peace.

We need to vote “yes” on this resolution. It is simple. It is bipartisan. It just requires us to do our job and to exercise our constitutional responsibilities. Enough is enough. We cannot allow the American people to have no voice in what is said and what is being done with their taxpayer dollars.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us here today, in my judgment, is dangerous and should be defeated.

For months, Congress and the American people have demanded a strategy from this administration to defeat and destroy ISIS, a barbaric and growing terrorist empire that threatens not only the people of Iraq and Syria but also the United States.

Today the Secretary of Defense testified that "ISIS is a threat to the homeland because of its avowed intentions to strike and recruit in this country. ISIS must be and will be dealt a lasting defeat."

But this President does not have a strategy to accomplish this. We continue to fight the terrorists with one hand tied behind our back, and the only thing worse would be to disengage completely, which is exactly what this resolution would do.

I recently led a bipartisan delegation to the Middle East, where I visited Iraq, ground zero in the fight against ISIS, a week before Ramadi was overtaken by ISIS, and I spoke with Prime Minister Abadi. Unfortunately, the current strategy, in my opinion, relies too heavily on Shia militias, a proxy of Iran, to defeat ISIS.

We now have over 3,000 American servicemembers there to advise and assist the Iraqi national military. But the President has restricted our ability to take the fight to the enemy because he is more committed to his campaign pledge to end the wars in the Middle East than he is to ending ISIS. The President has, in fact, made the situation more dangerous. His failure to negotiate a status of forces agreement and the complete failure of Prime Minister Maliki to govern effectively created a vacuum that ISIS now fills.

In Syria, a civil war continues to rage. There too ISIS has filled the void. Islamist fanatics from more than 100 countries have traveled overseas to fight with groups like ISIS and al Qaeda. Thousands of these jihadists carry Western passports and can exploit security gaps to return to the West and the homeland, where they plot attacks against the United States.

Meanwhile, Iran is actively engaged in both Iraq and Syria, embedding Shia fighters in Sunni communities in Iraq and doing Assad's bidding in Syria.

As Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu recently told our delegation: "Iran and ISIS are competing for the crown of militant Islam."

This resolution would ensure that Iran and ISIS will continue to dominate in the region while thousands of innocent civilians suffer and die.

Just ask the Yazidi Christians in Iraq if they support leaving security in the hands of ISIS and the Iranians. Thousands of Yazidis would have been killed last summer if it weren't for U.S. airstrikes to repel an ISIS advancement

against them. Nothing could be more irresponsible or damaging to our interests.

But let me say this in response to those who say this is a vote to urge an AUMF vote. I personally support a strong AUMF, an authorization, but one to defeat and destroy ISIS.

We met the White House counsel. He presented a very different AUMF that would restrict further the President's current abilities to destroy and defeat ISIS. I cannot support that.

And this resolution, with all due respect, is the wrong way to accomplish the goal of defeating ISIS through a strong Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I commend the sponsors, Mr. McGOVERN and Ms. LEE, for introducing it. And I do so not because I necessarily think we ought to withdraw all our troops in 6 months. Maybe we should. I am not sure of that yet. But I do know that we are waging a war that is probably unconstitutional, as we did in Libya.

Since World War II, we have time after time gotten away from the constitutional command that Congress shall declare war. The Framers said war is too important to allow one person—the President—to decide on it. But we have gotten away from that. We got away from it because we didn't have time. That was the excuse. With the missiles flying over the poles, you couldn't call Congress into session.

But then came Iraq. We had a resolution for the use of military force. Then came Libya. No excuse. Plenty of time to consult with NATO. Plenty of time to consult with Arab countries. No time to consult with Congress. I believe that was an unconstitutional—and a foolish, as it turns out—but an unconstitutional use of force.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, now we have this force in the Middle East, in Iraq and in Syria. We are getting more and more into a war. I am not commenting on the intelligence of that right now. It may be that we have no choice but to fight ISIS. Maybe, as the Republicans seem to want without saying so, we should have a lot of boots on the ground, because that is what they are really saying when they say the President is doing it halfway. Or maybe the bigger threat is Iran, and we should turn our attentions to Iran instead of tacitly allying with Iran against ISIS. Or maybe we should say it is up to the Middle Eastern people—they can handle it—and pull our troops out altogether. That is the debate we ought to

have. And what are the limits of our commitment, if any? That ought to be debated in Congress. Congress ought to make these decisions in the name of the American people, not the President.

Now, because we haven't had an AUMF on the floor, we must have this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. NADLER. This resolution is not intended to force a pullout in 6 months. It is intended to force a debate in Congress in 6 months. Let us get back to our constitutional tradition. Let Congress do its job, and if the President submitted an AUMF that is too strong or too weak, let's bring up a different one. But it is our job to make those decisions. It is our job to stand before our constituents to say we believe this is important enough to go to war with ISIS or with Iran, to send more troops there or not, and here is why and here are the limitations, we shouldn't have boots on the ground or we should.

Mr. Speaker, these are our decisions to make, and our decisions we shouldn't be able to avoid. That is what this is about. We have had 10 years of war, 13 years of war. The 2001 AUMF cannot possibly be relevant now. We thought we were voting for 3 weeks of strikes against bases in Afghanistan. The 2002 AUMF was to topple Saddam Hussein. He is gone. I didn't think that was a good idea, but it is over. The consequences are not over.

We ought to debate this. We ought to debate an AUMF. We ought to pass one or not. That is our decision, but let's pass this resolution that supports that decision on us.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

First let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for their tireless leadership on this issue.

Thank you, Mr. McGOVERN.

For 14 long years, our Nation has been at war. Our people are sick and tired of war. This resolution simply opens the door to bring American soldiers home.

Let me be clear. We must maintain a strong national defense. We have a responsibility to protect our borders, our diplomats, and Americans at home and abroad. But the end to terrorism is not found through the barrel of a gun or more boots on the ground. More weapons cannot stomp out the root causes of terrorism, and more bombs cannot eradicate the seeds of hate.

Over and over again, I have stood on this very floor and reminded my colleagues that the use of force cannot—

must not—be taken lightly, especially when the needs at home are so great and the sea of terrorism is so vast.

President John F. Kennedy once said, “Those who make a peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.”

Many years ago, I shared my concerns with you that young people in the Middle East would never forget the violence that they have experienced in their youth. I feared then—and I say it again—that they would grow up hating our children, our grandchildren, and generations yet unborn. I feared those young people would have very little faith in the idea of democracy, in the values of inclusion, or the hope for lasting peace.

“Hate begets hate,” as Martin Luther King, Jr., would say, “violence begets violence; toughness begets a greater toughness. We must meet the forces of hate with the power of love.”

These young people must be our focus. We must lift them up and listen to regional voices for peace. We must counter the consequences of violence by demonstrating that diplomacy and the spread of true democracy are the most effective weapons against terrorism.

Yes, I will say it again. Our people are sick and tired of war. I hope that all of my colleagues will support this resolution and vote “yes” for a method to build a peace for long a time and for years and generations to come.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. It is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York for yielding to me. I have something special to say.

Mr. Speaker, as the United States has increasingly drifted into war without the usual congressional authorization, I appreciate that today’s resolution permits the House to assert its appropriate role. I only ask that the residents of the District of Columbia be permitted to be heard in the same way as other Americans. My colleagues will not only speak today, they also will vote the will of their constituents. Although District residents are already serving in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere, I am limited to speaking without a vote.

What an outrage, especially to our veterans. That outrage is amplified, considering that District residents pay \$12,000 annually per capita in Federal taxes, more in Federal taxes than the residents of any State in the Union, to support our government in war and in peace. Regardless of what is decided on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, District residents will be there for America, as they have been for every war ever since the Nation was created. It is time that the Congress was there for District residents.

Nearly 200,000 D.C. residents have fought for America’s freedom in time of war, yet our residents, including our veterans, are still denied a vote in the national legislature that sent them to war. In fact, D.C. servicemembers fought and won the vote for citizens in Iraq and Afghanistan, yet our veterans came home without the same voting rights for themselves. The Nation willingly accepts their sacrifices and demands their tax dollars but denies them representation in Congress.

D.C. residents have not only given their lives for this country since its creation as a nation, they have died in disproportionate numbers in all of the 21st century wars; yet these veterans, among the 650,000 Americans who live in the District of Columbia, still have no vote on national security, no vote on defense spending, no vote in the decision to send our country to war, and no vote on anything else in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. I protest, Mr. Speaker. I protest continuing to demand full citizenship costs from the residents of our Nation’s Capital while denying them the vote granted to all other Americans that come with those costs.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD.)

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for offering this important proposal that he is joined with by colleagues from California, New York, North Carolina, and other places.

I am a Republican who stands proudly with this Democrat because I think he is hitting the nail on the head. I do so because, in this instance, it has been argued against as a blunt instrument. But what the Founding Fathers were incredibly deliberate about—very blunt about, if you will—was that only Congress had the ability to declare war. And so this one blunt instrument is ultimately about backing up the bluntness of the Constitution in absolutely being declarative in suggesting that only Congress has the power to authorize war.

What the Founding Fathers knew was that, at the end of the day, body bags don’t come back to Washington, D.C., when something goes wrong in some far-off battlefield; they come back to congressional districts across this country. So they wanted a check and a balance wherein people from those local districts could report into Congress and say that this is or this isn’t working for folks back home.

Again, the Founding Fathers were so blunt. I look here at a document that is 250 days beyond the authorization of war that is even granted in the War

Powers Act. I look at an administration and the Congress that is hinging, it is building and sustaining of war in the Middle East based on a 14-year-old document, in essence, a blank check, and there are no blank checks in this process.

I look at what James Madison said years ago. He said: “The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrates, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the legislature.”

This proposal is about cost. It is about saying we have spent \$2.5 trillion in the Middle East. The Harvard study says 6 trillion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, for all these different reasons, we need to stop and pause, not necessarily to bring troops home, but, as has been suggested by others, to force a debate on Congress’ role. This is something Republicans and Democrats ought to equally care about: Do we or don’t we have proper lanes in the channel? Is the executive exceeding its authority or not?

This is something Republicans absolutely ought to care about. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, again, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for his work on this and ask for this bill which is so important for, simply, Congress’ authorization of war effort.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to insert in the RECORD a letter of support from the Constitution Project, which is signed by our former colleague, Republican Mickey Edwards of Oklahoma; a letter in support of this resolution from the Council for a Liveable War; a letter of support from Win Without War; and a letter of support from the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

THE CONSTITUTION PROJECT,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. JIM MCGOVERN,
House of Representatives.
Hon. WALTER JONES,
House of Representatives.
Hon. BARBARA LEE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES MCGOVERN, JONES AND LEE: We write to applaud you for your efforts to compel Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility to decide on war. For ten months President Obama has prosecuted the war against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) under a specious legal claim that Congress authorized it fourteen years ago. Congress has done no such thing. It is high time that Members weighed in.

We take no position on grave policy choices about whether to continue to use military force against ISIL, and if so how. But Congress must. The Framers vested the war power in the legislative branch precisely because they believed that young Americans should only be put in harm's way when the people, through their representatives' collective judgment, approved it.

We know this is the most difficult issue that Members face. It is also your most important responsibility. If Congress agrees that U.S. service men and woman should be engaged in battle, it is Members' constitutional duty to say so. If Congress disagrees, those men and women should come home. What Congress cannot do is continue to avoid the question. We support H. Con. Res. 55 because it would force this long-overdue debate and vote.

Please do not hesitate to contact us, via Scott Roehm at The Constitution Project, with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

MICKEY EDWARDS,
Vice President, Aspen Institute; former Member of Congress (R-OK) and Chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee; co-chair The Constitution Project War Powers Committee.

LOUIS FISHER,
Specialist in Constitutional Law, Law Library of Congress (ret.); Scholar in Residence, The Constitution Project.

VIRGINIA SLOAN,
President, The Constitution Project.

COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD,
Washington, DC, June 16, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN, Later this week, Congress has the opportunity to take action it has conspicuously avoided: debate and vote on the war in Iraq and Syria.

While America has dropped thousands of bombs, deployed 3,500 troops—with plans to send 450 more and spent billions of dollars in our latest war, Congress has failed to perform its most basic constitutional responsibility: to debate and vote on war.

But this week, Reps. Jim McGovern (D-MA), Walter Jones (R-NC), and Barbara Lee (D-CA), are demanding that Congress do its job.

They have introduced a bipartisan resolution, H. Con. Res. 55, which could force the House of Representatives to debate and vote on the war.

If adopted, the legislation would direct the President to withdraw all American military personnel from Iraq by December 31, 2015 unless Congress votes to authorize the use of force.

The right of Congress to declare war is fundamental to our Constitution, yet Congress has avoided taking a stand on our most recent war in the Middle East. In addition, Congress holds the power of the purse, and yet the war is costing at least \$9 million per day without congressional approval. Congress owes it to the thousands of Americans we have put into harm's way to ensure it is for the right reasons.

The President should not be permitted to wage war without Congressional approval; he should not be able to claim outdated author-

izations for the use of military force dating to 2001 and 2002 as his cover for war.

We urge you to support H. Con. Res. 55, the McGovern-Jones-Lee resolution. It is time for Congress to take a stand.

Sincerely,

ANGELA CANTERBURY,
Executive Director.
JOHN ISAACS,
Senior Fellow.

WIN WITHOUT WAR,
Washington, DC, June 16, 2015.

On behalf of the Win Without War coalition and our 11 million members, we urge Rep. Jim McGovern to SUPPORT H. Con. Res. 55.

This bipartisan resolution, introduced by Reps. McGovern (D-MA), Jones (R-NC), and Lee (D-CA), would force Congress to debate the use of military force in Iraq and Syria. We expect the resolution to be on the floor tomorrow, June 17.

While America has dropped thousands of bombs, deployed 3,500 troops, and spent billions of dollars in our latest war, Congress has failed to perform its most basic responsibility to debate and vote on the war in Iraq and Syria. After ten months of bombing Iraq and Syria, it is past time for Congress to do its job and debate and vote on this war. It is simply unconscionable that we are asking our men and women in uniform to risk their lives in a war that Congress has not voted on.

The McGovern-Jones-Lee Resolution would force Congress to vote on the war in Iraq and Syria, and, importantly, if Congress continues to shirk its constitutional duty, it would bring our troops home. In the words of Rep. McGovern, "if this House doesn't have the stomach to carry out its constitutional duty to debate and authorize this latest war, then we should bring our troops home. If the cowardly Congress can go home each night to their families and loved ones, then our brave troops should receive that same privilege."

However one feels about this latest war in the Middle East, we can all agree that it is long past time for Congress to do its job and finally debate and vote on the war in Iraq and Syria.

Congress needs to fulfill its constitutional duty of debating and voting on this war. We hope you will SUPPORT H. Con. Res. 55.

As always, if we can be of any additional assistance as your office considers this important resolution, please let us know.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN MILES,
Advocacy Director, Win Without War.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON
NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Today your boss will take an important vote on war authority. The House is expected to consider H. Con. Res. 55, a privileged resolution led by Reps. Jim McGovern, Walter Jones, and Barbara Lee. By exercising Congress' ability under the War Powers Resolution to urge cessation of hostilities absent a congressional authorization of force, the resolution would serve as a forcing mechanism for Congress to finally debate the war against ISIS that has lasted more than ten months without specific congressional debate and authorization.

Nearly ten months ago, the Obama administration sidestepped its constitutional mandate to seek authority from Congress before engaging in new military hostilities. This greatly expanded the scope of the 2001 AUMF

and the scope of executive war powers. Further, it deprived the American people and their elected representatives of an opportunity to express opposition, or to ask important questions about the overall strategy, and why more war will solve the region's problems, when it has failed to do so any other time.

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) urges your boss to take this opportunity to debate the war, to vote for the re-establishment of congressional war power, and to vote in favor of H. Con. Res. 55. It's time for Congress to weigh in on this issue.

Please do not hesitate to reach out to us at Elizabeth@fcnl.org if you have any further questions or concerns.

Thanks,

MAGGIE O'DONNELL,
*Program Assistant,
Militarism and Civil
Liberties, Friends
Committee on Na-
tional Legislation.*

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to close.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from California and the gentleman from New York. I know that if it were left up to them, they could fashion an AUMF that could get 218 votes here. Quite frankly, we wouldn't be here today if we had done our job, because the only reason why you can bring up a privileged resolution under the War Powers Resolution is if our troops are in harm's way and we haven't acted. This could end right now if the Speaker of the House or the majority leader would give us a date certain by which we would debate and vote on an AUMF.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by our policy in Iraq and Syria. I do not believe it is a clearly defined mission, and I fear that it might be just more of the same.

□ 1515

I am not convinced that by enlarging our military footprint, we will end the violence in the region, defeat the Islamic State or address the underlying causes of unrest.

Regardless of whether you support the war or oppose the war, believe we should escalate our involvement or place restrictions on it, the bottom line is that Congress needs to debate an AUMF and vote on it. That is our duty. That is our job. If we don't have the guts to do so, then we should at least have the decency to bring our troops homes to their families and to their loved ones.

I hope that each Member of this House, before they come down to this floor to vote on this resolution, takes a minute to look in the mirror. Ask yourself: Why do we get to go home to our families when our troops don't have that privilege?

They have been sent to Iraq and Syria to fight in our name, but we

don't have the courage to stand up for them and to authorize the war, and we don't have the guts to bring them home.

Take a minute and ask: We are willing to send our troops into danger; we are willing to spend billions upon billions upon billions of borrowed money for this war, but we are not willing to carry out our constitutional duty, the same Constitution we keep asking our troops to put their lives on the line to protect? How can we keep asking them to sacrifice for us when we are not willing to put anything on the line for them?

I have had colleagues come up against this resolution and say: We share your frustration over the fact that we have not debated and voted on an AUMF.

I appreciate that, but I would ask them: What in the world can we do in a bipartisan way to force this question to come to the floor? What is it going to take to get the leadership of this House to say, I am going to schedule an AUMF, and we are going to debate it and vote on it?

We have been involved in this latest war for over 10 months. Our resolution would give them another 6 months to come up with an AUMF, and if they didn't, then we bring our troops home.

This resolution before us, I admit, is a bit of a blunt instrument; but if Congress had lived up to its responsibilities, we wouldn't need to be so blunt. Congress needs a clear deadline for a debate on an AUMF for Iraq and Syria.

That deadline is the withdrawal of our troops by the end of this year. It gives this House, it gives this Republican leadership 6 entire months to get an AUMF enacted. It gives this House and this leadership 6 more months in which to simply do their job.

A vote for this resolution is not a vote to pull out, as some have asserted; it is a vote to give House Republican leadership a deadline that they cannot ignore, to force them to do their duty as leaders of this House by finally bringing an AUMF to the floor for a vote.

I heard some of my colleagues complain that they don't like the President's policy in Iraq and Syria; yet rather than trying to bring an AUMF to the floor to define that policy better, they are simply content to sit back and criticize from the sidelines. That is not what we are here to do. That is not our job.

This is important stuff. War is a big deal. We ought to treat it like it is a big deal. War has become too easy for this Congress. I see no other way to force this issue than by supporting this resolution before us.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H. Con. Res. 55, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Let me, first of all, I will conclude the way I began. I want to commend my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for raising this issue. It is an issue that has to be raised, and I am in sympathy with many of the things that he said. I don't really think we are really disagreeing here; we are just disagreeing on tactics.

As I have said, the intentions behind this resolution are commendable, but I cannot support this policy which, when you all boil everything down, would require a straight withdrawal without conditions. That is not the right policy for this country, a straight withdrawal without conditions.

I share my colleague's frustration that we haven't acted on a new AUMF. We need to pass an AUMF, but we need to pass the right AUMF.

If we pass this resolution, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will be pushed to pass their own language overriding this measure. What will it look like? I would wager that it won't include the limitations that many of us on this side would like to see.

Worse still, we could just rubberstamp the argument that the 2001 AUMF applies to ISIS in 2015. Again, that is why I said we have to be careful we don't cut off our nose to spite our face.

Now, the President sent us an AUMF. I thought it was a good starting point. I know it was panned on both sides—Republicans thought it was too light; Democrats thought it was too harsh—but it was a good starting point.

There are many things in an AUMF we have to consider. We need to consider time, geography; we need to consider what we do with the previous AUMFs. These are issues that should be debated, and I hope we will debate, but I think the White House put forth a good starting position.

The American people expect us to do our job and pass a new AUMF. They expect us to keep the United States out of another large-scale open-ended war and pass a responsible policy for degrading and defeating ISIS. Voting for withdrawal is not the right way forward. I believe that with all my heart.

Let's vote down this resolution and go back to the drawing board. Chairman ROYCE and I will work together in a bipartisan way, as we have so many times in the past, and let's put before this Congress the right policy to get this job done.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I very much appreciate Mr. MCGOVERN for his consistency. Even when we may disagree on substance, I have worked with him on policies with respect to human rights in Africa and,

frankly, across the world on many, many issues. I agree that an AUMF would be good, but only the right AUMF.

I would make this point: the White House hasn't helped the case to move an AUMF. Indeed, as soon as the President sent up his draft AUMF text to the Congress in February, the White House said he has all the legal authority he needs to conduct these operations, regardless of what the Congress does, undercutting our effort to build a consensus, but we should not give up in terms of our effort to build this consensus.

To that end, I intend to continue to work with Mr. ENGEL and others and craft a bipartisan and successful AUMF that sends a message of unity, that sends a message of resolve.

To that end, I would point out that the committee has held seven full committee hearings and nine subcommittee oversight hearings on the ISIS threat. We have discussed the AUMF; we have discussed the U.S. and coalition response, but given the wide range of views, including the view that we have no military business in Iraq, reaching an agreement on a bipartisan AUMF that authorizes the actions needed to defeat ISIS may not be possible, but it may be possible. For that reason, we are going to redouble our effort.

There would, though, be a price paid for failure on this floor, signaling disunity. As we work towards the effort to build a consensus, we have passed legislation to directly arm the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga forces who are fighting ISIS on the ground.

We have worked to strengthen U.S. defense cooperation with our regional ally Jordan, to help prevent Americans who join and fight for ISIS from returning home to the homeland—we passed that legislation—and to combat the cultural genocide being perpetrated by ISIS forces.

As I say, we will continue to work with our colleagues to try to find a way forward on a revised and updated authorization focused on the vicious and growing threat posed by ISIS, but acting without a credible way forward would be foolhardy, not brave. A divisive and unsuccessful process would be perceived by our allies, our partners, and our enemies as a no-confidence vote in the fight against ISIS, resulting in a significant blow to the national security of this country.

For that reason, I would ask Members to contemplate for a moment what the world would look like should ISIS, should our forces, our airstrikes against ISIS, be pulled out of that region because I remember what it looked like when we did not have airstrikes on ISIS before they went into Mosul, and members of our committee, in a bipartisan sense, called for airpower to be used against ISIS on that

desert path as they were headed to Mosul.

Here is what we saw when they took that city: mass killings, beheadings, abductions, forced conversions, torture, rape, sexual assault, using women and children as human shields, people being burned alive and buried alive, women and girls the age of 13 being taken as captives to be sold as sex slaves and put into forced marriages with ISIS fighters. That is what we witnessed after the fall of that great city.

The question I would ask is: If we are to abandon our airstrikes in support of these Kurdish units on that 600-mile front—50,000 of those troops are women fighting against ISIS, and they no longer have U.S. air support to support them in their effort to turn back ISIS—what will become of them? What will become of others?

Because this is no longer simply a terrorist organization—it is now a full-blown army seeking to establish a self-governing state through the Tigris and Euphrates valley in what is now Syria and Iraq and Lebanon and seek to expand that further.

We know a lot now about its leader, Abu al-Baghdadi, in Syria. He is a designated global terrorist under U.S. law. His mission, he clearly states, if you want to go online and see the blueprint of ISIS.

Part of that is to gain resources and recruits and create a safe haven to attack the United States. Yes, this certainly goes to the direct security interest of the United States if we were to pull off and give a breather to Abu al-Baghdadi and to ISIS.

In Iraq, we are taking less than half measures to assist the ISF, the forces there fighting ISIS, with insufficient trainers and advisers, as I said, with no forward air controllers, with insufficient plans to train the Sunni tribes, and insufficient arms to the Kurds and Sunnis, something we are trying to do something about with our legislation. The balance of power in the Middle East is shifting against the U.S. regional interest and certainly against U.S. security.

As stated, there are no simple answers or solutions; we discussed this in this debate, but without our involvement—without our involvement—our adversaries will continue to be emboldened, and our friends out of fear are susceptible to poor decisions, while the Middle East region and the world become a more dangerous place.

This organization ISIS is simultaneously a strategic threat to the region and to the world and a genocidal terror movement. I recall us saying on the floor of this House, never again with respect to genocidal terror, and we are watching genocidal terror.

I would just close with this argument, Mr. Speaker, and that is let's work together to get an Authorization

for Use of Military Force, which the President already claims he has under our prior authorization that we gave for him to attack al Qaeda and any al Qaeda affiliate, but let us not pull out our airpower that is being used right now to slow the advance of ISIS as it tries to take over that region and as it attacks civilians throughout the Middle East.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 55, which requires the President to withdraw our troops deployed in Iraq and Syria before the end of the year unless Congress passes an Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) to combat ISIL.

I do want to stress that I support many aspects of the military operations the President is currently conducting against ISIL, including the use of American air power against ISIL targets and in support of Iraqi and Kurdish forces, as well as the deployment of limited numbers of American troops to help train and equip those forces. However, it has now been ten months since the President sent troops into Iraq and Syria and four months since the President sent Congress a proposed AUMF to combat ISIL. While I have serious concerns with that proposed draft, we owe it to our troops and the American people to at the very least have a debate in Congress on our military engagement in Iraq and Syria.

My primary concern is that the President continues to rely on the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force Against and Al-Qaeda and associated forces and the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq as justification to take military action against ISIL. While he has repeatedly stated that he will not deploy ground troops in a combat role in either Syria or Iraq, these existing authorities leave that door open. We need to sunset both the 2001 AUMF and 2002 AUMF and pass a narrowly tailored AUMF to combat ISIL that provides the authority necessary to degrade and defeat ISIL without dragging the United States into another unnecessary ground war in the Middle East.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 16, 2015, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 319, and adopting House Resolution 319, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 139, nays 288, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

YEAS—139

Adams	Hahn	Nugent
Bass	Hastings	O'Rourke
Becerra	Heck (WA)	Pallone
Benishek	Higgins	Pascarell
Beyer	Himes	Payne
Blum	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Honda	Pingree
Bonamici	Huffman	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Hurt (VA)	Polis
Burgess	Jackson Lee	Posey
Capps	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cárdenas	Jones	Rice (SC)
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Keating	Rush
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Clawson (FL)	Kildee	T.
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Sanford
Cohen	Kuster	Sarbanes
Conyers	Labrador	Schakowsky
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Schrader
DeFazio	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lee	Sensenbrenner
DeLauro	Lewis	Serrano
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Sires
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Slaughter
Dingell	Lowenthal	Speier
Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
F.	(NM)	Takai
Duncan (TN)	Lynch	Takano
Edwards	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Esty	Massie	Tonko
Farr	Matsui	Torres
Fattah	McCollum	Tsongas
Foster	McDermott	Van Hollen
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Velázquez
Fudge	McNerney	Visclosky
Gallego	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Garamendi	Mulvaney	Watson Coleman
Garrett	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Nadler	Woodall
Griffith	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Grijalva	Neal	Yoho
Gutiérrez	Nolan	

NAYS—288

Abraham	Chabot	Fincher
Aderholt	Chaffetz	Fitzpatrick
Aguilar	Clay	Fleischmann
Allen	Cleaver	Fleming
Amodei	Coffman	Flores
Ashford	Cole	Forbes
Babin	Collins (GA)	Fortenberry
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Fox
Barr	Comstock	Franks (AZ)
Barton	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Beatty	Connolly	Gabbard
Bera	Cook	Gibbs
Bilirakis	Cooper	Gibson
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Gohmert
Bishop (MI)	Costello (PA)	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Courtney	Gosar
Black	Cramer	Gowdy
Blackburn	Crawford	Graham
Bost	Crenshaw	Granger
Boustany	Crowley	Graves (GA)
Boyle, Brendan	Cuellar	Graves (LA)
F.	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Brady (TX)	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Al
Brat	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Grothman
Brooks (AL)	Delaney	Guinta
Brooks (IN)	Denham	Guthrie
Brown (FL)	Dent	Hardy
Brownley (CA)	DeSantis	Harper
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Harris
Buck	Deutch	Hartzler
Bucshon	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Bustos	Doggett	Hensarling
Butterfield	Dold	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	Donovan	Hice, Jody B.
Carney	Duckworth	Hill
Carson (IN)	Duffy	Holding
Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Hoyer
Carter (TX)	Ellmers (NC)	Hudson
Cartwright	Emmer (MN)	Huelskamp
Castor (FL)	Engel	Huizenga (MI)
Castro (TX)	Farenthold	Hultgren

Hunter Miller (MI) Scott, David
Hurd (TX) Moolenaar Sessions
Israel Mooney (WV) Sewell (AL)
Issa Moulton Sherman
Jenkins (KS) Mullin Shimkus
Jenkins (WV) Murphy (PA) Shuster
Johnson (OH) Neugebauer Simpson
Johnson, Sam Newhouse Sinema
Jolly Noem Smith (MO)
Jordan Norcross Smith (NE)
Joyce Nunes Smith (NJ)
Katko Olson Smith (TX)
Kelly (PA) Palazzo Smith (WA)
Kilmer Palmer Stefanik
Kind Paulsen Stewart
King (IA) Pearce Stivers
King (NY) Perlmutter Stutzman
Kinzinger (IL) Perry Thompson (PA)
Kline Peters Thornberry
Knight Peterson Tiberi
LaMalfa Pittenger Tipton
Lamborn Pitts Trott
Lance Poe (TX) Turner
Langevin Poliquin Upton
Latta Pompeo Valadao
Levin Price (NC) Vargas
Lipinski Price, Tom Veasey
LoBiondo Ratcliffe Vela
Loeb sack Reed Wagner
Long Reichert Walberg
Loudermilk Renacci Walden
Love Ribble Walker
Lowey Rice (NY) Walorski
Lucas Richmond Walters, Mimi
Luetkemeyer Rigell Walz
Lujan Grisham (NM) Roby Wasserman
Lummis Roe (TN) Schultz
MacArthur Rogers (AL) Weber (TX)
MacArthur Rogers (KY) Webster (FL)
Marchant Rohrabacher Welch
Marino Rokita Wenstrup
McCarthy Rooney (FL) Westernman
McCauley Ros-Lehtinen Westmoreland
McClintock Roskam Whitfield
McHenry Ross Williams
McKinley Rothfus Wilson (SC)
McMorris Rouzer Wittman
Rodgers Ruiz Womack
McSally Ruppertsberger Yoder
Meadows Russell Young (AK)
Meehan Ryan (WI) Young (IA)
Meeks Salmon Young (IN)
Meng Scalise Zeldin
Messer Schweikert Zinke
Mica Scott, Austin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—5

Byrne Johnson (GA) Sanchez, Loretta
Hanna Kelly (MS)

□ 1606

Messrs. ABRAHAM, MEADOWS, CRENSHAW, GRAVES of Louisiana, DUFFY, MCCAUL, COFFMAN, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, HARDY, CROWLEY, AL GREEN of Texas, RYAN of Wisconsin, and KLINE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FARR, COHEN, Mses. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, ADAMS, MESSRS. NEAL, RICE of South Carolina, Mses. KAPTUR, KELLY of Illinois, MESSRS. THOMPSON of California, MURPHY of Florida, and LABRADOR changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the concurrent resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 370 on H. Con. Res. 55, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 160, PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1190, PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 319) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 186, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]

YEAS—241

Abraham Denham Hill
Aderholt Dent Holding
Allen DeSantis Hudson
Amash DesJarlais Huelskamp
Amodei Diaz-Balart Huizenga (MI)
Babin Dold Hultgren
Barietta Donovan Hunter
Barr Duffy Hurd (TX)
Barton Duncan (SC) Hurt (VA)
Benishek Duncan (TN) Issa
Bilirakis Ellmers (NC) Jenkins (KS)
Bishop (MI) Emmer (MN) Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (UT) Farenthold Johnson (OH)
Black Fincher Johnson, Sam
Blackburn Fitzpatrick Jolly
Blum Fleischmann Jones
Bost Fleming Jordan
Boustany Flores Joyce
Brady (TX) Forbes Katko
Brat Fortenberry Kelly (PA)
Bridenstine Foxx King (IA)
Brooks (AL) Franks (AZ) King (NY)
Brooks (IN) Frelinghuysen Kinzinger (IL)
Buchanan Garrett Kline
Buck Gibbs Knight
Bucshon Gibson Labrador
Burgess Gohmert LaMalfa
Calvert Goodlatte Lamborn
Carter (GA) Gosar Lance
Carter (TX) Gowdy Latta
Chabot Granger LoBiondo
Chaffetz Graves (GA) Long
Clawson (FL) Graves (LA) Loudermilk
Coffman Graves (MO) Love
Cole Griffith Lucas
Collins (GA) Grothman Luetkemeyer
Collins (NY) Guinta Lummis
Comstock Guthrie MacArthur
Conaway Hardy Marchant
Cook Harper Marino
Costello (PA) Harris Massie
Cramer Hartzler McCarthy
Crawford Heck (NV) McCaul
Crenshaw Hensarling McClintock
Culberson Herrera Beutler McHenry
Davis, Rodney Hice, Jody B. McKinley

McMorris Renacci Stivers
Rodgers Ribble Stutzman
McSally Rice (SC) Thompson (PA)
Meadows Rigell Thornberry
Meehan Roby Tiberi
Messer Roe (TN) Tipton
Mica Rogers (AL) Trott
Miller (FL) Rogers (KY) Turner
Miller (MI) Rohrabacher Upton
Moolenaar Rokita Valadao
Mooney (WV) Rooney (FL) Wagner
Mullin Ros-Lehtinen Walberg
Mulvaney Roskam Walker
Murphy (PA) Ross Walorski
Neugebauer Rothfus Walters, Mimi
Newhouse Rouzer Weber (TX)
Noem Royce Webster (FL)
Nugent Russell Wenstrup
Nunes Ryan (WI) Westernman
Olson Salmon Westmoreland
Palazzo Sanford Whitfield
Palmer Scalise Williams
Paulsen Schweikert Scott, Austin
Pearce Perry Sensenbrenner
Perry Sessions Wittman
Pittenger Shimkus Womack
Pitts Shuster Woodall
Poe (TX) Poliquin Yoder
Poliquin Simpson Yoho
Pompeo Smith (MO) Young (AK)
Posey Smith (NE) Young (IA)
Price, Tom Smith (NJ) Young (IN)
Ratcliffe Smith (TX) Zeldin
Reed Stefanik Zinke
Reichert Stewart

NAYS—186

Adams Engel Maloney,
Aguilar Eshoo Carolyn
Ashford Esty Maloney, Sean
Bass Farr Matsui
Beatty Fattah McCollum
Becerra Foster McDermott
Bera Frankel (FL) McGovern
Beyer Fudge McInerney
Bishop (GA) Gabbard Meeks
Blumenauer Gallego Meng
Bonamici Garamendi Moore
Boyle, Brendan Graham Moulton
F. Grayson Murphy (FL)
Brady (PA) Green, Al Nadler
Brown (FL) Green, Gene Napolitano
Brownley (CA) Grijalva Neal
Bustos Gutiérrez Nolan
Butterfield Hahn Norcross
Capps Hastings O'Rourke
Capuano Heck (WA) Pallone
Cardenas Pascarell
Carney Higgins Payne
Carson (IN) Himes Pelosi
Cartwright Hinojosa Perlmutter
Castor (FL) Honda Peters
Hoyer Castro (TX) Peterson
Castro (TX) Chu, Judy Pingree
Chu, Judy Israel Pocan
Cicilline Jackson Lee Polis
Clark (MA) Jeffries Price (NC)
Clarke (NY) Johnson, E. B. Quigley
Clay Kaptur Rangel
Cleave Keating Rice (NY)
Clyburn Kelly (IL) Richmond
Cohen Kennedy Roybal-Allard
Connolly Kildee Ruiz
Conyers Cooper Ruppertsberger
Cooper Costa Rush
Coulter Courtney Ryan (OH)
Cummings Crowley Sanchez, Linda
Davis (CA) Cuellar T.
Davis, Danny Larsen (WA) Sarbanes
DeFazio Cummings Larson (CT) Schakowsky
DeGette Davis, Danny Schiff
Delaney DeFazio Schrader
DeLauro DeGette Scott (VA)
DeBene Delaney Scott, David
DeSaulnier Lieu, Ted Serrano
Deutch Courtney Lipinski Sewell (AL)
Dingell Kuster Loeb sack Sherman
Doggett Langevin Lofgren Sinema
Doyle, Michael Lowenthal Sires
F. Lujan Grisham Slaughter
Edwards (NM) Smith (WA)
Ellison Lujan, Ben Ray Speier
F. Swallow (CA)
Duckworth Takai
Edwards Takano
Ellison

Thompson (CA) Vargas
Thompson (MS) Veasey
Titus Vela
Tonko Velázquez
Torres Visclosky
Tsongas Walz
Van Hollen Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Byrne Hanna
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA) Kelly (MS)
Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1614

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 371, I was in a meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 186, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 372]

AYES—241

Abraham Denham Hill
Aderholt Dent Holding
Allen DeSantis Hudson
Amash DesJarlais Huelskamp
Amodei Diaz-Balart Huizenga (MI)
Babin Dold Hultgren
Barletta Donovan Hunter
Barr Duffy Hurd (TX)
Barton Duncan (SC) Hurt (VA)
Benishek Duncan (TN) Issa
Bilirakis Ellmers (NC) Jenkins (KS)
Bishop (MI) Emmer (MN) Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (UT) Farenthold Johnson (OH)
Black Fincher Johnson, Sam
Blackburn Fitzpatrick Jolly
Blum Fleischmann Jones
Bost Fleming Jordan
Boustany Flores Joyce
Brady (TX) Forbes Katko
Brat Fortenberry Kelly (PA)
Bridenstine Foxx King (IA)
Brooks (AL) Franks (AZ) King (NY)
Brooks (IN) Frelinghuysen Kinzinger (IL)
Buchanan Garrett Kline
Buck Gibbs Knight
Bucshon Gibson Labrador
Calvert Gohmert LaMalfa
Carter (GA) Goodlatte Lamborn
Carter (TX) Gosar Lance
Chabot Gowdy Latta
Chaffetz Granger LoBiondo
Clawson (FL) Graves (GA) Long
Coffman Graves (LA) Loudermilk
Cole Graves (MO) Love
Collins (GA) Griffith Lucas
Collins (NY) Grothman Luetkemeyer
Comstock Guinta Lummis
Conaway Guthrie MacArthur
Cook Hardy Marchant
Costello (PA) Harper Marino
Cramer Harris Massie
Crawford Hartzler McCarthy
Crenshaw Heck (NV) McCaul
Culberson Hensarling McClintock
Curbelo (FL) Herrera Beutler McHenry
Davis, Rodney Hice, Jody B. McKinley

McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.

Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Dofgren
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison

Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart

NOES—186

Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch

Thompson (CA) Vargas
Thompson (MS) Veasey
Titus Vela
Tonko Velázquez
Torres Visclosky
Tsongas Walz
Van Hollen Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Burgess Hanna
Byrne Johnson (GA) Kelly (MS)
Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1620

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2588

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2588.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 319, I call up the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114–157, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 160

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE EXCISE TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subchapter E.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 4221 of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 6416(b) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters for chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to subchapter E.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to sales in calendar quarters beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), the author of this legislation, be permitted to control the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, defibrillators, operating room monitors, insulin pumps, pacemakers, heart valves, artificial hips, x ray machines, ventilators, and ultrasound machines, these are life-improving and lifesaving technologies that have reduced costs for the improved health of millions of Americans.

Unfortunately, the President's healthcare law implemented a new tax on all of these innovative devices, a tax on medical devices. Only in Washington, Mr. Speaker, would you impose a tax on lifesaving medical technology and think you will actually reduce healthcare costs. This is bad tax policy, and it needs to be repealed.

The medical device industry is truly an American success story, employing more than 400,000 people. In my State of Minnesota, 35,000 people are employed in this industry, 400 companies alone in the State of Minnesota; 80 percent of device manufacturers are small businesses with less than 50 employees; 98 percent of all these companies have less than 500 employees.

It can take these small startups 10 to 15 years to even achieve profitability or earn one penny of profit because they rely on investment and the promise of a future of earnings to survive.

The device industry is a net exporter. We have a trade surplus with our exports. Most importantly, these companies are producing lifesaving and life-improving devices for millions of our patients across the world.

Medical advancements have helped add 5 years to U.S. life expectancy in the last two decades. It has helped slash the death rate from heart disease by a stunning 50 percent and cut the death rate from stroke by 30 percent.

Devices have contributed to a 16 percent decrease in mortality rates and an astounding 25 percent decline in elderly disability rates in just the last 20 years of innovation. Medical innovation is

leading and will continue to lead the way we improve lives for our seniors who have chronic disease.

Despite all the benefits that this industry provides, a 2014 Harvard Business Review article recently found that the device industry now faces one of the most uncertain competitive environments in the entire country. Instead of hurting this industry, we should be empowering this industry, creating more jobs, producing more innovation, and helping more patients.

We often hear that America needs to start making things again to help jump-start the economy, and one of the best ways to protect American manufacturing and spur innovation is to repeal this harmful medical device tax because here is what the tax is doing: it is costing us jobs.

One company that I spoke with said they have never laid off any employees in the last 22 years of their history of business, but they laid off 25 employees, and they refrained from hiring another 15 employees because of the tax.

If you take it to a bigger, larger picture, up to 39,000 jobs have been lost because of the tax since it has been imposed. These are high-paying jobs, Mr. Speaker, that pay nearly \$20,000 more than the national average.

□ 1630

And the 2.3 percent excise tax, it may not sound like much, but here's the problem: it is taxing revenue; it is not taxing profit.

A small device manufacturer, they may not be making any money, but they still have to pay that tax. One company I spoke to, they have 20 employees. They recently said they are borrowing \$100,000 a month from the bank just to pay the tax. That doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Speaker, it is also raising tax rates. Medical device companies now have to pay one of the highest effective tax rates of any industry in the world. Recent testimony in the Joint Economic Committee, there was a small company from Minnesota that now says because of the tax, they have a 79 percent effective tax rate. Who here can justify that?

It is also harming innovation because instead of investing in the next generation of innovative devices that can literally save people's lives, companies are spending money on compliance and accountants instead of on research and development, which is the lifeblood of this industry.

Members should know that this is separate from the debate about how we reform health care. This is about a bipartisan effort today on the floor to promote American innovation to protect and promote American manufacturing and research and development jobs because Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and liberals in both parties, in the House and the Sen-

ate, favor repealing this tax. It is a bad tax policy that is killing jobs. It is hurting our seniors, and it is harming innovation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to protect our American seniors, American patients, and American innovation and repeal this destructive tax.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

There are certain basic facts here. One is this industry participated in the creation of healthcare reform. They, like other providers, were involved; and like other providers, they said that they would participate in helping to pay for it. That is a fact. Now they want out.

Another fact is that they have benefited from it. According to a recent analysis by Ernst & Young, the industry's revenue increased by \$8 billion in the year the tax took effect.

Also, there has been a reference to R&D. R&D, according to that report, spending by the industry, also increased by 6 percent in the same year.

There has also been reference to employment. The analysis of Ernst & Young also says that, in that year, employment increased, and the overall employment has increased by 23,500. There has been a 23,500 increase in employment.

So those are the facts.

There is another aspect. If people vote for this industry to essentially go back on its commitment to participate, other providers are going to ask for the same treatment. So in that respect, what the Republicans are aiming to do is to unravel ACA.

Another fact is this is unpaid for. So when you add this unpaid-for provision, you get, all together, well over \$610 billion that the Republicans have passed in permanent tax cuts without paying for one dime.

Another factor is that this applies to imports as well as to those that are produced in this country and not at all to exports. So look at the equities. Look at how this industry has benefited. Look at the irrationality and irresponsibility and coming forth to this body and saying let's repeal and not pay for at all from a party that talks about fiscal responsibility.

So let me just read from the Statement of Administration Policy. That is another fact. If this were ever to pass the House and the Senate, it would be vetoed. So here is the Statement of Administration Policy:

"The Affordable Care Act has improved the American health care system, on which Americans can rely throughout life. After more than five years under this law, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage. Up to 129 million people who could have otherwise been denied or faced discrimination now have access

to coverage. And health care prices have risen at the slowest rate in nearly 50 years. As we work to make the system even better, we are open to ideas that improve the accessibility, affordability, and quality of health care, and help middle-class Americans."

And it concludes:

"In sum, H.R. 160 would increase the deficit to finance a permanent and costly tax break for industry without improving the health system or helping middle-class Americans. If the President were presented with H.R. 160, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill."

So I close with this. You know, people can be provincial in the sense that they respond to one pressure point or another, and I understand that. What you have to do is to look at an entire system, an entire structure, and what it means for Americans throughout this country.

This industry, as I said, participated in helping to pay for healthcare reform. They have benefited from it, and now, essentially, they are coming forth and saying: Just take us out of it; separate us out.

That is unfair, unwise, irresponsible, and sets a pattern that will do what Republicans really want to do, and that is to pick apart and tear apart this reform that has been 75 years in coming. So I urge everybody to look at the broader interests of the people of this country and to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 160, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, just in response to the report that was just mentioned, the Ernst & Young report, it is true that companies have been hiring and growing in certain cases, but all of that growth from the report is outside of the United States. So if you want to continue to promote more jobs outside of the United States, don't vote for the repeal, and we will continue to see jobs move overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by dispelling the premise that somehow this whole thing was devised so that we can allow the medical device companies to flourish. The thing we want to flourish is research and development that is producing the kinds of things that are helping the Amer-

ican people, and that is the essence of what the medical device R&D innovation is doing, and this is stifling.

At the precise moment where breakthrough opportunities, oftentimes, in small businesses—I see them, Mr. Speaker; I visit them in my district—and at the time that it is the most fragile for them, they are being hit with this 2.4 percent tax which touches them at the time when it is not on profits. These are the very dollars that are being used to be invested into R&D, whether they sell that product or not. We are killing our innovation right in the cradle.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the repeal of the medical device tax.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. LEVIN was correct. When we were designing the Affordable Care Act, everyone was expected to share in the cost as we work for the American people.

The medical device industry initially opposed 5 percent. They said: How about 2.3 percent? We will go for that.

They agreed to it. Here they are today asking for us to give them nothing, no taxes; they don't have to pay anything no matter how they benefit from it.

Now, repealing this tax, which the nonpartisan analysts have shown has no negative effect on jobs, will add \$24.4 billion to the deficit. It would eliminate an important source of revenue simply to appease an industry that has benefited directly and greatly from the expansion of the coverage of ACA.

On top of that, the bill is a distraction from a more important issue that the Congress needs to address in the context of medical devices. They would not let us vote on an amendment in the committee to bring up the institution of unique device identifiers.

An essential tool of improving patient safety is the UDI. A UDI is a number associated with a medical device right on the device. They contain important information about where, when, and by whom the device was made. They provide for post-market surveillance to identify problems and notify patients when objects that they put in their bodies are faulty or dangerous. This has dramatic impacts for safety.

In 2010, a massive recall of breast implants in France impacted tens of thousands of women. Many cancer patients undergo reconstructive surgery following mastectomy, and their lives are threatened when faulty implants leak dangerous contaminants into their bodies. In situations like this, it is essential that we know who has given the faulty device so that recall efforts can save as many lives as possible.

Unfortunately, even when the FDA finishes its new UDI regulations in the coming years, we will lack important tools, including devices, in the agency's postmarket safety checking system, the Sentinel Initiative. The primary source of information for the Sentinel is insurance claims forms, yet, unlike pharmaceuticals, CMS does not currently require UDIs to be listed on Medicare claims. That makes it all but impossible to apply the Sentinel Initiative to the device context.

Furthermore, additional gaps exist in the FDA's rulemaking on UDIs. For example, there is no requirement that UDIs be affixed directly to the implantable devices.

As we look forward, I encourage my colleagues to look beyond efforts to undermine the ACA and to look for opportunities to enhance safety and improve the system for patients, not just the device industry.

I urge Members to vote "no" on this and come back with a bill—if you want to take the tax off, that is one thing, but at least make them identify the name and the place and the number of where it came from so, if somebody you know gets impacted by one of these devices going bad, we will have a way to trace it.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a leader on the Ways and Means Committee, who is also concerned about the impact of this tax on his home State of Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare's medical device tax has already been devastating to innovation, patient care, and job creation, especially in my home State of Indiana.

Up north, we have Warsaw, which is known around the world as the orthopedics capital of the world. In central Indiana, we have a burgeoning life sciences industry centered around the Indianapolis area. Further south, we have Bloomington, which is home to Cook Medical, the largest privately held medical device manufacturer in the world.

Medical device startups dot Indiana's landscape from Lake Michigan down to the Ohio River. Indiana's world-class medical device companies like Biomet, Boston Scientific, Hill-Rom, Zimmer, and dozens more don't just create and produce lifesaving technology. They also employ tens of thousands of Hoosiers, and these jobs pay well.

At a time when factories have closed and jobs in rust belt States have been sent overseas, medical device manufacturing jobs have been a lifeline for hard-working Hoosiers and their families.

□ 1645

Every day this tax remains in effect, we continue to slow advancements in lifesaving and life-improving technologies, and we hinder patient care.

This day is long overdue. It is time to support H.R. 160 and finally repeal this harmful, ill-advised tax.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman from Indiana is leaving the floor right now because one of the companies he mentioned—one of the companies, there are others—was brought before the Justice Department because of their behavior not long ago. So my friend from Indiana talks about Zimmer Holdings. That is one of the reasons why I am asking you to review your support of this legislation. Because let me tell you what happened to Zimmer and Stryker in the State of New Jersey not that many years ago when the U.S. Attorney looked at these two companies and many others.

Here is what they were brought to heel about: bribing doctors to recommend their prosthetic to senior citizens under Medicare. Dante said, what place in hell will they be? These guys should be in the deepest place in hell—the deepest. You check the record. You can't make this stuff up.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation. When the Affordable Care Act was being negotiated, these companies were at the table. They agreed to this. You can't deny that. Because of the ACA, the health care market includes millions of newly insured Americans, more business for these companies, by the way, driving up the demand for medical devices and other health care services—increased demand, capitalism, you know about that.

However, the device industry wants it both ways. They want new businesses, and they want new business under the ACA, that the ACA has created, and since the law was passed, they have been lobbying for repeal of what they agreed to. I swear you can't make it up.

Mr. Speaker, I support the ACA and its goals. You don't. And it needs to be funded. It is the law of the land, as the Speaker once said. You can't support the goals of the ACA and then start stripping out the pieces of the law that fund the realization of the goals.

Oh, but you can. And you have tried 56 different times to repeal this legislation, and you failed every time, even though you are in the majority.

This legislation would add \$24.4 billion to the deficit—through the Speaker to my good friend from Pennsylvania—and it is not paid for. Despite industry claims of job loss and economic hardship, medical device companies have seen a 7 percent growth in employment since the ACA. Furthermore, I remain concerned about some of the behavior we have seen in this industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind the gen-

tleman to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PASCRELL. Sure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I became highly involved in the medical device issues since 2007 when a number of device manufacturers entered into controversial deferred prosecution agreements for providing doctors with kickbacks for using their knee and hip replacement devices. A number of these products ended up being recalled. That is the record.

As a result, on the justice side, I have worked to put an end to deferred prosecution agreements that don't hold the bad actors accountable. There are many good companies providing medical devices, but the facts are the facts, and the history is the history, and the culture of this industry needs to be known. I have also worked to improve the safety of medical devices for patients by encouraging the use of clinical data registries.

Repealing the device tax is not good policy, Mr. Speaker, and it is not good for our budget—another \$24.5 billion added to the deficit. I think if you would ask our ranking member, Mr. LEVIN, he would give you a precise number as to how much you have increased the deficit in legislation you have provided over the last 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to address something that was stated by one of the previous speakers from Washington State who made a comment to the effect that the medical device industry supported that tax. Well, that is a statement that is simply not based in fact. In fact, what happened, as I recall, Senator Baucus helped impose the tax on the industry because he felt that they were not providing enough at the table in terms of concessions for the ACA. In fact, since they weren't doing enough at the table, the medical device industry was placed on the menu. They fought this tax vigorously. There is no letter to indicate they had any support for this tax.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to repeal the medical device tax. However you feel about the 2010 health care law on the whole, we can all agree that the legislation has its flaws. Again, one of the most glaring deficiencies in the law is the medical device tax, designed to extract \$26 billion from the industry over 10 years. This new law is already stifling critical innovation and threatening high quality jobs in my district.

More importantly, it is increasing costs for consumers on products which are an absolute necessity of life for those who rely on them, such as prosthetics, pacemakers, and artificial hearts. Costs are also being passed on

to consumers at all levels through increased insurance premiums and bills from medical providers.

The medical device industry currently supports over 75,000 jobs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Several of the companies affected by the new tax are located in my district, including OraSure Technologies, Olympus, Boas Surgical, and B. Braun. In fact, B. Braun CFO Bruce Heugel recently testified before the Senate Finance Subcommittee on Health Care that his company has been forced to drastically reduce investments in research and development and also has had job losses as a result of the medical device tax. In fact, they are not building a new headquarters because of this tax. These are good paying, 21st century jobs, and this Congress should not support policies that will kill them or send them overseas.

Mr. Speaker, the medical device tax is a punitive tax, and it is creating disincentives for companies looking to stay competitive, hire domestically, and create lifesaving new technologies. It is past time that Congress repeal this onerous new tax, and I urge my colleagues to support the Protect Medical Innovation Act. Let's get rid of this thing once and for all. Let's excise the excise tax.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA). Since he was first elected in 2010, he has been a leader on this, organizing freshman Members, recognizing the importance of repealing this disastrous tax.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding the time. He has been the leader on this from day one, and I am happy to join him. I also thank Chairman RYAN of the Ways and Means Committee for allowing this to come to the floor the way it has. I think it is very important. Most of America thinks this is very important, and to have it stand alone here where it can be debated, hopefully honestly, I think speaks well to the process, I think it speaks well to the leadership of Chairman RYAN and Member PAULSEN and others who are behind this.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be back on the floor to support this. It is long overdue. It needs to happen. There is an old adage, Mr. Speaker, and that is, if you want less of something, tax it. The same is true here. If you want less jobs in this area, like the 56,000 jobs in Indiana alone, tax the devices that those jobs produce. If you want less innovation, tax these medical devices. If you want America to be less of a leader in the world when it comes to this industry, tax it. That is all their argument, Mr. Speaker, is saying, and our bill corrects that. Let the free market work, and let innovation work.

Let's keep us a leader in the world in this area.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) who has also been a leader as part of the Indiana delegation on the issue.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Minnesota for leading this effort since I came to Congress in 2013.

I rise today joining my fellow Hoosiers seeking greater opportunity for all Americans, and I rise today to call for a swift end to a tax that is standing in the way of that opportunity.

Back home, I hear from countless Hoosiers about the restrictions the medical device tax is placing on our life sciences industry, not only in Indiana but across the country. This tax takes away the opportunities to innovate, to hire more people, and most importantly to improve the patient access to critical technology.

In Indiana the life sciences industry is vitally important. It has a \$59 billion impact on our economy and employs more than 56,000 people. In fact, we are second—Indiana is second only to California in exports of life sciences products.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that the unfair medical device tax jeopardizes our competitive edge, it stunts our workforce opportunities, but most importantly, it is decreasing access to life-saving technology for people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stand for jobs, stand for improving people's health, and stand for more opportunity. I urge my colleagues to repeal the medical device tax.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK) who has also been doing an awesome job of organizing a lot of the freshman Members and recognizing the importance of this issue to the State of New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act introduced by Mr. PAULSEN, and in March I was proud to lead a bipartisan letter by 43 freshman lawmakers to Speaker BOEHNER calling for a vote to repeal the medical device tax.

According to a 2014 industry survey, the tax resulted in employment reductions of 14,000 industry workers in 2013 and years prior to implementation of this tax, with approximately an additional 4,500 jobs lost in 2014. Furthermore, if we don't repeal this tax, the industry will forgo hiring of nearly 20,500 employees over the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this important bipartisan legislation will repeal the Affordable Care Act's medical device tax that

is limiting access to health care devices that North Country families need and undermining the medical device industry that is so important to our local economy.

Repealing the medical device tax will help our small businesses create jobs for North Country families and protect employees who are currently at risk from this job-killing tax. This an extremely important issue for my district, especially in Warren County, home of what is called "catheter valley" because of the numerous catheter manufacturers.

I commend the House for bringing this important legislation to the floor, and I urge all Members to support this measure.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), someone I traveled with in the State of Indiana who showed me firsthand the impact this device tax had in Indiana.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, and I appreciate the work that Congressman PAULSEN has done on this very important issue that has affected my district dramatically.

As a sitting U.S. Congressman of Warsaw, Indiana, known as the Orthopedic Capital of the World, the burdensome medical device tax hits very close to home for my constituents. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Hoosier State as a whole is second in the Nation in exports of life science products, and across the State over 20,000 Hoosiers are directly employed by this industry. The impact on our communities and our neighbors is one of the reasons I have fought so long and hard alongside Mr. PAULSEN and my colleagues to repeal this very destructive tax.

Mr. Speaker, back home in Indiana, Hoosiers know that taxation does not create jobs; it kills them. In fact, a recent study has shown that the medical device tax, implemented to fund ObamaCare, has cost more than 33,000 jobs nationally so far. Mr. Speaker, repealing this medical device tax is a simple, commonsense reform, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), who knows the importance of this issue.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the cost of health care continues to increase in this country.

As a philosophical matter, I do not believe inserting more government between a patient and their doctor will reduce costs. In fact, to the contrary.

But there are things government can do.

That is why we in the House of Representatives are putting more money into NIH funding. It is why 21st Century Cures has been introduced—to streamline approval processes at the FDA and make sure that various stakeholders involved in finding cures are all working together.

Yet what remains as a contradiction at the heart of ObamaCare is the policy that taxes those who seek to innovate and improve public health outcomes through pioneering medical device equipment. We are taxing those who are trying to help improve, and who have improved, public health outcomes. It just doesn't make sense.

Simply put, it is a disincentive to invest capital in precisely the industry that has proven itself to be the single most important in the history of civilization to improve public health—our life sciences industry here in this country.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) to speak on this issue.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015, also known as the medical device tax repeal.

This bill would repeal the tax on medical device manufacturers that was put into place under ObamaCare. The medical device tax rate is 2.3 percent, and this is in addition to the State sales tax on common medical devices such as pacemakers, hearing aids, and insulin pumps.

This tax hurts the very same Americans we should be helping. For example, 13 percent of West Virginians—the State I am blessed to represent—have diabetes. This 2.3 percent tax makes it more difficult for struggling taxpayers in West Virginia and around the country to access critical healthcare devices like insulin pumps.

If gone unchecked, this tax will continue to weaken the industry's ability to grow and help people in need. It will also continue to hinder the development of lifesaving treatments and devices.

I hope my colleagues will join me tomorrow in voting for the repeal of the ill-advised medical device tax.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), a physician who works with patients each and every day and understands the importance of repealing this tax.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act.

H.R. 160 will permanently repeal the misguided excise tax on medical devices that was imposed by the President's healthcare law.

I am a cosponsor of this important legislation, along with over 280 Members of this House of Representatives. In the 113th Congress, the Senate endorsed getting rid of this burdensome tax by an overwhelming margin. It is clearly time for this tax to go.

The medical device tax discourages innovation, lowers the quality of medical care available to the American people, and cuts jobs while driving production overseas.

Companies like RTI Surgical, based in my district, are being harmed by this burdensome tax. Instead of hamstringing these manufacturers, we should be allowing them to produce new medical devices and create jobs.

I am a doctor who treated patients in northern Michigan for 30 years. I know how important medical devices are for providing quality health care, and I believe that getting rid of this tax will improve our Nation's healthcare system.

I hope all my colleagues will join me in supporting this commonsense and long overdue fix for the train wreck that is the President's healthcare law.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a State that has been a leader in developing new medical technologies.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this effort to prevent this very destructive tax from having the harmful impact that we know it will have. This medical device tax is perhaps the most odious of any tax that has ever been loaded upon the shoulders of the American people in the history of our Republic.

Our first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Marshall, once pointed out: "The power to tax is the power to destroy." Well, who is being destroyed and who is being hurt by this medical device tax? It is the American people who are suffering maladies and health challenges, and we are putting them as the people who are going to be basically paying the bill or doing without their medical devices.

I would like to give a personal example of this. I know it is very painful for me to do so, but I think I need to share this with my colleagues.

Two and a half years ago, I was notified that my daughter, who was at that time 9 years old, had leukemia. It was a horror story for my family, a horror story, just like it is for families across America. We came out of that. We went through it. It was a tough, tough road for a year. Last week, she had her last cancer treatment and, last week, she was declared cancer free.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAULSEN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Ninety percent of the kids who get leukemia today are cured from leukemia after a period of time. They actually will live through this. Only 40 years ago, 90 percent of the kids who got leukemia died.

We have had different advances in medicine that have actually achieved this goal. But in my daughter's case, I could see very easily a medical device was put under her skin, a portal, so that she did not have to take the chemotherapy into her arms, which resulted in younger kids decades ago with their veins collapsing because of the chemotherapy being shot into their arm.

The people who devised that medical device saved my daughter's life, and now we want to make them the most heavily taxed people in our country. That is ridiculous. We want to encourage people to build these types of devices that will save our children and help those people who are suffering.

This medical device tax is odious, it is wrong, and it was wrongheaded from the very beginning. In the name of saving future children from things that we might be able to cure with a proper medical device, we need to make sure we eliminate this tax and keep faith with future generations, as well as those people who are suffering today.

I ask my colleagues to join me in getting rid of this tax on medical devices.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire the amount of time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota.

I rise today as a 30-year health care professional and a proud cosponsor of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015.

This bill would repeal the Affordable Care Act's 2.3 percent tax on medical devices. These are medical devices that save and improve lives for millions of Americans. These devices include pacemakers, artificial joints, CAT scan machines, and many, many more.

Mr. Speaker, the medical device tax is a terrible policy that is stifling innovation and United States competitiveness and is hurting small businesses all across the Nation, and certainly in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District.

This legislation, which has strong bipartisan support, will help to protect American jobs, keep America at the cutting edge of technological medical advances, and preserve a patient's access to affordable, lifesaving devices.

Having served in a nonprofit healthcare setting for three decades, I rise today and ask my colleagues to join me in voting to repeal this unnecessary and very harmful tax.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

There is no one that questions the importance of this industry—no one. This country has been in the forefront in terms of creating medical devices. There has been innovation and there has been enterprise, and it has impacted the lives of millions of people. That is not the issue here.

The issue is this. A number of industries and a number of providers participated in creating the Health Care Reform Act. Essentially, I am not sure it is the industry as much as some Members are essentially coming here and saying: Give this industry a free ride in terms of their participation, while others are doing their part.

That isn't fair; it isn't workable; and it is also fiscally irresponsible. I would like to talk to the CEOs of any of these companies and ask them if they think it is fiscally responsible to repeal this provision costing well over \$20 billion, unpaid for, made permanent.

Indeed, this is industry joined with others in the healthcare world in this country in a letter of May 11, 2009, to the President:

Dear Mr. President,
We believe that all Americans should have access to affordable, high-quality healthcare services. Thus, we applaud your strong commitment to reforming our Nation's healthcare system. The times demand and the Nation expects that we, as healthcare leaders, work with you to reform the healthcare system.

And it concludes with this paragraph:

We, as stakeholder representatives, are committed to doing our part to make reform a reality in order to make the system more affordable and effective for patients and purchasers. We stand ready to work with you to accomplish this goal.

And it was signed by a number of representatives—the AMA; America's Health Insurance Plans, their leadership; the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers; et cetera, and also signed by the president and CEO of the Advanced Medical Technology Association.

So now people are coming here and saying what was essentially committed to in 2009 should essentially be ripped out of ACA in 2015.

I just want to read from a report by the National Center for Health Research. And I refer, for example, to the chart on the number of employees at the 12 largest U.S.-based device companies. All of them show an increase in employment of the 12 largest, except two, and in one case, the reduction was from 10,800 to 10,500. One company did have a larger loss, but it wasn't anything close to catastrophic.

Then the number of employees at the small, publicly traded device companies—one, two, three, four, five, six,

seven, eight, nine—of those, only seven show a reduction in the number of employees from 2012 to 2014. In one of them, there was a reduction of one, and the other, a reduction of four employees. And then there is another with a reduction of four, and another, a reduction of six. The others had increases in their employment, and two of them, one went from 230 to 320, and another from 244 to 303. These are the smallest.

□ 1715

Let me also refer in this document to stock prices for the 12 largest U.S.-based device companies.

When you look down at the profit margin, all of their profits went up except one, which had a reduction of 1.6 percent from the close of January 2, 2013, to the close of January 2, 2015. That reduction was tiny. The others had a very substantial reduction, some in the twenties, one in the thirties, and the average was a 13.8 percent increase in the profit margin.

Also, this report reads:

Similarly, the report on 2013 employment, released by a financial analysis news service, EP Vantage, showed that 11 of the top 15 device makers expanded their workforce after the device tax went into effect.

I think what is happening here is that a few of my colleagues are coming here and are using a few examples—and I don't deny, in a capitalist system, there are some losers as well as winners.

Everybody isn't necessarily a winner, and there was a recession in this country during some of these years, but to come here and to use those examples that really are refuted by the overall data, I think, is essentially saying that we ought to begin, on this point, to rip apart the ACA because, in every case, there hasn't been an improvement for every company. In terms of research and development, the Ernst & Young report makes it very clear that spending by the industry increased by 6 percent in the same year.

I am just asking everybody who cares about healthcare reform and who cares about the overall picture here in the United States to resist the temptation to take several examples, perhaps, from their own districts, to draw conclusions about what really has happened in the medical device industry and to, essentially, come forth because of those relatively few examples and say that we should now, essentially, repeal this provision, costing well over \$20 billion—unpaid for—permanently.

That is not only contrary to the letter I read, but it is contrary to fairness within the healthcare industry, and it is really unfair to the millions of people who have benefited from the ACA when the motive, really, of so many of the Republicans who come here is not to simply repeal this tax, but it is part of an effort to, essentially, repeal the ACA altogether. We should resist that.

The people of this country do not want that repeal, so let's vote "no"—and a resounding "no"—on this proposal.

MAY 11, 2009.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We believe that all Americans should have access to affordable, high quality health care services. Thus, we applaud your strong commitment to reforming our nation's health care system. The times demand and the nation expects that we, as health care leaders, work with you to reform the health care system.

The annual growth in national health expenditures—including public and private spending—is projected by government actuaries to average 6.2% through the next decade. At that rate, the percent of gross domestic product spent on health care would increase from 17.6% this year to 20.3% in 2018—higher than any other country in the world.

We are determined to work together to provide quality, affordable coverage and access for every American. It is critical, however, that health reform also enhance quality, improve the overall health of the population, and reduce cost growth. We believe that the proper approach to achieve and sustain reduced cost growth is one that will: improve the population's health; continuously improve quality; encourage the advancement of medical treatments, approaches, and science; streamline administration; and encourage efficient care delivery based on evidence and best practice.

To achieve all of these goals, we have joined together in an unprecedented effort, as private sector stakeholders—physicians, hospitals, other health care workers, payors, suppliers, manufacturers, and organized labor—to offer concrete initiatives that will transform the health care system. As restructuring takes hold and the population's health improves over the coming decade, we will do our part to achieve your Administration's goal of decreasing by 1.5 percentage points the annual health care spending growth rate—saving \$2 trillion or more. This represents more than a 20% reduction in the projected rate of growth. We believe this approach can be highly successful and can help the nation to achieve the reform goals we all share.

To respond to this challenge, we are developing consensus proposals to reduce the rate of increase in future health and insurance costs through changes made in all sectors of the health care system. We are committed to taking action in public-private partnership to create a more stable and sustainable health care system that will achieve billions in savings through:

Implementing proposals in all sectors of the health care system, focusing on administrative simplification, standardization, and transparency that supports effective markets;

Reducing over-use and under-use of health care by aligning quality and efficiency incentives among providers across the continuum of care so that physicians, hospitals, and other health care providers are encouraged and enabled to work together towards the highest standards of quality and efficiency;

Encouraging coordinated care, both in the public and private sectors, and adherence to evidence-based best practices and therapies that reduce hospitalization, manage chronic disease more efficiently and effectively, and

implement proven clinical prevention strategies; and,

Reducing the cost of doing business by addressing cost drivers in each sector and through common sense improvements in care delivery models, health information technology, workforce deployment and development, and regulatory reforms.

These and other reforms will make our health care system stronger and more sustainable. However, there are many important factors driving health care costs that are beyond the control of the delivery system alone. Billions in savings can be achieved through a large-scale national effort of health promotion and disease prevention to reduce the prevalence of chronic disease and poor health status, which leads to unnecessary sickness and higher health costs. Reform should include a specific focus on obesity prevention commensurate with the scale of the problem. These initiatives are crucial to transform health care in America and to achieve our goal of reducing the rate of growth in health costs.

We, as stakeholder representatives, are committed to doing our part to make reform a reality in order to make the system more affordable and effective for patients and purchasers. We stand ready to work with you to accomplish this goal.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. UBL,
President and CEO,
Advanced Medical
Technology Association.

KAREN IGNAGNI,
President and CEO,
America's Health Insurance Plans.

RICH UMBDENSTOCK,
President and CEO,
American Hospital Association.

J. JAMES ROHACK, MD,
President-elect American Medical Association.

BILLY TAUZIN,
President and CEO,
Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America.

DENNIS RIVERA,
Chair, SEIU Healthcare, Service Employees International Union.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have a couple of points right off the bat. My friend from Michigan claims that the tax hasn't necessarily impacted jobs, that there are only certain stories. I would just point out that, in his home State, there is a company named Stryker—now, it is a larger company—that laid off 1,000 employees back in November of 2011 to provide efficiencies and realign resources in advance of the new medical device excise tax.

As to a lot of data that was mentioned earlier, those figures that are talking about how well the industry is doing and as to the growth and the sales numbers are global data. These are companies that have global awareness and a global presence. Those are

not U.S. jobs. We want those jobs in the United States. If we can repeal this tax, we can make sure that job growth is here in the U.S. instead of outside of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is not smart tax policy. It is hurting our innovators, and it is costing us jobs. This industry is an American success story. We all know the names of the larger companies because some of those were mentioned here in debate on the floor today, but there are thousands of these companies—the vast majority—because, again, 98 percent have fewer than 500 employees, and over 80 percent have fewer than 50 employees.

These are companies you have never heard of, but there is a doctor or an engineer or an entrepreneur who has started or who has come up with an idea to create a company in the backyard or in the garage to help improve lives or to save lives. That is what we are trying to protect here, Mr. Speaker.

These are not technicians in some white lab coats who are trying to improve widgets or to build a widget faster. These are, literally, small businesses that are on missions to save lives. If you think about it, what could be more entrepreneurially worthwhile than that?

We in Congress have a responsibility to give America's innovators the best shot, the best opportunity possible, by removing any obstructions to those inventions that are going to bring us all a better quality of life. We have the ability to help create a new age of American innovation, and we can help kick-start that process this week—today, tomorrow, with a vote—by repealing the destructive medical device tax.

It was mentioned as a part of the debate also that the industry came forward and that there was vast support for the Affordable Care Act, and they agreed to the tax. Mr. Speaker, there are no letters from the industry whatsoever that support their buy-in for a 2.3 percent excise tax—a tax on revenue, not on profit.

It is true that there were letters that were put out that said they were committed to healthcare reform and that they wanted to see that process move forward, but then they were very vocal when this excise tax idea was floated as a part of the new healthcare law and even after the law passed. It has been continuous, this awareness about their opposition in their knowing of the detrimental effects that it would have.

Mr. Speaker, this is also not about the Affordable Care Act because we have had many votes on that—to repeal it, to change it, to move in a different direction. This is about a tax that is going into the general fund, that is not going into some special account to fund ObamaCare. That is not what this tax is doing. This is going into the general fund.

That Affordable Care Act discussion will come up at another time with the Court case coming up in the near future. This is more of an opportunity to stand up with a bipartisan voice to declare our support for American manufacturing, for American jobs, and for protecting our patients, including our seniors.

I just want to remind my friends that the President has said that he has been open to any ideas that will improve accessibility, that will improve affordability, and the quality of health care. That is exactly what this bill does. It is about protecting access to those devices.

It is also important to point out the 281 cosponsors. The bipartisan support is deep, and it is broad. If you think back to the sustainable growth rate debate we had just a little over a month ago, that is important to bring up. Why? It is because there was broad, bipartisan support and a belief that the policy was harming patient care and innovation.

This is good policy now if we can repeal this tax. It is about doing the right thing for our constituents, which outweighs the concerns of the offsets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my frustration with the latest attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act. I strongly support expanding access to quality, affordable health care for all Americans. Now, the Affordable Care Act isn't perfect, but where problems arise in the law, we should work together to find solutions and fix them. But crippling the law by cutting billions of dollars or robbing the Prevention and Public Health Fund is not a real solution. I've consistently opposed bills that would undermine or repeal the Affordable Care Act, and that's why I cannot support either H.R. 160 or H.R. 1190.

I do not support the creation of the Independent Payment Advisory Board and believe that the medical device tax needs to be changed. I am committed to working with my colleagues to responsibly fund the vital programs under the ACA without stifling innovation or slowing research and development. Medical device manufacturers in Connecticut develop essential and lifesaving products that are critical to treating every patient whether in a physician's office, a hospital, a nursing home, or in the field by emergency responders. They provide well-paying jobs throughout my district making products that are sold throughout our country and exported around the world. I will continue to call for the medical device tax to be responsibly replaced.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts on the medical device tax.

H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015, would repeal the 2.3 percent excise tax on medical devices enacted as part of the Affordable Care Act. While I voted in opposition of H.R. 160, I recognize the concerns of many in the medical technology industry regarding the implications of an excise tax on medical devices.

Under the Affordable Care Act, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage and access to critical health services. The tax on medical devices was designed as a means to offset the gains made by the industries that benefit from the law's successful expansion of healthcare coverage and is a critical component of paying for the law's implementation. It is problematic that H.R. 160 does not provide for the cost of eliminating the tax. I do not believe that it is prudent to repeal this tax at this time, but we should continue to monitor its long-term impact and perhaps revisit the issue in the future.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 160, the "Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015," which would repeal the 2.3 percent excise tax on medical devices that was enacted as part of the Affordable Care Act.

I oppose this bill strongly because repeal of the excise would increase the deficit by \$24.4 billion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 160 is nothing but our Republican friends' latest unpaid-for permanent tax cut bill.

If H.R. 160 were to become law, House Republicans will have passed unpaid-for GOP tax cuts that increase the deficit by a total of \$611 billion just this year.

Mr. Speaker, given the real challenges facing our nation, it is irresponsible for the Republican majority to continue bringing to the floor bills that have no chance of becoming law and would harm millions of Americans if they were to be enacted.

House Republicans have tried at least 58 times to undermine the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled more than 16 million previously uninsured Americans to know the peace of mind that comes from having access to affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Their record to date is 0–58; it will soon be 0–59 because the President has announced that he will veto this bill if it makes it to his desk.

Mr. Speaker, all sectors of the health care industry are benefiting from the projected 25 million Americans who will gain coverage under reform, all were called upon to contribute.

The medical device tax that H.R. 160 would repeal was simply the medical device industry's contribution to this collective undertaking.

A repeal of the medical device tax would encourage drug companies, health insurers, hospitals, clinical laboratories, and home health agencies to seek the repeal of their own contributions as well.

According to a study conducted by Wells Fargo Securities, increasing the number of insured Americans, will increase medical device sales by 3.6 percent over its first decade.

Moreover, the medical device tax, which went into effect in 2013, has not damaged the medical device industry.

In fact, the medical device industry is prospering grandly.

A recent analysis by Ernst and Young indicates that the medical device industry's revenue increased by \$8 billion in 2013, while R&D spending by the industry increased by 6 percent and employment in the industry increased by 23,500.

Also, despite industry's claims to the contrary, the medical device tax has not forced companies to ship jobs overseas and there is no disadvantage for U.S.-based firms.

Mr. Speaker, our friends across the aisle just cannot accept the fact that the Affordable Care Act is a success and is making a positive difference in the lives of more than 16 million persons.

These Americans come from all walks of life.

They are women, who can no longer be denied coverage or be forced to pay exorbitant amounts for coverage simply because of their sex.

They are nine million seniors and people with disabilities, who have saved \$1,600 each on expensive and lifesaving prescription medication.

And they are this country's most vulnerable citizens; people who are working hard and struggling to make ends meet while living in near-poverty, and who have been covered by Medicaid expansion in 27 states and the District of Columbia.

These benefits have been felt across the country, and especially in my home state of Texas where:

1. 10,695,000 individuals with pre-existing conditions such as asthma, cancer, or diabetes—including up to 1,632,000 children—will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage or charged higher prices because of their health status or history.

2. 4,889,000 uninsured Texans have new health insurance options through Medicaid or private health plans in the Marketplace.

3. 5,198,000 individuals on private insurance have gained coverage for at least one free preventive health care service such as a mammogram, birth control, or an immunization in 2011 and 2012.

4. In the first ten months of 2013, 233,100 seniors and people with disabilities saved on average \$866 on prescription medications.

5. 357,000 young adults have gained health insurance because they can now stay on their parents' health plans until age 26.

In addition to the tangible healthcare benefits for millions of families, the ACA has had powerful effects on the financial state of our nation.

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, we have extended the solvency of the Medicare Trust fund by more than a decade, and helped save taxpayers \$116 billion through new Medicare efficiencies.

H.R. 160 will not make our country better, it will not help uninsured Americans obtain coverage; it will cost the medical device industry jobs and will increase the deficit.

It is an irresponsible proposal and should, like the previous 58 attempts to undermine Obamacare, be rejected.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 160.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I will vote in favor of H.R. 160, legislation to repeal the onerous medical device tax, when it comes before the House today. I have always said that I strongly support the repeal of this tax on Massachusetts' growing medical device industry, especially because the tax disproportionately affects small- and medium-sized medical device manufacturers that don't

have the compliance resources of larger companies. I also believe we must responsibly pay for the repeal of the tax. In light of our nation's growing national debt, I am hopeful that voting in favor of H.R. 160 sends a message to the Senate and the President that we must repeal this tax and pay for it in a responsible way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

STRENGTHENING MEDICARE ADVANTAGE THROUGH INNOVATION AND TRANSPARENCY FOR SENIORS ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2570) to establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the co-payments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2570

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Medicare Advantage through Innovation and Transparency for Seniors Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF PATIENT ENCOUNTERS IN AMBULATORY SURGICAL CENTERS IN DETERMINING MEANINGFUL EHR USE.

Section 1848(o)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(o)(2)) is amended by adding at the end of the following new subparagraph:

“(D) TREATMENT OF PATIENT ENCOUNTERS AT AMBULATORY SURGICAL CENTERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), for a payment year after 2015 any patient encounter of an eligible professional occurring at an ambulatory surgical center (described in section 1833(i)(1)(A)) shall not be treated as a patient encounter in determining whether an eligible professional qualifies as a meaningful EHR user. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may implement this clause by program instruction or otherwise.

“(ii) SUNSET.—Clause (i) shall no longer apply as of the first payment year that begins more than 3 years after the date the Secretary determines, through notice and comment rulemaking, that certified EHR technology is applicable to the ambulatory surgical center setting.”.

SEC. 3. VALUE-BASED INSURANCE DESIGN DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the “Secretary”) shall establish a 3-year demonstration program to test the use of value-based insurance design methodologies (as defined in subsection (c)(1)) under eligible Medicare Advantage plans offered by Medicare Advantage organizations under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21 et seq.). The Secretary may extend the program to a duration of 4 or 5 years, as determined necessary by the Secretary in coordination with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation.

(b) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM DESIGN.—

(1) SELECTION OF MEDICARE ADVANTAGE SITES AND ELIGIBLE MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) select at least two Medicare Advantage sites with respect to which to conduct the demonstration program under this section; and

(B) approve eligible Medicare Advantage plans to participate in such demonstration program.

In selecting Medicare Advantage sites under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall take into account area differences as well as the availability of health maintenance organization plans and preferred provider organization plans offered in such sites.

(2) START OF DEMONSTRATION.—The demonstration program shall begin not later than the third plan year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) ELIGIBLE MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS.—For purposes of this section, the term “eligible Medicare Advantage plan” means a Medicare Advantage plan under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21 et seq.) that meets the following requirements:

(A) The plan is an Medicare Advantage regional plan (as defined in paragraph (4) of section 1859(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-28(b))) or Medicare Advantage local plan (as defined in paragraph (5) of such section) offered in the Medicare Advantage region selected under paragraph (1)(A).

(B) The plan has—

(i) a quality rating under section 1853(o) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(o)) of 4 stars

or higher based on the most recent data available for such year, or (II) in the case of a specialized Medicare Advantage plan for special needs individuals, as defined in section 1859(b)(6)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-28(b)(6)(A)), a quality rating under section 1853(o) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(o)) equal to or higher than the national average for special needs plans (excluding Institutional-Special needs plans) based on the most recent data available for such year; and

(ii) at least 20 percent of the population to whom the plan is offered in a service area consists of subsidy eligible individuals (as defined in section 1860D-14(a)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-114(a)(3)(A))).

(4) DISCLOSURE TO BENEFICIARIES.—The Secretary shall provide to each individual eligible to enroll under a Medicare Advantage plan approved to participate under the demonstration program during a plan year for which the plan is so selected—

(A) notification that the plan is participating in such demonstration program;

(B) background information on the demonstration program;

(C) clinical data derived from the studies resulting from the demonstration program; and

(D) notification of the potential benefits that the individual will receive, and of the other potential impacts that the individual will experience, on account of the participation of the plan in the demonstration program.

(c) VALUE-BASED INSURANCE DESIGN METHODOLOGIES.—

(1) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “value-based insurance design methodology” means a methodology for identifying specific prescription medications, and clinical services that are payable under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, for which the reduction of copayments, coinsurance, or both, would improve the management of specific chronic clinical conditions because of the high value and effectiveness of such medications and services for such specific chronic clinical conditions, as approved by the Secretary.

(2) USE OF METHODOLOGIES TO REDUCE COPAYMENTS AND COINSURANCE.—A Medicare Advantage organization offering an eligible Medicare Advantage plan approved to participate under the demonstration program, for each plan year for which the plan is so selected and using value-based insurance design methodologies—

(A) shall identify each prescription medication and clinical service covered under such plan for which the plan proposes to reduce or eliminate the copayment or coinsurance, with respect to the management of specific chronic clinical conditions (as specified by the Secretary) of Medicare Advantage eligible individuals (as defined in section 1851(a)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21(a)(3))) enrolled under such plans, for such plan year;

(B) may, for such plan year, reduce or eliminate copayments, coinsurance, or both for such prescription medication and clinical services so identified with respect to the management of such conditions of such individuals—

(i) if such reduction or elimination is evidence-based and for the purpose of encouraging such individuals in such plan to use such prescription medications and clinical services (such as preventive care, primary care, specialty visits, diagnostic tests, procedures, and durable medical equipment) with respect to such conditions; and

(ii) for the purpose of encouraging such individuals in such plan to use health care providers that such organization has identified with respect to such plan year as being high value providers; and

(C) if a reduction or elimination is applied pursuant to subparagraph (B), with respect to such medication and clinical services, shall, for such plan year, count toward the deductible applicable to such individual under such plan amounts that would have been payable by the individual as copayment or coinsurance for such medication and services if the reduction or elimination had not been applied.

(3) PROHIBITION OF INCREASES OF COPAYMENTS AND COINSURANCE.—In no case may any Medicare Advantage plan participating in the demonstration program increase, for any plan year for which the plan is so participating, the amount of copayments or coinsurance for any item or service covered under such plan for purposes of discouraging the use of such item or service.

(d) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the demonstration program under this section begins under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the status of the implementation of the demonstration program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall, with respect to eligible Medicare Advantage plans participating in the demonstration program for the first plan year of such program, include the following:

(A) A list of each medication and service identified pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(A) for such plan with respect to such plan year.

(B) For each such medication or service so identified, the amount of the copayment or coinsurance required under such plan with respect to such plan year for such medication or service and the amount of the reduction of such copayment or coinsurance from a previous plan year.

(C) For each provider identified pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(ii) for such plan with respect to such plan year, a statement of the amount of the copayment or coinsurance required under such plan with respect to such plan year and the amount of the reduction of such copayment or coinsurance from the previous plan year.

(e) REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF UTILIZATION OF VALUE-BASED INSURANCE DESIGN METHODOLOGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into a contract or agreement with an independent entity to review and assess the implementation of the demonstration program under this section. The review and assessment shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the utilization of value-based insurance design methodologies by Medicare Advantage plans participating under such program.

(B) An analysis of whether reducing or eliminating the copayment or coinsurance for each medication and clinical service identified pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(A) resulted in increased adherence to medication regimens, increased service utilization, improvement in quality metrics, better health outcomes, and enhanced beneficiary experience.

(C) An analysis of the extent to which costs to Medicare Advantage plans under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act participating in the demonstration program is less than costs to Medicare Advantage plans under such part that are not participating in the demonstration program.

(D) An analysis of whether reducing or eliminating the copayment or coinsurance

for providers identified pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(ii) resulted in improvement in quality metrics, better health outcomes, and enhanced beneficiary experience.

(E) An analysis, for each provider so identified, the extent to which costs to Medicare Advantage plans under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act participating in the demonstration program is less than costs to Medicare Advantage plans under such part that are not participating in the demonstration program.

(F) Such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) REPORT.—The contract or agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall require such entity to submit to the Secretary a report on the review and assessment conducted by the entity under such paragraph in time for the inclusion of the results of such report in the report required by paragraph (3). Such report shall include a description, in clear language, of the manner in which the entity conducted the review and assessment.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 4 years after the date on which the demonstration program begins under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the review and assessment of the demonstration program conducted under this subsection. The report shall include the following:

(A) A description of the results of the review and assessment included in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (2).

(B) Such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate for enhancing the utilization of the methodologies applied under the demonstration program to all Medicare Advantage plans under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to reduce copayments and coinsurance under such plans paid by Medicare beneficiaries for high-value prescription medications and clinical services for which coverage is provided under such plans and to otherwise improve the quality of health care provided under such plans.

(4) OVERSIGHT REPORT.—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the demonstration program that includes an assessment, with respect to individuals enrolled under Medicare Advantage plans approved to participate under the demonstration program, of the impact that the age, co-morbidities, and geographic regions of such individuals had upon the implementation of the demonstration program by the plans with respect to such individuals.

(f) SAVINGS.—In no case may any reduction in beneficiary copayments or coinsurance resulting from the implementation of the demonstration program under this section result in expenditures under parts A, B, and D of the title XVIII of the Social Security Act that are greater than such expenditures without application of this section.

(g) EXPANSION OF DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Taking into account the review and assessment conducted under subsection (e), the Secretary may, through notice and comment rulemaking, expand (including implementation on a nationwide basis) the duration and scope of the demonstration program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, other than under the original medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of such title, to the extent determined appropriate by the Secretary, if the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) of subsection (c) of section 1115A of the Social Security Act

(42 U.S.C. 1315a), as applied to the testing of a model under subsection (b) of such section, applied to the demonstration under this section.

(h) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may waive such provisions of titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act as may be necessary to carry out the demonstration program under this section.

(i) **IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING.**—For purposes of carrying out the demonstration program under this section, the Secretary shall provide for the transfer from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under section 1817 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i) and the Federal Supplementary Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t), including the Medicare Prescription Drug Account in such Trust Fund, in such proportion as determined appropriate by the Secretary, of such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 4. TREATMENT OF INFUSION DRUGS FURNISHED THROUGH DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT.

Section 1842(o)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(o)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “(and including a drug or biological described in subparagraph (D)(i) furnished on or after January 1, 2017)” after “2005”; and

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by striking “infusion drugs” and inserting “infusion drugs or biologicals” each place it appears; and

(B) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking “2004” and inserting “2004, and before January 1, 2017”; and

(ii) by striking “for such drug”.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF QUALITY INCENTIVE PAYMENTS TO MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Health and Human Services has incorrectly interpreted subsection (n) of section 1853 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23) as prohibiting the provision of any Medicare quality incentive payments under subsection (o) of such section with respect to Medicare Advantage plans that exceed the payment benchmark cap under such subsection (n) for the area served by such plans; and

(2) the Secretary should immediately apply quality incentive payments under such subsection (o) with respect to such Medicare Advantage plans without regard to the limits set forth in such subsection (n).

SEC. 6. MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking “during and after fiscal year 2020, \$0” and inserting “after fiscal year 2020, \$220,000,000”.

SEC. 7. NON-INCLUSION OF DME INFUSION DRUGS UNDER DME COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1847(a)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and excluding” and inserting “, excluding”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and excluding drugs and biologicals described in section 1842(o)(1)(D)”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1842(o)(1)(D)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(o)(1)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking “2007” and inserting “2007, and before the date of the enactment of the Strengthening Medicare Advantage through Innovation and Transparency for Seniors Act of 2015”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2570, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I stand in strong support of H.R. 2570, the Strengthening Medicare Advantage through Innovation and Transparency for Seniors Act.

This package is comprised of two policies, and I will let the sponsors, who have worked so hard, speak to them in more depth.

The Electronic Health Fairness Act of 2015, as marked up by the committee back in February, brings fairness to physicians who are practicing in the ASC setting by reducing meaningful use burdens for sites of service that were left out of the EHR technology requirements. This exemption only lasts until the ASCs are able to catch up, and then everybody will be on an equal footing regarding meaningful use requirements.

The bill then establishes a new demonstration program based on value-based insurance design. This proposal would give plans the ability to adjust benefits based on their enrollees' needs. The one-size-fits-all policies in Medicare Advantage create the need for different types of plans that wouldn't be necessary if regular Medicare Advantage plans could adjust their benefit structures to better serve our seniors.

Reducing copays or cost sharing for beneficiaries for the sake of better healthcare outcomes is right in line with the principles that I support as all seniors are different and should be served as such, so that all have an opportunity for positive health outcomes.

The bill also includes a policy that changes the way Medicare pays for drugs that doctors prescribe that are infused through durable medical equipment items. This change means that Medicare payments will be more market based.

The policy does take away the potential that these rates could change significantly in the future by exempting the drugs from DME competitive bidding. I am committed to ensuring that beneficiaries who need these drugs are able to continue to get them in their homes, and I will certainly monitor the impact.

I want to thank Ways and Means members Mrs. BLACK of Tennessee and Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon for their continued leadership in improving Medicare Advantage. Their very hard work will ensure that seniors, for years to come, will enjoy better healthcare choices and more options at that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I join with the gentleman from Texas in supporting H.R. 2570. Representative DIANE BLACK and Representative EARL BLUMENAUER have worked hard on this issue.

This legislation will allow the Secretary of HHS to conduct a demonstration, giving managed care organizations the ability to offer plans with a variety of benefit structures that would lower the cost sharing for high-value service. We think it makes a lot of sense, and I concur.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1730

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a key member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a healthcare professional herself.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, as a nurse for over 40 years, I understand the challenge of helping Americans find affordable healthcare coverage, but the sad truth is, even for those who do have health coverage, high deductibles and out-of-pocket costs can leave too many Americans functionally uninsured.

When families are forced to choose between buying groceries and filling a prescription, their health is sidelined, and they risk facing even higher medical costs down the road. That is why I authored H.R. 2570, the Strengthening Medicare Advantage Through Innovation and Transparency for Seniors Act. Our bill directs CMS to set up a pilot project for what is known as Value-Based Insurance Design, or otherwise known as VPID.

Instead of the current one-size-fits-all approach to cost sharing, VPID embraces the idea that by lowering a patient's out-of-pocket costs for essential prescription drugs and services, customers will then be motivated to stick with their regimen and stay healthier. This will, in turn, decrease the overall long-term costs to our healthcare system and provide a higher quality of care for our patients.

My bill also helps our providers by offering ambulatory surgical centers relief from the electronic health records' meaningful use mandate. While this recordkeeping system may make sense in a hospital setting, it doesn't always work for a small, outpatient surgical facility. Providers who practice medicine in these settings should not be penalized as a result.

I thank Congressman BLUMENAUER and Congresswoman CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS for their strong commitment to VBIID policy.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 2570.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I concur with the gentleman from Texas. Members have worked hard in perfecting these bills, and I support H.R. 2570.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very good bill. It is a good improvement to Medicare Advantage, and it is really a case of Republicans and Democrats finding common ground and doing it in a way that helps seniors with their choices and really tailoring health care to them.

I strongly urge support for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2570, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING REGULATORY FAIRNESS ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2507) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2507

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Increasing Regulatory Fairness Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHING AN ANNUAL RULEMAKING SCHEDULE FOR PAYMENT RATES UNDER MEDICARE ADVANTAGE.

Section 1853(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(b)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting "ANNUAL RULEMAKING SCHEDULE FOR PAYMENT RATES FOR 2017 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS" after "RATES";

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting "BEFORE 2017" after "YEARS"; and

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting "and before 2017" after "2005"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) ANNUAL RULEMAKING SCHEDULE FOR PAYMENT RATES FOR 2017 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—For 2017 and each subsequent year, before April 1 of the preceding year, the Secretary shall, by regulation and in accordance with the notice and public comment periods required under paragraph (2) for such a year, annually determine and announce the following:

"(i) The annual MA capitation rate for each MA payment area for such year.

"(ii) The risk and other factors to be used in adjusting such rates under subsection (a)(1)(A) for payments for months in such year.

"(iii) With respect to each MA region and each MA regional plan for which a bid was submitted under section 1854, the MA region-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount for that region for the year involved.

"(iv) The major policy changes to the risk adjustment model, and the 5-star rating system established under subsection (o), that are determined to have an economic impact.";

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting "(or, for 2017 and each subsequent year, at least 60 days)" after "45 days"; and

(B) by inserting "(for 2017 and each subsequent year, of no less than 30 days)" after "opportunity".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2507 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of H.R. 2507, the Increasing Regulatory Fairness Act. This is an important piece of legislation. Today, the Medicare Advantage program serves more than 16 million seniors throughout the country. Enrollment has increased more than threefold over the past decade, and it is expected to nearly double in the next.

To ensure that seniors are able to continue receiving the kind of high-quality care they receive under the program, the Centers for Medicare and

Medicaid Services, known as CMS, is expected to pay about \$156 billion to more than 3,600 Medicare Advantage plans just this year. That is nearly 30 percent of all Medicare spending, by the way.

Typically, every year CMS sends out what is called the rate notice to plans and Medicare Advantage companies that details the various payment rates and benefit changes the agency plans to make for the following year. This notice follows the standard rulemaking process of other payment systems. That is, a draft notice is published, the public has a certain amount of time to submit comments and questions, and then the agency publishes a final notice based on that feedback.

Right now, this current process takes about 45 days. Do you know how many days are currently allotted for public comment? The answer: A mere 15 days—15 days for thousands of plans and millions of stakeholders to submit comments on proposed changes to a program that amounts to one-third of all Medicare spending.

I could almost understand this if the rate notice were a short and concise document, easy to understand, and simple to implement, but of course it is not. The rate notice has grown from around 16 pages in 2006 to nearly 150 pages this year. That is over a ninefold increase. All the while, the time for the public comment period has remained the same. This means less and less time for plans and Congress to conduct the necessary review so we can provide CMS with the kind of feedback that would better help the agency assess the impact of their proposed changes. This is important because without accurate feedback, CMS could inadvertently move forward with a proposed change to the Medicare Advantage program that might negatively impact these seniors who depend on these plans for access to essential medical care.

The legislation before us is simple and straightforward. All it proposes to do is extend the public notice period from 45 days to 60 days, which would mean an extension of the comment period from 15 to 30 days. This is a commonsense, good government fix we can make that will give plans more time to understand the changes that Medicare proposes, offer constructive feedback, and make the Medicare Advantage program overall more responsive to senior needs.

I want to thank Mr. THOMPSON of California, who is a key member of our Committee on Ways and Means, and Mr. PITTS, the chairman of the Health Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce, for their thoughtful and very helpful work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. BRADY. It was a pleasure working with him on this piece of legislation.

I rise in support of H.R. 2507. Every year, as was pointed out, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services publishes its Medicare Advantage call letter and rate notice that outlines all the payment rates and the changes for nearly 2,000 plans that serve our most vulnerable population.

About 10 years ago the call letter and rate notice were less than 20 pages long. Since then, enrollment in Medicare Advantage has nearly tripled. Medicare Advantage policies have become more complex, and the call letter and the rate notice has grown nearly tenfold. They run about 150 to 200 pages.

The same time, the time between the publishing of the draft notice and the final notice, which is currently 45 days, has remained unchanged. During this 45-day period, in which there are only 15 days to comment on the proposed changes in the program, the plans, Members of this body and our staff are expected to review 150 pages of regulatory changes and understand the impacts of the proposed policy changes on those programs that provide essential medical care to over one-third of Medicare beneficiaries.

As we all know, and as we have all experienced every February and March, this does not lend itself to an efficient, effective, nor transparent process. Moreover, it deprives CMS of thoughtful, constructive feedback that is necessary to improve a program that our seniors love and rely on. This bill is a simple, straightforward measure that will improve the current process by expanding the current cycle from 45 to 60 days, which will give plans, stakeholders, Members, and our staff 30 full days—double the current time allowed—to analyze and provide feedback on the draft call letter and rate notices.

This is a no-cost, good government, bipartisan bill that will make the process more transparent, more fair, and more advantageous for the beneficiaries whom we serve. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a key new member of the House of Representatives who understands the importance of Medicare Advantage.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I always strive for in my personal and professional life is always trying to do things better. As I tell my staff, there is no such thing as standing still. If you are not moving forward, then you are moving backward. We can all continue to get better at what we do.

That is the goal of H.R. 2507, the Increasing Regulatory Fairness Act of 2015. As part of an annual rulemaking process, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services update payments to the Medicare Advantage program. With the current structure of this annual process, health insurers are given little time to submit comments to the new payment rates or even determine whether the payment adjustment is beneficial to Medicare Advantage enrollees.

With H.R. 2507, health insurers will have additional time to analyze whether the payment adjustments for Medicare Advantage plans are justified and overall beneficial. I believe we must always try to get better every day. This includes our work as civil servants. H.R. 2507 will provide a better environment for CMS and health insurers to create the best payment rate agreement regarding Medicare Advantage plans. By providing more time for comments and the finalizing of rates, Medicare Advantage enrollees will receive a better calculated benefit for their plans.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the statements previously made by my colleagues and thank both Mr. BRADY and Mr. PITTS for working with me on this legislation. As I have stated before, this is a simple, no-cost bill that will improve the current process and the Medicare Advantage program for our seniors. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2507.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Congressman THOMPSON. I appreciate so much his work in this area in a bipartisan way on a bill that not only bridges both parties but a number of committees in this Congress and really just provides a commonsense way to make sure the public, Congress, and others can comment, and to make sure these rules really benefit the seniors who are receiving Medicare Advantage. I urge strong support for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today expands an annual regulatory schedule for Medicare Advantage (MA) payment rates so that stakeholders have the necessary time to review and provide feedback to ensure seniors continue to have access to quality, low-cost plans of their choosing.

H.R. 2507, the Increasing Regulatory Fairness Act of 2015, was introduced by my colleague, Representative KEVIN BRADY (TX), Chairman of the Health Subcommittee of Ways and Means, and I cosponsored along with MIKE THOMPSON (CA), PETE SESSIONS (TX), and KYRSTEN SINEMA (AZ). This bipartisan, commonsense legislation will facilitate greater understanding and collaboration between industry stakeholders and regulators,

and will offer a greater opportunity for public input in the establishment of policies affecting the MA and Part D plans.

Since 2006, when the Medicare Modernization Act's official implementation, and the Medicare Advantage/Part D call letter and rate notice were around 16 pages long, a two-week comment period may have been adequate. Today, however, that document has grown to nearly 150 pages—and the comment period—still just 15 days—is simply not enough time for plans that now serve one-third of the Medicare population to analyze and gather substantive comments on increasingly complex policy changes. This bill would increase that comment period to 30 days, a strong step towards regulatory fairness for the successful Medicare Advantage/Part D programs.

Expanding this comment period allows for a fair amount of time in which both stakeholders, as well as Members of Congress and Committees, have sufficient time to understand the policy implications and formulate comments, if they so choose. More time equals better, more thoughtful policies.

Mr. Speaker, by approving this legislation, we will be giving seniors, insurance plan providers and other interested stakeholders adequate time to comprehend and provide comments on proposed changes to Medicare Advantage plans.

This is an important and necessary legislative change and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2507.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to, specifically, the provision of H.R. 2570 that pays for the Value Based Insurance Design for Better Care Act. If this bill passes with its current pay-for in place, it will do so at the detriment of Americans who rely on home infusion therapies.

"Infusion therapy" refers to the administration of medication directly into the bloodstream through a needle or catheter. A patient will undergo infusion therapy when his or her disease or infection cannot be adequately treated by oral medications. Infusion therapy is used to treat cancers, congestive heart failure, immune deficiencies, multiple sclerosis, rheumatoid arthritis, gastrointestinal diseases, and other conditions.

The administration of infusion therapies is significantly more involved than that of oral medications. Infusion therapy entails specialized equipment, supplies, and professional services, including sterile drug compounding, care coordination, and patient education and monitoring.

Currently, Medicare fully covers infusion therapy when it is administered in a hospital, doctor's office or nursing home. However, Medicare's coverage of infusion therapy in the home is fractured and does not adequately cover the services needed to provide infusions in the home.

Not only does this coverage gap force patients into expensive institutional settings, but it also puts patients at risk of developing additional infections in these environments. What's more, this coverage gap prevents patients from receiving the treatment they need in the most comfortable setting possible: their homes.

Although Medicare does not presently pay for the services that are essential for a patient

to receive infusion therapies at home, providers have been able to offer a limited set of home infusion drugs to Medicare beneficiaries via Medicare Part B DME coverage, as the reimbursement they receive for home infusion drugs is substantial enough to cover the services necessary to administer those drugs.

If H.R. 2570 passes in its current form, this will no longer be the case.

The demonstration program that this legislation creates is financed by modifying the reimbursement structure for infusion drugs under the Medicare Part B durable medical equipment benefit. This change will perpetuate the coverage gap that prevents Medicare from covering the indispensable service component of home infusion therapy.

In addition, the drug reimbursement that providers receive will no longer be significant enough to capture home infusion services as it does currently. As a result, it will become exceedingly difficult for providers to offer Medicare beneficiaries infusion therapy in their homes.

I want to emphasize that I do not oppose changing the manner in which home infusion drugs are paid for. On the contrary, I have introduced H.R. 605, the Medicare Home Infusion Site of Care Act, with Congressman PAT TIBERI. Our bill, which has garnered cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, would explicitly cover the services that must be provided to administer infusion drugs at home.

I ask that my colleagues think about the patients who depend on home infusion therapies. If we allow H.R. 2570 to pass in its current form, we simultaneously deny patients the ability to receive life-saving therapies in their homes, forcing them into institutional settings that will come at a cost to the Medicare program and, most importantly, to patients' quality of life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2507, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1745

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE COVERAGE TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2505) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2505

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT FOR ENROLLMENT DATA REPORTING FOR MEDICARE.

Section 1874 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kk) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) REQUIREMENT FOR ENROLLMENT DATA REPORTING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 1 of each year (beginning with 2016), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on enrollment data (and, in the case of part A, on data on individuals receiving benefits under such part) for the plan year or, in the case of part A and part B, for the fiscal year or year (as applicable) ending before January 1 of such plan year, fiscal year, or year. Such enrollment data shall be presented—

"(A) by zip code, congressional district, and State;

"(B) in a manner that provides for such data based on enrollment (including receipt of benefits other than through enrollment) under part A, enrollment under part B, enrollment under an MA plan under part C, and enrollment under part D; and

"(C) in the case of enrollment data described in subparagraph (B) relating to MA plans, presented in a manner that provides for such data for each MA-PD plan and for each MA plan that is not an MA-PD plan.

"(2) DELAY OF DEADLINE.—If the Secretary is unable to submit a report under paragraph (1) by May 1 of a year for data of the plan year, fiscal year, or year (as applicable) ending before January 1 of such year, the Secretary shall, not later than April 30 of such year, notify the committees described in such paragraph of—

"(A) such inability, including an explanation for such inability; and

"(B) the date by which the Secretary will provide such report, which shall be not later than June 1 of such year."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2505 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, after my remarks, I will include in the RECORD an exchange of letters between the committees of jurisdiction.

I stand in strong support of H.R. 2505, the Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act of 2015. This is commonsense legislation. It is truly about transparency in healthcare data.

Medicare Advantage currently makes up close to one-third of the Medicare program's enrollees. The Congressional

Budget Office projects that Medicare enrollment numbers will swell over the next decade and that Medicare Advantage will grow to over 40 percent of Medicare.

It will be beneficial for Members of Congress to fully understand what the makeup of health enrollment is in their district, whether it is Medicare Advantage; part D, the prescription drug plan; or fee-for-service. Members and their staff will be able to serve their constituents better and more fully with access to this data. As we continue to work on, process, and pass legislation to improve the Medicare program, getting this enrollment snapshot will provide very necessary transparency and openness.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), Mr. KIND, and Mr. BILIRAKIS for their hard work in getting this legislation through the committee and to the House floor.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 12, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: I write in regard to H.R. 2505, Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act of 2015, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on June 2, 2015. As you are aware, the bill also was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 2505 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 2505 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2505 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2505, the Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act of 2015, and your willingness to forego consideration by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of the bill and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your

committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of H.R. 2505. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I concur with the gentleman from Texas. My dear friend MIKE KELLY and Congressman RON KIND have worked together in trying to get more information for the Congress from our congressional districts to see exactly what the enrollments are in Medicare. It makes us better legislators so we can improve the bill.

I think these bills are worthy of the support of the House of Representatives, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a new member of the Ways and Means Committee and a businessperson who understands the openness and transparency required to improve Medicare.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once opined:

The cornerstone of democracy rests on the foundation of an educated electorate. Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government.

Jefferson's vision for our democracy was premised on the notion that individuals are intelligent enough to determine the best choices for their lives, their families, and their communities, and not some monolithic, paternalistic government.

A prerequisite to being well-informed, however, is to ensure that the American people have adequate information about how Federal policies and decisions made in Washington will or are impacting their lives. That is why transparency is so vital to our system of government: it provides the necessary information to educate or our on which our democracy depends.

Laws and their impacts should not be shrouded in secrecy. Congress and the administration need to be fostering a culture of openness and transparency when legislating and making decisions here in Washington. That is what this legislation is all about: providing more transparency to the American people about their health care, specifically Medicare Advantage coverage.

H.R. 2505, the Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act, is a bill to do just that. With passage of H.R. 2505, CMS will be required to provide additional information on Medicare Advantage enrollment based on ZIP Code, congressional district, and State.

This data will be available for both Medicare Advantage Prescription Drug

Plans as well as regular Medicare Advantage. Enrollment data under part A, part B, enrollment under an MA plan under part C, and enrollment under part D would also be covered.

The purpose of this additional data is to provide greater information to the public, policymakers, and the healthcare community so that they have the benefit of more and better information when making decisions.

CMS should provide a more transparent accounting of Medicare enrollment data to Congress, other government offices, and the American people so committees of jurisdiction can better understand how Medicare is serving the healthcare needs of the Nation as well as individual congressional districts.

H.R. 2505 would require an annual report on Medicare enrollment data so that Members of Congress have more accurate information regarding the constituents' use of Medicare programs. Such transparency will allow Americans and Members of Congress to better know and understand the scope of Medicare enrollment on a local level as well as the specific population affected.

In 2014, the majority of the 54 million people on Medicare are in the traditional Medicare program, with 30 percent enrolled in a Medicare Advantage plan. Since 2004, the number of beneficiaries enrolled in private plans has almost tripled—from 5.3 million to 15.7 million in 2014.

In Pennsylvania, 18 percent of the total population in the Commonwealth is enrolled in some form of Medicare. Of the 18 percent, 39 percent of those Medicare beneficiaries are enrolled in Medicare Advantage plans. That means that 7 percent of Pennsylvanians are enrolled in the Medicare Advantage plan.

This legislation will give me and my constituents more information about how changes to Medicare Advantage plans in Washington will impact my constituents at home in the Third Congressional District of Pennsylvania and every Member and their constituents around this great country.

I want to thank Chairman RYAN for bringing up this bill. I also want to thank Leader MCCARTHY for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), one of the key authors of the legislation and one of the leaders of health care on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill I am proud to sponsor with my friends—Representative KELLY, who is the lead sponsor, and Representative KIND—H.R. 2505,

the Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act.

Fifteen million Americans choose Medicare Advantage. By all accounts, Medicare Advantage has been successful for its enrollees, including those I represent. Similarly, approximately 37 million seniors chose part D as of 2014. Over 1,000 Medicare part D plans are offered nationwide, and the program has continued to grow in popularity and be well under its initial budget projections. I think Medicare part D is one of the greatest programs in the history of the Congress.

The Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services' Office of Legislation used to issue reports on the Medicare Advantage and part D enrollment data for each congressional district; however, in 2012, they stopped issuing these reports. Why? It is now 2015, and they have still not provided this data.

Information is valuable to legislators and health researchers. The more information we have about how a program is working, the better decisions we can make. Currently, enrollment data for Medicare Advantage and part D come from third-party sources; however, it is time for CMS to continue to do its job and provide this information.

As I said earlier, by all accounts from third parties, both Medicare Advantage and part D are successful programs and, of course, as is traditional Medicare. These programs are used by so many seniors, Mr. Speaker. They are keeping our seniors healthier and saving them money.

This is a good government bill, and I am hopeful for a strong, bipartisan vote.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the objectives of this bill. I advocate a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the leadership of Mr. KELLY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. KIND from Wisconsin, who together, Republicans and Democrats, crossed committees and recognized the need for openness.

Knowledge is power. Knowledge of Medicare Advantage and who is receiving it in whose district we think is very important to strengthening Medicare as an entire program going forward.

I urge support for this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2505, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2146, DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS (during consideration of H.R. 2505) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-167) on the resolution (H. Res. 321) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SENIORS' HEALTH CARE PLAN PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2582) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the risk adjustment under the Medicare Advantage program, to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2582

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Seniors' Health Care Plan Protection Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DELAY IN AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE CONTRACTS FOR MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS FAILING TO ACHIEVE MINIMUM QUALITY RATINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Consistent with the studies provided under the IMPACT Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-185), it is the intent of Congress—

(1) to continue to study and request input on the effects of socioeconomic status and dual-eligible populations on the Medicare Advantage STARS rating system before reforming such system with the input of stakeholders; and

(2) pending the results of such studies and input, to provide for a temporary delay in authority of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to terminate Medicare Advantage plan contracts solely on the basis of performance of plans under the STARS rating system.

(b) DELAY IN MA CONTRACT TERMINATION AUTHORITY FOR PLANS FAILING TO ACHIEVE MINIMUM QUALITY RATINGS.—Section 1857(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-27(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) DELAY IN CONTRACT TERMINATION AUTHORITY FOR PLANS FAILING TO ACHIEVE MINIMUM QUALITY RATING.—The Secretary may not terminate a contract under this section with respect to the offering of an MA plan by a Medicare Advantage organization solely because the MA plan has failed to achieve a minimum quality rating under the 5-star rating system established under section 1853(o) during the period beginning on the

date of the enactment of this paragraph and through the end of plan year 2018.”.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENTS TO MA RISK ADJUSTMENT SYSTEM.

Section 1853(a)(1)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(a)(1)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clauses:

“(iv) EVALUATION AND SUBSEQUENT REVISION OF THE RISK ADJUSTMENT SYSTEM TO ACCOUNT FOR CHRONIC CONDITIONS AND OTHER FACTORS FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING THE RISK ADJUSTMENT SYSTEM MORE ACCURATE, TRANSPARENT, AND REGULARLY UPDATED.—

“(i) REVISION BASED ON NUMBER OF CHRONIC CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall revise for 2017 and periodically thereafter, the risk adjustment system under this subparagraph so that a risk score under such system, with respect to an individual, takes into account the number of chronic conditions with which the individual has been diagnosed.

“(ii) EVALUATION OF DIFFERENT RISK ADJUSTMENT MODELS.—The Secretary shall evaluate the impact of including two years of data to compare the models used to determine risk scores for 2013 and 2014 under such system.

“(iii) EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS ON CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE (CKD) CODES.—The Secretary shall evaluate the impact of removing the diagnosis codes related to chronic kidney disease in the 2014 risk adjustment model and conduct an analysis of best practices of MA plans to slow disease progression related to chronic kidney disease.

“(iv) EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON USE OF ENCOUNTER DATA.—The Secretary shall evaluate the impact of including 10 percent of encounter data in computing payment for 2016 and the readiness of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to incorporate encounter data in risk scores. In conducting such evaluation, the Secretary shall use data collected as encounter data on or after January 1, 2012, shall analyze such data for accuracy and completeness and issue recommendations for improving such accuracy and completeness, and shall not increase the percentage of such encounter data used unless the Secretary releases the data publicly, indicates how such data will be weighted in computing the risk scores, and ensures that the data reflects the degree and cost of care coordination under MA plans.

“(v) CONDUCT OF EVALUATIONS.—Evaluations and analyses under subclause (ii) through (iv) shall include an actuarial opinion from the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services about the reasonableness of the methods, assumptions, and conclusions of such evaluations and analyses. The Secretary shall consult with the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and accept and consider comments of stakeholders, such as managed care organizations and beneficiary groups, on such evaluation and analyses. The Secretary shall complete such evaluations and analyses in a manner that permits the results to be applied for plan years beginning with the second plan year that begins after the date of the enactment of this clause.

“(vi) IMPLEMENTATION OF REVISIONS BASED ON EVALUATIONS.—If the Secretary determines, based on such an evaluation or analysis, that revisions to the risk adjustment system to address the matters described in any of subclauses (ii) through (iv) would make the risk adjustment system under this subparagraph better reflect and appropriately weight for the population that is served by the plan, the Secretary shall, beginning with 2017, and periodically thereafter, make such revisions.

“(vii) PERIODIC REPORTING TO CONGRESS.—With respect to plan years beginning with 2017 and every third year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the most recent revisions (if any) made under this clause, including the evaluations conducted under subclauses (ii) through (iv).

“(v) NO CHANGES TO ADJUSTMENT FACTORS THAT PREVENT ACTIVITIES CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL HEALTH POLICY GOALS.—In making any changes to the adjustment factors, including adjustment for health status under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall ensure that the changes do not prevent Medicare Advantage organizations from performing or undertaking activities that are consistent with national health policy goals, including activities to promote early detection and better care coordination, the use of health risk assessments, care plans, and programs to slow the progression of chronic diseases.

“(vi) OPPORTUNITY FOR REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING CHANGES TO ADJUSTMENT FACTORS.—For changes to adjustment factors effective for 2017 and subsequent years, in addition to providing notice of such changes in the announcement under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall provide an opportunity for review of proposed changes of not less than 60 days and a public comment period of not less than 30 days before implementing such changes.”.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO MEDICARE ADVANTAGE STAR RATING SYSTEM.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has inadvertently created a star rating system under section 1853(o)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(o)(4)) for Medicare Advantage plans that lacks proper accounting for the socioeconomic status of enrollees in such plans and the extent to which such plans serve individuals who are also eligible for medical assistance under title XIX of such Act; and

(2) Congress will work with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and stakeholders, including beneficiary groups and managed care organizations, to ensure that such rating system properly accounts for the socioeconomic status of enrollees in such plans and the extent to which such plans serve such individuals described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO MEDICARE ADVANTAGE RISK ADJUSTMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should periodically monitor and improve the Medicare Advantage risk adjustment model to ensure that it accurately accounts for beneficiary risk, including for those individuals with complex chronic comorbid conditions;

(2) the Secretary should closely examine the current Medicare Advantage risk adjustment methodology to ensure that plans enrolling beneficiaries with the greatest health care needs receive adequate reimbursement to deliver high-quality care and other services to help beneficiaries avoid costly complications and further progression of chronic conditions and to the extent data indicate this to be the case, the Secretary should make necessary adjustment to the risk adjustment methodology; and

(3) the Secretary should reconsider the implementation of changes in the Medicare Advantage risk adjustment methodology finalized for 2016 and to use to the extent appropriate the methodology finalized in 2015 for one additional year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2582, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 2582, the Securing Seniors' Health Care Act of 2015.

When Medicare began implementing the STARS ratings measurement system, they did so using the typical Washington approach of one size fits all. The STARS program uses the same measures to evaluate plans with different benefit designs and different coverage mixes. Congress needs to work with stakeholders and Medicare to reform this system to make it work for all.

CMS should continue to study issues like the effect that socioeconomic conditions have on health care and the effect that coverage of duals has on various rating systems and thus properly serve their populations.

This legislation is common sense. Let's not restrict seniors from plans they have chosen and like just because they aren't performing well under CMS's poorly managed STARS standards.

Until we truly understand the effects of duals and low-income beneficiaries on the plan's STARS ratings, we shouldn't be terminating them. A 3-year delay will do just that: give CMS and Congress the time to address the STARS rating system and allow all seniors access to the plans they choose and that they like.

CMS has made some poor policy decisions in recent years through the regulatory process in Medicare Advantage and part D of the prescription drug plan, and this year's call letter and rate notice is no exception.

The changes to the risk adjustment system include masking coding intensity adjustments, while in press releases CMS touts not exceeding statutory levels of coding intensity adjustments.

In plain English, Medicare Advantage plans are managed care plans, and the changes in the recent regulations handcuff plans from properly managing some of our frailest seniors suffering from, for example, blood and kidney diseases.

This bill requires that CMS review the changes made in their most recent regulatory cycle and reverse those that negatively affect risk adjustments.

□ 1800

This bill has CMS reviewing the use of encounter date as well. CMS has told Congress, the Government Accountability Office, and MedPAC that the data is not ready yet to show us; yet it is being used for risk adjustment in Medicare Advantage? That doesn't make sense. We need to see a stronger commitment by CMS to be transparent about their policies and their data in Medicare Advantage.

The changes made this year to MA just don't make sense, and I look forward to working with all my colleagues to reverse some of these changes and make continued improvements to the system as a whole.

I want to thank Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. LOESACK for their hard work in getting this policy moving forward.

I want to, again, reiterate my thanks to Mrs. BLACK and Mr. BLUMENAUER on our committee for their leadership regarding these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing up this bill and also my colleague, Mr. BUCHANAN of Florida.

There was some comment that CMS was making some mistakes that have not been transparent. It has been my understanding that they have had problems wrestling with this so-called star system themselves and have not enforced the law, that we are now saying that they will not enforce the law until after they study the complexities and report back to the Congress in an additional 3 years.

In short, they have this star system and, as most people should recognize, that when you are dealing with old, fragile, sick, poor people, there are more complexities to performance than in ordinary programs that compete with Medicare Advantage.

We have this population, and they have penalized some of the providers because they have had just more problems to deal with than just medical problems, and they haven't been able to resolve them. They haven't enforced this provision.

Under this bill, which Mr. BUCHANAN and the other sponsors have agreed, it tells the CMS to go back and to find out a way that you can treat these recipients of health care in a fairer way. It also tells CMS to take into consideration that the problems that Medicare Advantage has still to come are far more severe and far more complex than in other areas.

This is particularly true with our citizens in Puerto Rico that don't really have an option to anything except Medicare Advantage. Of course, as we all know, the economic conditions and the poverty that prevails there is extreme.

I don't have any other requests for time, but I do want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for assisting to make certain that the Affordable Care program and other programs like it become more effective.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), one of the thoughtful leaders on health care on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership and for, really, his commitment to working these issues through. As you have heard him say, dealing with Medicare Advantage issues are important, and it is important that we get them right.

That is why I appreciate the fact that we come to the floor with these suspension bills to revisit these issues and say: Look, there are some things that just are not working as they were intended.

As you have heard, there has been bipartisan agreement, that the stars rating program needs a revisit, and CMS even agrees that the rules are not working.

As the gentleman from New York said, this has a specific effect on the frail, the low-income, those beneficiaries that are the most frail. It also affects the dual eligibles, those that are both Medicare and Medicaid eligible.

It is appropriate that we look at this rating program, that we back up and pause and consider the negative impact that some of these arbitrary ratings have on these programs when it may be the only program that is available that will meet these needs.

This is common sense. It is the right thing to do. I thank my colleagues that they are willing to say: CMS, it is not working; you have to come to the table with us.

This delay, this pause, and a review of the system is appropriate.

I thank everyone involved for their leadership, and I do express thanks to Mr. BUCHANAN and his team for the way they have worked with us and the Energy and Commerce Committee on the issue.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), again, one of our key healthcare leaders on the Ways and Means Committee who is

critical in the advancement of this legislation.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2582, the Seniors' Health Care Plan Protection Act.

I am pleased that this legislation includes the language of my bill, the Securing Care for Seniors Act; and I thank Congressman BUCHANAN for his efforts to bring this important policy solution to the floor of the House today.

Across the country, 16 million seniors enjoy the flexibility of the Medicare Advantage plan. When we make changes to this program, seniors are the ones impacted. It just makes sense that they would have a place at the table when these changes are discussed.

Recently, CMS revised the Medicare Advantage risk adjustment model under the shroud of secrecy with little input from Congress and, most importantly, from Medicare beneficiaries.

Members of both parties have concerns that these modifications could discourage plans to detect and care for the chronic conditions in their early stages. That is why, today, we are calling for a timeout on CMS' changes.

We are instructing the agency to reevaluate their risk adjustment model and to move forward with metrics that are accurate, evidence-based, and are transparent. This will ensure that seniors pay a fair cost for their healthcare plans, and that the MA program remains sustainable in the long term.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 2582.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to say that this has been one of the most exciting recent legislative experiences I have had, where we are dealing with Americans who are not Republican and Democrat, but they are sick people; and, in this particular case, they are sick, and they are old, and they are fragile, and the government is not serving them.

Both sides of the aisle have agreed that the administration has to do something to make certain that they study how we can be fair to the providers and, at the same time, provide the service to those people that need it. They, themselves, agree that, for 3 years, they have not been able to find an answer.

What we have said jointly is you find that answer in 3 years. Until such time, don't you think about terminating these programs. It is with this cooperation that we both have a common sense of our obligation as legislators, and it has been really a legislative pleasure working with my colleagues on these suspensions this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I agree with the gentleman from New York that this is a bill that brings,

really, a team of Republicans and Democrats together with their best ideas on how we can help improve Medicare for our seniors.

This bill is titled "Securing Seniors' Health Care Act." It is aptly titled.

I am hopeful that today is just one example of more common ground between Republicans and Democrats, not just on the Ways and Means Committee, but through the House as well. I urge strong support for passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2582, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings, to make improvements to the Medicare Adjustment risk adjustment system, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

— HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

— PASS THE PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this body to pass the Protect Medical Innovation Act, which will repeal the 2.3 percent medical device excise tax.

This harmful tax, mandated by ObamaCare, stifles innovation, sends jobs abroad, hurts consumers, and places a heavy burden on small businesses in my State and across the country.

More than 35,000 Minnesotans are employed in the medical device industry, and thousands of Minnesotans depend on these state-of-the-art devices to enhance or even save their lives.

This bill has been stalled for long enough. It is imperative that Congress pass this legislation now to encourage the development of these innovative technologies, rather than enact laws that discourage their creation and accessibility.

I am grateful for the tremendous work by my Minnesota colleague, ERIK PAULSEN. Representative PAULSEN has done much to ensure the medical device industry in Minnesota continues to thrive for many years to come with this legislation.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support the Protect Medical Innovation Act and pass it immediately.

— REPEAL THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the medical device tax that is found within the President's Affordable Care Act sends American jobs overseas, hurts American jobs here in the United States, raises healthcare costs for all Americans, and stifles innovation.

While I have supported the House's action to repeal this onerous tax and support innovation, it is important that I highlight an important issue to my constituents back home in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, because it is tied into this whole debate. That issue is medical device safety, and it is patient safety.

Many who serve in this Chamber may have seen the headlines over the past several months regarding a medical device known as a power morcellator and, specifically, the devastating damage it has caused to women's health by spreading unsuspected cancer throughout their body.

These devices are gynecological tools used to remove uterine fibroids and have been on the market for over two decades, but only recently, we have learned that the use of these devices increases the risk of spreading unsuspected cancers in women to as high as 1 in 350 cases.

That finding prompted the FDA to issue a black box warning on the devices last fall. Several major insurance companies have stopped covering the procedure, and some medical device manufacturers have pulled them from the shelves—all appropriate steps to be taken when it becomes clear that a previously approved device has potential to harm instead of help.

As a lawmaker, I must ask: How is it that we have gotten to this point? What are the FDA and the medical device industry's protocols?

That is why, on February 19 of this year, I sent a letter to the FDA asking pointed questions about the current streamlined regulatory process that the power morcellator went through, known as 510(k).

I asked about FDA's reporting process for dangerous devices and their

postmarket surveillance techniques. I asked for detailed explanations on why the power morcellator remains on the market, despite the high risks that have now been revealed.

To date, nearly 4 months from the date that this letter was hand-delivered to the FDA, I have not received a written reply. I will insert my letter to the FDA into the RECORD.

These are important questions, the answers to which will inform any next steps that we need to take.

□ 1815

My constituents want answers. I want answers. And I think this Chamber needs answers so that we can properly begin to address these gaps in our device safety regulations that allowed the morcellator to slip through the cracks for so long.

Ensuring the safety of our constituents is paramount to each Member of this body, and that is what I seek when it comes to this issue. I am hoping the FDA will partner with me. I am hoping that every Member of this body will partner with me.

Industry and government need to work together to develop a robust, modernized postmarket device surveillance program that allows us to catch issues like the power morcellator faster and encourages responsive reporting protocols so if a doctor finds an issue with a device, the manufacturer and the FDA are promptly notified and provided accurate data to take the next appropriate steps.

But, unfortunately, it is becoming clear that the reporting system for faulty and deadly devices is broken. A recent Wall Street Journal story highlighted how, in 2006, a doctor from central Pennsylvania started to raise the alarm and asked questions about power morcellators. He was seeing an alarming number of cancerous tissues arriving at his lab that were coming in from morcellation surgeries. He estimated the occurrence at somewhere in the range of 1 in 300.

It took the FDA and industry nearly a decade to come to that same conclusion. Within that decade, an unknown number of women were harmed and deceased because their cancers went from localized and treatable to stage four and metastasized within days of being spread by the blades of this device.

What happened with the power morcellator should never be allowed to happen again. We need to ensure that risks are adequately assessed before devices hit the market. We need to monitor the devices once they are on the market. And we need to have efficient and effective reporting procedures in place. And those within industry and the FDA need to be held accountable if it is found that they are turning a blind eye to these issues.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in ensuring that patients and safety always come first.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 19, 2015.
Commissioner MARGARET A. HAMBURG,
U.S. Food and Drug Administration,
Silver Spring, MD.

DEAR COMMISSIONER HAMBURG, I write to seek clarification of your agency's regulation of medical devices. I am specifically looking to obtain answers about the 510(k) process, and hoping to gather information about whether the FDA has plans to alter this process in light of recommendations from the Institute of Medicine (IOM).

It is my understanding that the 510(k) clearance process for medical devices was established through the Medical Devices Amendments (MDA) passed by Congress in 1976. The process was created as a by-product of the three-tiered medical device regulatory framework created by the MDA to balance competing considerations of ensuring product safety and fostering further innovation.

After 1976, medical devices were organized into three classes.

Class I—devices for which general controls such as misbranding and adulteration prohibitions and Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) suffice to reasonably assure safety and effectiveness.

Class II—devices that require both general controls and product performance to reasonably assure the same.

Class III—devices for which only a premarket approval (PMA) process similar to new drug approval can ensure safety and effectiveness.

Section 510(k) was created as part of the MDA's attempt to address medical devices that were on the market prior to its enactment and new medical devices introduced later consistently within this framework. Since its creation, the 510(k) process has come to dominate the path to market for virtually all Class I, Class II, and some Class III medical devices despite the fact that consumer protection is severely lacking. To reinforce this statement, it has been reported that between 1976 and 1990, more than 98 percent of FDA-regulated medical devices were cleared through the 510(k) premarket notification, and in the year 2005, almost 99 percent of devices were cleared through the 510(k) process.

In 2011, the FDA sought to address this process, and turned to the Institute of Medicine (IOM) to review the 510(k) process and answer two questions:

1. Does the current 510(k) process protect patients optimally and promote innovation in support of public health?

2. If not, what legislative, regulatory, or administrative changes are recommended to achieve the goals of the 510(k) process optimally?

IOM found that the current 510(k) process is flawed based on its legislative foundation. Rather than continuing to modify the thirty-five year old 510(k) process, the IOM concluded that the FDA's finite resources would be better invested in developing an integrated pre-market and post-market regulatory framework that provides a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness throughout the device life cycle. The IOM outlined its criteria for the framework in a comprehensive report they provided to your agency that same year.

Following the release of IOM's recommendation, the US Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor & Pensions (HELP) held a full committee hearing entitled "Medical Devices: Protecting Patients and Promoting Innovation" on November 15, 2011.

During this hearing, Jeffrey Shuren, the Director of the Center for Device and Radiological Health (CDRH) within the FDA, provided testimony to Committee Members about CDRH's premarket review process and the center's plan to improve the predictability, consistency, and transparency of their regulatory processes. When asked about 510(k) Mr. Shuren stated that getting rid of this clearance process as IOM suggested would be highly disruptive to both the FDA and medical device manufacturers, but assured the Committee that the FDA would focus on trying to improve the process along with the safety of medical devices.

Nearly four years has passed since this hearing and to my knowledge, the 510(k) process remains the same. I respectfully request that you answer the following questions regarding this process:

1. Does the 510(k) mechanism ensure patient safety in the medical device arena by requiring premarket safety testing?

2. Does the 510(k) mechanism have a specific mechanism for surveillance of adverse outcomes? What are the legislative barriers to FDA surveillance of adverse outcomes in the medical device space?

3. The majority of medical devices in the United States are cleared via the 510(k) process. This process operates based on a "predicate" system. What is the process through which FDA makes the determination that a device is an appropriate predicate?

4. Type 2 devices are reviewed via the 510(k) mechanism. Who assigns a device as being a type 2 device? Is this determination reviewed by any expert committees, and how? If not, why not? Are there specific examples where the Type 2 status was assigned, but was then later changed or should have been changed?

5. As previously mentioned, A committee of The Institute of Medicine concluded and subsequently testified to the senate HELP committee, in 2011, that the 510(k) legislation cannot ensure patient safety and must be overhauled. What specific steps did the FDA take to mitigate the patient safety deficit in response to this analysis?

6. The Institute of Medicine report of 2011 also expressed significant concern to FDA and congress regarding the lack of pre-market safety testing requirements and absence of any post-market adverse outcomes surveillance mechanisms in 510(k). What are the barriers at FDA for implementation of such safety standards in the medical device space?

7. What specific guidelines does the FDA currently use to determine if a device is eligible for a 510(k) application?

8. Does the FDA currently permit persistence of devices approved via 510(k), whose predicate device has been found to be faulty?

The FDA's primary focus should be to ensure patient safety. Please consider the following questions regarding the reporting process and post-market surveillance techniques for harmful medical devices:

9. Does FDA have a legal and prosecutable "positive mandate to self-report adverse outcomes in the medical device space" for individual practitioners? If so have there been any prosecutions for failure to report?

10. Does FDA have a legal and prosecutable "positive mandate to self-report adverse outcomes in the medical device space" for hospitals? If so have there been any prosecutions for failure to report?

11. Does FDA have a legal and prosecutable "positive mandate to self-report adverse outcomes in the medical device space" for device manufacturers? If so have there been any prosecutions for failure to report?

12. The FDA has a database that could be used to report adverse outcomes in the medical device space, known as MAUDE. Public concerns have been raised that this database is a “dead mail-box” with inefficient to ineffective monitoring. How is the MAUDE database monitored? And how are safety concerns registered in MAUDE addressed by FDA?

13. Is there a role for implementation of new legislation to require a window of post-market surveillance of adverse outcomes related to the use of new devices? And can the FDA under its current authority mandate post-market surveillance of adverse outcomes related to the use of new devices?

14. Can the FDA, under its current legal authority, mandate a positive duty for practitioners, organizations that provide health care services, and manufacturers to report adverse outcomes to the FDA? And is there a role for new legislation focused on more strongly and clearly mandating a “positive requirement to self-report adverse outcomes” to FDA by practitioners, hospitals and manufacturers?

15. Please explain the asymmetry between the safety and reporting requirements imposed on the medical device, versus drug industries, by FDA?

The Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH) is the branch of the FDA responsible for the premarket approval of all medical devices, as well as overseeing the manufacturing, performance and safety of these devices. Please respond to the following questions regarding the CDRH:

16. How many people are employed at the CDRH and in what capacities? How effective is this staff at protecting patient safety and is the first and foremost priority of this group's agenda to protect and promote patient safety? What consumer/patient protection mechanisms have been established by the CDRH to promote patient safety and how is the efficacy of these mechanisms evaluated?

17. Does the CDRH consider the medical device industry as equal stakeholder to patients and consumers in the United States?

Lastly, as you are likely aware, many safety concerns have been raised in conjunction with the use of power morcellators in routine surgeries. Please consider the following questions regarding that specific device.

18. Recently, FDA placed a black box warning on a device known as a power morcellator. FDA recognized and reported to the public that as many as one in 350 unsuspecting American women undergoing morcellation will be at risk of having their occult uterine cancers upstaged with devastating consequences. Johnson & Johnson, the largest manufacturer of the power morcellator subsequently voluntarily recalled its product from the worldwide market. Other manufacturers, such as the German company KARL STORZ, have elected not to recall the product and many gynecologists continue to believe the risk to be minimal.

a. Given the avoidable nature of this potentially deadly hazard and unwillingness of industry advocates and many gynecologists to abandon this practice, why did FDA elect not to ban this device from market?

b. Was there any role for the FDA commissioner's office to exercise its authority under Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulation, Section 895? And why was this option not exercised?

19. The FDA's analysis demonstrated that up to one in 350 unsuspecting American women undergoing morcellation were put in deadly harm's way using FDA authorized power morcellators. The American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology subsequently demonstrated that the incidence may be as high as one in 156. It, therefore, appears that morcellation and Power morcellators may have caused the unnecessary or premature deaths of many hundreds (if not thousands) of American women for over 2 decades. It now appears that the manufacturers of power morcellators and many gynecological specialty organizations had full knowledge of this hazard. However, no one appears to have reported this potentially deadly hazard back to FDA, a complication associated with the use of this device until December 2013–20 years after the device was introduced to market using 510(k) clearance.

a. Can you confirm that this is, in fact, the case? The reporting of adverse outcomes associated with the use of medical devices is a requirement set forth in the Code of Federal Regulation, Title 21, Section 803. This requirement was not followed by the manufacturers, practitioners, hospitals, or specialty organizations.

b. Is there any role for the FDA, the HHS Office of Inspector General or the United States Congress to inquire and hold FDA, the device manufacturers or the gynecological specialty organizations accountable for the loss of life in the United States?

Thank you in advance for your diligent and timely reply.

Sincerely,

MIKE FITZPATRICK,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL
YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, Office of the Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the budget allocations of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016, S. Con. Res. 11, pursuant to section 4503 of such concurrent resolution—a Deficit Neutral Reserve Fund Related to the Medicare Provisions of the President's Health Care Law. These revisions are designated for H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, as amended pursuant to H. Res. 319. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of budgetary enforcement. These revised allocations are to be considered as the allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted. Pursuant to section 3403 of such resolution, the revision to the allocations shall apply only while H.R. 1190, as amended pursuant to H. Res. 319, is under consideration or upon its enactment.

Sincerely,

TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

TABLE 1—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Ways and Means				
Current Allocation	962,805	962,080	13,224,077	13,222,960
Adjustment for H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015	0	0	7,100	7,100
Revised Allocation	962,805	962,080	13,231,177	13,230,060
Energy & Commerce				
Current Allocation	389,635	392,001	4,341,991	4,346,043
Adjustment for H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015	0	0	–8,845	–7,145
Revised Allocation	389,635	392,001	4,333,146	4,338,898

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 18, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1852. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Han-

dling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2014–2015 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0087; FV14-985-1B FIR] received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1853. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department

of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2014-15 Crop Year for Tart Cherries [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0077; FV14-930-2 FR] received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1854. A letter from the Finance and Loan Analyst, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reserve Account (RIN: 0575-AC99) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1855. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Relaxation of the Handling Regulation for Area No. 3 [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0092; FV15-948-1 FIR] received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1856. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Progress Report to Congress on the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program and the National Cord Blood Inventory Program, pursuant to the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005 (Pub. L. 109-129), as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1857. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Progress Report on the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program and National Cord Blood Inventory Program, pursuant to the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005 (Pub. L. 109-129), as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1858. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Person to the Entity List [Docket No.: 150304211-5211-01] (RIN: 0694-AG55) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1859. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to Secs. 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTTC 15-047; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1860. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1861. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; Rate Setting for Community-Rated Plans (RIN: 3206-AN00) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1862. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, and Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense

Joint Executive Committee FY 2014 Annual Report, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 8111; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1626. A bill to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1633. A bill to provide for certain improvements relating to the tracking and reporting of employees of the Department of Homeland Security placed on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2200. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2206. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require recipients of State Homeland Security Grant Program funding to preserve and strengthen interoperable emergency communications capabilities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1640. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 321. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-167). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr.

TAKANO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 2798. A bill to modify provisions of law relating to refugee resettlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 2799. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to stroke telehealth services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 2800. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide protections against pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 2801. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of General Services from leasing space for certain purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEST-MORELAND, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BABIN, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRAT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 2802. A bill to prevent discriminatory treatment of any person on the basis of views held with respect to marriage; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2803. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure State control over academic standards,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 2804. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and tribal governments and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 2805. A bill to address prescription opioid abuse and heroin use; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 2806. A bill to ensure prompt access to Supplemental Security Income, Social Security disability, and Medicaid benefits for persons released from certain public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2807. A bill to create a centralized website on reports issued by the Inspectors General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2808. A bill to prohibit U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from negotiating contracts with private detention companies that require a minimum number of immigration detention beds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2809. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit sewage dumping into the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERA, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 2810. A bill to provide for a review of efforts to reduce Federal agency travel ex-

penses through the use of video conferencing and a plan to achieve additional reductions in such expenses through the use of video conferencing, to implement such plan through rescissions of appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. JONES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GALLEG0, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2811. A bill to repeal section 3003 of the the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. YOH0, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. COLE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROUZER, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 2812. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for premiums for insurance which constitutes medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 2813. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a grant pilot program to provide housing to elderly homeless veterans; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 2814. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Sevierville, Tennessee, the Dannie A. Carr Veterans Outpatient Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROKITA, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2815. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to complete a data analysis study on the impacts of all income- or employment-based outcome measures of quality in higher education before issuing or implementing regulations utilizing such metrics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2816. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in Blaine County, Idaho, to the city of Ketchum, Idaho, to be used to support recreation, educational, and public purposes, including river restoration, floodplain management, and municipal water storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KATKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 2817. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Historic Preservation Fund; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 322. A resolution recognizing the importance of providing services to children of incarcerated parents; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H. Res. 323. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of Mexico should forthwith repatriate the remains of those American Soldiers who fought in the battle of Monterrey in 1846; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BASS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 324. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO,

Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H. Res. 325. A resolution recognizing the month of June as "Immigrant Heritage Month," a celebration of the accomplishments and contributions immigrants and their children have made in shaping the history, strengthening the economy, and enriching the culture of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which states:

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 2800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to regulate commerce among the several states.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide protections against pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 2801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation has been written pursuant to protections guaranteed by the First Amendment, which states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech."

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" as outlined in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution. Additionally, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states, Congress shall have power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof".

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 2805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of section 8 of , Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 2809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 2814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 2817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States of America

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. KATKO, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 167: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 169: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 170: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 213: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 333: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 358: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 540: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 546: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 600: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 605: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 624: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 662: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 663: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LONG, and Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 680: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 684: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 692: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 699: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 707: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 712: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 746: Mr. POLIS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 766: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 767: Mr. HANNA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 774: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 828: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 829: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 920: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 963: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 970: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 985: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 986: Ms. GRANGER.
 H.R. 999: Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.R. 1002: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1087: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
 H.R. 1094: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 1151: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 1211: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 1247: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
 H.R. 1299: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 1321: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 1356: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 1369: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 1375: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 1388: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. PITTENGER.
 H.R. 1401: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 1457: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 1462: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 1464: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 1475: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R. 1479: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 1516: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
 H.R. 1531: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1533: Mr. COHEN and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 1559: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
 H.R. 1599: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.R. 1608: Ms. MOORE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 1610: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 1624: Mr. POLIS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 1655: Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. TAKAI.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 1728: Mr. TAKAI.
 H.R. 1742: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 1752: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 1769: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 1781: Mrs. TORRES and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 1814: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. CARNEY, and Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 1834: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1848: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1854: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 1900: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1901: Mr. JORDAN.
 H.R. 1910: Ms. MOORE and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 1920: Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 1953: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 1964: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
 H.R. 1977: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 1982: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 1994: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. ZINKE.
 H.R. 2017: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 2019: Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 2043: Mr. TONKO and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 2072: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2083: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 2096: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 2102: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 2123: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 2124: Mr. POCAN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 2128: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 2141: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 2147: Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 2148: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2156: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 2216: Mr. TAKAI.
 H.R. 2217: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 2230: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 2259: Mr. ISSA.
 H.R. 2260: Mr. GALLEGO.
 H.R. 2280: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 2303: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 2309: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2358: Mr. WESTERMAN.
 H.R. 2362: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 2404: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 2407: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 2410: Mr. LEWIS.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2431: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 2450: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2457: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2477: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 2500: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 2516: Mr. COHEN and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2523: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 2560: Mr. PALMER.
 H.R. 2567: Mr. KLINE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 2576: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 2582: Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 2609: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 2616: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2646: Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 2652: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 2653: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 2654: Mr. KILMER, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 2658: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 2660: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 2662: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 2669: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 2675: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 2689: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 2692: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2694: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 2697: Mr. COHEN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 2698: Mr. GUINTA.
 H.R. 2710: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 2716: Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 2726: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 2739: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 2742: Ms. GRAHAM.
 H.R. 2747: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 2750: Ms. MCSALLY.
 H.R. 2770: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 2775: Mr. ROSS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mrs. LOVE.
 H.R. 2788: Mr. MARCHANT.
 H. J. Res. 22: Mr. TAKAI.
 H. J. Res. 32: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. PETERS.
 H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. HAHN.
 H. Res. 34: Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H. Res. 139: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 207: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. NORCROSS.
 H. Res. 220: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H. Res. 291: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. RUSH.
 H. Res. 310: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. SIREs.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2588: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECIPIENTS OF THE 2015
CONGRESSIONAL AWARDS

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Awards recognize four avenues of individual growth—community service, physical fitness, exploration, and personal development—and how the fulfillment of these goals forms balanced and promising young citizens.

In their pursuit of these goals, recipients of the Congressional Awards have gained new skills and greater confidence. For many, these projects will be the cornerstone for future endeavors, further enriching their lives and encouraging others to follow their lead.

The recipients of the 2015 Congressional Awards set the finest example and demonstrate dedication to improving their communities and the Nation as a whole.

Gabriela Abadia, Lincoln Abbott, Biraspati Adhikari, Radhika Adhikari, Seth Alicea, Naomi Allen, Michael Alvaro, Maria Alverio, Julie Ambo, Griffin Armstorff, Kobi Axelrod, Atalie Bale, Zoe Barbeau, J. Aaren Barge, Mackenzie Batten, Hunter Benkoski, Rajat Bhageria, Jamuna Bista, Michael Boyson, Olivia Brophy, Camden Brown, Rachel Bugge, Ryan Buraus, William Buster, Mary Ann Cahoon.

Victoria Cannon, Matthew Cha, Wing Kay Joyce Chan, Corbin Chance, Jacob Chasan, Michael Cheng, Emily Chiles, Alexander Cho, Daniel Cho, Justin Cho, Bogeun Choi, Noah Choi, Siri Choragudi, Joshua Chung, Daniel Cieply, Melody Colliatie, Brandon Colling, Matthew Connell, Patrick Connell, James Cook, Virginia Cook, Phillip Costello, Hannah Crane, Kamila Czachowski, John Dadouris, Jui Dalal.

Maria Dattolo, Nolan Dexter-Brown, Nielsen Dias, Randell Doane, Rupa Dulal, Maxwell Durtschi, Caroline Dutzi, Casey Eble, Edison Elder, Michael Epperly, Michaela Fallon, James Fantin, Nicole Farese, Carianna Farrell, Frank Faverzani, Lesli Fernandez.

Catherine Fisher, Bri Flaherty, Christina Flear, Alie Fordyce, Samuel Fordyce, Abbie Foster, Michael Frye, J. Parker Garrison, Jeremy Geiger, Tristana Giunta, Kyle Goggio, Alec Gonzales, Adan Gonzalez, Katherine Grabowsky, Matthew Grillo, Alana Gross, James Grubbs.

Felix Guo, Devika Gurung, Emma Hall, Matthew Halloran, Jacob (Jungwoo) Han, Robert Hapke, Katrina Hayes-Macaluso, Charlotte Heffelmire, Danielle Heins, Josh Heisey, Jordan Helfand, Jocelyn Hernandez, Noah Hicks, Matthew Higgs, Joseph Hinton, Joanna Hong, Ellen Ingwersen, Michael Ivkov, Avinash Iyer, Catherine Jessen, KeeGan Johnson.

Brister Jones, Jonathan Jow, Raghav Kalra, George Kanellitsas, Aaron Kang, Arjun Kapoor, Serhat Kariparduc, Karna Karki, Karishma Kashyap, Robynn-Emmanuelle Katzeff, Justin Kawaguchi,

Sabrine Keane, Juliana Kemenosh, Reber Kennedy, Taylor Kennington, Arbab Khalid, Christopher Kim, Lucia Kim, Yoorhim Kim, Sara Knighton, Juliana Kochis.

Sarah Kopsa, Nikki Kothari, Isaac Kuo, Sam Kuster, Michelle Laker, Basanta Lamichhane, Taylor Lane, Jennifer Lang, Holly Laws, Jeff Lee, Ji Hye Lee, Sophia Lee, Shanley Lenart, Chester Leung, Brit-tany Levy, Erin Lewis, Jessica Li, Emilie Liu, Abigail Lockhart, Savannah Logan, Shivani Lokre.

Harrison League Loughman, Amanda Lu, Morgan Ludwig, Ferdinand Luhur, Tess Luman, Mason Magee, Jonathan Mak, Jordan Marino, Zachary Maxwell, Kailey McCormick, Gabriel McDonald, Hugh McGinley, Grace McGowan, Laura Mediorreal, Samuel Meyerson, Alexander Mietchen, Amrita Mojundar, Emma Moon, Andrew Morgan, Olivia Morton, Taylor Murphy.

Nicole Nam, Michael Negraru, Kevin Ng, Jennifer Nicholas, Kirsten Norton, Jessica Ocampo, John Wesley Orton, Fernando Osornio, Zachary Pantan, Ni Em Par, Eli Parker, Mili Patel, Brandon Paul, Avani Pavuluri, Henry Pawelczyk, John Peruzzi, John Peters, Marianna Pizzato, Rishi Prasad, Samantha Price, Jessica Pritchard.

Anne-Marie Prochaska, Rebecca Pulley, Stephanie Quinton, Morgan Redford, Casey Riggs, Micheal Riggs, Jose Andres Rocha, Anna Rogers, Ashley Royce, Ashley Ryan, Sabrina Saintil, Marisa Salvador, Suhani Sanghavi, Tara Santora, Aakanksha Saxena, Michael Schaja, Jericho Schroeder, Lauren Seckar, David Seo, Dae han Seong, Supreet Shah.

Jeremy Shockley, Ki Wan Sim, Samantha Singer, Austin Smith, Chelsea Smith, Dorothy Smith, Hunter Smith, Shelbi Smolak, Mollie Somers, Arjun Sridhar, Shimona Srivastava, Cassandra Steele, Annalise Stevenson, Rachel Stogner, Kyle Sukley, Thomas Sych, Kavya Tangella, Emma Taylor-Brill, Seth Taylor-Brill, Gopinath Thangada, Kabita Thapa.

Jacob Thiemann, Brooke Tobias, Vincent Tran, Mary Turney, Nihar Varanasi, Robert Vaughn, Ellie Vigurie, Samuel Vilchez, Patrick Vin, Stephen Waldrep, Samuel Walker, Merran Waller, Christopher Warburton, Lorne Wasserman, Tiffani Webb, Jaynie Welsh, Jessica Williams, Jessica Wilson, Rachel Wilson, Lyssa Winslow, Jacqueline Wong.

Jared Wong, Daniel Yang, Karen Yang, Nicolas Yang, Jonathan Ye, Joshua Yoo, Seung-Hee Yoo, GiHyeon Yoon, Daniel Yoon, Michael Youn, Nick Zamora, Andrew Zehner, Cameron Zetterlund, Sophie Zhang, Bradley Zhu.

HONORING SABRINA SAINTIL FOR
RECEIVING THE 2015 CONGRES-
SIONAL AWARD GOLD MEDAL

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a young leader from Northeast

Florida who has been selected as a winner of the 2015 Congressional Gold Medal Award. Sabrina Saintil has shown incredible dedication in completing the rigorous challenges that the Gold Medal demands. She has set and achieved goals in volunteer public service, personal development, physical fitness, and exploration. Ms. Saintil and her comrade, Jessica Ocampo, are the first two Gold Medal recipients from my district, and I could not be more proud to recognize both of them.

Ms. Saintil is a recent graduate from Fletcher High School who is planning on attending the University of South Florida to study international business in the fall. This promising young woman took on and directed the after school program at the Beaches Habitat Education Department. She has shown incredible passion, not only in her pursuit of education, but also in her work to better the greater Jacksonville community.

As a part of the exploration requirement for the Award, Ms. Saintil planned and went on a historical journey that began in Savannah, Georgia. From there, she ventured through the historic downtown section of the city and proceeded to Koinonia Farms, the birthplace of Habitat for Humanity. She then travelled to President Jimmy Carter's home in Plains, Georgia, followed by a trip to Global Village, a model village containing various types of homes built in Habitat for Humanity communities worldwide. Her last stop on the historical exploration was the Kingsley Plantation back in Jacksonville.

I am so proud of what this young woman has accomplished. When I look at all that she has done, I am not worried about the future of this great nation, for we will surely have great people to lead it. I would also like to take this time to recognize Kathy Christensen from Habitat for Humanity, who served as Ms. Ocampo's and Ms. Saintil's adult advisor and has been essential to the success of this program in Jacksonville. Thank you, Ms. Christensen, for all that you do and for your constant assistance and support.

I first met Ms. Saintil back in 2012, and since then she has grown both as an individual and as member of the Jacksonville community. I could not be happier with Ms. Saintil's success in receiving the Congressional Gold Medal Award, as it stands as proof of a culmination of years of hard work and sacrifice. Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating this young leader of Northeast Florida.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING ROBERT L. AYERS ON
HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life of a beloved leader in the Merced community, Robert L. Ayers on his 90th birthday. Bob was born in New York's most populous borough, Brooklyn, on June 14, 1925.

During his youth, Robert and his family lived in different parts of New York but eventually settled in the town of Bellmore, Long Island. Growing up during the Great Depression his family was faced with daily struggles, despite the economic hardships, Robert continued to strive towards a better future.

On June 19, 1942, at the young age of seventeen, Robert left his hometown of Bellmore with the goal of enlisting in the Navy. As part of the Navy Squadron VPB-33, he was stationed in South America and also the South Pacific where his active duties involved chasing submarines, air sea rescue, and sinking enemy ships. In February of 1945, Robert returned to the states and was stationed at NAS, Jacksonville, Florida.

Shortly after his return, Bob was released from the Navy and immediately joined the Marine Corps. He spent two years as a Marine and then resigned to pursue service in the Army Air Corps where he gained experience from all over the world. Not only did he heroically fight in the Korean War but also his perseverance continued throughout the Vietnam War.

Upon returning to the homeland, Robert met his wife Yvonne and they were married on January 19, 1946. After bravely serving his country for twenty-eight years, Robert retired from the Air Force on July 31, 1970 and he and his wife moved to Merced, California.

For two years Robert sold insurance and then decided to try his luck in the title and escrow business at First Merced Title Co. Transamerica Title Company bought the company in March 1977 and by July, he was named the branch manager where he remained until 1985. It was then he decided to become a business owner when he purchased the company and formed TransCounty Title Co. After numerous years in the business, Bob made the decision to retire in 2010, turning the operation over to his daughter Peg, who is now the president. TransCounty Title Co. remains the only locally owned title company in Merced County.

In addition to being a business owner, Bob was a dynamic member of the Merced community. He was actively involved in Kiwanis and served on the capital campaign for Mercy Medical Center. Also, he has been an active contributor to the Greater Merced Chamber of Commerce and both higher education facilities, UC Merced and Merced College.

During their nearly 70 years of marriage, Robert and Yvonne welcomed three children, sons Robert Jr. and John Ayers and daughter Peg Larson. Both sons followed in their father's footsteps by serving their country. Robert Jr. is a retired Lieutenant Colonel from the

U.S. Army and a retired correctional warden of several California State prisons. Their son John pursued a career in medicine and served as a medic in the United States Navy. Currently, he works in the surgery center at Marin General Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Robert Ayers for his unwavering leadership, and recognizing his accomplishments and contributions to this nation. As Bob celebrates his 90th birthday, he serves as an example of excellence to those in our community.

HONORING WILLIAM WALTER
HOWARD

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 8, William Walter Howard passed away in Johnson City, Tennessee, at the age of 87. Bill was one of the finest men I have ever known, and I knew him from my teenage years until his passing.

Bill was very accurately described in his obituary as being the "epitome of sweetness," and he certainly was. He was a kind, soft-spoken man, and I never knew anyone who said anything but good things about Bill Howard.

He was married for 67 years to his wife Carolyn, who passed away just a short time ago. He was a devoted husband and father and loved God, family, and country.

He was proud of his service in the Navy and was very patriotic. He sometimes gave me conservative tapes and expressed similar views in our conversations. He worked very hard for me in several of my campaigns and had great concern about the direction of this Nation.

He was a successful banking and savings and loan executive and also did accounting work in the hotel-motel industry. He served the community through the Kiwanis club and also had me speak at the church where he was a Deacon.

Bill Howard was a great man, successful as a husband, father, businessman, community and church leader, and political activist. This country is a better place and many, many people are better because of the life Bill led and the example he set.

This Nation needs more people like Bill Howard. He was quite simply, a good man, and I will miss him greatly.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,717,537,302.13. We've added \$7,525,840,488,389.05 to our debt in 6

years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF NORCELL D.
HAYWOOD

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of a dear friend, Mr. Norcell D. Haywood who passed away on Monday, June 15, 2015. Mr. Haywood and I had a friendship that spanned forty years. We were introduced by another of my good friends, the late Congressman Mickey Leland who made significant contributions during his service to our country.

Norcell Haywood was a pioneer in his own right. He was among the first seven African American students to be admitted to the University of Texas at Austin in 1954, the period that preceded the protections guaranteed by the 1964 Civil Rights Act. He secured his spot by fighting against systematic discrimination and segregation. Despite the battle, he remained steadfast. He took on a gruesome 21-hour course load, fulfilled his obligations to the ROTC program and worked as a restaurant valet. His dedication and sacrifices paid off; he became the second African American to graduate from the University of Texas School of Architecture in 1960.

Upon graduation, he served as a positive role model and instructor at Prairie View A&M University's school of Engineering. He later gained employment with the City of Austin's Planning Department. He also published a local newspaper, "The East Side Reporter," which distributed 20,000 papers weekly in the eastern section of San Antonio.

In 1968, Norcell Haywood became the first licensed African-American Architect in San Antonio, Texas. He then founded a private architecture firm, Norcell D. Haywood & Associates (1968-71) and later in 1971, founded the firm of Haywood Jordan McCown SAT Inc. ("HJM"). He operated three offices throughout the state of Texas: San Antonio, Houston and Dallas. Under Norcell's leadership, HJM has been the recipient of the numerous prestigious Merit Design Awards. He received awards for his design of The University of Texas—Dallas's Student Union Center and numerous housing developments in Houston, Austin, Dallas and San Antonio areas, including the Texas Southern University Physical Education Building and Business Technology Building in Houston, Texas; Lincoln Magnet High School in Dallas, Texas; Alamo Dome Stadium and the Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center both in San Antonio, Texas. He was the first African American to be appointed to the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners and served as Vice Chairman of the Board.

Mr. Haywood has received widespread acclaim for his exceptional accomplishments. He was chosen by President Clinton to serve as a delegate on the White House Sub-Committee on Small Business in 1995. Mr. Haywood is the recipient of the 1997 Bank of

America—San Antonio, Black History Chronicles Trail Blazer Award and a 1997 Texas Legislative Black Caucus Outstanding Texans at Large Honoree.

Mr. Haywood used his life experiences, especially those that molded his tenacity at the University of Texas to direct his professional pursuits and community involvement. His most passionate interests lie in early child training and development. He actively supported the YMCA, Boy's and Girl's Club of San Antonio and many other local youth organizations. He established the National Association of Minority Architecture to encourage and mentor young African-American architects and is a life member of Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity.

IN HONOR OF MR. EDWIN D. HILL

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Edwin D. Hill on his retirement from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Mr. Hill's nearly six decades of service will have a lasting impact for generations to come. I would like to join my IBEW brothers and sisters in applauding him for this lifetime of service.

Edwin Hill is a visionary leader whose legacy can best be seen in those who have joined the realm of public service because of Ed's encouragement and support. As the first Business Agent to serve in the People's House—the U.S. House of Representatives—his influence and legacy have impressed on me personally, but it does not end there.

Ed was a pioneer and activist in his field. Mr. Hill joined IBEW in 1956 as journeyman and a wireman. By 1964, he was elected Vice President of his local and became active in larger labor movement issues. Ed's success led the Brotherhood to elect him as president in January of 2001 and Ed easily won re-election for five consecutive terms. With his leadership, Mr. Hill laid the foundation for IBEW's future success and growth.

As President, Ed improved jobsite productivity, increased IBEW membership and oversaw an expansion of training programs. One of his many contributions was the "Code of Excellence," which streamlined union contract language. The program was so successful that it eventually became the universal code used by the electrical industry.

An innovator, Ed was always in search of new ways for members to address the changing economic environment and for IBEW to raise the working standards and overall quality of electrical construction. I join my IBEW brothers and sisters in wishing him a happy retirement and thank him, once again, for his outstanding contributions to the industry.

CELEBRATING WEST VIRGINIA'S 152ND BIRTHDAY

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate West Virginia Day, which will be celebrated on Saturday, June 20. On this special and historic day, West Virginians will join together to honor the 152nd anniversary of the founding of our great state and to recognize the history, culture, landmarks and most importantly, the people that make our state truly special.

West Virginia's Third Congressional District, which I am proud to represent, has some of the most beautiful scenery and tourism attractions found in our state, including Chief Logan State Park, Beechfork Lake, Hatfield McCoy Trails, New River Gorge, and so many more. People from all over the world travel to West Virginia to experience and enjoy all our state has to offer.

Our state has a rich culture, one that combines music, food, language and arts into a tradition that is unique to West Virginia. Glass blowing is a traditional art form that has thrived for more than a century in West Virginia and quilters make family heirlooms in the style made by their grandparents and great-grandparents, and musical instruments are passed down generation to generation.

While we are rich in natural resources and traditions, our greatest resource has always been and will continue to be our people. The people of West Virginia stand for the values of friendship, hard work and charity to others. West Virginians have a true sense of family and never hesitate to help a friend—or a stranger—in need.

West Virginia has the most hardworking and genuine people in the nation. I am proud to represent them in this House and look forward to working with them to make a better West Virginia for generations to come.

HONORING FORMER CERES POLICE CHIEF GAIL W. "PETE" PETERSON

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life of a leader in the Ceres community, former Ceres Police Chief Gail W. "Pete" Peterson. The beloved father, son and husband died peacefully at the age of 77 after a courageous eight month battle with bladder cancer.

Pete was born on November 28, 1937 to Milburn and Lucille Peterson in the charming town of Panton, Illinois. In his adult years, Pete found his calling in law enforcement when he became a reserve officer for the Newport Beach Police Department. Following his service in Newport Beach, he moved to the Laguna Beach department and then on to the City of Orange, known as a "major city with small-town ambiance."

During Pete's time at the Orange Police Department, he took many different positions. Initially, he started as a patrolman, but was quickly promoted to the first accident investigation officer. Not one to rest on his laurels, he became a motorcycle officer and continued to further his career by being promoted from Sergeant to Lieutenant. From there, Pete migrated to Idaho where he became the Chief of Police for the Moscow Police Department.

Chief Peterson began his distinguished career with the Ceres Department of Public Safety on June 30, 1983 where he spent sixteen years of his life being a local hero. Pete was involved in integrating the Ceres Police Department headquarters and the Ceres Fire Department into one department of Public Safety. He introduced new technology and instrumental programs into the police department such as mobile data terminals, the canine unit and a motorcycle unit which the department still utilizes today.

Admired by each member of the public safety family, Chief Peterson is fondly remembered for positively impacting the lives of his fellow officers by his concern, dedication and leadership. To honor him, his name will be put on the new Ceres Police Department building where his commitment to serving the Ceres community can be forever acknowledged.

Believing that community involvement is important, Chief Peterson was an active member of the Rotary Club of Ceres and the Ceres Lions Club. In addition, he was also the former president of the Stanislaus County Peace Officer Association.

After retiring in 1999, Pete and his loving wife of 27 years, Karen Peterson, spent time at their vacation homes but made their residence in Modesto, California. Together they have a large, loving family who were there at every opportunity to lend their love and moral support. Pete is survived by his daughter, Lisa Kermode and sons: Brett Peterson, Jeff Peterson, Steve Peterson, Ken Katz, Kim Katz, Khris Katz, and Kurt Katz as well as his grandchildren, Jeff Cravens, Jesse Peterson, Shaun Peterson, Tanner Peterson, Matthew Peterson, Jordan Katz, Rebecca Hailstones, Kelly Kermode, Abigale Kermode, Chelsea Hanney, Jo Lynn Peterson, Hannah Peterson, Erika Webber, Brittaney Da Branca, Kendra Katz, Tara Katz and six great grandchildren. Pete is preceded in death by his parents and oldest son, Chris Peterson.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing Gail W. "Pete" Peterson for his unwavering dedication to the Ceres Department of Public Safety and the community at large. He was a true hero to his family, fellow officers and the City of Ceres; he will be deeply missed by many. God bless him always.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I would have voted 'Aye' on the Schiff of California Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 2596.

REMEMBERING JOAN MARIE
DONNELLY

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 2010 at 2:45 p.m., an email was sent to proud grandparents to announce the birth of their seventeenth grandchild, born earlier that day, "Mom and baby boy are both doing well". Joan Marie Donnelly had given birth to her son, Max. Her parents, Bob and Rose Mary Donnelly, were overjoyed and her husband and daughter, Todd and Sofie Marie, were preparing for little Max's homecoming. What a spectacular moment in a family's life. Unfortunately, this abundance of happiness soon turned into tragedy. Joan suffered from eclampsia and died at their home just days after giving birth on August 6, 2010.

Worldwide, preeclampsia and other hypertensive disorders of pregnancy are a leading cause of maternal and infant illness and death. Thousands of women and babies die or get very sick each year from preeclampsia, a life-threatening disorder that occurs only during pregnancy and the postpartum period. Eclampsia is a variant of preeclampsia that causes seizures to occur. For Joan, this tragedy could have been prevented, but instead Joan succumbed to a perfect storm of neglected symptoms.

"The Donnelly Clan", a Catholic, Irish and Italian Family from West Virginia included Bob, Rose Mary and their nine children. Joan was their eighth child, born on May 24, 1967. Joan had a wonderful smile and a laugh that was contagious and she had dreams to travel, start a career, fall in love, have children, save animals, and help her family. Her dreams came true when she moved to Florida and started her 22-year career with Walt Disney World. She met Todd in 2001 when the two became good friends while traveling. They were married in Florence, Italy in 2006.

Joan had three pregnancies with two births as did her youngest sister, Mia. Their mother similarly had twelve pregnancies with nine births. These three women were each diagnosed with preeclampsia, are diabetic, and suffered miscarriages. The death of a child is one of the hardest obstacles in life. The pain of having your child go before you is unspeakable.

Joan's life was celebrated at her funeral mass on August 12, 2010 with over 300 mourners. Joan will be remembered, not by her death, but by how she lived her life.

Joan's family has hope that changes can be made to federal law in honor of Joan to save women who are at high risk of preeclampsia from suffering as she did. The family advocates for a number of reforms to prevent eclampsia including better screening during pregnancy; proper testing; more education for patients and doctors on preeclampsia and eclampsia; and longer hospital stays. Joan's family will continue to educate the public about preeclampsia and eclampsia by talking about Joan to all that will listen so that her untimely death is not in vain.

RECOGNIZING KIWANIS
INTERNATIONAL

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to Kiwanis International on the 100th anniversary of a global service organization of more than 600,000 members. Kiwanis club members contribute to their communities in countless ways through service projects and fundraising. Along with the recognition of this milestone day, Kiwanis clubs in Bucks County have carried on the Kiwanis mission of changing the world, one child and one community at a time. Each year, Kiwanis raises more than (U.S.) \$100 million and acquires 18.5 million volunteer hours toward strengthening their communities and serving children. In addition to its community work, The Eliminate Project is a notable Kiwanis campaign that focuses on saving and protecting millions of mothers and their future children. In partnership with UNICEF, the clubs are working to eliminate a disease that kills one baby every 11 minutes and has pledged to raise (U.S.) \$110 million toward this life-saving goal. Again, congratulations for 100 years of dedicated service to the worldwide and local communities and best wishes for future success.

HONORING CINDY HALEY

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Cindy Haley on her 20th anniversary working at the Texas County Food Pantry in Houston, Missouri. The food pantry assists those in the community in need of food, clothing, health care, and shelter.

Mrs. Haley began her work at the food pantry in May of 1995 and has set a wonderful example of hard work and selflessness. Today she serves as the food pantry's patient advocate, bookkeeper and grant writer and has helped bring more than 3 million dollars to Texas County over the past two decades. The food pantry will be celebrating with a party for Mrs. Haley on June 17th.

Mrs. Haley has provided support to so many in the Texas County community, and I truly admire her strength and dedication to helping others. It is my pleasure to recognize her efforts and accomplishments before the House of Representatives.

HONORING TIM SPOHN

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, Tim Spohn has ably served the citizens of the City of Industry for eight

years on the City Council (2007–2015) and served the citizens of the City of Industry as Mayor for two years; and

Whereas, Tim Spohn championed regional economic strength and stability for the entire San Gabriel Valley by promoting manufacturing, trade, retail, construction, and financial industries, to name just a few, as a public servant for the City of Industry; and

Whereas, Tim Spohn provided counsel and guidance for residents and fellow elected officials of the San Gabriel Valley with his commitment to regional government by serving as a representative on the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments; and

Whereas, Tim Spohn provided leadership on critical regional issues of mobility, air quality, transportation control measures, and communications as a member of the Southern California Association of Governments' Transportation Committee for five years; and championed the concerns of San Gabriel Valley residents while serving as a member of the Ad-Hoc Regional Transportation Plan Committee; and

Whereas, Tim Spohn served on the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments' Transportation Committee for eight years providing policy recommendations and technical expertise on transportation programs and infrastructure improvements; and was a delegate and Board Member of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments: Now, therefore, be it

Recognized, That Mayor Tim Spohn of the City of Industry has made enduring contributions to the State of California; and we applaud his sacrifice and commitment to the well-being of families and to neighborhoods; and we encourage all to honor the leadership and service he provided for San Gabriel Valley residents.

HONORING JESSICA OCAMPO FOR
RECEIVING THE 2015 CONGRES-
SIONAL AWARD GOLD MEDAL

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a young leader from North Florida who has been selected as a winner of the 2015 Congressional Gold Medal Award. Jessica Ocampo has shown incredible dedication in completing the rigorous challenges that the Gold Medal demands. She has set and achieved goals in volunteer public service, personal development, physical fitness, and exploration. Ms. Ocampo and her comrade, Sabrina Saintil, are the first two Congressional Gold Medal recipients from the 4th District of Florida and I could not be more proud to recognize both of them.

Ms. Ocampo is currently studying at Florida State College of Jacksonville and plans to attend the University of North Florida after her graduation. She tutors her fellow students in Spanish at FSCJ and despite the huge load of requirements the Gold Medal requires, she still finds time to work in a doctor's office during her free time. This inspiring young woman has shown incredible passion, not only in her pursuit of education, but also in her work to better the greater Jacksonville community.

As a part of their exploration requirement for the Award, Ms. Ocampo planned and went on

a historical journey that began in Savannah, Georgia. From there, she ventured through the historic downtown section of the city and proceeded to Koinonia Farms, the birthplace of Habitat for Humanity. From there, she travelled to President Jimmy Carter's home in Plains, Georgia, followed by a trip to Global Village, a model village containing various types of homes built in Habitat for Humanity communities worldwide. Their last stop on the historical exploration was the Kingsley Plantation back in Jacksonville.

I am so proud of what this young woman has accomplished. When I look at all that she has done, I am not worried about the future of this great nation, for we will surely have great people to lead it. I would also like to take this time to recognize Kathy Christensen from Habitat for Humanity, who served as Ms. Ocampo's adult advisor and has been essential to the success of this program in Jacksonville. Thank you, Ms. Christensen, for all that you do and for your constant assistance and support.

I first met Ms. Ocampo back in 2012, and since then she has grown both as an individual and as member of the Jacksonville community. I could not be happier with Ms. Ocampo's success in receiving the Congressional Gold Medal Award, as it stands as proof of a culmination of years of hard work and sacrifice. Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating this young leader of Northeast Florida.

RECOGNIZING TERRY COLLINS
FOR HER OUTSTANDING PER-
FORMANCE WITHIN THE GRAND
ISLAND AND BUFFALO COMMU-
NITY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor Mrs. Terry Lynn Collins for her hard work and commitment to the Grand Island community. Mrs. Collins is this year's recipient of Accu Theranostic's annual award and is being honored for her professional achievements as well as her active participation in many local groups.

Mrs. Collins lived on Grand Island before marrying her husband Tim. The couple moved back to Grand Island in 1992 and, shortly after, had their younger son Joe. Their older son Matt is 24 and works in finance in Manhattan, NY. Joe is now 23 and is in his first year of law school. She remains active in the Cub Scouts, the GI Soccer Club, the Parent Teacher Association, the Knights of Columbus, the Network in Aging, and WordPress meetup.

Furthermore, Mrs. Collins has made her mark in the business world. She received her BS in Electrical Engineering from the State University of NY at Buffalo as well as an MBA from Canisius College. Mrs. Collins serves as the president of Maroon Technology Ltd of Grand Island. She is also a Sales and Marketing professional with a strong background

in Software Engineering. Mrs. Collins is a small business owner who serves many clients in Grand Island. Her firm is on the cutting edge of business marketing and web design.

Her professional affiliations include Beta Gamma Sigma Business Honor Society, Sandler Strategic Sales, President's Club, and Toastmasters. She also is a Director on the Grand Island Chamber of Commerce. Mrs. Collins will be joined by family and friends for the presentation of the award on June 24th. The event and dinner begins at 6PM at River Oaks on Grand Island.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to honor Mrs. Terry Lynn Collins. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Mrs. Collins on her professional success and local involvement. Her leadership in business and technology has enhanced opportunities in Western New York and positively impacted the community.

RECOGNIZING COMMANDER DAVID
OVERCASH FOR RECEIVING THE
REAR ADMIRAL EDWIN T.
LAYTON LEADERSHIP AWARD

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Commander David Overcash, a naval intelligence officer with Commander Submarine Group (COMSUBGRU) 7, for receiving the Rear Admiral Edwin T. Layton Leadership Award.

A Chambersburg, Pennsylvania native, Commander Overcash currently serves our country as deputy chief of staff for Intelligence at Commander Submarine Group 7, which controls submarine activity from the Western Pacific to the Indian Ocean. I congratulate Commander Overcash on his receiving this award, which recognizes mid to senior active or reserve component intelligence officers, chief warrant officers, and enlisted personnel for outstanding leadership and mentorship in naval intelligence performance.

On behalf of the Ninth District of Pennsylvania, I want to thank Commander Overcash for his service, and moreover highlight the sense of purpose with which he serves. He has exemplified the selfless drive that is a hallmark of the brave men and women who defend our country, and this award is a well-deserved acknowledgment of that spirit of sacrifice.

It is my honor to recognize Commander Overcash and congratulate him for receiving the Rear Admiral Edwin T. Layton Leadership Award.

HONORING COLONEL J. MATTHEW
LISSNER

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Colonel J. Matthew Lissner of the

United States Army Reserve. Colonel Lissner has served in all three components of the Army (Active, National Guard, and Army Reserve) for over 28 years. Currently he serves as the Congressional Legislative Liaison for the 99th Regional Support Command, stationed at Fort Dix, New Jersey.

Colonel Lissner will leave his post as a Legislative Liaison to join the faculty of the U.S. Army War College in August of this year. I am grateful for his life of service to the Army, and wish him well as he transitions into his new assignment in Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

A career Infantry Officer, Colonel Lissner received his commission from the Officer Candidate School in 1988. His education includes a Bachelor of Science in Physical Education (Teaching) from Manhattan College in 1979, a Master of Arts in Exercise Physiology from Indiana State University in 1985, and a Master of Strategic Studies from the U.S. Army War College in 2007.

Prior to assignment as a Legislative Liaison, Colonel Lissner held a wide variety of infantry assignments through battalion level, and a number of staff positions at higher commands such as the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), Third U.S. Army, U.S. Joint Forces Command, and I Corps. His combat deployments include Operation Just Cause (Panama), Operation Iraqi Freedom/Operation Enduring Freedom (Kuwait), and Operation Iraqi Freedom (Iraq).

Although he is a highly decorated Soldier with more than 28 years of service to his credit, perhaps his most notable accomplishments have occurred off of the parade field. For example, prior to beginning his military service, Colonel Lissner worked with severely mentally and physically handicapped children, taught Physical Education, and coached a variety of sports at the scholastic and collegiate levels.

A diverse individual, Matt's interests include all sports, camping, and hunting with his five great kids—Kaitlyn, MariPat, Jessie, Lanie, and Robert—without whose love and support none of his accomplishments would have been possible. It is only fair and proper to acknowledge their tireless support as he worked tirelessly on his assigned duties. Let us thank them all for their sacrifices and wish them continued success in the future.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 18, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 23

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016".

SD-138

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the National Flood Insurance Program.

SD-538

Committee on the Budget

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine measuring the true cost of regulations, focusing on lessons from Great Britain and Canada on implementing regulatory reforms.

SD-G50

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine an update on the recalls of defective Takata air bags and NHTSA's vehicle safety efforts.

SR-253

11 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Atul Keshap, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, and Alaina B. Teplitz, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal.

SD-419

2 p.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety

To hold hearings to examine the impacts of EPA's proposed carbon regulations on energy costs for American businesses, rural communities and families, including S. 1324, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units.

SD-406

3 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Labor, Health and

Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016".

SD-138

JUNE 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 742, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to employees, S. 1411, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, S. 1550, to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in certain Federal agencies, S. 1073, to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, S. 1580, to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates, S. 1090, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, S. 1115, to close out expired, empty grant accounts, S. 779, to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency, S. 310, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, S. 991, to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, H.R. 1626, to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, H.R. 1640, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, H.R. 728, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office", H.R. 891, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building", H.R. 1326, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office", H.R. 1350, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building", an original bill entitled, "District of Columbia Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act of 2015", an original bill entitled, "EIN-

STEIN Act of 2015", an original bill entitled, "Representative Payee Fraud Prevention Act of 2015", an original bill entitled, "Saving Federal Dollars Through Better Use of Government Purchase and Travel Cards Act of 2015", and an original to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers, and the nominations of Carol Fortine Ochoa, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, General Services Administration, and Steven M. Wellner, and William Ward Nooter, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

SD-342

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine demanding results to end Native youth suicides.

SD-628

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine pending health care and benefits legislation.

SR-418

JUNE 25

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine country of origin labeling and trade retaliation, focusing on what's at stake for America's farmers, ranchers, businesses, and consumers.

SD-G50

JULY 7

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine highly pathogenic avian influenza, focusing on the impact on the United States poultry sector and protecting United States poultry flocks.

SR-328A

JULY 8

2:15 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism

To hold hearings to examine cyber crime, focusing on modernizing our legal framework for the information age.

SD-226

JULY 9

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the back-end of the nuclear fuel cycle and related legislation, including S. 854, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste.

SD-366

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 18, 2015

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God our Father, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of the people's House as they gather at the end of another week in the Capitol. Endow each with the graces needed to attend to the issues of the day with wisdom, that the results of their efforts might benefit the citizens of our Nation and the world.

We also ask Your blessing leading into this weekend upon fathers throughout our country. May they be their best selves, and may their children appreciate fully the blessing their fathers have been to them.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANCE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

FEDERAL OBSTACLES TO SAVING FOR RETIREMENT

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot in this Chamber about the negative impacts of overly burdensome rules and regulations handed down by bureaucrats in Washington.

Nowhere are the potential negative consequences more evident than the 700-page rule proposed by the Department of Labor. Among other things, it expands the Department's complex pension rules to cover IRAs as well as changes the definition of who is classified as a financial adviser. Ultimately, I believe this rule will restrict access to advice and drive up costs for small businesses.

It also illustrates a fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats. Democrats want everyone to end up in the same place with identical outcomes, and Republicans believe in providing individuals with the same level of opportunity. This rule seeks guaranteed outcomes for everyone, but there are inherent risks associated with investing.

While I am open to modernizing current rules in order to protect consumers against predatory practices that pose unnecessary risks, I will not support efforts that make it harder for American families to save and plan for retirement.

HONORING J.C. KILMER

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, Tom Brokaw once said:

It's easy to make a buck. It's much harder to make a difference.

Today I rise to honor someone who made a difference as a schoolteacher for 50 years. He began his career a half century ago at Roosevelt Junior High School in Port Angeles, Washington, where he taught seventh grade home-room and coached football.

I have met so many people who had him as a teacher; I think he may have taught my entire hometown. But the common themes from his former stu-

dents that I have met have been these: He was a great teacher. He cared about me as a student. He didn't just teach me English and geography; he taught me to be a better student and a better person.

Earlier this week, he finished out his career at the Chrysalis School in Woodinville, Washington, and yesterday he had his first well-deserved day of retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the teacher that I rise to honor today is named J.C. Kilmer, and he is my dad.

Mark Twain remarked that the two most important days in a person's life are the day he is born and the day he figures out why. My father was born to teach. And like so many fantastic educators, he has affected so many lives in so many ways.

So today I hope you will join me in thanking a teacher. I want to congratulate him for being a great educator, a difference maker, and a terrific dad.

Happy retirement, Dad.

REPEALING THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of repealing the medical device tax, a burdensome tax on medical devices that increases costs, stifles investment, slows the race for cures, and ultimately makes health care more expensive for patients.

The tax has resulted in less spending on research and development, escalating costs on the newest technologies, a reduction in capital investments, and, ultimately, is a factor in the loss of jobs in our Nation's vital life science sector, which is critical to keeping the United States a leader in the world and is crucial to my home State of New Jersey.

One of the major newspapers in our area editorialized recently in support of our efforts, the Easton Express-Times, pointing out that the medical device tax is having a depressing effect on a sector of the economy that until recently was doing well. Some are looking to relocate overseas.

I thank my close friend, Congressman ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota, and the Ways and Means Committee for sponsoring this legislation. I urge the House to pass repeal of the medical device tax and work with our Senate colleagues to send this measure to the President.

GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, the night before last, with the whole world watching, my home team, the Golden State Warriors, brought the O'Brien Trophy back to Oakland.

The Warriors, led by NBA MVP Stephen Curry, showed the power of persistence and teamwork both on and off the court.

The finals against the well-matched and talented Cleveland Cavaliers were a thrill to watch. These games were basketball at its best, with both teams showing real passion on the court.

It has been 40 years since Oakland last brought home the championship, and throughout this long journey, Warrior fans have stayed loyal and faithful.

Thank you to the Warriors team for making our dreams of another championship a reality. I have no doubt that this remarkable team will go down in Oakland's history. Thank you to head coach Steve Kerr, Stephen Curry, Clay Thompson, finals MVP Andre Iguodala, and all of the talented players who brought this championship home.

I can't wait to celebrate this win with all the Warriors fans and players at the victory parade tomorrow morning in Oakland.

Go Warriors. Go Oakland. Go Dub Nation.

IN HONOR AND MEMORY OF
CLEMENTA PINCKNEY

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor and memory of my former South Carolina General Assembly colleague, State Senator Clementa Pinckney.

Tragedy shot through the hearts of every family and community last night in South Carolina. It is important in times like these to remember that we are all made in the image of God. We are all brothers and sisters in Christ and are there to shoulder the burden of tragedy and loss.

Please pray for the 180-year-old Emanuel AME Church, who suffered the loss; the city of Charleston, tormented with distress; the State of South Carolina and its law enforcement personnel. We all need to come together with compassion and love.

Remember from the Book of Matthew:

Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted.

Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the Earth.

Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied.

Blessed are the merciful, for they shall receive mercy.

Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.

Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

May God comfort the city of Charleston and the State of South Carolina this morning.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. AGUILAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to highlight the familiar predicament Congress has found itself in because the Republican leadership continues to govern by crisis.

As of today, we have only 4 legislative days until the Export-Import Bank expires. This bank helps American businesses of all sizes and markets around the world.

China's businesses have the support of their country's export-import bank, and we need to give our businesses the same certainty.

For years, the Ex-Im Bank has helped level the playing field for businesses in my district and across this Nation, empowering and supporting them to grow and conduct business overseas.

I have had the opportunity to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support businesses and create jobs in my home district in San Bernardino County.

There is no reason we can't continue working together to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank so American workers and businesses have the opportunity to play a role in the global economy.

We cannot force American businesses and workers to pay the price for Congress' inaction. The Ex-Im Bank doesn't cost taxpayers a cent and has created or maintained 1½ million private sector jobs since 2007. We need to stop the political games and reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION
AMENDMENT ACT

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, in the 21st century workplace where women account for nearly half of the workforce, it is vital that our policies reflect today's new realities. Specifically, the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act, PDA, is in need of modernization.

Recently, the act was litigated before the Supreme Court, but even the Justices were unable to fully resolve how to apply the PDA. That is why Senator

MURKOWSKI and I have introduced the Pregnancy Discrimination Amendment Act. It says working moms-to-be should have access to reasonable accommodations from their employers if health issues arise from pregnancy.

Unlike other proposals that will create more mandates, confusion, and litigation, my bill simply clarifies existing law to ensure the 21st century workplace works for families, employers, and expectant mothers.

IRAN

(Mr. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we approach the deadline of negotiations with Iran to stress that any agreement must unequivocally guarantee that Iran cannot obtain nuclear weapons.

While a diplomatic solution is the ideal method of stopping Iran's illicit nuclear weapons program, we owe it to the American people of this country to end up with not just a good deal, but a great deal.

A great deal means giving inspectors robust access to nuclear facilities to promptly verify compliance. A great deal means Iran acknowledges the full extent of its nuclear weapons program. A great deal would remove tools that could leave Iran with a pathway toward nuclear weapons and provide a long-term solution. Finally, a great deal phases in sanctions relief so we aren't rewarding Iran for deception and noncompliance.

A nuclear Iran is one of the greatest threats to the United States; our greatest ally, Israel; and to regional stability in the Middle East. I cannot stress enough how important it is that Iran must not, under any circumstance, be able to obtain a nuclear weapon.

COMMEMORATING AMERICAN
EAGLE DAY

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to once again rise to join in commemorating June 20, 2015, as American Eagle Day and celebrate the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

On June 20, 1782, the eagle was designated as a national emblem of the United States by the Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress. The bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States and is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government.

The bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and democracy

of the United States. Since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning, and symbolism of the eagle have played a significant role in art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture, and the culture of the U.S. The bald eagle's habitat only exists in North America.

I hope my colleagues will join in celebrating June 20, 2015, as American Eagle Day, which marks the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle.

□ 0915

INTERNATIONAL YOGA DAY

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a resolution to commemorate the first ever International Yoga Day.

This day is occurring on Sunday, June 21, and it was a day that was designated by the United Nations with over 177 countries in support. Over 24 million Americans and 250 million people around the world practice some form of yoga, and, on Sunday, people all around the world will be celebrating the benefits of living a yoga lifestyle.

India's Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, addressed the UN General Assembly on September 27, 2014, stating:

Yoga is an invaluable gift of India's ancient tradition. It embodies unity of mind and body, thought and action, restraint and fulfillment, harmony between man and nature, a holistic approach to health and well-being. It is not about exercise, but, rather, it is about discovering the sense of oneness within yourself, the world, and nature.

As a longtime yoga practitioner myself, I have experienced firsthand the positive impact of yoga on my own life, and I am honored to be introducing this resolution today and sharing with others the true meaning of yoga.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2146, DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 321 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 321

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the

Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 321.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed by section 425 of that same Act.

House Resolution 321 states that it "shall be in order . . . to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion . . . that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution."

Therefore, I make a point of order pursuant to section 426 that this resolution may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentlewoman from New York makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to take a moment, if I may, to mourn the horrific loss of life in Charleston, South Carolina.

Places of worship used to be places of sanctuary, but there are no more sanctuaries in the United States from gun violence. Whether it is an elementary school, a college, a hospital—anywhere in the world—gun violence is there among us. We want to all give our condolences to our colleague JIM CLYBURN, who represents that area in Charleston.

I have a personal interest in it as a very good friend of mine, who had been pastor of Baber AME Church for decades in Rochester, left us to go to pastor that church and is still an elder there. So our hearts go out to all of them for all of the grief. We hope that we will see brighter days when people can go to a sanctuary place of worship in peace.

Now to the matter before Congress today, Mr. Speaker, our Chamber and

our Nation are off balance. There is something drastically wrong when Members of the people's House are asked to vote on greasing the skids for a trade deal they are discouraged from reading and, even if they do read, cannot discuss with their constituents, the people who sent them here.

That is what we are being asked to do today regarding a massive trade deal: abdicate our authority by approving fast track and to give the simple vote of "yea" or "nay" on an issue that is not simple at all. In fact, it could not be more complex or more far-reaching. Unlike the Senate action on this measure, Members of the House were totally unable to have any amendment or very much discussion of what is going on here.

Mr. Speaker, fast track is an anachronism that needs to die. There is no longer any need for it at all. It came as a matter of convenience in the seventies when the United States was the biggest manufacturer on the face of the Earth and when we were pretty sure we always would be. So it was decided by the powers that were in place then that the Congress would just hand it over to the administration to go ahead and negotiate whole trade agreements despite the fact that the Constitution of the United States gives us that power. We allowed the administration to do it. One committee, Ways and Means, got to see it. There was no amendment, and the only vote we can take on a trade bill is "yea" or "nay."

Mr. Speaker, it is not just we who are forbidden, basically, to see what is in this bill and to talk about it. It is also the countries of Australia and New Zealand. Let me read from a report on that.

They are very much concerned there with the fact that this TPP—what they had found leaked out, that what PhRMA is doing here is to extend all of their patents for 12 years so that they can not only raise those prices here in this country but for all of those countries involved in the trade agreement.

Jane Kelsey, who is on the faculty of law of the University of Auckland, described what was happening here as one of the most controversial parts—that is, the pharmaceutical part—because the U.S. pharmaceutical industry used a trade agreement to target New Zealand's Pharmaceutical Management Agency, PHARMAC, which is their health system.

This transparency act will erode the process and decisions of agencies that decide which medicines and medical devices to subsidize with public money and by how much. The leaked test shows that TPP will severely erode PHARMAC's ability to continue to deliver affordable medicines and medical devices as it has for two decades.

The parliamentarians in Australia and New Zealand are under the same restriction as we are, only theirs is

even worse. A member of that Parliament who goes to read the trade agreement has to sign a paper that he will not discuss it for 4 years.

I make this point because two of the great democracies on this planet—the United States of America and Australia—have given over the right of the people's elected Representatives to know what is in these trade deals that will have such devastating effects on all of the people they represent. How in the world can this continue, and how can we let it go on?

If we don't do anything in this Congress—and we may not—I would really like to see us do away with the whole idea of fast track. We can't afford it any longer. At least I am sure, when it began, there was no problem with certain corporations deciding that they were going to make the main decisions as we have had made known by leaks here. I have not gone to read the bill. I do not want to be hamstrung by anything that I can discuss and concerns that I have with the people whom I serve. This is one of many reasons, I think, this trade bill is bad.

Let me say I have a few more here that I would like to go over, and I need to make sure that everybody understands this. When you vote for TPA today, you are voting for things that were in that Customs bill. Again, hardly any of us knew anything about it.

Let me just tell you what they are:

Preventing action on climate change. This is going to be written in this bill. Nobody anywhere can even bring up climate change. It is a great step backward, and they managed to get this in, and the Pope is in sync, too. That is very interesting.

Secondly and most grievous to many of us who have worked so hard on human trafficking, including Members on both sides of this House with whom I have worked, it weakens the language on human trafficking. They had to do that because the nation with the worst standards on human rights and human trafficking is Malaysia, which is one of the countries with whom we want to be allied.

Third, they ignore currency manipulation, which we have been told for a decade or more is one of the most serious acts against the United States from countries that trade with us, which is changing their currency. As one of my colleagues has pointed out, Mrs. DINGELL, one automobile company made more money from its trade manipulation than it did by selling its cars. We don't want to expand that. We don't want that to go on.

There is also a strong anti-immigration provision that we are being asked to vote on today, and we won't do that—giving up our rights as the elected Representatives of the people of the United States. It says that trade agreements do nothing to address the immigration. They may not.

Then Democratic priorities, such as ensuring that Dodd-Frank would not be affected by the trade agreement, because we have heard that financial services is very heavily involved here, were rejected in the Senate and were not included in this bill. We are very much concerned about that.

We are very much concerned about where we are going, but the fast-track deal will be an absolute rubber stamp to disaster.

As I mentioned before, it has been negotiated in a cloud of secrecy by multinational conglomerates and the financial services industry and pharmaceutical companies that have one priority, and that is the bottom line. What we know, again, is all we have heard from leaks. Not a lot has made its way to the light of day, but what has been appalling, and it does certainly give anyone who wants to vote pause to think about what that vote means before he gives it, because we don't know what is in that bill.

One of the things that some of us are very much concerned about is food safety and prescription drugs, the erosion of environmental protections, and the degradation of the financial sector. This deal is headed down the wrong path. Not only would the TPP certainly ship good-paying American jobs overseas, but it would endanger the food on our tables by weakening the safety standards. Ninety percent of the seafood consumed in America is imported, but only 1 to 2 percent is inspected, much of it from countries with little controls on sanitation and water quality that American consumers expect.

One of the biggest threats comes from shrimp imported from Vietnam, a TPP partner. The dangerous bacteria in Vietnamese shrimp is really ubiquitous and has included shrimp contaminated with MRSA, which is fatal, and drug-resistant salmonella. What is more, the TPP report includes due differential preference to rules negotiated by drug companies extending their patents, as I have said, in an unfair way for 12 years. They are rigging the system in a way that would make it harder for people in TPP countries to have access to life-saving drugs.

Now, we have got a history to warn us about this. This thing has been modeled after NAFTA, which cost us over 5 million jobs. My part of the country is just now recovering from NAFTA a little bit, and we don't want to see this happen again. All over this country, there are factories that are closed and cities that are gone—places where there, literally, is no work.

Even doing TAA, which is very important to us, would be training people for jobs, in most cases, that don't even exist; but this has been hidden away from the American people and certainly has been hidden away from the Congress, the people who represent

them. It is causing a stir all the way around the world. As I pointed out, other countries are looking at this with great interest.

Let's follow what our minority leader said last week. Let's put this thing to rest and negotiate openly a trade agreement that we can be proud of. We all believe in trade. Everybody talks about free trade. I want to change that now to fair trade that will be enforceable and that will benefit everybody involved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise with a sad heart regarding the occurrences and the things which happened in South Carolina last night. I know, I join the gentlewoman as well as all the Members of this body to express our condolences and our sorrow with the things that have happened. I know that later in the day we will take time to offer those formally by the members of the South Carolina delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is, should the House now consider House Resolution 321. That is what we are here for. While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the motion to concur with the amendment, the committee is not aware of any violations of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. This is simply a dilatory tactic that the gentlewoman wants to use to talk further about the issue at hand. I get that.

We have spent weeks talking about this. The United States Senate spent weeks talking about this issue. The gentlewoman wanted to use her time to talk about all the things that she believes are wrong with the bill, and that is okay. That really doesn't bother me.

But the bottom line to the entire matter is that we are using our responsibility under the Constitution for the Congress of the United States to establish the laws and to direct the President of the United States that we believe is very constitutional to say to the President of the United States, we want you to go engage the world in a trade deal, and we are going to tell you the parameters, some 160 different parameters about how we believe you should engage the foreign countries in these trade deals.

The gentlewoman is right, there are some difficult piece parts in there, as the gentlewoman mentions about immigration. Yes, I made sure that was in there because I don't believe this should be about immigration or visas. I believe this should be about trade. And,

yes, there is language that is in there about climate change because I don't believe this should be about the United States in a political circumstance trying to push our ideas on a trade deal about global warming or these considerations that might be related to that issue.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is right, there are piece parts of this agreement, the trade promotion authority, that not everybody likes, but let's not act like you didn't have an opportunity to read the bill or understand the bill. But much like any contract—and that is what we are engaging here in. We are engaging in saying to the President, we want you to go sign a contract, an agreement with these foreign countries that are in the Far East who have not only large populations, but growing economic circumstances to buy our products, and us to make sure that we lower tariffs or taxes on those products to where they are available to us.

Yes, we understand currency manipulation is a problem, and primarily that is a problem with perhaps two countries. Neither of those countries do we have a free trade agreement with, and one of them we want to have a free trade agreement with. Another country simply, I don't believe, understands rule of law or intellectual property, and I think they are thugs and don't care. They are a country that steals openly hundreds of billions of dollars from the United States, and they do not respect any rule of law or international agreements. So we probably won't sign an agreement with them.

But this is a good deal. It is a good deal. The last 10, 20 countries that America has had a trade agreement with, we have a \$10 billion surplus with those countries because those countries want American products, because the American worker does a great job, and we have the best engineering and manufacturing and pricing, but the product is worthy in the world market and will sell.

The State of Texas, which I am from, sells \$289 billion of Texas-made products overseas every year. That is an example of how important trade is.

This trade deal contract that we are wanting to empower the President—whoever that may be for the next 7 years—is to say let's go cut a deal that is good to that country and to America. In the process, Mr. Speaker, we added some language for those of our friends that are watching along with you, Mr. Speaker, as I address my comments to you.

Section 8, subsection A on page 101 says:

United States law to prevail in event of conflict.

Mr. Speaker, it lays it out right here:

No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 3(b) nor the application of any such provision to any person or

circumstance that is inconsistent with any law of the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality in the United States shall have effect.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to suggest to you is, there are a lot of things about this bill; some that some people like, some things that others don't like. But we had a chance to read it; we had a chance to understand it. This is a contract that we have not even agreed to yet. Why would someone go and publicly talk about a deal that they haven't made?

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what is happening right now is that we should say that this point of order should not prevail. I think that what we should do is move to the direct discussion that we are going to have to allow the House to continue its business, and I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question under consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will state his inquiry.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry: In the underlying bill, is there anything to prevent taxpayers from having to pay out hundreds of millions of dollars for the privilege of enforcing the very laws that the gentleman from Texas says this agreement would preserve, any local ordinance, any State agreement like happened in Canada recently, that the taxpayers end up having to pay the bill for simply enforcing existing law?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. I urge a "yes" vote. I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I need to inquire from you, if my colleague was reading from the trade bill, what he had read and is forbidden to speak about. It is classified, you know. Did he reveal classified information?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry. Now, if the gentlewoman has a parliamentary inquiry, please state it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. My concern is that he is reading from a classified document. I need to know if that is the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Section 8 of the TPA. I did not say TPP.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have pretty well beaten this dead donkey to its point. Its logical conclusion is we now move forward. I urge a "yes" vote on the question of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I believe that our comments this morning should be tempered with a reminder about the events of South Carolina and how much this body and its Members offer their prayers and consideration not only of our colleagues but all the people of South Carolina, the men and women, law enforcement, and people of faith all across this country. I want to, once again, express my consideration of those ideas.

Mr. Speaker, before I go through my opening statement, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Irvine, California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent considerable time debating the merits of TPA in this body. I want to bring us back to the fundamentals of this debate. I want to talk about why trade is so important to our economy, why trade is a conservative cause, and why trade is so vital to our Nation. Simply put, free trade empowers the individual to make decisions in his or her best interest without undue government influence.

Look around at your house or at your car. Without question, there are imported products. Free trade allows you, as an individual, to make the best economic choice for your family. When economic enterprise is free from unnecessary government interference and all enterprise is treated equally, the most competitive actors will rise to the top. That means higher quality products and lower prices, which translates to improved standards of living and economic growth.

Opponents of free trade will say we need protectionist measures to maintain certain industries, but that is a flawed argument. Protectionist measures may benefit a few in select industries, but ultimately protectionism is more harmful to the Nation's economic health. Protected industries become inefficient. Consumers are denied choice,

and American businesses face retaliatory trade measures overseas. Bottom line, protectionism is an abandonment of the free market in favor of government intervention.

I believe that when American businesses and entrepreneurs are placed on an equal playing field, when we eliminate tariffs and protectionist barriers at home and abroad, American businesses can compete and win against any of their foreign competitors. The famed economist Milton Friedman said: Free trade ultimately forces competitors to put up or shut up.

Mr. Speaker, let us set the table for free trade. Let us pass TPA. I know American businesses will put up.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who has been so effective on this bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this fast-track bill, which is only made worse by a gimmick of it being attached to unrelated legislation designed to help Federal public safety professionals. I might add, as has already been mentioned, the general president of the International Association of Firefighters, which this rule addresses as well, has said: We urge you to oppose this rule.

For 20 years, our Nation's trade policy has been failing American workers and the businesses that want to invest in this country. It has driven away jobs, pushed down wages, and exacerbated inequality. A vote for fast track is a vote to continue that bad trade policy for another generation because if we approve fast track today, we rubberstamp the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership asks American workers to compete with labor in developing countries like Vietnam, where the minimum wage is 56 cents an hour. It does nothing to combat the biggest source of lost jobs—currency manipulation—which The Economist's Fred Burcksen has said has cost us in the United States up to 5 million jobs. People lost their jobs and lost their livelihoods. It allows thousands of foreign corporations to challenge U.S. laws on food safety, drug safety, environmental protection, health care, labor rights, the minimum wage, and, indeed, any domestic law on any subject.

□ 0945

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle said that that is not the case.

Just witness what happened last week when the majority in this body voted to repeal country of origin labeling so that we know where our meat, our poultry, and our pork comes from because the World Trade Organization and Canada and Mexico ruled against us. So we are going to give up our domestic law.

This is a trade agreement that has been crafted by lobbyists for the special interests and industries that stand to gain the most by weakening U.S. regulation and shipping jobs overseas, yet the administration has shown absolutely no interest in improving this deal or even listening to our concerns. That means that when the Trans-Pacific Partnership comes to this House, we need the ability to amend it. At the very least, it must include sanctions against currency manipulation, enforceable labor, environmental standards, and include a transparent process.

If we vote for fast track today, we throw away our ability to make any of those amendments, and we turn our backs on our commitment to American workers: to their jobs, to their families, and to their economic security.

We must make this a vote, and this vote must be a turning point so that at long last the American public can say that those of us in this House opposing fast track demand policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. The vote last Friday and today's vote are critical in letting the American public know where we stand and that, in fact, we prioritize their economic security, their jobs, their increased wages and that we are opposed to special interests. And that is what this Trans-Pacific Partnership is all about.

We must reject this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of confusion down here. Everybody thinks we are now talking about ObamaCare, and we are not.

The gentlewoman talked about diminishing wages, diminishing job opportunities for the future, diminishing opportunities for American workers to have higher wages. There is no bill that I have ever seen that diminished wages or people's opportunity to work the hours that they would like to work more than ObamaCare. But we are not debating that today.

Mr. Speaker, we are here—and I want to be clear—about trade promotion authority, TPA—not TPP, not any of the other bills. We are here for TPA today, exactly the same bill that this House passed last week. That is what we are here for.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Sunny-

side, Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying trade promotion authority bill.

Look at my State of Washington. We have jobs, economic growth, and increased exports because of trade. Those benefits and the example of that can be applied to our entire Nation.

By passing TPA, Congress will set priorities to ensure that any agreement levels the playing field with our trading partners and creates jobs here at home. Without it, the administration will be setting those priorities, and we, Congress, will have no say and little oversight.

In my State, we export coffee, many agricultural products, aircraft, footwear, and software. We export, fully, 30 percent of our apples, 60 percent of our hops, and over 85 percent of our wheat.

TPA is about instructing our trade negotiators to reduce the trade barriers that American farmers and manufacturers face so that we can create and sell openly around the world.

Right now, our American wines face very stiff tariffs in Japan, but Chilean and Argentinean wines face none. Our beef faces a 38 percent tariff; oranges, 16 percent. TPA will instruct our trade negotiators to work on lowering these tariffs.

The reason to vote on TPA and why it is so important is that it will make the deal public and give the American people several months to review any negotiated deal. Without passing this, there is no review period. The deal can stay secret.

Some have objected that their voices have not been heard on this matter, but for months, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Rules Committee have considered dozens of amendments to three different trade-related bills. There has been ample time for debate.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and the underlying bill are critical to our economy. Without it, our country will continue to face enormous barriers; but with it, we can grow our businesses, create more jobs, and ensure the American economy remains the most competitive and strongest in the world for decades to come.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The administration seems to think the Democrats and the coalition that is opposing the TPP would reject any trade deal. We are called protectionists. We are called unreasonable. But that is not true. Rather than these fancy parliamentary manipulations, we should take the time now to fix it.

Some of the most odious positions that we know that are in the TPP

which this fast track will speed us to are U.S. negotiating positions. Our trading partners are not clamoring for the extrajudicial investor dispute resolution authority, allowing huge corporations to challenge their hard-fought consumer protections, worker and environmental laws, et cetera. These are our negotiating positions. We could drop them and that would be welcomed abroad among our trading partners.

Countries want the opportunity and the right to protect their food supplies—and that includes us. Decrease smoking; promote Buy America; increase the minimum wage; control the cost of drugs; protect our environment. We could reset the balance of the intellectual property rights and access to lifesaving, affordable medicines by rewriting the pharmaceutical chapter, which I did look at.

More than a trade bill, this establishes a new regulatory regime that favors the wealthiest and the most powerful corporations. We could change that.

These votes we are taking today are not the end of the track. It is beginning the track to a new negotiation. It is the beginning of an opportunity for us to sit down and make sure that we get the best for workers, consumers, and our trading partners, and that we benefit our economy not just for the very few at the top that can go to some extrajudicial court and challenge our regulations, but for everyone. This is a bill that we can make better.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman knows that in the TPA agreement there is an agreement that she can go and attend every single round of the discussions and negotiation, by law. She can be right there. She can watch it as it happens. We can be engaged in this, as Members of Congress, the entire way. That is what this agreement is about. This is about TPA, not TPP.

The fear factor, Mr. Speaker, is incredible. Let's go and do the right thing for the American worker and our future. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Raleigh, North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

Here we go again, Mr. Speaker, debating what should be the United States' future role in the global economy.

We have heard a lot over the past few months about the economic benefits associated with free and fair trade, but trade is just as important to our Nation's foreign policy as it is to our bottom line. There is no question that trade is an important, strategic soft-power tool.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think for one second China isn't watching this very debate right now, waiting to see how serious we, the Congress, are about America's economic future and commitment to retaining our position of global leadership. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to guess they have been focused on what a deal like the TPP would mean for their sitting and future ambitions in the Asia Pacific region for a long time now.

The United States can either be in a position where we can write the rules for the future trade agreements and develop closer bilateral ties with our negotiating partners, or we can sit on the sidelines.

Passing TPA is about expanding our influence in a critical region of the world with the TPP and solidifying our alliances with our partners in Europe with the TTIP. Failing to pass TPA, I fear, will confirm many of our allies' own fears that America is in retreat from the global stage.

But we can send a strong signal today, Mr. Speaker, that while our Nation's foreign policy has recently been adrift, the House of Representatives—and the United States—supports closer economic ties with our partners and wants to see an America that is engaged on the world stage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this rule and support for the TPA legislation later today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule. It is such a danger, Mr. Speaker, that the majority is trying to move through the back door what it could not get through the front door on the floor of this House last week. And they are doing it in the most shameful way, Mr. Speaker: hiding behind our first responders. That is right; hiding behind firefighters and emergency personnel.

The International Association of Firefighters, representing more than 300,000 firefighters and emergency room personnel, oppose what is being done here today on this floor, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

There is one thing that I agree with the gentleman from Texas about. This is a donkey that died last week when we stood up for American workers, small businesses, and American jobs. And right now that donkey is like roadkill, and we are going to kill it right here on the floor of this House of Representatives.

We know that this body can pass legislation that in fact is not just about free trade, but is about free trade—and they are not doing it today—protecting our workers, protecting our climate, protecting our Buy America provisions for our procurement.

And so, Mr. Speaker, even as we are just getting word of the Pope's encyclical

on climate change and overwhelmingly recognizing the human cost to us all, we have a letter from our U.S. Trade Representative, Michael Froman, saying that this deal doesn't do anything to deal with the authority of the administration to negotiate climate change. That, in fact, is shameful. And what we are doing here today is against American workers, against American businesses, and against American jobs.

It is time to kill this donkey once and for all by putting it to rest and coming back to the table to reset for the American workers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), one of the most exciting new Members of Congress from the Ways and Means Committee. I have visited and watched this young man as he not only ably represents a proud group of people, but is a strong American.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in this House, we have a duty to legislate based on truth, not fiction. We cannot afford to be uneducated, uninformed, or untruthful when it comes to TPA. Maybe the problem is we labeled it wrong. Maybe we should have called it "Congressional Trade Authority Oversight." Maybe that is what we should have called it.

There is a great misunderstanding—and I hope it is a misunderstanding—about what this does for us. There is no way America can compete in the global economy without strong trade agreements. When Congress sets the parameters and very carefully constructs what the agreement has to contain, there is no mystery, there is no bogeyman, there is nobody hiding under the bed, there is nobody hiding in the closet. You don't have to have a secret decoder ring. You don't have to have some magical knock at the door to read all these different items. It is there for you to look at.

For crying out loud, will you stop pushing a false narrative if it is about growing our economy? The only way we can grow is protecting what we have and then going into the global economy and increasing our market penetration. It is that simple.

If you want America to grow, then you must allow America to grow. And you must allow America to lead, because when America leads, America wins. And when America wins, the rest of the world wins. It is just that simple.

Why in the world fast track? It is not fast track. If you want to call it slow track, that is fine, because you are going to have 60 days to read it. That is pretty slow, at least around here. You want to call it smart track? That is what it is. It is smart track. It is safe track, and it is sure track. The other thing, it puts America back on the track to economic prosperity.

Pass TPA today and put America back on the track to protect American jobs. Allow the economy to grow, and allow our workers not just to produce and distribute products at home, but around the world. That is how we win, and that is how the people who depend on us win. When America is strong, America leads.

□ 1000

When we are not strong, we create a vacuum at the top of the world that is going to be filled with bad actors.

Please stop using a false narrative. If you are not informed, get informed; if you are not educated, get educated, but for God's sake, don't be untruthful.

I urge passage of the TPA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Members, what I really dislike about this whole debate is that there is so much invective thrown around, claims of untruth.

Now, here is the truth. The reality is that, if we pass trade promotion authority, we will have nothing more than an up-or-down vote at the end of the process. They don't have to take our amendments. They don't have to listen to what we say. Very likely, what will happen is that whatever has been negotiated already will be what the deal is.

For some Members to try to claim that others don't get it or they are not being honest is, quite frankly, insulting and does not add one thing to the quality of the debate.

The American people deserve to know that if trade promotion authority passes, there is a "yes" or "no" vote that will happen at the end of the process, and nobody here will be able to impact it through the normal course of events. We can go to some meetings; we can write some letters; but can we actually legislate? No.

Now, the reason that this is a very bad outcome is because the United States Constitution delegates Congress, this body, with the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. It says: "Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

What we are doing here is taking that constitutional authority and we are handing it to the Executive and hoping for the best.

Now, the people who have been negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership all along are a body of about 600 multinational lawyers and businesspeople. The voice of the workers haven't been there. The voice of the environment

has not been there. The voice of ordinary citizens who have every reason to want a better world and impact this process have been muted in favor of big multinational corporate types. We must vote "no" on TPA today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and an awesome free trader.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for giving me time.

Let's set the facts straight here. Liberal union leaders, radical environmentalists, some of our friends on the other side have been relentless in pushing misinformation to confuse and distract the American people. It undermines the confidence that the American people have in this body, the people's House.

Let's look at the facts. TPA, trade promotion authority, it is not a trade agreement. It is the process by which we get the best possible trade agreement, the best possible agreement on behalf of the American worker and the American farmer.

This is Congress asserting its constitutional authority by setting the priorities for our negotiators. We are robustly involved in the negotiation process, and this TPA version is even better than previous ones because it empowers all Members of Congress, not just the Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee.

TPA has been public. It has been public for months for anybody and everybody who wants to read it. Just go to congress.gov. It is not secret.

They are trying to deliberately confuse TPA, trade promotion authority, with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is a trade negotiation underway and not completed yet. We want a strong TPP—Trans-Pacific Partnership—agreement for the American workers and for farmers. We won't get that without TPA.

TPA puts a strong check on the President, placing the Congress in the driver's seat with 150 negotiating objectives that must be addressed or else the final agreement won't be brought up for a vote. We will kill it. We have the power, not the President.

It contains strong protections against the President from putting in any new immigration authority in violation of American law. It prevents the President from subverting U.S. sovereignty and all these urban myths that are out there.

Frankly, the misinformation is disturbing, and it undermines the trust of this body. We have to put the facts on the table for the American people. This has been supported by a wide number of groups—business groups, conservatives, many other groups.

If you support transparency, if you support placing a check on the Presi-

dent, if you support robust oversight, and if you support getting the best deal for the American worker, knocking down barriers—whether they are tariff or nontariff barriers in these other countries—to give the American worker a break, open markets, then you support TPA.

TPA is a catalyst for economic growth. It opens the door for a robust trade agenda for the United States.

We created the global trading system after 1945. Are we going to walk away from it? We only have 20 agreements—with 20 countries, that is, free trade agreements. These are important agreements. Other countries have 40, 50, hundreds of them.

Why are we sitting on the sidelines? We have been sitting on the sidelines for decades. It is time for American leadership. We can't walk away from the trading system we created. Our partners around the world want us engaged.

This is the catalyst for American leadership. This is an important part of our national strategy and an important part of our foreign policy.

You want a strategy? You want economic growth? You want fairness for the American worker? Support TPA as a catalyst for growth and leadership.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

I am not going to go into the exact same debate we had 1 week ago because the facts are still the same. If we pass fast track authority, the facts are identical around the fact we will lose jobs here in this country and we will depress our wages here in this country. We will lose our sovereignty and control over our laws, and we will have problems with everything from food safety to intellectual property rights and so many other laws.

What is different about this week from last week is this is not the same trade promotion authority. This trade promotion authority will take away American jobs, but it lacks the trade authority that gives us the assistance and the dollars to help those people find other jobs.

This includes all of the amendments that affect us from taking away the provisions the Senate put in around currency manipulation, take away the amendments around human trafficking, and specifically say that we cannot address climate change in these trade negotiations.

Now, that alone is an issue that I want clarity from the White House on. I have been in and looked at the language, and I will not talk about classified language on the floor, but the amendment specifically—we need clarity about where we are on climate change in this agreement.

This is not the same TPA. It will cost jobs. It will lower our wages. It will not

provide any protections for those workers who lose their jobs because of this. Now, because of last week's actions, the bill before us is a far, far worse bill.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues, let's let the American people have a say. The only way they will is if Congress retains our authority to amend and debate this bill. If we give that away, it is our own fault today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, I have to remind my colleagues we have got to follow some understanding about what we are trying to do here. This is TPA.

TAA was up last week, and my colleagues that are Democrats turned down the same things they are now talking about were provisions to protect the American worker. The Democrat Party voted against the American worker last week.

They are the ones that turned down exactly what the gentleman is talking about needs to be a part of this deal. The Democrat Party turned their back on the American worker. That was last week.

This week, now, they are trying to talk about things that are in TPP. Mr. Speaker, we are not here today for TPP. We are here today for trade promotion authority. That is it, TPA.

The gentleman, Mr. KELLY, was very right to say let's talk about the real facts of the case and the truth. This is about TPA. It is exactly the same bill that was here last week.

There were other considerations last week. The Democrat Party turned their back last week on the worker. We are not trying to do that today—trade promotion authority.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Cincinnati, Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I think every Member of this body, on both sides of the aisle, have something in common. We all have small businesses in our district and probably a lot of them.

One of the privileges we have, as Members of Congress, is to talk to those people and find out what is important to them. What is important to them is important to the country because about 70 percent of the new jobs that are created in the American economy nowadays are created by small businesses.

In thinking about what I would say about TPA here this morning, I thought, rather than just tell people what I thought about it, I thought I would bring some examples of some of those folks that we have talked to.

As Chair of the Small Business Committee, I get to talk to small businesses all across the country. Here are some examples of what they are telling us.

Here is Michael Stanek of Hunt Imaging in Berea, Ohio. He said:

Free trade agreements are extremely important as they lower foreign barriers to our exports and produce a more level playing field.

Without TPA, the U.S. is relegated to the sidelines as other nations negotiate trade agreements without us, putting American workers and companies, especially small ones, at a competitive disadvantage.

Here is Dyke Messenger of Power Curbers in Salisbury, North Carolina:

Passage of TPA, which lapsed back in 2007, is critical to restore U.S. leadership on trade.

Manufacturers in the U.S. face steeper trade barriers abroad than virtually any other major country, including Mexico and China and European countries, largely because those countries have entered into more market access agreements than the United States. Trade and foreign markets are critical for small businesses like Power Curbers.

Here is Kevin Severns of Severns Farm in Sanger, California.

Without TPA, critical negotiations with some of our key export markets may well stall. My understanding is that, on average, U.S. citrus exports to countries included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership can currently face tariffs as high as 40 percent.

That is tariffs at 40 percent.

Given that 35 percent of California's citrus crop is exported around the world, access to these markets is vital to us.

Here is Brian Bieron of eBay, which helps many small businesses sell their products abroad. He said:

Through our experience, we have found that technology is transforming trade by allowing Main Street businesses to directly take part in globalization, reaping the benefits of markets previously only open to the largest global companies. This is good economics because it means more growth and wealth, and it is good for society because it means a more inclusive form of globalization.

That is what people from around this country—small-business men, small-business women—are saying about TPA and TPP and trade. In effect, they are saying, if we want to grow the American economy and create jobs, which I think we all want to do, we must be proactive on trade, and that means passing TPA and then TPP.

Better trade agreements mean small businesses will be able to access new international customers and offer their products more easily and at a lower cost than ever before.

It means that more products will be built and sold. When that happens, jobs are created, wages go up, and more opportunity is available to all.

You put an American worker against anyone in the world, and I will take that bet every day of the week and twice on Sunday; but we can't get there without TPA.

Without TPA, other nations, especially China, will dictate the rules of the new economy, nations that do not respect the rule of law or the rights of individuals in many cases, especially in the case of China.

Ninety-six percent of the people that are on this globe that we all share live outside the borders of the United States. Many of the world's consumers are not here. We want to sell our products overseas, and TPA gets us on the right track.

□ 1015

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding.

I wish to say that if the underlying Trans-Pacific Partnership were such a good deal, then why is the Rules Committee limiting our ability to read it and vet it fully and amend it?

By voting for the trade promotion authority, what we basically do is handcuff Members of Congress. So we should vote "no."

Why should we believe anything the executive branch sends up here? We have a right to read it fully and vet it fully.

Let's look at the history of these trade agreements. Over the last 25 years, every time we have signed a so-called free trade agreement that benefits the 1 percent—not the 99 percent—America has lost more jobs. Post-NAFTA, look what happened. We used to have trade balances with these countries. They have all gone into trade deficit, which means they send us more goods than we are able to get into their markets. Here is what happened after the WTO. Then we got into the China PNTR deal. Then the Colombia deal. Then with Korea.

There hasn't been a balanced trade account in this country for 30 years; 40 million lost jobs; \$9.5 trillion of trade deficit, trading away one-fifth of our economic might to other places.

And what did the American people get? Lost jobs, outsourced jobs, stagnant wages. The average income in regions like mine—\$7,000 less a year than 25 years ago. Not a good deal.

You can't create jobs in America and have free trade when you have closed markets abroad. Japan is closed. Korea is closed. China is closed. Europe limits 10 percent imports. We don't. We have an open market.

You can't create jobs and have free trade when you try to trade with countries where their people have no rights, no legal rights.

This Congress should vote "no" on this Trans-Pacific Partnership, the underlying bill, and the trade promotion authority because we have a right to read the agreement and openly debate it.

Right now we have to go down to a secret room. We have people who monitor us. And we can't even talk to the American people about what is in it. What is free about that?

The executive branch has totally overreached its power. Only four titles

of the dozen in this TPP are actually about tariffs.

This bill is a treaty. It should be considered as a treaty, openly read by the Senate, and it should be able to be amended and fully vetted. This is so important. When you have gone through a quarter century of job loss and income loss by the American people, why can't we produce a bill that benefits the 100 percent—not just the 1 percent, the ones that were able to pay the plane tickets to go over to Asia and help to represent very important transnational interests? But there are not just the interests of those companies. We have to represent the interests of the American people.

Let's balance these trade accounts and develop a new trade model—not a NAFTA-based trade model, but a model that produces jobs in America, good wages, and balanced trade accounts for the first time in a quarter century.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. We forgot to make sure everybody knew: we are only doing TPA today. We are not doing TPP. We are not doing these other agreements. I am sorry. I forgot to say that for the 57th time.

Where we cut deals, we win. With the 20 trade agreements America has, we had a \$10 billion surplus last year alone.

I don't know where all these people are getting off and scaring and making fear statements about the American worker. I don't get it, when they talk about us not passing TAA when they are the ones—the Democrat Party—that turned it down. I don't understand why they are beating us up for putting in provisions about immigration. I guess they want to flood our workforce with foreign workers. I don't get where the Democrat Party and its great stalwarts are coming from today. This is about TPA, and that is what we are going to vote on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear, the Members on this side of the aisle—the Democratic Party Members on this side of the aisle—completely understand what we are debating today. We know we are debating the rule on TPA, the same TPA which has been modified. As the gentleman has said, we are not debating TPP.

The problem we have is, the trade promotion authority is intended to be the method by which this body, this Congress creates the parameters for negotiation of trade agreements, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership. And the reason that this has been difficult, this House and the Republican leadership,

in particular, is trying to create a TPA that accommodates the already negotiated TPP.

So while it is a good rhetorical argument to say we are not debating TPP, the fact of the matter is, the reason that there has been such a lack of willingness to consider any modification, any amendments to the TPA bill is because any change would not align with the already negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The reason, for example, that a bipartisan amendment that I and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON) offered—with equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans, 22 of us—to deal with currency manipulation was not made in order is because it would not align with the already negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Most everybody agrees that it would be good policy, but this deal is already written. And now we are trying to back in a TPA bill that it will accommodate the TPP.

So it is rather difficult for me to accept the argument that this TPA question has nothing to do with the Trans-Pacific Partnership when everybody in this House of Representatives knows that it has everything to do with it.

The other thing that is important for us to keep in mind is that this is a worse piece of legislation than the bad one that came before the House last week. Because of the modifications to TPA that came through in the customs bill, as my colleagues have said, despite the fact that many on the other side have argued that our attempts to deal with climate change here in the U.S. alone will not be affected because it is not a global approach, when we have an opportunity to take a broader approach, representing 40 percent of the global economy and deal with climate change, we now have an absolute prohibition, a gag order where we can't talk about climate in the greatest opportunity we would have to deal with climate change; nor can we have even a weak provision regarding currency, which has been excised from the TPA. And, unbelievably, we will actually weaken our ability to deal with bad actors when it comes to human trafficking.

This is shameful, it ought to be rejected.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The gentlewoman from Ohio will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to know, if Members vote in favor of the trade promotion authority currently before us, will Members be allowed to amend the underlying bill, the TPP?

Could the chairman of the Rules Committee address that, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is engaging in debate and is not making a parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, in what form could I ask the question that I could get a straight answer as to whether Members will be able to amend the underlying 1,000-page trade agreement called the Trans-Pacific Partnership?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman may look to the managers for a specific item of debate.

Ms. KAPTUR. So, in other words, the chairman of the Rules Committee cannot answer my question? He is my friend. I think it would be important for Members to know that because it is my understanding that we are not allowed to amend the agreement if, in fact, TPA passes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

The gentlewoman from New York is recognized.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

TPA shouldn't stand for "trade promotion authority"; it should stand for "taking prosperity away," because that is exactly what it is going to do for millions of hard-working Americans.

The House failed to advance its proposal less than a week ago, and today the TPA we are voting on is even worse.

And hiding the vote behind our brave first responders? This is shameful.

Republican leaders are doing everything they can to jam through a special interest agenda that will depress wages, exacerbate inequality, and cost jobs. TPA will take away the constitutional responsibility that Congress has to strengthen and improve the Trans-Pacific Partnership. If we approve this measure, we are surrendering our ability to improve a trade agreement for working families.

We are not voting on TPP, as the chairman said, but we are voting on TPA, on the rules to govern these negotiations and the process to be filed. And if we vote for this TPA, we are saying that we are fine moving forward on a trade agreement that has no enforceable provisions against currency manipulation; meaning, there are no protections to stop countries from devaluing their currency, artificially reducing the price of their goods, and putting American manufacturers and American jobs at a competitive disadvantage. We are saying, we are fine with a trade agreement that fails to address the critical issue of climate change. We are saying that we are fine with entering into a trade agreement with countries like Brunei, where

LGBT individuals can be stoned to death and women can be flogged in public. We are saying, we are fine with having a trade agreement that weakens protections against human trafficking; and we are fine with entering into a trade agreement with countries like Vietnam, which denies workers even the most basic collective bargaining rights, while throwing workers' advocates into prison.

So we are not voting on TPP. We are voting on TPA. But we are setting the rules for governing the negotiations, and we are removing ourselves from the process of improving and strengthening this trade agreement.

The House should reject this proposal and stand with hard-working Americans. We should oppose TPA. We should oppose the rule.

For 30 years, we have had trade policies in this country that have failed American workers, driving down wages, increasing income inequality, and, as a result of it, costing jobs. A vote for fast track is a vote to abandon our responsibility to ensure that trade works for our country and for American workers.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule, to reject the underlying bill, and to vote "no" on TPA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will control the time for the minority side.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a letter to Members of Congress from the general president of the International Association of Firefighters opposing House Resolution 321 when it attaches trade promotion authority to H.R. 2146, the Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF FIRE FIGHTERS,
June 18, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of more than 300,000 professional fire fighters and emergency medical personnel, I strongly urge you to oppose H. Res. 321 which attaches Trade Promotion Authority to HR 2146, the Defending Public Safety Employee's Retirement Act.

The underlying legislation provides an important measure of retirement security to the federal fighters who protect our nation's defense installations, VA hospitals and other vital facilities. It should not be politically exploited and used in a last ditch, desperate effort to pass TPA.

HR 2146, which simply enables federal fire fighters to access their own retirement savings once they reach retirement age, was passed by the House by a vote of 407-5 and adopted unanimously in the Senate with a technical amendment. This amended legislation deserves to be considered free of political gamesmanship and procedural tricks.

The IAFF urges you to oppose this rule, and consider HR 2146 without controversial amendments.

Sincerely,

HAROLD A. SCHAIBERGER,
General President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if we vote for trade promotion authority, fast track, without Trade Adjustment Assistance, if that is how we vote today, that is what we will get.

The Republican chair of the Rules Committee has made it clear. He has already used his precious time to start blaming Democratic leadership for the fact that Trade Adjustment Assistance will not become law.

The fact is that if Trade Adjustment Assistance ever comes before this House, it will, no doubt, be loaded up by the Republican leadership with a host of poison pills, making sure that Democrats cannot vote for it. I can't vote for Trade Adjustment Assistance if you terminate the Affordable Care Act as part of the bill, for example.

Now the proponents of trade promotion authority have had to misstate the actual economic facts, the figures on our trade surpluses and deficits, in order to make their case. They have come again and again and said, we have a trade surplus with our free trade agreement partners.

Completely false. I will put into the RECORD the chart listing each of our free trade agreement partners, and we are running a \$177 billion deficit in goods. Including services, you are now down to a little over a \$100 billion deficit.

□ 1030

Now, how is it that Member after Member has come here and said something demonstrably false? They have been fooled by slippery charlatans who feed them the following line: Since NAFTA, we have a surplus with those countries that have a free trade agreement.

"Since NAFTA" implies since the early 1990s. No, they mean those agreements we entered into after NAFTA. So they look at our free trade agreements while ignoring NAFTA. That is like looking at the Cavs and ignoring LeBron. You can't do that.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the success and failure of our free trade agreements, number one is NAFTA. If you include all of our free trade agreements, including NAFTA, we have a \$177 billion goods deficit. And then if you look at MFN for China, most favored nation status for China, well, then you are talking \$400 billion of deficit. That was not a free trade agreement. That was an even worse agreement.

This TPP is a gift to China. First, it enshrines the idea that currency manipulation will be allowed, even encouraged. It sets Chinese rules for trade in Asia, preserving for them their number one tactic in running such a

huge trade surplus with the United States. It hollows out American manufacturing, thus endangering our national security. And the rules of origin provision available for review in the basement will show you that goods that are 50 and 60 percent made in China, admitted to be made in China, which means actually 70 or 80 percent really made in China, come fast-tracked into the United States. China gets the benefit and doesn't have to make a single concession.

Vote "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. First, we were all on the fast track, then the slow track with postponement into July, and now we are back on rush-hour scheduling, being told that fast track, which has been mangled in the meantime with new changes, has to be approved by high noon today.

Railroading this bill through now will deny any opportunity to ensure that our trade policy gets on the right track. The fast-trackers have rejected every constructive improvement for a better trade measure that we have advanced. And even these fast-trackers, if they are really candid with the American people, would concede there is not a Member of this Congress who knows what is in this agreement to the extent that the Vietnamese Politburo does. Because so much of it has been secreted, we do not have one word that has been made public or accessible to us about how it is that Vietnam will enforce provisions to ensure greater worker freedom and opportunity instead of being part of a race to the bottom.

What we do know about this fast-track agreement from a recent Canadian ruling, *Bilcon v. Canada*, is that corporate panels will be empowered to charge taxpayers millions of dollars for the privilege of maintaining public health and safety laws. The language to which my colleague from Texas has referred about preserving American laws is really meaningless because, yes, they are preserved, but when your city or your State acts to protect you, foreign corporations are accorded more rights than American businesses, and they can demand millions for keeping our laws in place.

What we do know is that, since last week, this railroad has picked up some mighty unsavory characters. The irony is that on the very day Pope Francis is formally releasing his encyclical on global warming, this railroad has picked up a troubling new provision that would deny any opportunity to address the greatest environmental challenge that our world faces.

Even Trans-Pacific Partnership supporters concede that it looks like a

charter for corporate America rather than a high-level trade agreement. The Financial Times said, "In too many aspects, it looks like a charter for corporate America."

We learn, I think, more from USTR's past failures than from its current promises. USTR has never in its history successfully challenged worker or environmental abuses by any of our foreign trading partners. Usually the reason that USTR fails is that it doesn't really try. It doesn't seem to have a belief in law enforcement when it comes to worker and environmental abuse. In Guatemala, it took it eight years to even bring a dispute. In Honduras, it took nearly four years to issue another bureaucratic report. In Peru, we cannot get the audit that USTR was responsible for obtaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, "Asleep at the Wheel" is a great Texas swing band, but it is a horrible philosophy for trade law enforcement. Reject this rule; help us get a better trade policy; protect American families; and advance our economy. We can do better than this by rejecting this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, let me say to my colleagues that they should be appalled by this process. This is again being brought up under a process where nobody—not just Democrats, but Republicans as well—can offer amendments.

In the United States Senate when TPA was considered, they were able to offer amendments, but when it came before the House last week, we were told we could offer no amendments. The excuse we were given is because, if we passed it, it would go right to the White House. But what we are doing today is actually not going to the White House. It is going back to the Senate, yet we are again being presented with a closed process.

Why can't Members of both sides of the aisle have an opportunity to make their views known on this important issue? Why are we being shut out when it comes to the issue of trade and TPA?

I heard a number of speakers say that this debate is not about TPP. Well, this is indeed about the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Whether or not TPP is implemented will depend almost entirely on whether the President has fast track in place.

The vote on fast track, or TPA, will determine the fate of the TPP trade deal. So a "yes" vote on TPA is a "yes" vote on TPP. It is that simple. History shows that is how it has worked time and time and time again.

Fast track is not just about TPP. If we vote for TPA for fast track, we are fast-tracking any trade deal that any President negotiates anytime in the next 6 years. We have no idea who the next President will be, but you are giving the next President—or next Presidents—the authority to have fast-track authority on whatever they want. Why are we just giving away all of our ability to play a role in these negotiations? The problem with these trade deals is that only the well-off and well-connected have a seat at the table.

I urge my colleagues to put American workers first. Vote "no" on the rule and vote "no" on the underlying bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the TPP is modeled after a failed trade agreement. It will further erode our national economy and change the rules in ways that hurt American workers. We are supposed to be here to protect the American workers and to create more opportunity, and we are yet going down the road of another trade deal that is going to rob America of important middle class jobs. It is appalling, and this process is appalling.

Vote "no" on the rule, and vote "no" on the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this debate today has been most interesting about the differences between the speakers who showed up today. One group of speakers is for America, for growth, for America leading, for America engaging the world, and for cutting deals with our friends against one other huge country that will overrun in every single economic circumstance the rest of the world because they do not respect intellectual property or rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, this is about gathering together the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to where we gather together the best rules and regulations that we can, parameters by which the President would go negotiate. This isn't about abdicating our role and responsibility. It is trade promotion authority.

Mr. Speaker, please, we understand that some people haven't read the bill. We understand some people think this is about TPP or other agreements, but it is not. This is about a simple process: Are we going to exert our constitutional authority? Are we going to engage the President where the President can go engage the world on behalf of the American worker? Are we going to lead, or are we going to stick our head in the sand?

Mr. Speaker, America needs to lead, and the world wants us to lead. Mr. Speaker, the world wants American products, and American business wants to sell to others without high prices and without tariffs. What we want to do is to compete. That is why we are here today.

I urge adoption of this rule. I look forward to the debate that will follow, and I look forward to our young chairman, PAUL RYAN, leading that effort, proving not only to the Members here today and to you, Mr. Speaker, but to the American people that we want more jobs. We have not created all the jobs that we need in this country. We need more, and this is a part of that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

YEAS—244

Abraham	Curbelo (FL)	Hudson
Aderholt	Delaney	Huelskamp
Allen	Denham	Huizenga (MI)
Amash	Dent	Hultgren
Amodei	DeSantis	Hunter
Ashford	DesJarlais	Hurd (TX)
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Barletta	Dold	Jenkins (KS)
Barr	Donovan	Jenkins (WV)
Barton	Duffy	Johnson (OH)
Benishek	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, E. B.
Bilirakis	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (MI)	Ellmers (NC)	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Emmer (MN)	Joyce
Black	Farenthold	Katko
Blackburn	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Blum	Fitzpatrick	Kind
Blumenauer	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Bost	Fleming	King (NY)
Boustany	Flores	Kinzing (IL)
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Kline
Brat	Fortenberry	Knight
Bridenstine	Fox	Labrador
Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	LaMalfa
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Buchanan	Garrett	Lance
Buck	Gibbs	Latta
Bucshon	Gibson	LoBiondo
Burgess	Goodlatte	Long
Calvert	Gowdy	Loudermilk
Carter (GA)	Granger	Love
Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Lucas
Chabot	Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Clawson (FL)	Griffith	MacArthur
Coffman	Grothman	Marchant
Cole	Guinta	Marino
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	Massie
Collins (NY)	Hanna	McCarthy
Comstock	Hardy	McCauley
Conaway	Harper	McClintock
Cook	Harris	McHenry
Cooper	Hartzler	McKinley
Costa	Heck (NV)	McMorris
Costello (PA)	Hensarling	Rodgers
Cramer	Herrera Beutler	McSally
Crawford	Hice, Jody B.	Meadows
Crenshaw	Hill	Meehan
Culberson	Holding	Messer

Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratchliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell

Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

Byrne
Clyburn
Davis, Rodney

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch

Gohmert
Gosar
Hurt (VA)

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Jolly
Kelly (MS)

NOT VOTING—8

□ 1108

Mrs. ROBY and Mr. BRADY of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 373 on H. Res. 321. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

□ 1115

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY
EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 321, I call up the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

On page 3, strike lines 9 through 11 and insert the following:

(d) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2015.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with the amendment printed in House Report 114-167.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

At the end of the Senate amendment, add the following:

TITLE I—TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

(a) OVERALL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—The overall trade negotiating objectives of the United States for agreements subject to the provisions of section 103 are—

(1) to obtain more open, equitable, and reciprocal market access;

(2) to obtain the reduction or elimination of barriers and distortions that are directly related to trade and investment and that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade;

(3) to further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines and procedures, including dispute settlement;

(4) to foster economic growth, raise living standards, enhance the competitiveness of the United States, promote full employment in the United States, and enhance the global economy;

(5) to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive and to seek to protect and preserve the environment and enhance the international means of doing so, while optimizing the use of the world's resources;

(6) to promote respect for worker rights and the rights of children consistent with core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 111(7)) and an understanding of the relationship between trade and worker rights;

(7) to seek provisions in trade agreements under which parties to those agreements ensure that they do not weaken or reduce the protections afforded in domestic environmental and labor laws as an encouragement for trade;

(8) to ensure that trade agreements afford small businesses equal access to international markets, equitable trade benefits, and expanded export market opportunities, and provide for the reduction or elimination of trade and investment barriers that disproportionately impact small businesses;

(9) to promote universal ratification and full compliance with ILO Convention No. 182 Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor;

(10) to ensure that trade agreements reflect and facilitate the increasingly interrelated, multi-sectoral nature of trade and investment activity;

(11) to recognize the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce;

(12) to take into account other legitimate United States domestic objectives, including, but not limited to, the protection of legitimate health or safety, essential security, and consumer interests and the law and regulations related thereto; and

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

(b) PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—

(1) TRADE IN GOODS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade in goods are—

(A) to expand competitive market opportunities for exports of goods from the United States and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through the

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney
Malone
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore

Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating tariff and nontariff barriers and policies and practices of foreign governments directly related to trade that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade; and

(B) to obtain reciprocal tariff and nontariff barrier elimination agreements, including with respect to those tariff categories covered in section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(2) **TRADE IN SERVICES.**—(A) The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding trade in services is to expand competitive market opportunities for United States services and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating barriers to international trade in services, such as regulatory and other barriers that deny national treatment and market access or unreasonably restrict the establishment or operations of service suppliers.

(B) Recognizing that expansion of trade in services generates benefits for all sectors of the economy and facilitates trade, the objective described in subparagraph (A) should be pursued through all means, including through a plurilateral agreement with those countries willing and able to undertake high standard services commitments for both existing and new services.

(3) **TRADE IN AGRICULTURE.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to agriculture is to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of agricultural commodities in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in bulk, specialty crop, and value added commodities by—

(A) securing more open and equitable market access through robust rules on sanitary and phytosanitary measures that—

(i) encourage the adoption of international standards and require a science-based justification be provided for a sanitary or phytosanitary measure if the measure is more restrictive than the applicable international standard;

(ii) improve regulatory coherence, promote the use of systems-based approaches, and appropriately recognize the equivalence of health and safety protection systems of exporting countries;

(iii) require that measures are transparently developed and implemented, are based on risk assessments that take into account relevant international guidelines and scientific data, and are not more restrictive on trade than necessary to meet the intended purpose; and

(iv) improve import check processes, including testing methodologies and procedures, and certification requirements,

while recognizing that countries may put in place measures to protect human, animal, or plant life or health in a manner consistent with their international obligations, including the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (referred to in section 101(d)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(3)));

(B) reducing or eliminating, by a date certain, tariffs or other charges that decrease market opportunities for United States exports—

(i) giving priority to those products that are subject to significantly higher tariffs or

subsidy regimes of major producing countries; and

(ii) providing reasonable adjustment periods for United States import sensitive products, in close consultation with Congress on such products before initiating tariff reduction negotiations;

(C) reducing tariffs to levels that are the same as or lower than those in the United States;

(D) reducing or eliminating subsidies that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or unfairly distort agriculture markets to the detriment of the United States;

(E) allowing the preservation of programs that support family farms and rural communities but do not distort trade;

(F) developing disciplines for domestic support programs, so that production that is in excess of domestic food security needs is sold at world prices;

(G) eliminating government policies that create price depressing surpluses;

(H) eliminating state trading enterprises whenever possible;

(I) developing, strengthening, and clarifying rules to eliminate practices that unfairly decrease United States market access opportunities or distort agricultural markets to the detriment of the United States, and ensuring that such rules are subject to efficient, timely, and effective dispute settlement, including—

(i) unfair or trade distorting activities of state trading enterprises and other administrative mechanisms, with emphasis on requiring price transparency in the operation of state trading enterprises and such other mechanisms in order to end cross subsidization, price discrimination, and price undercutting;

(ii) unjustified trade restrictions or commercial requirements, such as labeling, that affect new technologies, including biotechnology;

(iii) unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including restrictions not based on scientific principles in contravention of obligations in the Uruguay Round Agreements or bilateral or regional trade agreements;

(iv) other unjustified technical barriers to trade; and

(v) restrictive rules in the administration of tariff rate quotas;

(J) eliminating practices that adversely affect trade in perishable or cyclical products, while improving import relief mechanisms to recognize the unique characteristics of perishable and cyclical agriculture;

(K) ensuring that import relief mechanisms for perishable and cyclical agriculture are as accessible and timely to growers in the United States as those mechanisms that are used by other countries;

(L) taking into account whether a party to the negotiations has failed to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or has circumvented obligations under those agreements;

(M) taking into account whether a product is subject to market distortions by reason of a failure of a major producing country to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or by the circumvention by that country of its obligations under those agreements;

(N) otherwise ensuring that countries that accede to the World Trade Organization have made meaningful market liberalization commitments in agriculture;

(O) taking into account the impact that agreements covering agriculture to which

the United States is a party have on the United States agricultural industry;

(P) maintaining bona fide food assistance programs, market development programs, and export credit programs;

(Q) seeking to secure the broadest market access possible in multilateral, regional, and bilateral negotiations, recognizing the effect that simultaneous sets of negotiations may have on United States import sensitive commodities (including those subject to tariff rate quotas);

(R) seeking to develop an international consensus on the treatment of seasonal or perishable agricultural products in investigations relating to dumping and safeguards and in any other relevant area;

(S) seeking to establish the common base year for calculating the Aggregated Measurement of Support (as defined in the Agreement on Agriculture) as the end of each country's Uruguay Round implementation period, as reported in each country's Uruguay Round market access schedule;

(T) ensuring transparency in the administration of tariff rate quotas through multilateral, plurilateral, and bilateral negotiations; and

(U) eliminating and preventing the undermining of market access for United States products through improper use of a country's system for protecting or recognizing geographical indications, including failing to ensure transparency and procedural fairness and protecting generic terms.

(4) **FOREIGN INVESTMENT.**—Recognizing that United States law on the whole provides a high level of protection for investment, consistent with or greater than the level required by international law, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding foreign investment are to reduce or eliminate artificial or trade distorting barriers to foreign investment, while ensuring that foreign investors in the United States are not accorded greater substantive rights with respect to investment protections than United States investors in the United States, and to secure for investors important rights comparable to those that would be available under United States legal principles and practice, by—

(A) reducing or eliminating exceptions to the principle of national treatment;

(B) freeing the transfer of funds relating to investments;

(C) reducing or eliminating performance requirements, forced technology transfers, and other unreasonable barriers to the establishment and operation of investments;

(D) seeking to establish standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation, consistent with United States legal principles and practice;

(E) seeking to establish standards for fair and equitable treatment, consistent with United States legal principles and practice, including the principle of due process;

(F) providing meaningful procedures for resolving investment disputes;

(G) seeking to improve mechanisms used to resolve disputes between an investor and a government through—

(i) mechanisms to eliminate frivolous claims and to deter the filing of frivolous claims;

(ii) procedures to ensure the efficient selection of arbitrators and the expeditious disposition of claims;

(iii) procedures to enhance opportunities for public input into the formulation of government positions; and

(iv) providing for an appellate body or similar mechanism to provide coherence to

the interpretations of investment provisions in trade agreements; and

(H) ensuring the fullest measure of transparency in the dispute settlement mechanism, to the extent consistent with the need to protect information that is classified or business confidential, by—

(i) ensuring that all requests for dispute settlement are promptly made public;

(ii) ensuring that—

(I) all proceedings, submissions, findings, and decisions are promptly made public; and

(II) all hearings are open to the public; and

(iii) establishing a mechanism for acceptance of amicus curiae submissions from businesses, unions, and nongovernmental organizations.

(5) **INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade-related intellectual property are—

(A) to further promote adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights, including through—

(i) (I) ensuring accelerated and full implementation of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(15)), particularly with respect to meeting enforcement obligations under that agreement; and

(II) ensuring that the provisions of any trade agreement governing intellectual property rights that is entered into by the United States reflect a standard of protection similar to that found in United States law;

(ii) providing strong protection for new and emerging technologies and new methods of transmitting and distributing products embodying intellectual property, including in a manner that facilitates legitimate digital trade;

(iii) preventing or eliminating discrimination with respect to matters affecting the availability, acquisition, scope, maintenance, use, and enforcement of intellectual property rights;

(iv) ensuring that standards of protection and enforcement keep pace with technological developments, and in particular ensuring that rightholders have the legal and technological means to control the use of their works through the Internet and other global communication media, and to prevent the unauthorized use of their works;

(v) providing strong enforcement of intellectual property rights, including through accessible, expeditious, and effective civil, administrative, and criminal enforcement mechanisms; and

(vi) preventing or eliminating government involvement in the violation of intellectual property rights, including cyber theft and piracy;

(B) to secure fair, equitable, and non-discriminatory market access opportunities for United States persons that rely upon intellectual property protection; and

(C) to respect the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, adopted by the World Trade Organization at the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar on November 14, 2001, and to ensure that trade agreements foster innovation and promote access to medicines.

(6) **DIGITAL TRADE IN GOODS AND SERVICES AND CROSS-BORDER DATA FLOWS.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to digital trade in goods and services, as well as cross-border data flows, are—

(A) to ensure that current obligations, rules, disciplines, and commitments under

the World Trade Organization and bilateral and regional trade agreements apply to digital trade in goods and services and to cross-border data flows;

(B) to ensure that—

(i) electronically delivered goods and services receive no less favorable treatment under trade rules and commitments than like products delivered in physical form; and

(ii) the classification of such goods and services ensures the most liberal trade treatment possible, fully encompassing both existing and new trade;

(C) to ensure that governments refrain from implementing trade-related measures that impede digital trade in goods and services, restrict cross-border data flows, or require local storage or processing of data;

(D) with respect to subparagraphs (A) through (C), where legitimate policy objectives require domestic regulations that affect digital trade in goods and services or cross-border data flows, to obtain commitments that any such regulations are the least restrictive on trade, nondiscriminatory, and transparent, and promote an open market environment; and

(E) to extend the moratorium of the World Trade Organization on duties on electronic transmissions.

(7) **REGULATORY PRACTICES.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the use of government regulation or other practices to reduce market access for United States goods, services, and investments are—

(A) to achieve increased transparency and opportunity for the participation of affected parties in the development of regulations;

(B) to require that proposed regulations be based on sound science, cost benefit analysis, risk assessment, or other objective evidence;

(C) to establish consultative mechanisms and seek other commitments, as appropriate, to improve regulatory practices and promote increased regulatory coherence, including through—

(i) transparency in developing guidelines, rules, regulations, and laws for government procurement and other regulatory regimes;

(ii) the elimination of redundancies in testing and certification;

(iii) early consultations on significant regulations;

(iv) the use of impact assessments;

(v) the periodic review of existing regulatory measures; and

(vi) the application of good regulatory practices;

(D) to seek greater openness, transparency, and convergence of standards development processes, and enhance cooperation on standards issues globally;

(E) to promote regulatory compatibility through harmonization, equivalence, or mutual recognition of different regulations and standards and to encourage the use of international and interoperable standards, as appropriate;

(F) to achieve the elimination of government measures such as price controls and reference pricing which deny full market access for United States products;

(G) to ensure that government regulatory reimbursement regimes are transparent, provide procedural fairness, are nondiscriminatory, and provide full market access for United States products; and

(H) to ensure that foreign governments—

(i) demonstrate that the collection of undisclosed proprietary information is limited to that necessary to satisfy a legitimate and justifiable regulatory interest; and

(ii) protect such information against disclosure, except in exceptional circumstances

to protect the public, or where such information is effectively protected against unfair competition.

(8) **STATE-OWNED AND STATE-CONTROLLED ENTERPRISES.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding competition by state-owned and state-controlled enterprises is to seek commitments that—

(A) eliminate or prevent trade distortions and unfair competition favoring state-owned and state-controlled enterprises to the extent of their engagement in commercial activity, and

(B) ensure that such engagement is based solely on commercial considerations,

in particular through disciplines that eliminate or prevent discrimination and market-distorting subsidies and that promote transparency.

(9) **LOCALIZATION BARRIERS TO TRADE.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to localization barriers is to eliminate and prevent measures that require United States producers and service providers to locate facilities, intellectual property, or other assets in a country as a market access or investment condition, including indigenous innovation measures.

(10) **LABOR AND THE ENVIRONMENT.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to labor and the environment are—

(A) to ensure that a party to a trade agreement with the United States—

(i) adopts and maintains measures implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)) and its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(6)),

(ii) does not waive or otherwise derogate from, or offer to waive or otherwise derogate from—

(I) its statutes or regulations implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)), in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, where the waiver or derogation would be inconsistent with one or more such standards, or

(II) its environmental laws in a manner that weakens or reduces the protections afforded in those laws and in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, except as provided in its law and provided not inconsistent with its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(6)) or other provisions of the trade agreement specifically agreed upon, and

(iii) does not fail to effectively enforce its environmental or labor laws, through a sustained or recurring course of action or inaction,

in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party after entry into force of a trade agreement between those countries;

(B) to recognize that—

(i) with respect to environment, parties to a trade agreement retain the right to exercise prosecutorial discretion and to make decisions regarding the allocation of enforcement resources with respect to other environmental laws determined to have higher priorities, and a party is effectively enforcing its laws if a course of action or inaction reflects a reasonable, bona fide exercise of such discretion, or results from a reasonable, bona fide decision regarding the allocation of resources; and

(ii) with respect to labor, decisions regarding the distribution of enforcement resources

are not a reason for not complying with a party's labor obligations; a party to a trade agreement retains the right to reasonable exercise of discretion and to make bona fide decisions regarding the allocation of resources between labor enforcement activities among core labor standards, provided the exercise of such discretion and such decisions are not inconsistent with its obligations;

(C) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to promote respect for core labor standards (as defined in section 111(7));

(D) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to protect the environment through the promotion of sustainable development;

(E) to reduce or eliminate government practices or policies that unduly threaten sustainable development;

(F) to seek market access, through the elimination of tariffs and nontariff barriers, for United States environmental technologies, goods, and services;

(G) to ensure that labor, environmental, health, or safety policies and practices of the parties to trade agreements with the United States do not arbitrarily or unjustifiably discriminate against United States exports or serve as disguised barriers to trade;

(H) to ensure that enforceable labor and environment obligations are subject to the same dispute settlement and remedies as other enforceable obligations under the agreement; and

(I) to ensure that a trade agreement is not construed to empower a party's authorities to undertake labor or environmental law enforcement activities in the territory of the United States.

(11) CURRENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to currency practices is that parties to a trade agreement with the United States avoid manipulating exchange rates in order to prevent effective balance of payments adjustment or to gain an unfair competitive advantage over other parties to the agreement, such as through cooperative mechanisms, enforceable rules, reporting, monitoring, transparency, or other means, as appropriate.

(12) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

(13) WTO AND MULTILATERAL TRADE AGREEMENTS.—Recognizing that the World Trade Organization is the foundation of the global trading system, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the World Trade Organization, the Uruguay Round Agreements, and other multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements are—

(A) to achieve full implementation and extend the coverage of the World Trade Organization and multilateral and plurilateral agreements to products, sectors, and conditions of trade not adequately covered;

(B) to expand country participation in and enhancement of the Information Technology

Agreement, the Government Procurement Agreement, and other plurilateral trade agreements of the World Trade Organization;

(C) to expand competitive market opportunities for United States exports and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, through the negotiation of new WTO multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements, such as an agreement on trade facilitation;

(D) to ensure that regional trade agreements to which the United States is not a party fully achieve the high standards of, and comply with, WTO disciplines, including Article XXIV of GATT 1994, Article V and V bis of the General Agreement on Trade in Services, and the Enabling Clause, including through meaningful WTO review of such regional trade agreements;

(E) to enhance compliance by WTO members with their obligations as WTO members through active participation in the bodies of the World Trade Organization by the United States and all other WTO members, including in the trade policy review mechanism and the committee system of the World Trade Organization, and by working to increase the effectiveness of such bodies; and

(F) to encourage greater cooperation between the World Trade Organization and other international organizations.

(14) TRADE INSTITUTION TRANSPARENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to transparency is to obtain wider and broader application of the principle of transparency in the World Trade Organization, entities established under bilateral and regional trade agreements, and other international trade fora through seeking—

(A) timely public access to information regarding trade issues and the activities of such institutions;

(B) openness by ensuring public access to appropriate meetings, proceedings, and submissions, including with regard to trade and investment dispute settlement; and

(C) public access to all notifications and supporting documentation submitted by WTO members.

(15) ANTI-CORRUPTION.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the use of money or other things of value to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any improper advantage in a manner affecting trade are—

(A) to obtain high standards and effective domestic enforcement mechanisms applicable to persons from all countries participating in the applicable trade agreement that prohibit such attempts to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any such improper advantage;

(B) to ensure that such standards level the playing field for United States persons in international trade and investment; and

(C) to seek commitments to work jointly to encourage and support anti-corruption and anti-bribery initiatives in international trade fora, including through the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, done at Paris December 17, 1997 (commonly known as the “OECD Anti-Bribery Convention”).

(16) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT AND ENFORCEMENT.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to dispute settlement and enforcement of trade agreements are—

(A) to seek provisions in trade agreements providing for resolution of disputes between governments under those trade agreements in an effective, timely, transparent, equitable, and reasoned manner, requiring determinations based on facts and the principles of the agreements, with the goal of increasing compliance with the agreements;

(B) to seek to strengthen the capacity of the Trade Policy Review Mechanism of the World Trade Organization to review compliance with commitments;

(C) to seek adherence by panels convened under the Dispute Settlement Understanding and by the Appellate Body to—

(i) the mandate of those panels and the Appellate Body to apply the WTO Agreement as written, without adding to or diminishing rights and obligations under the Agreement; and

(ii) the standard of review applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreement involved in the dispute, including greater deference, where appropriate, to the fact finding and technical expertise of national investigating authorities;

(D) to seek provisions encouraging the early identification and settlement of disputes through consultation;

(E) to seek provisions to encourage the provision of trade-expanding compensation if a party to a dispute under the agreement does not come into compliance with its obligations under the agreement;

(F) to seek provisions to impose a penalty upon a party to a dispute under the agreement that—

(i) encourages compliance with the obligations of the agreement;

(ii) is appropriate to the parties, nature, subject matter, and scope of the violation; and

(iii) has the aim of not adversely affecting parties or interests not party to the dispute while maintaining the effectiveness of the enforcement mechanism; and

(G) to seek provisions that treat United States principal negotiating objectives equally with respect to—

(i) the ability to resort to dispute settlement under the applicable agreement;

(ii) the availability of equivalent dispute settlement procedures; and

(iii) the availability of equivalent remedies.

(17) TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws are—

(A) to preserve the ability of the United States to enforce rigorously its trade laws, including the antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard laws, and avoid agreements that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies, or that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international safeguard provisions, in order to ensure that United States workers, agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions; and

(B) to address and remedy market distortions that lead to dumping and subsidization, including overcapacity, cartelization, and market access barriers.

(18) BORDER TAXES.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding border taxes is to obtain a revision of the rules of the World Trade Organization with respect to the treatment of border adjustments for internal taxes to redress the disadvantage to countries relying primarily on direct taxes for revenue rather than indirect taxes.

(19) **TEXTILE NEGOTIATIONS.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in textiles and apparel articles are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of textiles and apparel in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in textiles and apparel.

(20) **COMMERCIAL PARTNERSHIPS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to an agreement that is proposed to be entered into with the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership countries and to which section 103(b) will apply, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding commercial partnerships are the following:

(i) To discourage actions by potential trading partners that directly or indirectly prejudice or otherwise discourage commercial activity solely between the United States and Israel.

(ii) To discourage politically motivated actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel and to seek the elimination of politically motivated nontariff barriers on Israeli goods, services, or other commerce imposed on the State of Israel.

(iii) To seek the elimination of state-sponsored unsanctioned foreign boycotts against Israel or compliance with the Arab League Boycott of Israel by prospective trading partners.

(B) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term “actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel” means actions by states, non-member states of the United Nations, international organizations, or affiliated agencies of international organizations that are politically motivated and are intended to penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or in Israeli-controlled territories.

(21) **GOOD GOVERNANCE, TRANSPARENCY, THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF LEGAL REGIMES, AND THE RULE OF LAW OF TRADING PARTNERS.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to ensuring implementation of trade commitments and obligations by strengthening good governance, transparency, the effective operation of legal regimes and the rule of law of trading partners of the United States is through capacity building and other appropriate means, which are important parts of the broader effort to create more open democratic societies and to promote respect for internationally recognized human rights.

(C) **CAPACITY BUILDING AND OTHER PRIORITIES.**—In order to address and maintain United States competitiveness in the global economy, the President shall—

(1) direct the heads of relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to work to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to carry out obligations under trade agreements by consulting with any country seeking a trade agreement with the United States concerning that country's laws relating to customs and trade facilitation, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical barriers to trade, intellectual property rights, labor, and the environment; and

(B) to provide technical assistance to that country if needed;

(2) seek to establish consultative mechanisms among parties to trade agreements to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environ-

ment and human health based on sound science;

(3) promote consideration of multilateral environmental agreements and consult with parties to such agreements regarding the consistency of any such agreement that includes trade measures with existing environmental exceptions under Article XX of GATT 1994; and

(4) submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate an annual report on capacity-building activities undertaken in connection with trade agreements negotiated or being negotiated pursuant to this title.

SEC. 103. TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY.

(a) **AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF BARRIERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Whenever the President determines that one or more existing duties or other import restrictions of any foreign country or the United States are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President—

(A) may enter into trade agreements with foreign countries before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c); and

(B) may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), proclaim—

(i) such modification or continuance of any existing duty,

(ii) such continuance of existing duty free or excise treatment, or

(iii) such additional duties,

as the President determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any such trade agreement.

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) **NOTIFICATION.**—The President shall notify Congress of the President's intention to enter into an agreement under this subsection.

(3) **LIMITATIONS.**—No proclamation may be made under paragraph (1) that—

(A) reduces any rate of duty (other than a rate of duty that does not exceed 5 percent ad valorem on the date of the enactment of this Act) to a rate of duty which is less than 50 percent of the rate of such duty that applies on such date of enactment;

(B) reduces the rate of duty below that applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreements or a successor agreement, on any import sensitive agricultural product; or

(C) increases any rate of duty above the rate that applied on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) **AGGREGATE REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.**—

(A) **AGGREGATE REDUCTION.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty on any article which is in effect on any day pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the aggregate reduction which would have been in effect on such day if—

(i) a reduction of 3 percent ad valorem or a reduction of $\frac{1}{10}$ of the total reduction, whichever is greater, had taken effect on the effective date of the first reduction proclaimed under paragraph (1) to carry out

such agreement with respect to such article; and

(ii) a reduction equal to the amount applicable under clause (i) had taken effect at 1-year intervals after the effective date of such first reduction.

(B) **EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.**—No staging is required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a duty reduction that is proclaimed under paragraph (1) for an article of a kind that is not produced in the United States. The United States International Trade Commission shall advise the President of the identity of articles that may be exempted from staging under this subparagraph.

(5) **ROUNDING.**—If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of reductions under paragraph (4), the President may round an annual reduction by an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between the reduction without regard to this paragraph and the next lower whole number; or

(B) $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent ad valorem.

(6) **OTHER LIMITATIONS.**—A rate of duty reduction that may not be proclaimed by reason of paragraph (3) may take effect only if a provision authorizing such reduction is included within an implementing bill provided for under section 106 and that bill is enacted into law.

(7) **OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.**—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B), (3)(A), (3)(C), and (4) through (6), and subject to the consultation and layover requirements of section 115 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3524), the President may proclaim the modification of any duty or staged rate reduction of any duty set forth in Schedule XX, as defined in section 2(5) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(5)), if the United States agrees to such modification or staged rate reduction in a negotiation for the reciprocal elimination or harmonization of duties under the auspices of the World Trade Organization.

(8) **AUTHORITY UNDER URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT NOT AFFECTED.**—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority provided to the President under section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(b) **AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF AND NONTARIFF BARRIERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—(A) Whenever the President determines that—

(i) 1 or more existing duties or any other import restriction of any foreign country or the United States or any other barrier to, or other distortion of, international trade unduly burdens or restricts the foreign trade of the United States or adversely affects the United States economy, or

(ii) the imposition of any such barrier or distortion is likely to result in such a burden, restriction, or effect,

and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President may enter into a trade agreement described in subparagraph (B) during the period described in subparagraph (C).

(B) The President may enter into a trade agreement under subparagraph (A) with foreign countries providing for—

(i) the reduction or elimination of a duty, restriction, barrier, or other distortion described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the prohibition of, or limitation on the imposition of, such barrier or other distortion.

(C) The President may enter into a trade agreement under this paragraph before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c).

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) **CONDITIONS.**—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(3) **BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.**—(A) The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (in this title referred to as “trade authorities procedures”) apply to a bill of either House of Congress which contains provisions described in subparagraph (B) to the same extent as such section 151 applies to implementing bills under that section. A bill to which this paragraph applies shall hereafter in this title be referred to as an “implementing bill”.

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) if changes in existing laws or new statutory authority are required to implement such trade agreement or agreements, only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement or agreements, either repealing or amending existing laws or providing new statutory authority.

(c) **EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL PROCESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in section 106(b)—

(A) the trade authorities procedures apply to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) before July 1, 2018; and

(B) the trade authorities procedures shall be extended to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) after June 30, 2018, and before July 1, 2021, if (and only if)—

(i) the President requests such extension under paragraph (2); and

(ii) neither House of Congress adopts an extension disapproval resolution under paragraph (5) before July 1, 2018.

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.**—If the President is of the opinion that the trade authorities procedures should be extended to implementing bills described in paragraph (1)(B), the President shall submit to Congress, not later than April 1, 2018, a written report that contains a request for such extension, together with—

(A) a description of all trade agreements that have been negotiated under subsection (b) and the anticipated schedule for submitting such agreements to Congress for approval;

(B) a description of the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title, and a statement that such progress justifies the continuation of negotiations; and

(C) a statement of the reasons why the extension is needed to complete the negotiations.

(3) **OTHER REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—

(A) **REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—The President shall promptly inform the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The Advisory Committee shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains—

(i) its views regarding the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(ii) a statement of its views, and the reasons therefor, regarding whether the extension requested under paragraph (2) should be approved or disapproved.

(B) **REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—The President shall promptly inform the United States International Trade Commission of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The International Trade Commission shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains a review and analysis of the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements implemented between the date of the enactment of this Act and the date on which the President decides to seek an extension requested under paragraph (2).

(4) **STATUS OF REPORTS.**—The reports submitted to Congress under paragraphs (2) and (3), or any portion of such reports, may be classified to the extent the President determines appropriate.

(5) **EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTIONS.**—(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term “extension disapproval resolution” means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the _____ disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 103(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, of the trade authorities procedures under that Act to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) of that Act after June 30, 2018.”, with the blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress.

(B) Extension disapproval resolutions—

(i) may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of such House; and

(ii) shall be referred, in the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules.

(C) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to extension disapproval resolutions.

(D) It is not in order for—

(i) the House of Representatives to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules;

(ii) the Senate to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance; or

(iii) either House of Congress to consider an extension disapproval resolution after June 30, 2018.

(d) **COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.**—In order to contribute to the continued economic expansion of the United States, the President shall commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers affecting

any industry, product, or service sector, and expand existing sectoral agreements to countries that are not parties to those agreements, in cases where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. Such sectors include agriculture, commercial services, intellectual property rights, industrial and capital goods, government procurement, information technology products, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, civil aircraft, and infrastructure products. In so doing, the President shall take into account all of the negotiating objectives set forth in section 102.

SEC. 104. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) **CONSULTATIONS WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.**—

(1) **CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.**—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) meet upon request with any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement;

(B) upon request of any Member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(D) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(E) with regard to any negotiations and agreement relating to agricultural trade, also consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(2) **CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO FORCE.**—Prior to exchanging notes providing for the entry into force of a trade agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis with Members of Congress and committees as specified in paragraph (1), and keep them fully apprised of the measures a trading partner has taken to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date that the agreement enters into force.

(3) **ENHANCED COORDINATION WITH CONGRESS.**—

(A) **WRITTEN GUIDELINES.**—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination

with Congress, including coordination with designated congressional advisers under subsection (b), regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(i) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) **CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.**—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall enhance coordination with Congress through procedures to ensure—

(i) timely briefings upon request of any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress conducted under this title, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement; and

(ii) the sharing of detailed and timely information with Members of Congress, and their staff with proper security clearances as appropriate, regarding those negotiations and pertinent documents related to those negotiations (including classified information), and with committee staff with proper security clearances as would be appropriate in the light of the responsibilities of that committee over the trade agreements programs affected by those negotiations.

(C) **DISSEMINATION.**—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(b) **DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.**—

(1) **DESIGNATION.**—

(A) **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In each Congress, any Member of the House of Representatives may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consulting with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(B) **SENATE.**—In each Congress, any Member of the Senate may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(2) **CONSULTATIONS WITH DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.**—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations designated under paragraph (1).

(3) **ACCREDITATION.**—Each Member of Congress designated as a congressional adviser under paragraph (1) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiating sessions relating to trade agreements.

(c) **CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY GROUPS ON NEGOTIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—By not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 30 days after the convening of each Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House

of Representatives shall convene the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall convene the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations (in this subsection referred to collectively as the “congressional advisory groups”).

(2) **MEMBERS AND FUNCTIONS.**—

(A) **MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.**—In each Congress, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the House of Representatives:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the House of Representatives that would have, under the Rules of the House of Representatives, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(B) **MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.**—In each Congress, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the Senate:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the Senate that would have, under the Rules of the Senate, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(C) **ACCREDITATION.**—Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in negotiations for any trade agreement to which this title applies. Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in the negotiations by reason of which the member is in one of the congressional advisory groups.

(D) **CONSULTATION AND ADVICE.**—The congressional advisory groups shall consult with and provide advice to the Trade Representative regarding the formulation of specific objectives, negotiating strategies and positions, the development of the applicable trade agreement, and compliance and enforcement of the negotiated commitments under the trade agreement.

(E) **CHAIR.**—The House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(F) **COORDINATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES.**—Members of any committee represented on one of the congressional advisory groups may submit comments to the member of the appropriate congressional advisory group from that committee regarding any matter related to a negotiation for any trade agreement to which this title applies.

(3) **GUIDELINES.**—

(A) **PURPOSE AND REVISION.**—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines to facilitate the useful and timely exchange of information between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) **CONTENT.**—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall provide for, among other things—

(i) detailed briefings on a fixed timetable to be specified in the guidelines of the congressional advisory groups regarding negotiating objectives and positions and the status of the applicable negotiations, beginning as soon as practicable after the congressional advisory groups are convened, with more frequent briefings as trade negotiations enter the final stage;

(ii) access by members of the congressional advisory groups, and staff with proper security clearances, to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(iii) the closest practicable coordination between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups at all critical periods during the negotiations, including at negotiation sites;

(iv) after the applicable trade agreement is concluded, consultation regarding ongoing compliance and enforcement of negotiated commitments under the trade agreement; and

(v) the timeframe for submitting the report required under section 105(d)(3).

(4) **REQUEST FOR MEETING.**—Upon the request of a majority of either of the congressional advisory groups, the President shall meet with that congressional advisory group before initiating negotiations with respect to a trade agreement, or at any other time concerning the negotiations.

(d) **CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC.**—

(1) **GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.**—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on public access to information regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) **PURPOSES.**—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) facilitate transparency;

(B) encourage public participation; and

(C) promote collaboration in the negotiation process.

(3) **CONTENT.**—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include procedures that—

(A) provide for rapid disclosure of information in forms that the public can readily find and use; and

(B) provide frequent opportunities for public input through Federal Register requests for comment and other means.

(4) **DISSEMINATION.**—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to

all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(e) **CONSULTATIONS WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.**—

(1) **GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.**—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with advisory committees established pursuant to section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) **CONTENT.**—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall enhance coordination with advisory committees described in that paragraph through procedures to ensure—

(A) timely briefings of advisory committees and regular opportunities for advisory committees to provide input throughout the negotiation process on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas represented by those committees; and

(B) the sharing of detailed and timely information with each member of an advisory committee regarding negotiations and pertinent documents related to the negotiation (including classified information) on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas the member represents, and with a designee with proper security clearances of each such member as appropriate.

(3) **DISSEMINATION.**—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(f) **ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF TRANSPARENCY OFFICER IN THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.**—Section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) There shall be in the Office one Chief Transparency Officer. The Chief Transparency Officer shall consult with Congress on transparency policy, coordinate transparency in trade negotiations, engage and assist the public, and advise the United States Trade Representative on transparency policy.”

SEC. 105. NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS.

(a) **NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS BEFORE NEGOTIATION.**—

(1) **NOTICE.**—The President, with respect to any agreement that is subject to the provisions of section 103(b), shall—

(A) provide, at least 90 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, written notice to Congress of the President's intention to enter into the negotiations with that country and set forth in the notice the date on which the President intends to initiate those negotiations, the specific United States objectives for the negotiations with that country, and whether the President intends to seek an agreement, or changes to an existing agreement;

(B) before and after submission of the notice, consult regarding the negotiations with

the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, such other committees of the House and Senate as the President deems appropriate, and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c);

(C) upon the request of a majority of the members of either the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c), meet with the requesting congressional advisory group before initiating the negotiations or at any other time concerning the negotiations; and

(D) after consulting with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance, and at least 30 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and regularly update thereafter, a detailed and comprehensive summary of the specific objectives with respect to the negotiations, and a description of how the agreement, if successfully concluded, will further those objectives and benefit the United States.

(2) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURE.—

(A) **ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATIONS FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT.**—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to the subject matter under section 102(b)(3)(B) with any country, the President shall—

(i) assess whether United States tariffs on agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country;

(ii) consider whether the tariff levels bound and applied throughout the world with respect to imports from the United States are higher than United States tariffs and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(iii) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(B) **SPECIAL CONSULTATIONS ON IMPORT SENSITIVE PRODUCTS.**—(i) Before initiating negotiations with regard to agriculture and, with respect to agreements described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 107(a), as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(I) identify those agricultural products subject to tariff rate quotas on the date of enactment of this Act, and agricultural products subject to tariff reductions by the United States as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, for which the rate of duty was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate which was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994;

(II) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning—

(aa) whether any further tariff reductions on the products identified under subclause (I)

should be appropriate, taking into account the impact of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned;

(bb) whether the products so identified face unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including those not based on scientific principles in contravention of the Uruguay Round Agreements; and

(cc) whether the countries participating in the negotiations maintain export subsidies or other programs, policies, or practices that distort world trade in such products and the impact of such programs, policies, and practices on United States producers of the products;

(III) request that the International Trade Commission prepare an assessment of the probable economic effects of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned and on the United States economy as a whole; and

(IV) upon complying with subclauses (I), (II), and (III), notify the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate of those products identified under subclause (I) for which the Trade Representative intends to seek tariff liberalization in the negotiations and the reasons for seeking such tariff liberalization.

(ii) If, after negotiations described in clause (i) are commenced—

(I) the United States Trade Representative identifies any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) for tariff reductions which were not the subject of a notification under clause (i)(IV), or

(II) any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) is the subject of a request for tariff reductions by a party to the negotiations,

the Trade Representative shall, as soon as practicable, notify the committees referred to in clause (i)(IV) of those products and the reasons for seeking such tariff reductions.

(3) **NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING THE FISHING INDUSTRY.**—Before initiating, or continuing, negotiations that directly relate to fish or shellfish trade with any country, the President shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and shall keep the Committees apprised of the negotiations on an ongoing and timely basis.

(4) **NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING TEXTILES.**—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to textiles and apparel products with any country, the President shall—

(A) assess whether United States tariffs on textile and apparel products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(B) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(5) **ADHERENCE TO EXISTING INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT AGREEMENT OBLIGATIONS.**—In determining whether to enter into negotiations with a particular country, the

President shall take into account the extent to which that country has implemented, or has accelerated the implementation of, its international trade and investment commitments to the United States, including pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS BEFORE ENTRY INTO AGREEMENT.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—Before entering into any trade agreement under section 103(b), the President shall consult with—

(A) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(B) each other committee of the House and the Senate, and each joint committee of Congress, which has jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters which would be affected by the trade agreement; and

(C) the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

(2) SCOPE.—The consultation described in paragraph (1) shall include consultation with respect to—

(A) the nature of the agreement;

(B) how and to what extent the agreement will achieve the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(C) the implementation of the agreement under section 106, including the general effect of the agreement on existing laws.

(3) REPORT REGARDING UNITED STATES TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—

(A) CHANGES IN CERTAIN TRADE LAWS.—The President, not less than 180 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate—

(i) the range of proposals advanced in the negotiations with respect to that agreement, that may be in the final agreement, and that could require amendments to title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or to chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.); and

(ii) how these proposals relate to the objectives described in section 102(b)(16).

(B) RESOLUTIONS.—(i) At any time after the transmission of the report under subparagraph (A), if a resolution is introduced with respect to that report in either House of Congress, the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) shall apply to that resolution if—

(I) no other resolution with respect to that report has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to those procedures; and

(II) no procedural disapproval resolution under section 106(b) introduced with respect to a trade agreement entered into pursuant to the negotiations in which the report under subparagraph (A) relates has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be.

(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term “resolution” means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the _____ finds that the proposed changes to United States trade remedy laws contained in the report of the President transmitted to Congress on _____ under section 105(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 with respect to _____, are in-

consistent with the negotiating objectives described in section 102(b)(16) of that Act.”, with the first blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress, the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date of the report, and the third blank space being filled with the name of the country or countries involved.

(iii) Resolutions in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee.

(iv) Resolutions in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(v) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(vi) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(vii) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) shall apply to resolutions.

(4) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS.—The report required under section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(e)(1)) regarding any trade agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 shall be provided to the President, Congress, and the United States Trade Representative not later than 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 103(a)(2) or 106(a)(1)(A) of the intention of the President to enter into the agreement.

(c) INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION ASSESSMENT.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO COMMISSION.—The President, not later than 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall provide the International Trade Commission (referred to in this subsection as the “Commission”) with the details of the agreement as it exists at that time and request the Commission to prepare and submit an assessment of the agreement as described in paragraph (2). Between the time the President makes the request under this paragraph and the time the Commission submits the assessment, the President shall keep the Commission current with respect to the details of the agreement.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 105 calendar days after the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report assessing the likely impact of the agreement on the United States economy as a whole and on specific industry sectors, including the impact the agreement will have on the gross domestic product, exports and imports, aggregate employment and employment opportunities, the production, employment, and competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the agreement, and the interests of United States consumers.

(3) REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE.—In preparing the assessment under paragraph (2), the Commission shall review available economic assessments regarding the agree-

ment, including literature regarding any substantially equivalent proposed agreement, and shall provide in its assessment a description of the analyses used and conclusions drawn in such literature, and a discussion of areas of consensus and divergence between the various analyses and conclusions, including those of the Commission regarding the agreement.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make each assessment under paragraph (2) available to the public.

(d) REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES WITH AGREEMENT.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) conduct environmental reviews of future trade and investment agreements, consistent with Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169), dated November 16, 1999, and its relevant guidelines; and

(B) submit a report on those reviews and on the content and operation of consultative mechanisms established pursuant to section 102(c) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(2) EMPLOYMENT IMPACT REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) review the impact of future trade agreements on United States employment, including labor markets, modeled after Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169) to the extent appropriate in establishing procedures and criteria; and

(B) submit a report on such reviews to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(3) REPORT ON LABOR RIGHTS.—The President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on a timeframe determined in accordance with section 104(c)(3)(B)(v)—

(A) a meaningful labor rights report of the country, or countries, with respect to which the President is negotiating; and

(B) a description of any provisions that would require changes to the labor laws and labor practices of the United States.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make all reports required under this subsection available to the public.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E), the President shall also submit to Congress a plan for implementing and enforcing the agreement.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The implementation and enforcement plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) BORDER PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required at border entry points, including a list of additional customs and agricultural inspectors.

(B) AGENCY STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required by Federal agencies responsible for monitoring and implementing the trade agreement, including personnel required by the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture (including additional personnel required to implement sanitary and phytosanitary measures in order to

obtain market access for United States exports), the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of the Treasury, and such other agencies as may be necessary.

(C) **CUSTOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS.**—A description of the additional equipment and facilities needed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(D) **IMPACT ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**—A description of the impact the trade agreement will have on State and local governments as a result of increases in trade.

(E) **COST ANALYSIS.**—An analysis of the costs associated with each of the items listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(3) **BUDGET SUBMISSION.**—The President shall include a request for the resources necessary to support the plan required by paragraph (1) in the first budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, after the date of the submission of the plan.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The President shall make the plan required under this subsection available to the public.

(f) **OTHER REPORTS.**—

(1) **REPORT ON PENALTIES.**—Not later than one year after the imposition by the United States of a penalty or remedy permitted by a trade agreement to which this title applies, the President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the penalty or remedy applied under United States law in enforcing United States rights under the trade agreement, which shall address whether the penalty or remedy was effective in changing the behavior of the targeted party and whether the penalty or remedy had any adverse impact on parties or interests not party to the dispute.

(2) **REPORT ON IMPACT OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 5 years thereafter, the United States International Trade Commission shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements with respect to which Congress has enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures since January 1, 1984.

(3) **ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS AND REPORTS.**—(A) The United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate after acceptance of a petition for review or taking an enforcement action in regard to an obligation under a trade agreement, including a labor or environmental obligation. During such consultations, the United States Trade Representative shall describe the matter, including the basis for such action and the application of any relevant legal obligations.

(B) As part of the report required pursuant to section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2213), the President shall report annually to Congress on enforcement actions taken pursuant to a trade agreement to which the United States is a party, as well as on any public reports issued by Federal agencies on enforcement matters relating to a trade agreement.

(g) **ADDITIONAL COORDINATION WITH MEMBERS.**—Any Member of the House of Representatives may submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and any Member of the Senate

may submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate the views of that Member on any matter relevant to a proposed trade agreement, and the relevant Committee shall receive those views for consideration.

SEC. 106. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **NOTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.**—Any agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

(A) the President, at least 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into the trade agreement, notifies the House of Representatives and the Senate of the President's intention to enter into the agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register;

(B) the President, at least 60 days before the day on which the President enters into the agreement, publishes the text of the agreement on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative;

(C) within 60 days after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement;

(D) the President, at least 30 days before submitting to Congress the materials under subparagraph (E), submits to Congress—

(i) a draft statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement; and

(ii) a copy of the final legal text of the agreement;

(E) after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft of an implementing bill described in section 103(b)(3);

(ii) a statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the trade agreement; and

(iii) the supporting information described in paragraph (2)(A);

(F) the implementing bill is enacted into law; and

(G) the President, not later than 30 days before the date on which the agreement enters into force with respect to a party to the agreement, submits written notice to Congress that the President has determined that the party has taken measures necessary to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date on which the agreement enters into force.

(2) **SUPPORTING INFORMATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The supporting information required under paragraph (1)(E)(iii) consists of—

(i) an explanation as to how the implementing bill and proposed administrative action will change or affect existing law; and

(ii) a statement—

(I) asserting that the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(II) setting forth the reasons of the President regarding—

(aa) how and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, and objectives referred to in subclause (I);

(bb) whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated;

(cc) how the agreement serves the interests of United States commerce; and

(dd) how the implementing bill meets the standards set forth in section 103(b)(3).

(B) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The President shall make the supporting information described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(3) **RECIPROCAL BENEFITS.**—In order to ensure that a foreign country that is not a party to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) does not receive benefits under the agreement unless the country is also subject to the obligations under the agreement, the implementing bill submitted with respect to the agreement shall provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement apply only to the parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement. The implementing bill may also provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement do not apply uniformly to all parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(4) **DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.**—Any agreement or other understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacts an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and

(B) is not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill with respect to that agreement is introduced in either House of Congress,

shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force and effect under United States law or in any dispute settlement body.

(b) **LIMITATIONS ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **FOR LACK OF NOTICE OR CONSULTATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) if during the 60-day period beginning on the date that one House of Congress agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution for lack of notice or consultations with respect to such trade agreement or agreements, the other House separately agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.

(B) **PROCEDURAL DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION.**—(i) For purposes of this paragraph, the term “procedural disapproval resolution” means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.”, with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements with respect to which the President is considered to have failed or refused to notify or consult.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i) and paragraphs (3)(C) and (4)(C), the President has “failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015” on negotiations with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements if—

(I) the President has failed or refused to consult (as the case may be) in accordance with sections 104 and 105 and this section with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(II) guidelines under section 104 have not been developed or met with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(III) the President has not met with the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations pursuant to a request made under section 104(c)(4) with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements; or

(IV) the agreement or agreements fail to make progress in achieving the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title.

(2) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERING RESOLUTIONS.—(A) Procedural disapproval resolutions—

(i) in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee; and

(ii) in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(B) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to a procedural disapproval resolution introduced with respect to a trade agreement if no other procedural disapproval resolution with respect to that trade agreement has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, and if no resolution described in clause (ii) of section 105(b)(3)(B) with respect to that trade agreement has been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) of such section.

(C) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(D) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(3) CONSIDERATION IN SENATE OF CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION TO REMOVE TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(A) REPORTING OF RESOLUTION.—If, when the Committee on Finance of the Senate meets on whether to report an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b), the committee fails to favorably report the bill, the committee shall report a resolution described in subparagraph (C).

(B) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the Senate to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A) if the Committee on Finance reports a resolution described in subparagraph (C) and such resolution is agreed to by the Senate.

(C) RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A resolution described in this subparagraph is a resolu-

tion of the Senate originating from the Committee on Finance the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply in the Senate to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.”, with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A).

(D) PROCEDURES.—If the Senate does not agree to a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to a resolution described in subparagraph (C), the resolution shall be committed to the Committee on Finance.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF A CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION.—

(A) QUALIFICATIONS FOR REPORTING RESOLUTION.—If—

(i) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives reports an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b) with other than a favorable recommendation; and

(ii) a Member of the House of Representatives has introduced a consultation and compliance resolution on the legislative day following the filing of a report to accompany the implementing bill with other than a favorable recommendation,

then the Committee on Ways and Means shall consider a consultation and compliance resolution pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF A QUALIFYING RESOLUTION.—(i) Not later than the fourth legislative day after the date of introduction of the resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means shall meet to consider a resolution meeting the qualifications set forth in subparagraph (A).

(ii) After consideration of one such resolution by the Committee on Ways and Means, this subparagraph shall not apply to any other such resolution.

(iii) If the Committee on Ways and Means has not reported the resolution by the sixth legislative day after the date of its introduction, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

(C) CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A consultation and compliance resolution—

(i) is a resolution of the House of Representatives, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.”, with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

(D) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or agreements which are the object of a con-

sultation and compliance resolution if such resolution is adopted by the House.

(5) FOR FAILURE TO MEET OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the United States Trade Representative, shall transmit to Congress a report setting forth the strategy of the executive branch to address concerns of Congress regarding whether dispute settlement panels and the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization have added to obligations, or diminished rights, of the United States, as described in section 102(b)(15)(C). Trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill with respect to an agreement negotiated under the auspices of the World Trade Organization unless the Secretary of Commerce has issued such report by the deadline specified in this paragraph.

(6) LIMITATIONS ON PROCEDURES WITH RESPECT TO AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country to which the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking are applicable and the government of which does not fully comply with such standards and is not making significant efforts to bring the country into compliance (commonly referred to as a “tier 3” country), as determined in the most recent annual report on trafficking in persons submitted under section 110(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)).

(B) MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking” means the standards set forth in section 108 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106).

(C) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (b) of this section, section 103(c), and section 105(b)(3) are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with the full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as any other rule of that House.

SEC. 107. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRADE AGREEMENTS FOR WHICH NEGOTIATIONS HAVE ALREADY BEGUN.

(a) CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding the prenegotiation notification and consultation requirement described in section 105(a), if an agreement to which section 103(b) applies—

(1) is entered into under the auspices of the World Trade Organization,

(2) is entered into with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries with respect to which notifications have been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act,

(3) is entered into with the European Union,

(4) is an agreement with respect to international trade in services entered into with

WTO members with respect to which a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(5) is an agreement with respect to environmental goods entered into with WTO members with respect to which a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, and results from negotiations that were commenced before the date of the enactment of this Act, subsection (b) shall apply.

(b) TREATMENT OF AGREEMENTS.—In the case of any agreement to which subsection (a) applies, the applicability of the trade authorities procedures to implementing bills shall be determined without regard to the requirements of section 105(a) (relating only to notice prior to initiating negotiations), and any resolution under paragraph (1)(B), (3)(C), or (4)(C) of section 106(b) shall not be in order on the basis of a failure or refusal to comply with the provisions of section 105(a), if (and only if) the President, as soon as feasible after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) notifies Congress of the negotiations described in subsection (a), the specific United States objectives in the negotiations, and whether the President is seeking a new agreement or changes to an existing agreement; and

(2) before and after submission of the notice, consults regarding the negotiations with the committees referred to in section 105(a)(1)(B) and the House and Senate Advisory Groups on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

SEC. 108. SOVEREIGNTY.

(a) UNITED STATES LAW TO PREVAIL IN EVENT OF CONFLICT.—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b), nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, that is inconsistent with any law of the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States shall have effect.

(b) AMENDMENTS OR MODIFICATIONS OF UNITED STATES LAW.—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall prevent the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States from amending or modifying any law of the United States, that State, or that locality (as the case may be).

(c) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT REPORTS.—Reports, including findings and recommendations, issued by dispute settlement panels convened pursuant to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall have no binding effect on the law of the United States, the Government of the United States, or the law or government of any State or locality of the United States.

SEC. 109. INTERESTS OF SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Trade Representative should facilitate participation by small businesses in the trade negotiation process; and

(2) the functions of the Office of the United States Trade Representative relating to small businesses should continue to be reflected in the title of the Assistant United States Trade Representative assigned the responsibility for small businesses.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS INTERESTS.—The Assistant United States Trade Representative for Small Business, Market Access, and Industrial Competitiveness shall be responsible for ensuring that the interests of small businesses are considered in all trade negotiations in accordance

with the objective described in section 102(a)(8).

SEC. 110. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS; APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ADVICE FROM UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—Section 131 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2151) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 2103(a) or (b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 2103(b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103(b) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “section 2103(a)(3)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103(a)(4)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(C) in subsection (c), by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(2) HEARINGS.—Section 132 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2152) is amended by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(3) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—Section 133(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2153(a)) is amended by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(4) PREREQUISITES FOR OFFERS.—Section 134 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2154) is amended by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” each place it appears and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(5) INFORMATION AND ADVICE FROM PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS.—Section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” each place it appears and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(II) by striking “not later than the date on which the President notifies the Congress under section 2105(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “not later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 106(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 2102 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Au-

thority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 102 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(6) PROCEDURES RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING BILLS.—Section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(7) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 162(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2212(a)) is amended by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(b) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—For purposes of applying sections 125, 126, and 127 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2135, 2136, and 2137)—

(1) any trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as an agreement entered into under section 101 or 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2111 or 2112), as appropriate; and

(2) any proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as a proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2112).

SEC. 111. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGREEMENT ON AGRICULTURE.—The term “Agreement on Agriculture” means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(2) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(2)).

(2) AGREEMENT ON SAFEGUARDS.—The term “Agreement on Safeguards” means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(13) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(13)).

(3) AGREEMENT ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES.—The term “Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures” means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(12)).

(4) ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT.—The term “Antidumping Agreement” means the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 referred to in section 101(d)(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(7)).

(5) APPELLATE BODY.—The term “Appellate Body” means the Appellate Body established under Article 17.1 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(6) COMMON MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “common multilateral environmental agreement” means any agreement specified in subparagraph (B) or included under subparagraph (C) to which both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations are full parties, including any current or future mutually agreed upon protocols, amendments, annexes, or adjustments to such an agreement.

(B) AGREEMENTS SPECIFIED.—The agreements specified in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, done at Washington March 3, 1973 (27 UST 1087; TIAS 8249).

(ii) The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, done at Montreal September 16, 1987.

(iii) The Protocol of 1978 Relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, done at London February 17, 1978.

(iv) The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, done at Ramsar February 2, 1971 (TIAS 11084).

(v) The Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, done at Canberra May 20, 1980 (33 UST 3476).

(vi) The International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, done at Washington December 2, 1946 (62 Stat. 1716).

(vii) The Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, done at Washington May 31, 1949 (1 UST 230).

(C) ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS.—Both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations may agree to include any other multilateral environmental or conservation agreement to which they are full parties as a common multilateral environmental agreement under this paragraph.

(7) CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term “core labor standards” means—

(A) freedom of association;

(B) the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;

(C) the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor;

(D) the effective abolition of child labor and a prohibition on the worst forms of child labor; and

(E) the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

(8) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT UNDERSTANDING.—The term “Dispute Settlement Understanding” means the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(16)).

(9) ENABLING CLAUSE.—The term “Enabling Clause” means the Decision on Differential and More Favourable Treatment, Reciprocity and Fuller Participation of Developing Countries (L/4903), adopted November 28, 1979, under GATT 1947 (as defined in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501)).

(10) ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—The term “environmental laws”, with respect to the laws of the United States, means environmental statutes and regulations enforceable by action of the Federal Government.

(11) GATT 1994.—The term “GATT 1994” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

(12) GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TRADE IN SERVICES.—The term “General Agreement on Trade in Services” means the General Agreement on Trade in Services (referred to in section 101(d)(14) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(14))).

(13) GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT AGREEMENT.—The term “Government Procurement Agreement” means the Agreement on Government Procurement referred to in section 101(d)(17) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(17)).

(14) ILO.—The term “ILO” means the International Labor Organization.

(15) IMPORT SENSITIVE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT.—The term “import sensitive agricul-

tural product” means an agricultural product—

(A) with respect to which, as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, the rate of duty was the subject of tariff reductions by the United States and, pursuant to such Agreements, was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate that was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994; or

(B) which was subject to a tariff rate quota on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(16) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGREEMENT.—The term “Information Technology Agreement” means the Ministerial Declaration on Trade in Information Technology Products of the World Trade Organization, agreed to at Singapore December 13, 1996.

(17) INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term “internationally recognized core labor standards” means the core labor standards only as stated in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-Up (1998).

(18) LABOR LAWS.—The term “labor laws” means the statutes and regulations, or provisions thereof, of a party to the negotiations that are directly related to core labor standards as well as other labor protections for children and minors and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health, and for the United States, includes Federal statutes and regulations addressing those standards, protections, or conditions, but does not include State or local labor laws.

(19) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of the United States; and

(C) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of a foreign country and is controlled by entities described in subparagraph (B) or United States citizens, or both.

(20) URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS.—The term “Uruguay Round Agreements” has the meaning given that term in section 2(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(7)).

(21) WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION; WTO.—The terms “World Trade Organization” and “WTO” mean the organization established pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(22) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term “WTO Agreement” means the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization entered into on April 15, 1994.

(23) WTO MEMBER.—The term “WTO member” has the meaning given that term in section 2(10) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(10)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 321, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in

which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2146, Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Welcome back, everybody. I have to admit, I am a little disappointed that we are back here today. Last week, a bipartisan majority stepped up to pass trade promotion authority. That vote showed that Republicans and Democrats can still come together to do what is right for this country. It was a vote that I am very proud of.

Unfortunately, many of our friends on the other side of the aisle would not stand with their President and voted to sacrifice a program that they support—a program that they asked for—in order to block our path. It was disappointing, but we are not going to be discouraged. That is why we are back here today.

Enacting trade promotion authority is critical for our economy and our national security, and so we are going to get it done here today. Why do we need TPA? Well, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty easy, an easy question to answer—because we need more trade. Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers don't live in America. They live in other countries. If we want to make more things here and sell them there, then we need to tear down those trade barriers that make American goods and services more expensive.

We know that trade is good for our economy. One in five jobs in America is already tied to trade, and they pay on average 18 percent more. We also need more trade to bolster our foreign policy and our national security. Stronger economic ties lead to stronger security ties. More market share means more influence. That is why so many national security voices, former military leaders, former Secretaries of Defense, former Secretaries of State have all called on Congress to pass TPA. They understand what is at stake here, Mr. Speaker.

What is at stake here is no less than America's credibility because the rules of the global economy are being written right now. The question is: Who is going to write those rules? Will it be the United States and our allies or will it be other nations that don't share our values or don't share our commitment to free enterprise and the rule of law?

Our friends in Asia and Europe are getting ready to place their bets. They want to sign up for American-style free enterprise, but they need to know that the United States is going to stand strong as a reliable ally, as a reliable trading partner before they do that. That is what TPA is all about.

So how does it work? We have heard all kinds of crazy misinformation spread by the opponents of trade. I mean, crazy stuff, really. Let me, one more time, explain what TPA is and what TPA is not. TPA is a process; it is not an agreement. It is a process that gives us the best shot at getting a good trade agreement. It is a process, dating back decades, that Congress has used to insert itself into trade negotiations in order to provide more accountability and more transparency to the administration, to the President.

This TPA has more transparency and more accountability than any version ever before. It lays out 150 objectives and guidelines that the administration must follow while negotiating a trade deal. These are our priorities. If the President wants an agreement, then he must meet to address these priorities. He must meet these guidelines in order to get it passed through Congress.

This TPA also requires that the administration consults with Congress during the negotiations: Give us access to all of the text, provide timely briefings on demand, allow Members to attend the negotiating rounds as accredited advisers if they want to. If we are here in session, we can send our people. That is what the Zinke amendment accomplishes.

Finally, perhaps most importantly, Mr. Speaker, TPA ensures that the American people can read any trade agreement, every trade agreement long before anyone is asked to vote on it—60 days. An agreement must be made public and posted online for 60 days before it can even be sent to Congress. This turns fast track into slow track.

Mr. Speaker, it is transparency, it is effective oversight, and it is accountability because if the President doesn't meet these requirements or doesn't follow the negotiating objectives, we can turn TPA off for that agreement. We can cancel the vote, we can amend the agreement, or we can stop it entirely. So it is ultimately, we, Congress, we always have the final say. No agreement takes effect, no laws are changed unless we vote to allow it.

This process, TPA, creates a pact between Congress and the administration that allows our trading partners to know that we speak with one voice. It allows them to make their best efforts, knowing that as long as the administration follows TPA, Congress won't try to rewrite an agreement later. In other words, it gives America credibility, Mr. Speaker. And, boy, do we need credibility right now.

Make no mistake, all of my colleagues, make no mistake: the world is watching us; they are watching this vote. The foreign policy failures of the last few years, not to mention the stunt pulled here last week, have capitals all around the world wondering if America still has it. Are we still the leader? Are we still the Republic that

other countries aspire to be? They want to know that we are still willing to engage, still willing to lead, that we are still a nation that is out front. Or are we in retreat and decline?

We are here today to answer that question again. America does not retreat; America leads. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for TPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that we should write the rules, not China. But make no mistake, the "we" is not Congress, leaving us with only a "yes" or "no" vote at the very end. To vote for TPA now is to surrender congressional leverage. To get it right in shaping TPP, the most significant trade negotiation in decades, Congress will have settled for a bill with so-called congressional negotiating objectives so vague they are essentially meaningless.

That won't matter to those who basically approach trade with a 19th century dogma, that trade between any two nations will naturally be beneficial, simply matching the comparative economic advantages of each. But that has not worked out when, in this era, one nation manipulates its currency as it trades with the other, when nations suppress worker rights to keep their wages low, or degrade their environment to help them compete, or when nations heavily subsidize their markets or they keep their markets closed while their competitor keeps them very open in vital areas, whether industrial or agricultural.

So let us write the rules, but Congress must be sure they are right. We must make sure that the beneficiaries are the many in our Nation, not just the few.

As often stated in this debate, trade does, indeed, create winners and losers. As one who has worked hard to help put together expanded trade agreements, I know that in a globalizing world economy, failure to write the rules effectively is one of the reasons there have been too many losers. Millions of jobs lost, with middle class wages stagnant for decades, while the relative few have done so well.

Congress should not give what would be essentially a blank check to USTR on key outstanding issues in the TPP negotiations. With this TPA, you are saying "fine" to no meaningful currency provision. You are saying "fine" to giving private investors in growing numbers the ability to choose an unregulated arbitration panel instead of a well-established judicial system in order to overturn local or national health or environmental regulations. With this TPA, you cannot be confident Vietnam and Mexico will adhere to meaningful labor standards. With this TPA, you can't be confident that Japan will open its market at long last

to our cars or agricultural products. With this TPA, you can't be confident that there will be access to lifesaving medicines.

Despite a bombardment of rhetoric, instead of the approach that we laid out in the substitute that we have not even been allowed to consider in the committee or in this House, the reality is that this TPA will not put Congress in the driver's seat, but the backseat, for TPP and for 6 years in important negotiations with Europe in TTIP and who knows what else. Congress has a responsibility to get trade negotiations on the right track, not the fast track. Vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a senior member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, free trade is economic freedom. It is the freedom to buy and sell and compete around the world with as little government interference as possible. It is really one of the great economic rights of every American. Given the choice between more economic freedom or less, we should always choose more. We know if America doesn't lead in free and fair trade, we will grow weaker and our foreign competitors will grow stronger, and our factories and farmers and manufacturers will be priced out and shut down.

Texas is made for trade. America is made for trade. It is time, through expanded trade, to preserve these economic principles that have helped us thrive and grow over the century. That is why Congress flexing its constitutional muscles and setting clear rules for future American trade is not just a good thing for America; it is a great thing.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of our caucus and a member of our committee.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this trade promotion authority legislation, as we have heard, is all about writing the rules, writing the rules on trade. It is about who will lead or who will retreat on assisting on free and fair trade.

This TPA legislation sets forward the instructions on how we will write the rules in any trade agreement. Okay. So who is going to lead in writing the rules? On currency manipulation, where countries, not just the companies, but the countries themselves that want to trade with us are cheating by manipulating their currency to make the value of their goods look less expensive than American products in the same area, when those countries are cheating, what are we going to say should be the rules when it comes to currency manipulation?

□ 1130

Under this TPA, we can't say anything because we are prohibited from including anything in a trade agreement that will deal with currency manipulation.

You then have to ask a second question. You are telling me that countries that are going to sign these deals are going to be allowed to cheat when it comes to how they manipulate their currency so their products will look cheaper than ours? We are supposed to depend on those same countries that are cheating to now enforce the rules in these agreements against companies in those countries that are cheating? What kind of instruction is that?

What about when it comes to letting people in America know what is in these deals? What if we want to know where the products that are going to be bought and sold in our stores come from? Shouldn't we have the right, if we want, to know the country of origin of a particular product?

I have heard about tainted milk coming from places around the world. We have heard about toys that have dangerous chemicals in them that our kids play with. Don't we want to know where these products are coming from? That is all we are saying, just to know where they are coming from, not that we are going to degrade the place where they come from; we just want to know if it is made in the USA or made somewhere else.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BECERRA. Under this TPA, we can't ask those questions. We won't be able to find out where a product is made because someone else—a tribunal, not an American court—will decide whether we can label a product as made in the USA or not.

Right now, these international tribunals that have no American jurists or judges sitting on them get to decide for us if Americans should have the right to know where a product is coming from that they are buying from a store in their neighborhood.

How does that lead to making sure trade is free and fair if we can't even put a label on a product coming from some other country that has in the past sent us tainted products?

We can do much better. We have over two or three decades of experience in writing trade deals. We know what works; we know what doesn't. The thing we know most is that enforcement is the most difficult aspect of trade because most companies in far-away places don't follow American law and American rules and they cheat and they think they think can get away with it.

We can do much better. Let's get a better trade deal that is free and fair. This TPA doesn't give us that. It

doesn't give us the right rules. Reject this TPA legislation.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last week, in a bipartisan majority, this House granted this administration trade promotion authority so that it can begin to elevate standards and level the playing field for our workers, our farmers, and our businesses so we can effectively compete in one of the fastest growing regions of the global economy.

It is time for us to move forward. I feel confident that, with the assurances that we received from the Republican leadership, this body will have another opportunity to also pass Trade Adjustment Assistance so that the training programs and education for the workers who need it will be in place.

Out of consideration for some of our colleagues who are trying to get home to their communities today after last night's terrible shootings, I end by encouraging my colleagues to support this legislation. It is time for America to move on.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, if at first you don't succeed, try, try again. That seems to be the approach on trade.

Despite the fact that TPA passed the House last week by only eight votes, at no point did the lightbulb go off for the leadership that perhaps they could work with the majority of the Democratic Caucus to find agreement on how to move forward. I don't know why that didn't occur to you. Instead of cooperation, they have opted to use procedural tricks to pass the TPA.

The leadership has chosen to take a bipartisan bill passed by both Chambers of Congress that would aid our law enforcement officers and public safety workers and inject the unrelated, controversial trade debate into it. I can speak firsthand because I am one of the sponsors of the bill.

This bill, the Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act, I have worked on with my friend Congressman REICHERT, on behalf of the men and women who serve the public in physically demanding work each and every day.

It would ensure that they could access their full retirement benefits at the time they retire without incurring a tax penalty. It is a good bill. I am not only one of the sponsors, I vote for it.

Today, this bill to provide tax fairness for our law enforcement officers has been twisted and diminished to a

convenient vehicle to ram through fast track for a deeply flawed trade bill.

This is not the same bill that we voted on Friday. Please read this bill. It is not. I urge a "no" vote.

In fact, Harold Schaitberger, president of the International Association of Fire Fighters, has written a letter urging Members to oppose attaching TPA to this bill.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership would establish the biggest trade agreement we have seen in years, encompassing 40 percent of the world's economy. We need to take our time and do it right. In its current form, TPP is woefully inadequate and fails to ensure a fair deal for American workers.

Issues such as prohibiting currency manipulation and ensuring food safety have been neglected in TPP. As an example, only 1 percent of imported fish into this country—seafood—is inspected. I hope the next time you go into the restaurant, you ask the proprietor: Has this fish been inspected?

He will look at you like you have three heads. Isn't that interesting?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. This country got shafted with our deal with Korea on country of origin automobiles. You don't really see any more cars traveling through Korea—or certainly China—that are made in the United States of America. We are taking a backseat.

Instead of protecting the interests of American U.S. workers—not protectionism, we are not advocating that—this trade bill gives protections and sweetheart deals to multinational corporations, pure and simple. The American people look at every poll—from the left, from the right, from north, south, east, west—and do not accept this deal, and we shouldn't either.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was thinking what a difference a week does not make. The vast majority of the people in my congressional district were opposed to fast track last week, and they are even more opposed to fast track this week.

We have seen fast track before. We have seen the jobs leave our community, our district, our State, and our Nation fast enough. They don't need our help. They don't need anybody else's help. We need to create jobs here in America, not have them flee.

I agree with my colleagues who have said vote "no." I agree with the people of my congressional district, and I shall vote "no."

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I support TPA to give the President the authority to negotiate this agreement. It is very simple. A lot of those countries are already able to send their goods into our country duty free. What we want to do is allow our exporting companies to be able to export to those countries duty free, also, so we can send our goods over there.

Look at what has happened in Texas. Texas exported more than \$289 billion last year, up 146 percent from 2004. Let's look at the number of companies that export. They are not the big companies. Ninety-three percent of those 40,737 exporting companies were small- and medium-sized businesses.

Again, Members, I ask you to please support TPA. It is good for Texas; it is good for the United States, and it is a no-brainer to allow us to export to those countries.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great Nation are watching us today, and they are begging and pleading with us to please vote down this bill.

Who knows better than the American people who live in the towns and the cities where they have seen their manufacturing plants close and they have seen their jobs shipped overseas? Every trade deal has done it.

Let's look at the China deal. As a result of the China deal, 2 million manufacturing jobs have been shipped from America over to China.

Look at NAFTA. Yes, it created jobs; but where did they create jobs? They are in Mexico. Where did the manufacturing plants go? They went to Mexico.

That is why the American people are ringing everybody's office and urging them: Please let us not lose any more jobs.

Those of you who are concerned about income equality, the reason we have that as a burning issue in the heart and soul, particularly of middle class America, is because we are seeing the middle class vanish.

These are the jobs. These manufacturing jobs, ladies and gentlemen, are not where the big corporate presidents make millions of dollars. Yes, they are going to make plenty of millions of dollars; but these jobs go into the middle section of our economic stream and the lower income.

Look at Akron, Ohio; look at Atlanta, Georgia; look at Chicago; look at Detroit. They were once vibrant cities. The backbone of America is manufacturing, and we are shipping it out to the world.

You know what else we are shipping out there? We are shipping these jobs—not only that, the profits of these companies. Last year, \$2 trillion of profits were held in these overseas accounts, away from our taxing structure.

Can't you see America is getting weaker because of these trade policies? I urge you to vote "no" and stand up for the American people for a change.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the ranking member for yielding and, once again, for his tremendous leadership.

I rise in strong opposition to this bill and to once again say "no" to fast track. This legislation cynically uses a bill that would exempt retired Federal police officers and firefighters from paying a penalty on withdrawals from their retirement accounts if they retire after the age of 50. What does that have to do with fast track? Absolutely nothing—this is just plain wrong.

What is more, we know now that the Senate is considering attaching the Trade Adjustment Assistance, or TAA, to the recently passed African Growth and Accountability Act, better known as AGOA, as a means to get this flawed trade package passed.

That is why yesterday, my colleagues Congressional Black Caucus Chair Congressman BUTTERFIELD, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, Congressman KEITH ELLISON, and myself sent a letter to the Senate leadership expressing our opposition to what they are trying to do in using AGOA as a bargaining chip.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
United States Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER REID: We write to urge you to expeditiously pass H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, without attaching unrelated amendments. If passed, the bill would go to the President and reauthorize the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) until the end of FY 2025.

AGOA is too important to be used as a bargaining chip to pass unrelated trade legislation. As you know, AGOA is not controversial and passed out of the House of Representatives with almost 400 votes. AGOA is a trade preference program that is usually noncontroversial, and thus voice voted. It is the centerpiece of relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa. Though a small percentage of overall trade by the United States, AGOA has helped enhance trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

In its current form, AGOA expires September 30, 2015. It is imperative that the Senate move H.R. 1295 along to reauthorize the program soon. Delays will not only negatively affect global supply chains, but also adversely affect the livelihoods of individuals whose jobs come from AGOA.

The House has already passed H.R. 1295 to reauthorize AGOA. We urge the Senate to follow suit without delay and send the bill to President Obama's desk.

Sincerely,

GK BUTTERFIELD,
Member of Congress,
KAREN BASS,

Member of Congress,
BARBARA LEE,
Member of Congress,
KEITH ELLISON,
Member of Congress.

Ms. LEE. AGOA is a growth and trade act. That is a trade preference program that has helped enhance trade investment and job creation to democratic institutions throughout Africa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LEE. In no way should that be used as a bargaining chip on this bill. It is outrageous. Members should not have to choose between programs that they support, like TAA and AGOA, and then supporting fast track.

These procedural gimmicks are outrageous, and they are fundamentally dishonest. If Members fall for this maneuver, we not only risk imperiling the TAA, a program that many of our constituents rely on, but also AGOA.

We have got to vote "no" on this bill, "no" to attaching TAA to AGOA. Let's get back to the drawing board and come up with a real fair, free, and transparent trade bill.

□ 1145

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if you vote for this bill, you get fast track without Trade Adjustment Assistance. There is no assurance Trade Adjustment Assistance will come to this floor or that it will come to this floor in a form that either Republicans or Democrats will support.

The supporters of this deal can't make their case without repeating demonstrably false statistics. The fact is we won a \$177 billion trade deficit in goods with the countries with which we have free trade agreements. The \$75 billion surplus in services brings the net to over a \$100 billion deficit.

How have so many Members been misled by charlatan lobbyists into coming to this floor and giving false statistics? They are given this slippery phrase: Go down to the floor and talk about what has happened since NAFTA.

Now, "since NAFTA" usually sounds like, well, since the early 1990s. What they mean is excluding NAFTA. Excluding NAFTA when we review free trade agreements is like excluding LeBron James when you evaluate the Cavaliers.

This bill is catastrophic for our national security. It hollows out our manufacturing base, and it is the greatest gift to China that we could possibly make because it enshrines the sacrosanct nature of currency manipulation. It says, in the future, countries can manipulate their currency all they want and there will be no accounting for it.

In addition, the rules of origin provisions allow goods that are admitted to be 50 or 60 percent made in China—that are actually 70 or 80 percent made in China—to get fast-tracked into the United States. So China gets 80 percent of the benefit of this agreement without having to admit a single American export.

As for Vietnam, our workers are going to have to compete against 56-cent-an-hour labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SHERMAN. We are told that we will get free access to the Vietnamese markets. Vietnam doesn't have freedom. Vietnam doesn't have markets. They are not going to buy our exports any more than their Communist Party decides to do so.

The chairman points out that with trade comes influence. That is right. There will be Nike lobbyists here, financed by this bill and its effects, lobbying against going after Vietnam for its oppression of religion and its oppression of unions. So they will have influence here in Washington. They will continue not to have freedom, and we will continue to lose jobs.

THE TRADE DEFICIT WITH FTA PARTNERS
MERCHANDISE TRADE BALANCE WITH FTA COUNTRIES
(In thousands of dollars)

Country	U.S. Domestic Exports 2014	U.S. Imports for Consumption 2014	2014 Balance
Australia	24,460,776	10,846,176	13,614,600
Bahrain	996,619	930,049	66,570
Canada	262,930,650	345,304,263	-82,373,613
Chile	15,311,892	9,501,206	5,810,686
Colombia	18,313,501	17,162,947	1,150,554
Costa Rica	6,289,716	9,493,622	-3,203,906
Dominican Rep	7,218,421	4,462,740	2,755,681
El Salvador	3,062,786	2,390,272	672,514
Guatemala	5,653,385	4,140,518	1,512,867
Honduras	5,686,432	4,511,855	1,174,577
Israel	7,894,126	23,054,059	-15,159,933
Jordan	1,971,195	1,354,296	616,899
Korea	42,010,900	68,602,393	-26,591,493
Mexico	192,706,833	292,481,624	-99,774,791
Morocco	2,044,141	1,010,429	1,033,712
Nicaragua	905,977	3,079,467	-2,173,490
Oman	1,911,822	974,788	937,034
Panama	9,737,362	386,123	9,351,239
Peru	8,891,414	6,029,607	2,861,807
Singapore	26,468,896	16,259,527	10,209,369
Total	644,466,844	821,975,961	-177,509,117

SERVICES TRADE BALANCE WITH FTA COUNTRIES

According to the Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis, we ran a surplus in services of \$75 billion with FTA Countries as of 2013, the last year for which we have data on our services trade broken down for the FTA countries as a group. Assuming normal growth for 2014, our surplus in services is roughly \$77 billion.

Therefore, our TOTAL TRADE BALANCE with FTA partner countries is just over \$100 billion. We run a significant deficit with FTA Countries.

Explanation: There are different methods for measuring the trade balance of the United States. The table above uses the most accurate data for measuring the value of goods (merchandise) actually "Made in the USA" and exported from the United States to the various countries listed. The source for our goods data is the International Trade Commission (ITC) dataweb, available at <http://dataweb.usitc.gov>. ITC measures exports in two different ways ("Total Exports" and "Domestic Exports").

We use "Domestic Exports." According to the ITC, "Domestic Exports measures goods that are grown, produced and manufactured in the United States, or goods of foreign origin that have been changed in the United States." FTA proponents like to use an alternative measurement, "Total Exports," which "measures the total movement of goods out of the United States to foreign countries," whether those goods were made or altered by U.S. workers in the United States or not—it includes goods that were simply transiting the United States without alteration. Counting these "Re-Exports" that are included in the "Total Exports" measurement will give a distorted bilateral trade balance for given countries because it drastically over-counts exports. For similar reasons and in order to give an accurate, ap-

ples to apples comparison, on the import side we use "Imports for Consumption" which includes only imports that are not re-exported. Using the alternative ITC measurement for imports, "Total Imports," would overstate imports by counting those goods coming into the United States that are going to be re-exported. See <http://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/tradestatnote.pdf> for more on these terms and what the measurements represent.

Services data. Ideally our nation's trade balance figures would provide the trade balance for both goods and services. However, services are more difficult for government agencies to track, and the agencies therefore do not break the trade data down consistently for every partner country, every year. Also, the agencies cannot compile services data as quickly as merchandise data. We use a 2013 services balance figure for FTA countries in the aggregate that the Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis provided to the Chamber of Commerce for a report touting FTAs. We assume growth of about \$5 billion in the positive services balance for 2014. See the Chamber report for these services data at https://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/open_door_trade_report.pdf.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. How much time remains for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 22½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We are the only two speakers left on our side. Because of deference to our Members from South Carolina who are trying to get home to this tragedy, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), and then I am just going to

hold to close just for our South Carolina Members.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, read the bill. I have got it right here. The only thing different is the number at the top has changed. The content is the same.

TPA is not a trade deal. It is a process that holds this President accountable. It sets in motion Congress inserting itself.

By the way, NAFTA, I mean, I just continue to get blown away by the misinformation. No wonder the American people get confused.

I take this personally. As the gentleman from New Jersey knows, my dad lost his job way before NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in manufacturing with NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in services with NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in agriculture, food, and beverages with NAFTA. In fact, we have a trade surplus with NAFTA, if you take out oil and energy products. We have a trade surplus in manufacturing with NAFTA. I do get fired up about this.

Mr. Speaker, 95 percent of the world's population is outside the United States. A multinational corporation can move anywhere it wants to, a Fortune 500 company can move anywhere it wants to, and they do.

Lake Shore, in my district, a family-owned business, they cannot. This is about breaking down barriers for Lake Shore, for Screen Machine, because they can't move a plant overseas, and

they are at a competitive disadvantage. A large corporation can move. They can't.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is about jobs. This is about the American worker. This is about the fact that we have the ability today to complete anywhere in the world if those trade barriers are broken down.

We have to break them down, Mr. Speaker. One out of every five jobs is trade-related. They are good jobs.

Vote "yes" on TPA. Vote "yes" for the American worker.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke in favor of H.R. 1891, the AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015. In the middle of tremendous controversy and tension over TPA, it was encouraging to have legislation that wasn't controversial, in fact, had overwhelming support with 397 votes. The bill was sent to the Senate, and we were hopeful that H.R. 1891 would have already made it to the President's desk.

Unfortunately, the bill is a victim of its own success. So many rumors are floating around that because AGOA is popular, supported by both Democrats, Republicans, Senators, and House Members, that now Senators are considering adding more controversial bills into AGOA.

We are hearing TAA might be added. The press is even reporting consideration is being given to using AGOA as a vehicle to extend the Ex-Im Bank. We hear the thinking is, if TAA failed in the House last week, if it is added in to AGOA, we will all vote for it.

AGOA can and should stand on its own. The Senate should pass AGOA and send it to the President.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, once again, we are being asked to vote for an agreement that will cost jobs, undermine environmental protections, and erode workers' rights, all in the name of so-called free trade.

This agreement is being negotiated in the dark, behind closed doors. That secretive process may benefit large, multinational companies and their lobbyists, but it does not help small manufacturers in Brooklyn. It does nothing for New Yorkers struggling to raise a family while keeping their jobs from being exported.

When there is a bad process, we end up with a bad deal for American workers, and we have seen this in the past. New York lost 374,000 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA and the World Trade Organization agreements.

This vote, Mr. Speaker, comes down to a simple question: Are you going to

side with Wall Street, large corporations, and their lobbyists, or will you stand with working families in your district? I will take the latter.

Vote "no."

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in Washington we never seem to lack for self-certified smart people. They are the folks who know what is best for you and your family.

While they, today, are insisting on railroading through this fast-track trade deal—and they say it is so sweet for working families—is it so unreasonable to ask: What do the workers think about this bill?

While the environmental provisions have been secreted away from the public, we do know that USTR does not believe in environmental law enforcement. Is it unreasonable to stop and ask: What do those who advocate for clean water and clean air and conservation of our resources think about this trade deal?

I believe they support fair trade. They recognize that it raises all boats, but unfair trade sinks too many of them. They are capsized by competing with those who pay an average minimum wage of 60 cents an hour and whose only worker organization is the Communist Party in Vietnam.

I believe our workers deserve respect. This bill asks American businesses to go out and compete with countries that mistreat their workers, that pollute their air and water and destroy their natural resources, and that deflate or adjust their currency, manipulating it in ways that are unfair.

Railroading this bill through today will deny any opportunity, which we have struggled so long for so many months to try to achieve to make this a better right-track bill. The fast-trackers have rejected every constructive improvement that we have offered to this measure. And all of us here in Congress have to concede we know less about what is in this trade bill than the Vietnamese Politburo, than the Malaysian Government that has countenanced sex trafficking.

We need an open, fair process to advance real trade opportunities for all families. Reject this fast track.

Mr. LEVIN. We had one additional speaker. I don't see her, so I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I started off by saying it is said we should write the rules, not China. That is true. We have been striving to try to help write the rules. We did so for years.

We introduced a substitute bill that outlined where we were coming from and where we thought these negotiations should go. That wasn't even given time for discussion.

So here is what we are left with. When you vote for TPA under these circumstances, essentially what we are

saying to this administration, it is essentially a blank check. They may talk. They may let us see some of the documents, but often in ways we can't discuss them publicly.

This is likely to add up to a TPP that will be even more controversial than this TPA. For that reason, I strongly urge that, as was said earlier, we slow down this process in order to try to find a route to a TPP that would have broad bipartisan support. That has always been my aim, rather than this kind of vote with a few handfuls of Democratic votes making this far, far, far from a bipartisan vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

For those who are coming on the floor protesting this particular process from the minority, it is the stunt pulled last week that brought about this process.

We have talked a lot about what TPA is. It is a process, not a trade agreement.

I want every Member in this body to think about what this vote represents. It is one that will speak loudly about our political system: Can it still work?

It is a vote about what kind of Congress we want to be: Will we empower ourselves in trade agreements or just let the administration do whatever it wants?

It is a vote about what kind of country we want to have: Are we still committed to leading? Are we still the symbol of freedom in free enterprise?

Mr. Speaker, this is a vote for accountability and for transparency. This is a vote for a stronger economy and higher wages. This is a vote for our system of free enterprise. This is a vote for American leadership. This is a vote to declare that America still has it. This is a vote to reestablish America's credibility.

The world is watching. Vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2146, the Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015. For the past several years I have had many conversations about trade with the people of Northwest Oregon. I've spoken with farmers, environmentalists, semiconductor manufacturers, wine makers, workers, sports and outdoor apparel employees, and others.

The district I represent has many trade-dependent jobs and industries. We export a broad array of products—from computer chips to potato chips. Last year in Oregon, nearly 6,000 Oregon companies exported more than \$20 billion in products. Expanding the overseas markets for U.S. goods will help businesses expand in this country. Trade agreements done right make it easier to sell American-made goods and they level the playing field by reducing tariffs that currently make it difficult for Oregonians to compete in many of the world's markets.

This legislation is not the trade agreement itself, but rather a bill through which Congress

establishes requirements for the negotiation of trade agreements and the procedure for Congress to use when voting on whether to approve the agreement when it is final.

The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act earned my vote because it requires the President to negotiate a trade agreement that includes strong and enforceable labor and environmental standards, fosters innovation, would help expand exports, provides transparency for the American people, and guarantees a meaningful role for Congress in trade negotiations.

I strongly support the rights of workers and their ability to collectively bargain and work in a safe environment. I also oppose child labor and forced labor. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act raises the bar in these areas and includes provisions that require trading partners to comply with internationally-accepted labor standards and face trade sanctions if they do not. For the first time it includes human rights—one of the cornerstones of our democratic values—as a negotiating objective. Oregon's First Congressional District is known for its natural treasures—from the Pacific Ocean to the Columbia River to the Clatsop State Forest—and it is imperative that they be preserved for future generations. Deciding between conserving our natural resources and growing our economy is a false choice; we can and must do both. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act ensures that our clean air, land, and water will not be up for negotiation.

The bill also protects intellectual property to safeguard innovation and fight piracy overseas, but with provisions to ensure that those protections will not impede access to much-needed medicines for people in developing countries.

The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act requires trade agreements to contain high standards and protections, and it also requires that the agreements include strong enforcement provisions to make clear that the standards and protections will be upheld and enforced.

It is important to my constituents that any trade agreement be accessible and transparent to the public. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act includes unprecedented access to trade agreements; the entire final agreement must be made available to the public for a minimum of 60 days before the President signs it. In addition, after the full text of the trade agreement becomes public, there will still be months before Congress votes on whether to approve it.

To earn my vote, any trade agreement must be good for Americans. The jobs we gain by expanding exports tend to pay high wages, but there is a risk that some workers may be displaced by trade and by globalization. Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) is an important program to help workers transition into new fields by investing in skills and worker retraining. Without a reauthorization, TAA will expire at the end of September 2015. I voted in favor of TAA last week, but unfortunately it did not pass. But let me be very clear, I voted for the TPA again today because the Speaker, the Senate Majority Leader, and the President have committed that Trade Adjustment Assistance and customs enforcement legislation will also move forward without delay.

I was deeply concerned that an early version of TAA legislation included cuts to Medicare. Seniors serve our country, contribute to our economy, raise families, and strengthen communities across the nation. I urged House leadership to eliminate this provision. The bill I voted for did not cut Medicare and I will continue to work with my colleagues to ensure seniors are not singled out to pay for this program.

This trade package, however, is far from perfect, and as we move forward I will continue to work to pass TAA and improve the trade agreement. I am very disappointed that partisan language to tie the administration's hands on climate change was inserted at the last minute into the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act, which passed the House of Representatives last week without my support. I am also very concerned that two very smart enforcement provisions offered by my colleague from Oregon, Representative EARL BLUMENAUER, were deleted. His "Green 301" and enforcement fund provisions were very important to the overall effectiveness of the customs bill, and I will encourage the conferees to insist upon their inclusion in the bill we ultimately send to the President's desk for signature.

We live in a changing and global economy. Markets, industries, and technologies evolve and American businesses and workers need to be able to react and adapt to thrive. A 21st century trade agreement broadens our country's reach and, done right, leads to more opportunity, more growth, and more job creation. It also supports the principle of trade according to fair rules, equally applied, as opposed to all parties doing whatever they want on a playing field that is far from level.

I am committed to policies that support a strong, long-term economy for hardworking Oregonians and Americans. A trade agreement done right can help achieve this goal, and passing H.R. 2146 is an important step in this process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 321, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of H.R. 160.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 208, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—218

Abraham
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin

Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishchek
Bera

Beyer
Billirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black

Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler

Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Peters
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe

Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—208

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardenas
Carney

Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cook
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier

Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fleming
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett

Gibson	Lujan Grisham	Ruiz	[Roll No. 375]		Yoho	Young (IA)	Zeldin
Gohmert	(NM)	Ruppersberger	YEAS—280		Young (AK)	Young (IN)	Zinke
Graham	Lujan, Ben Ray	Rush					
Grayson	(NM)	Russell	Abraham	Graves (LA)	Palazzo		
Green, Al	Lummis	Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Palmer	Adams	Gallego	Neal
Green, Gene	Lynch	Ryan (OH)	Aguilar	Paulsen	Bass	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Griffith	MacArthur	Sánchez, Linda	Allen	Pearce	Beatty	Grayson	Pallone
Grijalva	Maloney,	T.	Amash	Perry	Becerra	Green, Al	Pascrell
Gutiérrez	Carolyn	Sánchez, Loretta	Amodei	Peters	Beyer	Grijalva	Payne
Hahn	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes	Ashford	Peterson	Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Harris	Massie	Schakowsky	Babin	Pittenger	Bonamici	Hahn	Perlmutter
Hastings	Matsui	Schiff	Barletta	Hardy	Brady (PA)	Hastings	Pingree
Heck (WA)	McCollum	Scott (VA)	Barr	Pitts	Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Higgins	McDermott	Scott, David	Barton	Poliquin	Butterfield	Himes	Polis
Honda	McGovern	Serrano	Benishek	Pompeo	Capps	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Hoyer	McKinley	Sherman	Bera	Posey	Capuano	Honda	Quigley
Huffman	McNerney	Sinema	Bilirakis	Price, Tom	Carney	Hoyer	Rangel
Hunter	Meadows	Sires	Bishop (GA)	Ratcliffe	Carson (IN)	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Israel	Meng	Slaughter	Bishop (MI)	Reed	Cartwright	Israel	Richmond
Jackson Lee	Mooney (WV)	Smith (NJ)	Bishop (UT)	Reichert	Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Jeffries	Moore	Smith (WA)	Black	Renacci	Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Jenkins (WV)	Moulton	Speier	Blackburn	Ribble	Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Johnson (GA)	Mulvaney	Swalwell (CA)	Blum	Rice (SC)	Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Jones	Murphy (FL)	Takai	Bost	Rigell	Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Jordan	Nadler	Takano	Boustany	Roby	Clay	Kelly (IL)	T.
Joyce	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)	Boyle, Brendan	Roe (TN)	Cleaver	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Kaptur	Neal	Thompson (MS)	F.	Rogers (AL)	Cohen	Kildee	Schakowsky
Katko	Nolan	Titus	Brady (TX)	Rohrabacher	Connolly	Kind	Schiff
Keating	Norcross	Tonko	Brat	Rokita	Conyers	Langevin	Schrader
Kelly (IL)	Nugent	Torres	Bridenstine	Issa	Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Kennedy	Pallone	Tsongas	Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Costa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Kildee	Palmer	Van Hollen	Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Courtney	Lawrence	Sherman
Kirkpatrick	Pascrell	Vargas	Brownley (CA)	Johnson (OH)	Crowley	Lee	Sires
Kuster	Pearce	Veasey	Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Cummings	Levin	Slaughter
Labrador	Pelosi	Vela	Buck	Jones	Davis, Danny	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Langevin	Perlmutter	Velázquez	Bucshon	Jordan	DeFazio	Lofgren	Takai
Larson (CT)	Perry	Visclosky	Burgess	Joyce	DeGette	Lowenthal	Takano
Lawrence	Peterson	Walz	Bustos	Katko	DeLauro	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Pingree	Waters, Maxine	Calvert	Keating	Ryan (WI)	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Pocan	Watson Coleman	Cárdenas	Kelly (PA)	Salmon	(NM)	Tsongas
Lewis	Poliquin	Webster (FL)	Carter (GA)	Kilmer	Dingell	Lujan, Ben Ray	Van Hollen
Lieu, Ted	Posey	Welch	Carter (TX)	King (NY)	Doggett	(NM)	Veasey
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Chabot	Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)	Doyle, Michael	Maloney,	Vela
LoBiondo	Rangel	Chaffetz	Chaffetz	Kirkpatrick	F.	Carolyn	Velázquez
Loeb sack	Richmond	Clark (MA)	Clark (MA)	Kline	Edwards	Matsui	Visclosky
Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Clawson (FL)	Clawson (FL)	Knight	Ellison	McCollum	Wasserman
Lowenthal	Rothfus	Coffman	Coffman	Kuster	Engel	McDermott	Schultz
Lowe y	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth	Cole	Labrador	Eshoo	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
		Zeldin	Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Esty	Meeks	Watson Coleman
			Collins (NY)	Lance	Farr	Meng	Welch
			Comstock	Latta	Foster	Moore	Wilson (FL)
			Conaway	Lieu, Ted	Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Yarmuth
			Cook	Lipinski	Fudge	Napolitano	
			Costello (PA)	LoBiondo			
			Cramer	Loeb sack			
			Crawford	Long			
			Crenshaw	Loudermilk			
			Cuellar	Love			
			Culberson	Lucas			
			Curbelo (FL)	Luetkemeyer			
			Del (CA)	Lummis			
			DelBene	Lynch			
			Denham	MacArthur			
			Dent	Maloney, Sean			
			DeSantis	Marchant			
			DesJarlais	Marino			
			Diaz-Balart	Massie			
			Dold	McCarthy			
			Donovan	McCaul			

from the House for family medical reasons. Due to my absence, I did not record any votes for the day.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 373, rollcall 374, and rollcall 375.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act, sponsored by Representative ED WHITFIELD. This bill is essential for families all across the Nation. If we do not act, the electricity bills could skyrocket as a result of EPA's clean power plan rule.

The House will also continue the annual appropriations process with consideration of fiscal year 2016 Interior appropriation bill sponsored by Representative KEN CALVERT.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I note that the Export-Import Bank, which, of course, expires on June 30, is not among the scheduled pieces of legislation.

As the gentleman knows, Speaker BOEHNER has been quoted as saying that, if we don't pass the Export-Import Bank, that there are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear. He then again said, as the Chamber closest to the people, "The House works best when it is allowed to work its will."

The majority leader knows that I am absolutely convinced that the Export-Import Bank is supported by a majority of Members of this House, but this House has not been allowed to work its will on the Export-Import Bank.

Predecessors of yours and a very dear friend of mine, Senator BLUNT, said not too long ago that he believed that, if a bill were brought to the floor of the

House, it would have the votes. More importantly, because he is now, of course, in the other body but is among the leadership in the other body, he said that the bill had the votes in the Senate. I believe he is right on both of those observations.

I understand the majority leader is not for the bill. It is my understanding that the Speaker is. I would hope that those of us who support it and, frankly, those who oppose it would have the opportunity, as the Speaker indicated, for the House to work its will.

Can the gentleman tell me whether there are any plans prior to June 30, when the Export-Import Bank authorization to give loans expires, are there any plans to bring that legislation before this House in a timely fashion so that the authorization would not expire?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman did say he knows my stance on this issue; and, no, there is no action scheduled before the House.

Mr. HOYER. I apologize. Could the gentleman repeat himself?

Mr. MCCARTHY. There is no action scheduled for this House, no.

Mr. HOYER. Does the majority leader intend to, therefore, have the authority of the Export-Import Bank expire, notwithstanding the Speaker's observation and that it will cost thousands of jobs?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is no action scheduled at this appropriate time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for repeating his answer. I heard that answer, but my question to the gentleman was: Is it his intention that the Export-Import Bank expire and, therefore, not bring legislation to the floor?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding for the third time with the same question.

There is no pending action before this House for next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for repeating for a third time his answer to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply observe, sadly, that the representation the House can work its will on an issue of great importance to the United States and to jobs in the United States will not be brought to this floor, notwithstanding the fact that 180 Democrats have signed a discharge petition and 60 Republicans filed a bill to extend the Export-Import Bank.

That is 240 votes, Mr. Speaker, as the Speaker well can add himself. Two hundred and forty votes is a majority of this House. They reflect in my view, Mr. Speaker, the will of this House.

It is extraordinarily regrettable that, when the Speaker of the House says that, if we don't do something, thou-

sands of American jobs are going to be lost—it is particularly regrettable, just after we had a vote on a bill that many people believe is going to lose us jobs and, therefore, they opposed.

How sad it is that we don't bring to the floor a bill which will, like 85 other countries—85 other countries—help us export goods? Those 85 countries, Mr. Speaker, are not going to stop helping their countries export goods, so the loss will be to our exporters and those they employ.

I very much regret that that won't be brought to the floor. As the majority has told me, it is not scheduled; I know it is not scheduled. I lament the fact that it is not scheduled.

Representative CHRIS COLLINS of New York said: I can't figure out for the life of me why my party, the Republican Party, that stands for jobs, and in every conference meeting, it is jobs and the economy.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is on the floor; he talks about jobs and the economy.

Here I am, says CHRIS COLLINS, in the majority of my own Conference, fighting to defend the Export-Import Bank, which is the best example of creating jobs in America.

I regret that that is not being brought to the floor. I won't ask the question again because he has already told me it is not scheduled, and apparently, there is no intent to schedule. I regret that.

Now, Mr. Leader, if I can ask you, we passed now six appropriations bills. Yesterday, the Labor, HHS bill was marked up in subcommittee and the Financial Services in full committee.

Can the gentleman tell me whether it is the intention, whether they are scheduled right now or not, to bring all 12 appropriations bills to the floor before—well, whenever—all 12 bills to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

□ 1245

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, this is the earliest we have ever started the appropriation process. The gentleman is correct that we are halfway through the 12 bills, having passed 6 already, and we are bringing up Interior next week. It is our intention to do the work that we are responsible for in finishing the appropriation process.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that.

Let me ask him further as he knows what is happening in the Senate and whether they can take those bills up: Does the gentleman contemplate, as the majority leader, or does he know whether the Speaker contemplates any effort to come to a bipartisan agreement as was done when Mr. RYAN and Senator MURRAY met and came to grips with a resolution and a compromise on

what otherwise would be the sequester 302(a) allocations on discretionary spending, which the chair of the committee, as you know, Chairman ROGERS, has called ill-conceived and unrealistic?

Does the majority leader know whether there is any plan to try to get us from the gridlock, which we are apparently in one more time on the appropriations process, to a place as Ryan-Murray got us where we moved ahead in a bipartisan way and, in fact, funded the government?

Although, it was not until December, and we had a stopgap measure in there. Is there anything scheduled to discuss that or to pursue that compromise?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, there is no gridlock here. We have passed half of the appropriation bills already. We have started the process earlier than ever before. As the gentleman knows, with just the bill before—very bipartisan—more than 46 Democrats joined us in repealing the medical device tax.

I would probably tell the gentleman that his question really goes to the minority leader on the Senate side, HARRY REID. In reading some of his statements, he wants to create a shutdown, which I think would be wrong for the American people.

I think the best way forward is for the Democrats and the Republicans in the Senate to take up DOD appropriations and move that to the President's desk.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend.

There is no Democrat in this House, in the Senate, or in the White House who wants to shut down this government. As a matter of fact, we have not done that. It was done in '95 and in early '96. It was done last year when many in your party said "shut it down" if the President doesn't change his immigration policy. Any suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats want to shut down the government is simply incorrect.

Now, what the minority leader has said in the Senate, I believe, is that, until such time as sequester is changed that it is not useful to waste time on bills that will not become law as we did, of course, many years during the Ryan budgets, which were never implemented, and they were never implemented in the House of Representatives fully—not once. Why? It is because, as Mr. ROGERS said, they were ill-conceived and unrealistic.

I just want to make it clear to the majority leader that I am prepared to work with him and with others to get us to a compromise on levels of funding that are realistic and well conceived by Mr. ROGERS, by Mr. COCHRAN, and by others.

Until we do that, we are going to be in a place where we are going to be, I

predict, in late September, on the threshold of giving some fear that the government is going to shut down again, the greatest government on the face of the Earth. I am not sure what people around the world thought when we shut our government down for 16 days. It was not a confidence builder. That is for sure.

We have another item that we are losing confidence on, the highway bill. You didn't mention, Mr. Leader, anything about the highway bill being scheduled. I understand it does not expire until July 31, so we have about 6 weeks, maybe a little longer than that.

Does the gentleman know whether there is any compromise being achieved so that we can give confidence to States, counties, municipalities, contractors, the business community that they will have a funding stream to invest in building, repairing, and maintaining our infrastructure in this country?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will answer your question, but, first, I just want to make sure I clarify as to your earlier question.

I am just reading here from Politico, as you have been able to read other statements. It says here that the Senate Democrats are prepared to shut down the government. Leader REID outlined Senate Democrats' obstructionist plan for the summer.

They have a title and a time for it, obstructionists for the summer, warning that, because of the Democrats' plan to block appropriations bills, we are heading for another shutdown.

Unfortunately, as I read in other articles of this same time period, I believe the incoming leader on the other side, too—Senator SCHUMER—said he was actually working with the administration on this. I do not think this is helpful.

For the history of why we are where we are, sequester was an idea from this administration. The President is the one who put that into the bill. We are writing appropriation bills to the law. That is what our rules are and what we are doing. We are getting our work done, and we are hopeful that this Democratic plan of obstructionists throughout the summer will not come true.

Now, you asked about the highway bill. This is a very good question and is one that I do want to work with you on because we were working together on this, Republicans and Democrats, from our committee.

Unfortunately, as the gentleman may know, a month or so ago, your side of the aisle said they had to stop working with us. Part of the reason we were given was that it fell into the obstructionist plan for the summer, that it wasn't just about appropriations, but that you wanted to somehow shut down

transportation, which we do not want to do.

We want to get to a 5-year plan, and we were working with you on offsets to be able to pay for this throughout the rest of the year. Unfortunately, when the Democrats decided to stop this program, we had to just go to July.

We know we have some time left, and we are very committed to getting this done. We think it is important for America to keep them working, and we hope you will come back to the table and work with us because we will be more than willing to work with you.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I think that is my reputation, that of wanting to work to constructively achieve joint objectives—in this case, the highway bill.

Mr. RYAN is on the floor, but I won't ask him to yield for a question as to whether or not the Ways and Means Committee has come up with a way to finance the highway bill.

I know he said that there is not going to be a gasoline tax, which, historically, Republican Presidents have been for. I am not suggesting this be it, but maybe tax reform, as my friend has said publicly for that.

I will repeat, Mr. Leader, there is no Democrat who wants to shut down the government. I hear what you said. I know the quote. What they have said is they are not going to shut it down indirectly as you want to do. Now, you have done it directly.

I do not mean you, personally, but the only two times that I have served in the Congress of the United States over the last 34 years when the government was shut down as a policy was in 1995 under Newt Gingrich and in the last Congress. Those were the only times, and I have been here 34 years.

Has it happened inadvertently for a couple of days? Yes, it has, because the legislation was not agreed to or we couldn't get it to the President in time or things of that nature.

Let me say something because, on your side of the aisle, you love to say this. You love to place sequestration at the feet of President Obama's. Now, my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has not been here as long as I have, but sequestration originally started certainly in Gramm-Rudman—or it may have even started before then—with Phil Gramm, a Republican from Texas, and Mr. Rudman, a Republican from New Hampshire. That is when it started. Then we see all the time the across-the-board cuts—the 1 percent, the 2 percent, the 3 percent. Now, we have defeated them, but that is a part of sequestration.

More importantly, on 7/15/11, your side, in charge of the Congress, offered a bill that you called Cut, Cap, and Balance. Now, this was 5 days or 6 days before your allegation that Mr. Lew went to the majority leader then, Mr.

REID, and said maybe sequestration will help get this bill through.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we were confronting the failure to reauthorize the payment of America's bills, the debt limit. That was what we were facing. What Mr. Lew was suggesting was that the Republicans liked sequestration, so maybe if we put that in the bill, even though we don't like it, they will vote for not defaulting on the national debt.

In fact, that is what happened; but if you look at your Cut, Cap, and Balance bill—your bill I voted against—the fall-back that you suggested was sequestration. That was about a week before Mr. Lew said to Mr. REID that maybe that will get our Republican friends to support paying the national debt.

That passed, by the way, on the July 19, 2011. It was 6 days later that Mr. Lew, in trying to get something done to make sure that America did not default, suggested to Mr. REID maybe putting that in the bill will get the Republicans' votes so that we will pay our debts.

The problem is, if you know the facts, you get a little frustrated with hearing this representation, the President was for sequester. Let's just, for the sake of argument, say that nobody here was for sequester. Then let's get rid of sequester. If you are for sequester, I get it. You don't want to change it.

There are a lot of your Members who certainly don't want to change it. I tell people all over this country when I talk to them that sequester is a complicated word. It starts with an S. It stands for "stupid." It is a policy unrelated to opportunities, to challenges, and to needs. It was a number pulled out of the air.

I would hope, Mr. Leader, that we don't talk about "you did it" and "you did it." Let's talk about how we solve the problems confronting our country. Ex-Im is one of them. Appropriations bills that we can agree on is another and highway bill funding to give confidence to our economy and to our entities that have to keep people moving and commerce moving.

Let's give them confidence. Let's sit down. Let's get these done. Let's bring it to the floor. As Speaker BOEHNER said, let this House work its will.

The gentleman referred to the 46 Democrats who voted with him and his party on the most recent bill, which was a tax reduction and which is, as are all of the tax reductions that you have brought to the floor, unpaid for.

Very frankly, as the father of three daughters, as the grandfather of three grandchildren, and as the great-grandfather of three great-grandchildren, I don't like the fact that the expectation is they will pay the bill. They don't vote, of course, so they can't vote for or against us.

My daughters can, notwithstanding the 46 people who voted for it on our

side of the aisle because they are for the policy. I will tell you I have talked to a lot of them, and they are not for not paying for it, but they were put in the position of either being for something, therefore, or being against something because it is not paid for and is hurting future generations.

The only reason I mention that is the gentleman brought it up, and I will tell him that there is very broad, almost unanimous sentiment on our side that we ought to pay for things, and when that policy was in place, we balanced the budget for 4 years in a row.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Hopefully, I can take from the gentleman's comments that he is willing to work with us on highways and on coming back to the table. I appreciate that.

We may disagree on whether the administration put it in the bill in sequester, but I think history will prove me right. I look forward to it just as we worked throughout this week and passed two bills today on a bipartisan level.

You may have disagreed with one, but 28 on your side of the aisle agreed with it, so did your President. We look forward to getting this work done for the American people. We work within the current law. That is what we look to do, and I look forward to continuing to work with you.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's observations.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that in that spirit, there are 240 people in this House who think the Ex-Im Bank ought to be extended and reauthorized. I hope we will follow that process. I would reiterate, yes, I am willing to work with the gentleman on highways or on anything else which will benefit the American people and our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

—
 HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 2015, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, June 23, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 319, I call up the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114-157 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1190

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.

Effective as of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), sections 3403 and 10320 of such Act (including the amendments made by such sections) are repealed, and any provision of law amended by such sections is hereby restored as if such sections had not been enacted into law.

SEC. 3. RESCINDING FUNDING AMOUNTS FOR PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

Section 4002(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u-11(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "2017" and inserting "2016";

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking "2022" and inserting "2026"; and

(B) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (7); and

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

"(3) for fiscal year 2017, \$390,000,000;

"(4) for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, \$487,000,000;

"(5) for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, \$585,000,000;

"(6) for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025, \$780,000,000; and"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What we are bringing to the floor today is Dr. ROE's bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board. This is a bill that came out of the Committee on Ways and Means with a bipartisan vote. This is an agency that Members on both sides of the aisle believe does not have the right to exist, should not exist, and does not follow our democratic process.

Let me explain why we are doing this. There is no greater example of the conflict of visions than this. ObamaCare created something called IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board. It is a board of 15 people who are not elected or appointed.

They have the power to cut Medicare's payments for treatment. They have a quota which they have to hit in order to find the same number to actually cut. Every year, a formula kicks in, and the 15 unelected bureaucrats find where they are going to cut Medicare payments to providers to hit that quota.

They can do all of this without Congress' approval. The idea, of course, is that unelected bureaucrats know best, unelected bureaucrats know better than patients, their doctors, or their representatives in Congress; they will know which treatment works the best because they are detached, they are distant, they are above the fray, they are not involved in the emotions or the personal relationships that such personal decisions like your health care ultimately involve.

That is the big problem. They are totally unaccountable. They are divorced from reality. Health care is not a statistic. It is not a formula. It is not uniform. It is not cookie cutter. It is personal. It is individual. It is distinct.

Every patient is different. This is why patients, along with their doctors, need to be put in charge of their health care. What IPAB would essentially do is ration health care. It would take control away from patients.

Now, the other side says, Hey, no, not so fast; Congress can override them—but that is only with a supermajority vote.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this movie before. It never ends well. Seniors will suffer the consequences. Medicare is more than a program; Medicare is a promise. Seniors have worked hard; they have paid their taxes; they have planned on Medicare throughout all their working lives, and now that they are retired, it is something that they deserve, a secure retirement. It needs to be there, just like it has been for our parents.

Think about what a Member of Congress will do. This Board of unelected

bureaucrats will say, We are cutting Medicare X, Y, and Z ways to these providers for Medicare, which will deny services to seniors; and they will do it according to this formula that is in law.

If Congress doesn't like it, then the law says Congress has to go cut Medicare somewhere else and overturn this ruling with a three-fifths supermajority vote in the House and the Senate—as if that would ever happen.

All this thing has done, it is designed to basically go around Congress, go around the laws, and have unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats ration care for our seniors.

This is wrong; it is undemocratic; it does not fit with our Constitution, and we think it ought to be repealed. That is why we are bringing this bill to the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 12, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: I write in regard to H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on June 2, 2015. As you are aware, the bill also was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 1190 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 1190 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1190 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, and your willingness to forego consideration by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of the bill and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of H.R. 1190. Thank you again for your cooperation.
Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The real purpose of this bill at this time, indeed, is to take a further effort to repeal ACA. That is really what this is about at this particular moment. The Republican leadership is, yet again, taking aim at ACA. H.R. 1190 would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, IPAB. This would really be the 59th vote to repeal or undermine ACA.

Since it passed, we have seen the slowest growth in healthcare prices over any period of that length in nearly 50 years. Growth in per enrollee healthcare spending across both the public and private sectors has been controlled.

The three slowest years of growth in real per capita national health expenditures on record were 2011, 2012, and 2013. The ACA, in essence, has changed the healthcare cost landscape, keeping cost increases down and keeping or helping, at least, to keep families out of debt.

While we know the Medicare delivery system reforms have been working to deliver value and lower costs, the IPAB was created as a backstop—a backstop—only to come into effect if other efforts weren't successful. This should be clear. IPAB only comes into being if delivery system reforms aren't doing their job to manage Medicare.

According to the CBO, Medicare growth rates are projected to remain beneath IPAB targets throughout the entire budget window, thereby not triggering the Board's provisions until 2024. I think, when you subtract 2015 from 2024, you get 9 years; so here we are, on this date, at this time, 9 years, according to CBO, before the provisions would come into effect, asking this Congress to repeal the IPAB provision.

If the ACA's delivery system efforts continue to be successful, IPAB may never even need to be constituted. It is specifically prohibited from cutting benefits or raising costs on seniors.

What IPAB can do, however, is to make recommendations to go after overpayments, go after fraud and abuse, and try to improve, if needed, the way there is reform of the delivery system. IPAB will not take away Medicare benefits; it will not shift costs to seniors.

If we in Congress are doing our job as stewards of Medicare, we can manage cost growth while protecting beneficiaries on the front end. In the event IPAB makes recommendations, Congress always has the ability to disapprove or modify them. If we do our job, we won't need IPAB. If we fail to do our job, IPAB will prod us to action 9 years from now or perhaps even later.

Let me talk a few words about the offset. It is a significant reduction of funding for the prevention and public health fund. While the Republicans so far have come forth with their proposals that are never paid for, this time, they have decided to have a pay-for, but it would cut by half or more than that the current funding for the prevention and public health fund.

That fund was established in the ACA to provide expanded and sustained national investments in prevention and public health and will provide \$900 million this year alone for interventions that will reduce smoking, tackle heart disease, and help improve prenatal outcomes.

I have a listing of what it has meant for Michigan, just as one example: \$3.5 million for State health department efforts to prevent obesity and diabetes; \$3.8 million to address chronic disease risk factors among African Americans, American Indians, Latinos, and other minorities; \$3.3 million for community transformation grants in central Michigan to address heart disease prevention and diabetes; and almost \$3 million for tobacco use prevention.

Here we are, at long last, the Republicans come forth with a pay-for, and they are paying for it by taking away something that really, really matters.

We have in front of us a Statement of Administration Policy, and I ask that it be placed in the RECORD. It just repeats some of the points that I have made, so I will leave it just to be entered into the Record; and, therefore, I will now say that we should not vote for this legislation.

It would repeal a part of ACA designed to help keep healthcare costs under control, and so importantly, it would cut critical public health and prevention funding.

I reserve the balance of my time.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 1190—PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO
MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

(Rep. Roe, R-TN, June 15, 2015)

The Affordable Care Act has improved the American health care system, on which Americans can rely throughout life. After more than five years under this law, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage. Up to 129 million people who could have otherwise been denied or faced discrimination now have access to coverage. And, health care prices have risen at the slowest rate in nearly 50 years. As we work to make the system even better, we are open to ideas that improve the accessibility, affordability, and quality of health care, and help middle-class Americans.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) will be comprised of fifteen expert members, including doctors and patient advocates, and will recommend to the Congress policies that reduce the rate of Medicare growth and help Medicare provide better care at lower costs. IPAB has been highlighted by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) economists, and health policy experts as contributing to Medicare's long-term sustainability. The Board is pro-

hibited from recommending changes to Medicare that ration health care, restrict benefits, modify eligibility, increase cost sharing, or raise premiums or revenues. Under current law, the Congress retains the authority to modify, reject, or enhance IPAB recommendations to strengthen Medicare, and IPAB recommendations would take effect only if the Congress does not act to slow Medicare cost growth.

H.R. 1190 would repeal and dismantle the IPAB even before it has a chance to work. The bill would eliminate an important safeguard that, under current law, will help reduce the rate of Medicare cost growth responsibly while protecting Medicare beneficiaries and the traditional program. While this safeguard is not projected to be needed now or for a number of years given recent exceptionally slow growth in health care costs, it could serve a valuable role should rapid growth in health costs return.

CBO estimates that repealing the IPAB would increase Medicare costs and the deficit by \$7 billion over 10 years. The Administration would strongly oppose any effort to offset this increased Federal budget cost by reducing the Prevention and Public Health Fund. The Affordable Care Act created this Fund to help prevent disease, detect it early, and manage conditions before they become severe. There has been bipartisan and bicameral support for allocation of the Fund, and the Congress directed uses of the Fund through FY 2014 and FY 2015 appropriations legislation. The Fund supports critical investments such as tobacco use reduction and programs to reduce health-care associated infections. By concentrating on the causes of chronic disease, the Fund helps more Americans stay healthy.

The Administration is committed to strengthening Medicare for those who depend on it and protection of the public's health. We believe that this legislation fails to accomplish these goals. If the President were presented with H.R. 1190, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), the author of the legislation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a proud sponsor of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act. This bipartisan legislation, which I introduced with my colleague, LINDA T. SANCHEZ, would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB.

Created by the Affordable Care Act, this panel of 15 unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats exists to cut Medicare spending to meet arbitrary budgets and have been given enormous powers to do so.

Listen to this carefully. Peter Orszag, President Obama's former budget director, has noted IPAB represents the single biggest yielding of power to an independent entity since the creation of the Federal Reserve. Let me repeat that: the single biggest yielding of power to an independent entity since the creation of the Federal Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, we just spent, in a bipartisan way, 3 years working through SGR reform. Seventeen times, we kicked the can down the road so our

seniors wouldn't be denied access to care. This bill is basically SGR on steroids. It trumps all the work we just did on SGR reform.

Any proposal made by IPAB will be considered using expedited procedures, and without a three-fifths vote in the Senate, Congress can only modify the type of cuts proposed, not the amount, so we have to do the amount. If Congress doesn't act on IPAB's recommendation, the cuts will automatically go into effect. To make matters worse, the Board is exempt from administrative or judicial review.

On the projections between 2020 and 2024, the CBO can't tell me from year to year, within the tens of billions of dollars, what the budget deficit is going to be each year, so I don't put a lot of stock in that.

If the President does not nominate individuals to serve on the IPAB or if the IPAB fails to recommend cuts when required to do so, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has the power to make the changes unilaterally.

□ 1315

One person will make those changes for the entire country. Think about that for a second. One person would have the ability to reshape a program that has 55 million enrollees. Whatever you may think about the President's healthcare law, this just isn't right.

After practicing medicine for more than 30 years, I can tell you that no two patients are the same and that different approaches are required for different needs. IPAB is blind to that fact and will ration seniors' access to care through a one-size-fits-all payment policy.

Medicare desperately needs reform to ensure it continues to be there for current beneficiaries and the next generation, but this is not the way. We can do better.

It is time to go back to the drawing board. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and put medical decisions back where they belong. Mr. Speaker, that is between patients and doctors.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

This legislation is a ghost hunt. It doesn't exist. There is no IPAB. There is nobody that has been appointed. Nothing is going to happen until 2024.

So the question you have to ask yourself is: Why are we out here? Well, we are out here because some people think that trying to control costs in health care is a bad idea.

If you go back and read the Medicare legislation when it was put in, the AMA extracted from this Congress the right to charge their usual and customary fees. They have been driving

the costs, and we have been trying to control it with all kinds of mechanisms all the way through it. Only with the incidence of the ACA have we seen the curve come down.

We have actually extended the life of Medicare to 2030. Right now, we are spending 17 percent of our gross domestic product on health care. When I came to this Congress, it was about 12 or 13 percent. It has only gone up. We have not been able to do it ourselves. So the creators of this bill said: Let's put something in on the outside that can give us some suggestions.

Now, when we had Simpson-Bowles—and I know the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee thought the Simpson-Bowles idea was a good idea—what happened after it was brought out in public? Nothing. We ignored it.

The reason for IPAB is to put pressure on the Congress to act to control costs. I guess Republicans don't care about costs because they don't understand that there are 10,000 people signing up for Social Security every single day. That is 3.5 million people.

The numbers are going up. The costs are going to go up. People are going to run around here saying we have got to cut benefits; we have got to shift the costs to the old people; we have got to do all this. The IPAB was a way to force the Congress to face the consequences of their own inaction.

Dr. ROE is correct; we spent 16 years kicking the can down the road on this issue of SGR. That was, again, an attempt to control costs. It never worked. It was ill-conceived in the beginning.

This is an issue where there is some real muscle in it, and people are afraid of that. They are afraid of it 9 years out because they know how the Congress does. This is just another way to try to undercut and make Medicare and the ACA not work.

Mr. LEVIN pointed out the other thing that is important, and that is the place they look for the money is to go to community health, health departments. Nobody needs health departments. Why do you need people looking at restaurants to see if they are safe to go into, or to look at the water supply or look at what is happening in sewage? You don't need that stuff.

This \$7 billion they are going to grab here is straight out of the health departments of our country. Every one of your counties is going to be facing the impact of this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. McDERMOTT. The only thing that I think one can say is that it is a bad idea to get rid of some muscle to force us to look at costs, but it is worse to pay for it by taking money away from health departments. They are the ones that always get cut.

Who wants inspectors? The other side says: We don't like regulations. It is regulations that are ruining America. We have got to get those regulations out.

You don't want regulations enforced in restaurants? Then take \$7 billion away from it and see what kind of restaurant problems you start to have.

Milwaukee had the cryptosporidium organism in the water supply. That is a health problem that is dealt with by the actual health department in the county. We are taking \$7 billion to pay for this badly constructed idea.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have spent going on four decades taking care of patients in rural east Tennessee, and I saw access becoming more and more and more of a problem. It is a serious issue now, as Medicare costs have gone up and up and up.

I have a mother who is almost 93. She has a difficult time affording her health care and other needs that she has. One of the things I am very concerned with, as Dr. McDERMOTT said, we have 10,000 seniors a day getting on that program. We need to leave those decisions to doctors and patients, not to bureaucrats.

Let me give a little more information. There is a similar panel in England called NICE, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, I believe is what the acronym is. The other day, the Royal College of Surgeons talked about how they noticed that over 75, almost nobody got operated on for breast cancer, almost nobody over 75 got a gall bladder operation, almost nobody over 75 got a knee fixed, and almost nobody over 75 got a hip fixed. That is wrong, and that is exactly the pathway we are going down if we don't stop this nonsense.

There is a very good article in the New England Journal of Medicine published in 2011. I recommend you all read it. It is a look back from 25 years. That is the only information they had. This particular author was not for IPAB or against it; he just analyzed it.

Twenty-one of those 25 years, IPAB would have kicked in, meaning those cuts would have happened. And I can tell you this right now: our seniors better look at this with a laser beam on because their care is going to be cut if this goes into effect. We need to get rid of it now, before that happens.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California), a very active member of our committee.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act.

I am the Democratic lead, along with Congressman PHIL ROE, and I am proud

of the bipartisan work we have done to repeal the unelected bureaucracy known as the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB. I proudly voted for the ACA, and I think time has shown that the law works. The ACA has reduced the number of uninsured Americans, lowered healthcare costs, prevented disease, and increased access to cures.

Despite the success of the law, no bill is perfect. I believe that there are certain areas for improvement in the ACA, and I am committed to working in a bipartisan manner to solve these issues and provide our constituents with the world-class health care that they deserve.

The ACA is a good law and a few small tweaks can make it stronger, and that is why I decided to reach across the aisle to work with Congressman ROE on this legislation. Repealing IPAB is not the exclusive purview of the Republican Party, and it is a bipartisan effort.

Unfortunately, much like the last time Congress considered IPAB repeal in 2012, an unpalatable pay-for undermined the bipartisan support for a deal. I know Congressman ROE has worked tirelessly to avoid repeating the pay-for battle that we had back in 2012 in order to retain Democratic support.

Despite these efforts, Republican leadership has chosen to draw from the prevention and public health fund to pay for H.R. 1190. This is something that I simply cannot support, and it is with great disappointment that I must cast my vote against H.R. 1190. I truly believe that repealing IPAB is the right thing to do, but I cannot support gutting a great provision in the ACA to get rid of a bad one.

The prevention and public health fund is an unprecedented investment in public health to prevent costly and life-threatening diseases. The fund has invested nearly \$5.25 billion in States, cities, and communities to keep our constituents healthy and safe before they need costly, long-term care to manage their illnesses.

The fund also exists to prevent stroke, cancer, tobacco use, and obesity, while also funding vital childhood immunization programs, and invests in detecting, tracking, and responding to infectious diseases. County public health departments rely on this fund to serve their constituents, and I know my home State of California has received over \$195 million thus far.

Despite all this, the Republican leadership has decided to take approximately \$8.85 billion from the fund which actually helps lower the cost of health care through prevention, eliminating the need, ironically, for IPAB in the first place.

In closing, I again want to thank Congressman ROE and the 235 bipartisan cosponsors for their hard work. I

am disappointed that I must vote against my own bill, because I know the underlying policy is good policy, but I cannot vote for something that drains an essential fund from the ACA.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time allotment remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, let me take a couple of minutes to explain why Americans fear the Independent Payment Advisory Board, as it meddles with their health care.

As I stand here today, I will tell you that I am a physician, and I can tell you what is already taking place within private insurance with these peer reviews when you recommend something. I recommended an MRI to a patient.

That afternoon, I get on the phone. The woman says: I have had a problem for 10 years. I have had cortisone injections, physical therapy, blah, blah, blah.

I said: You need an MRI.

I am being denied the MRI by the insurance company because I have only seen her once. And I said to the gentleman, the doctor on the phone: How many times have you seen her?

None.

I said: What State do you have a license to practice in?

Not Ohio, which is where we were.

And so I said: Tell me your specialty. My specialty is foot and ankle. This woman was in for a foot problem.

He said: I am an emergency room doctor.

I said: Well, then you would refer her to a specialist, which is where she is today.

He said: Well, I am not going to let you get that MRI.

I said: I hope this call is monitored for quality assurance, because I want someone to hear what you said to me today.

And then I asked the patient if she would go to her HR director and call the insurance company and say: We are going to drop the insurance because you are not letting the patients get the care their doctor recommends.

And then we got it. Within 3 weeks, I had her better because I knew what was wrong once I had the MRI.

Imagine trying to have that type of a discussion with the Independent Payment Advisory Board. If they pick up their phone, will they have a conversation with you about the patient?

This is a problem. This is what Americans are fearing today. And this is why the Independent Payment Advisory Board should go away.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. It is a great bill. We should pass it. IPAB is a bad agency. It should not have been created in the first place.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today repeals the Independent Payment Advisory Board, IPAB, one of the most ominous provisions in the sweeping overhaul of health care known as the Affordable Care Act.

The stated purpose of IPAB is to reduce Medicare's per capita growth rate. The Board is to be made up of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats—by the way, you can't have a majority of docs on the Board—who will be paid \$165,300 a year to serve 6-year terms on the Board.

This panel of 15 unelected and unaccountable government bureaucrats is tasked with reducing Medicare costs through arbitrary cuts to providers, limiting access to care for seniors. If Medicare growth goes over an arbitrary target, the Board is required to submit a proposal to Congress that would reduce Medicare's growth rate.

These recommendations will automatically go into effect, unless Congress passes legislation that would achieve the same amount of savings. In order to do so, Congress must meet an almost impossible deadline and clear an almost insurmountable legislative hurdle.

The Board has the power to make binding decisions about Medicare policy, with no requirement for public comment prior to issuing its recommendations, and individuals and providers will have no recourse against the Board because its decisions cannot be appealed or reviewed. In other words, the Board will make major healthcare legislation essentially outside the usual legislative process.

The Board is also limited in how it can achieve the required savings. Therefore, IPAB's recommendations will be restricted to cutting provider reimbursements. In many cases, Medicare already reimburses below the costs of providing services; and we are already seeing doctors refusing to take new Medicare patients—or Medicare patients at all—because they cannot afford to absorb the losses.

Any additional provider cuts will lead to fewer Medicare providers, and that means that beneficiary access will suffer. Seniors will be forced to wait in longer and longer lines to be seen by an ever-shrinking pool of providers or have to travel longer and longer distances to find a provider willing to see them.

Clearly, Medicare growth is on an out-of-control trajectory that endan-

gers the solvency and continued existence of the program. IPAB, however, is not the solution.

Mr. Speaker, the House voted 223-181 in 2012 to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Today, H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, enjoys the support of 235 of our House colleagues who have signed on as cosponsors.

The time has come for the House to once again repeal this flawed policy, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1190.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1190. This bill would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB, and pay for it by drastically reducing our investment in prevention and public health.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support IPAB. I oppose independent commissions playing a legislative role other than on the recommendatory basis. It is not the job of an independent commission to make decisions on healthcare policy for Medicare beneficiaries. Congress simply must stop ceding legislative power to outside bodies.

However, IPAB remains an insignificant provision from the Affordable Care Act, as it has not even been convened. Because of how well other provisions of the ACA are working, Medicare cost growth rates are projected to remain beneath IPAB targets through the entire budget window, thereby not triggering the IPAB provisions until 2024 at the earliest.

That said, I urge this House to oppose H.R. 1190, which would pay for IPAB repeal by effectively gutting the Affordable Care Act's prevention and public health fund, an incredibly significant provision from the ACA.

The prevention and public health fund is a mechanism to provide expanded and sustained national investments in prevention and public health, to improve health outcomes, and to enhance healthcare quality. The fund has worked to reduce tobacco use, promote community prevention and use of preventive services, and combat healthcare associated infections.

This year the fund will invest nearly \$1 billion in programs that will benefit every State, and these dollars go to proven, effective ways to keep Americans healthier and more productive.

In my home State of New Jersey, we have received more than \$47.5 million for prevention and public health fund programs. This bill would walk back these and other important strides we have made in public health and prevention.

This bill is yet another Republican attempt to attack and undermine the Affordable Care Act. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) manage the remainder of the Committee on Energy and Commerce time on the Democratic side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a valued member of our Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act.

The President's healthcare law included the creation of the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB. Despite its name, IPAB is the opposite of independent, Mr. Speaker. IPAB is a group of 15 unelected members, unaccountable to the American people. IPAB's job is to control Medicare spending. That sounds nice, but they only have one way to do that, by cutting reimbursement rates for doctors and hospitals.

Seniors rely on Medicare, as well as the doctors who will see them. If this unelected, unaccountable Board cuts reimbursement rates, doctors will stop seeing Medicare patients. That is bad for the 180,000 seniors in my district.

Support this bill, and let's abolish IPAB. I look forward to a bipartisan vote in support of H.R. 1190.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this legislation, H.R. 1190, for reasons that I will detail in a moment.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman indicated there were 235 people for this bill in this House. I just observed a few minutes ago there are 240 people for Export-Import Bank. We have brought this bill to the floor. I would hope the gentleman would urge his side, when 60 of his folks are for it, all of ours are for it, to bring the Export-Import Bank to the floor because it is about jobs.

Having said that—and I want to acknowledge that I am a good friend and have great respect for the sponsor of this bill, Dr. ROE. He and I have worked together on anaphylactic shock and the dangers caused by the eating of peanuts. He is a good doctor. He is a good person.

We happen to disagree on this bill, however. This, essentially, will be the 60th vote, over the next 2 days, 4 days, on the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

We obviously have a difference of opinion on the Affordable Care Act. I believe it is working. I believe that

millions of people are covered by insurance. Because of the Affordable Care Act, millions of children are covered under their parents' policy, and millions of seniors are paying less for prescription drugs. Millions of people with a preexisting condition have the confidence that they can get insurance.

The bill we are debating today and voting on next week would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB, as it is referred to.

Now, I was disappointed at the reference of "bureaucrats." It is used as an epithet, unfortunately, not as a descriptive term.

The fact of the matter is these folks are appointed and they make recommendations. They make recommendations to the Congress of the United States, and the Congress of the United States can reject them; and/or the President of the United States, if the Congress passes legislation to set that aside, can consider it as well.

IPAB develops proposals to contain the rate of growth of Medicare spending. The Board hasn't been formed. There are no members appointed yet; yet Republicans are asking taxpayers to spend \$7-plus billion over the next 10 years to eliminate it. It is not that it has acted badly. It is not that they are irresponsible. There are no people appointed to this Board yet.

The Affordable Care Act has slowed the growth of healthcare costs to its lowest rate in 50 years. That helps every American, whether they are covered by the Affordable Care Act or private employer insurance or self-insured.

As a result, CBO predicts that action by the Board would not even be triggered until 2024, but the cuts to the prevention fund would act now. Republicans are paying for this bill by cutting funding for disease prevention and public health now. Even then, CBO reports that this bill still bends the healthcare cost curve in the wrong direction over the long run.

Today, as has been observed, we passed another bill. That one was without offsets. That will create an additional \$24 billion deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the House has a choice. It can continue the same old partisan attacks against affordable health care and add billions to the deficit, undermine prevention and public health, bringing deficit-financed tax cuts passed by this Republican-led Congress up to \$610.7 billion since January.

Somebody is going to pay that bill because we are not. My generation is not being asked to pay for it, \$610.7 billion.

It could reject, of course, the politics as usual and, instead, work together in a bipartisan way to focus on creating jobs, lowering the deficit, and investing in a competitive economy.

You heard the sponsor of this bill saying, I cannot support it, the gentle-

woman from California, because the proponents of this bill would rather attack the Affordable Care Act than they would to pass this bill.

Now, they want to pass this bill, but their priority is undermining the Affordable Care Act, which is why they didn't work with Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ and others who agree with them on the policy. I have to disagree with them on the policy; but they have even put people who agree with them in a place where they cannot support the undermining of the Affordable Care Act and preventive health in America.

Let's choose to work together to do what American people are asking us to do, not undermine the critical healthcare reforms that are containing costs, increasing access, and improving quality.

That is why I opposed the medical device tax bill, and that is why I am urging my colleagues to defeat this one as well.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished minority whip, I do support Ex-Im Bank and urge my leaders to act on it. We are together on support of that.

Let me just mention a few things to correct the record. Number one, we had Secretary Burwell before the committee earlier this year and Dr. LARRY BUCSHON, on our Health Subcommittee, asked her specifically, when the IPAB cuts would begin to take effect. She said in 2019. In fact, the President's own budget request would begin the cuts of IPAB in 2019.

Now, you don't have to have the members of the IPAB appointed in order to have the cuts. The law, IPAB, designates the Secretary of HHS with the authority to make those cuts. To overcome those cuts, you really have to have two-thirds votes in the House and the Senate, with commensurate cuts from somewhere else in Medicare to replace those cuts that you are overcoming.

□ 1345

So this is a Board that has tremendous power that will deal with provider payments and cuts.

We just dealt with the SGR, the sustainable growth rate, in a bipartisan manner. We acted to repeal the sustainable growth rate that required cuts to provider payments for seniors, and it was supported overwhelmingly.

But if you liked the SGR, you will love IPAB. This is the SGR on steroids. It will be very difficult to overcome these 15 unelected bureaucrats, experts, whatever you want to call them—it can't be a majority of docs, by the way—or the Secretary, whoever makes the recommendations.

We use the prevention fund as a pay-for, taking funds from the prevention fund until 2025 to reach the \$7.1 billion. But this prevention fund gets \$2 billion every year, beginning this year and

every year ad infinitum. So \$2 billion in 2015, 2016, '17, '18, '19, '20, '21, '30, '31, '40, '41. Every year, the Secretary gets \$2 billion to use at her sole discretion. She doesn't have to use it for public health purposes. She has sole discretion on how this money is used.

Would you like to know some of the things she has used the money for so far?

Well, \$450 million was used for the Navigator program and implementing the Affordable Care Act; \$400,000 has been used for pickle-ball; \$235,000 for massage therapy, kick boxing, and Zumba classes, whatever that is; \$7.5 million on promoting free pet neutering; \$3 million for the New York Department of Health to lobby for the passage of a soda tax; money for gardening projects, fast food, small businesses, bike clubs.

Rather than spend money on questionable projects, lobbying campaigns for higher taxes, and for Affordable Care Act media campaigns, H.R. 1190 would rather use these funds to protect Medicare seniors and their health care because the money for the operation of IPAB, for these salaries, for their travel, for all their expenses comes directly out of the trust fund moneys for seniors, used for seniors and those with disabilities. That is wrong.

We are constraining. We are not repealing the prevention fund to pay for this, but we need to constrain the use of that fund. And good public health policy ought to come before the Congress, not be at the sole discretion of this one Secretary or czar or however you might want to term it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in favor of this legislation, H.R. 1190, and I urge the Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I oppose H.R. 1190.

If the Republican appetite for the repeal of the Independent Payment Advisory Board was based solely on its merits, I might be a little bit more charitable about their bringing this bill to the floor because, as you have seen from the speakers on our side, there is a legitimate debate on the merits. I have some concerns myself about the IPAB. But, unfortunately, I think that where this is coming from is this impulse, this kind of ceaseless impulse to undermine and dismantle the Affordable Care Act, and the evidence of that is in the pay-for.

Why would you want to go undermine the public health portion, really, a significant commitment that was made through the ACA to begin to turn our healthcare system towards prevention, towards public health? Frankly, we need as many resources as we can muster to put behind that. And the pay-for for this repeal would take \$8.85 billion that has been set aside for the

prevention and public health fund away from that fund and undermine all of the various activities that are being funded by it.

I don't know why it is that our colleagues on the other side cannot restrain themselves when it comes to this shiny object of repealing the ACA when we now have plenty of evidence at our fingertips as to the positive impact that the Affordable Care Act is having: 3 million young people who now can stay on the health insurance coverage of their parents, who were not covered before; millions more that are benefiting from the health exchanges across the country; seniors who now have less anxiety about falling into the so-called doughnut hole under the part D prescription drug benefit program because, under the ACA, we are beginning to close that doughnut hole; insurance companies now being barred from discriminating against people based on a preexisting condition; preventive care screening for our seniors under the Medicare program; tests and other screenings that they used to have to come out of pocket for, now that is completely covered as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

You ask the average person out there about any of those things I just mentioned, and they say: Why would we want to give these up?

These are important to our health, important to the strength of our families and our community. Yet our colleagues just don't seem to be able to help themselves when it comes to wanting to attack the Affordable Care Act.

Furthermore, if you view this IPAB as an important mechanism in terms of controlling costs, as has already been said, the trigger mechanism would not kick in for a number of years here anyway. In other words, the costs are being controlled currently. So that basis for sort of the urgency of it now in terms of bringing these other pay-fors into the mix doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

Let's acknowledge that one of the reasons that that trigger isn't going to come any time soon is because, again, the Affordable Care Act is working when it comes to controlling costs. So that is the other side of the discussion. The Affordable Care Act is working in terms of providing more coverage and improving treatment and management of chronic care on the one hand, and the evidence is that it is also reducing cost on the other hand. So it makes sense to try to preserve that, and I think the public health fund and prevention fund is a critical piece.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation for the reasons enumerated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to read into the RECORD, so that we have this information, a couple of observations from some of the groups out there that are most engaged in prevention and public health across the country and the perspective that they bring in terms of this offset, of undermining and depleting the prevention and public health fund.

The American Lung Association said, using money from the prevention fund as a pay-for would have a devastating effect on our Nation's public health.

The American Heart Association: Cardiovascular disease is a leading cause of death in the United States and is our most costly disease. The fund supports evidence-based initiatives like WISEWOMAN, a preventive health services program that provides lifestyle programs and health counseling that help low-income, uninsured, and underinsured women ages 40 to 54 prevent, delay, or control heart disease and stroke.

The American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network observes that the national breast and cervical cancer early detection program is funded in 31 States through the fund.

And there are others that have observed—the March of Dimes, the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids—that it doesn't make any sense to go raid the prevention and public health fund to support this repeal of the IPAB.

For those reasons and the others that have been presented here today, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1190.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

While the programs enumerated by the gentleman from Maryland are laudable, there is nothing in the prevention and public health fund that guarantees that these will be funded or that they are priorities. It is at the sole discretion of the Secretary as to what she would allocate the funds for. And rightly, these kinds of funds should come before Congress, and Congress should approve these kinds of public health funds.

I might mention that CBO estimates that H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, as amended, would have no budgetary effect on fiscal years 2015–16. It would reduce direct spending by \$1.8 billion over the 2016–2020 period, and reduce the direct spending by \$45 million over the 2016–25 period.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, and repealing IPAB.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act. It was critical that the Affordable Care Act (ACA) included the cutting edge delivery and payment reforms that it did. But, I have never believed that the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) will

be effectively able to fulfill its stated mission of cost containment. I have concerns with how IPAB will operate and that it gives up important Congressional authority over payment.

For these reasons, I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, but once again, the House Republican majority has decided to kill the bipartisanship of this bill with a controversial pay-for. My Republican colleagues continue to prove that they would rather have an anti-ACA talking point rather than a real solution.

Since the Affordable Care Act became law, my home state of New Jersey has received more than \$20 million for evidence-based programs to prevent heart attacks, strokes, cancer, obesity, and smoking from the ACA's Prevention and Public Health Fund. This bill, as it is being considered today, would completely gut this fund by cutting \$8.8 billion—nearly \$2 billion more than is needed to pay for repealing IPAB.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to work with Democrats to find an agreeable way to pay for this bill, and I urge opposition to this bill in its current form.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act.

While I support repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB), I oppose offsetting the cost of repeal with funds from the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is the nation's single largest investment in prevention programs. Established under the Affordable Care Act, the Fund represents an unprecedented investment in preventing disease, promoting wellness, and protecting our communities against public health emergencies.

Since its creation, the Fund has invested in a broad range of evidence-based initiatives. These include community prevention programs, research, surveillance and tracking efforts, increased access to immunizations, and tobacco prevention programs.

Much of this work is done through partnerships with state and local governments, which leverage Prevention Fund dollars to best meet the local need. These monies have been used for important work, such as controlling the obesity epidemic, detecting and responding to outbreaks, and reducing health disparities.

Congress has a distinct responsibility to formulate and fund programs and initiatives that promote public health and wellness. The Prevention and Public Health Fund is one means by which Congress fulfils this obligation.

While I opposed the creation of the IPAB and support its repeal, gutting the Fund would be a significant step backwards on the path towards improving our nation's health. Rescinding \$8.85 billion to offset the costs of H.R. 1190 will have a devastating effect on our nation's health. It is not an acceptable trade off.

We spend billions of dollars on treating disease once people become sick. This investment in prevention is a key component of efforts to improve health and bend the health care cost curve. Using this money to pay for other priorities will only damage the long-term health of our nation.

I urge my colleagues to protect the federal government's only dedicated investment in prevention and vote against H.R. 1190.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, which repeals the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB), that was established under the ACA in response to high rates of growth in Medicare expenditures and charged with developing proposals to "reduce the per capita rate of growth in Medicare spending."

I oppose this bill strongly because by repealing IPAB before it has a chance to work, the bill would eliminate an important safeguard that will help reduce the rate of Medicare cost growth responsibly while protecting Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1190 is nothing but another attempt, in a long line of House Republican efforts to undermine both the Medicare guarantee and the Affordable Care Act.

Repealing IPAB cost over \$7 billion during the course of a ten year period according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO).

Republicans have chosen to pay for the cost of this repeal with cuts to the ACA's Prevention and Public Health Fund.

This fund has invested nearly \$5.25 billion into programs that support a number of public health initiatives, including obesity prevention and childhood immunization.

It has been used to increase awareness of and access to preventive health services and reduce tobacco use—concentrating on the causes of chronic disease to help more Americans stay healthy.

Eliminating these funds in the name of damaging the sustainability of Medicare is a two-pronged attack on our nation's public health.

After more than five years under the Affordable Care Act, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage; up to 129 million people who could have otherwise been denied or faced discrimination now have access to coverage.

Mr. Speaker, given the real challenges facing our nation, it is irresponsible for the Republican majority to continue bringing to the floor bills that have no chance of becoming law and would harm millions of Americans if they were to be enacted.

House Republicans have tried 58 times to undermine the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled more than 16 million previously uninsured Americans to know the peace of mind that comes from having access to affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Their record to date is 0–58; it will soon be 0–59 because the President has announced that he will veto this bill if it makes it to his desk.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look at the facts before prematurely repealing sections of the ACA that have significant negative impacts on Americans currently insured.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board recommends to Congress policies that reduce the rate of Medicare growth and help Medicare provide better care at lower costs.

IPAB has been highlighted by the non-partisan CBO, economists, and health policy experts as contributing to Medicare's long-term sustainability.

The Board is already prohibited from recommending changes to Medicare that ration health care, restrict benefits, modify eligibility, increase cost sharing, or raise premiums or revenues.

Under current law, the Congress retains the authority to modify, reject, or enhance IPAB recommendations to strengthen Medicare, and IPAB recommendations would take effect only if the Congress does not act to slow Medicare cost growth.

Despite the Supreme Court's upholding of the law's constitutionality, the reelection of President Obama, and Speaker JOHN BOEHNER's declaration that: "Obamacare is the law of the land," Republicans refuse to stop wasting time and taxpayer money in their effort to take away the patient protections and benefits of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we stop wasting our time in taking away healthcare protections and benefits and work to ensure that we support the current law.

A law that is providing access to an industry once denied to so many Americans and now supports millions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 1190.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Medicare and Social Security are our nation's sacred trusts with seniors and disabled Americans. Senior citizens in New Jersey and across the country have worked hard throughout their lives to provide for their families and help build our communities, all while making their fair and full contributions of taxes into the programs. It is our duty to respect these sacrifices and ensure that programs continue to deliver on promises made.

To that end, I was proud to cosponsor and support today's House passage of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015. This bipartisan legislation would completely repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB), an unelected and unaccountable board of fifteen bureaucrats who would possess the power to determine what to pay doctors who provide critical treatments and services under Medicare.

Created under the fundamentally flawed and wildly unpopular Affordable Care Act (ACA)—or Obamacare—IPAB's recommendations would be considered under fast track procedures that would limit critical Congressional input and oversight. Whether or not it is called rationing, IPAB's mandated focus on short-term savings could result in deep cuts to physician payments and ultimately lead doctors to stop seeing Medicare beneficiaries—seriously undermining seniors' healthcare decision making process and jeopardizing their access to lifesaving and quality care.

The repeal of IPAB will allow Congress to continue focusing on policies to ensure that Medicare is sustainable for both current and future generations. Last week I was pleased to support four bills—H.R. 2505, H.R. 2507, H.R. 2570, and H.R. 2582—that strengthen and improve Medicare Advantage (MA). These bills will ensure increased transparency and accessibility to the popular MA program which provides millions of Medicare beneficiaries with affordable, comprehensive, and innovative care plans.

Medicare is an absolutely critical component for the delivery of affordable, quality healthcare services for American seniors—and I will continue to advocate for legislation that properly supports Medicare. Seniors and disabled individuals deserve better than an

unelected board of bureaucrats that will only serve to cut payments, ultimately resulting in the denial of certain treatments and services and reduced access to care. Congress must remain focused on solutions that ensure Medicare is sustainable for current and future generations, and the repeal of IPAB is critical first step.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the wellbeing of seniors in my district. The House passed H.R. 1190, which would repeal provisions in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, more commonly known as ObamaCare, to create an unelected Independent Patient Advisory Board (IPAB) to determine Medicare benefits.

Currently, ObamaCare grants the IPAB the authority to unilaterally cut Medicare spending, risking the solvency and stability of the program, without an Act of Congress. Simply put, the unelected and unaccountable Washington bureaucrats, not patients and doctors, control the level of benefits at the most important health care system for seniors.

Like millions of seniors, my late mother depended on Medicare for quality health care to meet her needs during her golden years. Because this issue is so personal to me, I am proud to join Representative ROE (R-TN) and 233 other bipartisan cosponsors in the House to vote in favor of this critical legislation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to protect Medicare for today's seniors, while providing a fiscally sound program to assist future generations. Our seniors deserve the best health care, and the right to make their own choices and not rely on unaccountable executive appointments to make decisions for them.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support the bipartisan Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015 and the repeal of the IPAB.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPEAL THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

(Mr. POLIQUIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, Maine is home to the most skilled woodworkers on Earth, but ObamaCare's medical device tax is killing our jobs.

Hardwood Products and Puritan companies in Guilford have been family-run businesses for nearly 100 years. 450 hard-working Mainers produce 3.5 million popsicle sticks per day. The company also manufactures more tongue depressors and medical swabs than any other business in the Western Hemisphere. Its only competitor is located in China.

Puritan Company pays nearly \$250,000 per year in medical device tax. As a result, they can't afford to buy new equipment to manufacture new medical products or hire more workers.

It is not right for this ObamaCare tax to export our manufacturing jobs to China. It is not right for this punitive tax to smother innovation that helps Americans enjoy longer and healthier lives.

Today, let's all band together, Republicans and Democrats here in the House, to deep-six this horrible tax.

□ 1400

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF JUNETEENTH

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Juneteenth, the oldest celebration honoring the end of slavery in Texas and in the U.S.

In Texas, the observance of June 19 as Emancipation Day for Blacks has spread across the United States and beyond as a symbol of freedom and opportunity that reflects how far we have come as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, as Texas commemorates Juneteenth, I want to take just a little time here to acknowledge a few of the public celebrations that will take place in the congressional district that I represent.

In Grand Prairie, in the very proud Dalworth community at Tyre Park, they are going to celebrate the holiday with a fish fry and live music on Juneteenth. Also, in the city of Fort Worth, there will be a Juneteenth parade and celebration, and there will be a gathering at the Fort Worth Water Gardens in downtown Fort Worth.

I also want to acknowledge my good friend, Opal Lee, who has worked very hard to bring so much recognition of Juneteenth around the city of Fort Worth, the State, and the Nation as well.

As we mark 150 years celebrating Juneteenth, let us commemorate a new era of achievements in the Black community giving us all a chance to reflect on our roots and an opportunity to educate the next generation about such a historic day.

PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, which repeals ObamaCare's arbitrary Independent Payment Advisory Board, known as IPAB.

One of the most concerning and equally troubling aspects of ObamaCare is its unprecedented shift of power to Washington bureaucrats. The Independent Payment Advisory Board is no exception to that. Entrusting 15 unelected bureaucrats with across-the-board power to reduce Medicare spending and decide which treatments are determined necessary only serves to jeopardize access to quality care for our seniors.

We know by now that one-size-fits-all solutions coming from D.C. will not fix our healthcare system. Instead, we should focus on advancing well thought-out, long-term solutions to make Medicare more sustainable so we can protect access to care now and for future generations.

This bill brings us one step closer to getting Washington out of the way and putting Americans back in charge of their healthcare decisions.

DACA ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week we marked 3 years since President Obama created the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA. He did this in response to Congress' failure to pass the DREAM Act and help children of undocumented immigrants stay here and help build a better future for America.

For children who probably know no language other than English and know no country other than America, for many of these immigrants brought here as children through no fault of their own, America is the only home they have ever known. They love this country, and they deserve a chance to stay and contribute to our Nation's future.

President Obama announced an expanded DACA last year, along with the program that deals with parents of such children to help the immigrant parents of American citizens and legal residents. Unfortunately, a partisan lawsuit has held up their implementation, and Republicans have now voted three times to end this opportunity for children of immigrants. They would split families apart.

If my Republican friends wish to change our immigration policies, they

have a perfect vehicle, Mr. Speaker, for doing so: a comprehensive immigration reform bill supported, in my opinion, by a majority of the House of Representatives. Let's bring such a bill to the floor so that we can fix our broken immigration system and create a pathway to citizenship for these DREAMers and others who have been living and working here for almost all their lives.

OUR DOCUMENTS OF FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, quite often, as others have already done today, when I have come before this body, it has been to recognize someone who has done something significant in my district or to speak about a bill, whether I was for it or against it, or a piece of policy or an issue. But today I don't have pre-prepared remarks. I just wanted to remind those of us who are here of why we are here. Why do we attend sessions here in this body day in and day out? What is the purpose for our being here?

Before I begin remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to personally extend my thoughts and prayers on behalf of myself and my family, as well as those of the 11th Congressional District in Georgia, to those victims of the horrific attack that happened last evening in Charleston, South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on Homeland Security as well as the special task force on foreign fighters, and as part of that, we spend a lot of time studying terrorism and the terrorist attacks against this Nation. One thing that I have seen that is consistent about these terrorist attacks is that they are attacking us not because of who we are. Most of them don't even know our names. They may not know our families or what we believe, and it may well be the case in Charleston, as I know it was in Garland, Texas, in the attacks there, they didn't even know their victims. But what I have seen with these attacks of terrorism is they are attacks about what we stand for, and that is freedom.

In Garland, Texas, it was an attack on the First Amendment, our freedom of speech. Last night, it was an attack on the most fundamental right that our Founding Fathers gave to us, and that is our freedom of religion, a right that, as they said, was given to us by God and cannot be taken away.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity since being in Congress a short amount of time—and it is more than an opportunity, it is really a privilege—to take constituents as they come to the Capitol here on tours. As I walk down the Halls of this building and I point

out the statue of Thomas Jefferson that we have right outside the Chamber, or even as I stand here, the image of Moses is looking at me as he is looking over the Chamber, as I see the statues of our Founding Fathers, they have left us reminders of why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, as we are getting close to the great anniversary festival of the birth of this Nation, I think it is imperative and important that we as a body are reminded of why we are here. I just want to speak briefly about two phrases that you can find in Washington, D.C., that remind us not only of why we are here, but what it takes to preserve the freedom that we have been given.

Mr. Speaker, as I walked down the aisle to come to this podium, I just glanced up above the rostrum where you are standing, and I see four words, "In God We Trust." That is one of the phrases that my eyes often go to as I am sitting in this Chamber as we are debating bills. I reflect back on why do we have that phrase here?

Well, it also goes back to another phrase that I have seen recently as I was taking a tour of The Mall outside this building, where we have the museums of the heritage of this Nation. There is also a building there, the National Archives. Inside that building are the documents of freedom, the most hallowed of all of our documents: the Constitution; the Bill of Rights; and then the one that we hold the most sacred, the one that is most requested by visitors to this Nation's Capital to see, and that is the Declaration of Independence.

In that Declaration, our Founding Fathers expressed what they believed that this Nation would be one day. It was their vision, it was their faith, and it was their philosophy about this new Nation. They were revolutionary ideas that they brought forth because it was the first time in the history of mankind that a government existed with emphasis on the freedom of individual, empowering the individual. Every other government on the face of the Earth before this had focused its attention upon a group, a collective, whether it was by their race or their religion or aristocracy or their family line. But our Founding Fathers sensed something different: if we empower the individual, if we recognize the rights that God has given them and we give them the freedom to excel and exceed, then our Nation, as a whole, would excel.

They believed that these rights were important to be protected: the right to speak freely, the right to have ideas, the right to pursue happiness, the right to pursue commerce, and the right to worship without fear of oppression from the government. These were revolutionary ideas.

They also knew that they had a challenge. Because of these revolutionary ideas, they knew that they would not

be well accepted by other governments because it threatened the power base of those governments. In fact, they knew they would have to take on the most powerful military force in the history of the entire world if they were ever going to see these ideas come to fruition.

Now, think about that. This ragtag rabble of Washington's soldiers would have to take on the most powerful military force in the history of the world. It was an impossible task, and they understood that. But, Mr. Speaker, that phrase that is in marble above the rostrum reflects one of those two key phrases, because in the last line of the Declaration of Independence, our Founding Fathers wrote these words: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm Reliance on the Protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor."

You see, "In God We Trust" was the first element that they identified that we must have if we were going to preserve this freedom that they were fighting for.

Now, outside the National Archives, where that Declaration is still on display, are the words, "Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom."

"Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom."

You see, that is the second phrase that I think we must be reminded of today. The second part of that last line of the Declaration of Independence says, "we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor." You see, freedom is not free, and it is held and it is protected at a price.

Just recently, I was given the opportunity to travel to the beaches of Normandy. As I stood upon the sands of Omaha Beach, I started reflecting upon the price that was paid that day for our freedom and our liberty. I brought back a little bit of the sand from the beach, as my dad was in World War II and served in that theater. And as I sat at home right around Memorial Day, I was looking at that jar of sand, and I started thinking: What if these sands could speak? What would they say? What would they tell us in this august body here? What would they tell the people of our Nation if that sand could speak?

You see, that sand absorbed the blood of American patriots who had the courage to step off of those Higgins boats into the line of fire, and I wondered why would they do that, knowing that more than likely they would never return back home. You see, that sand absorbed the blood of these patriots.

The sand also may be able to tell us of the last words that were spoken by some of those patriots as they drew their last breath after giving their lives, their very lives, for our freedom. Would they tell the name of the father

or mother as they cried out their last cry of hope?

□ 1415

Would they tell the name of a sweet-heart which they will never embrace or a brother or a sister or a child that they will never see?

As I started thinking about it, I started realizing that sand held the DNA of these soldiers—not just DNA of the soldiers, but the DNA of our entire Nation.

I believe today, Mr. Speaker, that, if that sand could tell us anything today in this body, it is to remember what they died for.

I believe, if that sand could speak today, that sand would tell us these words: this is why we died, because we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to ensure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

As we are nearing that celebration—we celebrate 239 years of the birth of this Nation—I call upon the Members of this body to once again reflect on why we are here, and that is to preserve freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to speak.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ISIS CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of weeks, America has asked what is our strategy to defeat ISIS and what is the President's plan to prevent the spread of barbarism in Syria and Iraq?

For all of our advancement in self-governance, the rule of law, and a betterment of people's lives, the world stands in shock at beheadings, immolations, crucifixions, sexual enslavement, and human suffering as a way of governance could exist on earth today.

As the world has watched in horror, it has also looked to America. Where America leads, nations stand shoulder to shoulder; where America is absent, tyranny takes its chances and rears its ugly head—but who would have thought barbarity would emerge?

Since last year, the President has been unable to articulate his strategy to aid our ally in Iraq to combat ISIS. As a combat veteran of Iraq that has had to watch my American and Iraqi friends die, that has had to handle the flesh and blood of battle, that has had to do terrible things to destroy en-

emies, that has had to watch the good people of Iraq suffer in absence of effective government, this is deeply personal.

It is personal because I have lived among the Sunni Arab. I have celebrated his victories, his wedding, his birthdays, and his accomplishments. I have mourned as close Iraqi friends have died to acts of terror and mourned when Iraq's educated, intelligent, and free people have been expunged.

The President's refusal to negotiate a status of forces agreement and decision to abandon Iraq in 2012 is largely responsible and aided ISIS' path to destruction in that country.

We soldiers and servicemembers who have sacrificed so much in Iraq weep. We defeated Saddam's army, toppled the Ba'athist government, captured and brought a world tyrant to justice, fought an insurgency, and stood shoulder to shoulder with disenfranchised Sunnis and Kurds to restore control to Iraq's Government. We turned the country around with a military pause.

The President used that pause for abandonment and political expediency; where we sacrificed, he quit. I speak for so many of the Iraq veterans when I say: Mr. President, you have hurt us deeply. You have torn a hole within us. We are at a loss to see the state of Iraq today.

Now, as we ask what can be done, we see a strategy offered by this administration. I heard it yesterday in the House Armed Services Committee when Secretary of Defense Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Dempsey attempted to articulate it. I left more confused than when I entered.

The President is offering a plan without vision or conviction. Indeed, Secretary Carter could not even name it, calling it the so-called nine-line strategy. So-called? Do we not even have enough conviction to call the strategy some name? Is it our strategy or not? Are we so unsure of it that we do not even know what to call it? Then we were informed of the "lily pad strategy." I suppose that is the one that makes us look like a bunch of toads.

The nine lines, if we decide to actually call it that, this strategy, when taken together, is mostly passive and defensive. In my 21 years of military infantry service, I have never seen enemies defeated by defense.

While passive measures are important, they are only complementary. The President is looking for nations in the Middle East to lead. Middle Eastern countries are looking to the United States for leadership. We cannot approach this problem like pushing a strand of wet spaghetti. Grab it by the front, and it will go where you want it to go.

If Iraq and Syria were a crime-ridden neighborhood, this nine-line strategy would be like relying on neighborhood watches to physically fight criminals

and restore leadership of the town. The mayor and police would then tell them, Well, if you clean up your neighborhood, then we will come and provide the protection that you require—if only life worked that way.

The military can provide pauses, but we cannot provide an Iraqi collapse when the President pulls out all the protection necessary to sustain a nascent government. If the United States is not committed with a diplomatic, economic, and informational solution, all the heroics exerted by our men and women in uniform to provide a window will be squandered once again if we abandon our gains.

Secretary Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Dempsey spoke of trying to find people willing to fight in Iraq. There are plenty of them. The problem is they are Sunni Arabs and Kurds. They do not wish to live under ISIS; yet we will not organize them into a Sunni-Arab and Sunni-Kurd federation that would actually stand a chance of success and would be a deadly blow to the objectives of ISIS.

They want to govern themselves because Baghdad cannot include them. They do not wish to live under ISIS' barbarity, and we should embrace them.

In the interim, what can be done that is not passive? How about some of this? Cripple Raqqa. This town, it is clear, is the center of ISIS power. The President's Cabinet says: We are worried about collateral damage and civilian casualties.

News flash, the most humane thing we can do to end the suffering of hundreds of thousands of people is cripple what ISIS draws its strength from; destroy their infrastructure, hammer the electricity capacity of that city, destroy the bridges on their roads of ingress and egress, take away the oil refining installations that they possess and use to fund themselves with millions of dollars of illegal cash.

We have the ability to rebuild those later, but ISIS would be diminished deeply by their loss. The most humane thing we can do to protect civilians is defeat the barbarians, causing their suffering. That is true humanity. If the United States leads, others will stand shoulder to shoulder. Mr. President, we need you to lead.

We hear talk about counterterrorism. Well, here is something every American can help with. News stations, stop putting ISIS recruiting videos as B-roll on your newscasts. Replace it with crosshairs and explosions of their defeat, or show the world their acts of barbarity, instead, for the B-roll. Stop using their images and their propaganda for furthering American newscasts. Americans, write your local news stations and tell them to stop it.

Iran, here is the cold reality and its impact on ISIS and Middle East unrest. Lifting sanctions on Iran will introduce tens of billions of dollars into

these war-torn nations and will destabilize the entire region. Mr. President, do not lift the sanctions on Iran. They must show good action before we show good will.

Finally, we must go back to the drawing board on this so-called strategy of halfheartedness. Using American warriors should mean backing them with the full weight and might of this Republic.

Mr. President, do you not realize that our enemies hear you loud and clear when you say you will not sign the Defense Authorization? Secretary Carter, do you not realize that we are still negotiating it between both Houses of Congress? Why do you say you support a veto when we are still in the process of its negotiation? By such actions, one thing is certainly clear: nothing is too good for the troops, and nothing is what they will get.

Instead, lead, achieve, get an ISIS strategy worthy of this mighty Republic, sign the Defense Authorization, and let's get back to our constitutional requirement to provide for our Nation's defense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had an interesting vote today on the trade agreement, and I know my friends at Club for Growth have scored that.

They wanted people to vote "yes" because they believed, as some have said, it is about free trade; but it is a bit ironic for those who follow politics because, on the one hand, Republicans were being told this will allow us to force the President to keep us apprised, to give us notice of what is going on so that we can reign anything in that is not helpful to the country.

I didn't have that impression of the bill, not when reading the TPA, not going to the classified setting. I mean, I did that; I read the TPP, most of it.

Having been a lawyer and a judge, prosecutor, done defense, a chief justice, I have litigated a lot of loopholes. There are a lot of loopholes in that TPP. There were loopholes in the TPA.

□ 1430

One of my Democratic friends was telling me, Mr. Speaker, that he was being told that the whole reason the President came up here is that, by passing this trade agreement, it is going to allow the President to get his agenda done in the next 18 months

without Congress being able to stop him.

Some of my Democratic friends prefer that Congress have more say than that, and some were not happy with the proposal at all. They also were smart enough to know there are a lot of American jobs that will be lost because of that bill. I am not an isolationist. I believe in free trade, but I don't believe in free rein for a President. I am afraid that is what it will do, and that is why I had to vote "no" once again.

But it passed, and now, we will see if what some of my Democratic friends were told is accurate in that the bill will allow the President to achieve his agenda without Republicans being able to stop him. It appears that way to me, in reading the bills, that he has got enough loopholes he can take advantage of.

Plus, even without loopholes, there is a requirement of notification. He was required to notify us before he released anybody from Guantanamo. He didn't do it. He went ahead and released five of the worst murderers in return for a guy who is, we are told, about to be charged with desertion.

The President doesn't seem to be bogged down by having to follow the law, but I am impressed with my friends who think—but, yes—if we pass one more law that makes him give us notice, after 6½ years of his not keeping us apprised as the law requires, this time, we think he really, really will.

I am impressed with that kind of optimism, even though the old expression here in Washington is, no matter how cynical you get, it is never enough to catch up. Sometimes, I think there is merit to that.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, there is an issue even far more important than trade that is about to hit this country. It could create a constitutional crisis of proportions that some of the Justices on the Supreme Court can't imagine. Mr. Speaker, I blew up the law. This is the law. It is not an ethical requirement.

I mean, having been a prosecutor, a defense—heck, I was even court-appointed to appeal a capital murder conviction. I don't know how many here on the floor have appealed a capital murder conviction. I begged the judge not to appoint me, but he did anyway, and when I got into the thousands of pages of records, I found out he had not gotten a fair trial.

I fought for him in the highest court in Texas and got the death penalty reversed. Some clients felt like I was a pretty good lawyer. I was told before I went on the bench that I got the only jury verdict against what was then the largest oil company in the world. I don't know if it was or is. That is what I was told.

I know something about practicing law, and I know something about being

a judge. I know that, with any case in which the public would suspect that I could not be impartial, I would have to recuse myself. Sometimes, judges will just recuse themselves so they don't have to make a tough call—I never did that—but there are times when you have such a strong opinion about a matter that you have no business sitting on that case.

Now, ethical requirements would insist that a judge conduct his performance as a judge in such a way that it comports with the requirements of the canons of ethics. However, this isn't an ethical violation that would get you a letter from some bar president or from somebody saying: We think you violated the canons of ethics.

This isn't it. This is United States law. This is the law of the land. This is part A. Part B goes into some different possibilities when a judge might have to recuse him or herself, but it is volume 28 of the United States Code, section 455, and section A doesn't have any subparts to it like B does. B is, like I say, other examples where the judge might have to recuse himself, but A is unequivocal.

"Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall"—that is a "shall"—"disqualify himself"—generic, male or female—"in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned."

This is not some model code of ethics. This is the United States law. No one in the country, including on the United States Supreme Court, is supposed to be above the law. As we have talked about, we have two Justices who have performed same-sex marriages.

In fact, the article by Greg Richter, May 18 of 2015, is quoting from Maureen Dowd in her article in which Maureen Dowd writes regarding Justice Ginsburg: "With a sly look and special emphasis on the word 'Constitution,' Justice Ginsburg said that she was pronouncing the two men married by the powers vested in her by the Constitution of the United States."

Now, there is no question that Justice Ginsburg is biased, prejudiced. She has her own opinion about this matter. She has had her opinion about this. That was clear in the first same-sex marriage she performed. For her not to disqualify herself is a violation of the law of the United States; yet we are told that Justice Ginsburg is not going to recuse herself, that she wants to be part of a majority opinion.

What happens when someone who is disqualified for sitting on a case sits on a case anyway in order to use her partial, biased position to bring about a majority opinion? It would certainly seem that that would be an illegal act, not criminal—this isn't criminal law—but it is an illegal act for someone to violate this law.

Then, of course, we also had Justice Kagan as mentioned in the fall of last

year, in September of last year, in *The Hill*, when Peter Sullivan reported: “‘Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan officiated a same-sex wedding on Sunday,’ a court spokeswoman told the Associated Press.

“The ceremony in Maryland for a former law clerk is the first same-sex wedding that Kagan has performed. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and retired Justice Sandra Day O’Connor have performed same-sex weddings in the past.

“Gay marriage,” the article reads, “has been a divisive topic at the Supreme Court as it has been elsewhere in the country.”

The article reads: “The Court could decide as early as this month whether to take up the issue again in the coming session, this time to consider a more sweeping ruling declaring a right to same-sex marriage across the country.

“Ginsburg said last week that, unless an appeals court allows a gay marriage ban to stand, ‘there is no need for us to rush’ on a Supreme Court ruling.”

But they took the case up, and now, we are told they are going to rule by June 30 of this month.

Clearly, Justice Kagan is disqualified. She has had a profound opinion. It reads “in which the impartiality might reasonably be questioned.”

There are different standards of evidence in the law. Some States use different burdens of proof. You can have more likely than not if it is a group, like on a jury, one more than half. If there is a preponderance of the evidence that it is more likely than not, then you find that way.

Probable cause is an issue that has an evidentiary requirement. It has got to be, probably, something is likely or has occurred, a preponderance of the evidence. I mentioned that “beyond a reasonable doubt” is what most criminal courts have before you can find someone guilty. Evidence must be beyond a reasonable doubt. There are some courts that use a standard called “clear and convincing evidence.”

This United States law doesn’t use any of those standards. It is a very weak threshold before a judge or a Justice must disqualify himself. He must disqualify himself. I hated the fact that Justice Scalia, some years back, had to disqualify himself, but he had already had an opinion expressed about, I believe it was, the Pledge of Allegiance.

He could not be sure that it wouldn’t end up as a 4-4 decision, which meant the ninth circuit decision would stand, which struck down “under God” in the pledge, as I recall, but he disqualified himself. Justice Scalia followed 28 USC 455.

He disqualified himself because his judgment—his impartiality—might reasonably be questioned. It appeared that he was partial, that he had an opinion in the case, so he disqualified

himself. That is acting in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I keep coming back to this. It is a matter of a constitutional crisis when the Highest Court in the land not merely strikes down and says that their opinion is more important than Moses’, depicted up there in the center point of this room, more important than Moses’, depicted in the marble wall over the Supreme Court, holding the Ten Commandments.

The Supreme Court says theirs is more important than the opinions established and stated by Jesus Christ when he said—and he was quoting Moses—that a man shall leave his mother and father, a woman leave her home, and the two will come together and be one flesh, and what God has joined together, let no man put asunder.

That is the law of God according to Moses. It is the law of God according to Jesus. It is tough enough if you have a United States Supreme Court which, back in the 1890s, said this is clearly a Christian nation. Despite what any opinions may be, the evidence established. This country was established as a Christian nation.

The great thing is that, if a nation is established on Judeo-Christian beliefs, it allows anybody to live here and to function here and to do so without impediment to one’s beliefs because one can be an atheist, an agnostic, a Buddhist, a Muslim.

You can be any of those things, as long as you are not trying to take over the country like some would like to do.

□ 1445

But otherwise, by basing a country on Judeo-Christian beliefs, we have provided more freedom for individuals than any nation in the history of the world. And yet we may have an ultimate crisis here when a Court says our opinion is more important than God, if there is one, more important than Moses, more important than Jesus. Our opinion is not only more important than those people, but it is the law of the land, and it is so important that our opinion count that we are going to violate the law ourselves in order to force our opinion—clearly what it is—our opinion on the United States of America.

I don’t want anybody to be prejudiced against anybody else. I was sick to my stomach this morning hearing about the shooting in Charleston, South Carolina. This evil perpetrator killed my brothers and sisters. We are brothers and sisters in Christ. Skin color does not matter one bit. He killed my brothers and sisters.

I hope America joins me in mourning. I know the people on both sides of this aisle do. At our prayer breakfast this morning, we prayed and will continue to pray for the families of those who were lost. Those Christians, we as

Christians believe, as Jesus told the thief beside him: This day you will be in paradise with Me. We believe they are better off than any of us here in the United States or on Earth.

Because of their beliefs, we believe they are in paradise with Jesus himself, with the Lord, but it is the terrible wake they leave behind that is so tragic. State senator, from all accounts a good man, not only a Christian brother, but a really good man, pastor. Three men, six women. So our hearts go out to them. We don’t want anybody to be prejudiced against anybody.

But when it comes to the founding block, the foundation of any solid society, it doesn’t matter what relationships exist. It doesn’t matter who loves or is friends with whom. As a Christian, I think I can love most everybody. There are a few it is kind of tough, but most everybody. I have got some Democrats over here. I love them. They are just wonderful people. They are wrong on issues, but I love them. They are great folks. There is no animus.

But when it comes to the foundation of this Nation, the home, a mother and a father, regardless of what other relationships may exist between siblings, between anybody else, what matters is you don’t destroy the central building block.

I was intrigued when the Iowa Supreme Court back in 2009 didn’t use these words, but basically said there is no evidence in nature to indicate a preference of a marriage being between a man and a woman. It was clear the people of Iowa spoke—I love those folks. They were awesome. They came out, and for the first time since the up-or-down retention vote started, I understand, in 1960 or 1962 or so, they threw out the judges that were up for reelection because the vast majority in Iowa knew that is ridiculous.

Nature makes very clear that you start a family, whether you keep both a mother and father, things happen. There are so many of our greatest Americans have arisen from orphanages or from single-parent homes, but still it doesn’t get away from the optimum being nature says you are best off if you have a mother and father. They can produce children. Yes, you can adopt children, sure, but that is where nature comes in and says, yeah, but the optimum is a mother and a father in a home.

I know there are some who are involved in same-sex marriage. They are not able to love as I do. They hate anybody that disagrees with them. There are some that can love me, though we disagree. I hope that the continued hatred that has been growing among some in the same-sex community can be tamped down, but this is an issue that is foundational to any society that is going to maintain strength, going to maintain viability for a long

time into the future rather than show we just crossed another milestone on our way to the dustbin of history. This is something that is important to our society, to our foundation. Let's love everybody. Let's use law enforcement to stop those like the evil perpetrator in Charleston, like the leftwinger I think it was in North Carolina that killed the Muslims. There is no call for that. The man needs to go to prison. In Texas, we would say it is a multiple murder. I would say you need to get the death penalty for killing more than one Muslim. There is no place for that.

But again, when it comes to the optimum home, a loving mother and father can procreate, adopt, but regardless of who agrees or disagrees, this is going to be a civilization changer, and it is not going to be for the better. We are going to continue our divisiveness and destructiveness when the highest Court in the land has Justices that say: My opinion is so much more important than the Bible, Moses, Jesus. My opinion is so much more valuable that I am going to violate the law; I am going to break the law so I can sit on this opinion, so the country can have my forced opinion on it.

I know there are Christian leaders, some are ready to capitulate, but there are some that won't. But we are now to the point, STEVE KING and I and some others, addressed back when the hate crime bill was being discussed, that we are going to lead to the point where you ultimately persecute, eventually prosecute people because of their beliefs about sexuality. People then were wrong because they couldn't see the future, but this is where we have come.

Now, if you hold the same beliefs that David Axelrod says the President didn't, but he said it in order to get elected, that a marriage is a man and a woman, you hold that belief that most Americans have held and still hold, that the Founders all held regardless of their sexuality, they believed a family, marriage at least, was a man and a woman, that that was foundational.

So I am not sure what is going to happen in this country. I don't have that kind of crystal ball. But I know if we have two or three Justices who are clearly disqualified, who have clearly indicated—not only raised questions as to whether they could be reasonably questioned as to their impartiality, they made clear they are very, very partial. I don't know what happens, but it isn't going to be good at all.

Justice Sotomayor has made statements that indicate she has an opinion before this case was decided. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope scholars will look carefully at this and they will understand, if Supreme Court Justices violate the law in order to change the law dramatically, as they want to do, is that a valid law? I don't believe it is. If they break the law in order to make the law, it is a void law. They need to

recuse themselves and let an impartial group on the Court make the decision. It should be left to the States anyway.

It is probably sufficient grounds for impeachment for a Supreme Court Justice to violate the law so that they can force their will upon the American people to push through their legislative agenda even though they are not legislators. Probably impeachment would be in order. If they break the law in order to change dramatically the law, they shouldn't be on the Supreme Court.

It is my hope and prayer they will do the legal thing, recuse themselves before the Court makes its final decision with regard to marriage. If they don't, they will go down in legitimate American history books as being exceedingly destructive, and history will note that they violated the law in order to change the law so that it would be the way they wanted, not with a constitutional amendment, not through a legislative process, not by a constitutional convention that article V provides for. They just had the feeling that they wanted to tinker with over 200 years of law and foundational societal structure and force America to abide by their legislative agenda. Again, I just can't get over that.

If they don't disqualify themselves, they will violate the law to try to change the law with the agenda they have made clear that they have. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope Americans will join me in not only hoping, but praying that their hearts will be touched, that they will decide not to act illegally, that they will be moved toward acting lawfully, disqualify themselves, and let us get a proper opinion from the Supreme Court.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. JOLLY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 19, 2015, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1863. A letter from the Secretary, Office of the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Proceedings before the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; Rules Relating to Suspension or Disbarment from Appearance and Practice (RIN: 3038-AE21) received June 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1864. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0106; FV15-925-2 FR] received June 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1865. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing ten officers on the enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), as indicated, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1866. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Bruce E. Grooms, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1867. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Removal of Obsolete Provisions received June 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1868. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1869. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1870. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1871. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1872. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Designation of National Security Positions in the Competitive Service, and Related Matters (RIN: 3206-AM73) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2390. A bill to require a review of university-based centers for homeland security, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-168, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1646. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to research how small and medium sized unmanned aerial systems could be used in an attack, how to prevent or mitigate the effects of such an attack, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 114-169 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CALVERT: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2822. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1646 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2390 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 2818. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 2819. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to make certain provisions relating to health insurance inapplicable in a State that does not have an exchange established by the State under section 1311 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 2820. A bill to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform partnership audit rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 2823. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to ensure that juveniles adjudicated in Federal delinquency proceedings are not subject to solitary confinement while committed to juvenile facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2824. A bill to provide whistleblower protections to certain workers in the offshore oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 2825. A bill to eliminate the offsetting accounts that are currently available for use by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BERA, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2826. A bill to establish the Commission on Government Transformation to make recommendations to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, of Federal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2827. A bill to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2828. A bill to amend titles 28 and 10, United States Code, to allow for certiorari review of certain cases denied relief or review by the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2829. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, House Administration, Rules, Appropriations, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2830. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2831. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions classified to chapters 44, 45, 46, and 47

of title 50, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2832. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 52, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 2833. A bill to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 2834. A bill to enact certain laws relating to the environment as title 55, United States Code, "Environment"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 2835. A bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 2836. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand the number of employers required to provide a reasonable time and place for employees to express milk at the workplace; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2837. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue depicting Pierre L'Enfant from the District of Columbia and to provide for the permanent display of the statue in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 2838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to agricultural research organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2839. A bill to reform and modernize domestic refugee resettlement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2840. A bill to prohibit any appropriation of funds for the Science and Technology account of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that eligible product developers have competitive access to approved drugs and licensed biological products, so as to enable eligible product developers to develop and test new products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify individual income tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. KILDEE):

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution supporting National Men's Health Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 326. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need to reduce the influence of money in politics; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mr. SIREN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H. Res. 327. A resolution recognizing the three-year anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which permits young people who were brought to the United States by their parents as children to remain temporarily in the United States and make meaningful contributions to our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H. Res. 328. A resolution commemorating the inaugural "International Yoga Day" on June 21; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr.

POLIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 329. A resolution encouraging the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H. Res. 330. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Members of Congress should support and promote the respectful and dignified disposal of worn and tattered American flags; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H. Res. 331. A resolution expressing support for States to adopt "Racheal's Law"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Res. 332. A resolution recognizing the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

57. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4, urging Congress to enact legislation allowing individual states to establish daylight saving time as the standard time in their respective states throughout the calendar year; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

58. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 4, urging Congress to pass legislation that would better align 42 C.F.R. part 2 with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

59. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Resolution 15-003, supporting pregnancy resource centers in their unique contributions to the individual lives of women and men and of babies—both born and unborn; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

60. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial 1422, urging the Congress and the President to pass and enact new economic sanctions against Iran should that nation be found to be in violation of the Joint Plan of Action or fail to reach an acceptable agreement by the dates set forth in the November 2014 extension of the Joint Plan of Action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

61. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 21, Urging Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

62. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 19, urging the Secretary of Energy and Congress to support siting of United States Department of Energy's Frontier Observatory for Research in Geothermal Energy at the Newberry Geothermal Project; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

63. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 15-019, declaring March 23, 2015, to be "Colorado Aerospace Day"; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

64. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 11, urging the Congress to support the mission of the Veterans Health Administration Office of Rural Health and efforts to improve access to health care for veterans in rural areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

65. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 9, urging the Congress to recognize the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure for United States veterans who served in the waters defined by the combat zone in Vietnam, and in the airspace over the combat zone; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

66. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 141, urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to designate Grambling State University as a United States Department of Agriculture 1890 land-grant institution; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Education and the Workforce.

67. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 109, commending the United States Congress on the passage of bipartisan legislation to permanently set the payment amounts that Medicare pays for physician services, known as the doc fix; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, I, Section 8, Clause 1 (The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

"The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

This bill also makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the People, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 2821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 2822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause I of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power. . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 2823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 2824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 2825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4—To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 2827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 2829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions classified to chapters 44, 45, 46, and 47 of title 50, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 52, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 1 and 18, and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 2834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation, which maintains the United States Code by codifying Federal statutes, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation enacts certain laws relating to the environment as title 55, United States Code, "Environment." Codifying Federal statutes is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the legislative branch of the United States.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 2 of section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Constitution's Commerce Clause allows Congress to enact laws when reasonably related to the regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises,

to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TROTT, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. REED, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 154: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 167: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 282: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 288: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 292: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 320: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 347: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 358: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 465: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 540: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 556: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. HILL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 578: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 600: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 610: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 649: Ms. SLAUGHTER

H.R. 699: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 700: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 721: Mr. TONKO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. POLQUIN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 727: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 771: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 775: Mr. WELCH and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 836: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 855: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 865: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 868: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 887: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 911: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 913: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1019: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1151: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1197: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1202: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1220: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BERA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1233: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1270: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1282: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1300: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1309: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1312: Mr. KIND and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1321: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1360: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1378: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1388: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1414: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1427: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1434: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1460: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1475: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1516: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 1559: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1581: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. WALZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JONES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1595: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 1598: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1610: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1613: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1644: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 1678: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1683: Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FARR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1684: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1686: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1688: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1718: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1739: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1748: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1779: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1784: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1786: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1804: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1853: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1877: Ms. ESTY and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1893: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1919: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2016: Mrs. CAPPs.

H.R. 2046: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2050: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 2059: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2063: Ms. LEE and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2072: Mr. POCAN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2125: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2147: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2217: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2244: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2247: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. O'Rourke.

H.R. 2259: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2295: Mr. PERRY and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 2296: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2302: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2341: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2360: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2379: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2400: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 2404: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2410: Mr. CLAY and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 2417: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2429: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2461: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 2466: Mr. YOHIO and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2510: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 2520: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2524: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 2555: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2571: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2576: Mr. SCHRADER and Ms. SCHKOWSKY.

H.R. 2620: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2643: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 2647: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2680: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2691: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 2710: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2716: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 2721: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2734: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2737: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 2738: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2740: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2745: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 2748: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2750: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2761: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2770: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 2788: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 2805: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2817: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LONG.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H. Con. Res. 56: Ms. ESTY, Mr. COLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H. Res. 54: Mr. HANNA.

H. Res. 112: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 117: Mr. KILDEE.

H. Res. 130: Mr. TROTT.

H. Res. 214: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. DEUTCH.

H. Res. 230: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HILL, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 259: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H. Res. 282: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 286: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H. Res. 294: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 318: Mr. LANCE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. JOYCE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

14. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Oakland County Board of Commissioners, Michigan, relative to miscellaneous resolution No. 15110, urging the Michigan Legislature to adopt legislation creating a sales and use tax exemption for the purchase of tested and approved firearms safety and storage devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, June 18, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are perfect in wisdom and goodness. Thank You for the great and mysterious opportunities of our lives. Empower our Senators to seize these opportunities, thereby, fulfilling Your purposes for their lives in this generation. May Your Spirit guide them in their thoughts, words, and deeds, providing them with the wisdom they need to navigate through life's turbulent seas. Keep their thoughts pure, their words truthful, and their actions trustworthy, giving them consciences void of offense toward You or humanity. Lord, inspire them to be mindful of their eternal destiny and their accountability to You. Use them today as instruments for Your glory.

And, Lord, comfort the families and loved ones of the victims of the Charleston, SC, church shooting.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I don't know another way to describe what I heard this morning in my morning briefing and then the news accounts of this sickening revelation of what took place in South Carolina last night.

Think about this. The sanctity of a house of worship was violated as a gunman opened fire in the historically Black Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, SC.

We know now at least nine people are dead, and others, of course, are hurt. I don't know how to describe it. This individual was like a wolf in sheep's clothing. He sat among the congrega-

tion for a substantial amount of time before he pulled out a weapon and started firing at people. The thought of people who were in a house of worship being gunned down as they gathered to pray is heart-wrenching, devastating, and is the ultimate act of cowardice and hatred.

As our good Chaplain said, our hearts go out to the families and friends of the people who were gunned down in that church. It is hard to even comprehend anything so awful. So, on behalf of the Senate family, we send our support and our sympathy.

We hope Charleston law enforcement are able to capture this murderer, and the perpetrator be swiftly apprehended and brought to justice.

Mr. President, I had some remarks I was going to give, but they could be deemed partisan in nature and I can give them some other time. I don't feel it would be appropriate for me now to talk about these things that are definitely inappropriate today with this pall hanging over our country.

Based upon that, I would ask that the Presiding Officer announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, with the time equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, typically I would come to the floor and talk about the business at hand before the Senate, but I think that in light of the horrific news we all woke up to this morning, I wish to touch briefly on the

tragic events that unfolded overnight in Charleston, SC.

Although we don't know all the facts, by all appearances, the gunman targeted worshippers while they were in church in a way that certainly shocks all of our conscience and sensibilities. I think it is the sort of act that we all find hard to understand, and it is truly unspeakable.

Law enforcement is doing what it does best, which is conducting its investigation, including looking for the suspect.

I think it is appropriate that we all offer our thoughts and perhaps say a private prayer for all of those who were affected by this senseless and horrific tragedy.

Obviously, the Senate has some important business to do, and I will come back later and talk more specifically about the Defense authorization bill and the next business we have in line, which is to make sure that our troops get paid and that we provide them the resources they so justly deserve and are entitled to.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before beginning my remarks, I want to express my profound sorrow, sympathy, and condolences to the people of South Carolina and the people of Charleston for the tragedy that occurred last night. To my colleagues, Senators SCOTT and GRAHAM, and to all the people of South Carolina, these things are very hard to understand, very hard to fathom, and I think I speak for all of our colleagues when I say our hearts go out to the people of South Carolina this morning concerning this unspeakable tragedy.

PAPAL ENCYCLICAL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion this week, and there will be, I am sure, over the next few days, about Pope Francis's comments in his encyclical issued this morning on the issue of climate change and on the issue of the

preservation of the environment. Some of the reaction has been that the Pope should stay away from science and stick to morality and theology. I am here this morning to say I believe that is exactly what he is doing. He is sticking to morality and theology, and that is why he has made the statement that he has.

I have always viewed this issue in fundamentally an ethical and moral context. There has been a lot of talk, discussion, and debate in committees and on this floor about the science, which I think is irrefutable—the science of climate change, the science of the increasing load of CO₂ in the atmosphere, the most we have ever had in some 3 million years, and the impact it will have. I have talked about the practical impact it will have on the lobster population in Maine and on the shellfish, on our forests, on moose in New Hampshire, on water-edged cities and communities all over this country. All of those practical and scientific things we have talked about at great length on this floor. The only thing I would say is that I am convinced the science is irrefutable that, A, something is happening; B, it is detrimental to the future of the world; and, C, we—people—are largely responsible for it.

Fundamentally, this is a moral and ethical issue. It has always occurred to me in two moral and ethical contexts. One is that I don't understand what right several generations of people on this Earth have to use up a finite resource that was created over millions of years. It took 3 or 4 million years to create the oil and gas that is underneath our Earth. How do we have the right to use it all up in 200 or 300 years? That assumes we are the only people who will ever occupy this planet. Indeed, I don't believe that is the case. Obviously, it is not the case. There are generations that will come after us—6, 7, 8, 10 generations of people who will come after us. Why do we have the right to use resources that the Earth created for all of time?

One of the fundamental premises of the Old Testament is, of course, the Ten Commandments. One of the basic Ten Commandments is "Thou shalt not steal." I believe we are stealing resources from future generations by simply using them up in our lifetimes. That is moral and ethical issue No. 1.

The second ethical issue is the fundamental ethical and moral principle of stewardship. The first line of the Bible says: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." God created—God created—the heaven and the Earth. We have a responsibility to steward, to take care of the creation that God gave us.

There are some very interesting Biblical references early in the Bible, in Leviticus, the third Book of the Bible, about this concept of stewardship. One is in Leviticus 25. The Lord said to

Moses: "The land must never be sold on a permanent basis, for the land belongs to me." This is God speaking: The land belongs to me. "You are only foreigners and tenant farmers working for me."

That is the concept of a long-term stewardship—that we don't own the land. Yes, we have deeds and we think we own it, and we can pass it on to our children, but we don't own the planet, and we have a responsibility to pass that resource on to our children in good shape and not destroy it.

Another interesting provision in Leviticus—and I hope it is OK to make notations in the Lord's Book because that is what I did. In Leviticus 25, Moses is told a very interesting thing about how to take care of the land. God talked about a Sabbath for the land, just as He talked about a Sabbath for people—a day of rest. "For six years you may plant your fields and prune your vineyards and harvest your crops, but during the seventh year the land must have a Sabbath year of complete rest."

Very interesting—the land must have a Sabbath. It is the Lord's Sabbath. Do not plant your fields or prune your vineyards during that year.

And then later on in Verse 32, God tells Moses what will happen if you don't observe that rule. In other words, if you just keep planting and abusing the land, He said—this is again quoting God here in Leviticus 25: "Your land will become desolate." There is an interesting observation. God said:

Your land will become desolate, and your cities will lie in ruins. Then at last the land will enjoy its neglected Sabbath years as it lies desolate while you are in exile in the land of your enemies. Then the land will finally rest and enjoy the Sabbaths it missed.

The concept is we have an obligation to the land, to the Earth that has been given to us.

Then, we skip all the way from the beginning of the Old Testament to the end of the New Testament to the Book of Revelations, and there is a kind of admonition, I think, for all of us in terms of our stewardship of the Earth.

In Revelations 11:18, the Chapter says: "But your wrath came, and the time for the dead to be judged, and for rewarding your servants . . . and for destroying the destroyers of the earth."

That is something we ought to take very seriously; that the time will come for the destroying of the destroyers of the Earth. This is all about morality, theology, and ethics. This is about simply taking care of the asset the Good Lord gave us—whatever Name you give to the Good Lord. It is the Earth we have been given. It is the only Earth we have. It is the only home we have, and we simply can't destroy it. Yet in Genesis it says man is given dominion over the waters, the Earth, and the animals. But that doesn't mean we are en-

titled to destroy it. It means we have to steward it, we have to conserve it. That is really what this discussion is all about. This is about ethics. This is about morality. It is about theology, as I have demonstrated.

Now, I want to go from the Good Book to another way to state this. In Maine we have what is called the Maine rototiller rule. It is all you need to know about environmental stewardship: If you borrow your neighbor's rototiller to clean up your garden in the spring, the principle is you always return it in as good shape as you got it, with a full tank of gas. That is environmental stewardship. We don't own this planet. We have it on loan. Therefore, we have a responsibility to pass it on to our children and grandchildren and countless generations ahead of us in as good of shape as we got it and maybe with a full tank of gas. And that means we just can't willy-nilly act like there are no consequences for our actions, that we can befool the air and the land and the water for our convenience, for our aggrandizement, for our material comfort. We have to think about other people. That is of course the fundamental principle of every religion in the world: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." I would submit that "others" includes not only those of us here or those of us in America or those of us around the world but those of us who haven't been born yet. We have an obligation to "do unto others as we would have them do unto us."

So I welcome the Pope's words this week as a valuable voice in an important discussion. I realize we will have differences about how to solve this problem. We will have differences about the exact dimensions of it. We will have differences about what the resolution should be and the technology we should use and how we should get there and transitions and all those kinds of things. That is perfectly legitimate. But, fundamentally, we have to think of this as a moral and ethical issue—as a moral and ethical issue—the obligations we owe to other people in this country, to other people in the world who have no voice in the use of the resources that are being taken away from them, and particularly to the people whom we don't yet know who are going to follow us on this wonderful home we have been given to steward, to preserve, to use but to pass on in as good or better shape than we found it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I wish to begin by extending my deepest condolences and prayers to the families and loved ones of those lost in the heinous church shooting in Charleston,

SC. Our hearts break for the people of Charleston and especially for the congregation of this house of God—a place of refuge, a place of peace, a place of love. The perpetrator of this hate crime must be found and swiftly brought to justice.

Tragedies like this remind us that we are all interconnected, in our hometowns, in our country, across the planet. Whether it is our common home of worship or the common home of our planet, we are called every day to care for one another, especially those who are most in need.

PAPAL ENCYCLICAL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today, Pope Francis released a historic encyclical—a message to the world to preserve the planet from climate change and environmental degradation. In giving us his message to protect what he calls “our common home,” Pope Francis has also given us a common goal—we must act now to stop climate change.

Pope Francis’s encyclical calls all people of conscience to examine our own lives, our relationships to people and the planet, and our duty to take action. The Pope’s message is clear: Mankind created the problem of climate change and now mankind must solve it.

Pope Francis delivered this message to the world, but the world needs America to lead.

As the wealthiest Nation in the world and one of its largest pollution emitters, it is our economic and moral responsibility to act now. There is time to avoid the worst effects of climate change, but we must act now.

Global temperatures are warming, glaciers are melting, sea levels are rising, extreme downpours and weather events are increasing, the ocean is becoming more acidic. Last year was the warmest year ever recorded, and it is the poorest and the most vulnerable in developing nations who have suffered the most from the developed world’s pollution. By reducing U.S. carbon pollution, the United States can be a leader, not a laggard, in answering Pope Francis’s call.

Climate change deniers may be the doubting Thomases of the 21st century, but there is no doubting the science anymore when national academies of sciences across the globe, including the Vatican’s, all agree that burning fossil fuels is changing the Earth’s climate.

So to all of the critics of Pope Francis’s message, let’s stop denying the science and let’s start deploying the solutions. Let’s deploy more wind and solar energy and renew tax breaks for these projects. Let’s make our cars and trucks even more fuel efficient. Let’s fully implement and defend President Obama’s Clean Power Plan

that will reduce carbon pollution from America’s powerplants.

The United States can be the leader in the clean energy revolution to reduce the pollution imperiling this planet, and then we can partner with other nations to share this technology and protect the most vulnerable. The United States has the technological imperative to lead on clean energy. We have the economic imperative to engage in massive job creation that will make it possible to save all of creation. We have the moral responsibility to protect our planet for future generations.

The Pope has given us the guidance—the moral guidance—in his encyclical, and we know, ultimately, science and technology will be the answer to our prayers. But the leadership must begin here. This cannot happen without leadership from the U.S. Senate, from the United States of America. If we want to see more solar and wind deployed in our country, then we must put the tax credits on the books that incentivize the private sector and individuals across the country to deploy it.

Last year, there were 5,000 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is twice as much as has been deployed in the whole history of the United States up until 5 years ago. This year, there is going to be 7,500 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is triple the whole history of the United States up until 5 years ago. Next year, there is going to be 10,000 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is four times as much as had ever been deployed in the whole history of our country cumulatively. So this is a revolution that is absolutely helping to transform the way in which we generate electricity in the United States.

The same thing is true for wind. Wind is expanding at the same exact pace, in terms of generating sources of electricity from a place that has always been there, using God’s energy in order to provide electricity for American homes and businesses.

What is happening in both areas? Well, the Republican Senate has allowed the wind tax breaks to already expire. Already they have expired. The solar tax breaks expire at the end of next year. We have no agreement, no signal that this Senate is sending to the investors and solar consumers across the country that solar will be given any incentives past the end of next year.

Similarly, we have seen a dramatic increase in the fuel economy standards of the vehicles which we drive. In fact, much of the problem we have in finding a source of revenues for a robust transportation bill comes from the fact that people are now consuming less gasoline in their much more fuel-efficient cars since President Obama took the au-

thority—by the way, which this Senate gave to him in 2007—to dramatically increase the fuel economy standards for those vehicles. We have to go all the way up to the 54.5 miles per gallon which the President has proposed. That will dramatically reduce greenhouse gases.

And we must ensure that the President’s clean power rules, which he is going to promulgate within the next month, stay on the books. There are already those in the Senate who are saying they are going to try to vitiate, to overturn, to make impossible the implementation of those powerplant rules which will keep the greenhouse gases coming out of coal-burning plants—especially across our country—to a minimum, to reduce by 30 percent the amount of greenhouse gases, carbon, that comes out of powerplants generating electricity in our country by the year 2030. We can do this. We are a technological power. The Pope, the world, they look to us.

They say to us: President Kennedy challenged the Nation to put a man on the Moon in 8 years in order to say to the Soviet Union that we would not allow them to dominate outer space, and in 8 years our country invented new metals, invented new propulsion systems, returned that crew from the Moon safely. And we, with our American flag, said we are going to use outer space for peaceful purposes. Well, the flag that flew on the Moon is now in the Capitol. That is the return on investment in science and technology in the United States to help the rest of the world ensure that outer space would be used for peaceful purposes.

The rest of the world expects us to be able to invent new technologies, new batteries, solar, wind, geothermal, energy efficiency, vehicles, metals that will dramatically reduce the amount of pollution we are sending up into the world but simultaneously spread these technologies across the planet.

In the 1990s, we invented new digital technologies. It was first just a very plain phone, but no one had one in their pocket until 1995 and 1996 because the phone was the size of a brick and it cost 50 cents a minute. No one had one. It was too expensive. But then this Congress moved over 200 megahertz of spectrum. It incentivized the private sector to begin to move. Within 3 years, everyone had one of these phones in their pocket. Within another 8 years, it moved to a smartphone because we had begun the revolution. Where was the smartphone invented? Right here in the United States.

Let’s take Africa, for example. Twenty years ago did anyone believe that 700 million people in Africa would have a wireless device in their pocket? No. Why do they? Because the United States invented—the United States put the policies on the books that generated this revolution. They skipped

telephone poles. They went right to wireless, right to cell phone towers. We did that. We gave the leadership.

That is leading to a lot of economic development in Africa and in continents around this world. We have to do the same thing in energy technology. They can envision a day where they bypass having to put wires down the street for electricity as well and solar panels could be on their roofs, providing electricity to power their cell phones, their refrigerators, their stoves, their air-conditioning.

We can do this. We have the capacity to do it, but we have to set our mind to doing it because there is an economic incentive for us. Oh, yes, there is a national security incentive for us. Oh, yes, we can tell the Middle East we don't need their oil anymore than we need their sand. We are going to provide our own power, and we are going to give other countries in the world the capacity to produce their own power. But we can do it as well because it is a moral imperative, because God's Earth, his creation is, in fact, now in jeopardy.

We have to be the leaders. We have to answer this moral cause. We cannot say we can't do it. We can't say we can't invent our way out of this potential catastrophe for the entire planet. The Pope is calling upon us to be the world's leader, morally and economically. We can do it.

Today is an important day, I think a watershed moment. I am a Catholic. The Pope is a Jesuit who is trained as a chemist. For those who say the Pope has no business talking about climate, he is a chemist. There are many people who say: Well, I don't have a view on climate because I am not a scientist.

The Pope is a scientist. He has looked at the evidence. He has asked the Vatican academy of arts and sciences to study this issue. They have come back with their conclusions. Man is creating the problem and mankind now must solve the problem, but it is those who have created the pollution that the greatest responsibility falls.

You cannot preach temperance from a barstool. You cannot tell people to reduce what they are doing—smoking or drinking or engaging in dangerous activities—if you, too, are engaging in them. The leadership must come from this Chamber. The leadership must come from the United States of America. Pope Francis's message must resonate throughout this Chamber in the months and years ahead. If we do it, we will have been doing—as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address—truly God's work here on Earth.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I hope we are in the final hours of a 2½-week consideration of the Defense authorization bill. Not all amendments were debated and not as many were reported yet. We still have hopes that there could be a managers' package, which is composed of agreed-upon amendments by both sides, equally divided by both sides of the aisle, both Republican and Democratic. There are some important amendments, so I hope we are able to get approval of at least some of them prior to the votes that I believe will be scheduled for this afternoon in order to conclude debate and consideration of the Defense authorization act.

As we enter the final throes—and there are Members on the other side of the aisle and maybe even on this side of the aisle who are deeply concerned about the OCO funding for this authorization—I repeat again to my colleagues, I don't like the use of OCO. I would like to follow the advice of every one of our military leaders who say that continued sequestration puts the lives of the men and women who are serving in the military in greater danger. I am not sure we have a greater obligation than to do everything possible to prevent the lives of our men and women serving in uniform from being put in greater danger. To get hung up on the method of funding, which many will use as a rationale for opposing this bill, seems to me an upside down set of priorities—badly upside down.

If we don't fund, if we don't authorize, if we don't make possible for us to equip and train and retain the finest military force in the world, why is it a higher priority to object to the method of funding? As I said, in a perfect world, I would argue vigorously—and have continued to—about the harmful effects of sequestration.

I am not talking about a political opinion. I am talking about the view of the uniformed leaders of our Nation who have the respect and admiration of all of us. They are telling us that if we continue sequestration, which would be the effect of not including the additional funding of the overseas contingency operations, then obviously in this world that becomes more and more dangerous as we speak—and I continue to quote probably the most respected man in America, in many respects, Henry Kissinger, who testified before our committee that he has never seen more crises around the world since World War II, as is the case today.

I would entreat my colleagues who may be contemplating voting against this legislation on the grounds that the funding is a disqualifying factor—it is a troubling factor and it is troubling to me—but shouldn't we care more about the men and women who are serving in the military than the problem you might have with a certain process that was followed in order to get there? I would think not.

If you look at the world in 2011, when the unthinkable happened; that is, that sequestration automatically kicked in because both sides were unable to agree on a process that would reduce the deficit and put us on a path to a balanced budget. Everyone said sequestration will not happen because they will come to an agreement. Obviously, sequestration did happen. But if you look at the world in the year of 2011, when sequestration kicked in, and the world today, I think—I think—there is a compelling argument that national security and national defense is far more important than it was then. Because of a series of events that began in 2011—including an incredibly misguided decision by the President of the United States to withdraw all forces from Iraq, which then, inevitably, as some of us predicted, led to the situation as it exists today—the world is now and the Middle East is now literally on fire.

What are the results of the misguided policies and the commitment on the part of the President to get us out of wars? The President ignored one reality; that is, that we may get Americans out of wars, but that doesn't mean the wars are over. What we have seen is the spread of ISIS. We have seen Iran on the move in nations throughout the region, including the latest information we have that Iran is supplying weapons to the Taliban in Afghanistan, not to mention Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and Lebanon, where they are basically in control. Our Sunni Arab—Middle Eastern Arab nations are now going their own way because they have no confidence in the United States.

What has been the result? All you have to do is pick up this morning's copy of the Washington Post. "Refugee crisis hits tipping point. U.N. ranks 2014 as worst year on record, cites dire need for aid."

London—The number of people uprooted from their homes by war and persecution in 2014 was larger than in any year since detailed record-keeping began, according to a comprehensive report released early Thursday by the U.N. refugee agency that will add to the evidence of a global exodus unlike any in modern times.

Just a year after the number of refugees, asylum-seekers and people forced to flee within their own countries surpassed 50 million for the first time since World War II, it surged to nearly 60 million in 2014—“a nation of the displaced” that is roughly equal to the population of the United Kingdom.

The rapidly escalating figures reflect a world of renewed conflict, with wars in the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Europe driving families and individuals from their homes in desperate flights for safety. But the systems for managing those flows are breaking down, with countries and aid agencies unable to handle the strain as an average of nearly 45,000 people a day join the ranks of the displaced.

I urge my colleagues to understand two things: One, a lot of these things didn't have to happen. The absence of American leadership and involvement is largely responsible for a great deal of this. Second of all, it is of vital importance, in my view, given the situation throughout the world, that we pass the Defense authorization bill, reconcile our differences with the legislation with the House and the administration, and take into account that this is probably the greatest piece of reform legislation in recent history, perhaps in the last 30 years, since the then-well-known Goldwater-Nichols Act was passed.

In Reuters today, it says: “World's displaced hits record high of 60 million, half of them children.”

Of the 60 million people who are displaced, half of them are children. They are the ones who always suffer the most.

The article says:

... at the end of last year, the highest ever recorded number, the U.N. refugee agency said on Thursday.

More than half the displaced from crises including Syria, Afghanistan and Somalia were children, UNHCR said in its Annual Global Trends Report.

In 2014, an average of 42,500 people became refugees, asylum seekers, or internally displaced every day, representing a four-fold increase in just four years.

In 4 years, there was a fourfold increase in the number of refugees. Again, that is not an accident.

“We are witnessing a paradigm change, an unchecked slide into an era in which the scale of global forced displacement as well as the response required is now clearly dwarfing anything seen before,” said U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees Antonio Guterres in a statement.

UNHCR said Syria, where conflict has raged since 2011, was the world's biggest source of internally displaced people and refugees.

There were 7.6 million displaced people in Syria by the end of last year and almost 4 million Syrian refugees, mainly living in the neighboring countries of Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey.

For the information of my colleagues, there are now more Syrian children in school in Lebanon than there are Lebanese children in school in Lebanon.

UNHCR said there were 38.2 million displaced by conflict within national borders, almost five million more than a year before, with wars in Ukraine, South Sudan, Nigeria, Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo swelling the figures.

It also noted that more than 1.6 million people sought political asylum in a foreign country last year, a jump of more than 50 percent compared to the previous year—largely due to the 270,000 Ukrainians who submitted asylum claims in Russia.

While many conflicts have erupted or reignited in the past five years, few have been conclusively resolved. Just 126,800 refugees were able to return home in 2014, the lowest number in 31 years, UNHCR said.

I say to my colleagues, I have been to refugee camps, and I have seen the suffering and pain and the hopelessness there. I was taken around by a teacher at a refugee camp where there were about 175,000 people, as I recall, in Jordan, and there were a large number of children around in this camp.

The teacher said to me: Senator MCCAIN, do you see all of these children here?

I said: Yes, I do.

She said: They believe you Americans have abandoned them, and when they grow up, they are going to take revenge on you.

My friends, we are sowing the wind, and we will reap the whirlwind. It is time that the United States assumed again a leadership role in the world.

Now many of the critics who call me “Defense Hawk” MCCAIN—I am not sure why the opponents are not called “Defense Doves,” fill in the blank—seem to believe I am advocating that a large number of American troops be dispatched to the region. I am not, but I am saying we should listen to the successful military leaders who succeeded in the surge in Iraq and to a large degree succeeded in Afghanistan. I am speaking of General Petraeus, General Keane, and Admiral McRaven. There are a number of people, both military and civilian, we should listen to. Ryan Crocker, to me, is the most respected member of the diplomatic corps I have ever seen. Those people ought to be brought together and asked for their views to see if we can develop a strategy—a strategy, by the way, which the President of the United States just a few days ago stated is nonexistent. They should be called, and we need to develop a strategy. There is no strategy. If we had a strategy—and these numbers of a record high of the world's displaced of 60 million people, half of them children—perhaps we could turn this situation around.

No one believes we are winning in the struggle against ISIS. We are at the negotiating table in various luxuriant hotels and resorts in Europe, negotiating

with the Iranians over a nuclear deal while they are moving and controlling four nations, and the latest, of course, is that they are supplying weapons to the Taliban.

We need to have a strategy that is inclusive, and we need to draw on the experience and knowledge from some of the most respected men we have in this country with a military, political, diplomatic, and economic background and come up with a strategy.

I will tell my colleagues there is no good answer. There is the least of bad options. But we have to exercise an option rather than run in place for the next year and a half until we have a new President of the United States.

This legislation is not going to solve those problems. This legislation has certain policy implications. This legislation does not achieve the goals I was just speaking about. But this legislation does do the things we need to do—we, as the people's elected representatives whose first obligation is the defense of this Nation. This legislation addresses many issues that will make our defense establishment more responsive, more responsible, more efficient, and most of all will provide the equipment and the capabilities for the men and women who are serving in the military, many of them still in harm's way, so that they can defend this Nation. Anybody who believes ISIS would be content to remain in the Middle East and not export that terror to the United States of America has not listened to the Director of the CIA, the head of the FBI, and every other military expert. ISIS is bent on harming America.

When Mr. Baghdadi left Camp Bucca, where he spent 4 years—Mr. Baghdadi, obviously, as we know, is the leader of ISIS. He spent 4 years at Camp Bucca in Iraq. When he left, he said: I will see you in New York. Mr. Baghdadi wasn't kidding. ISIS is bent on attacking us. Can they destroy us? No. But the ability of ISIS to be able to launch some attacks on the United States of America grows every time there are thousands of young men and some young women who go to Syria and Iraq and are radicalized even more and return, sooner or later, to the country from which they came.

I ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle put aside the smaller differences we have. And there are differences with my colleagues on this side of the aisle concerning, for example, the sage-grouse and a number of other provisions in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to put aside those differences—and in the view of many, there are significant differences—and vote in favor of this legislation and send a message that at least on the issue of defending the Nation, we will provide the men and women who are putting their lives on the line on our behalf the best possible

capabilities we can possibly provide for them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Refugee crisis hits tipping point" in the Washington Post this morning be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 2015]
REFUGEE CRISIS HITS TIPPING POINT
(By Griff Witte)

LONDON.—The number of people uprooted from their homes by war and persecution in 2014 was larger than in any year since detailed record-keeping began, according to a comprehensive report released early Thursday by the U.N. refugee agency that will add to the evidence of a global exodus unlike any in modern times.

Just a year after the number of refugees, asylum-seekers and people forced to flee within their own countries surpassed 50 million for the first time since World War II, it surged to nearly 60 million in 2014—"a nation of the displaced" that is roughly equal to the population of the United Kingdom.

The rapidly escalating figures reflect a world of renewed conflict, with wars in the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Europe driving families and individuals from their homes in desperate flights for safety. But the systems for managing those flows are breaking down, with countries and aid agencies unable to handle the strain as an average of nearly 45,000 people a day join the ranks of those either on the move or stranded far from home.

"We are witnessing a paradigm change, an unchecked slide into an era in which the scale of global forced displacement as well as the response required is now clearly dwarfing anything seen before," U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres said in a statement. "It is terrifying that on the one hand there is more and more impunity for those starting conflicts, and on the other there is seeming utter inability of the international community to work together to stop wars and build and preserve peace."

The annual report on global trends in displacement, issued by the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, or UNHCR, offers perhaps the most authoritative look at who is being uprooted by conflict, where they come from and where they go. The agency, created in 1950 to support Europeans displaced by World War II, said the figures for 2014 were higher than it has ever recorded.

The overall number, which does not include those displaced by natural disasters or economic migrants in search of a better life, had been relatively stable, at around 40 million, since the start of the 21st century.

But it abruptly shot up in 2013, and the pace accelerated last year. Although the report does not cover 2015, there is no indication that the trajectory has changed.

The four-year-old war in Syria has been the single biggest driver of the surging numbers. Last year, 1 in 5 displaced persons worldwide was Syrian. The country in 2014 became the planet's largest source of refugees, displacing Afghanistan, which had held that dubious distinction for three decades.

The impact of a Syrian population on the move has been felt across the Middle East. Neighboring Turkey now hosts more refugees than any other nation, knocking Pakistan to No. 2. Lebanon has the world's highest concentration, at nearly a quarter of those living in the tiny Mediterranean nation.

The vast majority of refugees last year were hosted by poor countries that can least afford the added strain. Nearly 9 out of 10 refugees were living in the developing world—a figure that hit a two-decade high.

Meanwhile, with nations across the developing world either at war or in crisis, some of the world's wealthiest nations have focused on how to beat back the rising tide of those seeking escape.

France and Austria have stepped up police checks at crossings with Italy, leaving migrants to camp out at train stations in Rome and Milan. Hungary on Wednesday announced plans to build a 12-foot fence along its border with Serbia. Nations across Europe have balked at proposals to more equitably share the burden of asylum-seekers while rushing to approve plans to blow up smuggler ships in the Mediterranean.

The tough response has been largely due to political pressure among populations hostile to the influx of migrants. But it prompted Pope Francis on Wednesday to suggest that those "who close the door" to migrants seeking protection should ask forgiveness from God.

The UNHCR and other aid groups have pleaded for more assistance to keep pace with the ever-growing numbers, but to little avail.

"There's a real risk that we're seeing the unraveling of the refugee regime that was created in the aftermath of the Second World War on the basis of cooperation and reciprocity," said Alexander Betts, director of the Refugee Studies Center at Oxford University.

Betts said that unlike during other conflicts, including those in Southeast Asia, the Balkans and Central America, governments are not stepping up to offer assistance commensurate with the scale of a problem that now touches virtually every corner of the globe.

"This isn't a regional problem," he said. "It's a global challenge."

The UNHCR's report identifies at least 15 wars across three continents that have either erupted or reignited in the past five years, and that together have forced millions to abandon their homes. A total of 13.9 million people were displaced in 2014 alone.

About a third of those were in sub-Saharan Africa, where wars in the Central African Republic, South Sudan, Somalia, Nigeria and Congo all flared. Somalia alone is the source of more than a million refugees, the world's third-highest total.

Europe experienced the biggest proportional increase in displaced persons last year, with a staggering 51 percent increase over 2013.

While much of that was due to Syrian refugees streaming into Turkey, it also reflected the 219,000 people who entered the continent via the perilous journey across the Mediterranean. And as Russian-backed rebels brought war back to European soil, more than 800,000 people were left internally displaced in Ukraine. About 200,000 Ukrainians applied for asylum in Russia.

Worldwide, the number of internally displaced people vastly outstripped the number of refugees. Once people fled their home countries, they had little hope of returning. Just 126,800 refugees went back to their home countries in 2014 out of a global refugee population of 14.4 million. That marked the lowest level of return since 1983.

Mr. MCCAIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would note for my colleagues the presence of General Dunford, Commandant of the Marine Corps, a great combat leader and leader of our military and considered to be the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a man we all admire a great deal.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, like many have said here today, I would like to express my deepest condolences to the victims of the shooting at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, SC, last night. This was a senseless act of violence. My thoughts and prayers are with the victims, their families, and all affected by this horrible tragedy.

I know we all hope the perpetrator is swiftly brought to justice. I pray for the safety of the entire Charleston community. This was an act of senseless violence, to be sure. But as I understand it, the perpetrator saved one woman and told her: "I want you to tell everyone what happened here." That is beyond sinister. That is evil. That evil must be stopped and must be dealt with.

OBAMACARE

What I would like to talk about now is the Supreme Court's critical ruling on the most recent review of the Affordable Care Act—Obamacare. It is important to highlight many of the ways this law is negatively impacting our health care system as a whole, my constituents in Kansas, the Presiding Officer's constituents in her neighboring State of Nebraska—all over the country.

Trying to list all of the problems with this law is nearly impossible. Perhaps the best way is to review the promises of the President of the United States. The crafting of this law was supposed to follow his promise of being the most transparent administration in history. The problem is that there has been a lack of transparency—not to mention the oversight of this law since it was originally being crafted and throughout its implementation.

Despite hearing the contrary from our docs and nurses about practices

and hospitals closing and premiums and copays increasing, the administration continues to turn a blind eye. The administration continually moves the goal posts to which they measure success and have claimed victory.

In 2012, the Congressional Budget Office projected there would be 14 million people enrolled in exchange plans this year. Then late last year, the administration back-pedaled on its projections for the second year of enrollment, moving the goal posts. The most recent data out of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the infamous CMS, shows that when you look at how many individuals had effectual coverage or actually paid their first month's premium and continued to have an active policy, that number is 10 million. Madam President, that is nearly 30 percent below the 2012 enrollment projections—30 percent. That is not transparency. That is not victory.

So why is this number lower? Why aren't folks signing up? First, we had a Web site that crashed and that didn't work. Then Americans tried to shop around and view the policies available to them. But as it turns out, the law didn't lower premiums for the average family by \$2,500—remember that promise—as the President promised. This didn't happen. Premiums are increasing.

The President also promised you could keep your same health care plan and your doctor. We have known for some time that is just not true. It didn't happen.

Yet just last week the President responded to questions regarding his signature law—his legacy law, if you will—at a press conference following the G-7 summit. He said: "The thing is working." Now, one might add that the "thing" is a pretty good term for the Affordable Care Act.

The President also said: "I mean, part of what's bizarre about this whole thing is we haven't had a lot of conversation about the horrors of ObamaCare because none of them have really come to pass."

Really?

President Obama concluded: "It hasn't had an adverse effect on people who already had health insurance."

Well, I am not sure what data has been presented to the President or which American family he has been listening to, but it is certainly not the reality that I have experienced and that Kansans are experiencing. The real-life threats of this law we hear from Kansans back home have not stopped. They are increasing.

A small business owner in Cummings, KS, called my office to inform me his premium this year went up over \$500 a month—more than double last year's.

Eddy, in Spring Hill, says his premium has doubled and his deductible has doubled. He is being forced to choose between running his company

and buying health insurance. He says he can't do both.

Let's go back to the President's comments about this "thing" having no adverse effect. Just a couple of weeks ago his own administration published the proposed double-digit—double-digit—premium increases for 2016—next year. The plans on the list affect more than 6 million people across the country and are seeking an average increase of 21 percent.

The Kansas Insurance Department tells us that premiums for some individual and small group health care plans are likely to increase by as much as 38 percent.

According to the administration's list, 14 insurance plans are seeking premium increases above 10 percent for next year. That covers 100,000 Kansans. When you look at just two insurance plans, those two insurance plans have increases of 28 and 38 percent. Perhaps the President does not categorize these 100,000 Kansans as being adversely affected by this "thing."

Simply put, premiums will continue to spiral upward if we do not act. Facts and reality are really very stubborn things. Even ObamaCare's chief architect, Jonathan Gruber—we all remember Jonathan Gruber—was quoted last year as saying if "you made it explicit that healthy people pay in and sick people get money, it would not have passed. Lack of transparency is a huge political advantage." So said Mr. Gruber.

Still quoting Mr. Gruber: "And basically, call it the stupidity of the American voter or whatever, but basically that really was really, really critical for the thing to pass." That is his quote.

Those comments belittle the American people and try to rationalize why, when you have an agenda, the government should not be transparent. The President and proponents of ObamaCare all said publicly this was the first step to nationalized health insurance. That certainly has become transparent.

Now, not only are individuals adversely affected in terms of their own insurance coverage, but also due to the law's mandate on employers, many are seeing the law's negative repercussions at their jobs. The law's employer mandate hinders job creation and growth. Its new definition of full-time employment at 30 hours a week has been a real problem. According to one estimate, 2.6 million workers—2.6 million workers—could potentially have their hours and therefore their paychecks reduced as a result of this provision.

Most concerning is that this new definition of full-time employment hits low-wage earners who work in the service industries. Of the individuals at risk, about half work in retail and half in restaurants. If these folks were previously working the traditional 40

hours per week, you are not just taking 10 hours from them, but you are reducing their paycheck by 25 percent a week. That is why they work in two different jobs. That is a very noticeable adverse effect.

The concerns I have outlined today are only a few of the many reasons why we need to repeal this law, both the individual and employer mandates. We need to fix health care. Everybody knows that. But we don't need to fix ObamaCare. We need to give peace of mind to the families hurt by ObamaCare.

Now, no one is saying go back to the system we had before. We need reforms to our health care system every day. ObamaCare is costing millions of dollars. But with this law—what the President has called "this thing"—we may have mandated greater coverage for all but not access to care and at a cost that is unaffordable. Let me repeat that. We may have mandated greater coverage for all—if that was the goal of my friends across the aisle—but not access to care and at a cost that is unaffordable. That is not a health care plan.

Perhaps some can afford the rising premiums, but can you actually go see your doctor and receive treatment or is your deductible too high? And is your doctor still available to you? Will your doctor spend at least 5 minutes with you—5 minutes with you—or more time filling out forms or electronic medical records? And are those records secure?

Any day now the Supreme Court will hand down its decision in *King v. Burwell*. This is the case that will determine the legality of the administration's regulation extending health insurance subsidies to people in States that use the Federal insurance exchange. And we will see—we will see—if the Court decides that the law should be implemented as written by this Congress—with all of us on this side of the aisle voting no—or implemented as interpreted by the administration.

This is similarly troubling for Kansas, where we have a federally facilitated exchange. If these tax subsidies go away, 77,000 Kansans and millions of Americans, will be affected. These individuals would be confronted with ObamaCare's true cost—true cost—and would face much higher premiums, with only the administration to blame for recklessly offering tens of billions of dollars in subsidies they had no authority to offer, if the Court rules that way.

A ruling against the administration would also free many of these Kansans from the individual mandate penalty if that coverage is too expensive for them and they, therefore, would qualify for an affordability exemption.

The employer mandate penalties would also be unenforceable. Employers can then add employees above the

50 threshold without fear of penalty and increase workers' hours to more than 30 hours per week.

If the Court invalidates the subsidies, we will be ready. We will be ready on this side of the aisle with our solutions to help mitigate the pain for those individuals harmed by the administration and provide States greater flexibility and build a bridge away from ObamaCare.

However the Court rules, I know that I and everybody on this side of the aisle will continue fighting to repeal this harmful law and replace it with true health care reforms that lower costs, lift the burden on our job creators, and restore the all-important relationship between a doctor and a patient.

The test to fix health care, not ObamaCare, is coming soon. Let's fix health care.

I yield the floor.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, on June 4, I was not present to vote on Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN's amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2016, amendment No. 1494 to H.R. 1735. I would have voted against this measure.

Madam President, as well, had I been present for the vote on amendment No. 1889, I would have voted no on this amendment. I do not support telegraphing to the enemy what interrogation techniques we will or won't use and denying future Commanders in Chief and intelligence professionals important tools for protecting the American people and the U.S. homeland.

MARITIME PARTNER CAPACITY BUILDING EFFORTS IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, in the interests of moving the defense bill forward I withdraw my amendments, Nos. 2038 and 2056.

These amendments were intended address a set of issues where I share a concern with the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee that the U.S. needs to make additional concerted effort and provide additional focus to our maritime partner capacity building efforts in the Asia-Pacific region. Indeed, the chairman included a significant provision in this bill for a South China Sea initiative which I support. My efforts were intended to compliment the work of the chairman and assure that we have a fully articulated and whole-of-government approach to this issue, with both the Department of Defense and the Department of State fully and appropriately engaged.

The chairman and I have had some positive discussions on this issue in recent days, and I have received his assurances that my concerns will be addressed as this legislation moves forward. And I also intend to make sure that other aspects of this issue are addressed in legislation that the Foreign

Relations Committee will take up, and where I look to the chairman for his partnership and continued leadership on this issue.

With those assurances—and given the deep and shared commitment the chairman and I have on this issue—I do not see a need to press forward for a vote on my amendments at this time.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his consideration. I can assure him that we share a common set of concerns and common set of goals on this issue. We have discussed a pathway forward that addresses the questions raised by his proposed amendments, and I look forward to working with him going forward. And I very much look forward to continuing to work with him on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise today to thank colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the debate and votes we will be casting today on the National Defense Authorization Act. We have come together in a bipartisan fashion, and we have spent significant time in committee and now on the floor to deal with countless provisions. This act is nothing if not detailed with countless provisions that are critical to the defense of the Nation.

We have a long tradition of bipartisanship in this body on the NDAA. The Senate passes an NDAA in one form or another every year, and that can't be said about any other piece of legislation. I want to congratulate the new chairman, Senator MCCAIN, and the new ranking member, Senator REED, and I want to congratulate my colleagues who serve together on the committee, including our Presiding Officer, and also all of our staff, both our personal staff and committee staff—I see some committee staff here—because this is a significant amount of work.

There are many important provisions in the NDAA that affect our national security, and my Commonwealth of Virginia is deeply connected to the American military. In addition to grand items, the NDAA also examines in some excruciating detail some very, very fine points.

Just to give a few examples, the NDAA includes a provision dealing with storage facilities that are needed to help us combat rust on military vehicles, the transmission systems that are used in some army land vehicles, the reflective markings and lights that are used on military air fields, one particular military barracks that has sewage, mold, hot water, and rodent problems, and we even deal in the NDAA with some details of West Point's football program—some of the athletic programs at West Point.

But after all this minute analysis and debate and discussion over the past weeks, both in committee and on the floor, I do notice something a little bit

strange. While Congress is very willing to debate and vote on all things great and small concerning our military, there is one thing we don't want to debate or vote on—whether the United States should be at war, whether we should be at war with ISIL. We will vote on shipbuilding, we will vote on military pensions, we will vote on vehicle rust, and we will vote on barracks mold. But we don't want to vote on whether the Nation should be at war.

I proposed an amendment to the NDAA with Senator FLAKE and Senator MANCHIN expressing the sense of the Senate that we should have an authorization debate about whether we should be at war with ISIL, and the amendment that I proposed was ruled nongermane—so barracks mold, yes; vehicle rust, yes; the athletic programs at West Point, yes; whether we should be at war, nongermane to the Defense authorization act.

Interestingly, we even took a vote on the floor of the Senate in the NDAA about whether we should arm the Kurds in a war that Congress has not authorized that we could debate and vote on; but whether we should be at war we have not debated and voted upon.

So I went back and looked at article I of the Constitution. I found that there is no requirement that Congress vote on barracks mold or rust prevention or military airfield lighting. Certainly we can and should take up those matters because each of those matters—even if they just affect one barracks or one airfield—is about the safety of our troops and military personnel. Of course we should take them up. But there is nothing in the Constitution that requires that we take them up and debate and vote on them. But we are required to debate and vote to authorize war. Article I, section 8, clearly declares that Congress shall have the power to declare war—not the President; Congress. Yet, on this item, on this large item, on this largest of items, we are unwilling to debate and vote.

The war against ISIL is now in its 11th month; more than 3,500 U.S. airstrikes, more than 3,000 U.S. forces now in Iraq. U.S. servicemembers and American hostages have lost their lives in the battle against ISIL. The cost of the war to the American taxpayer is now more than \$2.5 billion—an average cost of \$9 million a day. The ISIL threat is spreading, the mission expanding.

In response to ISIL advances in the Anbar Province, the administration recently announced that an additional 450 trainers would be deployed to train and support Iraqi security forces.

So my question as a strong supporter of the NDAA is a simple one: How much longer will we allow war to be waged without Congress even being willing to have a debate about the

strategy and scope of the mission? How much longer will we keep asking servicemembers to risk their lives without Congress doing the basic job of authorizing this war?

U.S. airstrikes started on August 8—313 days ago. Let me put this in a historic perspective. The 1-year anniversary of this war is approaching quickly. Congressional inaction on it is already of historic proportions.

World War I: It took President Wilson 33 days to bring an authorization to Congress. Congress acted in 4 days.

World War II: It took President Roosevelt 1 day to bring a request to Congress. Congress acted on the same day.

The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution: President Johnson brought a resolution to Congress within 3 days. Congress acted 5 days thereafter.

The invasion of Kuwait in gulf war 1: It took 160 days for the President to bring an authorization to Congress, but Congress acted within 4 days in approving an authorization.

The 9/11 attacks: President Bush came the same day to Congress. It took 3 days for Congress to act.

In this war against ISIL, it took the President nearly 6 months to bring an authorization to Congress, and it is now more than 4 months since that happened—313 days—and Congress has said virtually nothing.

I appreciate that Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN have made a recent commitment to discuss an ISIL authorization in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which is the committee of jurisdiction. I understand that. Senator FLAKE and I have introduced a bipartisan proposal to show that there is bipartisan support for this mission, and we have been pushing to have the matter heard.

Yesterday, in a debate on the House floor, the chairman of the HASC committee stated plainly that it is time that we “ought to have a real AUMF debate.”

So I am here to support the NDAA and the good work our chair and ranking member and all the members have done. But I am here to point out that on day 313, if we are willing to deal with important, narrow, small issues, we should be finally willing to address the most important issue we have before us. I challenge my colleagues to do this and to bring the same amount of attention and bipartisanship to debating whether we should send American troops to war as we are willing to apply to barracks mold and vehicle rust.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, with the bill managers' permission, I

ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I know the bill managers are working on a final agreement, and I would defer to them at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1974, AS MODIFIED; 2030; 1472, AS MODIFIED; 1890; 1705; 1720; 1708; 1908; 1678; 1811; 1825; 2020; 2050, AS MODIFIED; 1474; 1901; 1902; 1563; 1703; 1944, AS MODIFIED; 1747; 2006; 1931; 2011; AND 1916 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, the ranking member and I have a small package of amendments that have been cleared by both sides.

Notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII and adoption of the McCain substitute, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up and agreed to en bloc: McCain No. 1974, as modified; Murkowski No. 2030; Vitter No. 1472, as modified; Daines No. 1890; Coats No. 1705; Flake No. 1720; Gardner No. 1708; Enzi No. 1908; Paul No. 1678; Hatch No. 1811; Fischer No. 1825; King No. 2020; Menendez No. 2050, as modified; Coons No. 1474; Murphy No. 1901; Warren No. 1902; Blumenthal No. 1563; Durbin No. 1703; Tester No. 1944, as modified; Casey No. 1747; Schatz No. 2006; Leahy No. 1931; Ayotte No. 2011; and Bennet No. 1916.

These have been agreed to by both sides, and I thank all Members for the agreement of this package. I am sorry it is not larger, but it is equally divided between both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up and agreed to en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1974, as modified; 2030; 1472, as modified; 1890; 1705; 1720; 1708; 1908; 1678; 1811; 1825; 2020; 2050, as modified; 1474; 1901; 1902; 1563; 1703; 1944, as modified; 1747; 2006; 1931; 2011; and 1916) agreed to en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1974, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on the security and protection of Iranian dissidents living in Camp Liberty, Iraq)

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE SECURITY AND PROTECTION OF IRANIAN DISSIDENTS LIVING IN CAMP LIBERTY, IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The residents of Camp Liberty, Iraq, renounced violence and unilaterally disarmed more than a decade ago.

(2) The United States recognized the residents of the former Camp Ashraf who now reside in Camp Liberty as “protected persons” under the Fourth Geneva Convention and committed itself to protect the residents.

(3) The deterioration in the overall security situation in Iraq has increased the vulnerability of Camp Liberty residents to attacks from proxies of the Iranian Revolu-

tionary Guards Corps and Sunni extremists associated with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(4) The increased vulnerability underscores the need for an expedited relocation process and that these Iranian dissidents will neither be safe nor secure in Camp Liberty.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) take prompt and appropriate steps in accordance with international agreements to promote the physical security and protection of Camp Liberty residents;

(2) urge the Government of Iraq to uphold its commitments to the United States to ensure the safety and well-being of those living in Camp Liberty;

(3) urge the Government of Iraq to ensure continued and reliable access to food, clean water, medical assistance, electricity and other energy needs, and any other equipment and supplies necessary to sustain the residents during periods of attack or siege by external forces;

(4) oppose the extradition of Camp Liberty residents to Iran;

(5) implement a strategy to provide for the safe, secure, and permanent relocation of Camp Liberty residents that includes a relocation plan, including a detailed outline of the steps that would need to be taken by recipient countries, the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and Camp residents to relocate the residents to other countries;

(6) encourage continued close cooperation between the residents of Camp Liberty and the authorities in the relocation process; and

(7) assist the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in expediting the ongoing resettlement of all residents of Camp Liberty to safe locations outside Iraq.

AMENDMENT NO. 2030

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on the coordination of hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities on military land)

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COORDINATION OF HUNTING, FISHING, AND OTHER RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES ON MILITARY LAND.

It is the sense of Congress that, in situations where military lands are open to public access for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities, the Department of Defense should seek to ensure that coordination with State fish and wildlife managers, tribes, and local governments occurs sufficiently in advance of traditional hunting, fishing, and recreational use seasons to facilitate communication with hunting, fishing, and recreational user groups.

AMENDMENT NO. 1472, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To exclude AbilityOne goods from the authority to acquire goods and services manufactured in Afghanistan, central Asian states, and Djibouti)

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. EXCEPTION FOR ABILITYONE GOODS FROM AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE GOODS AND SERVICES MANUFACTURED IN AFGHANISTAN AND CENTRAL ASIAN STATES.

(a) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN ITEMS NOT MANUFACTURED IN AFGHANISTAN.—Section 886 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (d),” after “subsection (b),”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **EXCLUSION OF ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT CATALOG.**—The authority under subsection (a) of this section shall not be available for the procurement of any good that is contained in the procurement catalog described in section 8503(a) of title 41 in Afghanistan if such good can be produced and delivered by a qualified non-profit agency for the blind or a nonprofit agency for other severely disabled in a timely fashion to support mission requirements.”.

(b) **EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN ITEMS NOT MANUFACTURED IN CENTRAL ASIAN STATES.**—Section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2399) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (h),” after “subsection (b),”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) **EXCLUSION OF ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT CATALOG.**—The authority under subsection (a) shall not be available for the procurement of any good that is contained in the procurement catalog described in section 8503(a) of title 41 if such good can be produced and delivered by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or a nonprofit agency for other severely disabled in a timely fashion to support mission requirements.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1890

(Purpose: To modify the immediate applicability of basic allowance for housing for married members assigned for duty within normal commuting distance)

On page 213, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(3) **PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BAH FOR CERTAIN OTHER MARRIED MEMBERS.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the amount of basic allowance for housing payable to a member of the uniformed services under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, shall not be reduced by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) unless—

(A) the member and the member's spouse undergo a permanent change of station requiring a change of residence;

(B) the member and the member's spouse move into or commence living in on-base housing; or

AMENDMENT NO. 1705

(Purpose: To provide for military exchanges between senior officers and officials of the United States and Taiwan)

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. MILITARY EXCHANGES BETWEEN SENIOR OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense should carry out a program of exchanges of senior military officers and senior officials between the United States and Taiwan designed to improve military to military relations between the United States and Taiwan.

(b) **EXCHANGES DESCRIBED.**—For the purposes of this section, an exchange is an activity, exercise, event, or observation opportunity between members of the Armed Forces and officials of the Department of Defense, on the one hand, and armed forces personnel and officials of Taiwan, on the other hand.

(c) **FOCUS OF EXCHANGES.**—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focused on the following:

- (1) Threat analysis.
- (2) Military doctrine.
- (3) Force planning.
- (4) Logistical support.
- (5) Intelligence collection and analysis.
- (6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.
- (7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

(d) **CIVIL-MILITARY AFFAIRS.**—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include activities and exercises focused on civil-military relations, including parliamentary relations.

(e) **LOCATION OF EXCHANGES.**—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall be conducted in both the United States and Taiwan.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “senior military officer”, with respect to the Armed Forces, means a general or flag officer of the Armed Forces on active duty.

(2) The term “senior official”, with respect to the Department of Defense, means a civilian official of the Department of Defense at the level of Assistant Secretary of Defense or above.

AMENDMENT NO. 1720

(Purpose: To authorize transportation to transfer ceremonies for the family and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who die overseas during humanitarian operations)

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. TRANSPORTATION TO TRANSFER CEREMONIES FOR FAMILY AND NEXT OF KIN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO DIE OVERSEAS DURING HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS.

Section 481f(e)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting “(including during a humanitarian relief operation)” after “located or serving overseas”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1708

(Purpose: To require a strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region)

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. STRATEGY TO PROMOTE UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) **STRATEGY.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall develop an overall strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. Such strategy shall be informed by the following:

(1) The national security strategy of the United States for 2015 set forth in the national security strategy report required under section 108(a)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 5043(a)(3)), as such strategy relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(2) The 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(3) The 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(4) The strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region as contained in the report required by section 1251(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3570).

(5) The integrated, multi-year planning and budget strategy for a rebalancing of

United States policy in Asia submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7043(a) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76)).

(b) **PRESIDENTIAL POLICY DIRECTIVE.**—The President shall issue a Presidential Policy Directive to appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government that contains the strategy developed under subsection (a) and includes implementing guidance to such departments and agencies.

(c) **RELATION TO AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS AND ANNUAL BUDGET.**—

(1) **AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS.**—In identifying agency priority goals under section 1120(b) of title 31, United States Code, for each appropriate department and agency of the United States Government, the head of such department or agency, or as otherwise determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall take into consideration the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

(2) **ANNUAL BUDGET.**—The President shall, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, ensure that the annual budget submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, includes a separate section that clearly highlights programs and projects that are being funded in the annual budget that relate to the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 1908

(Purpose: To provide for a small business procurement ombudsman)

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT OMBUDSMAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The small business offices in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military departments shall serve as intermediaries between small businesses and contracting officials prior to the award of contracts in cases where a small business prospective contractor notifies the small business office that it has reason to believe that the contracting process has been modified to preclude a small business from bidding on the contract or would give another contractor an unfair competitive advantage.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude a contractor from exercising the right to initiate a bid protest under a contract.

AMENDMENT NO. 1678

(Purpose: To provide for the more accurate and complete enumeration of members of the Armed Forces in any tabulation of total population by the Secretary of Commerce)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . IMPROVED ENUMERATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN ANY TABULATION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) Effective beginning with the 2020 decennial census of population, in taking any tabulation of total population by States, the Secretary shall take appropriate measures to

ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that all members of the Armed Forces deployed abroad on the date of taking such tabulation are—

“(1) fully and accurately counted; and
“(2) properly attributed to the State in which their permanent duty station or homeport is located on such date.”

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not be construed to affect the residency status of any member of the Armed Forces under any provision of law other than title 13, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 1811

(Purpose: To provide for sustainment enhancement)

On page 375, line 4, insert “, which includes a sustainment strategy,” after “strategy”.

On page 377, line 13, strike “(d) In this section” and insert the following:

“(9) A sustainment strategy which includes all aspects of the total life cycle management of the weapon system, including product support, logistics, product support engineering, supply chain integration, maintenance, acquisition logistics, and all aspects of software sustainment.

“(d) INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATE.—The Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation shall perform an evaluation of the sustainment portion of the acquisition strategy required by subsection (c)(9) prior to the Milestone B decision.

“(e) In this section

On page 410, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 852. SUSTAINMENT ENHANCEMENT.

(a) ASSESSMENT EXPANSION OF FUNCTIONS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR LOGISTICS AND MATERIEL READINESS TO INCLUDE SUSTAINMENT FUNCTIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of—

(1) assigning to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness—

(A) functions relating to the sustainment strategy required under section 2431a(c)(9) of Title 10, United States Code, as added by section 841 of this Act; and

(B) functions relating to manufacturing and industrial base policy currently being carried out within the Office of the Secretary of Defense; and

(2) redesignating such Assistant Secretary (with such functions so assigned and together with the current logistics and materiel readiness functions of such Assistant Secretary) as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Department of Defense does not place sufficient emphasis on sustainment of a weapon system during the entire acquisition process; and

(2) the Department of Defense should address this deficiency and ensure that all aspect of weapon system sustainment are carefully considered throughout the entire Integrated Defense Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics Life Cycle Management System.

AMENDMENT NO. 1825

(Purpose: To authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of June 8, 2015, under “Text of Amendments.”)

AMENDMENT NO. 2020

(Purpose: To demonstrate the effects of a method to facilitate the disposal of excess Army property and management of underutilized and unutilized property by providing an exemption from certain requirements for off-site use and off-site removal only of non-mobile properties)

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. EXEMPTION OF ARMY OFF-SITE USE AND OFF-SITE REMOVAL ONLY NON-MOBILE PROPERTIES FROM CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Excess or underutilized non-mobile property of the Army that is situated on non-excess land shall be exempt from the requirements of title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411 et seq.) upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that—

(1) the property is not feasible to relocate;
(2) the property is located in an area to which the general public is denied access in the interest of national security; and
(3) the exemption would facilitate the efficient disposal of excess property or result in more efficient real property management.

(b) CONSULTATION.—Before making an initial determination under the authority provided under subsection (a), and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of the Army shall consult with the Executive Director of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness on types of non-mobile properties that may be feasible for relocation and suitable to assist the homeless.

(b) SUNSET.—The authority under subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2017.

AMENDMENT NO. 2050, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To require a report on the security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus)

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1274. REPORT ON THE SECURITY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of ongoing military and security cooperation between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

(2) A discussion of potential steps for enhancing the bilateral security relationship between the United States and Cyprus, including steps to enhance the military and security capabilities of the Republic of Cyprus.

(3) An analysis of the effect on the bilateral security relationship of the United States policy to deny applications for licenses and other approvals for the export of defense articles and defense services to the armed forces of Cyprus.

(4) An analysis of the extent to which such United States policy is consistent with overall United States security and policy objectives in the region.

(5) An assessment of the potential impact of lifting such United States policy.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 1474

(Purpose: To propose an alternative to section 1204, relating to the National Guard State Partnership Program)

Strike section 1204 and insert the following:

SEC. 1204. PERMANENCE AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 897; 32 U.S.C. 107 note) is amended by adding at the end before the period the following: “to support the national interests and security cooperation goals and objectives of the United States, including applicable policy and guidelines for United States security sector assistance”.

(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting “that is not” after “an activity that the Secretary of Defense determines is a matter”.

(c) PROCEDURES.—Such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) PROCEDURES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall—

“(A) establish, maintain, and update as appropriate a list of core competencies to support each program established under subsection (a), collectively and for each State and territory, and shall submit for approval to the Secretary of Defense the list of core competencies and additional information needed to make use of such core competencies; and

“(B) designate a director for each State and territory who shall be responsible for the coordination of activities under a program established under subsection (a) for such State or territory and reporting on activities under the program.

“(2) MILITARY-TO-CIVILIAN CORE COMPETENCIES.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may conduct an activity under a program established under subsection (a) relating to military-to-civilian core competencies.”

(d) NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUND.—Subsection (e) of such section (as redesignated) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUND.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(i) BOOKS OF DOD.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary of Defense shall establish on the books of the Department of Defense a National Guard State Partnership Program Fund.

“(ii) BOOKS OF TREASURY.—If not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that in the opinion of the Secretary a fund such as the Fund described in clause (i) should be established on the books of the Department of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish on the books of the Treasury on that date a Fund to be known as the National Guard State Partnership Program Fund.

“(B) CREDITS.—In administering the Fund established under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall, to the extent the Secretary determines it to be appropriate, provide for the following amounts to be credited to the Fund:

“(i) Amounts authorized and appropriated to carry out operations under this section.

“(ii) Amounts that the Secretary of Defense transfers, in such amounts as provided in appropriations Acts, to the Fund from amounts authorized and appropriated to the Department of Defense, including amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard.

“(C) INCLUSION IN ANNUAL BUDGET.—The President shall include the Fund established under subparagraph (A) in the budget that the President submits to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year in which the authority under subsection (a) is in effect.”

(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (f) of such section (as redesignated) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by inserting “or other government organizations” after “and security forces”;

(2) in clause (iv), by adding at the end before the period the following: “and country”;

(3) in clause (v), by striking “training” and inserting “activities”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) An assessment of the extent to which the activities conducted during the previous year met the objectives described in clause (v).

“(vii) The list of core competencies required by subsection (c)(1) and any update to any changes to the list of core competencies required by subsection (c)(1).”

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (h) of such section (as redesignated) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) the congressional defense committees; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as amended) the following:

“(2) CORE COMPETENCIES.—The term ‘core competencies’ means military-to-military and military-to-civilian skills and capabilities of the National Guard, consistent with the roles and missions of the Armed Forces as established by the Secretary of Defense.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each of the several States and the District of Columbia.

“(5) TERRITORY.—The term ‘territory’ means the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.”.

(g) PERMANENT AUTHORITY.—Such section is further amended by striking subsection (i).

AMENDMENT NO. 1901

(Purpose: To require reporting on foreign procurements)

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. ANNUAL REPORT ON FOREIGN PROCUREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2338. Reporting on foreign purchases

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the end of fiscal year 2016, and each fis-

cal year thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional defense committees a report listing specific procurements by the Department of Defense in that fiscal year of articles, materials, or supplies valued greater than \$5,000,000, indexed to inflation, using the exception under section 8302(a)(2)(A) of title 41. This report may be submitted as part of the report required under section 8305 of such title.

“(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2337 the following new item:

“2338. Reporting on foreign purchases.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1902

(Purpose: To require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces)

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON GAMBLING AND PROBLEM GAMBLING BEHAVIOR AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on gaming facilities at military installations and problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) With respect to gaming facilities at military installations, disaggregated by each branch of the Armed Forces—

(A) the number, type, and location of such gaming facilities;

(B) the total amount of cash flow through such gaming facilities; and

(C) the amount of revenue generated by such gaming facilities for morale, welfare, and recreation programs of the Department of Defense.

(2) An assessment of the prevalence of and particular risks for problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces, including such recommendations for policies and programs to be carried out by the Department to address problem gambling as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) An assessment of the ability and capacity of military health care personnel to adequately diagnose and provide dedicated treatment for problem gambling, including—

(A) a comparison of treatment programs of the Department for alcohol abuse, illegal substance abuse, and tobacco addiction with treatment programs of the Department for problem gambling; and

(B) an assessment of whether additional training for military health care personnel on providing treatment for problem gambling would be beneficial.

(4) An assessment of the financial counseling and related services that are available to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents who are impacted by problem gambling.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the

appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 1563

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly submit to Congress a report on the implementation of new or updated electronic health records in certain environments)

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF DATA SECURITY AND TRANSMISSION STANDARDS FOR ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the standards for security and transmission of data to be implemented by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs in deploying the new or updated, as the case may be, electronic health record system of each such Department (required to be deployed by each such Department under section 713 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note)) at military installations and in field environments.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF DATA.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include information on standards for transmission of data between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs and standards for transmission of data between each such Department and private sector entities.

AMENDMENT NO. 1703

(Purpose: To authorize the provision of post-traumatic stress disorder training to military and security forces of the Government of Ukraine)

On page 636, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

(10) Training and best practices to identify and treat post-traumatic stress disorder among Ukrainian Armed Forces and National Guard personnel.

AMENDMENT NO. 1944, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To reform and improve personnel security, insider threat detection and prevention, and physical security)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. REFORM AND IMPROVEMENT OF PERSONNEL SECURITY, INSIDER THREAT DETECTION AND PREVENTION, AND PHYSICAL SECURITY.

(a) PERSONNEL SECURITY AND INSIDER THREAT PROTECTION IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) PLANS AND SCHEDULES.—Consistent with the Memorandum of the Secretary of Defense dated March 18, 2014, regarding the recommendations of the reviews of the Washington Navy Yard shooting, the Secretary of Defense shall develop plans and schedules—

(A) to implement a continuous evaluation capability for the national security population for which clearance adjudications are conducted by the Department of Defense Central Adjudication Facility, in coordination with the Suitability Executive Agent,

the Security Executive Agent, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(B) to produce a Department-wide insider threat strategy and implementation plan, which includes—

(i) resourcing for the Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center (DITMAC) and component insider threat programs, and

(ii) alignment of insider threat protection programs with continuous evaluation capabilities and processes for personnel security;

(C) to centralize the authority, accountability, and programmatic integration responsibilities, including fiscal control, for personnel security and insider threat protection under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(D) to align the Department's consolidated Central Adjudication Facility under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(E) to develop a defense security enterprise reform investment strategy to ensure a consistent, long-term focus on funding to strengthen all of the Department's security and insider threat programs, policies, functions, and information technology capabilities, including detecting threat behaviors conveyed in the cyber domain, in a manner that keeps pace with evolving threats and risks;

(F) to resource and expedite deployment of the Identity Management Enterprise Services Architecture (IMESA); and

(G) to implement the recommendations contained in the study conducted by the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation required by section 907 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 1564 note), including, specifically, the recommendations to centrally manage and regulate Department of Defense requests for personnel security background investigations.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the plans and schedules required under paragraph (1).

(b) PHYSICAL AND LOGICAL ACCESS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Secretary of Defense shall define physical and logical access standards, capabilities, and processes applicable to all personnel with access to Department of Defense installations and information technology systems, including—

(A) periodic or regularized background or records checks appropriate to the type of physical or logical access involved, the security level, the category of individuals authorized, and the level of access to be granted;

(B) standards and methods for verifying the identity of individuals seeking access; and

(C) electronic attribute-based access controls that are appropriate for the type of access and facility or information technology system involved;

(2) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services, and in consultation with representatives from stakeholder organizations, shall design a capability to share and apply electronic identity information across the Government to enable real-time, risk-managed physical and logical access decisions; and

(3) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in conjunction with the

Director of the Office of Personnel Management and in consultation with representatives from stakeholder organizations, shall establish investigative and adjudicative standards for the periodic or regularized re-evaluation of the eligibility of an individual to retain credentials issued pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004), as appropriate, but not less frequently than the authorization period of the issued credentials.

(c) SECURITY ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) formalize the Security, Suitability, and Credentialing Line of Business;

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committee that describes plans—

(A) for oversight by the Office of Management and Budget of activities of the executive branch of the Government for personnel security, suitability, and credentialing;

(B) to designate enterprise shared services to optimize investments;

(C) to define and implement data standards to support common electronic access to critical Government records; and

(D) to reduce the burden placed on Government data providers by centralizing requests for records access and ensuring proper sharing of the data with appropriate investigative and adjudicative elements.

(d) RECIPROCITY MANAGEMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council shall ensure that—

(1) a centralized system is available to serve as the reciprocity management system for the Federal Government; and

(2) the centralized system described in paragraph (1) is aligned with, and incorporates results from, continuous evaluation and other enterprise reform initiatives.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Security Executive Agent, the Suitability Executive Agent, and the Secretary of Defense, shall jointly develop a plan to—

(1) implement the Security Executive Agent Directive on common, standardized employee and contractor security reporting requirements;

(2) establish and implement uniform reporting requirements for employees and Federal contractors, according to risk, relative to the safety of the workforce and protection of the most sensitive information of the Government; and

(3) ensure that reported information is shared appropriately.

(f) ACCESS TO CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER PURPOSES.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 9101(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) The terms ‘Security Executive Agent’ and ‘Suitability Executive Agent’ mean the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent, respectively, established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.”.

(2) COVERED AGENCIES.—Section 9101(a)(6) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) The Department of Homeland Security.”.

“(H) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.”.

“(I) An Executive agency that—

“(i) is authorized to conduct background investigations under a Federal statute; or

“(ii) is delegated authority to conduct background investigations in accordance with procedures established by the Security Executive Agent or the Suitability Executive Agent under subsection (b) or (c)(iv) of section 2.3 of Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.”.

“(J) A contractor that conducts a background investigation on behalf of an agency described in subparagraphs (A) through (I).”.

(3) APPLICABLE PURPOSES OF INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “the head of”;

(ii) by inserting “all” before “criminal history record information”; and

(iii) by striking “for the purpose of determining eligibility for any of the following:” and inserting “, in accordance with Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Suitability Executive Agent and Security Executive Agent, for the purpose of—

“(A) determining eligibility for—”;

(C) in clause (i), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Access” and inserting “access”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(D) in clause (ii), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Assignment” and inserting “assignment”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting “or positions.”;

(E) in clause (iii), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Acceptance” and inserting “acceptance”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(F) in clause (iv), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Appointment” and inserting “appointment”; and

(ii) by striking “or a critical or sensitive position”; and

(iii) by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) conducting a basic suitability or fitness assessment for Federal or contractor employees, using Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent in accordance with—

“(i) Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto; and

“(ii) the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum ‘Assignment of Functions Relating to Coverage of Contractor Employee Fitness in the Federal Investigative Standards’, dated December 6, 2012;”.

“(C) credentialing under the Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004); and

“(D) Federal Aviation Administration checks required under—

“(i) the Federal Aviation Administration Drug Enforcement Assistance Act of 1988 (subtitle E of title VII of Public Law 100-690; 102 Stat. 4424) and the amendments made by that Act; or

“(ii) section 44710 of title 49.”.

(4) BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC SEARCHES.—Section 9101(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2)(A) A State central criminal history record depository shall allow a covered agency to conduct both biometric and biographic

searches of criminal history record information.

“(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Bureau of Investigation from requiring a request for criminal history record information to be accompanied by the fingerprints of the individual who is the subject of the request.”.

(5) USE OF MOST COST-EFFECTIVE SYSTEM.—Section 9101(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) If a criminal justice agency is able to provide the same information through more than 1 system described in paragraph (1), a covered agency may request information under subsection (b) from the criminal justice agency, and require the criminal justice agency to provide the information, using the system that is most cost-effective for the Federal Government.”.

(6) SEALED OR EXPUNGED RECORDS; JUVENILE RECORDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 9101(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: “, and includes any analogous juvenile records”; and

(ii) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “The term includes those records of a State or locality sealed pursuant to law if such records are accessible by State and local criminal justice agencies for the purpose of conducting background checks.”.

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not uniformly reject applicants for employment with the Federal Government or Federal contractors based on—

- (i) sealed or expunged criminal records; or
- (ii) juvenile records.

(7) INTERACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES ABROAD.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Upon request by a covered agency and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this section, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Overseas Citizens Services shall make available criminal history record information collected by the Deputy Assistant Secretary with respect to an individual who is under investigation by the covered agency regarding any interaction of the individual with a law enforcement agency or intelligence agency of a foreign country.”.

(8) CLARIFICATION OF SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTRACTORS CONDUCTING BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this subsection, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) If a contractor described in subsection (a)(6)(J) uses an automated information delivery system to request criminal history record information, the contractor shall comply with any necessary security requirements for access to that system.”.

(9) CLARIFICATION REGARDING ADVERSE ACTIONS.—Section 7512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or”;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period and inserting “, or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) a suitability action taken by the Office under regulations prescribed by the Office, subject to the rules prescribed by the President under this title for the administration of the competitive service.”.

(10) ANNUAL REPORT BY SUITABILITY AND SECURITY CLEARANCE PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY COUNCIL.—Section 9101 of title 5,

United States Code, as amended by this subsection, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) The Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, an annual report that—

“(1) describes efforts of the Council to integrate Federal, State, and local systems for sharing criminal history record information;

“(2) analyzes the extent and effectiveness of Federal education programs regarding criminal history record information;

“(3) provides an update on the implementation of best practices for sharing criminal history record information, including ongoing limitations experienced by investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency with respect to access to State and local criminal history record information; and

“(4) provides a description of limitations on the sharing of information relevant to a background investigation, other than criminal history record information, between—

“(A) investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency; and

“(B) State and local law enforcement agencies.”.

(11) GAO REPORT ON ENHANCING INTEROPERABILITY AND REDUCING REDUNDANCY IN FEDERAL CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION ACCESS CONTROL, BACKGROUND CHECK, AND CREDENTIALING STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the background check, access control, and credentialing requirements of Federal programs for the protection of critical infrastructure and key resources.

(B) CONTENTS.—The Comptroller General shall include in the report required under subparagraph (A)—

(i) a summary of the major characteristics of each such Federal program, including the types of infrastructure and resources covered;

(ii) a comparison of the requirements, whether mandatory or voluntary in nature, for regulated entities under each such program to—

(I) conduct background checks on employees, contractors, and other individuals;

(II) adjudicate the results of a background check, including the utilization of a standardized set of disqualifying offenses or the consideration of minor, non-violent, or juvenile offenses; and

(III) establish access control systems to deter unauthorized access, or provide a security credential for any level of access to a covered facility or resource;

(iii) a review of any efforts that the Screening Coordination Office of the Department of Homeland Security has undertaken or plans to undertake to harmonize or standardize background check, access control, or credentialing requirements for critical infra-

structure and key resource protection programs overseen by the Department; and

(iv) recommendations, developed in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, regarding—

(I) enhancing the interoperability of security credentials across critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(II) eliminating the need for redundant background checks or credentials across existing critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(III) harmonizing, where appropriate, the standards for identifying potentially disqualifying criminal offenses and the weight assigned to minor, nonviolent, or juvenile offenses in adjudicating the results of a completed background check; and

(IV) the development of common, risk-based standards with respect to the background check, access control, and security credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(C) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the term “Performance Accountability Council” means the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

AMENDMENT NO. 1747

(Purpose: To require the Department of Defense to support the security of Afghan women and girls during and after 2015)

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SUPPORT FOR SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN AND GIRLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Through the sacrifice and dedication of members of the Armed Forces, civilian personnel, and our Afghan partners as well as the American people's generous investment, oppressive Taliban rule has given way to a nascent democracy in Afghanistan. It is in our national security interest to help prevent Afghanistan from ever again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism and to solidify and preserve the gains our men and women in uniform fought so hard to establish.

(2) The United States through its National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security has made firm commitments to support the human rights of the women and girls of Afghanistan. The National Action Plan states that “the engagement and protection of women as agents of peace and stability will be central to United States efforts to promote security, prevent, respond to, and resolve conflict, and rebuild societies”.

(3) As stated in the Department of Defense's October 2014 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, the Department of Defense and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) “maintain a robust program dedicated to improving the recruitment, retention, and treatment of women in the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF), and to improving the status of Afghan women in general”.

(4) According to the Department of Defense's October 2014 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, the "Afghan MoI showed significant support for women in the MoI and is taking steps to protect and empower female police and female MoI staff". Although some positive steps have been made, progress remains slow to reach the MoI's goal of recruiting 10,000 women in the Afghan National Police (ANP) in the next 10 years.

(5) According to Inclusive Security, women only make up approximately 1 percent of the Afghan National Police. There are about 2,200 women serving in the police force, fewer than the goal of 5,000 women set by the Government of Afghanistan.

(6) According to the International Crisis Group, there are not enough female police officers to staff all provincial Family Response Units (FRUs). United Nations Assistance Mission Afghanistan and the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees found that "in the absence of Family Response Units or visible women police officers, women victims almost never approach police stations willingly, fearing they will be arrested, their reputations stained or worse".

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROMOTION OF SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to prevent Afghanistan from again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism;

(2) as an important part of a strategy to achieve this objective and to help Afghanistan achieve its full potential, the United States Government should continue to regularly press the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to commit to the meaningful inclusion of women in the political, economic, and security transition process and to ensure that women's concerns are fully reflected in relevant negotiations;

(3) the United States Government and the Government of Afghanistan should reaffirm their commitment to supporting Afghan civil society, including women's organizations, as agreed to during the meeting between the International Community and the Government of Afghanistan on the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework (TMAF) in July 2013;

(4) the United States Government should continue to support and encourage efforts to recruit and retain women in the Afghan National Security Forces, who are critical to the success of NATO's Resolute Support Mission and future Enduring Partnership mission; and

(5) the United States should bid on no less than one gender advisor billet within the Resolute Support Mission Gender Advisory Unit and continue to work with other countries to ensure that the Resolute Support Mission Gender Advisory Unit billets are fully staffed.

(c) PLAN TO PROMOTE SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—

(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall include in the report required under section 1225 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3550)—

(A) an assessment of the security of Afghan women and girls, including information regarding efforts to increase the recruitment and retention of women in the ANSF; and

(B) an assessment of the implementation of the plans for the recruitment, integration,

retention, training, treatment, and provision of appropriate facilities and transportation for women in the ANSF, including the challenges associated with such implementation and the steps being taken to address those challenges.

(2) PLAN REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to the extent practicable, support the efforts of the Government of Afghanistan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls during and after the security transition process through the development and implementation by the Government of Afghanistan of an Afghan-led plan that should include the elements described in this paragraph.

(B) TRAINING.—The Secretary of Defense, working with the NATO-led Resolute Support mission should encourage the Government of Afghanistan to develop—

(i) measures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of existing training for Afghan National Security Forces on this issue;

(ii) a plan to increase the number of female security officers specifically trained to address cases of gender-based violence, including ensuring the Afghan National Police's Family Response Units (FRUs) have the necessary resources and are available to women across Afghanistan;

(iii) mechanisms to enhance the capacity for units of National Police's Family Response Units to fulfill their mandate as well as indicators measuring the operational effectiveness of these units;

(iv) a plan to address the development of accountability mechanisms for ANA and ANP personnel who violate codes of conduct related to the human rights of women and girls, including female members of the ANSF; and

(v) a plan to develop training for the ANA and the ANP to increase awareness and responsiveness among ANA and ANP personnel regarding the unique security challenges women confront when serving in those forces.

(C) ENROLLMENT AND TREATMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Afghan Ministries of Defense and Interior, shall seek to assist the Government of Afghanistan in including as part of the plan developed under subparagraph (A) the development and implementation of a plan to increase the number of female members of the ANA and ANP and to promote their equal treatment, including through such steps as providing appropriate equipment, modifying facilities, and ensuring literacy and gender awareness training for recruits.

(D) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the Afghan Security Forces Fund for Fiscal Year 2016, no less than \$10,000,000 should be used for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women in the ANSF as well as the recruitment, training, and contracting of female security personnel for future elections.

(ii) TYPES OF PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Such programs and activities may include—

(I) efforts to recruit women into the ANSF, including the special operations forces;

(II) programs and activities of the Afghan Ministry of Defense Directorate of Human Rights and Gender Integration and the Afghan Ministry of Interior Office of Human Rights, Gender and Child Rights;

(III) development and dissemination of gender and human rights educational and training materials and programs within the

Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Afghan Ministry of Interior;

(IV) efforts to address harassment and violence against women within the ANSF;

(V) improvements to infrastructure that address the requirements of women serving in the ANSF, including appropriate equipment for female security and police forces, and transportation for policewomen to their station

(VI) support for ANP Family Response Units; and

(VII) security provisions for high-profile female police and army officers.

AMENDMENT NO. 2006

(Purpose: Relating to the policies of the Department of Defense on the travel of next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas)

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON TRAVEL OF NEXT OF KIN TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DIGNIFIED TRANSFER OF REMAINS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WHO DIE OVERSEAS.

(a) REVIEW OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a review of the current policies of the Department of Defense on the travel for next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The review required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the changes to Department instructions and Federal regulations necessary to provide Government funded travel to the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurred in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(B) An action plan and timeline for making the changes described in subparagraph (A).

(b) MODIFICATION OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to modify the policies of the Department in order to provide Government funded travel for the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurs in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary is not required to modify the policies of the Department as described in paragraph (1) if, by not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary certifies, in writing, to the congressional defense committees that such action is not in the best interest of the United States. The certification shall include the following:

(A) An assessment and reevaluation by the Secretary of the rationale for excluding the next of kin from Government funded travel if the death of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the Department overseas occurs in a non-combat area.

(B) Recommendations for alternative plans to ensure that the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas in a non-combat area may participate in the dignified

transfer of the remains of the deceased at Dover Port Mortuary, including through the actions of appropriate non-governmental organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1931

(Purpose: To improve the annual reports of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau on the ability of the National Guard to meet its missions)

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU ON THE ABILITY OF THE NATIONAL GUARD TO MEETS ITS MISSIONS.

Section 10504(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “The Chief of the National Guard Bureau”;

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by striking “, through the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force.”;

(3) by striking the second sentence; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) Each report shall include the following:

“(A) An assessment, prepared in conjunction with the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force, of the ability of the National Guard to carry out its Federal missions.

“(B) An assessment, prepared in conjunction with the chief executive officers of the States and territories, of the ability of the National Guard to carry out emergency support functions of the National Response Framework.

“(3) Each report may be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2011

(Purpose: To provide for cooperation between the United States and Israel on anti-tunnel capabilities)

Strike section 1272 and insert the following:

SEC. 1272. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ANTI-TUNNEL COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Tunnels can be used for criminal purposes, such as smuggling drugs, weapons, or humans, or for terrorist or military purposes, such as launching surprise attacks or detonating explosives underneath civilian or military infrastructure.

(2) Tunnels have been a growing threat on the southern border of the United States for years.

(3) In the conflict in Gaza in 2014, terrorists used tunnels to conduct attacks against Israel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to develop technology to detect and counter tunnels, and the best way to do this is to partner with other affected countries;

(2) the Administration should, on a joint basis with Israel, carry out research, development, test, and evaluation of anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel; and

(3) the Administration should use developed anti-tunnel capabilities to better protect the United States and deployed United States military personnel.

(c) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH ANTI-TUNNEL CAPABILITIES PROGRAM WITH ISRAEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and in consultation with the Secretary

of State and the Director of National Intelligence, is authorized to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel. Such authority includes authority to construct facilities and install equipment necessary to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation so authorized. Any activities carried out pursuant to such authority shall be conducted in a manner that appropriately protects sensitive information and United States and Israel national security interests.

(2) REPORT.—The activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (d) may be carried out after the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth the following:

(A) A memorandum of agreement between the United States and Israel regarding sharing of research and development costs for the capabilities described in paragraph (1), and any supporting documents.

(B) A certification that the memorandum of agreement—

(i) requires sharing of costs of projects, including in-kind support, between the United States and Israel;

(ii) establishes a framework to negotiate the rights to any intellectual property developed under the memorandum of agreement; and

(iii) requires the United States Government to receive quarterly reports on expenditure of funds, if any, by the Government of Israel, including a description of what the funds have been used for, when funds were expended, and an identification of entities that expended the funds.

(d) ASSISTANCE IN CONNECTION WITH PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide procurement, maintenance, and sustainment assistance to Israel in support of the anti-tunnel capabilities research, development, test, and evaluation activities authorized in subsection (c)(1).

(2) REPORT.—Assistance may not be provided under paragraph (1) until 15 days after the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth a detailed description of the assistance to be provided.

(3) MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.—Assistance may not be provided under this subsection unless the Government of Israel contributes an amount not less than the amount of assistance to be so provided to the program, project, or activity for which the assistance is to be so provided.

(e) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress on a quarterly basis a report that contains a copy of the most recent quarterly report provided by the Government of Israel to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(iii).

(f) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(g) SUNSET.—The authority in this section to carry out activities described in sub-

section (c), and to provide assistance described in subsection (d), shall expire on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 1916

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate a construction agent for certain construction projects by the Department of Veterans Affairs)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DESIGNATION OF CONSTRUCTION AGENT FOR CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall seek to enter into an agreement subject to subsections (b), (c), and (e) of section 1535 of title 31, United States Code, with the Army Corps of Engineers or another entity of the Federal Government to serve, on a reimbursable basis, as the construction agent on all construction projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs specifically authorized by Congress after the date of the enactment of this Act that involve a total expenditure of more than \$100,000,000, excluding any acquisition by exchange.

(b) AGREEMENT.—Under the agreement entered into under subsection (a), the construction agent shall provide design, procurement, and construction management services for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of facilities of the Department.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on H.R. 1735 expire at 1:45 p.m. today, with the time equally divided between the managers or their designees for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I have asked the members of the committee to convene in the President's Room at 1:30 p.m., if they would, because there is a portion of the bill, the annex, that needs to be approved. We need a quorum for that so that we can move forward with the final vote on the bill.

I also wish to thank all Members on both sides of the aisle for the conduct of this debate in consideration of a very large and very complex piece of legislation.

I especially thank my friend from Rhode Island, who has worked diligently, along with his staff, to see that we arrive at this point. We have a lot of other hurdles to go through, but without getting through this one, we couldn't have been prepared for those that are laid before us before the President puts his signature on this most important piece of legislation.

I yield to my friend from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I, too, want to commend the chairman and his staff for extraordinarily diligent, cooperative, and careful work. I am pleased to be here to support this block of amendments. As the chairman noted,

we are on the verge of passage of the legislation. Then we will be able to move forward and address other issues.

I thank the chairman for his cooperation and his great leadership.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I congratulate the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee for this heroic effort, doing, as the chairman said, the most important business we can do as part of the Federal Government; that is, keeping America safe and making sure we keep our commitments to those who volunteer to serve, many in harm's way, to protect our liberties.

In a couple hours, we will vote to pass the Defense authorization bill, and that is an important bipartisan accomplishment. It is just another step in a new Congress which has acted in a bipartisan way to deal with a number of challenges confronting the country.

I am more optimistic today than I have been in a long time that the Senate is finally back to work and Congress is doing what the American people who elected us sent us here to do, and that is to do their work and to represent them to the best of our ability, which is one reason why I have come to the floor to express some of my concerns at what we have heard from the Democratic leadership about their intentions with regard to the next piece of legislation we turn to—the Defense appropriations bill. As we all know, the Democratic leader and some Democrats in his caucus have threatened not to move forward on this Defense appropriations bill.

I want to talk about the consequences in the real world of holding up this Defense appropriations bill and particularly how it will affect my home State of Texas.

Obviously, the Defense appropriations bill will provide the military with resources necessary to meet the significant demands they face and we face as a country around the world but most basically to defend our country and to keep us safe.

This bill provides for training and readiness funds and makes sure our troops are well prepared to carry out any mission that might be assigned to them anywhere in the world.

The appropriations bill provides the money for critical modernization of our aircraft, ships, ground vehicles, and other equipment so that our troops can fight with the best cutting-edge weapons systems at our disposal so they can accomplish their objective.

Perhaps most importantly, this legislation helps make sure our troops and military families enjoy a good quality of life. We have an all-volunteer military, and the family members of those

who wear the uniform serve no less than the ones who wear the uniform. So making sure the families of our military members enjoy a good quality of life is very important. We will never be able to repay our troops for all they have given us, but we can at least provide appropriate benefits to their families to help make their lives a little easier.

This bill also includes funding to actually pay our troops their salary and provides them a modest, well-deserved raise.

Like the Presiding Officer, I am proud of those who serve our Nation and our military and our home States. Nearly 120,000 Texans are serving on Active Duty today, as well as more than 55,000 Guardsmen and Reservists. We have 15 major military installations in Texas, which have more than 168,000 Active and Reserve component servicemembers assigned to them. These world-class bases, posts, air stations, and depots are critical facilities where our troops train for combat and learn the skills they need in order to accomplish their mission and where we maintain essential military equipment. So when I consider the possibility that for a cynical political reason some might decide to block this appropriations bill that actually literally pays the salary of the troops, I am very disappointed. I hope they will reconsider.

These resources we will vote on—starting this afternoon, we will start that process—go to places such as Fort Bliss and Fort Hood, TX, homes to the finest heavy ground combat units in the world.

Fort Bliss in El Paso sits on more than 1 million acres. It is an irreplaceable training range for our troops, and it is the Army's second largest installation by size. It is the proud home of the Army's famed 1st Armored Division. And Fort Hood, which serves as home to both III Corps and the storied 1st Cavalry Division, has more Army brigades than any Army installation in the country.

When I think about Members of the Senate actually considering the possibility of blocking pay for our troops and support for our military, I also think about bases such as Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, TX. This key base is home to units that have deployed time and time again in recent years in support of combat missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, including the 317th Airlift Group. Dyess is also home to the 7th Bomb Wing, one of only two B-1 strategic bomber wings in the U.S. Air Force. The 7th has been the tip of the spear in the fight against ISIL, conducting airstrikes against the terrorist army in Iraq and in Syria.

We are also proud in my State to boast the Corpus Christi Army Depot, the largest rotary wing repair facility in the world. When our Army helicopters come back from battle, many

of them are pretty beat up and barely operable. They typically make a pit stop in Corpus Christi to make sure our battle-tested warfighting equipment is ready for the next challenge.

Between our naval air stations at Corpus Christi and Kingsville, Texas provides the proving ground and crucible for more than 1,000 new Navy and Marine aviators each year. Shortly after they leave Texas, they find themselves in skies over Iraq or Syria or landing in rough seas, in near-zero visibility, on aircraft carriers bordering hostile shores around the globe. But these bases represent only a fraction of the U.S. military presence in Texas. All of our military installations are integral to making sure our military is prepared, trained, healthy, and ready for action.

The Defense appropriations bill that some have threatened to filibuster in order to extract a negotiation about more government spending makes sure that the servicemembers assigned to those bases and countless others across our Nation have what they need.

We ask a lot of our men and women in uniform. The very least we can do is pass legislation that provides for the training and equipment they need in order to accomplish their mission and to ensure them the quality of life they and their families have so richly earned.

I find it very troubling and, indeed, dumbfounding that some of our colleagues from across the aisle who have already voted overwhelmingly to move forward on the Defense authorization bill would today talk about blocking the necessary appropriations bill to actually carry out that policy that we will pass shortly in the Defense authorization bill.

I believe that to be consistent after such a big vote, as I anticipate we will have on the Defense authorization bill, any notion of blocking the appropriations bill that would actually pay for those policies to be carried out should simply evaporate.

So I hope our colleagues across the aisle—many of whom have said they actually support the policies behind this legislation—will defy their party's leadership and their misguided advice about blocking this legislation in order to extract a negotiation on more government spending and will decide instead to move this legislation forward. The brave men and women in Texas and throughout the country who are fighting on our behalf deserve nothing less. And I hope our colleagues who are even considering for a moment the idea of blocking the funding that would actually help pay our troops will reconsider and cast their vote in support of the troops and not cast their vote in favor of some cynical political strategy which will undermine our support for our troops.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, 3 years ago, President Obama announced that DREAMers—young people who were brought to the United States as children—would have the opportunity to apply for temporary protection from deportation through the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program or what has become known as DACA.

Today, more than 660,000 young people across this Nation have benefitted from DACA, including more than 7,000 in my home State of New Mexico. These are some of our brightest students and veterans who no longer have to fear deportation. Not only do DREAMers want to earn an education and work, they want to give back to their communities and their country. In fact, I would suggest that DREAMers don't know how to be anything but American.

We hear again and again of the remarkable stories of immigrants overcoming very difficult challenges in the genuine pursuit of a better life. Across the country, there are DREAMers working to become doctors, scientists, lawyers, and engineers. They want to start businesses or teach in classrooms. They want to contribute to America's success.

I had the privilege of meeting these twin sisters who are pictured here, Jazmin and Yazmin, earlier this year. They immigrated to the United States with their mother from Mexico when they were just 3 years old.

As students at Del Norte High School in Albuquerque, Jazmin and Yazmin worked hard to earn good grades, and as juniors and seniors, they took dual credit courses at Central New Mexico Community College.

Jazmin will graduate magna cum laude from the University of New Mexico with a bachelor of business administration, concentrating in finance. She earned an interdisciplinary studies distinction from the University of New Mexico Honors College, and her sister Yazmin would go on to graduate magna cum laude from the University of New Mexico with a bachelor of science in biology and Spanish, a minor in chemistry, and completed the University Honors Program. She received departmental summa cum laude honors.

These two young women are working tirelessly to ensure they have a better future for themselves and their mother.

In August, Jazmin will begin her second year at the University of New Mex-

ico School of Law, and Yazmin will begin her first year at the University of New Mexico School of Medicine.

Given their immigration status, the journey for Jazmin and Yazmin to get to where they are today was anything but easy. They have overcome many hardships, including homelessness and hunger.

After their mother—who is a single mom—suffered a stroke, it was up to them to find work to support their family, cover her medical costs, and pay for their education. To this day, there is another heavy burden these young women carry with them; it is living with the fear that at any moment their mother, whom they love dearly, will be deported because of her immigration status. Under these circumstances, you have to ask what drives these two bright young women and what keeps them going, and it is simple: They want to give back to their communities.

Jazmin, who is currently a summer law clerk at New Mexico's Center on Law and Poverty, wants to be a lawyer to ensure that every person has equal access to the law.

Yazmin, who is currently a medical assistant at the Casa de Salud Medical Office in the South Valley, wants to be a primary care physician so she can help families gain access to quality health care.

This is who DREAMers are, and I think their stories are absolutely inspiring.

This young man's name is Cesar. He is 26 years old and a DACA recipient.

Cesar and his family moved from Ciudad Juarez to Las Cruces, NM, when he was in the fifth grade.

As a middle and high school student, he earned great grades, and through local scholarships he enrolled at New Mexico State University. He earned a bachelor degree in biology, microbiology, and Spanish, not to mention minors in chemistry and biochemistry.

When he graduated from college in 2011, Cesar couldn't put his degrees to work because of his immigration status. So instead of working in the laboratory, he went to work as a landscaper.

When the President made his DACA announcement, Cesar immediately applied and was approved for deferred action. Because of DACA, Cesar was able to work and earn an income to help pay for graduate school.

This year, Cesar earned his master's degree in biology and a minor in molecular biology from New Mexico State University, where he focused his research on bioinformatics.

Cesar makes it a point to get involved in the local community. He has volunteered at La Casa and helped with the biology graduate organization. He said:

Once you start volunteering, you wish you had more time because you love it so much.

It can improve your outlook on everything you're doing.

Cesar's dream is to become a doctor so he can work to help prevent disease. Soon he will take a major step toward that goal. This coming school year, Cesar will be a medical and Ph.D. student at Loyola University in Chicago. "DACA has changed my life," he said. "Within two to three years, I went from working in landscaping to becoming a medical student."

The stories of Cesar, Jazmin, and Yazmin represent what makes this country great. They are inspiring, and there are hundreds of thousands of DREAMers like them across this country.

Immigrants make the United States a more prosperous nation. In New Mexico, our State's remarkable history is rooted in our diversity, our history, and our culture, which has always been enriched by our immigrant communities and their family members.

My own father is an immigrant who came to America from Nazi Germany in the 1930s, and I am sure many of us in this Chamber have immigrant roots in our own families which have contributed to America's success story. We are not a country that kicks out our best and brightest students, and we are not a nation that tears families apart.

The current DACA Program is only a temporary solution. DACA recipients have to renew every 2 years in order to maintain their deferred status, but that is no way to live. It is unfair for these DREAMers to live their lives 2 years at a time. We desperately need robust immigration reform.

Now, let's step back for a moment and remember that the Senate passed a comprehensive, bipartisan immigration bill almost 2 years ago now. That bill would have modernized our immigration system to meet the needs of our economy, provided an accountable pathway to earned citizenship for the undocumented workers currently living in the shadows, including making the DREAM Act the law of the land, and it would have dramatically strengthened security at our borders. Accountable immigration reform received 68 votes in this body and demonstrated the kind of legislation we can pass when we work together.

As a nation, we value the twin promises of freedom and opportunity. Those ideals are important no matter where you were born. However, too many of my Republican colleagues don't see it that way. Several of them want to rescind or even defund DACA and roll back the progress we have made over the past 3 years.

Why would we end such a successful program? What I would say to those who do this is come back to the table and work with us to pass immigration reform. We need pragmatic solutions to fix our broken immigration laws, and we need them now. Let's make the dream a reality after all.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be waived with respect to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak about the terrible news out of Charleston, which is a true tragedy. That an event such as this could occur at a house of worship makes it even worse.

It is always awful when one of these events takes place, but to have it happen at a house of worship makes it even worse. Churches should be a place of refuge, a place where people feel safe and secure, a place of mercy, a place of compassion. The depth of loss these families must be feeling is simply awful.

I want the American people to know the Senate is thinking of the families today and the victims they loved. We are also thinking of the entire congregation at this historic church. We will continue to do so as more about this tragedy is learned in the hours and days to come.

Our hearts go out to the families who have been affected by this awful tragedy.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, after almost 3 weeks, we are completing consideration of the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act. Again, I want to thank Senator McCAIN for what has largely been a bipartisan, serious consideration of issues important to the Department of Defense and to the national security of the United States. He has led the way, initially with a series of very thoughtful hearings with foreign policy experts setting the context for our debate.

Then we listened to our uniformed military leaders and our Defense Department officials. In the process of drafting the legislation, before it went

to the subcommittees, there was a collaboration that was inspired by his commitment—which he has always demonstrated—to do what he thought was in the best interest of the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States. His presence and his leadership, has, I think, brought us to this point where we are getting ready to consider a major piece of legislation on behalf of the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States and of the country.

We have considered many issues. We were briefly sidetracked by the cyber amendment. We all understand that the cyber bill is absolutely critical. In fact, I think it has to be addressed as soon as possible. That is probably the next piece of business we should take up in this Senate. But it was brought up in a procedure—in an unexpected way, in a way in which we could not give it the full consideration it deserves. So, once again, I think we should commit ourselves as a Senate to bringing up this bill as rapidly as possible—in fact, I would suggest it as the next major piece of legislation.

In the process of considering this National Defense Authorization Act, we brought a bill to the floor which had some very thoughtful and important provisions. Six hundred amendments were filed. We were able to consider many of them, both Republican and Democratic, either through votes on the floor in a very open process or through managers' packages which we put together and approved. We debated on very important issues—interrogation techniques, sexual assault in our military, and U.S. policies in Iraq and elsewhere. I think these debates and votes ensured that this authorization bill is better than it was when it left the committee.

There is, however, one overarching problem that remains with this bill, and it is one that I have persistently pointed to and persistently argued has to be corrected, and it is the fact that the bill is funded through the OCO accounts in a significant way, using an escape valve from the Budget Control Act, which OCO provides exclusively for defense, with some minor deviations for other some national security programs and other agencies, but essentially this is the defense funding mechanism. As a result, what we are confronted with is a bill that is overreliant upon the overseas contingency account. Ironically, it provides the same level of resources that the President asked for, but instead of putting it in the base budget, it grows OCO from roughly \$50 billion to \$90 billion, and that is all deficit spending. So this is not a way in which we are improving our fiscal situation; we are just adding \$40 billion of deficit spending.

The other aspect of this that is so critical is that if we adhere to the Budget Control Act, we will not ade-

quately fund other agencies, and many of these other agencies are as vital to our national security as the Department of Defense—the FBI, Homeland Security, and the State Department.

We have had speakers on floor talk about—rightfully so—this huge refugee crisis we are seeing all through the Middle East because of the instability in Iraq and Syria. Those refugees—when we try to help them, that help is typically sent through the State Department, through USAID, through those agencies, and they are still within the sequester caps.

As a result, I was very pleased to offer both in the committee and on the floor an amendment that would essentially say: Let's stop for a second. We have this \$39 billion of additional OCO spending that we are giving to the Department of Defense because it is not subject to BCA. Before we do that, let's put a fence around it, to put it in colloquial terminology, let's just say that money is there because we recognize that the needs of the Department of Defense are critical and they have to be fulfilled, but it is going to stay there until we fix the underlying issue, in my view, and that is the BCA, the sequestration issues that affect the State Department and every other Department in the government.

We had a very good debate. I am thankful to the chairman for encouraging that debate, allowing it to take place, and for it coming to a vote. We lost, 54 to 46. It had strong support on our side of the aisle, but it was a fair and full debate and we lost. The result, though, is that the problem remains. We are in a situation where, if we continue down this pathway, we will see the OCO account as an escape valve for defense while everyone else is subject to sequestration. I don't think that is good. I don't think it is good for defense. I certainly don't think it is good for these other agencies, and it is not good for our overall national security.

There are many who say: Don't worry about that. This is just an authorization bill. The appropriations bill is where we will have the appropriate discussion and debate.

I think that is going to happen, but my view is that authorizations and appropriations are so closely related that we couldn't ignore one and we couldn't ignore this authorization.

So, again, I think we have to recognize that underpinning this authorization, with all of its worthy programs, is this very difficult issue of overreliance on OCO funding.

Then there are some who say: Well, even so, it is a 1-year fix.

Well, I don't think that is the case at all. I think if we use these types of gimmicks—as some have called them—and accounting tricks once, our tendency to use them again will be there. In fact, once we use it once, it is easier to use it two, three, four, five times.

We have had this discussion on the floor, for example, interestingly enough, about how medical research in the Department of Defense went from \$25 million or so in 1992 to \$13 billion today. Well, the answer is easy. Back then, because we had similar—not identical—arrangements where we capped discretionary domestic spending but uncapped defense spending, people went to where—the chairman referred to the Willie Sutton approach—the money was. It was defense. And it has grown and it has grown. I think that is what is going to happen again if we take this trajectory, this pathway, using OCO.

I sense that if we make tough decisions today, it will benefit us in the long run. One of those tough decisions—and one I make very reluctantly—is to oppose this legislation. It is worthy legislation in many respects. I think we have to fix this problem, and I think we have to fix it now. I have tried in my efforts to focus the attention on the need to correct the BCA, the need to get us on a sustainable pathway where we do include within the base of the Department of Defense those funds they need to operate and then OCO really is for overseas contingency operations.

Let me conclude my comments by saying there has been tremendous cooperation and support. It starts with the chairman. I particularly want to thank his staff director, Chris Brose, for his great work.

I thank my colleagues on the Democratic side: Liz King, Gary Leeling, Creighton Greene, Kirk McConnell, Bill Monahan, Mike Kuiken, John Quirk, Jon Clark, Jonathan Epstein, Arun Seraphin, Carolyn Chuhta, Mike Noblet, Ozge Guzelsu, Maggie McNamara, Jody Bennett, and, once again, my staff director, Liz King.

I would like to thank the floor staff. I have come to appreciate more than I ever knew how vital a role they play on both sides of the aisle, and I thank them for what they have done.

Finally, this bill has some extraordinarily good provisions in it. Many of them are tough, hard, path-breaking provisions that are there because the chairman decided he was going to go all in on many different aspects, from acquisition, to troop support efforts, to incorporating provisions of the commission on pay and retirement, all of those things, and I commend him for that. It is just that I think I have to stand and say we have to fix this issue with respect to the underpinning fundamental budget approach which says: We will let BCA stand for every other agency, but we will be able to exploit, in a way, this OCO exception, and we will use it. And I think that is not the path we want to pursue.

With that, and again with my thanks to the chairman, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, as we approach a final vote on the National Defense Authorization Act, I take this opportunity to thank my friend and colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED. Despite his lack of substantive education somewhere on the Hudson River, he has been thoughtful, bipartisan, and he has maintained that throughout the consideration of this legislation.

We worked together through hundreds of amendments in markup and hundreds more during the past 2 weeks, and obviously we have some differences from time to time. Senator REED has never stopped searching for common ground and consensus, and so this legislation would not be what it is without his leadership and his cooperation.

I would just remind my friend, however, that the title of this legislation is “to authorize appropriations”—not to appropriate but to authorize appropriations. That is the task of the Appropriations Committee. So the OCO issue, which he and I are largely in agreement on, should have been repeal of sequestration. That is an issue which should be addressed where the authority lies—in appropriations, not in authorization. We can’t increase or decrease a single penny of authorization except what was given to us through the Budget Committee process, which was votes and decisions made on this floor on the budget.

So I say with respect and friendship, if there is a problem here, it is not with the authorization. We don’t spend a penny. We authorize the expenditure of money. And that is an issue that my friend from Rhode Island and I disagree on, but it did not prohibit him, me, our staffs, and members of the committee on both sides of the aisle from working on a piece of legislation that, in my view, which is clearly subjective, is a reform bill—a reform bill, working together, that is almost unprecedented, at least in the last 30 years when you look at the extent and the nature of the reforms in this legislation.

I thank the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, for his commitment to resuming regular order. Under Senator MCCONNELL’s leadership, the Senate has been able to take up this critical national security legislation on time, allowing for thoughtful consideration of amendments. This is how the Senate should operate—regular order, on time, giving our military the certainty they need to plan and execute their missions.

For 53 consecutive years, Congress has passed a National Defense Authorization Act. That is testimony to the vital importance of this legislation, which provides the necessary funding and authorities for our military to defend the Nation.

But perhaps at no time in the last half century has this legislation ever been so critical. Over the past few

months, the Senate Armed Services Committee has received testimony from many of America’s most respected statesmen, thinkers, and former military commanders. These leaders had a common warning, and that warning is clear: America is facing the most diverse and complex array of crises since the Second World War.

I won’t go into all the different events that have taken place that authenticate that assertion by the most respected leaders who served under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

We have faced challenges before. We marshalled our power—both soft and hard power—to defend the rules-based national order that is the foundation of our prosperity and security. We have deterred aggression, defended allies, defeated adversaries, and built peace through strength. As we look at our challenges today, the question being asked all over the world by both friend and foe alike and the question we must answer now is, Are we equal to those challenges again?

There is only so much one piece of legislation can do to answer that question, but the National Defense Authorization Act before the Senate today is a strong first step toward rising to the challenge of an increasingly dangerous world. This is an ambitious piece of legislation, but in the times we live, we cannot afford business as usual in the Department of Defense. To prepare our military to confront our present and future national security challenges, we must champion the cause of defense reform, rigorously root out Pentagon waste, and invest in modernization and next-generation technologies to maintain our military technological advantage. That is what this legislation is all about. It is a reform bill. It tackles acquisition reform, headquarters and management reform, military retirement reform, and personnel reform.

The bill authorizes every dollar of the President’s budget request of \$612 billion but focuses these resources more directly on our warfighters. The Committee on Armed Services identified \$10 billion of excess and unnecessary spending in the budget request, and we reinvested those savings in the military capabilities our troops need to succeed. We did all of this while upholding our commitments to our servicemembers, retirees, and their families.

My friends, America’s military technological advantage is eroding—and eroding fast. One of the primary causes of this is a broken Defense Acquisition System that takes too long, costs too much, and wastes billions of dollars—often on weapons programs that never become operational and with no one ever being held responsible. That is why this legislation includes the most sweeping acquisition reforms in a generation. We put the services back into

the acquisition process, create new mechanisms to ensure accountability for results, streamline regulation, and open the defense acquisition process to our Nation's innovators.

This bill advances unprecedented reforms to our military retirement system. Under the current 70-year-old system, 83 percent of servicemembers leave the service without any retirement assets. This system excludes the vast majority of current servicemembers who will not complete 20 years of uniformed service, including many veterans of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. The NDAA creates a modernized retirement system and extends retirement benefits to the vast majority of servicemembers through a new plan, offering more value and choice. Under this new plan, 75 percent of servicemembers would get retirement benefits. This reform is estimated to save \$15 billion a year in the out years.

In addition to retirement reform, the NDAA focuses on improving the quality of life of our military servicemembers, retirees, and their families. It authorizes a 1.3-percent pay raise for members of the uniformed services at the grade of O-6 and below. The bill authorizes \$30 million in support for schools serving military dependent children, including those with severe disabilities. It includes many provisions to improve the military health system and TRICARE. The NDAA allows a TRICARE beneficiary up to four urgent care visits without making them get a preauthorization and requires the Department of Defense to focus more on health care quality, patient safety, and beneficiary satisfaction by making them publish health outcome measures on their Web sites.

The NDAA builds on military justice reforms of the past few years to prevent and respond to military sexual assault. It contains a number of provisions aimed at strengthening the authorities of Special Victims' Counsel to provide services to victims of sexual assault. The legislation also enhances confidential reporting options for victims of sexual assault and increases access to timely disclosure of certain materials and information in connection with the prosecution of offenses.

On management reform, the NDAA ensures the Department of Defense and the military services are using precious defense dollars to fulfill their missions and defend the Nation, not expand their bloated staffs. While staff at Army Headquarters increased 60 percent over the past decade, the Army is now cutting brigade combat teams. The Air Force evaded mandated cuts to Headquarters personnel by creating two new Headquarters entities, while at the same time complaining it had insufficient personnel to maintain combat aircraft. The NDAA directs targeted reductions in Headquarters and administrative staff that would gen-

erate \$1.7 billion in savings in just the next fiscal year.

With these savings and billions more identified, this bill invests in providing critical military capabilities for our warfighters and meeting the unfunded priorities of our service chiefs and combatant commanders.

Even as challenges to maritime security increase in the Middle East and the Western Pacific and pressures on our shipbuilding budget increase, the Navy remains well below its fleet size requirement of 306 ships. The NDAA directs savings identified in the budget request to accelerate Navy modernization and shipbuilding, to mitigate impacts of the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine replacement, and to grow the Navy to meet rising threats.

As adversaries seek to counter and thwart American military power, the NDAA looks to the future and invests in the technologies that will maintain America's military technological superiority. It provides \$400 million in additional funding to support the so-called third offset strategy to outpace our emerging adversaries.

The NDAA details robust assistance to our allies and partners as they confront urgent challenges. The legislation authorizes nearly \$3.8 billion in support of the Afghan National Security Forces.

After an overwhelming bipartisan vote on an amendment offered by Senator FEINSTEIN and myself, the NDAA reaffirms the prohibition on torture and ensures that every U.S. Government agency always applies the same effective, humane interrogation standards as the U.S. military. Past interrogation policies compromised our values, stained our national honor, and did little practical good. This legislation provides greater assurances that never again will the United States follow that dark path of sacrificing our values for our short-term security needs. I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for her hard work on this vitally important issue.

Finally, this legislation contains a bipartisan compromise on how to address the challenge of the detention facility of Guantanamo Bay. President Obama has said from day one of his Presidency that he wants to close Guantanamo. But 6½ years into his Presidency, the administration has never provided a plan to do so. This legislation requires the administration to submit that plan. We are simply asking the executive branch to explain where it will hold those set for trial, how it will continue to detain dangerous terrorists pursuant to the laws of war, and how it will mitigate the risks of moving this population.

If the administration can provide answers to these basic questions to the satisfaction of the American people and their elected representatives, then congressional restrictions on the move-

ment of these detainees will be lifted and the plan can be implemented. If the Congress does not approve the plan, nothing would change. The ban on domestic transfers would stay in force, and the certification standards for foreign transfers included in the NDAA would remain.

My friends, America has reached a key inflection point. The rules-based international order, which has been anchored by U.S. hard power for seven decades, is being seriously stressed, and with it the foundation of our security and prosperity. It does not have to be this way. We can choose a better future for ourselves, make the right decisions now, and set our Nation on a better course.

That is what this legislation is all about—living up to our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense, increasing the effectiveness of our military, and restoring America's global leadership. This legislation is a small step towards accomplishing these goals, but it is an important step we can take right now, together. We owe the brave men and women in uniform nothing less.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL), is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Ernst	Murray
Ayotte	Feinstein	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Peters
Bennet	Flake	Portman
Blumenthal	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hatch	Rounds
Burr	Heinrich	Rubio
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Sasse
Capito	Heller	Schatz
Carper	Hoeven	Sessions
Casey	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cassidy	Isakson	Shelby
Coats	Johnson	Sullivan
Cochran	Kaine	Stabenow
Collins	King	Tillman
Coons	Kirk	Tester
Corker	Klobuchar	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Udall
Daines	Moran	Vitter
Donnelly	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker

NAYS—25

Baldwin	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Leahy	Reid
Boxer	Manchin	Sanders
Brown	Markey	Schumer
Cardin	Menendez	Warren
Cruz	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Graham	McCaskill
Lee	Scott

The bill (H.R. 1735), as amended, was passed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand the Democratic leader would like to make some remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. To respond to the majority leader, I have nothing to say until I hear what he has to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, America asks a lot of the men and women of its voluntary military force: to undertake dangerous missions in far-off lands, to spend months and years away from their families, and always to sacrifice so that we might live in freedom.

These brave men and women do it all without reservation. They ask precious little in return, save for the resources they need to do the job and the support they need to look after their families. It is the least we can do, to provide for them. We just voted 71 to 25 for a bill that promises a lot of things for our men and women.

It would be very cruel indeed for any Senator who just made that promise to turn around now and block the rest of us from fulfilling the pledge to our troops. Passing the legislation before us is a way to fulfill the promise we just made, 71 to 25. That is why nearly every Democrat voted to pass it in

committee, 27 to 3. That is why Democrats have hailed this bill as a win-win-win and a victory for each of their States.

They know it gives President Obama the same level of funding he asked for. They know it adheres to a bipartisan spending level that both parties agreed to, that President Obama signed into law, and that President Obama campaigned on in the last Presidential election.

Now our friends face a choice.

Option 1: Allow the promise just made to our troops to be fulfilled by voting for a bill they can't stop praising.

Option 2: Break the promise they just made by killing a bill they claim to love, all in the service of some unrelated and completely incomprehensible partisan plan.

It is the road of bipartisanship and support for our troops that brought us this far. We shouldn't let partisan politics trip us up now. We don't have to—not if commonsense Democrats continue to prioritize pay raises and medical care for our troops over some unrelated gambit to funnel more cash to bureaucracies such as the IRS and the EPA.

I will just leave my colleagues with something one of our Democratic friends said of men and women in the military. Here is what he had to say: "Just as we called on them to protect us, they are calling on us to provide them with the resources they need."

They are. Senators just promised they would, 71 to 25. They just made the promise. So now they shouldn't block us from fulfilling that promise by preventing us from getting on the Defense appropriations measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the bill that just passed the Senate, the Defense authorization bill, has 52 Republicans voting to fix sequestration. Only 2 voted against it. We are all in favor of fixing the sequester.

My friend, the Republican leader, is talking in a dreamland.

Ash Carter, the Secretary of Defense, is a very good man. We are so fortunate that he has dedicated his life to public service. He is a scientist and has worked for the defense establishment for a while in public service. He, the Secretary of Defense, says this bill my friend talks about is a bad bill. It doesn't help the military. This funny funding that is in this bill is not good. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee was on the floor this morning talking about that.

It is important that we solve the sequester problem. It is not good, but we cannot, and we should not, fix one part of our government and not the other part.

We support the Pentagon. We support the troops. Of course we do. But as the

Secretary of Defense has so implored us, don't do this to the military. To have a secure nation involves more than the people in the armed services. The people in the armed services, while their families are at home, want them to be protected as they travel to an airport. The TSA needs to be funded, the FBI needs to be funded, the Drug Enforcement Administration needs to be funded, Homeland Security needs to be funded, and in the process, we need to fund education properly. We need to fund research for health. We need to make sure the National Institutes of Health are not whacked again with sequestration the way they were the first time. They lost \$1.6 billion. They have never recovered from that. They have never gotten their money back. Do we want to give them another sequestration? Of course we don't.

We have until this fiscal year ends in the fall to work this out, and that is what we should do. We are legislators. I agree with the 52 Republicans who said we should fix sequestration, but this bill only fixes sequestration for the Department of Defense.

Let's sit down and do what we, as legislators, are supposed to do. Legislation is the art of compromise. We are not going to get everything we want, but the Republicans shouldn't get everything they want, and we should not fund this government by using funny money for defense and using the really unfunny money on the rest of the government. It is unfair, and above all the Republican Party, which used to stand for fiscal responsibility, should get fiscally responsible and help us work this out.

We are ready and willing at any time to sit down and work through this, and we need to start that now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, as the Democratic leader reminded me, on a virtually daily basis for 8 years, the majority leader always gets the last word.

Here is the issue, I say to my friends on the other side: You just voted for the troops. And now you are going to vote against them? Are you going to vote against the troops right after you voted for the troops? That is the fundamental question before us in deciding whether to go to the Defense appropriations measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know my friend gets the last word, and I am looking forward to his last word. However, the logic of my friend is illogical. We stand on our record, and we will continue in that fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, John Barasso, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Tom Cotton, Kelly Ayotte, Lindsey Graham, John McCain, John Thune, Jerry Moran, Richard C. Shelby, Daniel Coats, Jeff Flake, Rob Portman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Enzi	Paul
Ayotte	Ernst	Perdue
Barasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeben	Sessions
Collins	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Isakson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Johnson	Thune
Cotton	Kirk	Tillis
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Donnelly	Murkowski	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Reid
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Coats	Lee	Scott
Graham	McCaskill	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, the yeas are 50, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

(The remarks of Mr. CARDIN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 204 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. CARDIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a constituent of mine. Ilse is a 23-year-old graduate of the University of Washington who works at the Seattle Children's Hospital and is studying to become a nurse. She has faced a lot of challenges in her 23 years, not the least of which was being diagnosed with cancer when she was a teenager, going through treatment, and working to put herself through college.

And if the outstanding costs of cancer treatment weren't difficult enough for her, Ilse was brought to the United States by her mother when she was 6 months old as an undocumented immigrant, which makes navigating our health care system even harder.

Ilse persevered through her cancer treatment. She worked her way through high school with an impressive list of extracurriculars and went on to earn a scholarship that eventually got her to the front steps of her dream school, the University of Washington.

When I met Ilse in 2013, she told me that after 15 years of waiting for her petition to obtain a visa, she lost the

opportunity to obtain legal residency when she turned 21 years old. But thanks to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, or DACA, she had a second chance. She said she doesn't know where she would be now without that second chance. She told me that DACA opened doors that were previously closed to her. And thanks to the increased certainty DACA brought and the amazing work ethic she has, Ilse was able to find jobs that helped pave her way through school.

Today she is able to continue to pursue her dream of helping others as a nurse and building a life in Washington State, her home.

I am pleased to report that Ilse has now been cancer free for over 14 years. So while I rise to talk about Ilse, I also wish to celebrate DACA.

Three years ago this week, Americans celebrated a historic step forward in protecting young, undocumented immigrants known as DREAMers, people such as Ilse. When DACA was enacted, the national dialogue on immigration policy forever changed. The administration announced that America is not a place that will deport someone who plays by the rules but through no fault of their own is an undocumented immigrant, someone who has known no other home than the United States, someone who is an American in all but name. This was a major step toward changing the lives of so many immigrant families.

During the past 3 years, more than 600,000 young immigrants have benefited from deferred action. In my home State of Washington, almost 15,000 DREAMers have been able to receive the stability and peace of mind that DACA brought.

Too often in this debate, it is difficult for some people to understand that millions of undocumented families in our country are already an important part of our community. Immigrants—documented or not—work hard. They send their children to schools throughout this country. They pay their taxes, and they help weave the fabric of our society. In all but name, they are Americans, and America would not be the same without them.

Despite the steps this administration has taken, only legislation from Congress can solve the underlying problem of a very broken immigration system.

So I am here today to say I stand ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to achieve that. Until Congress truly passes comprehensive immigration reform, I am going to continue working each day to help the families and businesses—people such as Ilse—that are trapped by a broken system.

We must never forget the past and the fact that our Nation has long offered generations of immigrants a chance to achieve their dreams. Ilse is no different.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak today about the National Defense Authorization Act, which was just passed on the floor after almost 3 weeks of debate on the Senate floor. Today, a very strong bipartisan majority passed this legislation. It is a very important bill.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to start by offering prayers and thoughts—I think of every Member of the Senate—to the families of those who were killed in last night's horrific, horrific shooting in South Carolina. No words can undo the incredible pain that they are going through, but I think knowing that Members of this body and the entire Congress are thinking and praying for these families is something that I just wish to state on the Senate floor before I begin to talk about this very important bill.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, as I mentioned, we passed the NDAA this afternoon after almost 3 weeks of debate, and I do wish to extend congratulations to the leadership, particularly to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator MCCAIN, and the ranking member, Senator REED, who did such an outstanding job of working in a bipartisan fashion on this bill.

In many ways, this bill is about something that is so critical to American foreign policy and national security interests. What is that? It is credibility, the credibility of the United States. In many ways it is the coin of the realm in international security—how our friends, how our allies, and how our adversaries view American credibility, particularly in the realm of national security, international affairs, and foreign policy. They pay close attention to what we are doing on this floor, in the White House, and overseas—credibility.

Unfortunately, as many are aware, both at home and certainly overseas, we are rapidly losing credibility around the world. In fact, much of the world is puzzled. What is happening to American credibility in terms of foreign policy? We used to be the shining city on the hill, a beacon of strength, a beacon of freedom. Countries that wanted to do us harm didn't because they feared us. Our allies respected and trusted us.

But, unfortunately, that is starting to change. It is changing. Red lines have been crossed with no consequences in places such as Syria, Ukraine, Russia, and in the Iranian negotiations. Many say American credibility has declined. Some say American credibility overseas is in shambles. Nations that once counted on us as friends, as allies, are having a harder time trusting the United States and in some ways are even suspicious of our motives and our policies.

So it is a critical, critical issue. How do we, as a country, regain credibility in the world. It is something that everybody in this body and everybody in the Federal Government should be focused on.

The NDAA bill that we just passed, the National Defense Authorization Act, is a way to start regaining credibility for our country, and we did that this afternoon. A very strong bipartisan majority in the Senate, 71 Senators, voted to pass this very important bill. It is one of the most important bills that we are going to vote on all year.

This is an important signal. U.S. foreign policy—our national security is strongest when we act in a bipartisan manner, as we did on the Senate floor today, and when the executive and legislative branches are working together on foreign policy and national security issues. That is what this bill does.

In many ways, this bill does pretty much exactly what the President has asked in a whole host of areas regarding the military. For example, it funds the Department of Defense at the levels requested by the President. And again I congratulate Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED for many of the key programs, many of the key reforms, and such a powerful bill that got through this body.

This bill also strongly endorses one of the President's signature foreign policy issues—the rebalance of our military focus to the Asia Pacific. There are many provisions in the NDAA that support this rebalanced strategy. Most Members—Republicans and Democrats—of this body are supportive of the President's rebalance strategy.

There is even a directive in the bill from the Congress to the Department of Defense and our military leaders that states: "In order to properly implement the U.S. rebalance policy, United States forces under operational control of the U.S. Pacific Command should be increased"—increased, not decreased. That is strong language. That is supporting the President's rebalance. The Department of Defense needs to heed this language from Congress, and of course we will be keeping a close eye on whether they do.

So the NDAA just passed on the floor helps—it can help and it will help restore America's credibility in the

world. But it would be another blow to our credibility—to U.S. credibility globally—if, after all the hard work that has gone into this bill, after the strong bipartisan support this bill achieved, the President would then decide to veto the NDAA. What would the world think of that? What would the world think of our commitment to our troops with a bill that strongly passed in the House and Senate to fund the U.S. military, to set policies that support the President's policies, if the President then vetoed the bill? This would further undermine U.S. credibility in the world right at a moment when the Congress is trying to be supportive and rebuild this credibility.

After today's vote, after passing the NDAA, it is not clear that Members of this body are going to move forward to actually appropriate the money to fund the military. Think about that. The NDAA passes with strong bipartisan support out of the Committee on Armed Services and strong bipartisan support on the Senate floor this afternoon and the President of the United States vetoes it. That is not going to help America's credibility.

Now we are moving to Defense appropriations, again with strong bipartisan support out of the Committee on Appropriations. Yet we are hearing rumors that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not going to fund the military, that they are going to filibuster this bill.

Playing politics with the funding of our defense, the funding of our men and women in uniform, is not going to help enhance America's credibility anywhere. I think Members are going to have a hard time explaining votes that don't look to fund the men and women who so courageously defend us day in and day out here and abroad. It just doesn't make sense. We have to recognize that these actions that are being taken on the floor and in the White House are not only being watched by Americans, they are being watched by our allies and our adversaries overseas.

Another way to start to restore America's credibility in the world and to support the President and the White House's rebalance strategy in the Asia Pacific is to pass trade promotion authority next week. We have all talked about that. We debated that here on the floor for many weeks. It will help increase jobs. It will make sure that we, the United States, are setting the rules of the road for international trade in the Asia Pacific and not China. But it also goes to America's credibility.

I had the honor of traveling a couple of weeks ago with Chairman MCCAIN, Ranking Member REED, and the Senator from Iowa, Mrs. ERNST, to Vietnam and Singapore. We met with the Prime Minister of Singapore. All the discussion was on American engagement in the Asia Pacific. They want us

there. They want us leading. But the consensus was that if we can't move forward on TPA, it would be disastrous for our credibility.

So, again, the world is watching. We cannot afford to lose U.S. credibility in another region of the world. I am hopeful that next week, as this bill comes to the floor of the Senate, we will once again vote to pass trade promotion authority because that goes to not only helping spur economic growth and greater job growth in our own country, but it goes to America's leadership and credibility in the world.

Finally, I want to talk about another area of the world where U.S. credibility is at stake, and that is the Arctic. Fortunately, Congress has begun to recognize this fact. In the bill we just debated and passed on the floor today, the NDAA, there is an important provision about the national security of the United States in the Arctic. It is now up to the administration and the Department of Defense to start to focus on this very important area of the United States but also the world.

Nobody spoke more eloquently and compellingly about peace through strength and about our country's credibility in the world than former President Ronald Reagan. President Reagan's philosophy to win the Cold War was simple. As he put it, "We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression."

The important thing President Reagan did was he matched his rhetoric with credible actions. Under President Reagan, we strengthened our NATO allies, strengthened our military, provided strong funding for the men and women who defend us, modernized our strategic defense systems, and countered potential Soviet threats throughout the world.

As a result of this credible policy that people and countries around the world believed whether they were our allies or adversaries, the efforts of the Soviet Union to build an empire based on aggression were thwarted and the Soviet Union itself ended up collapsing.

Today, the Soviet Union no longer exists, but make no mistake—the imperialist dreams of expansion that have dominated much of Russian history since the days of the czars is still alive. Today's Russia is again a threat to its neighbors and to the peace of the world. Think about Russia's unlawful military aggression in the Ukraine. But that is not all. There are other vital areas of the world in which Russia is now taking new actions that should concern us. One of these areas is the Arctic.

We don't hear much about the Arctic from the mainstream media. That is largely because it is hard to get reporters and television cameras out to the Arctic. But America is an Arctic nation. We are an Arctic nation because

of my State, the great State of Alaska. And there is much at stake in the Arctic—new transportation routes, huge opportunities for energy. As a recent column in the Wall Street Journal pointed out, "No wonder Moscow has been racing to reopen old Soviet bases on its territory across the Arctic and develop new ones."

The signs are everywhere that Russia is making a new push into the Arctic. Let me provide a few examples. Earlier this year, the Russian military held 5 days of Arctic war exercises that included close to 40,000 troops, 50 surface ships, 13 submarines, and 110 aircraft. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, said recently that the Russians are increasing their military forces by six combat brigades, four of which will be stationed in the Arctic. President Putin has said he wants to build at least 13 new airfields, and they are starting in the Arctic. They are establishing a new Arctic command, with several new ice-breakers to add to their robust fleet.

In the paper just today, there was another report of the Russians planning yet another large-scale exercise in the Arctic involving two Arctic brigades.

Just last week, in a study called "America in the Arctic," CSIS talked about what the Russians are doing. The article said:

Recent actions taken by Russia do not instill confidence that the Arctic will be exempt from recent geopolitical tensions. The Kremlin continues to hold unannounced military exercises in the Arctic, which engage significant numbers of forces . . . and simulate the use of nuclear weapons. Moscow's authorization of the use of military force to protect Russian interests in the Arctic . . . the planned reopening of over 50 Soviet-era bases along Russia's Arctic coastline, and Russia's recently Unified Arctic Command, as well as Russian Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin's pronouncement that "the Arctic is Russia's Mecca," have all raised serious questions regarding Russia's intent in the Arctic.

I want to put this in perspective with a map. This shows the new push by the Russians into the Arctic. It shows the new airfields, the new bases. If we look at the map here, we see red on these different spots. These red spots are the new or existing Russian bases and airfields in the Arctic. The three blue spots on this map are the U.S. presence—a small airfield and radar station in Greenland and Alaska. America's Arctic. Two combat brigades in the great State of Alaska.

Our U.S. military commanders are starting to wake up to the fact that the red is clearly expanding on this map, and it is concerning them. Even Secretary of Defense Ash Carter said just 2 months ago:

The Arctic is going to be a major area of importance to the United States, both strategically and economically in the future—it's fair to say that we're late to the recognition of that.

We are late. So what are we doing? The Russians have Arctic exercises,

new airfields, a new Arctic command, and four new Arctic combat brigades, according to our own Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. What are we doing? The Department of Defense has a 13-page Arctic strategy. That is it—13 pages. That is what the United States of America has—the greatest military force in the world right now—as this is happening. We have this.

I want to talk about credibility. This is not credible. This is not credible. Worse—much worse—the Department of Defense is thinking about removing one or maybe two brigade combat teams from America's Arctic.

Let me repeat that. As the Russians are building up everywhere, we are looking at possibly removing the BCTs right here—these two blue dots—one or two, gone. That is not credible. These are the only U.S. soldiers in the Arctic. They are Arctic-tough soldiers, cold-weather trained. This is the only Arctic airborne brigade in the United States. This is the only airborne brigade in the entire Asia-Pacific, right here, Fort Richardson, Alaska. These soldiers, thousands of them, are capable, well-trained, tough U.S. soldiers, and they are the only ones capable of protecting our country's interests in the Arctic, as that part of the world becomes more and more an area that Russia becomes interested in.

So we have this, 13 pages. We have announced we are seriously contemplating removing these forces from the Arctic. Let me just say, Vladimir Putin must surely be smiling somewhere in Moscow as he makes these moves and he hears that the Department of Defense is thinking about removing our only Arctic forces out of the Arctic. This is not credible.

We are not only showing a lack of credibility, removing Army troops from the Arctic, removing them from Alaska, will show the world weakness. As President Reagan noted, weakness is provocative. We can be assured of that.

This strategy defies logic. Importantly, it also defies the direction of the U.S. Senate and the NDAA, which we just passed by large bipartisan numbers. As I mentioned at the outset, the bill we just passed states that the Department of Defense should increase troops in the Asia-Pacific region—increase troops—under the command of the PACOM commander, which includes these troops right here.

Fortunately, as I said, there are also provisions in the NDAA to start making sure our country wakes up to the security interests we have in the Arctic. The bill we just passed on the floor provides an important first step toward ensuring that the Arctic remains a peaceful, stable, and prosperous place.

The NDAA requires our military to lay out a specific strategy—not just 13 pages—in the Arctic region that protects our interests there. It requires

the Secretary of Defense to update the Congress on the U.S. military strategy in the Arctic region, and, importantly, requires a military operations plan for the protection of our security interests in this important region of the world.

The Department of Defense, the U.S. Army, should not even contemplate moving one single soldier out of America's Arctic until all of this has been completed, and they should look hard at this bill—that we hope the President will not veto—with regard to the direction of the Congress on the importance of increasing U.S. military forces in the Asia-Pacific to add credibility to our rebalanced strategy. That means keeping appropriate troop levels in appropriate places—like the Asia-Pacific, like the Arctic, and like Alaska—as required by the bill that we just passed by an overwhelming majority.

Alaska is the northern anchor of the Pacific rebalance. It is the gateway to the Arctic. It is what makes America an Arctic nation. It is our only Arctic State, and it probably is the single greatest repository of untapped energy resources that will power our Nation's future. That is why, in the words of Gen. Billy Mitchell—the father of the U.S. Air Force—it is the most strategic place in the world.

We need a strong rebalanced strategy that is credible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, let me say, before turning to the topic at hand, those of us from Connecticut—especially those of us in and around Sandy Hook, CT—our hearts go out to the community in Charleston. The grief and tragedy they are working and sifting through today is hard for anyone to imagine. All I can say is I hope they will find, as we did in Newtown, CT, that an internal strength over time comes from unlikely spots; that friends arrive from far-off places; that there is a community that is much bigger than one church or one city that is going to wrap its arms around families and friends of the victims during this terrible time.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I was so glad to see Senator STABENOW down on the floor a week ago talking about a pretty simple issue, which is the tax increase that is going to occur to 6.4 million Americans if the Supreme Court rules this week, next week, for the plaintiffs in the case of King v. Burwell. We wanted to come down to the floor and accentuate this message so people all around this country know what is at stake.

What is at stake is 6.5 million people losing their health insurance. That

maybe gets the headlines. But the way in which people get affordable health insurance under the Affordable Care Act is by tax credits. So the immediate effect of a reversal of subsidies for Federal exchange States is that 6.5 million Americans are going to have their taxes dramatically increased by thousands of dollars if this body refuses to act in the face of a Supreme Court finding for the plaintiffs.

So we wanted to come down to the floor just to talk a little bit about what the stakes are for people's tax bills and how this is going to be a gut punch for millions of American families if the Supreme Court rules the way we hope they don't.

I think it is, first of all, important to say at the outset that most of us who have followed the Affordable Care Act and its legal interpretation think this is a sham of a case. This is a political attack on the Affordable Care Act masked as a legal case.

There is absolutely no question that the Affordable Care Act is built in a way to deliver subsidies to both State exchanges and Federal exchanges. I will not go into all the details as to why that is the clear case. But though we are talking about what might happen if King v. Burwell comes down for the plaintiffs, many of us think that would be an absolutely ludicrous legal result, one that would be a stunning act of judicial overreach, essentially a political substitution of the Court for the legislature. But I want to talk about a couple case studies and then turn the floor over to my colleagues.

I have come down and talked about people from Connecticut. I talked about Christina, a small business owner from Stratford; Susie, a two-time breast cancer survivor from North Canaan, CT; and Sean and Emilie, two freelancers from Weston. All of these people have gotten tax credits through the Affordable Care Act, and it has allowed them to have a lower tax bill but also get insurance. Many of them, it was the first time in their lives or in recent history that they have been able to afford insurance. But there are stories all over the country that are parallel to the stories from Connecticut I have been telling on the floor of the Senate over the course of the last year.

For instance, there are 832,000 Texans who are receiving an average tax credit of \$247 a month. If the Supreme Court strips away these tax credits, those 800,000 people in Texas are going to see a tax increase of around \$3,000. People like Aurora, a 26-year-old from Houston, got health insurance coverage through Texas's Federal marketplace. She works at a small nonprofit where she helps her LGBT peers get the coverage they need. She is saving \$1,500 a year getting insurance she would have never been able to afford. She says, quite simply:

I wouldn't be able to afford my policy otherwise. It has really helped me be able to get

my well person exam and other preventions screenings that I'd not had in years.

She is one of 832,000 people in Texas who are going to have their taxes increased, their insurance stolen away.

I am a big New York Giants fan, so I get to watch a lot of games in which the Giants are playing in this stadium, which is, as Cowboy fans know it, AT&T Stadium. You could fill AT&T Stadium 10 different times. This is a huge stadium. People see the giant jumbotron on the roof of this stadium. You could fill AT&T Stadium 10 times with the number of people in Texas alone who could lose their health care and lose their tax cut—\$3,000, on average, per person a year in Texas—if King v. Burwell is decided in favor of the plaintiffs.

But I will tell another story of a young woman named Celia. She is a self-employed Pilates instructor in Florida. Since 2005, she hasn't been able to find health care coverage. Since 2005, she has been uninsured. Now, she has been lucky because she didn't get really sick during that time, but she only had a \$900-a-month plan that she could find. That was the cheapest. With the Affordable Care Act, Celia finally has insurance. Celia is able to finally sign up for a health insurance plan that has meant something to her because last year she had a minor accident in her home. She had to go to the emergency room. With her insurance, she received a bill of \$57. She said, "I couldn't have even imagined what that would have cost me out-of-pocket—more than I could ever afford." This year, Celia has reenrolled in another silver plan, and for around \$200 a month she knows that she is going to be covered if she gets sick or if she has another minor accident.

In Florida—we think this is a lot of people, 832,000. In Florida, there are 1.3 million people who are receiving health care tax credits right now. Now, I root for the University of Connecticut Huskies, and so we don't necessarily get to play in stadiums this big when you are playing out of the American Athletic Conference. But everybody in Florida knows The Swamp, and you could fill The Swamp 15 times over with the 1.3 million people who could lose their health care tax credit. Those are more people than attend Gator football games on an annual basis. Those are more people than attend Gator football games over a 2-year period of time. So 1.3 million people are going to lose their coverage in Florida alone.

So let's call a spade a spade. This is about health care. It is about our belief that for people who are working hard and playing by the rules, they should have a shot at being healthy, but it is also about keeping people's tax bills low. If we ever contemplated a bill on the floor of the U.S. Senate that raised 1.3 million people's taxes in Florida by

an average of \$3,500, my friends from the Republican side of the aisle—our friends would be screaming bloody murder that this was an unjustifiable, unconscionable, unworkable tax increase on the American people. But there is largely silence or temporary fixes and patches that are proposed.

So I am glad to join my colleagues to talk about what this means.

Now, I am from Connecticut and we have a State exchange. We have a State exchange. Conventional wisdom is that those of us who have State exchanges are going to be protected because we will continue to get subsidies. But this is going to be a death spiral nationally. We have no idea how this will actually play out. When you have all of these subsidies ripped away with the insurance reforms still baked in, even in States such as Connecticut, where you have a State exchange, we are not immune. Nobody is immune. The primary victims here are going to be the people in States such as Florida and Texas, as I mentioned. But this is going to be a national catastrophe.

We hope we don't ever have to have a conversation on the floor of the Senate as to how to fix this. But we better be clear ahead of time as to what the implications are.

I yield the floor.

I know my colleague will seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first I want to thank my friend from Connecticut, not only for those very powerful words but for his ongoing advocacy and leadership in the whole realm of health care and the importance of something as basic as being able to take the kids to the doctor, to make sure that you have the health care and the affordable health insurance that you need. I want to thank Senator MURPHY, and I also want to thank Senator BALDWIN as well, my partner and neighbor from Wisconsin. Senator BALDWIN is also a champion as it relates to quality, affordable health care for every American. Both of them are very important voices and leaders on what we call the HELP Committee. I am their partner on the other committee that does the financing of health care, which is, in fact, the Finance Committee.

As the ranking Democrat—the lead Democrat—on the Health Care Subcommittee and someone deeply involved through the Finance Committee as we were putting together the Affordable Care Act, I think it is appropriate for me to be able to talk about legislative intent. That is what I want to do for a moment. We knew that in putting together a way for everyone to be able to purchase affordable health insurance and indicating the expectation that we would, it had to be affordable.

I worked very hard to make sure that we had a tax credit system that would

essentially lower people's taxes so they could take those funds and be able to use those to be able to afford health insurance. In fact, at the time, Senator Baucus, the chairman of the committee, would razz me and call me "Senator Affordability" in all the meetings.

We spent a lot of time focusing on how to make sure health insurance was affordable. What is happening, as Senator MURPHY said, is that if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position, 6.4 million Americans are going to see tax credits go away and their taxes go up. The worst part is that their taxes are going to go up and their health care is going to go down. It is not a good deal for anybody.

Unfortunately, one of those States is my State of Michigan.

But let me talk a little bit more, first, about the broad picture, because we are looking at \$1.7 billion in tax increases to people all over America if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position. Basically, somehow we would have to say it is rational that Members from all of these States actually voted for a system that didn't help their own people, which makes absolutely no sense.

I can't believe anybody would do that. People wouldn't do that. Basically, we are saying that Members of Congress said that people in Massachusetts, where there is a State exchange, can have a tax cut, but if you live in Oklahoma you can't. Or if you live in the District of Columbia, right here, you can have a tax cut, but if you live in Louisiana, you can't. Or if you live in New York, you can have a tax cut, but if you live in Texas, you can't.

We can go right around looking at some of the numbers. I will not go through all of the charts that I did last week. I am very grateful for Senator MURPHY for pointing out two very important States.

Let me talk about my State of Michigan. I happen to be a baseball fan. I am a big Detroit Tigers fan. When we look at Comerica Park in Detroit, it is a beautiful stadium. Mr. President, we welcome you to come and watch a game and get our folks engaged in what they do best at winning games. The fact of the matter is that you would have to fill up Comerica Park five times—that is what it would take—to get the number of people who are going to lose their health care tax credits if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position—228,388 people.

A couple of other States: In Illinois, 232,371 people will see their taxes go up. In New Jersey, 172,000-plus will see their taxes go up. In Ohio, another State right down from the great State of Michigan, 161,011 people will see their taxes go up. Finally, in Pennsylvania, it is 348,823 people.

When we look at all of this, all of the States together, 6.4 million people are

going to see tax increases. It makes no sense that people who represent these States would have voted for a system that raises taxes on their people and doesn't give them the health care they need while other people, in fact, see lower taxes—tax credits that allow them to pay for their health care and get affordable health care. It makes absolutely no sense.

Let me also say this. When we look at the Chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate, the former distinguished chairman, Senator Max Baucus from Montana, all the time we were debating the Affordable Care Act, it was clear that Montana had absolutely no plan to set up their own exchange. They indicated that. In order for the Court to side with Republicans, we would have to somehow believe that Senator Baucus would write a health care bill with tax cuts for other States and not his own State of Montana, which I can assure you he did not do. The same can be said for myself.

The legislative intent is absolutely clear on this. What the Court is deciding, in my opinion, is something that I can't believe they are even bringing in front of the U.S. Supreme Court because on the face of it, it makes no sense. Unfortunately, depending on how they rule, millions of Americans—millions of Americans—will see their taxes go up and their health care go away.

The intent is very real. It is very clear in the Affordable Care Act. Title I, page 1: Quality, affordable health care for all Americans. What was true 5 years ago when we wrote this bill is true today: The right to get the tax cuts has nothing to do with the State in which you live. If you are in America, then you deserve the opportunity to receive tax cuts that will make your health care affordable, whether you get your plan on an exchange run by the State or through healthcare.gov.

This is about moms and dads in Michigan and across the country being able to go to bed at night without having to say a prayer that says: Please, God, don't let the kids get sick because what am I going to do? The Affordable Care Act has provided an answer and the peace of mind for millions of Americans. We certainly hope that the Supreme Court will not take that away.

I would now like to yield the floor to the great Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, before I begin my focus on the Affordable Care Act, I want to simply state that my heart goes out to the victims of last night's shooting in Charleston, SC, as they participated in a prayer service at Emanuel AME Church. The victims and

their families and the entire community are in my thoughts and prayers in the wake of this unspeakable hate crime.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Ms. BALDWIN. My colleagues and I gathered here on the floor today to share some good news—something we unfortunately don't get to hear quite enough on the Senate floor. I am here today with Senators MURPHY and STABENOW to talk about how the Affordable Care Act is working to strengthen and improve the economic security and the health security of our families all across the United States.

Before the Affordable Care Act, over 50 million Americans were uninsured, and seniors paid higher out-of-pocket costs for their prescription drugs. Insurance companies wrote their own rules and jacked up premiums. They denied coverage to people with pre-existing health conditions. And in too many cases they dropped your coverage because you got sick, got older or had a baby.

Making the Affordable Care Act the law of the land marked a critical turning point that was essential to stopping these predatory practices and to giving our families the quality, affordable health care they deserve and they need. Now the story has changed.

As my colleagues have noted, we have seen a historic reduction in the number of uninsured since Congress passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010. Thanks to the law, over 16 million previously uninsured Americans have received health coverage. This year more than 10 million individuals have an affordable, quality health plan through the law's new health care marketplaces. Nearly 8.7 million people are benefiting from the health insurance cost assistance provided under the new law.

I want to make it clear that the law's important benefits are making a real difference in my home State of Wisconsin. In Wisconsin, over 180,000 people have a quality insurance plan through our Federally facilitated Affordable Care Act marketplace.

More than 90 percent of these Wisconsinites are receiving support to make their coverage more affordable. More importantly, the insurance companies don't get to make their own rules anymore.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies can no longer deny coverage to the more than 2 million Wisconsinites who have some type of preexisting health condition. Insurance companies can no longer charge copays or deductibles for critical preventative services such as contraception or cancer screenings for over 1 million Wisconsin women. Thanks to the new law, 89,000 Wisconsin seniors on Medicare will see their prescription

drug doughnut hole closed by 2022. In the meantime, these same seniors on average have saved \$913 each on prescription drugs.

I could continue on to share more numbers that prove that the ACA is working for our families in Wisconsin and in States across the country. But the real proof, the real story is about the faces and the people behind these numbers. It is about real people, real Wisconsinites, who are realizing the benefits of this law every day—real Wisconsinites such as Doug from Colgate, WI. At age 62, Doug was worried about becoming uninsured. He and his wife had been insured through her employer, but she was about to apply for Medicare. Fortunately, Doug was able to find an affordable health plan on the Affordable Care Act marketplace. He did not have to lie awake at night worrying about being denied coverage due to his recent heart surgery or another preexisting condition.

There are real Wisconsinites such as Kim of West Allis. Kim runs a small costume shop. She lost Medicaid coverage when her son turned 18 years old. She went without medical care because she could not afford it, even though Kim's doctor had found an indication of cancer during a hysterectomy. But then she signed up for the affordable coverage on the Affordable Care Act's marketplace that costs only \$79 a month. And when she renewed her coverage this year, her premium dropped to \$20 a month. Without this coverage and the premium tax credits, she wouldn't have been able to afford the extra checkups she needed to keep track of the possibility of the cancer emerging.

Joelisa is a real Wisconsinite. She is a community health worker. Joelisa lost her health insurance when she switched jobs but was able to quickly find a new plan through the ACA marketplace. The plan cost only \$87 per month with premium tax credits—a tremendous tax savings from her \$500 monthly premiums through her previous job. Joelisa's health care coverage helps her manage several chronic conditions, including a metabolic syndrome that carries a high risk of progressing to diabetes, and it also makes sure that her daughter gets immunizations and stays as healthy as possible.

One part of this story has not changed, and that part is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want the Affordable Care Act to work. In fact, they continue to root for its failure. They don't want you to know about Joelisa's lower health insurance premiums or about Kim's affordable plan that is helping her prevent cancer.

Regrettably, what they do want is crystal clear. They want to repeal the law and turn back the clock to the days when only the healthy and wealthy could afford the luxury of

quality health insurance. Since its passage, Republicans have spent countless days trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act by any and all means. They have tried to repeal the law in Congress by voting over 50 times—that is 5-0—to repeal all or parts of the Affordable Care Act. They have also tried to repeal the law by advancing politically motivated lawsuits, including the most recent one that would rob millions of Americans of the health insurance they have today. In Wisconsin alone, this would mean that over 160,000 hard-working Americans would see their taxes increase if they were stripped of their health insurance subsidies. That is enough to fill historic Lambeau Field twice. It is one thing to say the numbers, it is another thing to imagine the number of Wisconsinites that affects.

It is not only Wisconsin families who would be impacted by this devastation but also families in our neighboring States—neighboring States with Federal exchanges—such as Michigan, Illinois, and Iowa.

Republicans have tried to say they have an answer, but their answer is really nothing more than another tired attempt to dismantle and repeal the Affordable Care Act. One of these proposals was put forth by a Republican colleague from my home State of Wisconsin. It would eliminate the health insurance subsidies in all States, including the federally facilitated and State-run marketplaces. His proposal would rob over 166,000 Wisconsin constituents of their premium support. His plan would attack the health care security of Kim and Joelisa. According to the American Academy of Actuaries, it would expand the ranks of the uninsured and raise premiums.

Naturally, his proposal would hand over the reins to the insurance companies and allow them the freedom to take us back to the days when they offered bare-bones plans without essential health care coverage. In Wisconsin, this means going back to the days when there were no—none, zip, zero—individual health care plans in the entire State that offered maternity coverage for families. We cannot go back, we must not go back, and we will not go back.

We know the Affordable Care Act is providing access, affordability, and quality in the State of Wisconsin. We also know that in the United States of America, health care should be a right guaranteed to all and not just a privilege reserved for the few. That is what we have fought for, and that is what we are going to continue to fight for as we move the Affordable Care Act forward.

I wish to once again thank my colleagues, Senator STABENOW and Senator MURPHY, for joining me on the floor this afternoon.

We have a case that is about to be decided by the U.S. Supreme Court.

There has been effort after effort in the Congress of the United States to repeal or defund all or part of the Affordable Care Act, but it is providing lifesaving coverage and good news for Wisconsinites and people across America.

I yield back my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

TRADE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe we are moving to a very important debate in the next week as the Senate moves forward with legislation passed by the House of Representatives today that would advance trade promotion authority. Trade promotion authority is a delegation by the U.S. Congress to the President of the United States, the Chief Executive—power that Congress has—authorizing and directing that the President go forward to negotiate a trade agreement. This trade agreement would then be brought back to the Congress and, through legislation, would be implemented. But the trade agreement would never be subject to full evaluation, full debate under the normal processes of Congress, nor would it be subject to any amendment. Indeed, if the trade promotion authority passes the Senate—maybe next week—this legislation, this trade agreement would be fast-tracked. That is why they call it a fast-track agreement.

The fast-track would mean that the treaty—they call it “agreement” to avoid the fact that a treaty requires a two-thirds vote—that this trade agreement would be brought up so that Congress—it would be on the floor for 20 hours, it would be subject to no amendment, and it would be voted on, up or down. It would be filed, for example, at 4 o'clock on a Monday afternoon and voted on final passage the next day at noon. That is the kind of situation we are faced with.

Fast-track has been used for a number of years, a number of times, but it has always been focused on trade—what the tariff rates might be between trading partners, details of trade agreements and definitions and those kinds of things. But this agreement is far more extensive. It is more extensive in the size and the scope of the trade agreement, the number of nations, and

the fact that it would cover—if the Atlantic agreement is also approved—75 percent of the world's economy.

But even more significant to me is that it creates something that is a non-trading entity, a commission, a trans-Pacific international commission. This commission will meet regularly. It will be created by legislation with certain rules. But according to the Trade Representative who is negotiating in advance of this legislation on behalf of President Obama and who is advocating for it, it will be a living agreement. That means the entity itself, the commission, will then be entitled to make the TPP say different things, eliminate provisions it does not like, and add provisions it does like. In fact, the commission is required to meet regularly and to hear advice for changes from outside groups and from inside committees of the commission so that they can update the situation to change circumstances.

It is a breathtaking event. It says it is designed to promote the international movement of people, services, and products—basically the same language used to start the European Union. In fact, I have referred to it as a nascent European Union. I do not think that is far off base.

So we will have 12 Pacific nations come together in this agreement. Well, the trade agreement, I would suggest, colleagues, is not that big of a deal—a part of it. We have free-trade agreements with big nations, such as Canada, Australia, Mexico, Chile. The negotiations—really have an impact with two nations of significance: Japan and Vietnam. Why we can't negotiate trade agreements with them in a bilateral fashion? I don't know. Why do we have to create a transnational union, an institution that has the power, as I will explain, to impact the laws of the United States of America? It is not necessary.

I voted for—it has not worked as well as we were told it would work, but I voted for the last bilateral agreement with South Korea. South Korea, like Japan, is our good friend. We do not have any fundamental disagreements with them. They are part of the civilized world and so forth. But they have a different view of trade than we have. They are mercantile. They have to be approached and considered in a different way. They just approach trade differently. They believe manufacturing and exports mean power. An actual study has shown not too long ago that mercantilism has enhanced their power. A nation with trading deficits like the United States has had their power diminished as their trade deficits have accrued.

So some of our colleagues reject mercantilism. It is not healthy to trade for sure. We would like to see it go away. But it is our trading partner's policy. We have to deal with that reality when we negotiate agreements.

So what I will say, colleagues, is that this is a significant event. I see no reason that when we are attempting to create a trade agreement, it can't be like South Korea in 2012. Why do we have to create an entirely new transnational union with the power where each nation has one vote? The Sultan of Brunei—Brunei is one of the countries, one of the 12—the Sultan of Brunei gets one vote, and the President of the United States gets one vote it appears, although from my reading of the document it is difficult to fully understand what they mean.

I would say, at the most fundamental level, this Congress should not fast-track any transnational union of which we are a part until we understand every word in it, we know exactly what it means, and the President can answer. I have asked questions. I have asked him what it means—the living agreement language—in a letter. No answer. I asked the President of the United States: Do you contend this agreement will reduce the big trade deficit we have or will it increase the trade deficit? They don't answer. The only thing advocates for this treaty say is that it will advance or enhance employment in the exporting industry. That is the only statement they have made. Why are they being careful about that? I have listened to them. No one has ever said much more than that.

Well, in 2011, the President of the United States asserted, when he was promoting the trade agreement with South Korea—this was his statement:

We don't simply want to be an economy that consumes other country's goods. We want to be building and exporting the goods that create jobs here in America . . .

Well, I agree with that. I think we do need to focus on that. We have a sustained trade deficit, we have a sustained decline in American manufacturing, and we have seen the wages of America's middle class decline for over a decade—since 2000. We have not had increases in wages but a decline in wages. Part of that is because of a decline in manufacturing, which is where higher wages are paid.

So this is what the President said with regard to the Korea Free Trade Agreement in his announcement back in 2011: “I'm interested in agreements that increase jobs and exports for the American people.”

Well, I am, too. Well, what do we know about the Korea trade agreement? Did it work? President Obama said this at that announcement. I hate to recall what he said, but this is what the promise was when he made this announcement. This is the President's statement that he personally delivered: “In short, the tariff reductions in this agreement alone are expected to boost annual exports of American goods by up to \$11 billion.” Annual exports would be increased by \$11 billion: “This would advance my goal of doubling U.S. exports over the next 5 years.”

So what happened after the trade agreement was signed? We have had less than \$1 billion in 3 years in export increases to South Korea. They have had a \$12 billion increase in imports to the United States, virtually doubling the trade deficit that was already large between our countries.

This is a chart which shows how that worked. This black line is when the treaty was signed. This is the trade deficit we have been running with South Korea. This is zero. These are the deficits we have been running. Then when the treaty was signed—the agreement was signed—we had a marked decline in exports. I wish it were not so. I voted for it. I bought into free trade and drank the free trade Kool-Aid. But did it work? I have to say it hasn't worked yet. The reason? Mr. Clyde Prestowitz, who was a trade negotiator for President Reagan with the Pacific and with Japan in the 1980s, said: They have nontariff barriers. They have a mercantilist philosophy, and their philosophy is to buy the least possible from abroad, make everything they can possibly make at home, and export as much as possible, creating jobs in their country, creating surpluses in trade, creating wealth, they believe, and also creating power.

So I am concerned about this. I would just contend that we do not need to be listening to Pollyannaish promises that these trade agreements are going to be so great for working Americans. They have not been doing so well, in my opinion.

In fact, Mr. Prestowitz, whom I just mentioned, wrote a book on trade. In January of this year, he wrote an op-ed for the Los Angeles Times in which he said this. Instead of saying that we are going to have a \$10 billion increase annually in exports, let's look at the facts. This is Mr. Prestowitz:

Over the last 35 years, the U.S. has brought China into the World Trade Organization and concluded many free-trade agreements, including one with South Korea three years ago. In advance of each, U.S. leaders promised the deals would create high-paying jobs, reduce the trade deficit, increase [gross domestic product] and raise living standards. But none of these came true. In fact, the U.S. non-oil trade deficit continued to grow, millions of jobs are offshored and mean household income has hardly risen since 2000. And economists overwhelmingly agree that rising U.S. income inequality is being driven in part by international trade.

That is President Reagan's adviser, a student of these issues who knows the Pacific well, who has written a book on trade and documents—contrary to what some people say—that for the first 150 years of our country we had high tariffs on products imported.

Now, I believe we should eliminate tariffs. I believe we should move to trade, and I have supported that over the years. But I just have to say I am less convinced that in a world where our partners aren't operating on the

same policies we operate on, we have to be careful about these agreements.

What our trading partners want, in substance, is access to the U.S. market, access so they can sell their products in the U.S. market and bring home wealth to their countries. That is their goal. It just is. That is the way they approach life.

We want access to their markets. There is nothing wrong with that. That is just what the world is about, and we are not negotiating very effectively.

So many of these countries have nontariff barriers that cause difficult problems in trade. And we reduce our tariff barriers and we have virtually no other barriers to the sale of foreign products in the United States, while we are not able to export competitive products abroad because of their nontariff barriers or even sometimes their tariff barriers.

I just wish to say at the beginning that I am not of the view that we have to have a trade agreement passed this week and as part of it that we have to pass some union with 12 countries each having one vote. I don't see that has to be done.

If we don't sign a trade agreement that affects Japan or Vietnam today, what, is the world going to collapse? We have been getting along without it for decades, apparently, maybe since the beginning of the history of the Republic. So I would say let's slow down, and I say we have to focus more effectively on what is good for America.

Fast-track is a decision by Congress to suspend several of its most basic powers for 6 years, and any treaty that is created in the next 6 years can take advantage of fast-track, be brought directly to the floor, and be passed on a simple majority in the House and the Senate without an amendment.

One of my Republican colleagues said: Oh, well, we will have a Republican President, and we can really put up some good trade bills. Who knows who is going to be elected President next year. Who knows if the President, if he is a Republican, will send up a good trade bill. Congress has its duty to respond and study trade agreements and cast a knowledgeable vote on it. I don't think Congress, in this instance, should give up its procedural processes for passing any important legislation. I think a decision of the magnitude we are dealing with deserves the most careful scrutiny.

This is not a trade agreement with one friend and ally, South Korea, it includes 12 nations in the Pacific. As soon as that is inked, we have been told—and brought forward for passage in the Congress—and, historically, if we get trade promotion authority, the agreements that are presented have always passed. Once that is said and done, we will begin to debate the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, TTIP. This transatlantic

agreement, I suppose, will also have some sort of commission, a transatlantic union with powers that discipline and set rules outside the powers of the Congress.

Then there is going to be a services agreement that has already been talked about. It has been leaked. Somebody leaked this. The other two are secret and cannot be seen by the American people.

So this services agreement has 10 pages on immigration. They are going to fast-track through changes in our immigration law. It is a very serious matter. We have other issues out there like environmental law—that I will mention in a minute—that absolutely the President intends to advance through this trade agreement.

So those are three major treaties, and those treaties would impact 75 percent of the GDP of America, but that is not all. For the next 6 years, any other treaty can be advanced in this same way. Presumably, three or four countries could get together and agree on some environmental regulation, and it could be advanced as some trade agreement in a fast-track procedure through Congress.

So I think the burden of proof rests on the promoters of fast-track to demonstrate why three-fifths of the Senate shouldn't be required to agree, since this is so akin to a treaty, and/or advance this contrary to the proceedings of Congress.

Some of my colleagues have been saying that the trade promotion authority, which the President is so desperately seeking—he has been hammering and bludgeoning his Members in the Senate and the House to get them to not vote their conscience but vote with what he wants—they say we should pass it because it restricts the power of the President.

Well, give me a break. If this were true, why would the President want it? If he could do all he wants to do without Congress, why isn't he doing it anyway? The entire purpose of fast-track is for Congress to surrender its power to the executive branch for 6 years. Legislative concessions include control over the content of the legislation. The President negotiates it, he brings it back, we can't amend it. He controls the content on it, the power to fully consider the legislation on the floor. It is filed on one day and voted the next day. The power to keep debate open until Senate cloture is invoked—on any other legislation, you have to get a cloture vote.

We couldn't get cloture on the Defense bill today. The Democrats refused to give 60 votes to pass the bill that appropriates the funds to defend America, but the President would be able to bring up this bill with a simple majority and no ability for extended debate that the Senate is famous for, and there is the constitutional requirement

that a treaty receives a two-thirds vote.

When you are creating an international union, I mean, this crosses the line. May be someone can technically say that somehow this is an agreement and not a treaty. I don't know, lawyers could perhaps disagree, but Congress should assert its power.

We should say: Mr. President, we have seen you operate. We are not going to authorize you to enter into the creation of an international union where you get to impose additional powers on us without creating it through the treaty process.

The legislation, finally, is not amendable, which is exceedingly unusual.

So without fast-track, Congress retains all its legislative powers. Individual Members retain all their procedural tools, and every single line of trade text is publically available before any action is taken to grease the skids for its final passage. I think that is the important issue.

What about this union. What kind of powers is it that we are talking about? I am of the belief that the President hasn't been a strong advocate of trade. His supporters, many of them oppose this kind of trade agreement. I am coming to believe the primary part of his understanding of the importance of this legislation, and why he is breaking arms and heads over it, is the union, this international commission that has powers that he believes will allow him to advance agendas. I don't say that conspiratorially. I will explain in a moment that clearly seems to be one of the incentives this President has to advance this legislation.

In a Ways and Means House document on a new Pacific union being formed by President Obama, a committee in the House hints at some of this union's power, this international commission on trade:

If a proposed change to a trade agreement is contemplated [by the TPP Commission] that would require a change in U.S. law, all of TPA's congressional notification, consultation, and transparency requirements would apply.

In other words, Ways and Means is intimating that this new secret Pacific union would function like a third House of Congress, with legislative primacy, the ability to advance legislation, sending changes to the House and Senate under fast-track procedures—receiving less procedure, for example, than post office reform.

Further, this legislative fast-track, Ways and Means implies, is a change in U.S. law, meaning that if this President or the next argues it is simply an Executive action, not a legal action, the Executive would have a free hand to implement any agreement the Commission creates without any approval of Congress.

Well, he said he wouldn't do that. Did you see where people who were unlaw-

fully in the country were given a photo ID card by the President of the United States, were given a Social Security number, and it says on the card "work authorization," when the law says if you are in the country illegally you cannot have a Social Security number. He did that.

He made a recess appointment in blatant violation of a definition of what a recess is. It took 2 or 3 years for the Congress to take it to the Supreme Court, and in a unanimous 9-to-0 ruling, the Supreme Court overturned it.

So to say the President will not push his powers is naive indeed. How do you stop it? Do you file a lawsuit to say the President shouldn't have agreed to the Pacific Commission? Now a whole government bureaucracy is carrying out some global warming, some immigration, some trade issues that Congress opposes.

Is a President capable of doing something like that, actually carrying out ideas and policies that Congress doesn't approve of. Absolutely. We have seen it time and again.

So this is not merely a loophole, it is a purposeful delegation of congressional authority to the Executive and to an international body. We should understand what we are doing. Not enough of our people have read some agreement and fully understand. The fast-track-implementing legislation would have the ability to make these binding delegations binding as a matter of law, it seems to me. Well, maybe not. It probably wouldn't work that way. I don't think it works that way.

Look, that is why I wrote the President and I said: Mr. President, make this part of the proposed TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership public. Let's have the lawyers study it. You explain to us exactly what these words mean—which he has refused to do. As a matter of fact, I don't think the American people have fully grasped that this is not a normal trade agreement but that it is the creation of an international entity.

Amendments to specify Congress retains exclusive legislative authority and to actively prohibit foreign worker increases were blocked by the fast-track supporters. I offered legislation that would make clear that the President couldn't alter the constitutionally exclusive power of Congress over immigration, and they refused to give us a vote. It is not in the bill. Why not?

I said: Well, we are not going to change immigration law.

Some administration underlings say that. They don't have the power to bind the President. They are not lawyers, perhaps. They don't know what the words mean. The President of the United States hasn't said it publicly, neither has his Trade Representative. He has come close, but if you read his words, you will see that they were clever words, in my opinion, with little meaning.

Fast-track supporters have tried to temper concerns about the formation of this transnational union and the subsequent Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, TTIP, and the Trade in Services Agreement, TISA, that would be approved through fast-track by adding additional negotiating objectives via a separate Customs bill.

However, negotiation objectives are, by design, not explicit or realistically enforceable. They include such vague language as saying it must be the goal of the White House "to ensure that trade agreements reflect and facilitate the increasingly interrelated, multi-sectoral nature of trade and investment activity." Those are the kinds of things in this language. That is not enforceable and has virtually no meaning.

One of the vague goals is "to recognize the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce." What does that mean?

Under the Ways and Means solution, TPP, TTIP, and TISA would establish broad goals for labor mobility—immigration—allowing Ways and Means to say their negotiating objective, about requiring or obligating certain changes, had not been violated. And the President would then implement those changes through Executive action or as a result of fast-track where the laws have changed.

So, together, TPP, TTIP, and TISA—these three trade agreements which we know are going to be advanced under fast-track—represent the goal of advancing the unrestricted global movement of goods and people and services.

The European Commission—this is how they started, how they were formed. In explaining TISA—presumably the second major trade agreement that would be submitted after the Pacific agreement and we move to trade in services—this is how the European Commission explains what it means:

TISA is open to all WTO members who want to open up trade in services. China and Uruguay have asked to join the talks. The EU supports their applications—

The EU supports their applications because it wants as many countries as possible to join the agreement.

TISA, of course, is the services agreement, and it will be worldwide. Anybody—even China—could be admitted to it. And the European Union Commission specifies that this services agreement, TISA, will be modeled on the General Agreement on Trade in Services, GATS. This provides insight into how TISA will affect U.S. immigration procedures.

When the United States became a member of the WTO in 1994, it signed on to the GATS and committed to issue certain numbers of work visas each year, immigration visas. Congress's ability to control the U.S. temporary entry programs has therefore been curtailed, as it would open up

the United States to foreign lawsuits in an international tribunal.

In other words, they made an agreement on immigration visas under work ideas as part of GATS in the WTO, and it violates and complicates our ability to enforce American immigration law. But if we enforce the law the way it is written, then we will get disciplined by the foreign body. So when we sign up to a foreign body, we agree to rules. They say we have to do this. So it is not being enforced.

So who wrote the law for the United States of America with regard to immigration? Under the Constitution, it is Congress, but in reality, once you join an international union, they have certain powers to enforce their will over the elected representatives, the accountable representatives of the people of the United States, and some other group does it.

TISA—this services agreement—will, as the European Union suggests, require the United States to make additional legislative commitments on a much larger scale. Do we understand that? When people are voting for this trade agreement, this Pacific trade agreement, do we understand that we are opening up a mechanism for the services agreement and for the Atlantic agreement and perhaps another commission for the Atlantic? Will there be a commission set up under the TISA or TTIP bills? Do we know? Do we want to give a fast-track to grease the skids for the President to negotiate such a thing as this? I think not.

The preamble to the South Korea Free Trade Agreement, for example, states that a principal goal of the agreement is to “create new employment opportunities, and improve the general welfare . . . by liberalizing and expanding trade and investment between their territories.”

In announcing that agreement, President Obama said:

Because we don't simply want to be an economy that consumes other countries' goods. We want to be building and exporting the goods that create jobs here in America and that keeps the United States competitive in the 21st century.

That is what he said at that time.

So for too long the United States has entered into trade deals on the promise of economic bounty, only to see workers impoverished, industries disappear, and manufacturing jobs decline. And we have been on a steady decline in manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Dan DiMicco, one of the great CEOs in America and chairman emeritus of Nucor Steel, has written about these issues recently. He explains that these deals haven't worked as they have been promised. They haven't been, he says, free-trade deals at all. Instead, they have been “unilateral trade disarmament,” where we lower our barriers to foreign imports but they retain their barriers to our ex-

ports. Mr. DiMicco calls this the “enablement of foreign mercantilism.”

So consider this in the context of automobiles. In May, the Wall Street Journal—who is a free-trade entity for sure—published a news story about how the American auto sector could be jeopardized by the TPP. The Wall Street Journal wrote:

In the transportation sector, led by cars, the TPP could boost imports by an extra \$30.8 billion by 2025, compared with an exports gain to Japan of \$7.8 billion, according to a study co-written by Peter Petri, professor of international finance at Brandeis University.

I think that is exactly accurate. We are not going to have an increase in sales of automobiles in Japan. They have a 4 million automobile surplus capacity. They want to hire their people and they want to sell automobiles in Japan by producing automobiles in Japan, not by importing them. They are mercantilists in their approach. They have successfully resisted the penetration of their automobile market for decades, and it is not going to happen under this agreement. It is just not. But if we reduce our little 2.5 percent tariff on automobile imports to America, this, on the Japanese, has some sort of balancing effect for their failure to allow their markets to be open, and we will increase imports to the United States.

I am not condemning Japan. I am just saying that is how they operate, and we need to understand that and be more effective in defending American interests.

So what we hear from the promoters of this deal is “We believe this trade deal will increase exports.” Well, surely we will get some additional ability to sell products abroad. Surely the President can honestly say: If you sign the agreement with South Korea, well, we will have increased exports to South Korea. And we did—\$800 million instead of the \$11 billion he promised. So we got a little increase, but they got a \$12 billion increase to the United States. And what did that do? That diminished manufacturing in the United States.

Additionally, Clyde Prestowitz, who also served as trade negotiator under President Clinton in addition to President Reagan, offered this warning about the TPP:

Two intertwined elements pose a virtually insuperable barrier to mass market auto imports in Japan. First, Japan's capacity for vehicle production is 13 million. Annual domestic sales are 4 million and exports are another 5 million. That leaves 4 million vehicles equivalent of excess capacity that constitutes a heavy cost burden on the Japanese automobile industry. In the face of this, neither the Japanese industry nor the Japanese Government will want to make life easier for imports. The second structural element is auto dealerships. By law U.S. dealers are independent of the automakers and are free to sell any brand they wish. Exporters to the United States thus find it easy to achieve

national distribution of their vehicles. Not so in Japan where the automakers effectively control the dealers.

And that is the big automobile manufacturing companies. I don't think anybody will dispute that.

The essence of what he is saying is that we are really not going to gain market share in Japan, while they are going to gain market share in the United States. So that is why people would like to see tougher, more vigorous negotiation of trade agreements.

Then there is the issue of currency manipulation. The President has made clear that he has no intention of enforcing currency manipulation, which can easily dwarf the impact of tariffs. A former Federal Reserve Chairman, a number of years ago—a great Chairman—said currency manipulation can dwarf the impact of tariffs. By manipulating their currency, our trading partners can artificially raise the price of our exports while lowering the price of their imports. This improper practice has resulted in closed plants, shuttered factories, and the shifting of U.S. jobs and wealth overseas. And China is a huge player in that.

The middle class has shrunk 10 percentage points in the United States since 1970, and real hourly wages are lower today than they were more than four decades ago. That is hard to believe. The real hourly wages are lower than they were 40 years ago. The percentage of men age 25 to 54 not working was less than 6 percent in the late 1960s; it has nearly tripled to 16.5 percent. The labor force participation rate for women—the percentage of women in their working years who are actually working—has fallen 3 full percentage points since 2009 alone.

We can't keep doing the same thing and expecting a different result. So last month, I sent a letter to the President asking how he planned to use fast-track authority and what it would mean for American workers. Those questions should not have been difficult to answer. These negotiators should have been having that on the front of their negotiating minds from the very beginning.

They have been working on this agreement for years. Not one of these questions have been answered—not one. Nor have they been answered by anybody promoting fast-track. They won't answer these questions—the questions about the trade pact, the text of which remains confidential, locked downstairs in a secret room.

This is a question I asked: Will it increase or reduce the trade deficit, and by how much?

Shouldn't we know that? Shouldn't that be discussed? Shouldn't that be the first thing we discuss? Is this going to help the U.S. economy?

No. 2, will it increase or reduce manufacturing employment and wages, including the auto sector, and accounting for jobs lost to imports?

No answer. Shouldn't we know that?

No. 3, will you make the "living agreement" section public and explain fully the implications of the new global governance authority known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership Commission?

Mr. President, shouldn't you tell us before we grease the skids to pass a new international commission? Shouldn't we know what it is about?

Congress should just say no on this, colleagues. We don't have to advance fast-track. We ought to insist that at least this new Commission part be fully public. We want to study it before we agree to committing this great Nation to an entity that has very small nations with the same vote as we have.

We asked: Will China be added to this Commission?

No answer. In fact, they have hinted they could be added, and apparently the Commission can vote in new members without Congress voting on it. That looks to me to be pretty clear, from my reading of it.

Will you pledge, we asked further, not to issue any Executive actions or enter into any future agreements impacting the flow of foreign workers into the United States?

No answer. Not one of these questions has been answered. Yet they want us to shut off debate, limit congressional procedural power, and advance this legislation with no amendments. I don't see how anyone can say Congress is not entitled to have at least these questions answered.

What about the American people? Shouldn't they know before their Members vote on whether it is going to improve their job prospects or reduce their job prospects, whether a new factory will be opened in Alabama or New Hampshire or closed? So we need to know about this.

We must know what powers this Commission will have, and how the United States will be represented, how the votes will be counted, how the Commission will impact immigration, environment or patent law, and how Congress can deal with decisions of the Commission it doesn't like.

The TPP is the agreement sitting in the basement room that lawmakers can go and read. It is the first secret fast-track agreement that would be put into effect.

But the TPP is just the first of three colossal agreements. There are two more.

Under what rationale should we in Congress acquiesce to such profound changes involving the global economy?

We will be talking about it in light of the rules of a new trade agreement—a new agreement that could impact 70 to 75 percent of the world economy, and we haven't given it sufficient thought.

Fast-track is an affirmative decision by the Congress of the United States to suspend several of Congress's most

basic powers for the next 6 years and to delegate those powers to the Executive. A decision of this magnitude should only be based upon the most thorough debate, the most complete evidence, and the most compelling data provided by proponents on the key questions at stake. A burden of proof rests on the promoters of fast-track to compel three-fifths of the Senate to agree to give up these powers. Fast-track not only authorizes the President to enter the United States into Trans-Pacific Partnership but into an unlimited group of agreements and partnerships in the future.

The President will sign these agreements before Congress votes on them. He will then deliver implementing legislation to Congress that overrides previous law of the United States. This implementing legislation cannot be amended, cannot be filibustered, cannot be debated more than 20 hours, and cannot be subjected to the two-thirds treaty vote in the Senate.

Well, I have been analyzing and thinking about this Commission—this transpacific Union, it is fair to call it. This goes far beyond the normal trade agreement. While it appears to give some respect to our domestic law, this respect is undermined by the difference between the trade agreement—the TPP—and the implementing legislation. While a trade agreement alone may not trump U.S. law—although it could—the implementing legislation necessary for the trade agreement would. Indeed, the implementing legislation is law. And as the last-passed law of the United States, it overrules any previous laws with which it might conflict. Then it would appear that, by implementing the trade agreement, the trade agreement itself could have the impact of law.

So we pass a law that says: Mr. President, we agree with this treaty. Not a treaty—they call this an agreement. We agree with this agreement, Congress said, and the President implements it. Does it then become superior to any law in the United States? I think a good argument can be made that it does. We need to know that absolutely. Certainly, the implementing law states that the Congress agrees that the United States will be bound by the obligations under the trade agreement. The President signs a trade agreement with 12 nations, and when we ratify that, we then say we agree. The United States is bound by these provisions. As part of the provisions we are bound by is a new commission—one nation, one vote.

But there is a further danger. What happens if the Commission uses its living agreement powers—as it will—to alter the obligations under the agreement? The Commission is empowered then to change its rules, clearly, by the powers given it. Is the United States bound by new rules that we never saw but are passed by the 12 nations?

What if President Obama or some other President has an agenda, and they all get together and pass it? Is the United States bound by it? Does Congress have no control over it?

Well, we don't sufficiently know. That is why we ought not to be fast tracking an international agreement until we have had it made public and it is studied by good lawyers who understand these things.

Is the United States bound by the new rules they have changed? Can they add new members to the Commission? There are provisions about how new members should be added in the document itself. Does it say the Congress has to vote to do that? Can China be admitted?

How about this. Can this new 12-nation body adopt environmental regulations or adopt liberal immigration laws? We have discussed these things in Congress. Congress has rendered opinions and passed legislation and rejected legislation. Can this Commission pass things that impact and override the powers of Congress?

President Obama has said that climate change is one of his—actually, I think he said it is his highest—priority. His Trade Representative has been open and frank about this. The Trade Representative has negotiated this treaty. I am going to talk about that in a minute.

But some say: JEFF, you are wrong. But I don't think I am wrong. I think the issues I raised are very real, and I believe the concerns I raised may in fact be what this new treaty requires. I believe this is a plausible scenario.

But if you don't agree, bring the thing out, lay it out, bring lawyers in here, bring trade people, and explain every provision of it. Before I am going to vote to fast-track it, count that down. Congress should never fast-track any agreement for any transnational union that has the power to bind this Nation.

Goodness gracious, every word should be studied, and all consequences understood. A vote for fast-track is a vote to erase valuable procedural and substantive powers of Congress concerning a matter of utmost importance involving the very sovereignty of this Nation.

Without any doubt, the creation of this living Commission, with all its powers, will erode the power of the American people to directly elect or dismiss from office the people who impact their lives.

Do you remember that in England they woke up one morning and somebody in the European Union in Brussels had outlawed fox hunting? How did this happen? They said: Well, it started just like this.

Well, you say: JEFF, this is an exaggeration. They wouldn't use the Pacific union to advance political agendas outside of trade, tariffs, and those kinds of things. Well, let's look.

This is an article in the American Thinker, "Fast Tracking an International EPA," by Howard Richman, Raymond Richman, and Jesse Richman. They are professors, I think, all three. But this is on the Web site.

This is a statement by Mr. Froman, President Obama's Trade Representative. He laid out environmental protection as President Obama's bottom line in trade negotiations—environmental protection. This is a quote from the Trade Representative:

The United States' position on the environment in the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations is this: Environment stewardship is a core American value, and we will insist on a robust, fully enforceable environment chapter in the TPP or we will not come to agreement.

If they reach an agreement on the environmental issues that Congress won't pass, what happens then? The President signs off on it, votes for it, and then we will be disciplined by this Commission for failure to abide by the rules of the Commission.

His Trade Representative—I believe this is Mr. Froman—continues:

Our proposals in the TPP are centered around the enforcement of environmental laws. . . .

Let me repeat that:

Our proposals in the TPP are centered around the enforcement of environmental laws, including those implementing multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) in TPP partner countries, and also around trailblazing, first-ever conservation proposals that will raise standards across the region. Furthermore, our proposals would enhance international cooperation and create new opportunities for public participation in environmental governance and enforcement.

Well, that is a powerful statement. So there is no doubt that this President is intent on utilizing this agreement to drive his environmental agenda, whether the Congress or the American people agree with it or not. He is not bringing it up to the floor of the Senate, because Democrats and Republicans have no intention of passing his environmental agenda. I am not worried. This is the President's top negotiator on this trade agreement.

Mr. Joshua Meltzer at the Brookings Institute said this:

As a twenty-first-century trade agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP) presents an important opportunity to address a range of environment issues, from illegal logging to climate change and to craft rules that strike an appropriate balance between supporting open trade and ensuring governments can respond to pressing environmental issues.

Ensuring that governments respond to pressing environmental issues.

Who is going to ensure? Who has the power to ensure that the United States meets some environmental standard somebody somewhere has set or even the President would like to see set? That is a serious matter. I don't think we should treat it lightly.

I do believe that the American people are correct to be dubious about this trade agreement. Polling data, as I understand it, clearly shows that it is not supported by the American people. Yet forces are at work, breaking arms and breaking hands and bludgeoning people into acquiescence to vote for this thing. It cleared the House by the narrowest of margins. We had 62 votes when it passed through the Senate. They needed 60, and they got 62. The President was working, the Republican leaders were working, the chamber of commerce was working, Big Business was working, money was working and wheeling and dealing, and pork projects were promised, I am sure, to get the votes to pass this, to put it on a fast-track skid.

I am against it. I believe I am speaking on behalf of the working people of the United States of America. I don't believe their interests are being properly considered. I am confident that if this agreement goes into effect, the trade deficit we have with Japan and with Vietnam will increase. Vietnam has 100 million people. We will not be much different with places such as Canada or Australia or Mexico because we basically have a free-trade agreement with them.

So it is not necessary that we create some 12-nation entity, some commission. Why don't we just negotiate trade agreements that serve the interests of the American people with Japan and Vietnam and ensure exactly that they comply with what they say, that their markets are open to ours, as well as our markets are open to theirs? And we should have some reasonable expectation that if we enter into this agreement, it will be good for American workers, not just Japanese workers or workers in Vietnam.

I don't say we shouldn't have a trade agreement. I am saying let's be more careful about it. Let's negotiate some trade agreements for a change that advance the interests of the United States. We need to reduce our trade deficits, not increase them. They are weakening our GDP. The deficit subtracts from the current account trade deficit, subtracts from our gross domestic product. It is not healthy for America to have this kind of deficit.

One of the reports that was done lays out the argument that power comes from this mercantilist approach. The Richmans' and the American Thinker—I will quote a study, and it says this:

To see if mercantilism works—

This is the exporting drive of our trading partners and competitors—

[the Richmans] conducted a statistical study of 11,623 country-year observations for 186 countries from 1870 through 2007 using panel data models. The results: a strong statistically-significant correlation between balance of trade and national power. A favorable balance of trade is associated with an increase in power (national material capa-

bilities), an unfavorable balance with a decrease.

This is what China believes to the core. This is what most of the Asian countries believe and act on. And apparently the Richmans conclude—an objective study—that it is accurate. I don't know. But those are the kinds of things we need to be careful about.

They have two scenarios they have laid out based on this scenario. The first envisions 20 years of trade deficits at the rate of the trade deficit we ran in 2007. The second scenario envisions balanced trade, where we don't have a trade deficit. Under trade deficit, their definition of "national power" declined 28 percent. So the national power declined 28 percent. Under a balanced trade, our national power remains basically stable, increasing by one-half of 1 percent. I think balanced trade is certainly preferable. It is certainly preferable for working Americans.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for your patience and allowing me to share these remarks. It could be that I am wrong. Maybe trade deficits make no difference. Maybe the loss of manufacturing is offset by the fact that we get cheaper goods. That is what some of our people in the United States say.

When somebody sends subsidized goods here and that closes the U.S. factory and people can purchase their goods for below cost, we should send those countries a thank-you note—no concern about the people who got laid off and the jobs lost. I am not sure that model is now appropriate. Maybe it was 20 years ago.

I sort of believe that cheaper products was the ultimate goal and voted that way, but I am reevaluating it. I think this country needs to go through a serious evaluation of that, No. 1. Secondly, we absolutely—colleagues, we absolutely should not fast-track a movement to the establishment of an international commission or international union and maybe creating two more of them as part of two more trade agreements—the three trade agreements that will be part of fast-track if it passes. And, of course, any number of other trade agreements for the next 6 years could be accelerated through this fast-track process, if it passes.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to again speak about the North Dakotans who made the ultimate sacrifice while serving our country in the Vietnam war.

Since March, I have had the honor of learning from families about the lives of their sons, brothers, husbands, fathers, and uncles who died during the Vietnam war.

Before speaking about the 13 of the 198 North Dakota young men who didn't return home from Vietnam, I want to first talk about Dan Stenvold of Park River. Dan is a Vietnam veteran who survived the war.

While a student at Sargent Central High School, Dan thought about joining the military. After graduation, he felt he should grow up before going to college, and he enlisted in the Army. He was sent to Vietnam and served three continuous tours of duty there. His records count that he was in Vietnam for 802 days. After returning home from Vietnam, Dan enrolled in college at North Dakota State School of Science in Wahpeton so he could fulfill his dream of playing college football. The combination of Dan's time in Vietnam and a football knee injury made Dan feel old, and he left college. He then had a 33-year career with Polar Communications in Park River.

In 1999, the North Dakota Vietnam Veterans of America voted him as their State president, and he has served in that position for the last 16 years. For the last 6 years, he has served on the National Board of Vietnam Veterans of America. The national president asked him to run for another 2-year term, and I wish Dan well in that upcoming election.

Dan also serves his community as a member of the DAV, AMVETS, VFW, and the American Legion, and he is currently in his third term as mayor of the city of Park River in North Dakota.

Dan is proud of his three wonderful children and seven grandchildren.

Agent Orange exposure education is one of his top priorities. He has seen his own family affected by the side effects of Agent Orange. Dan is grateful to the North Dakota State Legislature for once again approving funding for education and outreach related to Agent Orange exposure.

I thank Dan for his continuing service to our country.

And please, Dan, keep up your good work on behalf of the citizens of your community and Vietnam veterans all across this country.

RICHARD "RICH" BOEHM

Richard "Rich" Boehm was born on June 23, 1951. He was from Mandan. He served in the Army's 198th Infantry Brigade. Rich died on March 26, 1971. He was 19 years old.

Rich was one of six children. All three boys served our country in the military—Marvin and Clarence in the Army National Guard and Rich in the Army.

Rich served in Vietnam with Myron Johnson from Mandaree, and they became very close friends. Rich was engaged, and Myron was going to be his best man.

Keith Nolan's book "Sappers in the Wire: The Life and Death of Firebase Mary Ann" includes details of the day Rich and Myron died. Rich and Myron were in a foxhole together, ran for safety, and were both shot in the back and killed.

Dennis Bollinger was assigned to escort Rich's body home, and his family knew Rich's family. Dennis continues to serve our State and my community of Mandan as the current city of Mandan chief of police. Rich's brother Marvin says he is grateful to Rich's squad leader who contacted him from Texas and shared memories and photos of Rich during his time in Vietnam.

LARRY JACOBSON

Larry Jacobson was from Norma. He was born on March 15, 1949. He served in the Army's 1st Aviation Brigade. Larry was 21 years old when he died August 26, 1970.

He was the second of six children and grew up on his family's farm near Norma. He attended grade school in Norma and high school in Kenmare. His best friend in high school, Craig Livingston, remembers Larry as a shy person who never had an enemy.

Larry's older brother remembers the week Larry was killed in Vietnam. The family had been in Fargo celebrating his sister's graduation from nursing school. They had planned to host a party at home, too, but when they arrived home, there were a sergeant and captain waiting for them to deliver the news of Larry's death.

This year on Memorial Day weekend, a large memorial was dedicated at the Mouse River Park honoring Renville County veterans. The memorial includes Larry's photo, images of the soldier's cross, and a helicopter like the one Larry was riding in when it was shot down and he was killed.

CARL WOODS

Carl Woods was from Bottineau. He was born June 8, 1933. He served as a Navy pilot. Carl was 32 years old when he died on September 28, 1965.

His father Monte also served our country during World War I, and six of the eight boys in Carl's family served in the military.

Carl was an honor student in high school and college in Bottineau, where he made the All-Conference Football team. He then chose to enlist in the Navy. He served our country as a Navy pilot for over 12 years, reaching the rank of lieutenant commander.

While serving in the Vietnam war, Carl's plane was hit by an anti-aircraft

missile. Instead of bailing out over North Vietnam, Carl maneuvered the plane 40 miles to the Tonkin Gulf, where he died after his parachute failed to open.

The family is grateful to Carl's wingman for sharing with them the details of Carl's service and extraordinary flight skills the day he died.

In addition to his brother, Carl left behind his wife Elaine and three children, Mark, Jennifer, and Kathryn.

Carl is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

This summer, the Bottineau AMVETS Post 25 is going to rename themselves the Carl J. Woods Memorial Post 25 in honor of Carl's service and his sacrifice.

JOEL ELLINGTON

Joel Ellington was from Rolette. He was born January 21, 1945. He served in the Navy. Joel was 22 years old when he died on June 26, 1967.

Joel was the oldest of three boys. They were 3 years apart in age. At Rolette High School, Joel played in the band. Right after high school, Joel enlisted in the Navy. After serving 2 years, he returned home and worked in the local grocery store.

Due to the Vietnam war draft, Joel reenlisted in hopes that his brothers, Dennis and Doyle, would not have to serve in Vietnam. Dennis said of Joel's reenlistment, "I think he did that to try to protect me; he didn't think they'd take two brothers."

DAVID HAEGELE

David Haegle was from Napoleon. He was born on September 28, 1948. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. David died February 28, 1969. He was 20 years old.

He was the fifth of eight children and grew up on his family's dairy farm. His brother Tim also served our country in the Marines.

David's family said that he was such a kind person and a hard worker. They remember his jokes and how much he enjoyed playing fun pranks on people.

David's letters home to his family requested three things he and his fellow soldiers desired most: Kool-Aid, baked goods, and dry socks.

His mother gave David's niece Veronica a box she filled with David's things, such as the letters he mailed home from Vietnam and his wallet. She said that Veronica would know what to do with them. About 3 months before David's mother passed away at age 95, Veronica finished David's scrapbook, and his mother thought it was perfect.

GARRY KLEIN

Garry Klein was born November 22, 1947. He served in the Marine Corps' Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 9th Marines, 3rd Marine Division. Garry was 19 years old when he died on May 27, 1967.

He was third from the youngest of nine children. His sister Arlene said

that Garry was an easygoing kid who was lighthearted and never caused any trouble. She remembers the cartoons he liked to draw.

Garry chose to enlist in the Marines to serve his country. When he went home during Christmastime on leave, he told Arlene and her children, "I won't see you again, but you may see me."

He died almost exactly 1 year after he graduated from high school.

RANDY LEE HANSEN

Randy Lee Hansen was born October 23, 1948. He was from South Dakota, but he was living in Williston when he enlisted. He served in the Army's 1st Signal Brigade as a field radio repairer. Randy died on Easter Sunday, April 6, 1969. He was only 20 years old.

Randy's brothers, Jim and Mike, served our country in the Navy. His stepbrother, Arthur, also served in the Army.

Randy's brother, Jim, remembers that Randy liked to fish. Jim believed Randy had some great stories from his time fishing, as many fishermen do.

While his brothers, step-brothers, step-sister, and mother remained in South Dakota, Randy attended Williston High School, where his father was working in Williston as a brick-layer.

In 1966, Randy enlisted in the Army before he graduated from high school. The product of a service-oriented family, Randy felt it was important that he serve his country.

FRED JOHNSON

Fred Johnson was born on November 3, 1939. He grew up in Watford City and Leeds. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Fred was 27 years old when he died on January 20, 1967.

Fred's wife's name was Jacqueline, and they had one son and three daughters. Their oldest child, Richard, said that Fred loved to hunt and fish. Fred's dad was a game warden and Fred would go to work with his dad sometimes. They would bring home injured animals and nurse them back to health. Among the most memorable animals were a white owl, a baby skunk that behaved like a pet cat, and a raccoon that he kept for 6 years.

After high school, Fred joined the Army. He served for 7 years before he was killed in action in Vietnam on his second tour of duty.

Fred's son, Richard, remembers going fishing with his dad often and fishing together the week before Fred left for Vietnam on his second tour of duty.

Fred's brother, Robert, said he took Fred to the airport before he returned to Vietnam the last time. Fred was scared and didn't know if he would be back again.

Fred died shortly thereafter when his vehicle hit a landmine.

LYLE JOHANNES

Lyle Johannes was born June 25, 1949, and spent his high school years in

Kulm. He served in the Army as a radio operator. Lyle died January 29, 1970. He was 20 years old.

Lyle was the oldest of four children. His youngest sister, Sally, said that Lyle was a happy person who didn't get rattled by anything. He loved a good joke and had lots of friends. Sally said, "You'd never want to turn your back on him because you never knew what he might do!" He was a daredevil who loved motorcycles, had a number of Hondas—and crashes—over the years. He spent a lot of time hanging over the engine of a car. He would buy old cars and fix them up. He also worked on the cars of elderly women who lived in town. After high school, he attended a technical college in Denver for mechanics.

Lyle was glad to be in the Army serving in Vietnam. He kind of "adopted" a young Vietnamese boy. The boy really liked blue jeans and a turtleneck sweater, so Lyle asked his mom to send them for him. She said she sent them as well as other things, but for packing material she put popcorn in Lyle's packages. When the packages arrived, the soldiers would eat the stale popcorn because they were so happy to have something from home.

Lyle was accidentally killed by friendly fire. Since his death, the family occasionally finds items someone leaves on Lyle's grave.

Lyle had shipped cashmere sweaters home for the family as Christmas presents in late 1969. The package arrived after his funeral in January of 1970.

ERIC NADEAU

Eric Nadeau was born November 12, 1948. He was from Grand Forks and was a member of the Turtle Mountain band of Chippewa. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division, the Screaming Eagles. Eric died May 26, 1969, just days before his tour of duty was scheduled to end. He was 20 years old.

He was the eldest child of his family and had three sisters. Eric's sisters remember how much he loved hunting game in the Turtle Mountains before he enlisted in the Army, and they think that is part of the reason why he joined the Armed Forces.

Everyone liked Eric. He had a circle of friends he grew up with, and if he was ever in town on break from the service, Eric and his best friend Dale were inseparable. Wherever Dale was, one could find Eric, and vice versa.

His sister remembers a time when Eric came home and surprised their mother. She and her mother were playing bingo in the local church basement. When he walked into the room, everything stopped, and everyone stood up and sang the National Anthem. Eric's mother was shocked and thrilled.

Eric died when his company was outnumbered and overrun. He jumped back in to save his crew members, and did save some, but was killed in the process. Eric's sister thinks of Eric not only as her brother but her hero.

FRED JANSONIUS

Fred Jansonius was born June 23, 1948. He was from Jamestown. He served in the Army's 9th Infantry Division. Fred died February 2, 1968. He was only 19 years old.

He was the oldest of four children. His sister, Claire, said that Fred was a gentle soul and that his younger siblings looked up to him. In high school, Fred was a good student and enjoyed photography, golf, and tennis. After graduation, he attended Drake University and studied journalism.

One of his Drake professors told Fred's class, "To be a good journalist, you really need to see the world." Fred's draft number was high, but he was deferred for being in college. So he quit college and traveled to New York City to see part of the world while waiting to be drafted.

Claire shared some of Fred's letters he wrote home to his family, which revealed a talent for writing and the wisdom of someone who had definitely seen his share of the world in his 19 years. Many of his letters included vivid descriptions of Fred's experiences in Vietnam, so you could imagine Fred sleeping in a cemetery, using a bag of grenades for a pillow or his fellow soldiers drinking Coca-Colas and using their imaginations to create their own entertainment.

After Fred was killed in Vietnam, his casket arrived in Jamestown on the train. The same conductor who drove the train the day Fred left to go to basic training was driving the train that delivered Fred's body back to Jamestown.

About a year ago, one of Fred's officers, Lee Moorman, was traveling the United States visiting the graves of the soldiers he knew in Vietnam. Lee told Fred's family that Fred liked to read and was well liked by everyone.

GREGORY KRUEGER

Gregory Krueger was born March 1, 1949. He was from Garrison. He served in the Army's 173rd Airborne Division. Gregory died July 17, 1970. He was 21 years old.

He was the oldest of three boys. His brother, Stephen, said that Gregory was hard-working, responsible, and well-liked by everyone who knew him.

Stephen remembers that Gregory loved everything to do with the farm. He had fond memories of working with Gregory, hauling many bales of hay on Saturdays. Their brother, Fred, continues to farm that family farm today.

Gregory had a special relationship with a nearby farmer who trusted him at a young age to run his farm equipment and to help on the farm. Gregory hoped to eventually take over the neighbor's farm after completing his service in Vietnam.

The Heritage Park in Garrison is currently in the process of adding a stone memorial in memory of Gregory's service and his family's sacrifice.

RICHARD HOVLAND

Richard Hovland was from Williston, and he was born August 12, 1946. He served in the Army's 20th Engineer Brigade. Richard was 21 years old when he died on January 31, 1968.

He was one of four children and his family and friends called him Ricky.

Growing up, Richard was active in the Boy Scouts. He played baseball and sang in the choir. His sister, Deanne, remembers his beautiful voice and him singing country music in their living room with his friend, Charles Hanson.

Deanne thought she and her brother were the coolest when he would drop her off at school in his Chevy Impala. She looked up to Richard very much. When he left for Vietnam, she was in junior high and was in awe about what he was going to do.

Deanne said Richard was a fun-loving and family-oriented man who was especially kind and good with their brother, Duane, who had Down Syndrome. Richard always mentioned Duane in his letters he sent home from Vietnam.

After completing his service in Vietnam, Richard had plans to go to college and become a farmer. Deanne has drawings that Richard made of the farmhouse he wanted to build on the land he was picking out in the Williston area. His parents Arlene and Oscar often said Richard wanted to farm and loved the land so much that he didn't realize his true calling was becoming an architect.

These are just some of the stories of North Dakotans who sacrificed their lives on behalf of our country in Vietnam.

I have to say that every time I do this, I wonder who would they be today. Would they be standing here instead of me? But I do know the men and women in uniform who serve our country continue to serve when they take off the uniform. I also know our country suffers a great loss any time we lose a young man or a young woman in service of our country. That loss must be remembered, it must be respected, and we can never forget.

In this anniversary and commemoration of the Vietnam war, it is so important that we spend our time talking about the sacrifices our country and our servicemen gave in Vietnam and continue to give through the ravages of Agent Orange—the issue Dan worked so hard on. They continue to suffer the post-traumatic stress that was part of that service, and they continue to overrepresent in the homeless populations and populations of people who continue to be troubled from the experiences they suffered in Vietnam.

So today we celebrate these lives and we think about who they might have been. We offer a very humble and grateful thank-you to all of the family members who have helped us with these memorials but who have experienced this loss in a way we will never understand.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 2146.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2146) entitled "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes," with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2060

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with an amendment numbered 2060.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2061 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2060

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2061 to amendment No. 2060.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2062

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to refer to the Committee on Finance H.R. 2146 with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer H.R. 2146 to the Committee on Finance with instructions being amendment numbered 2062.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment"

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2063

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2063 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 2146.

The amendment is as follows:

In the instructions

Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days"

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2064 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2063

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2064 to amendment No. 2063.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment

Strike "4 days" and insert "5 days"

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 1295.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill (H.R. 1295) entitled "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code," and that the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2065
(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295 with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295 with an amendment numbered 2065.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2066 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2065

Mr. McCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 2066 to amendment No. 2065.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2067

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to refer to the Committee on Finance H.R. 1295 with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] moves to refer H.R. 1295 to the Committee on Finance with instructions being amendment numbered 2067.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment."

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2068

Mr. McCONNELL. I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 2068 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 1295.

The amendment is as follows:

In the Instructions

Strike "2 days" and insert "3 days"

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2069 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2068

Mr. McCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 2069 to amendment No. 2068.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment

Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days"

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295, an act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, following today's encouraging vote over in the House, I wish to update the Senate on where we stand with regard to trade.

First, a brief look back at how we got where we are today. Back in April, the Finance Committee came together to advance four trade bills on a big bipartisan vote. It was everyone's goal at that time to consider all of those bills and to begin the process of passing this significant trade agenda, and it remains everybody's goal now. That is a point that has been proven many times over.

When our Democratic colleagues insisted on tying TAA to TPA, it was difficult for most on my side to swallow. Many in my conference opposed TAA. But with the larger goal in mind—and understanding that for my friends on the other side, TAA has often ridden alongside TPA—we put the two policies together. This was not an easy lift, but in the interest of moving forward, we compromised.

The process was not easy. We had a few close calls. We even worked through a filibuster to address our colleagues' concerns, but all the hard work paid off. It eventually led to a good result at the end of last month, a 62-to-37 vote in the Senate in favor of more opportunities for American paychecks, for American workers and farmers, and for the American economy.

Unfortunately, though, as we all know now, that was not to be the end of the Senate's role in the process. That is OK. Not every plan turns out perfectly every time, but the point is that you don't give up. The American people didn't send us here to sulk but to work through tough problems. So that is what we are going to do.

Here is what it is going to take: No. 1, working together toward the shared goal of a win for the American people; No. 2, trusting each other to get there. I think we can do that.

So here are the next steps. In the judgment of Members of both parties in the House and in the Senate, our best way forward now is to consider TPA and TAA separately. That means TAA will come second after TPA, but the votes will be there to pass it—reluctantly, not happily, but they will be there if it means getting something far more important accomplished for the American people.

To that end, I just filed cloture on the motion to concur with the House-passed TPA bill. I then filed cloture on the AGOA and preferences bill—with an amendment that adds to that bill TAA. This puts the Senate on a procedural glidepath to consider and then pass the TPA bill, the AGOA and preferences bill, and TAA. So assuming everyone has a little faith and votes the same way they did just a few weeks ago, we will be able to get all of those bills to the President soon.

I know there is a fourth bill, too, the Customs bill. Given the complex and thorny procedural processes at work on that bill, we will have to turn to that one as soon as we are able—but we will turn to it. It will have to go to a conference committee and then return to the Senate floor, where it, too, will be passed and sent to the White House.

I know it is hard to do, but if we step back a few paces and recall what we were all asking for just a few weeks ago, we should be able to take some satisfaction in all of this. It means that before July 4, the President will have signed TPA, TAA, and the AGOA and preferences bill, and we will be well on our way toward enactment of a robust Customs package. All of that together would be quite an accomplishment. All it is going to take is some hard work, some faith in one another, and everybody voting the same way the next time they voted the last time.

TRIBUTE TO BOB LAWSON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to one of Kentucky's greatest teachers, and a man who has served the public good and the law for 5 decades. My friend Professor Bob Lawson, who has taught law at the University of Kentucky College of Law for 50 years, will be retiring this July 1.

Over the course of his 50 years of teaching, Professor Lawson has become one of the most respected lawyers and teachers in the Commonwealth. He is also well known and admired for his work outside the classroom as the author of much of the Commonwealth's penal code for criminal offenses and its rules of courtroom evidence.

Professor Lawson was born in a small town in southwestern West Virginia,

not far from the Kentucky border, in a coal community. Encouraged by his father to get an education and escape life in the coal camps, he attended Berea College in Kentucky and then earned his law degree at UK in 1963.

In 1965, he was asked to teach law at UK, which he has done ever since. His specialty is Kentucky criminal law and evidence law. In the 1970s, he worked with the State legislature to rewrite Kentucky's penal code, which was in need of an overhaul.

I would point out that of Professor Lawson's thousands of students, I was one of them. Bob Lawson was one of my favorite professors, and I still recall his teachings today. I am also proud to call him a friend over the years. UK has greatly benefitted from having him as a member of the faculty for all this time, and he will be sorely missed.

I want to thank Professor Bob Lawson for his five decades of service to the University of Kentucky and to the Commonwealth. For 50 years he led Kentucky's brightest young minds into the legal profession, and his many thousands of students serve as a fitting tribute to his legacy. I wish him all the best as he retires from UK and begins a new stage in life.

The Lexington Herald-Leader published an article detailing Professor Lawson's life and career. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER 50 YEARS AT UK, PROFESSOR WHO WROTE MUCH OF KENTUCKY LAW AND INVESTIGATED UK ATHLETICS IS RETIRING

(By John Cheves)

Robert Gene Lawson, who is retiring July 1, wrote much of Kentucky law and taught thousands of the people who practice it.

Lawson spent 50 years as a professor at the University of Kentucky College of Law, and he was dean twice. Among his students were U.S. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, Gov. Steve Beshear, U.S. Reps. Andy Barr and Ed Whitfield, and most of the Kentucky Supreme Court.

"It's been really interesting watching my students go on in life," Lawson, 76, said Friday, sitting in a cluttered campus office that showed no sign of getting packed up any time soon. "They've done important things and mostly have done them well."

Lawson built an equally large reputation for himself outside the classroom. He authored the state's penal code for criminal offenses and its rules of courtroom evidence. He harangued the General Assembly, with what he considers limited success, for packing the state's jails and prisons with the mentally ill and the addicted. He led investigations into ethics violations at the UK Athletics Department, which didn't win him many friends, and into the nightmarish Beverly Hills Supper Club fire in 1977 that killed 165 people in northern Kentucky.

"He was Kentucky law," said Allison Connolly, a onetime Lawson student who later joined him on the law school faculty. "He has done so much, when you look at his lifetime of work, to make Kentucky a better place."

The son of a coal miner, Lawson was born in 1938 in a tiny Logan County, W.Va., community almost entirely owned by Island Creek Coal Co. His father urged him to escape the coal camp through an education. He worked his way through tuition-free Berea College and then earned a law degree at UK in 1963.

After two years of practicing law, which he enjoyed, Lawson accepted an invitation in 1965 to teach at UK.

"I never thought I'd stay here," he said. "I thought I'd try teaching for a little bit, see what it was like, and get back into my law practice. But it was a wonderful experience from day one—for one thing: being around all of these bright young people."

Lawson's specialty is Kentucky criminal law and evidence law. He wrote the books on those subjects, books that occupy the shelves of law libraries and judicial chambers. In the 1970s, he worked with the legislature to rewrite the state's penal code, which was hugely disorganized at the time. "We had never reformed our criminal laws in Kentucky, so you had offenses that had been added one by one over a period of, what, 150 years, 180 years, and a lot of inconsistency in how these offenses were treated," he said.

To Lawson's frustration, within a decade of his penal code work, the national "war on drugs" and concern over urban violence led politicians in Kentucky and elsewhere to enact much tougher sentencing laws.

It's one thing to imprison a murderer for decades, but these new laws put even minor criminals behind bars for long stretches, Lawson said. For example: In dozens of Kentucky cases Lawson researched, people were convicted of the felony of "drug trafficking within 1,000 yards of a school" after police caught them with a small personal stash of drugs in their homes or cars several blocks from a school.

"Bob Lawson's philosophy was always, 'You lock up the people who genuinely scare you because they're dangerous, they're violent, and for the other people, you see if you can't rehabilitate them and make them productive members of society,'" said Fayette Family Court Judge Kathy Stein, a former chairwoman of the state House Judiciary Committee.

In 1974, the year Lawson's penal code changes took effect, Kentucky spent \$11 million housing about 3,000 inmates at two prisons. This year, the state expects to spend about \$500 million to keep about 22,000 inmates in 12 prisons and dozens of county jails that are paid to hold the state's felon spillover.

The General Assembly's effort four years ago to cut the inmate population—at Lawson's urging—has fallen short "because they aimed too low," he said. "They tinkered; they did too little."

Some county jails are so overcrowded that state inmates who are serving five to 10 years must sleep on the floor and seldom leave their cells, he said. There is little education or addiction treatment provided, so felons are no better off when they're finally released, and in many cases, they're probably harder than ever, he said.

"We got mad at the people who were committing criminal offenses, and we veered away from a philosophy of trying to correct them, which originally had been the thrust of our justice system," Lawson said. "We jacked up the penalties on everything. As a result, we've created this huge problem of trying to pay for all of this. We're just making things worse for ourselves than they were."

One of Lawson's other crusades over the years was trying to be a watchdog of UK's lucrative and popular sports programs. At the request of various UK presidents, he led investigations into possible ethics violations, including cases that brought about the departures of basketball coach Eddie Sutton in 1989 and athletics director Larry Ivy in 2002.

In 2002, as a member of the UK Athletics Administration's board of directors, Lawson cast the sole dissenting vote against hiring Mitch Barnhart as athletics director. Lawson said he didn't object to Barnhart, but the \$375,000-a-year salary was "ridiculous" compared to the more modest sums paid to other UK faculty and staff. (Barnhart remains in the job and now makes \$600,000 a year.)

Over the past 50 years, the UK Athletics Department evolved into its own universe with its own rules, Lawson said.

"They have become an independent entity, separate from the rest of the university, which is a problem," he said. "Their budget is their budget. The athletics department regards the money that comes in for athletics as their money, not the university's money. "And I guess I have felt, watching it through the years, that they sort of lost what I would consider to be a reasonable connection of these students to the university as compared to athletics. Let me just give you an example. When I first came here, the basketball season was 20 games. It's now 40. I have my doubts about how they can be a legitimate college student when they've got that problem."

Lawson said he also regrets the explosion in tuition costs at UK and other state universities around the nation, largely because of shrinking public support from state governments. The next UK budget will get just eight percent of its revenue from state appropriations, the smallest share ever.

"I think everyone who is 50 years old and older—including me—ought to be ashamed of themselves for what we're doing to our young people, making an education all but unaffordable," he said.

"When Mitch McConnell and Steve Beshear were in my classroom, I doubt they paid much more than \$100 a semester for their tuition. They went to school almost without any cost, substantially free," Lawson said. "A resident law student next year will pay between \$21,000 and \$22,000 in tuition. You can't work your way through school at that level. I have students graduating with \$100,000 or more in loan debts that will affect them for the rest of their lives. Shame on us."

EGYPT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week Egyptian government investigators working on behalf of a judge who is overseeing a 4-year-old case against international and Egyptian nongovernmental organizations, NGOs, visited the main office of the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, or CIHRS, and asked for registration and financial documents. The investigators reportedly tried to pass off an informal search warrant as legal cover, but CIHRS staff made clear they couldn't search the office without an official one. The investigators left, but their message was clear: a new crackdown is on the way.

According to information I have received, CIHRS is the second organiza-

tion to receive such a visit this year. The same investigators previously visited another organization, the Egyptian Democratic Academy, and looked into their activities and funding sources. Four members of the academy have since been banned from leaving Egypt.

Some Senators may remember this case: it is the same one that led to the conviction of 43 foreign and Egyptian NGO workers, including 16 Americans, in 2013. The fact that the Egyptian authorities have decided to resuscitate this old case against these NGOs shows that President Abdel Fattah al-Sisi's administration is confident that it can silence critical voices with little international objection.

Since the 2011 revolution, the government has made several efforts to replace a harsh 2002 law on associations—unevenly implemented under former President Hosni Mubarak—with even more draconian regulations, including a draft law that would have given the government and security agencies effective veto power over NGO boards of directors, foreign funding, and very existence. Although a new law has yet to be passed, the authorities have previously raided or detained staff from respected organizations such as the Hisham Mubarak Law Center, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and the Egyptian Center for Economic and Social Rights.

I am deeply concerned with the reinvigoration of this 4-year-old case and the message it sends about Cairo's intent to restrict independent NGOs. I am similarly concerned with recent press reports alleging that the authorities have disappeared a significant number of young people, some of whom later died, in a coordinated campaign, activists say, to silence dissent. Such actions, if true, are deplorable and are no way to effectively combat terrorism and related insecurity.

Support for a strong and flourishing independent civil society is a critical part of any pluralistic society, but we are seeing the reverse in Egypt. As the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of State and Foreign Operations which provides assistance for Egypt, I am dismayed by the al-Sisi government's rejection of basic freedoms, whether it is the right to express oneself or the right to assemble. Such repressive tactics are not likely to contribute to greater security or stability in Egypt—instead they are likely to do just the opposite.

VOTES ON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT AND MOTION TO PROCEED TO DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the honorable men and women in Maryland—including the 28,939 men and women on Active Duty,

the 6,223 in the National Guard, our Reservists, and our civilian employees and contractors—who are serving our Nation.

When I go around the State to bases such as Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Fort Meade, Fort Detrick, the U.S. Naval Academy, and others, I see the people who put their lives on the line every day to defend America.

I support you. I am fighting to make sure you and your families have the resources you need, from equipment, to training, to fresh, healthy food at our commissaries. That is why today I voted against the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act and the motion to proceed to the Defense appropriations bill. My vote was not a vote against our national defense; it was a vote for our national defense. It was a vote to end sequester and a vote for military readiness.

How will voting against a funding bill help end sequester? Because it brings us to the table now—in June—to agree on how we are going to fund the vital programs that we all agree are necessary to protect our Nation. Not in September. Not in November. Not when another funding deadline looms or when there is a clock ticking until the government shuts down. We are going to address this now, so the Senate can do its job to support our troops, our military families, our veterans, and our national security.

National security is more than the Department of Defense. We need diplomacy around the world to prevent conflicts when we can and end them once started. So we need our State Department. We need embassy security to keep our Foreign Service safe—and that is not funded by the Department of Defense.

Our law enforcement agencies here at home also protect our national security. The FBI, tracking down "lone wolf" terrorists; the Coast Guard, protecting our coasts from smugglers and drug traffickers; Customs and Border Patrol; the Drug Enforcement Administration; Immigration and Customs Enforcement—all standing sentry to protect America. Yet none are funded by the Department of Defense.

Nation states and organized crime are infiltrating our cyber networks, and we need the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to help us protect dot-com and dot-gov. Those key cyber warriors are not funded by the Department of Defense.

Finally, we need troops ready for duty. Sadly, only one in four recruits can pass muster, many for lack of education or lack of physical fitness. We need great schools turning out great graduates ready to work. We need childhood nutrition to feed them healthy meals that build healthy bodies. But education and nutrition are

not funded by the Department of Defense.

In order make the Department of Defense successful, we need to stop hollowing out America. This means making sure our other agencies have the resources necessary to meet national security needs at home and abroad.

However, the Republican Budget uses two sets of rules—first, pretend funding for basic, essential military operations—things that are supposed to be in the base budget—taken from the Overseas Contingency Operations, OCO, account that was created for funding wars. This gimmick allows \$38 billion of extra defense spending by evading the budget caps. The second rule the Republicans are using is saying: We are going to apply the sequester budget constraints to the rest of the Federal agencies. That is not acceptable, but we can fix it.

We need to end sequester for defense, without gimmicks, and we need to end sequester for the rest of our agencies. We need to make sure defense has the right resources, but we also need to make sure that the other agencies that protect our country and make it great and are not included in the Defense bill have the resources they need too. Today, I voted no to moving to the Defense appropriations bill, but that no is meant to speed up the process of getting a better outcome for our troops and our country.

Many of my colleagues fail to mention that we in Congress can go through these motions: We can pass funding bills, go to conference, and send them to the President's desk. But that will do no good if the President vetoes these bills, which he has said he will do if they include budget gimmicks.

I hope that after having this vote, our leadership will sit down and negotiate a new budget deal, now in June. We need to have a real solution for the budget constraints that impact all of our Federal agencies, so that our Nation can be protected and the government can serve the people. That is what the people deserve.

RECOGNIZING THE SIXTH BIENNIAL JAMAICAN DIASPORA CONFERENCE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, today, I want to take a moment to recognize the important relationship between the United States and Jamaica and the role Jamaican Americans play in promoting trade and development between our two nations.

The United States has a robust and important relationship with Jamaica. President Obama's trip to Jamaica in April 2015 illustrated that we see Jamaica as a key regional leader and that we have a strong interest in strengthening our bilateral security relationship with Jamaica.

The United States is Jamaica's leading partner in trade, chief source of foreign direct investment, FDI, and home to the largest Jamaican diaspora in the world. The more than 1 million Jamaicans in the United States make crucial contributions to the Jamaican economy through remittances and support for friends and family still in Jamaica. Proud Jamaicans like Delaware's Lorraine Badley connect business leaders with opportunities for investment and trade, host ministers and other Jamaican officials, and strengthen community connections in both countries.

From Bob Marley, who first emigrated from Jamaica to my home State, to former NBA basketball player Patrick Ewing and former Secretary of State Colin Powell, first- and second-generation Jamaican Americans have made significant and lasting contributions to our economy, sports, art, and political system.

The Jamaican Government recognizes the critical role Jamaicans living abroad play in Jamaica's economic advancement, and this week they are hosting the Sixth Biennial Jamaica Diaspora Conference in Montego Bay. The conference brings together members of the Jamaican diaspora from the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, and other countries to build connections and boost diaspora investment in the Jamaican economy. I would like to commend the Jamaican Government for their efforts to diversify their economy and become a regional leader in trade and investment.

The Diaspora Conference taking place this week will leverage that support into targeted investments to grow Jamaica's infrastructure, ports, and logistics capacity to make it the central hub for the transport of goods between Latin America and the United States.

As the Jamaica Diaspora Conference draws to a close, the United States looks forward to seeing new partnerships between the Jamaicans and the Jamaican diaspora emerge to further an economic development agenda that will result in mutual growth and benefit both our countries.

TRIBUTE TO SISTER MARGARITA BREWER

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a 2015 Northern Kentucky University Lincoln Award recipient, my friend and a community leader, Sister Margarita M. Brewer.

Sister Margarita has dedicated her life to serving the Latino community in Greater Cincinnati. Originally from Panama, Sister Margarita has taken an active role in programs assisting the underserved in her local community as well as in Central America.

Sister Margarita founded the English Language Learning—ELL—Foundation, Inc., in 2003 and continues to

serve as its president, working with Cincinnati public schools to help English language learners become successful in their academic lives while fostering their cultural identities.

I had the privilege of being one of Sister Margarita's ELL tutors while serving in the House of Representatives. I had to stop tutoring when I was appointed U.S. Trade Representative, but during my time as a tutor, I had the chance to see her good work in action. More recently, my wife Jane has worked as an ELL tutor and shares my admiration for Sister Margarita and her service. Jane was honored to receive the English Language Learning Foundation Tutor of the Year Award in 2014.

In collaboration with Latino Programs and Services' English Language Learners Program at Northern Kentucky University, she also helped develop NKY's Fun with Science Camp, exposing students to all fields of science through hands-on learning activities.

Additionally, Sister Margarita has been involved with the Crossroad Health Center, Family Service of Cincinnati, and Christian Community Health Services.

I join the community in congratulating Sister Margarita, who has served the people of Greater Cincinnati and Ohio with distinction.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish to honor Lincoln University of Jefferson City, MO, on the 125th anniversary of the signing of the Second Morrill Act of 1890, which provided Lincoln University and many other historically Black colleges and universities with land-grant institution status. Lincoln University has provided student-centered, post secondary education opportunities to countless students from a variety of backgrounds for more than a century.

On January 14, 1866, Lincoln University, at the time called the Lincoln Institute, was founded by soldiers and officers of the 62nd United States Colored Infantry, following their service in the Civil War. After its incorporation and the establishment of its board of trustees, the institution opened its doors to the first class in its history on September 17, 1866. Lincoln Institute moved to its current campus in 1871, where it would eventually gain land-grant university status under the Second Morrill Act of 1890.

Since then, Lincoln University, which changed its name from the Lincoln Institute in 1921, has continued to provide a wide variety of educational specializations with over 50 bachelor's degree programs along with master's degree programs in education, business, and the social sciences. Outside of its well-known, grant-funded research programs, Lincoln has also distinguished itself with its popular nursing

program and state-of-the-art aquaculture facilities.

Lincoln University is an outstanding and diverse educational institution that continues to impact future generations by looking forward without ever forgetting its roots. I congratulate Lincoln University on more than a century of successes.●

RECOGNIZING THE CARSON CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S 70TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize the 70th anniversary of the Carson City Chamber of Commerce, an important entity to Northern Nevada. I am proud to honor this chamber that gives so much support to local businesses and continues to fight to grow the capital city's economy and job market.

Growing up in Carson City and spending a lot of time working in my dad's automotive shop, I learned the importance of a day's work and what it took for my father to keep his business. No doubt, Carson City's businesses—small and large—play an important role in our State's growth.

It is through the hard work of the Carson City Chamber of Commerce that the business community continues to strive and maintain a high quality of life for Carson City residents. Even when Nevada's economy took a difficult turn, the Carson City Chamber of Commerce was there every step of the way to lift local businesses back up. It helped owners adapt to an adverse economic climate through innovation, creativity, and ingenuity. To say this chamber has had a positive impact on Northern Nevada would be an understatement. The strong foundation it has built will be felt for years to come.

Aside from helping local businesses expand and thrive, the Carson City Chamber of Commerce also offers Carson City's entrepreneurs networking opportunities, social functions, and educational programs. It is highly involved throughout the community, gathering volunteers to clean and revamp areas across the city, as well as supporting the sheriff and district attorney's offices. The chamber has 11 directors and 5 committee executives, all dedicated to making Nevada's capital the best it can be. I am thankful for their leadership and for the great things they are doing for businesses in Northern Nevada.

For the past 70 years, the Carson City Chamber of Commerce has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and true dedication to Nevada. Without the hard work of those who have served this chamber, Carson City would not have developed to be the city it is today. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Carson City Chamber of Commerce on its 70th anniversary and in thanking it for

all it does to press on and find ways to unleash the Nevada comeback.●

CONGRATULATING SERGEANT JON WRIGHT, RETIRED

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate SGT Jon Wright, Retired, on receiving a Bronze Star with V-Device for valor, honoring his heroic actions while serving this great Nation. It gives me great pleasure to recognize Mr. Wright for both his bravery and his accomplishments during his time with the U.S. Army.

On March 24, 2010, Mr. Wright, who was serving in Afghanistan, led and acted as security for a squad of engineers and explosive ordnance disposal team members working to diminish improvised explosive devices, IEDs. Soldiers from Wright's squad noticed three bystanders, one of whom threw a grenade, landing between Mr. Wright and another sergeant. Mr. Wright quickly responded by picking up the grenade and throwing it away from his group, ultimately saving the lives of those around him. His lifesaving actions were heroic and selfless and remain invaluable to this country.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Mr. Wright for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our nation.

His commitment to helping those around him, as well as serving the country, demonstrates his unwavering selfless character. His actions represent only the greatest of Nevada's values, including a sense of community and an obligation to help others.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation. Mr. Wright's sacrifice warrants only the greatest respect and care in return.

Mr. Wright continues to serve his community and now lives in Lovelock with his wife and three children. He retired from the U.S. Army nearly 4 years ago and earned a degree in environmental science from American Military University. He now works for a mining company and the local youth football league.

Throughout his tenure, Mr. Wright demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the U.S. Army. I am both humbled and honored by his service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask my col-

leagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Jon Wright on his much-deserved accolade and wish him well in all of his future endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING DELTA FUEL

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses are often vital in driving rural economies. The success of these entities provides crucial job creation and economic opportunity—especially among low-income and minority populations. This week I am proud to recognize Delta Fuel of Ferriday, LA, as Small Business of the Week.

In 1977, a small bulk fuel distributor serving ranchers and farmers was founded in the heart of the Louisiana and Mississippi Delta region. Today, Delta Fuel has grown to employ over 65 workers between their eight operations—7 in Louisiana and 1 in Mississippi—serving a cross-section of the agriculture, construction, aviation, marine, government, manufacturing, automotive, emergency response, and trucking industries with a variety of fuels, lubes, tanks, trailers, oil stations, and lube equipment. In a State known for its robust energy and natural resource industries, Delta Fuel's reputation for dependability, reliability, and exceptional service standards has helped it become one of the fastest growing distributors in the southeast.

In rural east Louisiana, Clint Vegas, president of Delta Fuel, has led the company to exponential growth, earning the company numerous recognitions as one of the most successful Hispanic-owned businesses in the United States. Vegas' business skills have led to crucial job creation for the region. Delta Fuel's success can be attributed in part to their being located in a Historically Underutilized Business Zone, or HUBZone. The Small Business Administration's HUBZone program was created to spur economic activity in economically disadvantaged areas—helping small businesses in urban and rural communities gain preferential access to government contracting opportunities. By using the resources at hand, including the HUBZone program, Delta Fuel has been able to expand, resulting in the addition of numerous jobs and service centers throughout the rural east Louisiana region.

Congratulations again to Delta Fuel for being selected as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your continued commitment to creating quality jobs and advancing economic opportunity in East Louisiana.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:51 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2505. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans.

H.R. 2507. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage.

H.R. 2570. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2582. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings, to make improvements to the Medicare Adjustment risk adjustment system, and for other purposes.

At 1:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2505. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2507. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2570. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2582. An act to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings, to make improvements to the Medicare Adjustment risk adjustment system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Report to accompany S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-67).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1619. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-68).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1635. An original bill to authorize the Department of State for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Lawrence B. Jackson and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Luke M. McCollum, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 12, 2015.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Christina M. Alvarado, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Katherine A. McCabe, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Grafton D. Chase, Jr., to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Daniel V. MacInnis, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Captain Alan D. Beal and ending with Captain Andrew C. Lennon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 12, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Brian K. Antonio and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Mark R. Whitney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 10, 2015.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Paul A. Sohl, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Nancy A. Norton and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Robert D. Sharp, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 10, 2015.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Terry J. Moulton, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Bret J. Muilenburg, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Mark L. Leavitt, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Ann M. Burkhardt, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. James P. Downey and ending with Capt. Stephen F. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Navy nomination of Capt. Michael W. Zarkowski, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. David G. Manero, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Paul Pearigen, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Anne M. Swap, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Peter G. Stamatopoulos, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. John W. Korka, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Col. Paul E. Bauman, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Antonio A. Aguto, Jr. and ending with Colonel Daniel R. Walrath, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. William W. Way, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Michael K. Hanifan and ending with Brig. Gen. Daniel M. Krumrei, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Hugh T. Corbett and ending with Colonel Gervasio Ortiz Lopez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2015.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. William C. Mayville, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Colonel Michael S. Cederholm and ending with Colonel Rick A. Uribe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. Clifford B. Chick, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. John W. Hesterman III, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Leela J. Gray, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Donald B. Tatum, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Timothy E. Gowen, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. William A. Brown, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Ronald F. Lewis, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Robert B. Abrams, to be General.

Marine Corps nomination of Col. John G. Baker, to be Brigadier General.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Daniel A. Lapostole, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Cynthia Aitaholmes and ending with Ryan J. Wang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 13, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Donald W. Algeo and ending with Amy L. H. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 13, 2015. (minus 2 nominees: James V. Crawford; Colin A. Meghoo)

Army nominations beginning with Robert B. Allman III and ending with Edward J. Yurus, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Lyde C. Andrews and ending with D012582, which

nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Army nomination of Elizabeth M. Libao, to be Major.

Army nomination of John J. Morris, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Christopher A. Wodarz, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Karen M. Wrancher, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Susan R. Cloft, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Robert A. Petersen and ending with Gene C. Wynne, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Ian D. Branum and ending with Bryan P. Hyde, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Josue M. Bellinger and ending with Donald E. Meserve, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with George J. Eberly III and ending with David Garlinghouse, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nomination of Gregory K. Emery, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Daniel B. Copeland and ending with George W. Laskey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Scott W. Arnold and ending with Kurt J. Zahnen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher P. Brown and ending with Van T. Wennen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Sabrina J. Bobkowski and ending with Diane C. Leblanc, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin R. Boardman and ending with Sean P. McDonauld, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nomination of Carl O. Pistole, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Jon E. Rugg, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Victor S. Chen and ending with Elizabeth A. Zimmermannyoung, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Donald W. Babcock, Jr. and ending with John J. Woods, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Glen A. Dieleuterio and ending with William Y. Pike, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard A. Braunbeck III and ending with Jeffrey J. Pronesti, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Thurraya S. Kent and ending with Wendy L. Snyder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael E. Biery and ending with Ricky M. Urser, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Neil T. Smith and ending with Dominick A. Vincent, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Jason B. Babcock and ending with Christopher P. Slattery, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Nicholas E. Andrews and ending with Vincent S. Tionquiao, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Sowon S. Ahn and ending with Craig M. Whittinghill, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Steven W. Connell and ending with Michael A. Whitt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Christine J. Caston and ending with James V. Walsh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael A. Hurni and ending with Elizabeth R. Sanabia, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert C. Bandy and ending with Douglas L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Dominic S. Caronello and ending with Michael J. Supko, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Fatmatta M. Kuyateh and ending with Michael J. Scarcella, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nomination of Maregina L. Wicks, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Nikki K. Conlin, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael R. Cathey and ending with Eric H. Twerdahl, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Teresa M. Allen and ending with Joon S. Yun, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Martin J. Anerino and ending with Martha S. Scotty, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with David J. Bacon and ending with Richard G. Zeber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Arthur R. Blum and ending with Florencio J. Yuzon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Patrick K. Amersbach and ending with Nancy V. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Craig L. Abraham and ending with Scott Y. Yamamoto, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Chad M. Brooks and ending with Rod W. Tribble, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nomination of Heather J. Walton, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with William A. Hlavin and ending with Bashon W. Mann, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nomination of Jacky P. Cheng, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Charles S. Abbot and ending with David G. Zook, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with John J. Andrew and ending with Mark C. Wadsworth, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with David A. Backer and ending with Scott E. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Antonio Alemar and ending with John L. Young III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Lyle P. Ainsworth and ending with Juan C. Varela, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Karin R. Burzynski and ending with Francisco E. Magallon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Paolo Carcavallo, Jr. and ending with Matthew G. Zublic, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Shelley D. Caplan and ending with Mike E. Svatek, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Audrey G. Adams and ending with Joel A. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Eugene A. Albin and ending with Kenya D. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Allan M. Baker and ending with Dennis M. Zogg, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert E. Beaton and ending with James L. Willett, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul T. Antony and ending with Peter C. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey M. Clark and ending with Carol W. Watt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Laura M. Mussulman and ending with Kenneth W. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Kerry L. Abramson and ending with Ian K. Thornhill, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Tamberlynn W. Baker and ending with Angelia W. Thompson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Saravoot P. Bagwell and ending with Kathy M. Warren, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory T. Stehman and ending with Rodney E. Tugade, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Terry W. Eddinger and ending with David R. Glassmire, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Daryll D. Long and ending with Milton W. Washington, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Holman R. Agard and ending with Mark E. Zematis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nomination of Natalie R. Bakan, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Patrick R. O'Mara, to be Commander.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1604. A bill to establish the Transition to Independence Medicaid Buy-In Option demonstration program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COONS, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1605. A bill to amend the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 to authorize concurrent compacts for purposes of regional economic integration and cross-border collabora-

tions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1606. A bill to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative strategies and methods to increase out-of-school access to digital learning resources for eligible students in order to increase student and educator engagement and disseminate evidence-based strategies to relevant stakeholders and the public; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1607. A bill to affirm the authority of the President to require independent regulatory agencies to comply with regulatory analysis requirements applicable to executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1608. A bill to protect the safety of the national airspace system from the hazardous operation of consumer drones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1609. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1610. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement officers, promote accountability for State and local law enforcement agencies, reenfranchise citizens, eliminate sentencing disparities, and promote re-entry and employment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1611. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1612. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify the final rule relating to flightcrew member duty and rest requirements for passenger operations of air carriers to apply to all-cargo operations of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1613. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding the likeness of a woman on the ten dollar bill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1614. A bill to provide for the inclusion of court-appointed guardianship improvement and oversight activities under the Elder Justice Act of 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. KING, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1615. A bill to reform and modernize domestic refugee resettlement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. McCASKILL, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1616. A bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1617. A bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1618. A bill to reallocate Federal Government-held spectrum for commercial use, to promote wireless innovation and enhance wireless communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

S. 1619. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 1620. A bill to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1621. A bill to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and Internet access service through the Lifeline program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1622. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to devices; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1623. A bill to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1624. A bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1625. A bill to require a report on the location of C-130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1626. A bill to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, improve safety, streamline rail project delivery, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1627. A bill to ensure the Secretary of State complies fully with reporting requirements in section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1628. A bill to preserve the current amount of basic allowance for housing for certain married members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1629. A bill to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 1630. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 to deter labor slowdowns at ports of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1631. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1632. A bill to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1633. A bill to require that the face of Federal Reserve Notes bear the likeness of Jeannette Rankin before the likeness of any other woman appears on a Federal Reserve Note, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1634. A bill to amend the Federal antitrust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORKER:

S. 1635. An original bill to authorize the Department of State for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1636. A bill to streamline the collection and distribution of Government information; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 1637. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1638. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress information on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1639. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assure educational stability for children in foster care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 204. A resolution recognizing June 20, 2015 as "World Refugee Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 205. A resolution congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 206. A resolution congratulating the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2015 National Basketball Association Championship; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 349

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 349, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts.

S. 389

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 389, a bill to amend section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that annual State report cards reflect the same race groups as the decennial census of population.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to terminate Operation Choke Point.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 600

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 600, a

bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency retrofit pilot program.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 688

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 688, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare hospital readmission reduction program to respond to patient disparities, and for other purposes.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 845

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 845, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to implement security measures in the electronic tax return filing process to prevent tax refund fraud from being perpetrated with electronic identity theft.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Academy of Sciences to study the vehicle handling requirements proposed by the Commission for recreational off-highway vehicles and to prohibit the adoption of any such requirements until the completion of the study, and for other purposes.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1082, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1347

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1347, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals.

S. 1362

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1362, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs).

S. 1434

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1434, a bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish an energy storage portfolio standard, and for other purposes.

S. 1461

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1461, a bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015.

S. 1516

At the request of Mr. REID, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1516, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the energy credit to provide greater incentives for industrial energy efficiency.

S. 1528

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1528, a bill to improve energy savings by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 1543

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1543, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 1552

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1552, a bill to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

S. 1588

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1588, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 1772

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1772 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1608. A bill to protect the safety of the national airspace system from the hazardous operation of consumer drones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Consumer Drone Safety Act.

In recent years, privately-operated unmanned aircraft have grown in popularity and capability. In many ways, this is brand new technology.

It is worrisome that these new drones, which are capable of flying thousands of feet in the air and at speeds in excess of 30 miles per hour, are available commercially to completely untrained consumers.

This combination of advanced new technology and broad availability has resulted in a rising number of reports of dangerous operations and narrowly avoided mid-air collisions between drones and passenger planes.

Our airports, pilots and travelers deserve meaningful safety protections, as do the people on the ground, in our stadiums and on our highways.

If we don't act, it's only a matter of time before we have a tragedy on our hands.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act would put in place common-sense safety precautions to minimize the risk of disaster.

As with any new technology, drones have attracted significant interest and have promising commercial uses, including package delivery, search and rescue, pipeline inspection, and agriculture.

I agree that the possibilities for this technology are promising, if properly managed. That is why I support research to make sure that the technology is safe and can be used in ways that respect people's privacy.

But there is no question that the technology comes with great risks, and its potential will never be developed if there is a big aircraft disaster.

What if, for example, a drone accidentally flew into a jet engine and brought down a commercial airliner? What if an airliner, having been hit by a drone on approach to a major airport like JFK or LAX, crashes in an urban area?

Safety must come first.

In the last year, unlawful drone use has proliferated and it's clear that there is a high risk to public safety.

In July of 2014, following an exposé by Craig Whitlock of the Washington Post, I wrote to the Federal Aviation Administration asking for data about drone flights and accidents.

What I received from the FAA was—simply put—startling, and it really crystallized for me the magnitude of the problem we face.

In nine months last year, from March through November, there were approximately 25 incidents where a drone nearly collided in midair with a manned aircraft, sometimes requiring evasive action.

In this time period, there were more than 190 incident reports. Since July 1, at least one incident per day was reported to the FAA. For example: On May 29, 2014, two aircraft on approach to LAX reported a “trash can sized” unmanned aircraft at 6,500 feet above ground level.

On June 29, 2014, an airplane on descent to Dulles Airport reported a near midair collision with a drone that flew within 50 feet of the plane at 2,800 feet above ground level.

On September 8, 2014, three separate airplanes reported “a very close call” with a drone on descent to LaGuardia airport at 1,900 feet above ground level.

On October 12, 2014, an aircraft near Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma reported taking evasive action at 4,800 feet above ground level to avoid a drone that came between 10 to 20 feet of the plane.

On February 8, 2015, a Southwest passenger jet on its way to land at LAX and reported that a small red drone flew “right over the top” of the plane at 4,000 feet above ground level.

These close calls are absolutely unacceptable. It is not just airplanes and

airports that are at risk. For example, the general manager of the Golden Gate Bridge reports that drones routinely fly over traffic on the bridge. One drone recently crashed onto the bridge roadway.

Drones equipped with cameras have also flown by the bridge in areas where photography is not permitted for security reasons, which is alarming.

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection—CAL FIRE—is also growing increasingly concerned about the unsafe use of drones. It reports that during last year's fire season, there were numerous incidents involving drones.

For example, in September, one of its helicopters, which was responding to the Pasqualie fire, had to brake in midair to avoid colliding with a recreational drone just 10 feet ahead of it.

In May, several drones were filming an active firefight in order to post videos online. If local police hadn't been able to identify the operators and convince them to stop, CAL FIRE believes it might have had to shut down its aerial firefighting operations for the Poinsettia and Cocos fires to avoid the risk of collision.

As far back as 2012, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, has issued warnings about obstacles to the safe operation of drones, which include the fact that many drones cannot “detect, sense and avoid” other aircraft or objects in the airspace.

Drones are also plagued by a phenomenon known as “lost link”—in which the remote connection between the pilot on the ground and the aircraft is simply lost, resulting in a loss of command and control of the aircraft.

The GAO's report also noted that many drones “currently use unprotected radio spectrum and, like any other wireless technology, remain vulnerable to unintentional or intentional interference.”

GAO continued: “This remains a key security and safety vulnerability because, in contrast to a manned aircraft in which the pilot has direct physical control of the aircraft, interruption of radio transmissions can sever the UAS's only means of control.”

Even the operators of consumer drones often know that their operations can be dangerous. Let me just read to you from one commenter on Amazon's page for a popular consumer drone:

It just kept climbing as it disappeared into the clouds. I lost visual, and was sure I'd never see my Phantom again. . . . From calculations based on DJI's web site that it climbs [6 meters per second, which means it attained an altitude . . . somewhere between 5,000 and 7,000 feet. I didn't realize until I got video back.

The commentator continued: “This is ‘not’ good, though, since until I saw the video, I didn't realize I was in controlled airspace. Do ‘not’ do this.”

This comment, to me, is really emblematic of what is happening. Con-

sumers with no training, certification, or instruction are buying highly-capable drones with few technological safeguards.

There are precautions we can take to reduce the risk of a catastrophic accident.

For example, after a consumer drone crashed on the White House lawn in January 2015, the manufacturer voluntarily released a firmware update to prevent flights near Washington, D.C.

The update was easy for consumers and commonsense. However, the FAA has no authority to require all manufacturers to follow suit, or to specify other areas that deserve similar protection.

Another easy precaution is education of drone operators. For example, the FAA has partnered with the Academy of Model Aeronautics, the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International, and the Small UAV Coalition to develop an educational campaign called “Know Before You Fly.”

This campaign includes sensible advice about staying under 400 feet in elevation, keeping the drone within range of eyesight, flying sober, and staying away from pedestrians, vehicles, and airports.

However, the FAA can't require manufacturers to print this type of information and include it in the box for consumers when they buy a new drone.

FAA needs the authority to require these basic safety precautions.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act calls for sensible new safety regulations in how drones are manufactured and used.

These new safety regulations apply only to consumer drones: civil unmanned aircraft that are manufactured for commercial distribution and that are equipped with an automatic stabilization system or are capable of providing a video signal allowing operations beyond the visual line of sight of the operator.

Notably, this definition does not override Section 336 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, which means that model aircraft flown for recreational purposes would continue to be subject to the safety guidelines of a community-based organization rather than to operational regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration.

The bill has operational requirements

The Consumer Drone Safety Act directs the FAA to clearly lay out what is acceptable for consumer drones that are operated outside the programming of a community-based organization, detailing when, where, and under what conditions drones can be operated. This includes how high, how close to airports or stadiums, and under what weather conditions a drone may be flown.

The bill has manufacturer requirements.

Any drone advanced enough to fly autonomously should also be equipped with advanced safety features, including geo-fencing.

But FAA does not currently have authority to require even the most basic safety precautions like providing educational materials.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act authorizes FAA to set meaningful safety requirements for manufacturers. These may include geo-fencing to govern the altitude and location of flights, a transponder or other method for pilots and air traffic control to detect and identify the drones, collision-avoidance software, and precautions for the loss of a communications link, anti-tampering safeguards, and educational materials.

The bill also requires manufactures to update existing consumer drones to meet these new requirements when feasible.

The bill would allow FAA to exempt particular types of consumer drones from any requirement that is technologically infeasible or cost-prohibitive if other precautions enable safe operations.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act is straightforward, balanced, and necessary. For the first time, it would allow the FAA to proactively respond to the increasing use and capabilities of consumer drones by requiring sensible precautions to protect the safety of our nation's airports and hospital helipads, stadiums and fairgrounds, bridges, electrical infrastructure, highways, and city sidewalks.

Congress must not wait for a tragedy before taking action. I encourage my colleagues to join me in this legislation to ensure that consumer drones are built and operated safely.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1609. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, as the labor market of the 21st century continues to transform, it will be critical to ensure that American workers are equipped with the skills and expertise needed to meet the variety of demands in the global marketplace. It is critical that we continue to reform and update our education system to ensure that America's students are prepared for cutting-edge careers. Today, many students enter high school and postsecondary education with little knowledge of the careers available to them outside of traditional pathways. Research has found that few middle school students have a lack of understanding of how what they are learning in school relates to careers. With college costs

continuing to rise, it is critical that students have exposure to the wide range of available work and career choices early in their academic careers so that, by the time they enter high school, they are more informed about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them.

Career and technical education, CTE, programs play a pivotal role in preparing students for America's job market, and are proven to help students explore their own strengths and preferences, and match up with potential future careers. However, a lack of Federal investment in middle school CTE programming often means students have to wait until high school for this exposure.

Middle school is a critical time when students explore their own strengths, likes, and dislikes, and begin to form long-term career goals. Studies have found that middle school students who participate in career and technical education development programs that promote career exploration skills are able to make more informed career decisions by increasing knowledge of career options and career pathways that match their interests. Additionally, these programs play a positive role in engaging students in the classroom and on their academic success.

I am proud to introduce the Middle School Technical Education Program Act, which establishes a pilot program for middle schools to partner with postsecondary institutions and local businesses to develop and implement career and technical exploration programs. This legislation will provide support for middle schools to create career and technical education programs that will provide students with introductory courses, hands-on learning, or afterschool programs. Career guidance and academic counseling is vital to ensuring that our students understand the educational requirements for high-growth, in-demand career fields. Many times students receive this information too late in their academic careers.

We need to work to improve middle school education to prepare students for cutting-edge careers and expose students to the variety of career pathways. This legislation also requires that programs help students draft a high school graduation plan that demonstrates what courses would prepare them for a given career field. If we provide youth with applied career exploration opportunities, they will be more informed about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them. I am hopeful this bill will help highlight current shortcomings in middle schools, and instigate further discussion on the importance of educating youth early on the multitude of educational and career pathways.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1610. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement officers, promote accountability for State and local law enforcement agencies, re-enfranchise citizens, eliminate sentencing disparities, and promote reentry and employment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I have introduced legislation along with Senator CARDIN called the Building And Lifting Trust In order to Multiply Opportunities and Racial Equity, or the BALTIMORE Act.

The people of Sandtown-Winchester, the people of Baltimore, and all Americans need to know they have a government on their side. Right now there is a trust gap between the people and the police department.

Baltimore is my hometown. I have lived there all my life. But what happened in Baltimore earlier this year could have happened anywhere, in anyone's hometown. I don't want to see this happen anywhere else. Where there is broken trust, we must rebuild it. And where there is lost hope, we must restore it.

That is why I joined Senator CARDIN in introducing the BALTIMORE Act. This bill is a package of reforms intended to reestablish a sense of trust between communities and the police departments that protect them.

First, the bill would ban discriminatory profiling by State and local law enforcement based on race, ethnicity, religion, or national origin. The bill makes sure that if police departments are receiving Federal funding, they are also adopting practices to cease the use of discriminatory profiling. It holds police departments accountable by requiring them to share officer training information, including how officers are trained in the use of force, racial and ethnic bias, de-escalating conflicts, and constructive engagement with the public. It also authorizes a grant program to assist local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body-worn cameras.

We need to look at how our sentencing laws contribute to racial disparity in our justice system. That is why this bill would reclassify specific, low-level, non-violent drug possession felonies as misdemeanors. The bill also eliminates the distinction between crack and powder cocaine.

Finally, the bill authorizes \$200 million annually for the Department of Labor's Reentry Employment Opportunities Program through the Workforce Investment Opportunity Act. This is important funding to give people a hand up—not a hand out. It also encourages the White House to "ban the box" in the Federal contracting process. This would allow employers to eliminate questions about criminal convictions on initial job applications.

Baltimore has begun to heal. We will come together as a community and a

city to rebuild. But I do not want to see another great American hometown follow in Baltimore's footsteps. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1625. A bill to require a report on the location of C-130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1625

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPORT ON THE LOCATION OF C-130 MODULAR AIRBORNE FIREFIGHTING SYSTEM UNITS.

Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the locations of C-130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System (MAFFS) units. The report shall include the following:

- (1) A list of the C-130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units of the Air Force.
- (2) The utilization rates of the units listed under paragraph (1).
- (3) A future force allocation determination with respect to such units in order to achieve the most efficient use of such units
- (4) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of modifications to the C-130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System program to enhance firefighting capabilities.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1628. A bill to preserve the current amount of basic allowance for housing for certain married members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1628

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING FOR CERTAIN MARRIED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the amount of basic allowance for housing payable under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, to a member of the uniformed services who is married to another member of the uniformed services shall not be reduced unless—

- (1) the member and the member's spouse undergo a permanent change of station requiring a change of residence; or
- (2) the member and the member's spouse move into or commence living in on-base housing.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 204—RECOGNIZING JUNE 20, 2015 AS “WORLD REFUGEE DAY”

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 204

Whereas World Refugee Day is a global day to honor the courage, strength, and determination of women, men, and children who are forced to flee their homes under the threats of conflict, violence, and persecution;

Whereas according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (referred to in this preamble as “UNHCR”)—

- (1) there are nearly 60,000,000 displaced people worldwide, the highest levels ever recorded, including almost 20,000,000 refugees, 38,000,000 internally displaced people, and 1,800,000 people seeking asylum;
- (2) children account for 51 percent of the refugee population in the world;
- (3) nearly 4,000,000 refugees have fled Syria since the start of the Syrian conflict and more than 7,600,000 people are internally displaced;
- (4) approximately 1,325,000 people are displaced within Ukraine with approximately 800,000 Ukrainians seeking protection in other countries as a result of a worsening humanitarian situation in nongovernment controlled areas;
- (5) since April 2015, sporadic outbursts of violence in Burundi have prompted more than 100,000 Burundians to flee to the neighboring countries of Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo;
- (6) violent insurgent attacks in Nigeria have forced 167,000 people to flee to the neighboring countries of Cameroon, Chad, and Niger, and have internally displaced nearly 1,500,000 people;
- (7) more than 88,000 women, men, and children, including many persecuted Rohingya refugees from Burma, have departed on smugglers' boats from the Bay of Bengal since 2014, more than 1,000 of whom have died at sea;
- (8) as of June 2015, more than 100,000 refugees and migrants have crossed the Mediterranean Sea from North Africa and at least 1,800 women, men, and children have died during such crossings or are missing;
- (9) more than 180,000 Iraqi refugees and nearly 3,000,000 internally displaced Iraqis;
- (10) nearly 6,000,000 internally displaced Colombians;
- (11) nearly 700,000 South Sudanese refugees in neighboring countries; and
- (12) more than 465,000 refugees from the Central African Republic;

Whereas refugees who are women and girls are often at a greater risk of sexual violence and exploitation, forced or early marriage, human trafficking, and other forms of gender-based violence;

Whereas the United States provides critical resources and support to the UNHCR and other international and nongovernmental or-

ganizations working with refugees around the world; and

Whereas since 1975, the United States has welcomed more than 3,000,000 refugees who are resettled in communities across the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of the millions of refugees and displaced persons who flee war, persecution, and torture in search of peace, hope, and freedom;

(2) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to continue its international leadership role in response to those who have been displaced, including the most vulnerable populations who endure sexual violence, human trafficking, forced conscription, genocide, and exploitation; and

(B) to find political solutions to existing conflicts and prevent new conflicts from beginning;

(3) commends those who have risked their lives working individually and for the countless nongovernmental organizations and international agencies such as UNHCR that have provided life-saving assistance and helped protect those displaced by conflict around the world; and

(4) reiterates the strong bipartisan commitment of the United States to protect and assist millions of refugees and other forcibly uprooted persons worldwide.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution to mark World Refugee Day, June 20, and to address the growing global crisis of people forcibly displaced by persecution or conflict.

According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, for the first time since World War II, over 60 million people have been forced from their homes and displaced in their own countries or forced to flee abroad. Last year alone, 14 million people were uprooted by violence and persecution, most escaping conflicts in Syria, Iraq, South Sudan, Ukraine, Burma, and Afghanistan. There are more and more protracted crises, and the result is an exponential increase in humanitarian needs.

The worldwide displacement from wars, conflict, and persecution in 2014 was the highest level recorded and accelerating fast, escalating to 60 million last year from 51.2 million in 2013, and a dramatic increase from the 37.5 million of a decade ago. We are on course to over double the number of refugees worldwide.

The increase since 2013 was the highest ever seen in a single year.

Syria is still the world's largest producer of internally displaced persons at 7.6 million and refugees at nearly 4 million.

The 60 million that I previously mentioned can be broken down to 20 million refugees, over 38 million internally displaced persons, and 1.8 million asylum seekers.

The magnitude of the Syrian disaster is perhaps the most shocking. After 4 years of conflict, the situation is increasingly desperate for both the refugees and the host countries such as

Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and northern Iraq. Since 2011, 4 million people have fled Syria. The futures of over 3 million Syrian children have been stolen because they have no access to education. Over 2 million Syrian women are in the neighboring countries trying to survive. Dangerous coping mechanisms are on the rise. More and more families are forced to send their children to work or marry off their young daughters. In the tiny country of Lebanon alone, there are over 300,000 Syrian refugee children who have no access to school.

It is hard to comprehend the demographic, economic, and social impact of millions of refugees in Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey. The number of refugees in Lebanon will be equivalent to 88 million new refugees arriving in the United States. Turkey has already spent \$6 billion in direct assistance for refugees in its care. At the same time, many countries in the West have been extraordinarily reluctant to admit the most vulnerable Syrians as refugees. While contributing generously to humanitarian funding, the United States has only accepted about 900 Syrian refugees. Because Syrians are finding it increasingly difficult to find safety, they are being forced to move further afield. Since January, over 100,000 people, mostly from Syria, have crossed the Mediterranean in boats in search of protection in Europe—an extremely dangerous journey.

We know that the Syrian humanitarian disaster, which has destabilized an entire region, is not the accidental byproduct of conflict. It is instead one result of a strategy pursued by the Assad regime. The United Nations Commission of Inquiry in Syria has documented that the Assad regime intentionally engages in the indiscriminate bombardment of homes, hospitals, schools, and water and electrical facilities in order to terrorize the civilian population. ISIL and al-Nusra have also shelled areas with high concentrations of civilians.

In Syria's neighbor next door, Iraq, the number of people requiring humanitarian assistance has grown to 8.2 million people. Three million people have been forced from their homes. Half of the displaced are children.

To the south, in Yemen, there is a grave and escalating humanitarian crisis. The country was particularly vulnerable even before this conflict. Now civilians throughout the country are facing alarming levels of suffering and violence. Over 1 million have been forced from their homes and are now living in empty schools and other public buildings or along highways.

We are also witnessing religious and ethnic persecution become part of the violent conflict that has pushed millions of people out of the regions of Sub-Saharan Africa. The unfolding human tragedy in South Sudan, which

is perhaps the most frustrating to me, never should have happened. The violence engulfing that small country is entirely manmade and wholly the responsibility of the President and opposition leader and their affiliate militias and armed groups.

Each leader refuses to prioritize the well-being of his own people and instead continues to seek military advantage, violating multiple ceasefire agreements and refusing to meet numerous deadlines for reaching a peace deal. It is hard to overstate the gravity of conditions in South Sudan. I fear there is no end in sight to the suffering of the people there.

The 18-month conflict in South Sudan has already killed an estimated 50,000 people and has displaced over 2 million more, including one-half million who fled to neighboring countries and over 120,000 sheltering in United Nations peacekeeping bases across the country. A nationwide famine was averted in 2014, thanks largely to the assistance from international community.

But the World Food Programme recently warned that 4.6 million people, nearly half the population, will need food aid by the end of this month. Conditions in the country of Sudan are hardly better for those affected by the continuing conflict in Darfur. Attacks on U.N. peacekeepers are on the rise in Darfur. Military offenses by the Khartoum have caused well over 50,000 people to flee their homes this year. The Khartoum has also expelled international nongovernmental organizations, NGOs, and is trying its best to drive out the U.N. peacekeeping mission in Darfur. This number does not include the hundreds of thousands of people who have fled the violence in the South Kordofan and Blue Nile states. But there has been little information about conditions in government-held areas in both of these states, as Sudan has not allowed human rights investigators access.

In northeastern Nigeria, 1.5 million people have fled their homes due to attacks by the terrorist group Boko Haram. Boko Haram is estimated to have killed over 12,000 people, kidnapped thousands, including 276 girls from the Chibok School whose whereabouts remain unknown.

Over 74,000 Nigerians are refugees in Cameroon, another 100,000 refugees are in the area. The global refugee trends are indeed alarming. The international assistance being provided is not keeping pace with the scale of the problem. For example, almost halfway through 2015, the United Nation's humanitarian appeal for Syria is only 20 percent funded. Yet, in the spirit of World Refugee Day, we must redouble our efforts to prevent conflicts that force families to flee their homes, villages, and cities. We must also then create the conditions to get these refugees safely back home.

First, we need to ask ourselves hard questions about how we can increase the effectiveness of the assistance we provide. Most refugees live in urban areas, not in traditional refugee camps. Refugees who live in cities face unique vulnerabilities, which must change how international assistance is now being given. Moreover, protracted crises are the new normal. Seventy-five percent of the world refugees are caught in long-term crisis situations, with many refugees displaced for an average of 17 years. We need to use our humanitarian and development dollars more skillfully so we are providing durable solutions to chronic vulnerabilities.

Second, the international community must get serious about protecting the most vulnerable refugees: women and children. Women are facing horrible threats in conflicts across the globe, where rape and sexual assault are being used as weapons of war, and as vulnerable refugees they continue to be targets of gender-based violence. Moreover, children now make up half of all refugees worldwide. We must do more to protect them from sexual exploitation and abuse, recruitment as child soldiers, and early marriages. The United Nations Population Fund, Mercy Corps, the International Rescue Committee, and Catholic Relief Services know how to provide targeted support and protection to women and children refugees, but we in the international community must fund them adequately to do the job.

Third, we must strengthen the capacity of U.N. peacekeeping. As David Miliband, former British Foreign Secretary, now head of the International Rescue Committee noted:

At a time of cuts in defense budgets, new and asymmetric threats, and record numbers of people fleeing conflict, the case of strengthened and more fairly shared UN peacekeeping is overwhelming. Peacekeepers, properly resourced and led, have never been more needed and the consequences of inaction never more evident.

Finally, we must do more to hold accountable the leaders who are responsible for mass humanitarian atrocities. The U.N. Commissioner for Refugees recently commented that he continues to be shocked by the indifference of those who carry the political responsibility for millions of people being uprooted from their homes. They accept forced displacement, with an impact on individuals, on countries, communities, and entire regions, as normal collateral damage of the wars they lead.

They act with the conviction that humanitarian workers will come and pick up the pieces. It is clear the international humanitarian community can no longer stanch the human misery brought on by this callous indifference and criminal leadership. The international community must hold those responsible accountable, those who

break all the rules in pursuit of their war aims.

To that end, it was a grave mistake that between October 2011 and July 2012, Russia and China vetoed three Security Council resolutions which were designed to hold the Syrian Government to account for its mass atrocities. It was also unfortunate that Sudanese President Umar al-Bashir was allowed to depart South Africa earlier this week without being detained again, escaping an arrest warrant from the International Criminal Court, where he would be on trial for crimes against humanity in Darfur.

In closing, we must recognize that as these conflicts proliferate, no corner of the world will be left unaffected. On World Refugee Day, we recognize that every person fleeing his or her home deserves compassion and help and to live in safety and dignity. We must recommit to work smarter and harder to assist the world's most vulnerable people.

Next year on this day, I want to stand before the Senate again and speak of the progress we have made and the lives we have saved by our collective efforts. History will judge us accordingly if we fail.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the United States has long been a safe and welcoming home for those fleeing persecution around the world. The refugees and asylum seekers who join our communities help to create new businesses, build more vibrant neighborhoods, and enrich us all. They are also a reminder of our history as a nation of immigrants and our American values of generosity and compassion. Saturday marks World Refugee Day, and to honor it we must renew our commitment to the ideal of America as a beacon of hope for so many who face human rights abuses abroad.

Millions of refugees remain displaced and warehoused in refugee camps in Eastern Africa, Southeast Asia, and other parts of the world. Ongoing political struggles and military conflicts in the Middle East and North Africa are dislocating large populations. Too many are without their families or safe places to find refuge. Some, though far too few, have been able to flee and rebuild their lives.

Peter Keny, one of the "Lost Boys" of South Sudan, is one of those inspiring refugees who escaped a civil war in his home country and has rebuilt his life in my home State of Vermont. He is just one of thousands of refugees Vermonters have welcomed over the years. Peter was 19 when he came to Burlington in 2001, and in the years since he has learned English, completed high school, and is earning a college degree. In describing his voyage to the United States and ultimately to Vermont, Peter told "The Burlington Free Press" that arriving here "was like a dream come true." I ask unani-

mous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article, "A Found Man Returns to South Sudan."

I am proud of Vermont's long history of supporting refugees by opening its communities, schools, and homes to those in need. It is not always easy, but it is a powerful example of our belief in the most basic ideals of human dignity and hope, and our commitment to responding to the suffering of others. We are fortunate to have remarkable organizations like the Vermont Refugee Resettlement Program leading the effort with its decades of experience and award-winning volunteer program, and the tremendous legal advocacy provided by the Vermont Immigration and Asylum Advocates. The hard work of these and other organizations and the daily welcoming gestures of Vermonters all over the State have made Vermont a role model for the rest of the country.

On this year's World Refugee Day, it is also important to acknowledge that there is more that we as a country can and must do. I remain deeply concerned about the administration's expanded family detention policy. The women and children it is placing in prolonged detention have fled extreme violence and persecution in Central America. They come seeking refuge from three of the most dangerous countries in the world, countries where women and girls face shocking rates of domestic and sexual violence and murder. Here in the United States, we recently celebrated the 20th anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act, a law we hold out as an example of our commitment to take these crimes seriously and to protect all victims. The ongoing detention of asylum-seeking mothers and children who have made credible claims that they have been victims of these very same crimes is unacceptable. I again urge the administration to end the misguided policy of family detention.

We must also do more to address the humanitarian crisis in Syria. Almost 4 million Syrians are officially recognized as refugees by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The vast majority of these are women and children, including hundreds of thousands of children under the age of 5. The United States traditionally accepts at least 50 percent of resettlement cases from UNHCR. However, we have accepted only approximately 700 refugees since the beginning of the Syrian conflict, an unacceptably low number.

Congress also plays an important role. Soon I will reintroduce the Refugee Protection Act to improve protections for refugees and asylum seekers and provide additional support and improvement to the national resettlement program and groups such as the Vermont Refugee Resettlement Program. This bill, which I have long

championed with Representative ZOE LOFGREN, reaffirms the commitments made in ratifying the 1951 Refugee Convention, and will help to restore the United States to its rightful role as a safe and welcoming home for those suffering from persecution around the world.

As we pause to take stock on World Refugee Day, let each of us reflect on what this great country means to those escaping persecution. Let us now and always live by and burnish the light of Lady Liberty's torch, our eternal beacon of hope to those struggling to breathe free.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, June 7, 2015]

A FOUND MAN RETURNS TO SOUTH SUDAN
(By Zach Despart)

Peter Keny sat on the side of the road in late December as the sun disappeared behind the acacia trees. He had traveled more than 7,000 miles from Burlington, only to be stranded just north of the South Sudanese capital of Juba.

The taxi he hired an hour earlier had broken down, and he was still 50 miles south of his destination, his native village of Kalthok. The driver walked back to Juba five hours earlier and had yet to return.

Keny took another delay in stride, as he had waited to return home since fleeing his country's civil war 25 years earlier. That decade-long journey, forged in tragedy and perseverance, took Keny on a dangerous trek through the Sudanese bush to a series of refugee camps and, finally, to a new start in America.

For most of his life, Keny has straddled two worlds. Each day he reconciles his life of opportunity in the United States with a longing for his war-torn homeland. For years, Keny balanced work to put himself through school and to save for a trip to Kalthok, the village of his brief childhood and keeper of the only memories of his parents.

Exhausted from two flights and a 12-hour bus ride from Uganda, Keny tried to imagine what the reunion would be like. As he peered through darkness toward Kalthok, he wondered if anyone would remember him.

A CHILD OF WAR

Keny was born in Kalthok in 1982, the youngest of four sons. He lived with his mother and father, who like many in the village were sorghum farmers. The Kenys belonged to the Dinka tribe, the largest ethnic group in southern Sudan.

In November 1989, farmers had finished the annual harvest as the wet season came to a close. One afternoon, 6-year-old Keny and a group of boys played on the banks of the White Nile north of Kalthok, as they often did when little else occupied their time. Around five o'clock, the boys heard gunfire and saw smoke in the village's direction. They rushed toward home but were intercepted by a villager who told them returning was unsafe. The boys, some of whom were Keny's cousins, hid along a riverbank that night. Keny would never again see his parents.

For most of the past 60 years, Sudan has been engulfed in civil war. By 1989, the Second Sudanese Civil War already had raged for six years. When war ended in 2005, 1 million to 2 million people were dead and another 2 million were displaced. Many of those

killed or displaced were from the Dinka tribe.

As a child Keny knew about the war, but until that day in 1989, fighting had never come to Kalthok.

"We were all the way to the south of the country, and the government militia did not have a problem with the local people," Keny recalled in a recent interview in Burlington. "There was no tension."

Unable to return to their village, Keny and his friends faced a harrowing journey. The morning after the attack on Kalthok, the boys crossed the river and joined a larger group of refugees who were walking east, away from the fighting. They walked each day until their legs could carry them no farther. Each time the boys stopped to rest, they feared lion attacks and roaming militias, which abducted children to use as soldiers. Keny was shoeless and without a change of clothing. He thought only of how to survive another day.

"The worry was, 'Are you going to make it to the next town?'" he recalled. "You focused on living to the next day, and that's all. There was nothing else you could do."

The Sudanese government was able to distribute grain to fleeing refugees. Keny and others received two cups each, which they made last as long as they could. Keny had nowhere to put the grain, so he wrapped it carefully in his shirt. When the grain ran out, the boys foraged for wild fruit and berries whenever they stopped to rest.

Keny said he was among an estimated 20,000 "Lost Boys of Sudan"—children separated from their parents during the war. As many as half died of disease and starvation during the journey to refugee camps.

After traveling several hundred miles over three months, Keny crossed from Sudan into Ethiopia and settled with others at Dimma, a refugee camp established by the Ethiopian government in 1986 to handle an enormous influx of Sudanese refugees.

Keny remained at Dimma for about a year, until spring 1991, when rebels overthrew Ethiopia's government in a coup. The boys fled back across the border and camped near the Sudanese community of Pakok until 1992, when the United Nations moved thousands of refugees to the newly opened Kakuma refugee camp in Kenya. Keny would live there for nine years.

At the Kakuma camp, Keny learned English and went to school daily. He said U.N. staff members encouraged the boys to settle into a routine. But he could not stop thinking about his family. Keny said some of the Lost Boys tried to find their way back to their villages, but he judged the trip back to Kalthok too dangerous. Refugees at Kakuma relied on new arrivals and wounded soldiers seeking care at the U.N. hospital for news about the war.

"The hope was that I would see someone from my village, so I might ask the situation of my family," Keny said. "But no one ever showed up. It was very difficult for me. I never knew whether someone was still there or not."

Keny received a surprise in 1998, when his oldest brother, Riak, found him at the Kakuma camp. Riak had joined the Sudanese army and had been granted a one-month leave. The brothers had not seen each other in nine years.

"It was one of the best days of my life, after going all that time without seeing my family," Keny said.

But the reunion was bittersweet. Riak brought news Keny had long feared: Their parents and brother were killed in the war,

and remaining brother had died of disease. Keny was devastated, but relieved finally to know the fate of his family. Riak tried to lift his spirits.

"He was like, 'Look, this is what it is. Someone has to die for someone to live. If we all had to die, and you lived, that's the best we can do,'" Keny recalled his brother saying.

Riak and Peter spent several weeks together, until the soldier's leave expired and he returned to war. Keny never again saw his brother. Riak died in 2006 after he succumbed to injuries received years earlier.

A NEW LIFE IN AMERICA

In 2001, when he was 19, Keny moved to the U.S. through the federal Office of Refugee Resettlement. He had several cities to choose among, but he picked Burlington because his cousin Abraham Awolich already had settled there. Five others from the Kakuma camp came with him.

For the first time in his life, Keny thought about his future.

"It was like a dream that had come true," he said. "I felt like this is the moment, if I don't have my parents, maybe in the future I'll be able to meet my extended family. Maybe I would be able to do something that my family would remember me."

In the U.S., Keny became proficient in English, earned a high school degree and dreamed of attending college.

Now 32, Keny lives in a small apartment on Front Street in Burlington with three other Lost Boys who immigrated to the U.S. He works as a janitor for the University of Vermont, where he cleans the athletic complex from 10 p.m. to 6:30 a.m., five days a week. When school is in session, he attends classes during the day, where he is a decade older than his peers. In the next year and a half, he hopes to complete a degree in community development and applied economics.

Keny is able to cram in only a few hours of sleep before walking uphill to class, but he said he must work to afford tuition if he ever hopes to find a better-paying job.

"It's about being willing," he said, sitting on the front porch of his home. "If I don't do it, I will be stuck here. I just tell myself I have to do it. Otherwise I don't have options."

Ever since moving to the U.S., Keny always hoped return to visit Kalthok. He was able to contact several uncles by telephone in 2002 and remained in touch with relatives regularly. He secured a travel visa in 2006 but was unable to use it, because a trip would have interrupted his studies at community college.

"The biggest fact was that I was struggling with my education," Keny said. "Every time I'd say, 'If I go home while I'm trying to complete this process, I might fall behind.'"

While studying, Keny kept abreast of news back home.

In 2005, civil war ended with a peace agreement that many Sudanese hoped finally would put an end to violence that had torn apart the country for half a century. In 2011, southern Sudanese voted overwhelmingly to break off from the north to form a new nation, South Sudan. The fragile peace collapsed two years later, when South Sudan plunged into civil war. Keny said Kalthok has so far been spared heavy violence, but the community is inundated with refugees again fleeing to the east.

Finally, in 2014, Keny acquired a new visa and was able to raise enough money for the costly trip, which required a stopover in Europe.

RETURN TO SOUTH SUDAN

Even after dusk in December, the air was still humid. Keny's driver returned around 7

p.m. with tools, but couldn't fix the car. Keny planned to spend the night on the side of the road and at dawn walk back to Juba. He lay down in the brush, careful not to wrinkle the dress shirt and slacks he had put on for the reunion.

Keny was comforted that he at least had company: Some of his cousins, who met him at the bus station in Juba, agreed to wait until another ride could be arranged.

Around midnight, Keny's fortunes turned. A Somali trader came upon him and agreed to drive him to Kalthok. As he braced himself for potholes that shook the vehicle, Keny tried to piece together fragmented memories of his youth.

"Will I remember anyone in the village? Will I remember the places I used to know? Is life still the same as when I left? All those questions were on my mind," Keny said.

Although the trip was only 55 miles, the roads were in such poor condition that Keny arrived in Kalthok at 5 a.m. It was Christmas morning. He was exhausted and hoped to find somewhere to sleep, but he found the entire village had stayed up waiting for him in the church.

"They were singing and dancing and praying for us, because they heard we had car trouble," Keny said.

At 8 a.m., Kalthok's villagers held a welcome ceremony. Keny said he recognized only a few faces, his maternal and paternal uncles. But all the village elders remembered him.

"They said, 'You look just like you did when you left,'" he recalled. "There was a lot of emotional reaction. They talked about my family, my mom and my dad."

Keny stood at the front of the sanctuary to greet the hundreds of villagers who came to see him. After daybreak they took him around Kalthok, but Keny couldn't pick out any landmarks.

He asked his cousins to take him to a lake with a waterfall he remembered from childhood. From there he looked back toward the village, and memories came back to him. He was able to point out his uncles' houses.

"They said, 'Yes, you now know. You recognize this place,'" Keny said.

Instead of having Keny stay in one of his uncles' homes, villagers arranged for him to sleep in the church. Each evening for the three weeks he was in Kalthok, villagers set up tents and slept outside the church to be closer to their returned son. Keny said many were surprised he came back after settling into a prosperous life in the U.S.

"They thought I would never go back, because I don't have a living parent anymore," Keny said. "But they still believe I belong to the village."

Keny had another reason to return to Kalthok, beside visiting relatives. He wanted to ensure success of the local clinic the Sudan Development Foundation, a Burlington nonprofit, helped fund. The clinic is vital to Kalthok, Keny said. In South Sudan, some villages are more than 100 miles from a hospital. South Sudan's infrastructure is so poor this can mean several days of traveling on foot.

Keny returned to Vermont in mid-January. He said leaving his uncles and cousins was difficult, but his visa expired after 30 days.

STRADDLING TWO WORLDS

The son of Kalthok said he is unsure if he will ever move back to South Sudan. Keny wants to help Kalthok and keep the clinic operational. He worries war will come again to the village.

"I see myself living in two worlds, here and South Sudan," he said. "I want to help my

people in any form they need. If I ever get married, maybe I would bring my wife over."

Kenya talks to his uncles regularly. A consequence of war, inflation has made staple goods too expensive for many villagers. A drought has raised the prospect of crop failure.

"This month they are supposed to cultivate, but there is no rain," he said, referring to May.

Kenya wants to help his countrymen and -women in Vermont. More than 150 Sudanese have resettled in Burlington since the late 1990s, and many have started families here. Kenya said the small community rents out local halls and churches to meet and celebrate holidays such as South Sudan's Independence Day.

Kenya hopes to help lease or purchase a permanent home to aid local Sudanese in preserving their culture. He said parents are concerned children will forget tribal languages when they speak English outside the home.

Kenya reflects on what his life would have been like if he never had the opportunity to immigrate to the United States. If he stayed in South Sudan, Kenya believes he likely would have been killed in the war or conscripted into the army. He said he feels blessed to have been given the chance to start a new life here, because so many Sudanese never had that option.

"It gave me the chance to look at the world differently," he said. "I have people who support me, and even though I do not yet have a college degree, I feel I've learned enough to help myself and help my people."

Kenya often thinks of his brothers and parents. In their memory, he wants to make the most of opportunities he now has.

"You have this feeling that for the rest of your life, you're going to be living knowing that you don't have someone you'd be taking care of," he said. "I just want to make sure I live a better life, and live it in a peaceful way."

SENATE RESOLUTION 205—CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS ON WINNING THE 2015 STANLEY CUP

Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 205

Whereas, on June 15, 2015, the Chicago Blackhawks Hockey Team won the Stanley Cup;

Whereas the 2015 Stanley Cup title is the third Stanley Cup title for the Blackhawks in 6 years;

Whereas Blackhawks fans at the "Madhouse on Madison" witnessed Duncan Keith and Patrick Kane score show-stopping goals while goaltender Corey Crawford seemed to stand on his head at times, stopping all 25 shots he faced;

Whereas the Blackhawks won their sixth Stanley Cup, tying the Boston Bruins for fourth on the franchise list of most titles won;

Whereas the Blackhawks joined the National Hockey League (referred to in this preamble as "NHL") in 1926 and have a rich history in the NHL;

Whereas the Blackhawks were 1 of the 6 original teams in the NHL;

Whereas the Blackhawks won the Stanley Cup in 1934, 1938, 1961, 2010, and 2013;

Whereas for the first time in 77 years, the Blackhawks fans saw their heroes win the Stanley Cup on home ice;

Whereas the Blackhawks began the playoffs with a double-overtime victory against the Nashville Predators;

Whereas a goal scored by Brent Seabrook in triple-overtime of Game 4 helped the Blackhawks defeat the Predators in 6 games;

Whereas a sweep of the Minnesota Wild followed in the second round of the playoffs, setting up a showdown with the Anaheim Ducks in the Western Conference Finals;

Whereas the Blackhawks earned triple and double-overtime victories against the Anaheim Ducks in Games 2 and 4 on their way to winning the series in 7 games and clinching a berth in the Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas the Blackhawks followed a familiar pattern in dropping Games 2 and 3 of the Stanley Cup Finals against the Tampa Bay Lightning, but took a 3-2 series lead into Game 6 on home ice on the night of Monday, June 15, 2015;

Whereas in another close contest, Patrick Kane scored a goal during Game 6 that marked the first time either team led by more than 1 goal in the series;

Whereas it was a great night for fans of the Blackhawks and the culmination of a tremendous team effort;

Whereas Antoine Vermette, acquired at the trade deadline, scored 2 game-winning goals in the Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas Goaltender Scott Darling, when called upon in relief of Corey Crawford, stood tall in net when his team needed him the most against the Predators;

Whereas Duncan Keith was an "ironman", earning the Conn Smythe Trophy for Most Valuable Player in the playoffs while logging more than 700 minutes of ice time in 23 games;

Whereas Niklas Hjalmarsson blocked shots left and right and seemed to be in the right place at all times;

Whereas General Manager Stan Bowman, Head Coach Joel Quenneville, President John F. McDonough, and owner Rocky Wirtz have put together and led one of the greatest dynasties in NHL history;

Whereas the Stanley Cup returns to the City of Chicago and gives Blackhawks fans across the State of Illinois a chance to celebrate championship hockey;

Whereas the Nashville Predators, Minnesota Wild, Anaheim Ducks, and Tampa Bay Lightning proved to be worthy and honorable adversaries and also deserve recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup;

(2) commends the fans, players, and management of the Tampa Bay Lightning for an outstanding series; and

(3) respectfully directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the 2015 Chicago Blackhawks hockey organization and Blackhawks owner Rocky Wirtz.

SENATE RESOLUTION 206—CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS FOR WINNING THE 2015 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 206

Whereas, on June 16, 2015, the Golden State Warriors won their second National Basketball Association (referred to in this preamble as the "NBA") Championship as a California team by defeating the Cleveland Cavaliers with a score of 105-97 in the sixth game of the NBA Finals;

Whereas during the 2015 NBA playoffs, the Warriors defeated the New Orleans Pelicans, the Memphis Grizzlies, the Houston Rockets, and the Cleveland Cavaliers en route to the NBA Championship;

Whereas during the playoffs, the Golden State Warriors twice overcame 2-1 series deficits and, in both series, responded with 3 straight victories to win the series;

Whereas in the regular season, the Warriors won a league-best 67 games;

Whereas all 15 players on the 2014-2015 Warriors roster should be congratulated, including NBA Finals MVP Andre Iguodala, the NBA regular season MVP Stephen Curry, as well as, Leandro Barbosa, Harrison Barnes, Andrew Bogut, Festus Ezeli, Draymond Green, Justin Holiday, Ognjen Kuzmic, David Lee, Shaun Livingston, James Michael McAdoo, Brandon Rush, Marreese Speights, and Klay Thompson;

Whereas first-year coach, Steve Kerr, did a tremendous job leading the Warriors to the NBA Title and, through his coaching, built a team that is the best in the NBA; and

Whereas the fans of the Warriors have been ever-loyal in their support of the team, waiting 40 years for their second NBA title, but can now again call their team a champion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2015 National Basketball Association Championship because of their selfless teamwork;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all the players, coaches, and staff who contributed to the 2014-2015 season; and

(3) celebrates the unique contributions of the Warriors fan base, who, through its unremitting and vocal support of the Warriors came to be known as "Dub Nation".

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2060. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

SA 2061. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2060 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, *supra*.

SA 2062. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, *supra*.

SA 2063. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, *supra*.

SA 2064. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2063 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, *supra*.

SA 2065. Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.

SA 2066. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2065 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) to the bill H.R. 1295, *supra*.

SA 2067. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, *supra*.

SA 2068. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, *supra*.

SA 2069. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2068 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2060. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.
 "This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

SA 2061. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2060 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment
 Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

SA 2062. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.
 "This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment"

SA 2063. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the instructions
 Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days"

SA 2064. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2063 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic

controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment
 Strike "4 days" and insert "5 days"

SA 2065. Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Findings.

Sec. 103. Extension of African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Sec. 104. Modifications of rules of origin for duty-free treatment for articles of beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 105. Monitoring and review of eligibility under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 106. Promotion of the role of women in social and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 107. Biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

Sec. 108. Deepening and expanding trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States.

Sec. 109. Agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 110. Reports.

Sec. 111. Technical amendments.

Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Sec. 201. Extension of Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 202. Authority to designate certain cotton articles as eligible articles only for least-developed beneficiary developing countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 203. Application of competitive need limitation and waiver under Generalized System of Preferences with respect to articles of beneficiary developing countries exported to the United States during calendar year 2014.

Sec. 204. Eligibility of certain luggage and travel articles for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Sec. 301. Extension of preferential duty treatment program for Haiti.

TITLE IV—EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Application of provisions relating to trade adjustment assistance.

Sec. 403. Extension of trade adjustment assistance program.

Sec. 404. Performance measurement and reporting.

Sec. 405. Applicability of trade adjustment assistance provisions.

Sec. 406. Sunset provisions.

Sec. 407. Extension and modification of Health Coverage Tax Credit.

TITLE V—IMPROVEMENTS TO ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Consequences of failure to cooperate with a request for information in a proceeding.

Sec. 503. Definition of material injury.

Sec. 504. Particular market situation.

Sec. 505. Distortion of prices or costs.

Sec. 506. Reduction in burden on Department of Commerce by reducing the number of voluntary respondents.

Sec. 507. Application to Canada and Mexico.

TITLE VI—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

Sec. 601. Tariff classification of recreational performance outerwear.

Sec. 602. Duty treatment of protective active footwear.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 701. Report on contribution of trade preference programs to reducing poverty and eliminating hunger.

TITLE VIII—OFFSETS

Sec. 801. Customs user fees extension.

Sec. 802. Additional customs user fees extension.

Sec. 803. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

Sec. 804. Payee statement required to claim certain education tax benefits.

Sec. 805. Special rule for educational institutions unable to collect TINs of individuals with respect to higher education tuition and related expenses.

Sec. 806. Penalty for failure to file correct information returns and provide payee statements.

Sec. 807. Child tax credit not refundable for taxpayers electing to exclude foreign earned income from tax.

Sec. 808. Coverage and payment for renal dialysis services for individuals with acute kidney injury.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015".

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth

and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost sixfold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(b) AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(g)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(2) EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “11 succeeding” and inserting “21 succeeding”; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(3) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “SEPTEMBER 30, 2015” and inserting “SEPTEMBER 30, 2025”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.”.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff treatment symbol “D” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol “A” or “A*” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “If the President” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or

limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”.

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

“(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

“(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

“(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

“(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

“(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

“(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

“(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

“(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

“(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

“(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.”

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “for men and women” after “rights”.

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as “AGOA utilization strategies”);

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider re-

questing the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) CONTENTS.—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) PUBLICATION.—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade

agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest” and inserting “, through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have”; and

(B) by striking “and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States” and inserting “, complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) by inserting after “from those countries” the following: “, particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) COORDINATION.—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.”

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) **TERMINATION.**—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “beneficiary sub-Saharan African country” means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) **SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “sub-Saharan African country” has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking “July 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013; and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1), shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) **REQUESTS.**—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) **PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.**—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **COVERED ARTICLE.**—The term “covered article” means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) **ENTER; ENTRY.**—The terms “enter” and “entry” include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.”.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “October 1” for “July 1” each place such date appears.

(b) **ARTICLE DESCRIBED.**—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (5)”;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking “Footwear” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (5), footwear”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or (E) of paragraph (1), the President may designate the following as eligible articles under subsection (a):

“(A) Articles classifiable under subheading 4202.11.00, 4202.12.40, 4202.21.60, 4202.21.90, 4202.22.15, 4202.22.45, 4202.31.60, 4202.32.40, 4202.32.80, 4202.92.15, 4202.92.20, 4202.92.45, or 4202.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

“(B) Articles classifiable under statistical reporting number 4202.12.2020, 4202.12.2050, 4202.12.8030, 4202.12.8070, 4202.22.8050, 4202.32.9550, 4202.32.9560, 4202.91.0030, 4202.91.0090, 4202.92.3020, 4202.92.3031, 4202.92.3091, 4202.92.9026, or 4202.92.9060 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as such statistical reporting numbers are in effect on the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (cc) to read as follows:

“(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking “succeeding 11 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(II) by striking “December 19, 2018” and inserting “December 19, 2025”.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking “September 30, 2020” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

TITLE IV—EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

SEC. 402. APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) **REPEAL OF SNAPBACK.**—Section 233 of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–40; 125 Stat. 416) is repealed.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.**—Except as otherwise provided in this title, the provisions of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on December 31, 2013, and as amended by this title, shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to petitions for certification filed under chapter 2, 3, or 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after such date of enactment.

(c) **REFERENCES.**—Except as otherwise provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of any such chapter, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

SEC. 403. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **EXTENSION OF TERMINATION PROVISIONS.**—Section 285 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” each place it appears and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(b) **TRAINING FUNDS.**—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “shall not exceed” and all that follows and inserting “shall not exceed \$450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021.”.

(c) **REEMPLOYMENT TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.**—Section 246(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2318(b)(1)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(d) **AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.**—Section 245(a) of the Trade Act of

1974 (19 U.S.C. 2317(a)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(2) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—Section 255(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2345(a)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2012 and 2013” and all that follows through “December 31, 2013” and inserting “fiscal years 2015 through 2021”.

(3) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS.—Section 298(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401g(a)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2012 and 2013” and all that follows through “December 31, 2013” and inserting “fiscal years 2015 through 2021”.

SEC. 404. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND REPORTING.

(a) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—Section 239(j) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2311(j)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “DATA REPORTING” and inserting “PERFORMANCE MEASURES”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “a quarterly” and inserting “an annual”; and

(ii) by striking “data” and inserting “measures”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “core” and inserting “primary”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “that promote efficiency and effectiveness” after “assistance program”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “CORE INDICATORS DESCRIBED” and inserting “INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) PRIMARY INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE DESCRIBED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The primary indicators of performance referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall consist of—

“(I) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who are in unsubsidized employment during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program;

“(II) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program and who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth calendar quarter after exit from the program;

“(III) the median earnings of workers described in subclause (I);

“(IV) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, subject to clause (ii), obtain a recognized postsecondary credential or a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, during participation in the program or within one year after exit from the program; and

“(V) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, during a year while receiving such benefits, are in an education or training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential or employment and who are achieving measurable gains in skills toward such a credential or employment.

“(ii) INDICATOR RELATING TO CREDENTIAL.—For purposes of clause (i)(IV), a worker who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who obtained a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent shall be included in the percentage counted for purposes of that clause only if the worker, in addition to obtaining such

a diploma or its recognized equivalent, has obtained or retained employment or is in an education or training program leading to a recognized postsecondary credential within one year after exit from the program.”;

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “DATA” and inserting “MEASURES”;

(B) by striking “quarterly” and inserting “annual”; and

(C) by striking “data” and inserting “measures”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) ACCESSIBILITY OF STATE PERFORMANCE REPORTS.—The Secretary shall, on an annual basis, make available (including by electronic means), in an easily understandable format, the reports of cooperating States or cooperating State agencies required by paragraph (1) and the information contained in those reports.”.

(b) COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF DATA.—Section 249B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2323) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “enrolled in” and inserting “who received”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “complete” and inserting “exited”; and

(II) by striking “who were enrolled in” and inserting “, including who received”;

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “complete” and inserting “exited”;

(iv) in subparagraph (F), by striking “complete” and inserting “exit”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) The average cost per worker of receiving training approved under section 236.

“(H) The percentage of workers who received training approved under section 236 and obtained unsubsidized employment in a field related to that training.”; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking “quarterly” each place it appears and inserting “annual”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) The median earnings of workers described in section 239(j)(2)(A)(i)(III) during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program, expressed as a percentage of the median earnings of such workers before the calendar quarter in which such workers began receiving benefits under this chapter.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) the reports required under section 239(j);”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “a quarterly” and inserting “an annual”.

(c) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL DEFINED.—Section 247 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2319) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(19) The term ‘recognized postsecondary credential’ means a credential consisting of an industry-recognized certificate or certification, a certificate of completion of an apprenticeship, a license recognized by a State or the Federal Government, or an associate or baccalaureate degree.”.

SEC. 405. APPLICABILITY OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—

(1) PETITIONS FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014, AND BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CERTIFICATIONS OF WORKERS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(i) CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) RECONSIDERATION OF DENIALS OF CERTIFICATIONS.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall—

(I) reconsider that determination; and

(II) if the group of workers meets the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(iii) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this clause is a petition for a certification of eligibility for a group of workers filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be eligible, on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to receive benefits only under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) COMPUTATION OF MAXIMUM BENEFITS.—Benefits received by a worker described in clause (i) under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be included in any determination of the maximum benefits for which the worker is eligible under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) PETITIONS FILED BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2014.—A worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or before December 31, 2013, shall continue to be eligible to apply for and receive benefits under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of such Act, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

(3) QUALIFYING SEPARATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PETITIONS FILED WITHIN 90 DAYS OF DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Section 223(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be applied and administered by substituting “before January 1, 2014” for “more than one year before the date of the petition on which such certification was granted” for purposes of determining whether a worker is eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and on or before the date that is 90 days after such date of enactment.

(b) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—

(1) CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(B) RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF CERTAIN PETITIONS.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall—

(i) reconsider that determination; and

(ii) if the firm meets the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(C) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this subparagraph is a petition for a certification of eligibility filed by a firm or its representative under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS THAT DID NOT SUBMIT PETITIONS BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 2014, AND DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall certify a firm described in subparagraph (B) as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, if the firm or its representative files a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 not later than 90 days after such date of enactment.

(B) FIRM DESCRIBED.—A firm described in this subparagraph is a firm that the Secretary determines would have been certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance if—

(i) the firm or its representative had filed a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on a date during the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) the provisions of chapter 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, had been in effect on that date during the period described in clause (i).

SEC. 406. SUNSET PROVISIONS.

(a) APPLICATION OF PRIOR LAW.—Subject to subsection (b), beginning on July 1, 2021, the provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.), as in effect on January 1, 2014, shall be in effect and apply, except that in applying and administering such chapters—

(1) paragraph (1) of section 231(c) of that Act shall be applied and administered as if subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of that paragraph were not in effect;

(2) section 233 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by substituting “104-week period” for “104-week period” and all that follows through “130-week period”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by substituting “65” for “52”; and

(II) by substituting “78-week period” for “52-week period” each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (g) as if it read as follows:

“(g) PAYMENT OF TRADE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES TO COMPLETE TRAINING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in order to assist an adversely affected worker to complete training approved for the worker under section 236 that leads to the completion of a degree or industry-recognized credential, payments may be made as trade readjustment allowances for not more than 13 weeks within such period of eligibility as the Secretary may prescribe to account for a break in training or for justifiable cause that follows the last week for which the worker is otherwise entitled to a trade readjustment allowance under this chapter if—

“(1) payment of the trade readjustment allowance for not more than 13 weeks is necessary for the worker to complete the training;

“(2) the worker participates in training in each such week; and

“(3) the worker—

“(A) has substantially met the performance benchmarks established as part of the training approved for the worker;

“(B) is expected to continue to make progress toward the completion of the training; and

“(C) will complete the training during that period of eligibility.”;

(3) section 245(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “December 31, 2007”;

(4) section 246(b)(1) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “the date that is 5 years” and all that follows through “State”;

(5) section 256(b) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021” for “each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and \$4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning on October 1, 2007”;

(6) section 298(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021” for “each of the fiscal years” and all that follows through “October 1, 2007”; and

(7) section 285 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a), by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “December 31, 2007” each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (b) as if it read as follows:

“(b) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 3 after June 30, 2022.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 3 pursuant to a petition filed under section 251 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

“(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

“(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.

“(2) FARMERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 6 after June 30, 2022.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 6 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

“(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

“(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.”;

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply on and after July 1, 2021, with respect to—

(1) workers certified as eligible for trade adjustment assistance benefits under chapter 2 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 221 of that Act before July 1, 2021;

(2) firms certified as eligible for technical assistance or grants under chapter 3 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 251 of that Act before July 1, 2021; and

(3) agricultural commodity producers certified as eligible for technical or financial assistance under chapter 6 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 292 of that Act before July 1, 2021.

SEC. 407. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF HEALTH COVERAGE TAX CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subparagraph (B) of section 35(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “before January 1, 2014” and inserting “before January 1, 2020”.

(b) COORDINATION WITH CREDIT FOR COVERAGE UNDER A QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN.—Subsection (g) of section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (13), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraphs:

“(11) ELECTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to any taxpayer for any eligible coverage month unless such taxpayer elects the application of this section for such month.

“(B) TIMING AND APPLICABILITY OF ELECTION.—Except as the Secretary may provide—

“(i) an election to have this section apply for any eligible coverage month in a taxable year shall be made not later than the due date (including extensions) for the return of tax for the taxable year, and

“(ii) any election for this section to apply for an eligible coverage month shall apply for all subsequent eligible coverage months in the taxable year and, once made, shall be irrevocable with respect to such months.

“(12) COORDINATION WITH PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible coverage month to which the election under paragraph (11) applies shall not be treated as a coverage month (as defined in section 36B(c)(2)) for purposes of section 36B with respect to the taxpayer.

“(B) COORDINATION WITH ADVANCE PAYMENTS OF PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—In the case of a taxpayer who makes the election under paragraph (11) with respect to any eligible coverage month in a taxable year or on behalf of whom any advance payment is made under section 7527 with respect to any month in such taxable year—

“(i) the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year shall be increased by the excess, if any, of—

“(I) the sum of any advance payments made on behalf of the taxpayer under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and section 7527 for months during such taxable year, over

“(II) the sum of the credits allowed under this section (determined without regard to paragraph (1)) and section 36B (determined without regard to subsection (f)(1) thereof) for such taxable year, and

“(ii) section 36B(f)(2) shall not apply with respect to such taxpayer for such taxable year, except that if such taxpayer received any advance payments under section 7527 for any month in such taxable year and is later allowed a credit under section 36B for such taxable year, then section 36B(f)(2)(B) shall be applied by substituting the amount determined under clause (i) for the amount determined under section 36B(f)(2)(A).”.

(c) EXTENSION OF ADVANCE PAYMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 7527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “August 1, 2003” and inserting “the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 7527(e) of such Code is amended by striking “occurring” and all that follows and inserting “occurring—

“(A) after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015, and

“(B) prior to the first month for which an advance payment is made on behalf of such individual under subsection (a).”.

(d) INDIVIDUAL INSURANCE TREATED AS QUALIFIED HEALTH INSURANCE WITHOUT REGARD TO ENROLLMENT DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “insurance if the eligible individual” and all that follows through “For purposes of” and inserting “insurance. For purposes of”.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of such Code, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by striking “insurance.” and inserting “insurance (other than coverage enrolled in through an Exchange established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).”.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (m) of section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “, 35(g)(11)” after “30D(e)(4)”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) PLANS AVAILABLE ON INDIVIDUAL MARKET FOR USE OF TAX CREDIT.—The amendment made by subsection (d)(2) shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(3) TRANSITION RULE.—Notwithstanding section 35(g)(11)(B)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this title), an election to apply section 35 of such Code to an eligible coverage month (as defined in section 35(b) of such Code) (and not to claim the credit under section 36B of such Code with respect to such month) in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2013, and before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) may be made at any time on or after such date of enactment and before the expiration of the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 6511(a) with respect to such taxable year; and

(B) may be made on an amended return.

(g) AGENCY OUTREACH.—As soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Health and Human Services, and Labor (or such Secretaries’ delegates) and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (or the Director’s delegate) shall carry out programs of public outreach, including on the

Internet, to inform potential eligible individuals (as defined in section 35(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of the extension of the credit under section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the availability of the election to claim such credit retroactively for coverage months beginning after December 31, 2013.

TITLE V—IMPROVEMENTS TO ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “American Trade Enforcement Effectiveness Act”.

SEC. 502. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO COOPERATE WITH A REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IN A PROCEEDING.

Section 776 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(B) by striking “ADVERSE INFERENCES.—If” and inserting the following: “ADVERSE INFERENCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If”;

(C) by striking “under this title, may use” and inserting the following: “under this title—

“(A) may use”; and

(D) by striking “facts otherwise available. Such adverse inference may include” and inserting the following: “facts otherwise available; and

“(B) is not required to determine, or make any adjustments to, a countervailable subsidy rate or weighted average dumping margin based on any assumptions about information the interested party would have provided if the interested party had complied with the request for information.

“(2) POTENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR ADVERSE INFERENCES.—An adverse inference under paragraph (1)(A) may include”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—When the” and inserting the following: “CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The administrative authority and the Commission shall not be required to corroborate any dumping margin or countervailing duty applied in a separate segment of the same proceeding.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SUBSIDY RATES AND DUMPING MARGINS IN ADVERSE INFERENCE DETERMINATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority uses an inference that is adverse to the interests of a party under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority may—

“(A) in the case of a countervailing duty proceeding—

“(i) use a countervailable subsidy rate applied for the same or similar program in a countervailing duty proceeding involving the same country, or

“(ii) if there is no same or similar program, use a countervailable subsidy rate for a subsidy program from a proceeding that the administering authority considers reasonable to use, and

“(B) in the case of an antidumping duty proceeding, use any dumping margin from any segment of the proceeding under the applicable antidumping order.

“(2) DISCRETION TO APPLY HIGHEST RATE.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the administering authority may apply any of the countervailable subsidy rates or dumping margins specified under that paragraph, including the highest such rate or margin, based on the evaluation by the administering authority of the situation that resulted in the administering authority using an adverse inference in selecting among the facts otherwise available.

“(3) NO OBLIGATION TO MAKE CERTAIN ESTIMATES OR ADDRESS CERTAIN CLAIMS.—If the administering authority uses an adverse inference under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority is not required, for purposes of subsection (c) or for any other purpose—

“(A) to estimate what the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin would have been if the interested party found to have failed to cooperate under subsection (b)(1) had cooperated, or

“(B) to demonstrate that the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin used by the administering authority reflects an alleged commercial reality of the interested party.”.

SEC. 503. DEFINITION OF MATERIAL INJURY.

(a) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES.—Section 771(7) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(J) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY.—The Commission may not determine that there is no material injury or threat of material injury to an industry in the United States merely because that industry is profitable or because the performance of that industry has recently improved.”.

(b) EVALUATION OF IMPACT ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IN DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL INJURY.—Subclause (I) of section 771(7)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(I) actual and potential decline in output, sales, market share, gross profits, operating profits, net profits, ability to service debt, productivity, return on investments, return on assets, and utilization of capacity.”.

(c) CAPTIVE PRODUCTION.—Section 771(7)(C)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking the comma and inserting “, and”;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking “, and” and inserting a comma; and

(3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 504. PARTICULAR MARKET SITUATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF ORDINARY COURSE OF TRADE.—Section 771(15) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(15)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) Situations in which the administering authority determines that the particular market situation prevents a proper comparison with the export price or constructed export price.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF NORMAL VALUE.—Section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking “in such other country.”.

(c) DEFINITION OF CONSTRUCTED VALUE.—Section 773(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “business” and inserting “trade”; and

(2) by striking the flush text at the end and inserting the following:

“For purposes of paragraph (1), if a particular market situation exists such that the cost of materials and fabrication or other processing of any kind does not accurately

reflect the cost of production in the ordinary course of trade, the administering authority may use another calculation methodology under this subtitle or any other calculation methodology. For purposes of paragraph (1), the cost of materials shall be determined without regard to any internal tax in the exporting country imposed on such materials or their disposition that is remitted or refunded upon exportation of the subject merchandise produced from such materials.”

SEC. 505. DISTORTION OF PRICES OR COSTS.

(a) INVESTIGATION OF BELOW-COST SALES.—Section 773(b)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE OR SUSPECT.—

“(i) REVIEW.—In a review conducted under section 751 involving a specific exporter, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that are less than the cost of production of the product if the administering authority disregarded some or all of the exporter’s sales pursuant to paragraph (1) in the investigation or, if a review has been completed, in the most recently completed review.

“(ii) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—In an investigation initiated under section 732 or a review conducted under section 751, the administering authority shall request information necessary to calculate the constructed value and cost of production under subsections (e) and (f) to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that represent less than the cost of production of the product.”

(b) PRICES AND COSTS IN NONMARKET ECONOMIES.—Section 773(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) DISCRETION TO DISREGARD CERTAIN PRICE OR COST VALUES.—In valuing the factors of production under paragraph (1) for the subject merchandise, the administering authority may disregard price or cost values without further investigation if the administering authority has determined that broadly available export subsidies existed or particular instances of subsidization occurred with respect to those price or cost values or if those price or cost values were subject to an antidumping order.”

SEC. 506. REDUCTION IN BURDEN ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF VOLUNTARY RESPONDENTS.

Section 782(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677m(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and by moving such clauses, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking “INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—In” and inserting the following: “INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In”;

(4) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (3), by amending subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), to read as follows:

“(B) the number of exporters or producers subject to the investigation or review is not so large that any additional individual examination of such exporters or producers would be unduly burdensome to the admin-

istering authority and inhibit the timely completion of the investigation or review.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DETERMINATION OF UNDULY BURDENSOME.—In determining if an individual examination under paragraph (1)(B) would be unduly burdensome, the administering authority may consider the following:

“(A) The complexity of the issues or information presented in the proceeding, including questionnaires and any responses thereto.

“(B) Any prior experience of the administering authority in the same or similar proceeding.

“(C) The total number of investigations under subtitle A or B and reviews under section 751 being conducted by the administering authority as of the date of the determination.

“(D) Such other factors relating to the timely completion of each such investigation and review as the administering authority considers appropriate.”

SEC. 507. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

TITLE VI—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 601. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking “For the purposes of subheadings” and all that follows through “6211.20.15” and inserting “For purposes of this chapter”;

(B) by striking “garments classifiable in those subheadings” and inserting “a garment”; and

(C) by striking “D 3600-81” and inserting “D 3779-81”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new notes:

“(c) For purposes of this chapter, the term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ means trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants, and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with five or more of the following features:

“(1) Insulation for cold weather protection.

“(2) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

“(3) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

“(4) Venting, not including grommet(s).

“(5) Articulated elbows or knees.

“(6) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

“(7) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

“(8) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

“(9) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

“(10) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

“(11) Odor control technology.

The term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ does not include occupational outerwear.

“(d) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

“(1) The term ‘treated with plastics’ refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

“(2) The term ‘sealed seams’ means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

“(3) The term ‘critically sealed seams’ means—

“(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

“(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

“(4) The term ‘insulation for cold weather protection’ means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

“(5) The term ‘venting’ refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

“(6) The term ‘articulated elbows or knees’ refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

“(7) The term ‘reinforcement’ refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

“(8) The term ‘weatherproof closure’ means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

“(9) The term ‘multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar’ means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar

component, to allow volume adjustments around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

“(10) The terms ‘adjustable powder skirt’ and ‘inner protective skirt’ refer to a partial lower inner lining with means of tightening around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

“(11) The term ‘arm gusset’ means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

“(12) The term ‘radial arm movement’ refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

“(13) The term ‘odor control technology’ means the incorporation into a fabric or gar-

ment of materials, including, but not limited to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

“(14) The term ‘occupational outerwear’ means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion, or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

“(e) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as ‘recreational performance outerwear’.

“(f) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.”.

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:					
	6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%		
	6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	”.	

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6201.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%		
	6201.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%		
	6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.	

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6201.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%		
	6201.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%		
	6201.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%		
	6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.	

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6201.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.
	6201.19.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6201.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%	”.
	6201.91.10	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%	
	6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6201.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.
	6201.92.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6201.92.15	Other: Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 through 6201.93.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6201.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.
	6201.93.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				

6201.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6201.93.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6201.93.30	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	
6201.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	”.

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6202.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.13.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.13.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6202.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6202.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6202.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 5.6% (OM)	58.5%	
	6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				

6202.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 through 6202.93.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“ 6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	Other:				
6202.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	Other:				
6202.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	Other:				
6202.93.40	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	Other:				
6202.93.45	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“ 6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	Other:				
6202.99.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6202.99.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“ 6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
6203.41.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.8% (AU) 3% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6203.42.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
	6203.42.20	Bib and brace overalls	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	”.

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.43.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.43.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.15	Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.25	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.35	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%	
	6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	”.

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.49 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.49 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.49	Of other textile materials:				
	6203.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	
		Other:				

6203.49.10	Of artificial fibers: Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%	
6203.49.15	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6203.49.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6203.49.80	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	”.

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.10	Other: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	”.

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.62.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
	6204.62.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
	6204.62.20	Other: Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6204.62.30	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%	
	6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	”.

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 through 6204.63.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.63.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
		Bib and brace overalls:				
	6204.63.12	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.25	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.30	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	”.

(24) By striking subheadings 6204.69 through 6204.69.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.69 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.69 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.69	Of other textile materials:				
	6204.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
		Of artificial fibers:				
	6204.69.10	Bib and brace overalls	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
	6204.69.20	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.69.25	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Of silk or silk waste:				
	6204.69.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%	
	6204.69.60	Other	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	

6204.69.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	"
------------	-------------	------	--	-----	---

(25) By striking subheadings 6210.40.30 and 6210.40.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6210.40.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6210.40.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.40.30	Other: Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.40.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	"

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6210.50.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.50.30	Other: Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	"

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in ef-

fect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.32	Of cotton:				
6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	"

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in ef-

fect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.33	Of man-made fibers:				
6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	
6211.33.10	Other	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	"

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6211.39.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.39.10	Other: Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%	

6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in ef-

fect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“ 6211.42	Of cotton:				
6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
			7.2% (AU)		
6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.
			7.2% (AU)		

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in ef-

fect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“ 6211.43	Of man-made fibers:				
6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
			8% (AU)		
			6.4% (OM)		
6211.43.10	Other	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.
			8% (AU)		
			6.4% (OM)		

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“ 6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
			6.5% (AU)		
			2.9% (KR)		
	Other:				
6211.49.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%	
			4.8% (OM)		
			8% (AU)		
6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.
			6.5% (AU)		
			2.9% (KR)		

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the 180th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 180th day.

SEC. 602. DUTY TREATMENT OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter

64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) For the purposes of subheadings 6402.91.42 and 6402.99.32, the term ‘protective active footwear’ means footwear (other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1) that is designed for outdoor activities, such as hiking shoes, trekking shoes, running shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over \$24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by

the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.”.

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

"	6402.91.42	Protective active footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	"
---	------------	---	-----	---	-----	---

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new sub-

heading, with the article description for subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of

indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

"	6402.99.32	Protective active footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P)	1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35%	"
---	------------	----------------------------------	-----	---	---	-----	---

(c) **STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.**—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section and the amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VIII—OFFSETS

SEC. 801. CUSTOMS USER FEES EXTENSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “July 7, 2025”.

(b) **RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.**—Section 503 of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking “June 30, 2021” and inserting “June 30, 2025”.

SEC. 802. ADDITIONAL CUSTOMS USER FEES EXTENSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) Fees may be charged under paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) during the period beginning on July 29, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025.”

(b) **RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.**—Section 503 of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **FURTHER ADDITIONAL PERIOD.**—For the period beginning on July 15, 2025, and ending

on September 30, 2025, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

“(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’; and

“(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’.”

SEC. 803. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 8 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 804. PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIRED TO CLAIM CERTAIN EDUCATION TAX BENEFITS.

(a) **AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY CREDIT, HOPE SCHOLARSHIP CREDIT, AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 25A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) **PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no credit shall be allowed under this section unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.”

(2) **STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.**—Section 25A(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a statement described in paragraph (8) and received by such individual shall be treated as received by the taxpayer.”

(b) **DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.**—Section 222(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7), and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) **PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.**—“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.

“(B) **STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.**—The receipt of the statement referred to in subparagraph (A) by an individual described in subsection (c)(3) shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as received by the taxpayer.”

(c) **INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED ON PAYEE STATEMENT.**—Section 6050S(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the information required by subsection (b)(2).”

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 805. SPECIAL RULE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS UNABLE TO COLLECT TINS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) **SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.**—No penalty shall be imposed under section 6721 or 6722 solely by reason of failing to provide the TIN of an individual on a return or statement required by section 6050S(a)(1) if the eligible educational institution required to make such return contemporaneously makes a true and accurate certification under penalty of perjury (and in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary) that it has complied with standards promulgated by the Secretary for obtaining such individual’s TIN.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 806. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS AND PROVIDE PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6721(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(b) **REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.**—

(1) **CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.**—Section 6721(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”; and

(B) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(C) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(2) **FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.**—Section 6721(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”;

(B) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$250”; and

(C) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(c) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6721(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(d) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6721(e) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”; and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(e) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6722(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(2) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(A) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6722(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”; and

(ii) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(iii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(B) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6722(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”; and

(ii) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by clause (i)) and inserting “\$250”; and

(iii) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(3) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6722(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(4) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6722(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect

to returns and statements required to be filed after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 807. CHILD TAX CREDIT NOT REFUNDABLE FOR TAXPAYERS ELECTING TO EXCLUDE FOREIGN EARNED INCOME FROM TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYERS EXCLUDING FOREIGN EARNED INCOME.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer elects to exclude any amount from gross income under section 911 for such taxable year.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 808. COVERAGE AND PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1861(s)(2)(F) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)(F)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, including such renal dialysis services furnished on or after January 1, 2017, by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under section 1881(b)(14) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in section 1834(r)(2))”.

(b) PAYMENT.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(r) PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.—

“(1) PAYMENT RATE.—In the case of renal dialysis services (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1881(b)(14)) furnished under this part by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under such section during a year (beginning with 2017) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in paragraph (2)), the amount of payment under this part for such services shall be the base rate for renal dialysis services determined for such year under such section, as adjusted by any applicable geographic adjustment factor applied under subparagraph (D)(iv)(II) of such section and may be adjusted by the Secretary (on a budget neutral basis for payments under this paragraph) by any other adjustment factor under subparagraph (D) of such section.

“(2) INDIVIDUAL WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘individual with acute kidney injury’ means an individual who has acute loss of renal function and does not receive renal dialysis services for which payment is made under section 1881(b)(14).”.

SA 2066. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2065 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 2067. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2068. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the Instructions

Strike “2 days” and insert “3 days”

SA 2069. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2068 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Water and Power be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 2 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Dead End, No Turn Around, Danger Ahead: Challenges to the Future of Highway Funding.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Re-examining EPA's

Management of the Renewable Fuel Standard Program.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

AMENDMENT NO. 1474, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the passage of H.R. 1735, the Coons amendment No. 1474, which was agreed to, be modified by replacing the text therein with the text of Coons amendment No. 2058.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve section 1204, relating to the National Guard State Partnership Program)

On page 599, after line 21, add the following:

(g) ENHANCED SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a)(1) of such section, as amended by subsection (b)(1) of this section, is further amended by inserting after “activities described in paragraph (2)” the following: “, to support the security cooperation objectives of the United States.”.

(h) PROCEDURES.—Such section, as amended by subsections (b) through (f) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall designate a director for each State and territory to be responsible for the coordination of activities under a program established under subsection (a) for such State or territory and reporting on activities under the program.”.

(i) ANNUAL REPORT.—Paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (h)(1) of this section, is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by inserting “or other government organizations” after “and security forces”;

(2) in clause (iv), by adding at the end before the period the following: “and country”;

(3) in clause (v), by striking “training” and inserting “activities”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) An assessment of the extent to which the activities conducted during the previous year met the objectives described in clause (v).”.

ORDER FOR PRINTING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill as passed by the Senate be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The bill, H.R. 1735, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Mon-

day, June 22, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to the en bloc consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 156 and 124; that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed, and that following disposition of the nominations the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 94, S. 808.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 808) to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 808) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 808

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Surface Transportation Board Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. References to title 49, United States Code.

Sec. 3. Establishment of Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment.

Sec. 4. Surface Transportation Board membership.

Sec. 5. Nonpublic collaborative discussions.

Sec. 6. Reports.

Sec. 7. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 8. Agent in the District of Columbia.

Sec. 9. Department of Transportation Inspector General authority.

Sec. 10. Amendment to table of sections.

Sec. 11. Procedures for rate cases.

Sec. 12. Investigative authority.

Sec. 13. Arbitration of certain rail rates and practices disputes.

Sec. 14. Effect of proposals for rates from multiple origins and destinations.

Sec. 15. Reports.

Sec. 16. Criteria.

Sec. 17. Construction.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD AS AN INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) REDESIGNATION OF CHAPTER 7 OF TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 49 is amended—

(1) by moving chapter 7 after chapter 11 in subtitle II;

(2) by redesignating chapter 7 as chapter 13;

(3) by redesignating sections 701 through 706 as sections 1301 through 1306, respectively;

(4) by striking sections 725 and 727;

(5) by redesignating sections 721 through 724 as sections 1321 through 1324, respectively; and

(6) by redesignating section 726 as section 1325.

(b) INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 1301, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Surface Transportation Board is an independent establishment of the United States Government.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—Section 1303, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (a), (c), (f), and (g);

(B) by redesignating subsections (b), (d), and (e) as subsections (a), (b), and (c), respectively; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SUBMISSION OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Board submits any budget estimate, budget request, supplemental budget estimate, or other budget information, legislative recommendation, prepared testimony for a congressional hearing, or comment on legislation to the President or to the Office of Management and Budget, the Board shall concurrently submit a copy of such document to—

“(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

“(2) NO APPROVAL REQUIRED.—No officer or agency of the United States has any authority to require the Board to submit budget estimates or requests, legislative recommendations, prepared testimony for congressional hearings, or comments on legislation to any officer or agency of the United States for approval, comments, or review before submitting such recommendations, testimony, or comments to Congress.”.

SEC. 4. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEMBERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1301(b), as redesignated by subsection 3(a), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “3 members” and inserting “5 members”; and

(B) by striking “2 members” and inserting “3 members”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) At all times—

“(A) at least 3 members of the Board shall be individuals with professional standing and demonstrated knowledge in the fields of transportation, transportation regulation, or economic regulation; and

“(B) at least 2 members shall be individuals with professional or business experience (including agriculture) in the private sector.”.

(b) **REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISION.**—Section 1301(b), as amended by this section, is further amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking “who becomes a member of the Board pursuant to paragraph (4), or an individual”.

SEC. 5. NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.

Section 1303(a), as redesignated by subsections (a) and (c) of section 3, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) **OPEN MEETINGS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall be deemed to be an agency for purposes of section 552b of title 5.

“(2) **NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 552b of title 5, a majority of the members may hold a meeting that is not open to public observation to discuss official agency business if—

“(i) no formal or informal vote or other official agency action is taken at the meeting;

“(ii) each individual present at the meeting is a member or an employee of the Board; and

“(iii) the General Counsel of the Board is present at the meeting.

“(B) **DISCLOSURE OF NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.**—Except as provided under subparagraph (C), not later than 2 business days after the conclusion of a meeting under subparagraph (A), the Board shall make available to the public, in a place easily accessible to the public—

“(i) a list of the individuals present at the meeting; and

“(ii) a summary of the matters discussed at the meeting, except for any matters the Board properly determines may be withheld from the public under section 552b(c) of title 5.

“(C) **SUMMARY.**—If the Board properly determines matters may be withheld from the public under section 555b(c) of title 5, the Board shall provide a summary with as much general information as possible on those matters withheld from the public.

“(D) **ONGOING PROCEEDINGS.**—If a discussion under subparagraph (A) directly relates to an ongoing proceeding before the Board, the Board shall make the disclosure under subparagraph (B) on the date of the final Board decision.

“(E) **PRESERVATION OF OPEN MEETINGS REQUIREMENTS FOR AGENCY ACTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to limit the applicability of section 552b of title 5 with respect to a meeting of the members other than that described in this paragraph.

“(F) **STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed—

“(i) to limit the applicability of section 552b of title 5 with respect to any information which is proposed to be withheld from the public under subparagraph (B)(ii); or

“(ii) to authorize the Board to withhold from any individual any record that is accessible to that individual under section 552a of title 5, United States Code.”.

SEC. 6. REPORTS.

(a) **REPORTS.**—Section 1304, as amended by section 3, is further amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

“**§ 1304. Reports**”;

(2) by inserting “(a) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—” before “The Board”;

(3) by striking “on its activities.” and inserting “on its activities, including each instance in which the Board has initiated an investigation on its own initiative under this chapter or subtitle IV.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **RATE CASE REVIEW METRICS.**—

“(1) **QUARTERLY REPORTS.**—The Board shall post a quarterly report of rail rate review cases pending or completed by the Board during the previous quarter that includes—

“(A) summary information of the case, including the docket number, case name, commodity or commodities involved, and rate review guideline or guidelines used;

“(B) the date on which the rate review proceeding began;

“(C) the date for the completion of discovery;

“(D) the date for the completion of the evidentiary record;

“(E) the date for the submission of closing briefs;

“(F) the date on which the Board issued the final decision; and

“(G) a brief summary of the final decision;

“(2) **WEBSITE POSTING.**—Each quarterly report shall be posted on the Board’s public website.”.

(b) **COMPILATION OF COMPLAINTS AT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1304, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **COMPLAINTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall establish and maintain a database of complaints received by the Board.

“(2) **QUARTERLY REPORTS.**—The Board shall post a quarterly report of formal and informal service complaints received by the Board during the previous quarter that includes—

“(A) the date on which the complaint was received by the Board;

“(B) a list of the type of each complaint;

“(C) the geographic region of each complaint; and

“(D) the resolution of each complaint, if appropriate.

“(3) **WRITTEN CONSENT.**—The quarterly report may identify a complainant that submitted an informal complaint only upon the written consent of the complainant.

“(4) **WEBSITE POSTING.**—Each quarterly report shall be posted on the Board’s public website.”.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1305, as redesignated by section 3, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following:

“(1) \$33,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

“(2) \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(3) \$35,500,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(4) \$35,500,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

“(5) \$36,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.”.

SEC. 8. AGENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) **DESIGNATION OF AGENT AND SERVICE OF NOTICE.**—Section 1323, as redesignated by section 3(a), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “in the District of Columbia.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “in the District of Columbia”.

(b) **SERVICE OF PROCESS IN COURT PROCEEDINGS.**—Section 1324(a), as redesignated by section 3(a), is amended by striking “in the District of Columbia” each place such phrase appears.

SEC. 9. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INSPECTOR GENERAL AUTHORITY.

Subchapter II of chapter 13, as redesignated by section 3(a)(2), is amended by inserting after section 1325, as redesignated by section 3(a)(6), the following:

“**§ 1326. Authority of the Inspector General**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Inspector General of the Department of Transportation, in accordance with the mission of the Inspector General to prevent and detect fraud and abuse, shall have authority to review only the financial management, property management, and business operations of the Surface Transportation Board, including internal accounting and administrative control systems, to determine the Board’s compliance with applicable Federal laws, rules, and regulations.

“(b) **DUTIES.**—In carrying out this section, the Inspector General shall—

“(1) keep the Chairman of the Board, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed about problems relating to administration of the internal accounting and administrative control systems of the Board;

“(2) issue findings and recommendations for actions to address the problems referred to in paragraph (1); and

“(3) submit periodic reports to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives that describe any progress made in implementing actions to address the problems referred to in paragraph (1).

“(c) **ACCESS TO INFORMATION.**—In carrying out this section, the Inspector General may exercise authorities granted to the Inspector General under subsections (a) and (b) of section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

“(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

“(1) **FUNDING.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation for use by the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation such sums as may be necessary to cover expenses associated with activities pursuant to the authority exercised under this section.

“(2) **REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENT.**—In the absence of an appropriation under this subsection for an expense referred to in paragraph (1), the Inspector General and the Board shall have a reimbursement agreement to cover such expense.”.

SEC. 10. AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF SECTIONS.

The table of sections for chapter 13, as redesignated by section 3(a), is amended to read as follows:

“**CHAPTER 13—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

“**I—ESTABLISHMENT**

“Sec.

“1301. Establishment of Board

“1302. Functions.

“1303. Administrative provisions.

“1304. Reports.

“1305. Authorization of appropriations.

“1306. Reporting official action.

“**II—ADMINISTRATIVE**

“1321. Powers.

"1322. Board action.

"1323. Service of notice in Board proceedings.

"1324. Service of process in court proceedings.

"1325. Railroad-Shipper Transportation Advisory Council.

"1326. Authority of the Inspector General."

SEC. 11. PROCEDURES FOR RATE CASES.

(a) SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURE.—Section 10701(d)(3) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The Board shall maintain 1 or more simplified and expedited methods for determining the reasonableness of challenged rates in those cases in which a full stand-alone cost presentation is too costly, given the value of the case."

(b) EXPEDITED HANDLING; RATE REVIEW TIMELINES.—Section 10704(d) is amended—

(1) by striking "(d) Within 9 months" and all that follows through "railroad rates." and inserting the following:

"(d)(1) The Board shall maintain procedures to ensure the expeditious handling of challenges to the reasonableness of railroad rates."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2)(A) Except as provided under subparagraph (B), in a stand-alone cost rate challenge, the Board shall comply with the following timeline:

"(i) Discovery shall be completed not later than 150 days after the date on which the challenge is initiated.

"(ii) The development of the evidentiary record shall be completed not later than 155 days after the date on which discovery is completed under clause (i).

"(iii) The closing brief shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date on which the development of the evidentiary record is completed under clause (ii).

"(iv) A final Board decision shall be issued not later than 180 days after the date on which the evidentiary record is completed under clause (ii).

"(B) The Board may extend a timeline under subparagraph (A) after a request from any party or in the interest of due process."

(c) PROCEDURES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Surface Transportation Board shall initiate a proceeding to assess procedures that are available to parties in litigation before courts to expedite such litigation and the potential application of any such procedures to rate cases.

(d) EXPIRED RAIL SERVICE CONTRACT LIMITATION.—Section 10709 is amended by striking subsection (h).

SEC. 12. INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO INITIATE INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 11701(a) is amended—

(1) by striking "only on complaint" and inserting "on the Board's own initiative or upon receiving a complaint pursuant to subsection (b)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: "If the Board finds a violation of this part in a proceeding brought on its own initiative, any remedy from such proceeding may only be applied prospectively."

(b) LIMITATIONS ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE BOARD'S INITIATIVE.—Section 11701, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) In any investigation commenced on the Board's own initiative, the Board shall—

"(1) not later than 30 days after initiating the investigation, provide written notice to the parties under investigation, which shall state the basis for such investigation;

"(2) only investigate issues that are of national or regional significance;

"(3) permit the parties under investigation to file a written statement describing any or

all facts and circumstances concerning a matter which may be the subject of such investigation;

"(4) make available to the parties under investigation and Board members—

"(A) any recommendations made as a result of the investigation; and

"(B) a summary of the findings that support such recommendations;

"(5) to the extent practicable, separate the investigative and decisionmaking functions of staff;

"(6) dismiss any investigation that is not concluded by the Board with administrative finality within 1 year after the date on which it was commenced; and

"(7) not later than 90 days after receiving the recommendations and summary of findings under paragraph (4)—

"(A) dismiss the investigation if no further action is warranted; or

"(B) initiate a proceeding to determine if a provision under this part has been violated.

"(e)(1) Any parties to an investigation against whom a violation is found as a result of an investigation begun on the Board's own initiative may, not later than 60 days after the date of the order of the Board finding such a violation, institute an action in the United States court of appeals for the appropriate judicial circuit for de novo review of such order in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5.

"(2) The court—

"(A) shall have jurisdiction to enter a judgment affirming, modifying, or setting aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Board; and

"(B) may remand the proceeding to the Board for such further action as the court may direct."

(c) RULEMAKINGS FOR INVESTIGATIONS OF THE BOARD'S INITIATIVE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board shall issue rules, after notice and comment rulemaking, for investigations commenced on its own initiative that—

(1) comply with the requirements of section 11701(d) of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (b);

(2) satisfy due process requirements; and

(3) take into account ex parte constraints.

SEC. 13. ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN RAIL RATES AND PRACTICES DISPUTES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 117 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 11708. Voluntary arbitration of certain rail rates and practices disputes

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Surface Transportation Board Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Board shall promulgate regulations to establish a voluntary and binding arbitration process to resolve rail rate and practice complaints subject to the jurisdiction of the Board.

"(b) COVERED DISPUTES.—The voluntary and binding arbitration process established pursuant to subsection (a)—

"(1) shall apply to disputes involving—

"(A) rates, demurrage, accessorial charges, misrouting, or mishandling of rail cars; or

"(B) a carrier's published rules and practices as applied to particular rail transportation;

"(2) shall not apply to disputes—

"(A) to obtain the grant, denial, stay, or revocation of any license, authorization, or exemption;

"(B) to prescribe for the future any conduct, rules, or results of general, industry-wide applicability;

"(C) to enforce a labor protective condition; or

"(D) that are solely between 2 or more rail carriers; and

"(3) shall not prevent parties from independently seeking or utilizing private arbitration services to resolve any disputes the parties may have.

"(c) ARBITRATION PROCEDURES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board—

"(A) may make the voluntary and binding arbitration process established pursuant to subsection (a) available only to the relevant parties;

"(B) may make the voluntary and binding arbitration process available only—

"(i) after receiving the written consent to arbitrate from all relevant parties; and

"(ii)(I) after the filing of a written complaint; or

"(II) through other procedures adopted by the Board in a rulemaking proceeding;

"(C) with respect to rate disputes, may make the voluntary and binding arbitration process available only to the relevant parties if the rail carrier has market dominance (as determined under section 10707); and

"(D) may initiate the voluntary and binding arbitration process not later than 40 days after the date on which a written complaint is filed or through other procedures adopted by the Board in a rulemaking proceeding.

"(2) LIMITATION.—Initiation of the voluntary and binding arbitration process shall preclude the Board from separately reviewing a complaint or dispute related to the same rail rate or practice in a covered dispute involving the same parties.

"(3) RATES.—In resolving a covered dispute involving the reasonableness of a rail carrier's rates, the arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, as applicable, shall consider the Board's methodologies for setting maximum lawful rates, giving due consideration to the need for differential pricing to permit a rail carrier to collect adequate revenues (as determined under section 10704(a)(2)).

"(d) ARBITRATION DECISIONS.—Any decision reached in an arbitration process under this section—

"(1) shall be consistent with sound principles of rail regulation economics;

"(2) shall be in writing;

"(3) shall contain findings of fact and conclusions;

"(4) shall be binding upon the parties; and

"(5) shall not have any precedential effect in any other or subsequent arbitration dispute.

"(e) TIMELINES.—

"(1) SELECTION.—An arbitrator or panel of arbitrators shall be selected not later than 14 days after the date of the Board's decision to initiate arbitration.

"(2) EVIDENTIARY PROCESS.—The evidentiary process of the voluntary and binding arbitration process shall be completed not later than 90 days after the date on which the arbitration process is initiated unless—

"(A) a party requests an extension; and

"(B) the arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, as applicable, grants such extension request.

"(3) DECISION.—The arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, as applicable, shall issue a decision not later than 30 days after the date on which the evidentiary record is closed.

"(4) EXTENSIONS.—The Board may extend any of the timelines under this subsection upon the agreement of all parties in the dispute.

"(f) ARBITRATORS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise agreed by all of the parties, an arbitration under this section shall be conducted by an arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, which shall be

selected from a roster, maintained by the Board, of persons with rail transportation, economic regulation, professional or business experience, including agriculture, in the private sector.

“(2) INDEPENDENCE.—In an arbitration under this section, the arbitrators shall perform their duties with diligence, good faith, and in a manner consistent with the requirements of impartiality and independence.

“(3) SELECTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the parties cannot mutually agree on an arbitrator, or the lead arbitrator of a panel of arbitrators, the parties shall select the arbitrator or lead arbitrator from the roster by alternately striking names from the roster until only 1 name remains meeting the criteria set forth in paragraph (1).

“(B) PANEL OF ARBITRATORS.—If the parties agree to select a panel of arbitrators, instead of a single arbitrator, the panel shall be selected under this subsection as follows:

“(i) The parties to a dispute may mutually select 1 arbitrator from the roster to serve as the lead arbitrator of the panel of arbitrators.

“(ii) If the parties cannot mutually agree on a lead arbitrator, the parties shall select a lead arbitrator using the process described in subparagraph (A).

“(iii) In addition to the lead arbitrator selected under this subparagraph, each party to a dispute shall select 1 additional arbitrator from the roster, regardless of whether the other party struck out the arbitrator's name under subparagraph (A).

“(4) COST.—The parties shall share the costs incurred by the Board and arbitrators equally, with each party responsible for paying its own legal and other associated arbitration costs.

“(g) RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the limitations set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3), an arbitral decision under this section may award the payment of damages or rate prescriptive relief.

“(2) PRACTICE DISPUTES.—The damage award for practice disputes may not exceed \$2,000,000.

“(3) RATE DISPUTES.—

“(A) MONETARY LIMIT.—The damage award for rate disputes, including any rate prescription, may not exceed \$25,000,000.

“(B) TIME LIMIT.—Any rate prescription shall be limited to not longer than 5 years from the date of the arbitral decision.

“(h) BOARD REVIEW.—If a party appeals a decision under this section to the Board, the Board may review the decision under this section to determine if—

“(1) the decision is consistent with sound principles of rail regulation economics;

“(2) a clear abuse of arbitral authority or discretion occurred;

“(3) the decision directly contravenes statutory authority; or

“(4) the award limitation under subsection (g) was violated.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 117 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“11708. Voluntary arbitration of certain rail rates and practice disputes.”.

SEC. 14. EFFECT OF PROPOSALS FOR RATES FROM MULTIPLE ORIGINS AND DESTINATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall commence a study of rail transportation contract proposals containing multiple origin-to-destination movements.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after commencing the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report containing the results of the study to—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 15. REPORTS.

(a) REPORT ON RATE CASE METHODOLOGY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Surface Transportation Board shall submit a report to the congressional committees referred to in section 14(b) that—

(1) indicates whether current large rate case methodologies are sufficient, not unduly complex, and cost effective;

(2) indicates whether alternative methodologies exist, or could be developed, to streamline, expedite, and address the complexity of large rate cases; and

(3) only includes alternative methodologies, which exist or could be developed, that are consistent with sound economic principles.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Beginning not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Surface Transportation Board shall submit quarterly reports to the congressional committees referred to in section 14(b) that describes the Surface Transportation Board's progress toward addressing the issues raised in each unfinished regulatory proceeding, regardless of whether the proceeding is subject to a statutory or regulatory deadline.

SEC. 16. CRITERIA.

Section 10704(a)(2) is amended by inserting “for the infrastructure and investment needed to meet the present and future demand for rail services and” after “management,”.

SEC. 17. CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to affect any suit commenced by or against the Surface Transportation Board, or any proceeding or challenge pending before the Surface Transportation Board, before the date of the enactment of this Act.

CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS ON WINNING THE 2015 STANLEY CUP

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 205, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 205) congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 205) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS FOR WINNING THE 2015 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 206, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 206) congratulating the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2015 National Basketball Association Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

FILING DEADLINE—H.R. 2146 AND H.R. 1295

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to both H.R. 2146 and H.R. 1295 be at 4 p.m., Monday, June 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 22, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
JUNE 22, 2015, AT 3 P.M.

ate, I ask unanimous consent that it
stand adjourned under the previous
order.

There being no objection, the Senate,
at 7:02 p.m., adjourned until Monday,
June 22, 2015, at 3 p.m.

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no fur-
ther business to come before the Sen-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORIAM OF ANN DUVALL

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ann Duvall, who passed away on June 15, 2014 at her home in Sausalito, California at the age of 66. Her family and friends are taking time this week to honor her extraordinary life. Fittingly, the celebration will be held at the Pt. Reyes National Seashore. As a lifelong outdoors enthusiast, Mrs. Duvall would have loved nothing more than to spend time with her loved ones in a place so close to heart.

Mrs. Duvall was known for her technological leadership and role in advancing free speech, but more than that she will be remembered for her kindness, her passion, and her love for life. Born and raised in New York, she moved to California after college, where she received a master's degree from Stanford University, began her career, and met her husband of 37 years, Bill.

Together, the Duvalls helped found and run Surfwatch Software, the first program that allowed users to block explicit online content back in the nascent days of the internet. Surfwatch was later used—successfully—as a linchpin in arguments to repeal the anti-indecency provisions of the Communications Decency Act, seen as a victory for free speech advocates.

While her professional accomplishments are impressive, I'd be remiss not to mention her unyielding enthusiasm, thirst for adventure, and compassion for others. Mrs. Duvall excelled at nearly every sport she came across, from tennis to swimming to cycling. A Francophile and avid backpacker, she and her husband hiked the entire GR10 trail in France, walking from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mediterranean Sea. But her gusto was not reserved just for herself. Following a bout with breast cancer, Mrs. Duvall worked as an advocate for other breast cancer patients. She had a way with people that left anyone she came across feeling welcomed and appreciated.

Our community is a slightly darker place today without Ann Duvall lightening our lives. On the first anniversary of her passing, Ann's memory prevails in our thoughts and our hearts. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to her today and express our deepest condolences to her husband, family, and friends.

HONORING MR. ANDREW BUEHLER

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Andrew Buehler for his acceptance to attend the People to People World Leadership Forum in Washington, D.C. Founded by President Eisenhower, this program has provided opportunities for over 500,000 potential leaders from around the world. Students accepted to this program are selected for their academic excellence, leadership potential and distinguished citizenship.

Andrew's hard work and dedication to his academics made him an exemplar candidate for the program. During his time at the forum, Andrew will participate in a curriculum focused on leadership and educational development with students from a variety of cultures and backgrounds. Andrew's selection as a 2015 World Leadership Forum participant is a testament to his achievements, and something that he and his family should be proud of.

I ask you to join me in congratulating Mr. Andrew Buehler for receiving this distinctive honor.

MOTION TO CONCUR IN THE SENATE AMENDMENT WITH AN AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1295—THE TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me just thank Representative RANGEL, a real leader and long-time supporter of AGOA, and Representative KAREN BASS for their leadership on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1295, to Concur in the Senate Amendment with an Amendment to the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.

This bipartisan bill provides for a long-term extension of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), renews the Generalized System of Preferences, and extends the HOPE and HELP programs for products from Haiti until 2025.

And as a senior member of the Appropriations Committee and the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, I know just how important these types of programs are to the U.S.-African relationship and to countries like Haiti.

As my colleagues have stated, AGOA has been a cornerstone of the U.S.-African rela-

tionship and has resulted in the creation of thousands of jobs—in Africa and the United States. With continued support for AGOA, we also have the potential to increase small-and-medium businesses between U.S. and African jobs.

Let me also just mention just how important the extension of the HOPE and HELP programs included in this bill are to Haiti. These programs have had a tremendous effect on Haiti's economy. Haiti's textile sector has made great progress in recent years, increasing production by 5.84% and increasing jobs by 15% in 2014 alone.

And as the author of the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act, which was passed into law last year, I know we need to do everything we can to continue to support programs that would aid its economic recovery—particularly after the devastating earthquake in 2010.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

HONORING SHERIFF JOHN H. RUTHERFORD FOR MORE THAN 40 YEARS OF SERVICE IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Jacksonville Sheriff John H. Rutherford, who is retiring after 12 years as our city's sheriff and after serving more than 40 years in law enforcement. He has been a voice of vision and action in our Jacksonville community. Although law enforcement always has its challenges, John's leadership style embraced the opportunities to make a difference and better the quality of life for the citizens of Jacksonville.

Sheriff Rutherford always wore his badge with pride. He received expert training as a law enforcement professional, and he made sure each one of his police officers received the best training available. That being said, I can tell you that John would be the first to acknowledge that though training is vital to the officers, it's not everything. It is his belief that a police officer also must learn to respect others who have different perspectives, beliefs, and histories, and to learn from them. John, a devout Christian, never shied away from that foundation in his beliefs and principles.

The list of programs that benefitted Jacksonville under Sheriff Rutherford's tenure is both long and varied. He believed strongly that we must put resources into programs for our youth as investments in our future and that crime prevention is the most cost-effective method of law enforcement. John utilized \$3.7 million in seized drug money for prevention and intervention projects that made a significant difference in many lives. He engaged in

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the community and encouraged his officers to set good examples, urging them to volunteer as mentors, coaches, charity board members, and participants.

John Rutherford is a man of vision who encouraged others to take courageous steps and make difficult decisions. He instituted crime fighting initiatives, such as Operation Safe Streets, that helped achieve the lowest crime numbers since records were first kept 35 years ago. In an effort to increase citizen engagement, John also established Advisory Councils, an initiative greatly appreciated in our Jacksonville community. Furthermore, Sheriff Rutherford regularly participated in Crime Prevention Walks throughout the city to meet with and listen to citizens one-on-one in their own neighborhoods. He hosted live Internet Call-In shows, established the Six Pillars of Character Award, and regularly recognized employees for their good works. In all of these ways, John led the 3,000 men and women at our Jacksonville Sheriff's Office to become a vital and interwoven part in the fabric of our community.

Sheriff John Rutherford led our Jacksonville Sheriff's Office for 12 years. He was an effective leader and his quiet, firm voice was always listened to during times of alarm. I am proud to call him friend and thank him for his service.

NASHVILLE COMMUNITY HIGH
SCHOOL HORNETTES

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the third state victory of the Nashville Community High School Hornets as the Class 2A softball state champions.

On June 6, 2015, the Hornets won the Class 2A State Championship in a 1-0 victory over Brimfield. I would like to congratulate freshman Mackenzie McFeron for scoring the game's only run, after reaching base on a bunt single.

I would like to congratulate Coach Dempsey Witte for leading the team to three state trophies in the past four years. I would also like to congratulate senior, Maci Ingram, who pitched for the team in all three state appearances. My congratulations go out to the entire coaching staff and team comprised of: Maci Ingram, Jordi Harre, Emily Thompson, Daley Buchanan, Karly Stanowski, Brooke Bartling, Paige Kasten, Dierdra Holzhauser, Brooke Burcham, Mackenzie McFeron, Jordan Stiegman, Alli Liske, Bethany Hinkle, Charlie Heck, Dakota Hunter, Patrick Weathers, Joey Lane, trainer John Becker, and head coach Dempsey Witte.

I look forward to the continued success of the Nashville Community High School Hornets. I extend my best wishes for another outstanding season next year.

PRESIDENT'S VOLUNTEER
SERVICE AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Smriti and Siddhant Ahuja for earning the President's Volunteer Service Award for the third consecutive year.

This prestigious award recognizes those who have taken action to positively serve the world around them. It is a great honor to earn this recognition once, but to receive the award three years in a row is outstanding. Smriti and Siddhant are currently juniors at Seven Lakes High School. Since age 4, these twins have spent countless hours volunteering and have worked hard to inspire others through community service. We are extremely proud of Smriti and Siddhant, and thank their parents for constantly encouraging a life of helping others.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Smriti and Siddhant Ahuja for earning the President's Volunteer Service Award. We are excited to see where your service takes you.

RECOGNIZING JEFFREY L.
BAARSTAD

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Jeffrey L. Baarstad, an influential and respected educator who has been committed to the success of our community, and has bestowed an immeasurable and remarkable quality of education upon students in Ventura County.

For over a decade, Superintendent Baarstad has served the Conejo Valley Unified School District with an unwavering commitment to the education of over 20,000 students within 27 schools throughout the district. The Conejo Valley Unified School District is an essential resource for many residents of Ventura County and is one of the top ranked school districts in California thanks to the dedication of outstanding educators like Superintendent Baarstad.

The Conejo Valley Unified School District serves as a beacon, which continues to lead the way towards a higher standard of quality education and academic success for countless children across our community. The work that the Conejo Valley Unified School District has accomplished, with Dr. Baarstad at its helm, has been recognized for its distinction by many national and state organizations. In 2010, Dr. Baarstad became the Superintendent of Conejo Valley Unified School District, and only three years later was recognized as Superintendent of the Year by the Association of California School Administrators for his outstanding work.

Extraordinary educators like Superintendent Baarstad exemplify Ventura County's commitment to education. Although Superintendent

Baarstad will be retiring from Conejo Valley Unified School District, he is leaving a significant mark on public education throughout the region, and an immense impact on our community. I am certain his work will continue to inspire educators in their own commitment to providing an excellent education to students in Ventura County.

For these reasons, I graciously thank Superintendent Baarstad for his unwavering dedication as an educator for the past 35 years. It has been my sincere pleasure to work with Dr. Baarstad, whose influence will extend to many future generations.

IN RECOGNITION OF ISAIAH
CROWELL

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend Isaiah Crowell, an outstanding football player and leader for the Cleveland Browns football team of the National Football League. Crowell will be hosting the Inaugural Isaiah Crowell Football Camp on Saturday, June 20, 2015 at the A.J. McClung Memorial Stadium in Columbus, Georgia.

Isaiah Crowell was born and raised in Columbus, Georgia, where he attended Carver High School. In high school, Isaiah excelled in football, track, and basketball. Upon graduation, Isaiah was a highly recruited athlete by the University of Alabama and the University of Georgia. In 2011, during a nationally televised conference, Isaiah chose to attend the University of Georgia.

During his freshman season at UGA, Isaiah led the football team with 850 rushing yards and five touchdowns, which led to him being named the SEC Freshman of the Year by the Associated Press in 2011. For his sophomore season, he transferred to Alabama State University where he was named the Southwestern Athletic Conference Newcomer of the Year, after rushing for 842 yards and 15 touchdowns. After two seasons, Isaiah finished fifth in Alabama State University's history in points scored (160) and sixth in rushing yards (1,963).

In the 2014 National Football League draft, Isaiah signed with the Cleveland Browns as an undrafted free agent. As a rookie, he made an immediate impact scoring two touchdowns in the season opener against the Pittsburgh Steelers. He finished his rookie season with eight touchdowns and over 600 yards. Isaiah will enter the 2015 football season as the starting running back for the Cleveland Browns.

But more than being a remarkable athlete, Isaiah has been incredibly active in the communities of Columbus, Georgia and Cleveland, Ohio and is dedicated to giving back to both communities.

This weekend, Isaiah will be hosting a football camp that is part of the USA Football FUNDamentals program in partnership with NFL Play60. This program introduces children to football by teaching basic skills in a fun and

energetic environment. Certified clinicians use a series of drills to show passing, catching, and running skills in a non-contact setting. The purpose of this camp is to ensure that children are learning and having fun while being active.

Isaiah was selected to bring this program to Columbus, Georgia, through the NFL Foundation's player grant program. The Columbus community is proud that Isaiah plans on making this area a priority for his charitable efforts throughout his NFL career and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I have long said that in our area of Middle and Southwest Georgia, we have some of the best, the brightest, the most creative, and the most talented young people anywhere in the world. And Isaiah Crowell proves that beyond the shadow of a doubt! This young man is a true representation of what it means to triumph in the face of adversity. Throughout his personal struggles, Isaiah has shown what it means to preserve and chase his dreams. I support Isaiah in his NFL career and I am immensely proud of the spirit of philanthropy that Isaiah is bringing to his local community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in recognizing and commending Isaiah Crowell for his remarkable accomplishments as an athlete and for his generous heart and humble spirit as a philanthropist.

RECOGNIZING MR. GRANT JONES OF KUKURUZA GOURMET POPCORN

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mr. Grant Jones, of KuKuRuZa Gourmet Popcorn of Seattle, on receiving the U.S. Small Business Administration's (SBA) Washington State 2015 Young Entrepreneur of the Year award.

Today's KuKuRuZa began modestly as Popcorn Pavilion in the garage of his father-in-law, Charles Brown. Shortly after, in 2011, Grant was approached by the original owners of KuKuRuZa with an offer to sell their business to Grant, who jumped at the opportunity. In just three short years, Grant, together with the strong support of his wife, Ashley, grew KuKuRuZa into a multimillion dollar international company.

Since 2011, KuKuRuZa has expanded from one downtown Seattle location to 17 stores in Washington state and around the world. During this time, KuKuRuZa's sales have increased substantially; from \$360,000 in its first year to \$2.7 million by 2014. Much of this success is due to strong demand for KuKuRuZa's products and the company's expansion into international markets, which include 13 stores in Japan, Korea, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt. At the store location in Japan, for example, customers are said to stand in line for up to two hours to purchase KuKuRuZa's products.

Despite its rapid growth into an international company, KuKuRuZa continues to put its consumers first and strives to keep its ingredients

organic, fresh, and local to the Pacific Northwest. The company's success has resulted in considerable growth in recent years and generated economic activity and jobs that have benefited Washington state.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Grant Jones in receiving this year's SBA's 2015 Young Entrepreneur Award. I look forward to hearing further great things from Grant and KuKuRuZa in the years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF PETER "ED" REILLY UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleague Representative JOHN LARSON of Connecticut to honor the long record of service to working men and women by Peter "Ed" Reilly, retiring Business Manager and Financial Secretary of the Ironworkers Union Local 15, of Hartford, Connecticut. Ed has been a leader in Local 15 for 19 years, advocating for his members who build the infrastructure of our state—buildings, transportation, water works and mass transit—leaving a lasting legacy which will benefit Connecticut businesses and families for generations. He did so while ensuring his members receive fair wages with health benefits and pension security which are the pillars of middle class prosperity.

During Ed's tenure, he created and maintained a strong apprenticeship program providing apprenticeships to young residents of Connecticut—many from low income families who otherwise would not have had any chance to escape their circumstances. He literally has transformed the lives of thousands with his apprenticeship efforts.

Ed has also served as a leader in Connecticut's labor community, presiding over the greater Hartford Building Trade Council, Eastern Connecticut Building Trade Council, and Connecticut Building Trade Council. He was a frequent presence at the State Capitol, calling on his deep understanding and respect for the political process. Ed drew his strong political knowledge in part from his father Peter Reilly Sr., who also led Local 15 and later had a distinguished career as Commissioner of the State of Connecticut Department of Labor. The Reilly family can be proud of a compelling and unique political and governing legacy in the State of Connecticut.

Lastly, we want to note that all of these accomplishments came with a high personal cost. Ed's workday started at the crack of dawn and ended late at night, with little or no break, even on the weekends. Ed and his family—his wife Noreen and his children Peter and Raeanne—have earned a long and fruitful retirement. We both ask the full House to join us in extending our sincerest congratulations and best wishes to Ed and his family as they begin this new chapter of their lives.

HONORING DR. PAUL HOMMERT

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great honor to recognize Dr. Paul Hommert, Director of Sandia National Laboratories and President of Sandia Corporation as he prepares for retirement.

In 1976, Paul began his career as a member of the technical staff for Sandia in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Paul stood out among his colleagues, and gradually was given increased responsibility with a broad range of programs and management assignments. He led programs supporting energy research, and from the mid- to late-1990s, Paul served as the Director of Engineering Services.

Paul went on to become the Director of Research and Applied Science at the Atomic Weapons Establishment in the United Kingdom, where he led the science and engineering division responsible for the country's nuclear deterrent. From 2003 to 2006, Paul served as the lead for the Applied Physics Division at Los Alamos National Laboratory, charged with nuclear weapon design and assessment, weapon performance code development, and weapon science support.

In 2009, Paul returned to Albuquerque to serve as the Executive Vice President and Deputy Laboratories Director for Sandia's Nuclear Weapons Program, eventually becoming the Director of Sandia National Laboratories and President of Sandia Corporation.

Paul has propelled Sandia to new heights, bolstering its reputation as the nation's premier science and engineering laboratory for national security and technology innovation. In recognition of Paul's efforts and accomplishments, the Federal Laboratory Consortium named Paul Laboratory Director of the Year in 2013 for his steadfast commitment to Sandia's technology-transfer activities.

Paul has received numerous accolades and achieved many accomplishments throughout his career. Most notably, he inspired and prepared a new generation of scientists and engineers who are making important contributions to our national security.

It is with great honor and privilege that I take this moment to thank Paul for his service on behalf of the United States of America. I wish him continued happiness and an enjoyable, well-deserved retirement. His successes and contributions will always be appreciated.

IN RECOGNITION OF CLAIRE KNOPF

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Claire Knopf as she is honored by the Monmouth County Historical Association at its 40th annual Garden Party on June 28, 2015. Claire's exemplary leadership and

contributions to the Monmouth County Historical Association and the greater Monmouth County area are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

A resident of Monmouth County, New Jersey since 1986, Claire has been an active and charitable member of the community. She has been an outstanding leader of the Monmouth County Historical Association for many years, serving as a trustee, first vice president and 20th president of the Board of Trustees. In addition to her work with the Monmouth County Historical Association, Claire has volunteered on the Rumson Country Day School Executive Council, the Leon Hess Cancer Center at Monmouth Medical Center Women's Council, the Spring House, the Two River Film Festival and the Junior League of Monmouth County, among others. Her involvement with numerous local charities and organizations reflect her passion to help others and improve our communities. Her leadership and hard work have greatly benefited the Monmouth County area and her efforts are admirable.

Claire received her Bachelor of Arts degree in English Literature from Boston University. She and her husband Woody reside in Rumson and are the proud parents of three beautiful children.

For over 115 years, the Monmouth County Historical Association has provided Monmouth County residents and visitors with a vast background of our local history and heritage. Its efforts to preserve and promote our local history through programs, exhibits, and resources are valuable to our community and help to ensure that this important knowledge is available for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in thanking Claire Knopf and the Monmouth County Historical Association for their immeasurable contributions to our community.

RECOGNIZING CASTRO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT JIM NEGRI ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Jim Negri, Castro Valley Unified School District (CVUSD) Superintendent, on the occasion of his retirement at the end of this month.

Born in Oakland and a resident of Castro Valley since 1985, Jim has devoted his career to educating students in California and, in particular, the East Bay. He earned his bachelor of arts degree in economics and teaching credential from the University of California, Berkeley, and his master of arts degree and administrative credential from Saint Mary's College.

Jim has played a major role in educating East Bay students for many years. He held a variety of positions in the Pleasanton Unified School District and the San Ramon Valley Unified School District as well as worked as a superintendent for the Acalanes Union High School District. Since 2009, Jim has been the CVUSD Superintendent.

Jim also has been active in the field of education administration. He served in many roles in the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), such as co-chair of the State Curriculum, Instruction, and Evaluation Committee and President of ACSA Region VI (Alameda and Contra Costa counties).

For his excellent work in education, Jim has received numerous awards. These include ACSA's Outstanding Central Office Administrator (2002) and St. Mary's College School of Education Alumnus of the Year (2001).

Jim's commitment to education is truly extraordinary. I want to thank him for his years of dedicated service and to wish him well in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote number 370 on H. Con. Res. 55, I mistakenly recorded my vote as No when I should have voted Yes.

FORT BEND CHRISTIAN ACADEMY SOFTBALL TEAM

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fort Bend Christian Academy softball team for their amazing 4-A district winning streak this past season.

After more than 100 games, the Lady Eagles maintained a remarkable winning streak and ended the year tied for first place. They were led on and off the field by an outstanding young player, Claire McKissick, who was selected for the 4A all-state first team as a sophomore. Additionally, the women had a trio of young players selected for the all-state second team including Tessa Cantrell, Emily Ferguson, and Kati Ray Brown. The Lady Eagles further packed the all-district team selections with the achievements of senior Morgan Kornegay, sophomore Kendall Bohny, and senior Madelyn Hill. These prestigious awards are achieved through both athletic and academic vigor and are highly competitive throughout the state of Texas. We are extremely proud of all the women of the Fort Bend Christian Academy softball team and look forward to their future accomplishments.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the entire Lady Eagle softball team on an incredible season.

RECOGNIZING MR. KYLE WEDEKIND

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize one of my constituents, Mr. Kyle Wedekind of Winter Garden, Florida, for his acceptance to the People to People World Leadership Forum in Washington, D.C. Mr. Wedekind was selected for his academic excellence, leadership potential and exemplary citizenship.

The mission of People to People Leadership Ambassador Programs is to bridge cultural and political borders through education and exchange. To this end, People to People offers domestic and international educational programs that promote cooperation, cross-cultural understanding and leadership. It is my hope that Mr. Wedekind benefitted greatly from his participation in the World Leadership Forum, and I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

THE RAINS IN THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, heavy rains poured down hammering the ground and streets of Georgia the Republic of Georgia.

The River Vere, a small stream that cuts through the center of the Georgian capital of Tbilisi, was transformed into a raging torrent. It caused flooding of an unprecedented scale.

So far, 13 people have been killed. The flooding allowed animals to escape from the local zoo. Lions, bears, tigers, and jaguars remain on the loose.

Homes, cars and roadways are destroyed. There are over 1 million residents in the capital, and it will take a long time before things get back to normal.

I've been to Georgia—twice. Texans and Georgians are likeminded people; they know the spirit and importance of Independence.

Still occupied by the Russians, Georgia sent troops to fight alongside ours in Afghanistan.

They have been a strong and steadfast U.S. ally in an important and often turbulent part of the world.

Americans must help our friends and allies; the Georgians, as they begin to rebuild their capital city after this historic flooding.

From across the globe we keep the Georgians in our thoughts and prayers.

We know our Georgian friends are resilient and will face this natural disaster with courage. We should stand by them in this effort.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 2015, due to the weather, I was unavoidably detained while traveling to Washington, D.C. and missed recorded votes number 364 and 365. Had I been present, on rollcall vote number 364, H. Res. 233—"Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Iran should immediately release the three United States citizens that it holds, as well as provide all known information on any United States citizens that have disappeared within its borders," I would have voted "yea"; and on rollcall vote number 365, H.R. 2559—"To designate the 'PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway' in the State of Texas," I would have voted "yea."

IN RECOGNITION OF CATHEDRAL INTERNATIONAL "STOP THE FUNERAL WEEKEND"

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cathedral International's upcoming "Stop the Funeral Weekend" hosted by Bishop Donald Hilliard, Jr. from June 18–21, 2015. The "Stop the Funeral Weekend" aims to highlight the issue of violence in our communities and I would like to join with Bishop Hilliard in bringing attention to this important issue.

Throughout his 32 years as Senior Pastor of Cathedral International, Bishop Hilliard has advocated for the end of violent behavior and injustice through improved community relations and engagement. He has seen the consequences of violence and the persistence of its existence in our communities. The "Stop the Funeral Weekend" will bring together community leaders, families and individuals to encourage open dialogue and the sharing of concerns, objectives and ideas. It will highlight Bishop Hilliard's mission to promote safe environments for our youth to live and grow. I commend Bishop Hilliard's leadership and his ongoing efforts to address the challenges facing our communities today.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing the importance of addressing the issue of violence in our communities and thanking Bishop Hilliard and Cathedral International for its efforts to bring awareness to this critical issue and creating a better environment for our youth.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LAREDO BEAUTY COLLEGE, INC.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a noteworthy occasion: the fiftieth anniversary of Laredo Beauty College, Inc. For five decades, this school has served the community by providing thousands of aspiring stylists with the training they need to succeed, as well as providing affordably priced salon services to the general public.

Upon its opening in 1965, Laredo Beauty College was the first cosmetology school in the Laredo area. The vision behind this significant contribution to the community was Peggy Dietrick, commonly known as Ms. Peggy. At the time of its founding, the school only offered courses in cosmetology. It has since expanded to include manicuring and cosmetology instructor courses as well.

Today, Laredo Beauty College has 102 students and 17 staff members. The school is exceptional in the dedication it inspires in both students and staff, with many of the staff having worked for the school for over twenty years. One of the current owners, Judy Rodriguez, was a former student, and has been involved with the school for 43 years. Peggy Dietrick and her niece, Deborah Dietrick, make up the remainder of the school's ownership.

In 1975, the National Accrediting Commission of Career Arts and Sciences recognized Laredo Beauty College for its achievements by conferring upon it national accreditation status. The school is currently a member of both the American Association of Cosmetology Schools and the Cosmetology Educators of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the Laredo Beauty College for having been such an essential part of their community for the past fifty years.

ON THE PASSING OF MICHAEL KING

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life of one of the legends of the entertainment industry, a man responsible for some of the greatest television touchstones of the past three decades: Michael Gordon King. Michael's passing last month at age 67 is a great tragedy, but we know he leaves a towering legacy of success and an indelible mark on American culture.

Michael and his late brother Robert inherited their business and their savvy from their father, Charles King, who founded a modest television syndication company named King World Productions in 1964. As Michael would recall, their father would go over every deal at the dinner table with his family, delving into the details of his transactions when Michael was as young as 14. Michael would take the

title of president of King World shortly after graduating from Fairleigh Dickinson University, at the salary of \$150 a week.

When Charles King died in 1972, King World had one product: the distribution rights to "The Little Rascals." Over the next 30 years, Michael and Robert would build King World into an entertainment empire.

In 1983, King World paid \$50,000 to acquire the rights to "Wheel of Fortune." With the hard-charging brothers traveling the country to secure top media markets to air the show, "Wheel of Fortune" became the highest-rated syndicated program in history. The company was awarded the distribution rights to the revival of "Jeopardy!"—the enduring television favorite that made Alex Trebek a national icon.

In 1986, the Kings' launched a national talk show with a former Baltimore news anchor and local-Chicago talk show host: Oprah Winfrey. The Oprah Winfrey Show would become one of the most widely watched and consequential television programs ever.

Under the leadership of Michael and Robert, King World reached astounding heights. According to the New York Times, "On a typical day in the late 1980s, 90 million people watched at least one of the company's three biggest shows—Wheel of Fortune, Jeopardy!, and The Oprah Winfrey Show."

Eventually, the Kings sold their company to CBS. Michael would serve as a consultant to CBS, and find a new passion for sports—opening a world-class boxing gym and a boxing promotions company dubbed King Sports Worldwide.

Michael measured himself against the biggest legends in entertainment history. As we reflect on his life and his legacy, we know that Michael King earned his place among the greats.

Michael's passion for entertainment, his showmanship and eye for talent, his dedication, drive and creativity shaped some of the most important cultural touchstones of recent memory.

I knew Michael as a father devoted to his family and concerned about the community. I hope it is a comfort to Michael's wife, Jena, his children, Alexandra, Theodore, Audrey and Jesse, and the entire King family that so many people mourn their loss. Many millions around the world have been entertained and moved by Michael's work, and are grateful for his legacy.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE RETIREMENT OF MASTER CHIEF BOB SEBASTE

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Master Chief Bob Sebaste on the occasion of his retirement after 29 years of service in the United States Navy and Coast Guard. Master Chief Sebaste's illustrious military career began as a Staff Instructor in Balston Spa, New York. During his distinguished career, Master Chief Sebaste served assignments throughout the United States as

Public Affairs Officer in the US Navy, Leadership Instructor at Coast Guard Air Station in Miami, as well as Maintenance Control Officer for USCG Base, Boston. Notably, for three years, from 1990–1993, he served as an instructor at the Naval Nuclear Power School in Orlando, Florida.

Throughout his career, Master Chief Sebaste continued to strive for self-improvement and successfully rose through the ranks. He distinguished himself as a well-respected leader in the US Navy and US Coast Guard. After attending Electronics Technician School, Master Chief Sebaste was commissioned as a Reactor Operator for submarine USS Tecumseh in Charleston, SC. He went on to serve in a variety of positions including Staff Instructor at Reactor Plant Training, Public Affairs Officer in the Operational Test Support Unit and Chief Electronics Technician for the US Coast Guard Cutter MOHAWK Division.

Behind every great serviceman and woman is a support network encouraging them to strive for greatness. I offer my gratitude to Master Chief Sebaste's wife, Betty, a school teacher at Sandpiper Elementary School in Sunrise, Florida, and their three children Rachel, Walter and Christopher. Following in his father's footsteps, Christopher Sebaste is currently a Staff Sergeant in the United States Air Force, stationed in Okinawa, Japan.

Mr. Speaker, we owe Master Chief Sebaste our infinite gratitude for his boundless devotion and years of service to our nation. It is because of individuals like Master Chief Sebaste that our nation remains safe and secure. I am honored and truly privileged to recognize Master Chief Bob Sebaste for his dedication to the US Navy and Coast Guard over the past 29 years, and offer him my best wishes for continued good health and success in the years to come.

LOGOS PREPARATORY ACADEMY
BASEBALL TEAM

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Logos Prep baseball team for their advancement to the 3A championship game after winning District 6–3A.

The Lions entered into the championship game with a remarkable 11–1 record and proudly represented the entire Fort Bend community. They were led on and off the field by four outstanding all-state players, including junior Andrew Richards, sophomore Sammy Kuntz, senior Makay Raven, and junior Marshall Allen. Additionally, the Lions had multiple players voted onto the all-district and academic all-state list. These prestigious awards are achieved through both athletic and academic vigor and are highly competitive throughout the state of Texas. We are extremely proud of all the men of the Logos Prep baseball team and look forward to their future accomplishments.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the entire team in representing the Logos

Prep Academy in the Texas State Tournament.

RABBINIC LETTER ON THE
CLIMATE CRISIS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit a Rabbinic Letter on the Climate Crisis.

Today, Pope Francis released the Papal Encyclical, calling on all of us to address the global crisis of climate change. But the Encyclical was not the only religious document this week calling for bold action. The Rabbinic Letter demonstrates that leaders in the Jewish faith share the commitment to meeting perhaps the greatest challenge of our time.

The Rabbinic Letter was initiated by seven leading rabbis from a broad spectrum of American Jewish life: Rabbi Elliot Dorff, rector of the American Jewish University; Rabbi Arthur Green, rector of the Hebrew College rabbinical school; Rabbi Peter Knobel, former president, Central Conference of American Rabbis; Rabbi Mordechai Liebling, director of the Social Justice Organizing Program at the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College; Rabbi Susan Talve, spiritual leader of Central Reform Congregation, St. Louis; Rabbi Arthur Waskow, director of The Shalom Center; and Rabbi Deborah Waxman, president of the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College. They were joined by Rabbi Irving (Yitz) Greenberg, a leader of the Orthodox community.

This letter makes clear the scope of the problem we face in combatting human-induced climate change. It also identifies clear and indisputable principles of the Jewish faith that prove that action on this issue isn't just smart from an economic and public health perspective—it's morally and religiously justified.

I thank the 360 Rabbis who have already signed this letter, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to follow the guidance of these religious leaders on this critical issue.

TO THE JEWISH PEOPLE, TO ALL COMMUNITIES OF SPIRIT, AND TO THE WORLD: A RABBINIC LETTER ON THE CLIMATE CRISIS

We come as Jews and rabbis with great respect for what scientists teach us—for as we understand their teaching, it is about the unfolding mystery of God's Presence in the unfolding universe, and especially in the history and future of our planet. Although we accept scientific accounts of earth's history, we continue to see it as God's creation, and we celebrate the presence of the divine hand in every earthly creature.

Yet in our generation, this wonder and this beauty have been desecrated—not in one land alone but 'round all the Earth. So in this crisis, even as we join all Earth in celebrating the Breath of Life that interweaves us all—

You sea-monsters and all deeps, Hallelu-Yah.
Fire, hail, snow, and steam, Hallelu-Yah.
Stormy wind to do God's word, Hallelu-Yah.
Mountains high and tiny hills, Hallelu-Yah
(Psalm 148)

We know all Earth needs not only the joyful human voice but also the healing human hand.

We are especially moved when the deepest, most ancient insights of Torah about healing the relationships of Earth and human earthlings, adamah and adam, are echoed in the findings of modern science.

The texts of Torah that perhaps most directly address our present crisis are Leviticus 25–26 and Deuteronomy 15. They call for one year of every seven to be Shabbat Shabbaton—a Sabbatical Year—and Shmittah—a Year of restful Release for the Earth and its workers from being made to work, and of Release for debtors from their debts.

In Leviticus 26, the Torah warns us that if we refuse to let the Earth rest, it will "rest" anyway, despite us and upon us—through drought and famine and exile that turn an entire people into refugees.

This ancient warning heard by one indigenous people in one slender land has now become a crisis of our planet as a whole and of the entire human species. Human behavior that overworks the Earth—especially the overburning of fossil fuels—creates in a systemic planetary response that endangers human communities and many other life-forms as well.

Already we see unprecedented floods, droughts, ice-melts, snowstorms, heat waves, typhoons, sea-level rises, and the expansion of disease-bearing insects from "tropical" zones into what used to be "temperate" regions. Leviticus 26 embodied. Scientific projections of the future make clear that even worse will happen if we continue with carbon-burning business as usual.

As Jews, we ask the question whether the sources of traditional Jewish wisdom can offer guidance to our political efforts to prevent disaster and heal our relationship with the Earth. Our first and most basic wisdom is expressed in the Sh'ma and is underlined in the teaching that through Shekhinah the Divine presence dwells within as well as beyond the world. The Unity of all means not only that all life is interwoven, but also that an aspect of God's Self partakes in the interwovenness.

We acknowledge that for centuries, the attention of our people—driven into exile not only from our original land but made refugees from most lands thereafter so that they were bereft of physical or political connection and without any specific land—has turned away from this sense of interconnection of adam and adamah, toward the repair of social injustice. Because of this history, we were so much pre-occupied with our own survival that we could not turn attention to the deeper crisis of which our tradition had always been aware.

But justice and earthiness cannot be disentangled. This is taught by our ancient texts—teaching that every seventh year be a Year of Release, Shmittah, Shabbat Shabbaton, in which there would be not only one year's release of Earth from overwork, but also one year's sharing by all in society of the Earth's freely growing abundance, and one year's release of debtors from their debts.

Indeed, we are especially aware that this very year is, according to the ancient count, the Shmita Year.

The unity of justice and Earth-healing is also taught by our experience today: The worsening inequality of wealth, income, and political power has two direct impacts on the climate crisis. On the one hand, great Carbon Corporations not only make their enormous profits from wounding the Earth, but then use these profits to purchase elections and to fund fake science to prevent the public from

acting to heal the wounds. On the other hand, the poor in America and around the globe are the first and the worst to suffer from the typhoons, floods, droughts, and diseases brought on by climate chaos.

So we call for a new sense of eco-social justice—a *tikkun olam* that includes *tikkun tevel*, the healing of our planet. We urge those who have been focusing on social justice to address the climate crisis, and those who have been focusing on the climate crisis to address social justice.

Though as rabbis we are drawing on the specific practices by which our Torah makes eco-social justice possible, we recognize that in all cultures and all spiritual traditions there are teachings about the need for setting time and space aside for celebration, restfulness, reflection.

Yet in modern history, we realize that for about 200 years, the most powerful institutions and cultures of the human species have refused to let the Earth or human earthlings have time or space for rest. By overburning carbon dioxide and methane into our planet's air, we have disturbed the sacred balance in which we breathe in what the trees breathe out, and the trees breathe in what we breathe out. The upshot: global scorching, climate crisis.

The crisis is worsened by the spread of extreme extraction of fossil fuels that not only heats the planet as a whole but damages the regions directly affected.

Fracking shale rock for oil and "unnatural gas" poisons regional water supplies and induces the shipment of volatile explosive "bomb trains" around the country.

Coal burning not only imposes asthma on coal-plant neighborhoods—often the poorest and Blackest—but destroys the lovely mountains of West Virginia.

Extracting and pipe-lining Tar Sands threatens Native First nation communities in Canada and the USA, and endangers farmers and cowboys through whose lands the KXL Pipeline is intended to traverse.

Drilling for oil deep into the Gulf and the Valdez oil spill in Prince William Sound off the Pacific have already brought death to workers and to sea life and financial disasters upon nearby communities. Proposed oil drilling in the Arctic and Atlantic threaten worse.

All of this is overworking Earth—precisely what our Torah teaches we must not do. So now we must let our planet rest from overwork. For Biblical Israel, this was a central question in our relationship to the Holy One. And for us and for our children and their children, this is once again the central question of our lives and of our God. HOW?—is the question we must answer.

So here we turn from inherited wisdom to action in our present and our future. One way of addressing our own responsibility would be for households, congregations, denominations, federations, political action—to Move Our Money from spending that helps these modern pharaohs burn our planet to spending that helps to heal it. For example, these actions might be both practical and effective:

Purchasing wind-born rather than coal-fired electricity to light our homes and synagogues and community centers;

Organizing our great Federations to offer grants and loans to every Jewish organization in their regions to solarize their buildings;

Shifting our bank accounts from banks that invest in deadly carbon-burning to community banks and credit unions that invest in local neighborhoods, especially those of poor, Black, and Hispanic communities;

Moving our endowment funds from supporting deadly Carbon to supporting stable, profitable, life-giving enterprises;

Insisting that our tax money go no longer to subsidizing enormously profitable Big Oil but instead to subsidizing the swift deployment of renewable energy—as quickly in this emergency as our government moved in the emergency of the early 1940s to shift from manufacturing cars to making tanks.

Convincing our legislators to institute a system of carbon fees and public dividends that rewards our society for moving beyond the Carbon economy.

These examples are simply that, and in the days and years to come, we may think of other approaches to accomplish these ecological ends.

America is one of the most intense contributors to the climate crisis, and must therefore take special responsibility to act. Though we in America are already vulnerable to climate chaos, other countries are even more so—and Jewish caring must take that truth seriously. Israeli scientists, for example, report that if the world keeps doing carbon business as usual, the Negev desert will come to swallow up half the state of Israel, and sea-level rises will put much of Tel Aviv under water.

Israel itself is too small to calm the wide world's worsening heat. Israel's innovative ingenuity for solar and wind power could help much of the world, but it will take American and other funding to help poor nations use the new-tech renewable energy created by Israeli and American innovators.

We believe that there is both danger and hope in American society today, a danger and a hope that the American Jewish community, in concert with our sisters and brothers in other communities of Spirit, must address. The danger is that America is the largest contributor to the scorching of our planet. The hope is that over and over in our history, when our country faced the need for profound change, it has been our communities of moral commitment, religious covenant, and spiritual search that have arisen to meet the need. So it was fifty years ago during the Civil Rights movement, and so it must be today.

As we live through this Shmittah Year, we are especially aware that Torah calls for *Hak'heyl*—assembling the whole community of the People Israel during the Sukkot after the Shmittah year, to hear and recommit ourselves to the Torah's central teachings.

So we encourage Jews in all our communities to gather on the Sunday of Sukkot this year, October 4, 2015, to explore together our responsibilities toward the Earth and all humankind, in this generation.

Our ancient earthy wisdom taught that social justice, sustainable abundance, a healthy Earth, and spiritual fulfillment are inseparable. Today we must hear that teaching in a world-wide context, drawing upon our unaccustomed ability to help shape public policy in a great nation. We call upon the Jewish people to meet God's challenge once again.

TPA AND TPP

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our friends on the other side of the aisle are

not opposed to job creation, Congressional oversight and global economic prosperity. But I predict they will unfortunately choose unions and outside groups over giving assistance to their own workers when a trade package comes before this body. So, because of that, for the first time in half a century, they will let this policy that is so important to their party expire.

While I predict that TPA will pass, it will be a shame if the whole package isn't enacted due to the failure of this President to work with members of his own party.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL JOSEPH MCNEIL

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, vision and resolve: the fertile grounds for greatness. These are the qualities that Major General Joseph McNeil exemplified when in 1960 he and three of his classmates protested segregation with a sit-in at a Woolworth store in Greensboro, North Carolina.

The 'Greensboro Four', as they came to be known, were denied service at a Woolworth lunch counter because of the color of their skin. With the spirit of peaceful protest, they committed themselves to a sit-in, which, little did they know, would reverberate across the nation.

With wisdom beyond his years, Joseph knew that strength was not in the individual but in the many. The Greensboro Four united the North Carolina A&T State University student body by establishing the "Student Executive Committee for Justice" and, in the face of all controversy, he won the battle. Woolworth agreed to allow service to blacks and whites alike.

Many years later, when asked in an interview what he had felt at that trying time, Joseph responded: "Intense sense of pride, a bit of trepidation". Not three weeks before he was to depart for training at a Texas Air Force Base he was so unwilling to stand idly by in the face of injustice that he was arrested at a demonstration alongside Reverend Jesse Jackson.

The Air Force saw in Joseph what everyone else did too. From first Lieutenant to Captain; from Major to Lieutenant Colonel; from Colonel to Major General, McNeil excelled in every aspect. Today he dons the Air Force Distinguished Service Medal as a symbol of his achievements, just one the many awards Mr. McNeil earned. He received honorary degrees from North Carolina A&T State University, North Carolina at Wilmington, Molloy College, and St. Johns University in my own district. He is a man truly worthy of every honor bestowed upon him.

Today, we honor Major General Joseph McNeil for his success as a civilian, a community leader, a husband, a father, and as a distinguished member of the United States Air Force. May many more be made of the cloth from which he was cut.

RECOGNIZING RAMADAN

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of Ramadan, which begins tonight at sundown for Muslims in Connecticut and around the world.

I offer my support for those marking the holiday. For Muslims worldwide, this month of fasting is a time for prayer, reflection, and charitable work.

With the constant cycle of violence plaguing our country and the world, let us all take this time to recommit ourselves to work together for equality and peace on earth.

Ramadan Mubarak to all observing the holiday.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS SHOOTING AT THE EMANUEL A.M.E. CHURCH IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to speak out against the senseless loss of innocent lives resulting from another senseless act of violence.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the people of Charleston, South Carolina, the members of the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, pastored by the Rev. Clementa Pinckney, who was one of nine persons slain by a gunman motivated by hate.

Last night Rev. Pinckney, who was also a member of the South Carolina State Senate, and eight others were shot in a horrific massacre at one of the nation's historic black churches.

Mr. Speaker, it shocks the conscience that this shooting took place during a prayer meeting in a house of sanctuary.

These types of events should never happen, and should never happen in a House of the Lord.

There is no place in a civilized society for senseless acts of violence.

I commend Attorney General Lynch for her moving quickly and decisively to launch an investigation into this hate crime and bring the perpetrator to the bar of justice where he will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

Mr. Speaker, as a country we have made major strides in equality and social justice but this tragedy reminds us that we still have work to do before Dr. King's dream of an America where all live and work together in brotherhood is realized.

There is no place for bigotry and hatred in our great country and individuals who wish to practice hate must be rooted out and ostracized.

Mr. Speaker, this senseless act of violence provides us with yet another opportunity to teach our children that violence is never the

answer and that we all must be compassionate, inclusive, and understanding to all regardless of age, economic status, race, religion, nationality or educational background.

We as a nation must live lives motivated by love, not hate.

We must teach our children to be tolerant, to show kindness, and to embrace and celebrate our differences.

Changing a culture of violence will not happen overnight but that is no excuse for failing to try.

We must try. For the sake of the victims of Emanuel A.M.E., we must not give up.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims in South Carolina, and victims of gun violence everywhere.

RECOGNIZING JANE ROZANSKI

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Jane Rozanski, a remarkable visionary and dedicated leader to the aging population of Ventura County, California.

As the Chief Executive Officer of the Camarillo Health Care District, Jane has demonstrated an outstanding commitment to providing health care and improving the access of medical services to seniors in our community. For over two decades, Jane oversaw the development of the district, which has grown to serve over 35,000 residents annually.

Under the steadfast leadership of Jane Rozanski, along with her highly skilled team, the Camarillo Health Care District embodies the commitment to provide quality and affordable medical care. The Camarillo Health Care District has been recognized throughout California as a model of innovation and efficiency, has received statewide recognition as the Executive Team of the Year by the Association of California Healthcare Districts, and has been recognized nationally as an innovative and competent partner in federal projects.

Jane has worked tirelessly to improve access to healthcare services throughout the community. In addition to her impressive work in the Camarillo Health Care District, she has upheld the responsibility of a commissioner on the California Commission on Aging for nearly three years and has brought her valuable expertise on how to best serve California's elderly citizens.

Community advocates like Jane exemplify Ventura County's impressive leadership. Though Jane will be stepping down from her position as CEO of the Camarillo Health Care District, her immense impact on the community will continue to inspire the future of public health services.

For her lifelong work, Jane is so deserving of our immeasurable gratitude. I graciously thank Jane for her unwavering commitment and dedication for the past 22 years as the CEO of the Camarillo Health Care District. It has been my sincere pleasure to work with Jane over the years.

There is no doubt that Jane's legacy will extend to future generations for her extraordinary

commitment to excellence. As she starts this new chapter in her life, I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

MIRABEAU B. LAMAR
OUTSTANDING EDUCATOR AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Rodney Bell of Needville High School and Junior High for receiving the Mirabeau B. Lamar Outstanding Educator Award. The Mirabeau B. Lamar Award is given to individuals who overcame personal adversity and have gone on to strengthen their community.

Dr. Bell, the choir director at Needville High School and Junior High, has shown outstanding perseverance and an unrelenting dedication to the education of our future leaders. For all of his efforts, the Morton Masonic Lodge No. 72 in Richmond has recognized him by giving him this prestigious award.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Dr. Rodney Bell for receiving the Mirabeau B. Lamar Outstanding Educator Award. Thank you for your positive impact on the Needville community.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR.
JACQUELINE H. GRANT

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to a great friend and outstanding public servant, Dr. Jacqueline H. Grant. Dr. Grant will be leaving her position as the District Health Director for the Southwest Georgia Health District, where she managed public health programs in fourteen counties for ten years. A reception will be held in her honor on Thursday, June 18, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. at the Dougherty County Health Department.

Dr. Grant is a native of Atlanta, Georgia, but traveled far and wide to attain different educational experiences before returning to her home state. She earned a Bachelor of Science degree from East Carolina University. She then received her medical degree from Morehouse School of Medicine, a Master's in Public Health from the University of Alabama in Birmingham, and a Master's in Public Administration from Harvard University. She completed her medical residency in obstetrics and gynecology at Emory University.

Dr. Grant previously served as Medical Director of the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology at the University of Missouri in Columbia. She also served on the faculty at Emory University and Morehouse School of Medicine prior to working full-time in the private sector from 1994-1997.

In 2005, Dr. Grant began serving as the top public health official in Southwest Georgia when she was named as District Health Director. Under her leadership, Southwest Georgia has seen incredible advancements in public health. The District has established an interactive worksite wellness program as well as the non-profit organization Friends of Southwest Georgia Public Health. Additionally, Dr. Grant has presided over district restructuring to improve efficiency and has provided valuable guidance during disease outbreaks and natural disasters.

In 2009, Dr. Grant was instrumental in obtaining a March of Dimes grant to launch CenteringPregnancy, a support group for pregnant women that promotes positive outcomes throughout the gestational period and beyond. It is the first Public Health-administered CenteringPregnancy program in the state of Georgia as well as the first such program in the southern part of the state. The program was a great success and a second site aimed primarily at Hispanic women soon opened, while the first site continued to address the needs of primarily African-American women.

A well-known and respected public health professional, Dr. Grant has received national recognition in Best Doctors of America in 2003, and was the recipient of the Tee Rae Dismukes Award in 2012 and the District Public Health Award for Excellence in Prenatal and Reproductive Health in 2015.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: "You make your living by what you get; you make your life by what you give." Not only has Dr. Grant established a legacy in public health leadership, but she has also done a tremendous job of giving back to Southwest Georgia, and I am very grateful for her tireless advocacy to make the community stronger and more healthy. A woman of great integrity, her efforts, her dedication, and her expertise in her field are unparalleled, but her heart for helping others is what makes these qualities truly worthy.

Dr. Grant has accomplished much in her life but none of it would be possible without the love and support of her husband Steve, and two children, Steve, Jr. and Michael.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and my wife, Vivian, in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Dr. Jacqueline H. Grant as she embarks upon a new journey in her life.

THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) recently announced a sweeping recall that encourages consumers to replace airbags installed in millions of vehicles on the roads of our nation.

The companies that manufacture the parts that go into the vehicles American families use

in their daily lives have a responsibility to ensure their products meet the highest possible standards. Americans deserve the confidence of knowing safety features will perform their mission effectively.

Government, for its part, also has a responsibility. Its job is to ensure there is accountability in the development and implementation of these mechanisms, and to apply the laws of our country fairly and judiciously in carrying out its mandate.

As the recall is implemented, the safety of American drivers and passengers must be our highest priority. We must ensure there is accountability for failures in the system. But we also must ensure that the recall process does not devolve into a scorched-earth campaign that wrecks a vital industry, destroys jobs, and ultimately makes Americans less safe.

The loss of any life in conjunction with a product failure is tragic and unacceptable. As a representative of TK Holdings stated in recent testimony before the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, "it is unacceptable to us and incompatible with our safety mission for even one of our products to fail to perform as intended and to put people at risk."

This is a higher standard than the federal government itself embraced nearly a quarter-century ago, when it mandated that all cars and light trucks sold in the United States be equipped with self-deploying driver-side airbags.

The federal airbag mandate was adopted by Congress in 1991 amid concerns by some experts that the airbags themselves could pose a danger to drivers and passengers in certain situations. Our colleagues, who authored the law, were aware of these concerns, but determined that the benefits far outweighed the risks.

Over time, their assessment has been proven correct. Thousands of lives have been saved by the presence of airbags as a standard feature in our vehicles.

Every life is precious. And the reality is that millions of airbags and other safety products produced by Takata—including those made by the many hard-working Americans employed by the company and its subsidiaries here in the United States—have inflated successfully and worked as intended. Thousands of Americans owe their lives to this success.

Correcting the problems identified with some of the airbags produced by Takata starts with recognizing this, and acknowledging the need for prudence in the manner in which the federal government responds to the problems that have been brought tragically to light.

We also should recognize that, in thinking about safety, we need to look beyond airbags to the broader question of how to protect drivers on the road and how to encourage them to drive more safely. As NHTSA itself recently recognized, "[o]nly a small percentage (approximately 2%) of the annual highway fatalities is directly attributable to vehicle factors (some design issues, some owner maintenance issues, some defect issues). Rather, 94 percent of highway fatalities are related to various human factors, including driver actions, such as speeding, distraction, impaired driving, and not wearing a seatbelt."

No one questions the need for accountability in this case. My concern is with poten-

tial unintended effects of going too far in an effort to ensure accountability, as well as potentially getting distracted from the larger issue of how to encourage our constituents to drive more safely and responsibly.

In this instance, pushing Takata too hard financially, for example, will not save a single American life. To the contrary, it will make it harder to ensure safe airbags are installed in every vehicle that needs one and potentially put lives at risk. Moreover, doing so could significantly disrupt the auto sector, which depends on the company for airbags, seat belts, and other safety features that are essential for protecting lives.

Let me put this in perspective.

Takata's Highland Industries, headquartered in Kernersville, North Carolina, in my congressional district, is one of the largest suppliers of fabric for the North American airbag market. My talented, hard-working constituents at Highland Industries take pride in their work, which has played a direct role over the years in saving thousands of American lives. In addition to helping save the lives of individuals in an accident, they produced the fabrics that have safely gotten astronauts into space, including to the moon and back. Indeed, the flag planted on the moon is made of fabric that was produced by these hard-working Americans in my congressional district.

Destroying the jobs of my constituents in the name of safety will not make American drivers and passengers safer. It will ultimately make them less safe.

We all mourn the American citizens who lost their lives tragically in accidents in which an airbag did not perform as intended. Their legacy should be a better and stronger system of airbag safety in the United States, through the development of even more advanced airbags and other safety features. We owe it to their families to put political agendas and posturing aside and work together to achieve that goal.

RETIREMENT OF COL. ROMNEY C. ANDERSEN, M.D.

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress and the U.S. military medical community, I congratulate Colonel Romney C. Andersen, M.D. on his longstanding dedication to our nation.

With over 30 years of service, Colonel Andersen exemplifies the values of a model soldier with his utmost commitment to caring for the combat injured casualty.

Colonel Andersen's distinguished service to our nation began as a cadet at West Point, followed by leadership as an infantry officer and continued training including ranger school.

Dr. Andersen's time in uniform is celebrated by the advancements he made in the military medical community. It has been my honor to serve under Colonel Andersen at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center; he is an irreplaceable asset to military medicine.

As an exemplary man of many roles, Dr. Romney Andersen has brought unparalleled virtue to himself, his family and his nation.

Congratulations on your retirement and thank you for your service to the United States of America.

May God bless you.

RECOGNIZING VALLEY CITIES ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Valley Cities Behavioral Health Counseling on the occasion of their 50th anniversary.

Valley Cities was first established in 1965, formed by members of south King County community who advocated for better mental health resources and with the belief that all people are capable of overcoming personal obstacles and barriers with proper support. The organization's aim is to strengthen communities through the delivery of holistic, integrated behavioral health services that "promote hope, recovery and improved quality of life." Valley Cities became a United Way partner agency in 1967.

Over the last 50 years, Valley Cities has grown to operate six clinics in the cities of Auburn, Federal Way, Kent, Renton, Des Moines, and Bellevue. As a reflection of the diversity of the 9th Congressional District, Valley Cities serves clients from around the world. Their health clinics often provide care for those with low incomes and who are from our most underserved neighborhoods, making Valley Cities an important healthcare partner in our community.

Today, Valley Cities remains dedicated to helping individuals and families through licensed mental health counseling, chemical dependency treatment for adults, family support programs, and specialized veterans services. In recognition of the pace of change in south King County, Valley Cities continues to evolve to meet the needs of the communities it serves.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate Valley Cities Behavioral Health Counseling on its 50th Anniversary. I am proud to have such a dedicated organization serving and healing community members in and around the 9th Congressional District of Washington.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO DIRECT THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY TO ACCEPT A STATUE DEPICTING PIERRE L'ENFANT FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue depicting Pierre L'Enfant from the District of Columbia and to

provide for the permanent display of the statue in the United States Capitol.

Pierre L'Enfant was born in France in 1754. He was an engineer and an architect, and he traveled to the United States to serve with the United States in the Revolutionary War. In March 1791, L'Enfant was hired to develop the design for the District of Columbia. L'Enfant's design for the city was so remarkable that it remains and is cherished today in the nation's capital and throughout this country. L'Enfant's design envisioned a federal and residential city with diagonal streets propelling from Congress and the President's home, beautiful boulevards on local streets and neighborhoods, and open spaces for monuments, memorials and historical structures, all of which largely remain intact, protected as a historical treasure.

In 2006, the residents of the District of Columbia chose L'Enfant as one of the top ten Americans that have given distinguished service to the District, and the selection committee created by the D.C. Commission on the Arts and Humanities chose L'Enfant as the second statue from the District of Columbia to be placed in the United States Capitol. The District's first choice for a statue was Frederick Douglass, and I am pleased that the Douglass statue now sits in Emancipation Hall. Because the United States Capitol does not currently appropriately recognize the contributions of Pierre L'Enfant, and because D.C. residents and stakeholders chose L'Enfant as a distinguished Washingtonian, this bill would require the Joint Committee on the Library to place the Pierre L'Enfant statue in the United States Capitol.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

CODIFICATION OF TITLE 55, UNITED STATES CODE, ENVIRONMENT

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to enact certain laws relating to the environment as title 55, United States Code, "Environment". The bill restates the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, and the Clean Air Act, along with related provisions in other Acts, as a new positive law title of the United States Code. The new positive law title replaces the existing provisions, which are repealed by the bill.

The bill was prepared by the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives as part of its ongoing responsibility under 2 U.S.C. §285b to prepare, and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary one title at a time, a complete compilation, restatement, and revision of the general and permanent laws of the United States.

All changes in existing law made by the bill are purely technical in nature. The bill was prepared in accordance with the statutory standard for codification legislation, which is that the restatement of existing law shall conform to the understood policy, intent, and pur-

pose of Congress in the original enactments, with such amendments and corrections as will remove ambiguities, contradictions, and other imperfections.

The bill is not intended to make any substantive changes in the law. As is typical with the codification process, a number of non-substantive revisions are made, including the reorganization of sections into a more coherent overall structure, but these changes are not intended to have any substantive effect.

The bill, along with a detailed section-by-section explanation of the bill, can be found on the Law Revision Counsel Internet site at <http://uscode.house.gov/codification/t55/index.html>. Interested parties are invited to submit comments, not later than 30 days after today's date, to Tim Trushel, Senior Counsel, Office of the Law Revision Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING BANDELIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 75th anniversary of Bandelier Elementary School in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The school opened its doors in the southeast heights of Albuquerque which, at the time, seemed like the middle of nowhere. There were no trees, houses or structures surrounding the school.

During World War II, military planes used the red roof of the building to guide them into landing at the Kirtland Army Air Field, as it was known in those early years.

The school became the center of activity as the community grew around it and served children from all walks of life. Many families looked forward to the annual events that included a Halloween Carnival, singing Christmas Carols around a bonfire, Track and Field Day and the Student Safety Patrol Program.

Over the years, the fundamental reading, writing and arithmetic were combined with music, art, track and field, baseball and soccer, which created an environment for well-educated and well-rounded students.

I join all the community members who are celebrating the 75th anniversary of Bandelier Elementary School. I am certain that the academic excellence, community involvement and exceptional learning environment will serve many more students in years to come.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the third anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program

established by President Barack Obama and which has transformed the lives of over half a million young people in our country.

The DACA program has given aspiring Americans of immigrant heritage across our country the chance to more fully contribute their talents to our society and aid in our nation's economic recovery.

I think of DREAMers like Jose Garcia, a young student from Los Angeles who was just accepted to Harvard University and is a DACA recipient. Because he was able to apply for DACA, his hard work in school paid off and now he can pursue a college education in the only country he has ever known.

Since the DACA program began in 2012, there are more than 261,000 young women and men in California, who like Jose, have been approved for DACA.

Today, on the third anniversary of DACA, we are here to say that we are ready and waiting for that opportunity to help all of these families who want to come out of the shadows. We're ready for the President's executive actions on expanded DACA and the Deferred Action Program for Parents (DAPA) to move forward.

We're ready—estamos listos. Y le digo a nuestras familias inmigrantes que se preparen, porque ya llega el día. [We're ready. And I want to tell our immigrant families to be prepared, because the day is coming].

Ojalá, en estos proximos meses, podemos darles a todos las buenas noticias que estos programas vitales del Presidente van a seguir adelante. [Hopefully, in the coming months, we will be able to convey the good news that the President's vital programs will be able to move forward].

Mr. Speaker, our families and our communities look forward to progress on the President's executive actions as well as the day when we finally enact comprehensive immigration reform.

**FORT BEND CHRISTIAN ACADEMY
BASEBALL**

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fort Bend Christian baseball team for a remarkable season.

The Eagles finished the season with a remarkable 11-3 record and proudly represented the entire Fort Bend community. They were led on and off the field by captain and all-state senior, Trent Bohny. Additionally, the Eagles had multiple players selected for the all-district teams with honorable state mentions, including senior Spencer Paschal, senior Derek Smith, and senior Garrett West. These prestigious awards are achieved through both athletic and academic vigor and are highly competitive throughout the state of Texas. We

are extremely proud of all the men of the Fort Bend Christian Academy baseball team and look forward to their future accomplishments.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Fort Bend Christian Academy baseball team on a successful season.

**HIGHLAND HIGH SCHOOL BULL-
DOGS CLASS 3A BASEBALL
STATE CHAMPIONS**

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the victory of the Highland High School Bulldogs as the Class 3A baseball state champions. This is their second title since 2008.

On June 13, 2015, the Bulldogs won the Class 3A State Championship in a 7-6 victory over Nazareth Academy. I would like to congratulate senior Grant Geppert for scoring the bases-loaded single during the seventh inning to give the Bulldogs the win.

I would like to congratulate the Bulldogs on their numerous, outstanding defensive plays, which kept the Nazareth Academy scoring to a minimum. My congratulations go out to the entire coaching staff and team comprised of: Grant Geppert, Pete Baumgartner, Andrew Winning, Tyler Kimmle, Cody Bentlage, Will Greenwald, Jordan Smith, Matt Augustin, Griffin Welz, Seth Luitjohan, Mike McGill, Austin Brown, Jim Smith, Jarrett Dubach, Tyler Polard, Sam Greene, Chris Dickman, Nick Schmollinger, Kyle Schmitt, Matt Beyer, Trent Carriger, assistant coaches Sam Weber, Caleb Houchin, Dave Miscik, and head coach Joel Hawkins.

I look forward to the continued success of the Highland High School Bulldogs. I extend my best wishes for another outstanding season next year.

**RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVER-
SARY OF JUNETEENTH AND THE
22ND CELEBRATION OF THE
JUNETEENTH URBAN MUSIC FES-
TIVAL IN MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE**

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the observance of Juneteenth in the United States. Even though the Emancipation Proclamation was signed by President Abraham Lincoln in September 1862, it was not until June 19, 1865 that Union Soldiers led by Major General Gor-

don Granger announced to the last slaves in Galveston, Texas, that they were free. This year also marks the 22nd annual Juneteenth Urban Music Festival in Memphis, Tennessee. To commemorate this day in our history and the contributions of African-Americans to our nation, the 2015 Juneteenth Urban Music Festival theme is: "Celebrating 150 Years with Music."

American music has long embodied influences of African culture, since the dark years of slavery when African instruments such as the banjo were introduced to America. Over time, African Americans developed their own musical style on southern plantations that is now heard in nearly every genre of music, including gospel, blues, bluegrass, jazz, country and rock and roll. This is the true history of American music.

The year's theme is an especially fitting one as Memphis has a rich musical history filled with contributions by African Americans. Memphis is home to Royal Studios, which was founded in 1957 and is one of the oldest recording studios in the world. Such talents as former owner and Memphian Willie Mitchell, Bobby Blue Bland, Ann Peebles, and Al Green have recorded hits at the studio. Most recently, the studio became the recording home of the 2015 Billboard Hot 100 chart topper, Uptown Funk, which held the number one spot for fourteen weeks. Memphis is also home to Stax Records, which is renowned for producing the sounds of Isaac Hayes, Booker T. & the M.G.'s, Otis Redding, Rufus and Carla Thomas, Mavis Staples, the Staple Singers, Lalah Hathaway, Albert King, the Bar-Kays and many more. Other well-known musicians to come out of Memphis include B.B. King, W.C. Handy, Ruby Wilson, Aretha Franklin, Kirk and Kenneth Whalum and the Oscar-winning rap group, Three 6 Mafia.

The 2015 Juneteenth Urban Music Festival will honor Memphis' own, the Bar-Kays, with a Legendary Award. With their beginnings at Stax producing backup music for other Stax artists, the Bar-Kays found their own voice and have been credited for creating "Black Rock," which is now known as "Funk," and have recorded 29 albums, of which five went gold and one went platinum, as well as 20 top ten singles. Some include: "Shake Your Rump To The Funk," "Hit and Run," "Freakshow On The Dance Floor," "Move Your Boogie Body," and "Soul Finger," which was used in the 1985 movie, Spies Like Us, the 2007 comedy, Superbad, and the 2012 remake of Sparkle. Last year, the Bar-Kays celebrated 50 years in the music industry and their music continues to be an inspiration to artists worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time to reflect upon the end of slavery in America and to recognize the many influences of African American citizens. It is in this spirit that I ask my colleagues to join me in observing our nation's 150th anniversary of Juneteenth and the 22nd celebrations in Memphis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, June 19, 2015*

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 19, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Kurt Gerhard, St. Patrick's Episcopal Church, offered the following prayer:

O God, who calls all people to live together in love and to seek reconciliation with each other in times of conflict:

Inspire in us the will to persevere in accomplishing Your vision for the good of creation.

Comfort our fellow citizens who grieve, experience daily injustice, and suffer in mind, body, or spirit.

During this session of the 114th Congress, in this, the people's House, may the hearts of the duly elected Representatives be blessed with the integrity of purpose and the steadfast commitment to seek and serve the people of the United States of America for the betterment of this country and the world.

We ask this all in the name of the one God, the God of all nations.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday next for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 23, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1873. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Carriage of Digital Television Broadcast Signals: Amendment to Part 76 of the Commission's Rules [CS Docket No.: 98-120] received June 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1874. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Coordination of the Scheduling Processes of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines and Public Utilities [Docket No.: RM14-2-000; Order No.: 809] received June 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1875. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the Australia Group (AG) November 2013 Interseasonal Decisions [Docket No.: 141229999-4999-01] (RIN: 0694-AG45) received June 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1876. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-042; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1877. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-149; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1878. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-037; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1879. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-038; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1880. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-030; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1881. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Blueline Tilefish Fishery; Secretarial Emergency Action [Docket No.: 150311250-5474-01] (RIN: 0648-BE97) received June 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1882. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Sixty-Month Period of Employment Requirement for Government Pension Offset Exemption [Docket No.: SSA 2007-0040] (RIN: 0960-AG50) received June 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2042. A bill to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units before requiring compliance with such rule, and to allow States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability (Rept. 114-171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 2843. A bill to require certain improvements in the Transportation Security Administration's PreCheck expedited screening program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2844. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2845. A bill to promote access to benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 2843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 clause 1—general welfare of the US

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 167: Mr. KIND, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 712: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 893: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 985: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1130: Mr. JOLLY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1174: Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1193: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1226: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1498: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1610: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1624: Mr. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1725: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1752: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1926: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1953: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2063: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2096: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2315: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2477: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 2522: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2610: Mr. REED, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2615: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. BASS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2646: Mr. BARR, Mr. TROTT, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2742: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2835: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. MESSER.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H. Res. 210: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. MARINO.

H. Res. 291: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. BASS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 328: Ms. MENG.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CELEBRATING THE LIFE, LEGACY AND WORK OF HARLEM ACTIV- IST MINNIE MOORE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life, legacy, and work of Harlem Activist Minnie Moore, a dear friend, a dynamic political activist and an excellent community service provider. She was a devout Christian that lived her life with an indomitable spirit of love and giving. She was a compassionate, hard working, and socially responsible individual that gave several decades of service that strengthen the entire community. On June 20, at Harlem's historic Abyssinian Baptist Church, the Africana community gathers to memorialize Minnie Moore's contributions to the Harlem community. Minnie Moore was born on June 28, 1921 to the late Claudia and Joseph Gassaway. She married her childhood sweetheart, Cleveland Moore (now deceased) and came with him to Harlem, New York, from Dothan, Alabama, during the Great Migration north.

As a life-long resident of Harlem, New York for more than 70 years, the impact of her meritorious service spanned many decades. In the early sixties Minnie was instrumental in incorporating the New York City Housing Authority Saint Nicholas Houses first tenants' association. Over a 10-year period she served in various offices including treasurer, vice-president and president. For many years Minnie was also a faithful member of the Mt. Nebo Baptist Church under the spiritual direction of the late Rev. William D. Gardner.

Minnie was a 'fireball' and worked tirelessly to support many outstanding political figures during their burgeoning years. In the 1970's and 1980's during the 'War on Poverty', Minnie Moore worked diligently and side-by-side with me, and my brothers Percy Ellis Sutton, David N. Dinkins and Basil Paterson. Other Harlem elites include The Hon. George Miller, The Hon. H. Carl McCall, The Hon. Fred Samuels, The Hon. Hilton Clark and The Hon. Keith L.T. Wright.

She was ecstatic at the election of President Obama and held great appreciation in knowing her years of community service and political activism must have contributed in some measure to this monumental, historical occurrence.

Though she was the granddaughter of slaves and did not complete her college education, Minnie Moore touched the hearts of the entire Harlem community. Minnie established the Harriet Tubman Block Association, which provided an array of programmatic activities including educational and social services to children and families through summer youth programs; recreational activities; annual block parties; support to struggling artists; after-

school homework assistance; on-going workshops on critical social and health-related issues; pantries, flea markets; and donations of holiday baskets for Thanksgiving and Christmas.

In addition to serving as Executive Director of the Harriet Tubman Block Association, Minnie held many positions of service and leadership within the New York area including Past-Worthy Matron of the Eastern Star, Universal Chapter #7; Captain of the 127th Street Block Association, Member Officer of HARYOU; Secretary for Community Board #10; Executive President of the Park Avenue North Color Guard; Executive President of the St. Nicholas Cavaliers Junior, Senior & All-Girls Softball Teams; Democratic County Committee Member and an Alternate Delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing our beloved Mother Minnie Moore and her contributions that has positively impacted the Harlem community and countless citizens across this Nation. Her dedication, commitment, and spiritual guidance is worthy of our Nation's highest esteem. Minnie was a family treasure and community icon. Her kindness, generosity and wisdom will truly be missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE TWEN- TIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COALITION FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the twentieth anniversary of the Coalition for Social Justice (CSJ) based in South-eastern Massachusetts.

For twenty years, the CSJ has been dedicated to the praiseworthy goal of building a grassroots movement for progressive social change, rooted in low-income communities and communities of color that have been excluded from the economic benefits of the current system.

The CSJ has a dual focus: to recruit and develop its own leaders from low income backgrounds; and to organize effective campaigns to address the economic survival issues that low-income communities and communities of color face. CSJ's agenda includes: funding essential community services through progressive taxes, worker's rights, housing, health care, education, welfare, criminal justice reform, immigrant rights, and environmental justice.

CSJ has actively participated in advocating for the needs of working-class families. For example, in 2014 CSJ helped increase minimum wage in Massachusetts, and also helped earn sick time for all workers in Massa-

chusetts. In 2011, CSJ helped to restore the children's clothing allowance of \$150 per year per child so children were able to start the school year with suitable clothing. These examples represent only a small fraction of CSJ's commendable work.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the CSJ on its twentieth year anniversary. It gives me great pride to recognize them for all of the admirable work they do for those in need.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE, LEGACY AND WORK OF REVEREND DR. JAMES E. GUNTHER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise today to recognize and honor the life of Reverend Dr. James E. Gunther, the well respected Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, ecumenist and an elder among African American Lutheran Pastors. I am honored to acknowledge the life and contributions of one of Harlem's forward thinking religious leaders of the 21st century.

On June 20th, at Harlem's historic Transfiguration Lutheran Church, the Harlem community gathers to memorialize Dr. Gunther. He devoted his life to enlightening African Americans and is noted for illuminating our spiritual enlargement to embrace a global unification and cultural learning.

Reverend Dr. James E. Gunther served the Harlem community and was a man of purpose, passion and true conviction in service to others. Known as a "Poor, Humble, Parish priest, he served for a brief time at Nativity Lutheran Church and Tabernacle Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, as part of the Center City Lutheran Parish, before moving on to Transfiguration Lutheran Church in Harlem where he served for 38 years, retiring in 1998. A year later he was named Pastor Emeritus.

A life-long teacher, leader and visionary, he led a large parish with many Caribbean roots at the Transfiguration Lutheran Church. He was a member of the Governing Board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA (NCC) representing the Lutheran Church of America (LCA). A Humanitarian, he served as a Board member of the National Committee of Black Churchmen. Focusing on Economic Justice Working Group, the Division of Overseas Ministry and the Committee on Research and Planning, he served as a Board member of the National Committee of Black Churchmen.

Through Reverend Gunther, illustrious leadership, he founded and chaired the Harlem College Assistance Project from 1964-1977 sending more than 5,000 young black and

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Hispanic students to college. An inspiring thought leader, he served on the Harlem Urban Development Corporation, the Board of the Roosevelt Island Corporation, the New York Urban Coalition and the Ministerial Interfaith Association.

A man way ahead of his time, Dr. Gunther, was born on May 5, 1932, in Philadelphia, PA. Educated in Philadelphia Public Schools, he continued his collegiate journey attending the University of Pennsylvania. He holds degrees from Philadelphia College of the Bible, Houghton College, the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, and Harvard University with studies in Psychology, Religion, Theology and Church and Society.

A worldwide global vanguard, Dr. Gunther served on the Executive council of the LCA and represented the church at the 1977 Sixth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation in Dar es Salaam, East Africa, working on the Statement Human Rights and the Statement on South Africa. Dr. Gunther encouraged all that he met "To Think Globally While Acting Locally".

In addition, Dr. Gunther served as Trustee of Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, PA; Wagner College, Staten Island, NY and Muhlenberg University, Allentown, PA. He subsequently served as a Board Member of Augsburg Fortress Publishers, an Adjunct Professor at Christ Bible College, Malcolm King College (associated with Fordham University and Marymount-Manhattan College, and the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing Reverend Dr. James E. Gunther, and his contributions and innovations that have positively impacted the quality of life for countless citizens across this Nation. His unwavering dedication, commitment, and spiritual guidance is worthy of our Nation's highest esteem.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "KEEP
OUR PENSION PROMISES ACT"

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the "Keep Our Pension Promises Act."

Pensions are one of the surest means to afford millions of middle class families an opportunity for security in retirement, to enjoy their golden years without being afraid that they haven't saved enough money or what they have saved could run out. Pensions guarantee our senior citizens will know they have a check arriving every month for as long as they live. This is true retirement security.

For forty years the federal pension law has ensured that retirees are given the highest level of protection. For forty years, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, or ERISA, controlled that pension benefits in multi-employer plans should be cut only when a plan runs out of money—and even then, the benefits of retirees should be the last to be cut. This has held true and true because it was the right thing to do. Retirees worked

their entire life to earn the promise and benefit of a guaranteed pension.

This was all uprooted by Congress' December vote on the Omnibus funding bill. A provision that was stuck into the 1,600 page Omnibus bill, at the last minute, forced a decision between shutting down the government and cutting retiree's pension benefits for the first time ever.

An estimated 1 million participants, including retirees, are in multi-employer pension plans that federal officials say are in danger of running out of money in the near future. The provision Congress passed allowed for the first time for the benefits of current retirees to be cut as part of a deal to address the fiscal distress confronting some of the nation's multi-employer pension plans, having a direct impact on 1.5 million American retirees.

This was wrong and today I introduce the "Keep Our Pension Promises Act" with Senator BERNIE SANDERS of Vermont, to correct this short sighted effort.

This Act corrects the injustices bestowed upon our most vulnerable retirees by restoring anti-cutback rules so that retirees in financially troubled multi-employer pension plans are protected from having their earned benefits cut.

It will allow plans to partition off "orphaned" participants into a separate plan, giving participating employers relief from having to shoulder the full financial burden and risk of underfunded "orphaned" participants—ensuring the ability for plans to become financially secure once more.

Recognizing that funding is the ultimate concern, the act shores up the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp and creates a legacy fund to ensure participants in partitioned plans will continue to receive the benefits they depend upon. The costs to create this fund are covered by closing tax loopholes the very wealthy use to accumulate expensive artwork and avoid estate and gift taxes.

Further the bill ensures pension obligations are prioritized during bankruptcies, which will help the remaining employers in the plan by making it less likely they become responsible for underfunded orphan plans.

Our pension system has allowed our senior citizens the opportunity to enjoy their years of hard work in retirement and receive the payouts they spent a life time to earn. This effort recognizes that shared sacrifices are the appropriate course of action to address weakness in pension plans. I encourage my colleagues to support this measure and correct the misguided action passed in last year's Omnibus funding bill.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 250TH AN-
NIVERSARY OF SHARON, MASSA-
CHUSETTS

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 250th anniversary of the founding of Sharon, Massachusetts, a town whose slogan "A Better Place to Live Because It's Naturally Beautiful" is uncontroversial.

Sharon's landscape represents a classic New England destination with its tree-lined streets, pristine white church spires encasing bells manufactured by Paul Revere, its forested high plains and the peacefulness of Lake Massapoag.

First settled in 1637 as part of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Sharon was established as the 2nd precinct of its neighboring town Stoughton in 1740. On June 21, 1765, an act passed by the Council and the House of Representatives and signed by Governor Bernard incorporated the second precinct of Stoughton into the district named Stoughtonham. It was subsequently named after the Sharon plains in Israel due to its plentiful forests and greenery. Engrained in the history of Sharon is the strength of its townspeople who manufactured weapons for the Continental Army during the American Revolution. The heroism of the colonial townspeople of Sharon is exemplified by the historical figure Deborah Sampson, a woman who disguised herself as a man in order to display her patriotism by fighting for her country in the Revolutionary War.

Present day Sharon has become a beacon for its thriving culture. Local artists and businesses have contributed to the unique character of this charming Massachusetts town.

A boisterous population of 18,000 individuals inhabit Sharon, providing the town with diversity of race, religion, and personalities. But one thing is a constant in Sharon: the friendliness of its townspeople. As my hometown, where I resided for over half a century, I had the pleasure of a place that valued the meaning of friendship. The people of Sharon are kind, tolerant, spirited and it is due to their love of neighborliness that Sharon has been able to remain a steadfast community, truly representing the very best that our Commonwealth and our country has to offer.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the 250th anniversary of Sharon, Massachusetts. May this beautiful Massachusetts town flourish for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO COL. PETE
HILGARTNER

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember a truly selfless resident of Great Falls, Virginia, Col. Pete Hilgartner.

Not long after graduating high school Col. Hilgartner began his service to our nation by enlisting in the U.S. Marine Corps. He received a fleet appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy and upon graduation in 1951 was commissioned a 2nd Lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps.

During the Korean War, he served as an artillery forward observer and received the Bronze Star with Combat "V" for meritorious conduct against the enemy in these actions.

In Vietnam, he commanded the 1st Battalion, Fifth Marine Regiment, the most decorated combat battalion in the U.S. Marine Corp. His tour as Battalion Commander of a frontline Marine Infantry Battalion was one of

the longest of any during the war and his battalion fought in numerous actions, including every major action that occurred in the 1st Marine Division sector from November 1966 to September 1967. His six and a half foot stature earned him the name "Highpockets" by his Marines, who loved him for his competency and his concern for his men's welfare. Under his command, his unit received two Presidential Unit Citations, for Operations Union, Union II, and Swift. Col. Hilgartner himself was awarded twice the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with Palm, the Legion of Merit, and the Silver Star medal, for gallantry in combat during Operation Swift.

Upon completion of his first tour, Col. Hilgartner completed a Master's degree only to return for an additional tour as a staff officer in Saigon eventually achieving the rank of Colonel by the time of his retirement from active duty in 1972. From there he would transition into a successful career in the brokerage investment business, author of two books and serve as an active member of the community; holding multiple roles as a Virginia Hunter Education Instructor, President of both the McLean Rotary Club and Northern Virginia Brittany Club, and in the aftermath of September 11th led the Great Falls Memorial Committee helping create the Great Falls Memorial in the remembrance of those lost in the September 11th attacks.

Col. Hilgartner is survived by his wife, Sara Hilgartner, his five children by his first wife, Frances Haynes Hilgartner: Linda Bassett, Diana Boyd, Dale Cirillo, David Hilgartner, and Paul Hilgartner, 10 grandchildren, five great-

grandchildren, his stepson Greg Fernlund and his step-grandchildren. "Uncle Pete" was also a loving uncle and grandfather to his deceased brother Fielding's 5 children and 11 grandchildren.

Col. Hilgartner will always be remembered for his heroic service to his nation and will truly be missed by all of the many lives that he touched and enriched.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE, LEGACY,
AND WORK OF CLEMENTE PUGH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the life, legacy, and work of my dear distinguished friend, Clemente Pugh who was affectionately known to all of us as "Clem". As a strong believer in the power of knowledge, she demonstrated the importance of learning and expanding educational opportunities to women and African Americans throughout our great Nation. On June 20th, at Harlem's historic, The Riverside Church, family and community gathers to memorialize Clem's life and contributions to opening our minds to the importance of culture, honesty, and knowledge.

On April 11, 1925, Clemente was born to Alberta and Otho High in Raleigh, North Carolina. She attended Shaw University where she earned a Bachelor of Arts degree. She began her career as a psychiatric social worker, mov-

ing on to becoming a public school teacher and eventually, a professor at Hunter and Lehman Colleges of the City University of New York. After 20 years of service at Lehman College, she was awarded the title of Professor Emeritus Education. She went on to earn a Master of Social Work degree in 1949 from New York's Columbia University and a Doctorate in Education from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst in 1982 where she was awarded the prestigious title of Professor Emeritus of Education for her teachings.

Clem vividly strived for honesty and understanding. She made it her duty to present others with the awareness she obtained. Her tireless effort to engage, enjoy, and educate people touched the hearts of every person she met. A woman ahead of her time, Clemente Pugh tackled the many realms of "isms" including, racism, sexism and classism. Her life was devoted to acknowledging and improving how these infected opinions affect African American people. With her remarkable resilience, I am proud to have called Clemente and her husband, Douglas Pugh, my dear and very special friends. I know that her legacy will live on for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me as we pay tribute to such a treasure to our community. I pledge to continue to carry out her tradition of provoking thought and feeling for all who have lost their way, or simply need to be reminded of who we are, what we come from, and how we can overcome any obstacle presented before us.

SENATE—Monday, June 22, 2015

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, strong to save, may this quiet moment prompt us to think thoughts about Your goodness and power throughout this day. May these thoughts keep us faithful and diligent in all our work, motivating us to labor for Your glory.

Lord, inspire our lawmakers to be honorable and generous in their dealing with each other, remembering Your great commandment to love their neighbors as they love themselves.

O God, You have been a refuge for Your people through many generations. Be our fortress in every moment and every need that we face this day. Guide us through the uncertainty and darkness, continually strengthening us for times of testing.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The majority leader is recognized.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, we will vote tonight to bring long-overdue permanent leadership to an agency in urgent need of reform and culture change, and that is the TSA. I wish the White House hadn't waited 6 months to send us a nominee to lead this troubled agency, but now that the administration finally has, we are pleased to see a highly qualified candidate such as Peter Neffenger.

It is never easy to ensure a Senate review process that is appropriately thorough yet necessarily expeditious in the face of so many months of White House delay, but that is just what Chairman THUNE and Chairman JOHNSON achieved with the nominee before us. I thank them both for their good work.

If confirmed this evening, Vice Admiral Neffenger will certainly have a tough job ahead of him. We are all aware of the recent inspector general report that questioned the TSA's ability to meet its security mission without some significant changes. The American people will be counting on Mr. Neffenger to validate the trust their elected representatives place in him tonight by pursuing every necessary reform in the wake of such troubled findings. The Senate appears to have confidence that he can achieve those goals. There is no doubt the Senate and the American people will be expecting that he will.

TRADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, when it comes to keeping the American people safe, there are many things Congress can do. Encouraging reform at the TSA is one important step, but so is leading on trade.

President Obama's own Secretary of Defense recently said that the trade legislation before us was as important to him "as another aircraft carrier." This is the Secretary of Defense of the United States who said that the trade legislation before us was as important to him as another aircraft carrier. But he cautioned that "time's running out [to] cement our influence and leadership in the fastest-growing region in the world."

We all know how critical this legislation is for lifting up American workers, American wages, and the American economy as well. We shouldn't let this opportunity for a significant bipartisan achievement slip past us. If we can continue working together in a spirit of trust and if we simply vote the same way we did a couple of weeks ago, we won't miss this opportunity.

I know how important it is—particularly for my friends on the other side of the aisle—to get both TPA and TAA, trade adjustment assistance. That linkage has been acknowledged from the beginning of this process. It is why I set in motion a process last week—filing cloture on the vehicles for both TPA and TAA so that we get one done followed immediately by the other—that will put both pieces of legislation on the President's desk before the July 4 State work period.

I don't want anyone to think we are getting TPA done this week, with a promise to get TAA done at some other time. The process this week is very clear: We will vote on TPA and then we will vote on TAA. So this is how that will look. Tomorrow, we will begin the

process of approving TPA. The next day, we will begin the process of approving TAA, along with the AGOA and preferences measure.

Before the week is out, I intend to go to conference on the Customs bill. This is a bill with broad bipartisan support. Members on both sides want to get it done, and we are going to formally begin the process to complete our work on the Customs bill. So I am committed to concluding work on that conference as quickly as possible. I am sure Members on both sides will hold us to that commitment.

So what does all this mean? It means that with continued bipartisan cooperation, we can ensure that TPA, TAA, and AGOA reach the President's desk this week, and it means we can ensure that the Customs bill is placed on a path to swift approval, too. It was always the goal to ensure that these bills passed Congress in the end. It remains the bipartisan goal today. We are now on the verge of achieving it. With just a little more trust, a little more cooperation, and simply voting consistently, we will get there.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. REID. Madam President, over the past several years there has been a disturbing practice that has become commonplace in the Congress, and sadly it is with no regard for the average American. The Republicans have resolved to govern by staggering from one ludicrous crisis to another crisis—one today, one next week. Unless the Republican leader acts, in just 5 days, for example, we will see the consequences of another manufactured crisis. On June 30, the charter for the Export-Import Bank is set to expire. This is serious business. This institution creates jobs by providing loans and loan guarantees to foreign customers who purchase American exports. This year alone, the Ex-Im Bank supports 165,000 American jobs—165,000 jobs that allow American workers to earn a living. These jobs cost taxpayers zero—nothing. In fact, this Bank saves the American taxpayers money. In the last 10 years, the Bank has returned more than \$7 billion to the U.S. Treasury.

With the threat of this Bank closing—other countries have similar institutions, such as China. People are going to China and other countries to

get their loan guarantees and buy products—not from America but from countries where those banks will take care of their loans. This is so sad.

Despite the positive benefits the Bank provides for our economy and thousands of Americans, Republicans have decided that reauthorization is not a priority. The Republican leader has openly opposed reauthorization of this important Bank. I repeat, there are 165,000 jobs as we speak, and they are American jobs.

Quoting the senior Senator from Kentucky: “I personally think the Ex-Im Bank has outlived its usefulness and ought to go away.” Really? The Bank should be put out of business? I don’t think so. This resource supports thousands of jobs for Americans and could not possibly have outgrown its usefulness. But in the 6 months since the Republicans have taken control of Congress, this mindset has governed their decisions. Sensible programs that benefit average Americans and strengthen our economy have taken a backseat to special interests. We can see that by what is going on in this body this week.

Just as he has on countless issues so far this Congress, the Republican leader is intentionally ignoring deadlines that are obvious—these deadlines are obvious weeks and even months ahead of time—and offering no plan or solution to these pertinent issues facing our Nation. Today, we are talking about two of those—surface transportation, and I have talked about the Export-Import Bank. No plan. No solution. No urgency. That is how Republicans have chosen to govern.

This misguided policy is not governing at all. It is all about crisis management and doing a very poor job. This crisis management could be avoided by not playing dodgeball with issues important to our country.

There are less than 5 days until thousands of jobs are threatened for no apparent reason. The senior Senator from Kentucky should put his partisan agenda aside, choose American jobs over political benefits, and allow a vote to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. This measure would pass. It would pass overwhelmingly because Republican Senators want this to pass also. So if a vote were allowed on this, it would get a sizeable majority.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM FUNDING

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Senate also faces another looming deadline manufactured by Republican leadership. At the end of July, Republican funding for the Federal highway program will expire. In 5 days, we will lose the Export-Import Bank. In just a few weeks, we are going to lose the highway program.

Our Nation’s roads, bridges, highways, and transit systems are in des-

perate need of repair. Some 64,000 bridges are structurally deficient. This isn’t 6,400; it is 64,000 bridges. Fifty percent of our roads are dangerously in need of repair. Still, Republicans in Congress have refused to work with Democrats in making an adequate long-term investment in our country’s surface transportation programs.

Delaying and stalling has become their normal practice. Republicans are content to take a page straight out of their playbook. That playbook is called “Republican Manufactured Crisis Playbook.” They do this day after day. They just go to that playbook that has been used over and over again. We have seen it before, and we are seeing it again with highways. We are seeing it with Ex-Im Bank. Instead of working with Democrats to create long-term solutions to our Nation’s woes, the Republican leader will wait until the deadline is imminent—and on highways, we can see it coming—and he will offer another short-term extension to stave off a disaster of his own making. That is unacceptable. We have already had 33 Republican short-term fixes—33. We don’t need a 34th.

Governing by crisis is a reckless strategy that leaves the well-being of Americans and our economy hanging in the balance. The Republican leader should abandon this policy and stop dragging our country from one crisis to another crisis. Republicans can get started today by bringing up reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank for a vote before the charter expires in just a few days. It will pass. Certainly he could focus on long-term, bipartisan reauthorization of the Federal highway program, which, as I have indicated, expires in a few weeks.

The American people should not be forced to endure manufactured crises at the hands of Republican leadership. I urge the Republican leadership to change course and govern with the well-being of the American people in mind.

Madam President, will the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Utah.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the distin-

guished Senator from Florida be given 5 minutes and that I immediately follow him with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee. I will be back at 5 o’clock to speak on behalf of our nominee for TSA, Admiral Neffenger.

YOUTUBE KIDS APP

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I want to address something that I was absolutely shocked about when I saw it over the weekend. We hear the term “age appropriate,” and when it comes to our children, that is necessarily something that parents should be concerned about because we parents—all of us who are parents—want our children to be able to take advantage of the Internet’s vast resources to learn, to stay connected. But we as parents do not want our children, especially small children, to encounter inappropriate content.

Well, unfortunately, there is a lot of violence, profanity, and sexualized material on the Internet, and kids can too often access this material with the click of a mouse. We have all been dealing with that. That is nothing unusual. And what are we parents to do? We can monitor our kids’ activities, but we can also depend on parental controls and filters in the marketplace. We have seen the development of many of these services for kids that promise a safe space for children. The problem is when companies do not completely deliver on that promise.

So I have read recent news reports and I watched Google’s YouTube Kids mobile application for smart phones, and I see that it contains material that is not, in fact, appropriate for small children. According to the press accounts—and what I saw repeated—the app has apparently been found to include videos with explicit language; mature subject matter, such as child abuse, drug use, pedophilia; demonstrations of unsafe behaviors; and—get this—advertisements for alcohol.

I want to show you a picture. This is on Google’s YouTube Kids app. Here is a lady hawking red wine. This is an advertisement for little kids? It is there, and I hope the offending parties will take heed to my remarks.

We all recognize what is shown in this picture—most appropriate for advertisements for the Super Bowl, but on a Google YouTube app for little children, preceded by the Clydesdales pulling the wagon with the Dalmatian—an icon in America. But for little children, an ad, the King of Beers?

And how about unsafe behaviors. Here is someone striking a match and taking this match down to a pile of

unlit matches, and then, of course, you know what happens—it all goes up in flame.

Have we lost our common sense? When Google rolled out its YouTube Kids app, it said: “The app makes it safer and easier for children to find videos on topics they want to explore” That is a good thing. It went on to say: “Now, parents can rest a little easier knowing that videos in the YouTube Kids app are narrowed down to content appropriate for kids.” Well, I certainly agree with Google on that statement. Parents should be able to trust these online venues for children, especially when they are designed and marketed as being safe. But is this safe for children? And, Madam President, is that safe for children? I do not think so.

If a company creates an online safe haven for kids, it must do everything it can to make sure children are not unnecessarily exposed to the very content parents want their children to avoid. Google certainly has the technical expertise to make sure that videos which are unsuitable for kids are screened or filtered out, especially when Google markets the app as being suitable for children. Indeed, section 5 of the FTC Act prohibits deceptive marketing practices.

I applaud Google for its efforts to create healthy online experiences for children, but in this case, their efforts fell short, and I would expect Google to change this right away.

Furthermore, YouTube Kids should also be sensitive to the fact that younger children often do not understand the difference between advertisements and noncommercial content. So kids’ online services that have commercial advertising should make sure that advertising is clearly distinguished from the other content. Google should not take advantage of this well-known vulnerability among children. Video advertisements should be easily and clearly distinguishable from other videos the kids are watching.

I should not have to come here and the Senator from Utah be so gracious to give me the time. It ought to be common sense that we should not be doing this. But this Senator, who is the ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee, is compelled to come here and speak of this kind of comment. We want companies to create online services and products that allow children safe access to age-appropriate content, and we understand that companies want to tap into the kids’ market, but everyone knows just how much Internet content is out there that is completely unsuitable for children.

Madam President, need I say any more? It is very clear, and I hope there will be quick action for appropriate content.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise to speak today on a matter of critical importance to our Nation’s security, but first I wish to extend my most heartfelt condolences to our friends in Charleston, SC.

Last week, we witnessed an unspeakable tragedy with the shooting at the Emanuel AME Church. This heinous act has left families reeling and the Nation in disbelief. Words can little console nor can they heal the hearts of those who have lost. Still, I wish to say just a few words to the neighbors, families, and friends who have suffered most.

Know that your Nation suffers with you—no question about it. You are in our prayers, our thoughts. May you feel peace and love. May you find healing in God. And may the shooter be swiftly brought to justice.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I now shift to a different threat we face.

Time and again—time and time again—the Islamic Republic of Iran has lied to the international community. The latest evidence emerged in the June 2 publication by the United Nations Security Council of a scathing report on Iranian noncompliance with the Joint Plan of Action. Written by a diverse panel of international experts, the report catalogs a growing list of Iran’s violations of multiple U.N. mandates. It deserves to be read widely by all those who care deeply, as I do, about the ongoing P5+1 negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program.

The lesson to draw from the Security Council report is clear: If Iran continues to violate its current agreements with impunity, how can we expect that Tehran would adhere to a new deal to suspend its nuclear program? This is a matter of plain common sense.

The specifics of the report paint a profoundly troubling picture. Iranian arms transfer activities have continued uninterrupted, despite the sanctions imposed by the unified international community. These arms have found their way into a number of regional conflicts, fuelling instability in Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and elsewhere. Hezbollah and Hamas—Iran’s perennial terrorist allies—continue to turn these weapons against Israel and our other allies in the region. Regional violence has been and continues to be Iran’s export of choice.

According to this report, not only does Iran illegally export weapons and oil, it has also imported prohibited materials and technology, circumventing

sanctions. The Iranians have long maintained a robust illicit procurement infrastructure. They have accomplished this through intermediaries controlled by Iranian and pro-Iranian interests, often involving false documentation, shell corporations, and foreign nationals.

For these and other reasons, our French allies have now declared that a rigorous inspection regime that includes military installations should be a prerequisite to any agreement. This should have been our position from the start.

Additionally, the report describes violations of foreign travel restrictions of high-ranking Iranian Government officials. One particularly noteworthy violation is the case of Major General Qasem Soleimani, the commander of Iran’s Special Forces Quds Force. Earlier this year, General Soleimani met with the Secretary General of Hezbollah in Lebanon. Just last month, photographs surfaced of General Soleimani surrounded by Shiite militia fighters in Iraq’s embattled Anbar Province.

I am disappointed to hear some try to minimize these Iranian violations of Security Council resolutions because some Iranian arms and personnel are currently being used against the heinous Islamic State. We must not turn a blind eye to Iranian malfeasance. We must not fall into the trap of accepting Iran’s transgressions simply because they are fighting a common foe. In this case, the enemy of our enemy is not our friend. Some of the armed Shia groups fighting the Islamic State are the same groups that were killing U.S. troops just a few short years ago. They might very well try to do so again.

A nuclear-armed Iran would be a disaster for the region and the wider world—not only for our Israel allies but also for our Saudi, Egyptian, Jordanian, Kuwaiti, Qatari, and Emirati allies as well. With the continuing turmoil in the region and the threat posed by the Islamic State, Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and other terrorist groups, the world cannot afford a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. Considering the hand-in-hand history between Iran and Hezbollah, one could easily translate a nuclear Iran into a nuclear Hezbollah.

It is therefore highly distressing that Iran has, to quote the Security Council, “continued certain nuclear activities, including uranium enrichment and some work at Arak.” If Iran has failed to sufficiently address even the core cause of the sanctions against them, what confidence do we have in them in moving forward?

It is particularly telling that the U.N. expert panel assessed that a decline in reports by member states of Iranian violations results from one of two factors: either Iran has decreased its prohibitive activities significantly

or member states have refrained from reporting noncompliance so as not to interrupt the negotiations process. In light of the revelations contained in this report, the latter appears far more likely.

As the President continues to push for a permanent deal with Iran's leadership, this report is as alarming as it is timely. Past performance may not universally predict future behavior, but it certainly should be part of the consideration. Moreover, this report is far from the only sign of Iranian malfeasance. As recently as yesterday, the Iranian Parliament voted to prohibit international inspections of military sites, casting into serious doubt its commitment to a workable nuclear deal.

Given these troubling moves, the President should explain to the American people what level of confidence he has negotiating with Iran given how it repeatedly violates the international community's mandates with impunity. The stakes are too high to act as if Iran were a trustworthy partner.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, the Senate is not in a quorum call; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, Senator.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak for a few minutes about the disaster that is known as ObamaCare and specifically the Supreme Court's upcoming decision in *King v. Burwell*, which we anticipate will be handed down later this week or perhaps as late as Monday. This case will decide whether the IRS can rewrite the law, and it actually challenges the legality of the subsidies to health care policies affecting people in up to 37 States.

If the Court rules against the IRS, that would be the third strike against ObamaCare in the Supreme Court. What more evidence would we possibly need of this administration's routine overreach of its authority under the Constitution?

Not surprisingly, the President once again has failed to accept responsibility for this flawed law that bears his name, and he has suggested that Congress could simply fix the problem with a one-sentence provision. In other words, even though President Obama and congressional Democrats jammed this partisan monstrosity through all by themselves in 2010, somehow, after three strikes in the U.S. Supreme Court, it is now our responsibility to clean up the mess.

But what is wrong with ObamaCare far exceeds the issue at hand in *King v. Burwell*. I hear of the disastrous effects

of ObamaCare every day from folks back home in Texas. They know, as do I, that a one-sentence provision won't fix a 2,700-page legislative disaster, unless that sentence were to repeal ObamaCare in its entirety.

If somehow this administration and congressional Democrats could be sued for misleading consumers under the usual legal standards, the case brought by millions of Americans against ObamaCare would be a slam dunk. The President claimed his law would help everyone—miraculously decreasing costs, increasing access, and reducing the deficit—when, in fact, time after time after time, the opposite has been shown to be the case. What we have seen instead has been great damage to the health care system in this country, leaving many Americans with their health care disrupted, their work hours cut, and higher costs for their health coverage.

Although proponents of the law, including the President and Democratic Members of Congress, claimed ObamaCare would reduce the financial burden of health care for American families, this has not been the case. In fact, one study found that ObamaCare actually increased individual market premiums by an average of almost 50 percent between 2013 and 2014. So rather than make health care more affordable, what ObamaCare did is to make it less affordable and more expensive by increasing individual market premiums by an average of almost 50 percent.

Recently, the administration released rate filings showing that insurers have requested double-digit premium increases for nearly 700 plans next year. So double-digit increases have been requested.

We can all remember the President's repeated promises that under ObamaCare those who wanted to keep their plans would be able to do so. In fact, the Associated Press has documented that more than 4.7 million Americans had insurance plans they liked that were canceled by ObamaCare.

And of course, just last week President Obama himself called the Web site platform for his trademark legislation—healthcare.gov—"a well-documented disaster."

The fact that this failed law has hurt patients is bad enough, but the truth is it is also hurting the economy and hurting jobs. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that ObamaCare is forcing employers to cut jobs and has projected that as many as 2 million jobs could be lost by 2017.

If the Court rules for *King*, the plaintiff in the lawsuit, millions more Americans could find their health care coverage temporarily disrupted—just one more painful consequence of this reckless piece of legislation.

Clearly, ObamaCare was not the silver bullet for our health care system or

our economy. Instead, what we know today is that ObamaCare really just amounted to a trail of broken promises. But you will never find the President or those who foisted this flawed legislation upon the American people taking responsibility for it. Rather, as I said earlier, somehow they think it is for somebody else to clean up their mess.

I continue to believe the American people would be well served to see this entire law scrapped in favor of real patient-centered reforms that lower costs and increase access to care. I thought that was what health care reform was supposed to be about—lowering cost and improving access to care. But ObamaCare did the opposite.

I am here to say that while Republicans did not create this mess, we are ready, willing, and able to do our best to protect the American people from any more harm caused by the President's flawed law. That is why we have been working hard for the last several months to provide the American people with a much needed off-ramp from ObamaCare, should the Court rule against the administration once again. But we really need to hit the reset button and start over again.

First and foremost, we are prepared to help the more than 6 million Americans, including nearly 1 million people in my home State of Texas, whose costs would suddenly skyrocket as yet another consequence of this disastrous piece of legislation. In doing so, we will empower the States to opt out of ObamaCare, allowing them the flexibility to more effectively lower costs and increase choices.

We will not promote command-and-control solutions emanating from here in Washington, under the philosophy that Washington knows best. We will promote market-based options without the threat of harmful, onerous, expensive mandates. Repealing these mandates will help the American people finally get the coverage they need at a price they can afford.

In short, we will do everything in our power to protect the people affected by this flawed piece of legislation, but we will not protect the President's failed law. It is time to scrap it and do better. It is my hope, if the Court rules against the administration once again, that Congress will find it within themselves to work together to protect the almost 1 million Texans and millions more Americans from yet another painful consequence of ObamaCare. I know Republicans stand ready to protect the American people from this failed law while providing a path forward for better health care for our country. That health care includes more freedom, more flexibility, and more choices.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I wish to take this opportunity to send my condolences to the families of those who were murdered in Charleston, SC, on Wednesday evening and to the entire city of Charleston.

It is hard to understand how someone could walk into a church, be welcomed into a prayer meeting, and then take out a gun and slaughter nine people who were in the process of discussing the Bible. That is hard to believe, but that is what happened.

In the last 60 years, this country has made significant progress in civil rights and in trying to become a less discriminatory society. Sixty years ago, parts of our country were part of an apartheid-type system, segregated housing, segregated schools, segregated restaurants, segregated transportation, segregated water fountains, and, in fact, an entirely segregated way of life. Perhaps most significantly, African Americans in a number of Southern States were denied the basic right to vote and were unable to participate in the democratic process.

Today, as a nation, we have a right to be proud of the significant changes that have taken place in our country over the last 60 years and the many advances that have been made in civil rights and in the creation of a less discriminatory society.

We should be proud that in 2008, this country surprised the world by overcoming our racist history and electing our first African-American President and then reelecting him 4 years later with a strong majority. You may like Barrack Obama, and I do, or you may dislike Barrack Obama, and many Americans have that view, but it is no small thing that this country was able to judge a candidate by his ideas and character and not the color of his skin. But clearly, while we have made significant progress, the events of last week remind us how far we yet have to go in order to create a nonracist society.

I am not the Governor of South Carolina, I am not in the South Carolina legislature, and I do not live in South Carolina, but I do believe the time is long overdue for the people of South Carolina to remove the Confederate flag from the statehouse grounds in Columbia. That flag is a relic of our Nation's stained racial history. It should come down. If any good can come of the terrible tragedy in Charleston, it is that the people of South Carolina now

have the opportunity to finally turn a page on our past. Frankly, the Confederate flag does not belong on statehouse grounds, it belongs in a museum.

I wish to also express my deep concern about the growth of extremist groups in this country, groups that are motivated by hatred—by hatred of African Americans, by hatred of immigrants, by hatred of Jews, by hatred of Muslims, and anyone else who is not exactly like them. According to the Southern Poverty Law Center, sadly, there are some 784 active hate groups in the United States and the number of those groups is growing. Let me express my agreement with NAACP President Cornell Williams Brooks that “we need vigorous prosecution and vigorous investigation of these hate groups and the resources to do so.” I call upon the FBI to do just that.

About 50 years ago, as a student at the University of Chicago, I was arrested in a civil rights demonstration to end segregated schools. I was also involved in helping to end segregated housing in Chicago. It is clear to me that over that period of time this Nation has come a very long way, but it is also clear to me—and I think to the majority of our people—that we still have a long way to go.

I will conclude by reminding my fellow Americans about those great words that appeared in the Declaration of Independence, that moment in history when the Colonies broke off from the British: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men”—and we would add women—“are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.” That is the dream of America, that is our vision, and that is a goal we must obtain. The tragedy in Charleston reminds us how far we yet have to go.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SALTS ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak about a major problem across my State—the Presiding Officer has seen it in Iowa—and across the country, and that is the scourge of synthetic drugs.

We have all seen reports of people who have hurt themselves or others or who have died under the influence of dangerous drugs. This issue hit home in my State after Trevor Robinson, a 19-year-old from Blaine, MN, died after

overdosing on a drug called 2C-E in 2010. I introduced a bill to outlaw 2C-E and other similar substances, and with the help of Senator GRASSLEY, as well as Senator SCHUMER, we were able to get that bill signed into law. But there is so much more that needs to be done, as we have learned since we passed that bill.

Here is one recent example. Law enforcement officials in Florida and throughout the country are dealing with a synthetic drug called Flakka. This extremely dangerous drug has been linked to hallucinations and other bizarre behavior. We are always trying to stay one step ahead of these new and dangerous compounds because the way the law works now, we have to keep adding new compounds. So what happens is that the crooks who are manufacturing these drugs—the drug leaders, the people who are running these drug rings—are actually just changing the compounds up so they are different, and they are staying one step ahead of the law in that way.

Before I was elected to the Senate, I spent 8 years serving as chief prosecutor in Minnesota's largest county. Drug cases made up about one-third of our caseload, and I had an opportunity to see firsthand the devastating impacts of drug addiction.

Recent statistics have shown that almost half of all high school students have used addictive substances, and synthetic drugs are a growing problem in Minnesota and across the country. A recent survey of 15,000 Minnesota high school students found that 26 percent have used illegal drugs, and of that group, 12 percent have used synthetic drugs.

The problem with synthetic drugs, which we have realized as I have done events with law enforcement in places such as Fargo and in places such as the suburbs of Minneapolis, is that many times people who buy these synthetic drugs get much worse drugs than the actual substance. They get much harder-core drugs, much more difficult drugs—drugs that cause them to hallucinate and drugs that cause them to either kill themselves or to hurt others. That is why I have reintroduced bipartisan legislation with Senators GRAHAM, FEINSTEIN, and GRASSLEY that would make it easier to prosecute the sale and distribution of new synthetic drugs that are analogues—or substantially similar to current illegal drugs.

What we are looking at is the fact that the people who sell these drugs or manufacture them just keep changing a compound here or there so they can skirt the law. What we are trying to do with this bill is to make it easier to prosecute the new drugs that are substantially similar. The Supreme Court actually very recently issued a decision in *McFadden* focused on the mens rea standard in analogue drug cases.

My bill, the Synthetic Abuse and Labeling of Toxic Substances or SALTS

Act is focused instead on the underlying factors for what makes something an analogue drug. Why do we need this new legislation? Because expert chemists are able to slightly alter the chemical makeup of synthetic drugs so they are no longer on the list of banned substances. To address this, current law provides the DEA with the mechanism to prosecute the sale and distribution of drugs that are analogues—analogue—that are substantially similar to controlled substances. However, the law specifically says that an analogue drug does not include any substance “not intended for human consumption.” This can be a big problem because synthetic drugs often are explicitly marked as “not intended for human consumption.” But manufacturers, distributors, sellers, and abusers of these substances all know exactly what to do with them—ingest them or snort them to get a dangerous and many times unpredictable high.

The SALTS Act amends the Controlled Substances Act to allow consideration of a number of factors when determining whether a controlled substance analogue was intended for human consumption, including looking at the marketing, advertising, and labeling of a substance and its known use. That is a much more honest way to look at what is actual consumption. You don’t just look at the fact that there is a label on it that says it because that is what the drug dealers do to protect themselves. Instead what you do is you look at what is actually going on here. You look at the marketing, advertising, and the labeling of a substance and its known use.

The bill also says the existence of some pieces of evidence that a substance was not marketed, advertised or labeled for human consumption should not stop prosecutors from being able to establish, based on all the evidence—the totality of the evidence—that the substance was, in fact, intended for human consumption.

New synthetic drugs constantly come onto the market. We need to give our law enforcement agencies the tools they need to combat them. This legislation will make it easier for prosecutors to demonstrate that a given synthetic drug is, in fact, intended for human consumption. We know that it is going on. We know that is why these guys are selling it over the Internet. They are trying to get around the law. They have actually been quite successful, causing many deaths, many people hurt, many people addicted.

So all this does is get to the facts. Is this really being used for human consumption or not? This legislation is going to make it easier for prosecutors to demonstrate with the totality of circumstances and not just the label that says it is not intended for human consumption—but looking at how it is sold, what it is used for, to make it

easier to meet that standard. That is the only way we are going to go after these guys who are constantly changing the compounds to get around the law.

I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the efforts, since we are talking about synthetic drugs, of the outgoing Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, my fellow Minnesotan, Michelle Leonhart. Administrator Leonhart has had a long career in law enforcement, serving with the DEA since 1980 and as Administrator since 2010. She started her career back in Minnesota and has served in the DEA since, for a very long time, over 30 years.

I would especially like to thank the Administrator for her work on the prescription drug take-back issue. During her tenure, the DEA has coordinated a series of national events that have collected over 2,400 tons of unused prescription drugs—2,400 tons. That is, by the way, why we worked with the Administrator—Senator CORNYN and I—to develop legislation which passed to make it easier for take-out programs, to do them more routinely, but meanwhile 2,400 tons were collected. These events are critical in preventing drug abuse and overdoses and getting old medicines out of the cabinet where people who are not prescribed them sometimes take them. I want to thank Administrator Leonhart for her law enforcement career.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PETER V. NEFFENGER TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY

NOMINATION OF DANIEL R. ELLIOTT III TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security; and Daniel R. Elliott III, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board for a term expiring December 31, 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I am delighted to serve on at least one committee with the Presiding Officer, and we have had the opportunity of late to have a number of folks come before us who have been nominated to serve. One of those is Coast Guard VADM Peter Neffenger, and I am delighted today to rise in strong support of Admiral Neffenger to serve as the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, affectionately known as TSA.

The women and men of TSA work in a very challenging environment to keep our aviation system and those of us who use it safe and secure. The mission is made all the more challenging by the two difficult and diametrically opposed tasks that we ask them to perform. On the one hand, we ask the TSA to screen some 1.8 million passengers and their luggage every day, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, without allowing a single dangerous individual—not one—or dangerous item to get through. On the other hand, we ask TSA to perform the screening as fast as possible so that travelers do not miss their flights, luggage and cargo get to their destination on time, and everybody is happy. That is what we ask them to do.

TSA’s job is, on most days, a thankless one, for which the Agency’s employees are rarely commended but often criticized. Can TSA do a better job? You bet they can. We all can do a better job. We can do a better job in the Senate.

A couple of weeks ago in the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, for example, we heard from the Department of Homeland Security’s inspector general about several troubling security vulnerabilities at our airports. The IG’s findings were more than troubling. They were unacceptable.

TSA can and must do better, but it is not all on them. We can help. Our Presiding Officer has oftentimes heard me talk about Home Depot: You can do it. We can help. The same is true here. TSA and employees can do it. We can help. We have an obligation to do that.

One of the ways we can help them do their jobs better is by voting in support of the President’s nominee for TSA Administrator, Admiral Peter Neffenger. Admiral Neffenger has served as a commissioned officer in the Coast Guard since 1982, assuming the position of

Vice Commandant in May of 2014. Throughout his nearly 34-year career in the U.S. Coast Guard, Admiral Neffenger has displayed exceptional leadership skills and the will to confront big challenges. These qualities will be very important if he is confirmed—and I hope he will be—as our next TSA Administrator.

Let me just take a moment if I can to share with my colleagues a few things that I learned about the admiral during the nominating process. First, Admiral Neffenger has a clear vision for TSA. He said the agency must strive to be an intelligence driven, risk-based counterterrorism agency.

Second, he has acknowledged the difficult challenges facing TSA today but, more importantly, he is committed to addressing them head on and striving for perfection. Finally, I learned that he is committed to working with Congress, with the inspector general, with GAO—the Government Accountability Office—and with the stakeholders to improve TSA.

But you don't have to take my word for it. Admiral Neffenger has received the support of all three former Secretaries of Homeland Security. One former Secretary of DHS, my old friend Tom Ridge, said the nominee's "experience is broad, his reputation superb, and his commitment to public service profound and unquestionable." After meeting with and getting to know Admiral Neffenger, I could not agree more.

(Mr. JOHNSON assumed the Chair.)

I thank Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON, who is here on the floor today, of the committee on commerce for working closely with our committee. The current Presiding Officer of our session here is our chairman of homeland security. I thank all of you for working closely with our committee on Admiral Neffenger's nomination. I thank Chairman JOHNSON and his staff for acting swiftly on this nomination so that it could be considered by the Senate today.

In less than 2 weeks, we will celebrate the 239th anniversary of our Nation's independence. On the days surrounding that celebration, millions of Americans will be traveling to spend time with their families and friends. We owe it to each of them to have a permanent, Senate-confirmed TSA Administrator in place. The President has given us a great name, a good man, and a good leader, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting today for Peter Neffenger.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

TRAGEDY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, before I speak about the two nominees who are before us this afternoon, I feel compelled to make a couple of brief com-

ments about the tragedy that occurred in South Carolina. Sometimes it is difficult to understand why there still seems to be so much hatred in the world.

I remember the President and First Lady of Rwanda telling my wife and me what had happened that led up to that genocide back years ago in which 1 million people were hacked to death with machetes because of the enmity and hatred between two tribes, where people didn't think of themselves as Rwandan, they thought of themselves as Hutu or Tutsi. And that enmity, that rivalry turned into hatred, and the hatred was spurred on by hate-talk over the airwaves. So we know about that sad chapter of two peoples who did unimaginable things, and here we see this continues.

I am reminded—because it is emblazoned in my mind's eye—of three decades ago and looking out the window of our spacecraft back at Earth. From that perspective, when you look back at Earth, which is so beautiful and so colorful, so creative as it is suspended in the middle of nothing, you don't see racial divisions, you don't see religious divisions, and you don't see ethnic divisions. What you see is this beautiful creation. My mind's eye carries that view constantly and that reminder that we are all in this together. Yet, on the face of the Earth, we always want to divide; we always want to separate; we want to say: You are different than I, and, as a result, I am going to take it out on you. The great genius of America is that we have overcome a lot of that by assimilating people of different colors and different races and different creeds and different backgrounds and different religions all together so that we think of ourselves as Americans first. In the world in which the Presiding Officer and I live—the world of politics—we have had a lot of that divisiveness, and we ought to be thinking of ourselves as Americans instead of as Republicans or Democrats.

This tragedy has riveted the Nation. It has riveted the Nation also on the question of the battle flag of the Confederacy.

This Senator's great-great grandfather, at the time of the Battle of Marianna, was well past 50 years. So he had not fought in the Civil War, but he was conscripted by the Home Guards to go into the Battle of Marianna, where he was taken prisoner and ended up in the northern prisoner-of-war camp, where so many of the prisoners died, in Elmira, NY. He probably survived because that winter that killed so many—the winter of 1864–1865—because he was past 50 years old, they probably did not put him in one of those cotton tents on the hillside where disease and cold took over.

But why should we attach our allegiance to a flag that represents separation instead of embracing “out of

many, one”; “In God We Trust”; “e pluribus unum”—“out of many, one”?

It was announced in the press this afternoon that the Governor of South Carolina said: Let's take that battle flag down from the capitol grounds in Columbia, SC, and put it in a museum.

We will see the ensuing fight that occurs with regard to the legislature and changing the law. It was a few years ago that a very courageous Republican Governor led the effort to take that battle flag off the top of the capitol in South Carolina and put it at that Confederate monument still on the capitol grounds. That courageous Republican Governor lost his next election as a result of that.

So it is time for us to move on. It is time for us to start thinking about unity and coming together. As the Good Book says, come, let us reason together.

Those are the remarks I wanted to make.

I wish to speak about our two nominees.

The nominee for TSA whom the Senator from Delaware just spoke about, Coast Guard VADM Peter Neffenger, has obviously had a distinguished career. His reputation precedes him, with 34 years in a variety of capacities. He has expertise in critical areas of crisis management and port security, which will serve him well as the head of TSA, and I believe the Senate will confirm him today. He was involved in that disastrous oilspill in the gulf. He was the national incident commander and he helped lead that emergency response. We are still seeing the results of that spill, those of us on the gulf coast, and that disaster required coordination between all levels of government and all of its agencies, as well as the management of people and technology.

Recently, it has been pointed out, as we receive new information about the status and condition of that ruptured well, the incident command had to weigh the risk and make difficult choices with a lot of incomplete information. Well, he exhibited strong leadership then, and I believe he will give that leadership to an agency which needs that strong leadership now.

The next nominee we will consider is Daniel Elliott to be a member of the Surface Transportation Board. That is an important agency which helps ensure we have a strong and efficient rail network to move goods throughout the United States.

We know how vital the railroad industry is to our economy and getting goods to market. We have to do that, and we can't do it with just trucks. We need the bulk of the materials to be carried on the rails. Decisions made by the Surface Transportation Board have long-lasting impacts on our Nation's economic competitiveness, and that is why last week the Senate passed the

Surface Transportation Board Reauthorization Act of 2015—to make the agency more efficient and effective.

We need individuals who are qualified to serve, and Daniel Elliott is such an individual. Earlier this year, he was nominated to be reappointed as a member of the Board. He previously served as Chairman. He also has had a great deal of experience as an attorney, including close to two decades litigating in the transportation sector. I ask the Senate to join in and support Mr. Elliott's nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, in the next couple of days, the Supreme Court is going to rule on a case that will have a long-lasting impact not only on just what health care is going on in this country but a long-lasting impact on how the law is to be interpreted. This is a law called the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. It was hurried through Congress before anyone had time to read it, and it contained multiple mistakes and contradictions.

Already this administration has unilaterally changed this law over 30 times to try to make it work, including completely rewriting a section about who gets the subsidies and who lives underneath the mandates. The law says the States that set up an exchange as a State exchange are under the subsidies and also have those mandates, but the administration claims that, no, it was intended for everyone.

Within days, the Supreme Court will release their opinion on this matter in a case called *King v. Burwell* and basically answer this one question: Does the law mean what the law says or does the law mean what the administration interprets it to mean?

This is not a political problem; this is a health care problem for millions of people. These days, the discussion seems to circle around on who is to blame. Well, people and families were hurt in the ObamaCare chaos because of the way this law was written. They are not worried about blame; they are worried about the issues facing their family in the days ahead. I have the obligation to do whatever I can to protect the people of my State from the harmful effects of this law, and there are many.

The people in my State distinctly heard people say 5 years ago: If you like your health care, you can keep it, except for the people who were forced off the State-run exchange that already existed in Oklahoma and were

pushed out—ObamaCare, that is 5 years old, came after *Insure Oklahoma*, which is 10 years old—except for the people who have higher deductibles in my State, except for the people who now have higher premiums in my State. In Oklahoma this year, the requested rate increase for health care is between 11 and 45 percent, depending on the plan and the county you live in. This year's rate increase is between 11 and 45 percent.

In addition, physician-owned hospitals are trapped in time, not allowed to grow larger than what they were 5 years ago. Many people in my State like the physician-owned hospitals, and they want to see it succeed, instead of being slowly bled to death.

People struggle to find a job in places in my State because of this 40-hour requirement that hangs over them. They now have to find two jobs, each having about 28 hours, so they can keep up the amount of pay. Those individuals were hurt in this process.

Higher premium costs in the plans will soon come to those in unions because they have too good of health care insurance. In the short days ahead, union members who have premium health care policies will now get a penalty for having insurance that is too good for this administration.

By next year, the Independent Payment Advisory Board kicks off its work. Its sole responsibility is to find areas to be able to save money by cutting options for patients.

This is not a mess that can be fixed with one sentence—unless that one sentence says “the bill is repealed.”

So how do we solve this in the days ahead? Let me lay out a couple of ideas before the Senate because very soon we are going to be confronted with this when the Supreme Court actually responds.

First, do the basic things: Do no harm and stop the existing harm. We need to transition out of the subsidies and mandates of ObamaCare for millions of people who will lose their subsidy when the Court rules in favor of the American people and the law of the United States—the clear text reading of the law.

Those individuals who were forced into ObamaCare are not the problem. We are not angry at those individuals. They are trapped in a mess that was made around them that they were forced into.

I will never forget a conversation I had with a Democrat in my State who was participating in a plan called *Insure Oklahoma*—who liked their insurance plan. It was a subsidized plan from our State. They pulled me aside 5 years ago and said: Is there any way I can keep the State-based plan I have now? And all I could do is look at him and say, no, you can't, actually, and that is not my decision. The Affordable Care Act which was passed and the

Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services and HHS forced the people in my State out of a State-based solution for health care and into the larger national solution. Many Oklahomans lost their health care coverage and were forced out of it. It was already a subsidized system, and now they were taken from one plan and pushed into another. Let's do no harm, and let's try to help those individuals to be able to find their way back to a plan they like and help in that transition.

The second thing is pretty straightforward: States should have the freedom to choose any path to help their citizens. States should not have to check in with the Federal Government to ask permission to take care of their neighbors and citizens. How ridiculous is that; that a State leadership would have to go to the Federal Government to say we want to develop a plan to be able to help our own citizens, and the Federal Government says, no, they have to check in with us instead.

This is basically a repeal option for all 50 States. For those States that like it, we would say, if you like your ObamaCare, you can keep it, and for all the States that don't, they have their own way out to be able to take care of their own citizens.

The tax money that is being supplemented for those came from those States. Why shouldn't it be returned to those States and give the States the ability to be able to speak to that issue for their own citizens. We have to stop this mentality that only the people of Washington, DC, love the individuals in each State and want to care for them and be able to manage what is happening in that State. That State leadership deeply cares about their own citizens. Let's let them step up and lead.

Third is probably the clearest of all of them: People should have the freedom to choose any health care plan they want. What a radical idea, to actually hand people freedom, to hand people opportunities. Free of the mandates and the penalties, patients should be able to pick their own doctor and their own plan for their own family.

I have to say, it is ironic. I hear people call this law either ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act. I am fascinated with that because the law's name is the “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.” Over the last 5 years, the words “patient protection” seem to have disappeared from every part of everyone's vernacular in this. I would only have to say, I agree.

When did we stop saying to the patient: You have no ability to make your own choices. I will tell you when. When ObamaCare passed and everything became about affordable rather than about patient. We have seen the consequences of this.

In the days ahead, the Supreme Court will rule on this, and I believe

strongly they are going to rule for the plain text of the law, not just about ObamaCare but because they have to make the decision as the Supreme Court: Does the law mean what the law says or can any administration on any law in the future reinterpret it based on their preferences?

If there is one area that would be a great path for us to follow, it is in the days ahead that we get back to the government is about the law, and we follow the law because we are a nation of laws, not just a nation of leaders. The law is to be king in our Nation.

So let's interpret it the way it is written and let's give people back the freedom they want and need. Let's put the patient back in health care. That is the next step I think we should take in this U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

VOTE ON NEFFENGER NOMINATION

The question occurs on the Neffenger nomination.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator

from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 217 Ex.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Ayotte	Fischer	Murray
Baldwin	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Gillibrand	Perdue
Blumenthal	Grassley	Peters
Booker	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hirono	Roberts
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sanders
Capito	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Manchin	Tillis
Cornyn	Markey	Udall
Cotton	McCain	Vitter
Daines	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	McConnell	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Mikulski	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden

NAYS—1

Sasse

NOT VOTING—18

Blunt	Graham	Rounds
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Corker	Kirk	Scott
Crapo	Lee	Tester
Cruz	Menendez	Thune
Franken	Murkowski	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON ELLIOTT NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Daniel R. Elliott III, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board for a term expiring December 31, 2018?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 217 and the voice vote that followed. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall vote No. 217, the confirmation of Peter V. Neffenger to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, I would have voted yea; on the voice vote, the confirmation of Daniel R. Elliott III to be a member of the Surface Transportation Board, I would have voted yea. •

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Arizona.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, nearly 12 million Americans, including 500,000 Iowans—more than that, actually—now have access to affordable health coverage because of the Affordable Care Act, and many for the first time in their lives.

We know what the health care law has meant in Ohio and across the country. Patients can't be dropped from coverage or charged higher rates just because they got sick. Also, 97,000 young Ohioans have been able to stay on their parents' health insurance until their 26th birthday, giving them the chance to focus on careers, education, and future plans. Lifetime insurance caps are no longer bankrupting people with chronic conditions. Those with preexisting conditions, such as children with diabetes and asthma, will no longer be denied coverage or charged higher premiums.

But despite all of these successes, the Supreme Court of the United States is currently considering a case that can take affordable health care away from hundreds of thousands of Ohioans, tens of thousands in the State of Oklahoma, and millions of Americans.

In Ohio alone, 161,000 people are at risk of losing access to affordable health coverage in the King v. Burwell decision that the Court will soon hand down. These Ohioans receive an annual subsidy of about \$240 a month to help them purchase private insurance plans. That is an average of nearly \$3,000 per person per year. Hard-working families stand to lose even more.

Taking away those subsidies—as many of my Republican colleagues have pushed the Court to do—would amount to a massive tax increase on Ohioans already struggling to get by. These same Republican colleagues have not come up with a workable solution if the Court rules their way. They have pushed this case all the way to the Supreme Court only to leave 161,000 Ohioans and nearly 12 million Americans without access to affordable coverage.

We know what this new access to health insurance has meant for families in my State. Let me read from a couple of letters.

This spring I met with Jumaane Cook from Parma Heights and his 5-year-old son James. Jumaane is 34 years old and has lived in Ohio for most of his life. He became insured for the first time in his adult life just last year when he purchased insurance for

himself and his son on the Federal exchange.

Jumaane was a college athlete but he tore his ACL in 2007. His injury left him unable to play sports, and his lack of insurance left him unable to afford treatment. Jumaane came to Washington to tell us how important the Affordable Care Act and his subsidy are to him and to his son. Because his employer doesn't offer health insurance, without the Federal subsidy Jumaane would be forced to go without insurance again and his son would have to go on public assistance.

Jumaane is not alone.

Rachael in Cincinnati wrote to me when the Supreme Court decided to hear the Burwell case. She and her husband "have insured ourselves through individual insurance since 2008. It has been difficult and, at times, we have had to go without insurance simply due to the incredibly high cost of insurance in our area. We have paid our premiums every month. I will be fit-to-bed if I have to look for health insurance again. I was disappointed with what I could afford on the Federal exchange. And, I fear I will not be able to afford any insurance if I lose my subsidy."

Lisa in Athens wrote:

I have been reviewing plans on Healthcare.gov. At my age—over 60, but not Medicare-eligible—the premiums are high, even for the Bronze plans. It concerns me that a court may rule that the subsidies are not available to those who access the Federal exchange.

That is why these subsidies exist—to help people such as Lisa afford coverage, regardless of where they live.

Jim from Streetsboro, near Akron, wrote, saying that he is "62, drawing a pension, on Social Security, and paying COBRA health care to the tune of \$1,200 a month." Jim is looking forward to buying cheaper insurance coverage through the Federal exchange, which he should be able to afford. He wrote: "At least that was the plan until someone decided to try and derail the ACA for the umpteenth time. If things go bad with this decision, please do all you can to remember those who have worked their entire lives"—to remember those who have worked their entire lives.

What the Supreme Court could do, and what clearly most Republican Members of this body and the House of Representatives want the Supreme Court to do, is to strike this part of this law down so that 161,000 Ohioans will either lose their insurance by losing their subsidy or pay increased fees—taxes in the years ahead.

Connie in Cincinnati wrote to me after the lower court decision came down. She said the ACA has been "a Godsend" for her. Connie wrote:

I believe strongly in the importance of having health care and have recently qualified for a catastrophic health plan with tax credits on healthcare.gov.

As you know, Ohio is one of those States that opted out of establishing its own State plans. That was not a problem until yesterday. Now, facing a plan that may be ineligible for the federal tax credit, I face a dire financial situation.

Connie says:

I have willingly paid my fair share of taxes throughout my life. My tax dollars helped bail out banks and automobile corporations. I need my government to look out for me.

The Supreme Court needs to hear from people such as Connie and Jim and Jumaane and Lisa and Rachael. These are hard-working Ohioans, most of whom have worked their entire life, but, unfortunately for them, have not worked for a company that has provided affordable health care. They have spent large chunks of their paychecks on health care, even with Federal subsidies. The Supreme Court should remember that before it takes away affordable coverage. That is a lifeline to these Ohioans and to so many millions of Americans.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MS. SENIOR NEVADA PAGEANT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Ms. Senior Nevada, Inc., on the organization's 30th anniversary.

Since it was founded in 1985, Ms. Senior Nevada, Inc., has honored the talents and accomplishments of senior women throughout the State of Nevada. The first Ms. Senior Nevada Pageant was held in 1986 at the former Sahara Hotel and Casino. At the time, only one contestant from each county was able to compete in the pageant. Today, the Ms. Senior Nevada Pageant is open to all women in Nevada who are age 60 or older, to celebrate the "age of elegance."

The contestants in the Ms. Senior Nevada pageant must demonstrate their strengths in four areas: talent, evening gown, philosophy of life, and an interview. The winner of the pageant represents Nevada on the national stage at the Ms. Senior America pageant. During her reigning year, Ms. Senior Nevada travels throughout the State to discuss a variety of issues affecting senior citizens and promotes her platform. Past Ms. Senior Nevada platforms have included "for the good of seniors" and "responsible pet ownership."

I commend Ms. Senior Nevada, Inc., on recognizing exceptional senior women in the Silver State for 30 years,

and I applaud their service to the State of Nevada.

RECOGNIZING WENLIANG WANG

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize entrepreneur and philanthropist Wenliang Wang for his commitment and dedication to restoring one of the world's most impressive wetlands, the Dandong Yalu River Estuary Wetland in China.

Mr. Wang is well-known in his country as the founder and chairman of the China Rilin Construction Group, which is among the largest private construction companies in China. Rilin is also the owner and operator of the Port of Dandong, a vital trading hub in Liaoning Province located in northeast China. Though Mr. Wang has important business ties to this region, it is his private efforts and personal connection to the area that has influenced him to invest millions of dollars in the restoration of the Dandong Yalu River Estuary Wetland.

Not far from Dandong Port, sit the Dandong wetlands. Bird watchers, scientists, and outdoor enthusiasts travel from around the world to Liaoning to study the area and watch the native species and migratory birds, including those that fly from New Zealand to Alaska each year. Mr. Wang recognized the significance of safeguarding and enhancing these wetlands. With his support, restoration work to revitalize the fields, shrimp pond, and tidal basin has made this important migratory destination a sanctuary for all of the species that depend on the wetland.

Today, the Dandong wetlands are among the most inhabited wetlands in the world, which includes feeding and resting areas for hundreds of thousands of migrating and wading birds, such as the rare saunders' gull. It is my understanding that there are approximately 14,000 of these birds left in the world and more than 1,300 have made the wetland their home.

I applaud Mr. Wang for his commitment to protecting the internationally significant Dandong Yalu River Estuary Wetland and wish him the very best in his continued efforts to protect our environment and restore these important sites.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING ARKANSAS POWER LINEMEN

• Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would like to recognize 12 Arkansas power linemen who recently traveled to Guatemala as volunteers with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's International Foundation to put into action cooperative principle number 6—cooperation among cooperatives. On their recent trip, Doug Evans, Kyle

Metcalfe, Andy Caywood, Michael Counts, Andy Ward, Brent Hufstедler, Kirk Kempson, Kris Rankin, Joey Burk, Paul Garrison, Ryan Hayes, and Will Glover donated their time and expertise to help those less fortunate.

Over 19 days, these men built an electric distribution system that extended 4 miles to the agricultural communities of Jolom Ijix and Zapotal. Their work connected homes to an electric grid powered by a small hydroelectric plant, helping bring electricity to these communities for the first time. Electricity plays a critical role in providing health care, education, access to clean water, and economic opportunity, and I am proud to have these Arkansans help the people of Jolom Ijix and Zapotal along the path towards long-lasting growth.

These 12 men and the many other volunteers from electric co-ops in Arkansas have traveled to Guatemala for rural electrification projects in recent years. Their compassion and spirit represent the best of our State. As a result of their efforts, the residents of these Guatemalan communities will see an immeasurable improvement in their quality of life. These volunteers, like others before them, have created a lasting impact on regions that need help the most.●

NATIVE AMERICAN CODE TALKERS

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to recognize four American heroes who exemplify the best Montana has to offer: Samson Birdinground, Cyril Not Afraid, Barney Old Coyote and Henry Old Coyote.

These men selflessly served our country during World War II by offering up the Apsaalooké Crow, language as part of a national “code-talk” program. This program used the unique style of several Native American languages to transmit and receive military intelligence, providing crucial communication to forces overseas.

These four brave gentlemen sacrificed much to defend their homeland during the war. Using skilled knowledge of the Apsaalooké tongue, they worked closely with American defense forces. The beautiful complexity of the Crow language allowed it to be processed without fear of enemy breach, leading the program to successfully save countless lives.

All four heroes were recently awarded Congress’ most prestigious honor: the Congressional Gold Medal. Their families will ceremoniously accept the medals on behalf of their forefathers this week.

Apsaalooké, or Crow, Nation has a rich heritage of members going above and beyond the call of duty, and these men are decidedly no exception. We Montanans are proud of our diverse heritage, and it is truly an honor to celebrate individuals who so humbly embody the spirit of patriotism.●

RECOGNIZING DR. PAUL HOMMERT

● Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Dr. Paul Hommert on his retirement. I have had the pleasure of working with Paul on a number of occasions during his tenure with Sandia National Laboratories. I greatly appreciate and respect his professionalism, knowledge, and dedication as the director of Sandia National Laboratories and president of Sandia Corporation. Paul has given a great deal to this Nation and to its defense. The importance of his work directly involves the complex threats facing our country focusing on national security and technology innovation.

Paul began his career with Sandia as a member of the technical staff in 1976 and then gradually moved to positions of increased responsibility in a broad range of programs and management assignments. He initially led programs supporting energy research, and from the mid- to late-1990s, he was director of engineering sciences. Later in his career, Dr. Hommert became the Director of Research and Applied Science at the Atomic Weapons Establishment in the United Kingdom, where he led the science and engineering organization responsible for the United Kingdom’s nuclear deterrent. From 2003 to 2006, Dr. Hommert led the Applied Physics Division at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The division was responsible for nuclear weapon design and assessment, weapon performance code development, and weapon science support. Dr. Hommert returned to Sandia to become vice president of Sandia’s California site, a position he held until 2009, when he transitioned to Sandia’s main site in Albuquerque to become Executive Vice President and Deputy Laboratories Director for the Nuclear Weapons Program. In July 2010, Dr. Hommert became the Director of Sandia National Laboratories and President of Sandia Corporation.

Throughout his distinguished career, Paul has received numerous awards, such as the Outstanding Alumnus Award for Professional Excellence from Purdue’s School of Mechanical Engineering, and a Distinguished Engineering Alumni Award from Purdue’s College of Engineering. In addition, Dr. Hommert was named Laboratory Director of the Year in 2013 by the Federal Laboratory Consortium for his support of Sandia’s technology transfer activities. This award recognizes federal laboratories and their industry partners for outstanding technology transfer efforts and has become one of the most prestigious honors in technology transfer. Paul has represented our country with integrity and honor, and it is my privilege to thank him for his contribution to our nation’s security. I wish him best of luck, continued happiness, and offer my congratulations on his retirement.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 160. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 160. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1973. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Sethoxydim; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9928-20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1974. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Di-n-butyl carbonate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 9928-63-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1975. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Reserve Account” (RIN0575-AC99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1976. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and

Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Michael J. Connor, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1977. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), Department of Defense, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1978. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Chief Management Officer, Department of Defense, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1979. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of ten (10) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1980. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report relative to the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1981. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Charlotte-Rock Hill; Base Year Emissions Inventory and Emissions Statements Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9928-88-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1982. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revision to the New York State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide" (FRL No. 9929-11-Region 2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1983. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets and General Conformity Budgets for the Scranton/Wilkes-Barre 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Maintenance Area" (FRL No. 9929-07-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1984. A communication from the Chair of the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Ac-

cess Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP" to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1985. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-017); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1986. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-024); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1987. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-026); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1988. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-047); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1989. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-056); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1990. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-030); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1991. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-038); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1992. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-037); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1993. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-042); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1994. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-149); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1995. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-033); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1996. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Admiral James A. Winnefeld, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1997. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting proposed legislation entitled "Modernization of Military Retirement System"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1998. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)" (RIN3170-AA19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1999. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of the Australia Group (AG) November 2013 Intersessional Decisions" (RIN0694-AG45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2000. A communication from the Chairman of the Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Appraisal Subcommittee's 2014 Annual Report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2001. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the feasibility study that was undertaken to document the development of a project for navigation of Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and New Hampshire; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2002. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sixty-Month Period of Employment Requirement for Government Pension Offset Exemption" (RIN0960-AG50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2003. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Documents and Regulatory Management, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Obsolete Provisions" (45 CFR Part 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2004. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary" ((RIN0938-AS54) (CMS-9938-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2005. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary" (RIN1210-AB69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2006. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification; Mica-Based

Pearlescent Pigments” (Docket Nos. FDA-2014-C-1616 and FDA-2015-C-0245) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2007. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Progress Report on the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program and National Cord Blood Inventory Program”; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2008. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Progress Report on the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program and National Cord Blood Inventory Program”; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2009. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015 and the Semi-Annual Report of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2010. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “2014 Report to Congress on the Benefits and Costs of Federal Regulations and Unfunded Mandates on State, Local, and Tribal Entities”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2011. A communication from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s Semiannual Report from the Office of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015 and a report entitled “Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2012. A communication from the Director, Policy and Planning Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; Rate Setting for Community-Rated Plans” (RIN3206-AN00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2013. A communication from the Director, Recruitment and Hiring, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Designation of National Security Positions in the Competitive Service, and Related Matters” (RIN3206-AM73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2014. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2015. A communication from the Acting Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting,

pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Presumption of Herbicide Exposure and Presumption of Disability During Service For Reservists Presumed Exposed to Herbicide” (RIN2900-AP43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-2016. A communication from the Acting Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Delegations of Authority: Office of Regulation Policy and Management (ORPM)” (RIN2900-AP47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-2017. A joint communication from the Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Report”; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-2018. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations” (RIN0648-BE83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2019. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Small-Mesh Multispecies Specifications” (RIN0648-BE87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2020. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Special Management Zones for Delaware Artificial Reefs” (RIN0648-BD42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2021. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648-XD973) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2022. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary/Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2023. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Carriage of

Digital Television Broadcast Signals: Amendment to Part 76 of the Commission’s Rules” (CS Docket No. 98-120, FCC 15-65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2024. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gray Triggerfish” (RIN0648-XD901) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2025. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment to the Commission’s Rules Concerning Effective Competition” (MB Docket No. 15-53, FCC 15-62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-44. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging the United States Congress to enact legislation allowing individual states to establish daylight saving time as the standard time in their respective states throughout the calendar year; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, When Congress enacted The Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973 (Pub. L. No. 93-182, 87 Stat. 707), it included in its findings and declarations of policy that “various studies of governmental and nongovernmental agencies indicate that year-round daylight saving time would produce an energy saving in electrical power consumption”; and

Whereas, Congress also found and declared that “the use of year-round daylight saving time could have other beneficial effects on the public interest, including the reduction of crime, improved traffic safety, more daylight outdoor playtime for children and youth of our Nation, [and] greater utilization of parks and recreation areas”; and

Whereas, Congress also found and declared that the use of year-round daylight saving time could result in “expanded economic opportunity through extension of daylight hours to peak shopping hours and through extension of domestic office hours to periods of greater overlap with the European Economic Community”; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That the Nevada Legislature urges the members of Congress to enact appropriate legislation to give individual states the option of establishing daylight saving time as the standard time in their respective states throughout the calendar year; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the

House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 544. A bill to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible (Rept. No. 114-69).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1640. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve immigration law enforcement within the interior of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1641. A bill to improve the use by the Department of Veterans Affairs of opioids in treating veterans, to improve patient advocacy by the Department, and to expand availability of complementary and integrative health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1642. A bill to reduce Federal, State, and local costs of providing high-quality drinking water to millions of people in the United States residing in rural communities by facilitating greater use of cost-effective alternative systems, including well water systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 207. A resolution recognizing threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority in efforts of the United States Government to promote democracy and good governance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Con. Res. 18. A concurrent resolution recognizing the daisy as the flower for military caregivers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 33

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 33, a bill to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 497

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 800

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to improve, coordinate, and enhance rehabilitation research at the National Institutes of Health.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 968

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 968, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Academy of Sciences to study the vehicle handling requirements proposed by the Commission for recreational off-highway vehicles and to prohibit the adoption of any such requirements until the completion of the study, and for other purposes.

S. 1135

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 1149

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1149, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require reporting of certain data by providers and suppliers of air ambulance services for purposes of reforming reimbursements for such services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1190

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved

areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1347

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1347, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes.

S. 1362

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1362, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs).

S. 1427

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1427, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to facilitate increased coordination and alignment between the public and private sector with respect to quality and efficiency measures.

S. 1509

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1509, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1538

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1538, a bill to reform the financing of Senate elections, and for other purposes.

S. 1544

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Missouri

(Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1544, a bill to rescind unused earmarks provided for the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 200

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 200, a resolution wishing His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama a happy 80th birthday on July 6, 2015, and recognizing the outstanding contributions His Holiness has made to the promotion of non-violence, human rights, interfaith dialogue, environmental awareness, and democracy.

S. RES. 204

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 204, a resolution recognizing June 20, 2015 as "World Refugee Day".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 207—RECOGNIZING THREATS TO FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND EXPRESSION AROUND THE WORLD AND REAFFIRMING FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AS A PRIORITY IN EFFORTS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO PROMOTE DEMOCRACY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 207

Whereas Article 19 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted at Paris December 10, 1948, states that "everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers";

Whereas, in 1993, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed May 3 of each year as "World Press Freedom Day" to celebrate the fundamental principles of freedom of the press, to evaluate freedom of the press around the world, to defend the media from attacks on its independence, and to pay tribute to journalists who have lost their lives in the exercise of their profession;

Whereas, on December 18, 2013, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/68/163) on the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity, which unequivocally condemns all attacks and violence against journalists and media workers, including torture, extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, arbitrary detention, and intimidation and harassment in both conflict and non-conflict situations;

Whereas 2015 is the 22nd anniversary of World Press Freedom Day, which focuses on

the theme "Let Journalism Thrive! Towards Better Reporting, Gender Equality, and Media Safety in the Digital Age";

Whereas the 2015 World Press Freedom prize was awarded to Syrian journalist and human rights activist Mazen Darwish, who remains imprisoned by the Assad regime;

Whereas the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-166; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note), which was passed by unanimous consent in the Senate and signed into law by President Barack Obama in 2010, expanded the examination of freedom of the press around the world in the annual human rights report of the Department of State;

Whereas, according to Freedom House, only approximately 14 percent of the world's inhabitants—or one in seven people—live in countries with a press ranked as "Free" by Freedom House;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, 69 journalists and 19 citizen journalists were killed in 2014 in connection with their collection and dissemination of news and information;

Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, the 3 deadliest countries for journalists on assignment in 2014 were Syria, Ukraine, and Iraq;

Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, more than 40 percent of the journalists killed in 2014 were targeted for murder and 31 percent of journalists murdered reported receiving threats first;

Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, 650 journalists have been killed between 1992 and April 2015 without the perpetrators of such crimes facing punishment;

Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, the 5 countries with the highest number of journalist murders that go unpunished, measured from 2004 to 2014, are Iraq, Somalia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Syria;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, 853 journalists and 122 citizen journalists were arrested in 2014;

Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, 221 journalists worldwide were in prison as of December 1, 2014;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, the 5 countries with the highest number of journalists in prison as of December 8, 2014 were China, Eritrea, Iran, Egypt, and Syria;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders' 2015 World Press Freedom Index, Eritrea, North Korea, Turkmenistan, Syria, and China ranked lowest according to a range of criteria that include "media pluralism and independence, respect for the safety and freedom of journalists, and the legislative, institutional and infrastructural environment in which the media operate";

Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, in 2014 Syria was the world's deadliest country for journalists for the third year in a row;

Whereas, according to the International Federation of Journalists, more than 40 journalists and media staff have been killed since January 2015;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, the Government of the Russian Federation continued to intensify its pressure on the media to bring independent news outlets under control or be throttled out of existence;

Whereas Freedom House has cited a deteriorating environment for internet freedom around the world and ranked Iran, Syria, China, Cuba, and Ethiopia as "Not Free" and having the worst obstacles to access, limits

on content, and violations of user rights among the 65 countries and territories rated by Freedom House in 2014;

Whereas freedom of the press is absolutely essential to the creation and maintenance of free and open societies and a key component of democratic governance, the activism of civil society, and socioeconomic development; and

Whereas freedom of the press enhances public accountability, transparency, and participation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates World Press Freedom Day by commending journalists like Mazen Darwish and others around the world for the vital role they play in supporting open and democratic societies, promoting government accountability, and strengthening civil society;

(2) expresses concern about the threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world, and pays tribute to journalists who have lost their lives carrying out their work;

(3) pays tribute to the journalists who have lost their lives carrying out their work;

(4) calls on governments abroad to implement United Nations General Assembly Resolution (A/RES/68/163), by thoroughly investigating and seeking to resolve outstanding cases of violence against journalists, including murders and kidnappings, while ensuring the protection of witnesses;

(5) condemns all actions around the world that suppress freedom of the press, including: the brutal murders of journalists by the terrorist group ISIS, violent attacks against media outlets like the French satirical magazine *Charlie Hebdo*, and kidnappings of journalists and media workers in eastern Ukraine by pro-Russian militant groups;

(6) reaffirms the centrality of freedom of the press to efforts by the United States Government to support democracy, mitigate conflict, and promote good governance domestically and around the world; and

(7) calls on the President and the Secretary of State—

(A) to improve the means by which the United States Government rapidly identifies, publicizes, and responds to threats against freedom of the press around the world;

(B) to urge foreign governments to transparently investigate and bring to justice the perpetrators of attacks against journalists; and

(C) to highlight the issue of threats against freedom of the press year-round.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18—RECOGNIZING THE DAISY AS THE FLOWER FOR MILITARY CAREGIVERS

Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 18

Whereas military caregivers are nameless, courageous, giving individuals whose determination and sacrifices are rarely acknowledged and little-known outside of the military community;

Whereas a military caregiver provides medical care to a member of the uniformed services or veteran who suffers from a physical, mental, or emotional wound or injury;

Whereas a military caregiver is a father, mother, spouse, sibling, family member, or

loved one of an injured member of the uniformed services or veteran;

Whereas since the first armed conflict of the United States, injured veterans have been cared for by family members and loved ones after returning home from combat;

Whereas since the Revolutionary War, military caregivers in the United States have tended to injured veterans as the veterans have recovered from seen and unseen wounds from combat operations;

Whereas military caregivers have shown time and time again, regardless of the conflict, that caring for those who return home is a part of the character of the United States;

Whereas many of the members of the uniformed services and veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom—

(1) suffered wounds or injuries; and

(2) require assistance from a caregiver to complete either activities of daily living such as bathing, dressing, and feeding, or instrumental activities such as transportation, meal preparation, and health management;

Whereas, according to a study of military caregivers conducted by the RAND Corporation, as many as 1,000,000 spouses, parents, and children of veterans have served or are currently serving as caregivers to veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas section 1672 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 1071 note; 122 Stat. 481) introduced an expansion of medical care available to family caregivers;

Whereas the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 124 Stat. 1130) facilitated a new program for access to health insurance, mental health services, caregiver training, and respite care by family caregivers of veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas the love and loyalty of military caregivers—

(1) endures through the hardships of extended hospital stays, multiple surgeries, and lifetimes of care; and

(2) helps create a fresh start that is hopeful even during difficult times;

Whereas the daisy is a flower that symbolizes both—

(1) loyalty to love; and

(2) new beginnings; and

Whereas there is no more appropriate representation of the devotion and determination to overcome obstacles shown every day by military caregivers than the daisy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) honors military caregivers for service and sacrifice to the United States;

(2) encourages the people of the United States—

(A) to show support to military families; and

(B) to recognize the sacrifices endured by those families in service to the United States; and

(3) recognizes the daisy as the flower for military caregivers.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2070. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2065 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and

Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2071. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2072. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2146, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2073. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2146, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2074. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2146, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2075. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2146, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2076. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BLUMENTHAL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 91, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2070. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2065 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VII, add the following:
SEC. 7. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE INSPECTION AND GRADING PROGRAM.

(a) FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008.—Effective June 18, 2008, section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 2130) is repealed.

(b) AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014.—Effective February 7, 2014, section 12106 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79; 128 Stat. 981) is repealed.

(c) APPLICATION.—The Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if the provisions of law struck by this section had not been enacted.

SA 2071. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE INSPECTION AND GRADING PROGRAM.

(a) **FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008.**—Effective June 18, 2008, section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 2130) is repealed.

(b) **AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014.**—Effective February 7, 2014, section 12106 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79; 128 Stat. 981) is repealed.

(c) **APPLICATION.**—The Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if the provisions of law struck by this section had not been enacted.

SA 2072. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective on the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), section 11016 of that Act (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 2130) and the amendments made by that section are repealed.

(b) **APPLICATION.**—The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) and the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 2130) and the amendments made by that section had not been enacted.

SA 2073. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Subtitle A—Application of Provisions Relating to Trade Adjustment Assistance

SEC. 201. APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) **REPEAL OF SNAPBACK.**—Section 233 of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-40; 125 Stat. 416) is repealed.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.**—Except as otherwise provided in this title, the provisions of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on December 31, 2013, and as amended by this title, shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to petitions for certification filed under chapter 2, 3, or 6 of title II of the Trade

Act of 1974 on or after such date of enactment.

(c) **REFERENCES.**—Except as otherwise provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of any such chapter, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

Subtitle B—Extension of Trade Adjustment Assistance Program

SEC. 211. EXTENSION OF TERMINATION PROVISIONS.

Section 285 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended by striking “2013” each place it appears and inserting “2020”.

SEC. 212. TRAINING FUNDS.

Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “and 2013” and inserting “through 2020”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “2013” each place it appears and inserting “2020”.

SEC. 213. REEMPLOYMENT TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

Section 246(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2318(b)(1)) is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2020”.

SEC. 214. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.**—Section 245(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2317(a)) is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2020”.

(b) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.**—Section 255(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2345(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$16,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000”;

(2) by striking “and 2013” and inserting “through 2020”;

(3) by striking “\$4,000,000” and inserting “\$6,250,000”; and

(4) by striking “October 1, 2013, and ending on December 31, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2020, and ending on December 31, 2020”.

(c) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITIES.**—Section 272(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2372(a)) is amended by striking “\$40,000,000” and all that follows through “December 31, 2010” and inserting “such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2020 and for the period beginning October 1, 2020, and ending December 31, 2020”.

(d) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS.**—Section 298(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401g(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and 2013” and inserting “through 2020”; and

(2) by striking “October 1, 2013, and ending on December 31, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2020, and ending on December 31, 2020”.

SEC. 215. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC AGENCY WORKERS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 247 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2319) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “The” and inserting “Subject to section 222(d)(5), the”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or service sector firm” and inserting “, service sector firm, or public agency”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(19) The term ‘public agency’ means a department or agency of a State or local government or of the Federal Government, or a subdivision thereof.”.

(b) **GROUP ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2272) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **ADVERSELY AFFECTED WORKERS IN PUBLIC AGENCIES.**—A group of workers in a public agency shall be certified by the Secretary as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under this chapter pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 if the Secretary determines that—

“(1) a significant number or proportion of the workers in the public agency have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

“(2) the public agency has acquired from a foreign country services like or directly competitive with services which are supplied by such agency; and

“(3) the acquisition of services described in paragraph (2) contributed importantly to such workers’ separation or threat of separation.”;

(3) in subsection (d) (as redesignated), by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **REFERENCE TO FIRM.**—For purposes of subsections (a) and (b), the term ‘firm’ does not include a public agency.”; and

(4) in paragraph (2) of subsection (e) (as redesignated), by striking “subsection (a) or (b)” and inserting “subsection (a), (b), or (c)”.

SEC. 216. LIMITATIONS ON TRADE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES.

(a) **LIMITATIONS.**—Section 233(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2293(a)(3)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “65 additional weeks in the 78-week period” and inserting “78 additional weeks in the 91-week period”.

(b) **PAYMENT OF TRADE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES TO COMPLETE TRAINING.**—Section 233(f) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2293(f)) is amended by striking “13” each place it appears and inserting “26”.

SEC. 217. JOB SEARCH AND RELOCATION ALLOWANCES.

(a) **JOB SEARCH ALLOWANCES.**—Section 237 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2297) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking “Each State” and all that follows through “an adversely affected worker” and inserting “An adversely affected worker”; and

(B) by striking “to file” and inserting “may file”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “not more than 90 percent” and inserting “100 percent”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$1,250” and inserting “\$1,500”; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “a State may” and inserting “the Secretary shall”.

(b) **RELOCATION ALLOWANCES.**—Section 238 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2298) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking “Each State” and all that follows through “an adversely affected worker” and inserting “An adversely affected worker”; and

(B) by striking “to file” and inserting “may file”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “not more than 90 percent” and inserting “100 percent”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$1,250” and inserting “\$1,500”.

SEC. 218. REEMPLOYMENT TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 246(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2318(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(B)—
(A) in clause (ii), by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$55,000”; and

(B) in clause (iii)(I), by striking “and is not enrolled” and inserting “whether or not the worker is enrolled”; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking “\$10,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$12,000”.

Subtitle C—General Provisions**SEC. 221. APPLICABILITY OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS.**

(a) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—

(1) PETITIONS FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014, AND BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CERTIFICATIONS OF WORKERS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(i) CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) RECONSIDERATION OF DENIALS OF CERTIFICATIONS.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall—

(I) reconsider that determination; and

(II) if the group of workers meets the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(iii) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this clause is a petition for a certification of eligibility for a group of workers filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be eligible, on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to receive benefits only under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) COMPUTATION OF MAXIMUM BENEFITS.—Benefits received by a worker described in clause (i) under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be included in any determination of the maximum benefits for which the worker is eligible under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) PETITIONS FILED BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2014.—A worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or before December 31, 2013, shall continue to be eligible to apply for and receive benefits under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of such Act, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

(3) QUALIFYING SEPARATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PETITIONS FILED WITHIN 90 DAYS OF DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Section 223(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be applied and administered by substituting “before January 1, 2014” for “more than one year before the date of the petition on which such certification was granted” for purposes of determining whether a worker is eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and on or before the date that is 90 days after such date of enactment.

(b) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—

(1) CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(B) RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF CERTAIN PETITIONS.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall—

(i) reconsider that determination; and

(ii) if the firm meets the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(C) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this subparagraph is a petition for a certification of eligibility filed by a firm or its representative under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS THAT DID NOT SUBMIT PETITIONS BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 2014, AND DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall certify a firm described in subparagraph (B) as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, if the firm or its representative files a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 not later than 90 days after such date of enactment.

(B) FIRM DESCRIBED.—A firm described in this subparagraph is a firm that the Secretary determines would have been certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance if—

(i) the firm or its representative had filed a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on a date during the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) the provisions of chapter 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, had been in effect on that date during the period described in clause (i).

SEC. 222. SUNSET PROVISIONS.

(a) APPLICATION OF PRIOR LAW.—Subject to subsection (b), beginning on January 1, 2021, the provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of

title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.), as in effect on January 1, 2014, shall be in effect and apply, except that in applying and administering such chapters—

(1) paragraph (1) of section 231(c) of that Act shall be applied and administered as if subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of that paragraph were not in effect;

(2) section 233 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by substituting “104-week period” for “104-week period” and all that follows through “130-week period”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by substituting “65” for “52”; and

(II) by substituting “78-week period” for “52-week period” each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (g) as if it read as follows:

“(g) PAYMENT OF TRADE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES TO COMPLETE TRAINING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in order to assist an adversely affected worker to complete training approved for the worker under section 236 that leads to the completion of a degree or industry-recognized credential, payments may be made as trade readjustment allowances for not more than 13 weeks within such period of eligibility as the Secretary may prescribe to account for a break in training or for justifiable cause that follows the last week for which the worker is otherwise entitled to a trade readjustment allowance under this chapter if—

“(1) payment of the trade readjustment allowance for not more than 13 weeks is necessary for the worker to complete the training;

“(2) the worker participates in training in each such week; and

“(3) the worker—

“(A) has substantially met the performance benchmarks established as part of the training approved for the worker;

“(B) is expected to continue to make progress toward the completion of the training; and

“(C) will complete the training during that period of eligibility.”;

(3) section 234 shall be applied and administered as in effect on December 31, 2013;

(4) section 245(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “2021” for “2007”;

(5) section 246(b)(1) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “December 31, 2021” for “the date that is 5 years” and all that follows through “State”;

(6) section 256(b) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “the 1-year period beginning on January 1, 2021” for “each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and \$4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning on October 1, 2007”;

(7) section 298(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “the 1-year period beginning on January 1, 2021” for “each of the fiscal years” and all that follows through “October 1, 2007”; and

(8) section 285 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a), by substituting “2021” for “2007” each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (b) as if it read as follows:

“(b) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 3 after December 31, 2021.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 3 pursuant to a petition filed under section 251 on or before December 31, 2021, may be provided—

“(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

“(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.

“(2) FARMERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 6 after December 31, 2021.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 6 on or before December 31, 2021, may be provided—

“(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

“(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.”.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply on and after January 1, 2021, with respect to—

(1) workers certified as eligible for trade adjustment assistance benefits under chapter 2 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 221 of that Act before January 1, 2021;

(2) firms certified as eligible for technical assistance or grants under chapter 3 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 251 of that Act before January 1, 2021; and

(3) agricultural commodity producers certified as eligible for technical or financial assistance under chapter 6 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 292 of that Act before January 1, 2021.

Subtitle D—Health Coverage Tax Credit

SEC. 231. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF HEALTH COVERAGE TAX CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subparagraph (B) of section 35(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “before January 1, 2014” and inserting “before January 1, 2021”.

(b) INCREASE.—Subsection (a) of section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “72.5 percent” and inserting “80 percent”.

(c) COORDINATION WITH PPACA CREDIT FOR COVERAGE UNDER A QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “In the case of an individual,” and inserting “In the case of an individual who elects the application of this section for the taxable year.”.

(2) COORDINATION RULE.—Subsection (g) of section 35 of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (12) and by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

“(11) COORDINATION WITH PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer who elects the application of this section for any taxable year, no credit shall be allowed under section 36B with respect to such taxpayer for such taxable year.

“(B) ELECTION.—Any election for this section to apply for a taxable year, once made, shall be irrevocable.”.

(3) ADVANCE PAYMENT.—Section 7527 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) COORDINATION WITH ADVANCE PAYMENT OF PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—No payment shall

be made under this section on behalf of any individual with respect to whom any advance payment is made under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act for the taxable year.”.

(4) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall issue such procedures and guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to coordinate, and facilitate taxpayer choices between, advance payments under section 7527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(d) HEALTH PLANS OFFERED THROUGH EXCHANGE TREATED AS QUALIFIED HEALTH INSURANCE.—Paragraph (1) of section 35(e) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(L) Coverage under a qualified health plan which was enrolled in through an Exchange established under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to coverage months beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) ADVANCE PAYMENT PROVISIONS.—The amendment made by subsection (c)(3) shall apply to certificates issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 232. TAA PRE-CERTIFICATION RULE FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING WHETHER THERE IS A 63-DAY LAPSE IN CREDITABLE COVERAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions are each amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2021”:

(1) Section 9801(c)(2)(D).

(2) Section 701(c)(2)(C) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

(3) Section 2701(c)(2)(C) of the Public Health Service Act (as in effect for plan years beginning before January 1, 2014).

(4) Section 2704(c)(2)(C) of the Public Health Service Act (as in effect for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2014).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) TRANSITIONAL RULES.—

(A) BENEFIT DETERMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by this section (and the provisions of law amended thereby), a plan shall not be required to modify benefit determinations for the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, but a plan shall not fail to be qualified health insurance within the meaning of section 35(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 during this period merely due to such failure to modify benefit determinations.

(B) GUIDANCE CONCERNING PERIODS BEFORE 30 DAYS AFTER ENACTMENT.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Treasury (or his designee), in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Labor, may issue regulations or other guidance regarding the scope of the application of the amendments made by this section to periods before the date which is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(C) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO CERTAIN LOSS OF COVERAGE.—In the case of a TAA-related loss of coverage (as defined in section 4980B(f)(5)(C)(iv) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that occurs during the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the 7-day period described in section 9801(c)(2)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, section 701(c)(2)(C) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and

section 2701(c)(2)(C) of the Public Health Service Act shall be extended until 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 233. EXTENSION OF COBRA BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN TAA-ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS AND PBGC RECIPIENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions are each amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2021”:

(1) Section 4980B(f)(2)(B)(i)(V).

(2) Section 4980B(f)(2)(B)(i)(VI).

(3) Section 602(2)(A)(v) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

(4) Section 602(2)(A)(vi) of such Act.

(5) Section 2202(2)(A)(iv) of the Public Health Service Act.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to periods of coverage which would (without regard to the amendments made by this section) end on or after the date which is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle E—Offsets

SEC. 241. ADDITIONAL CUSTOMS USER FEES EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) Fees may be charged under paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) during the period beginning on July 29, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025.”.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) FURTHER ADDITIONAL PERIOD.—For the period beginning on July 15, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

“(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’; and

“(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’.”.

SEC. 242. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 8 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 243. PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIRED TO CLAIM CERTAIN EDUCATION TAX BENEFITS.

(a) AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY CREDIT, HOPE SCHOLARSHIP CREDIT, AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 25A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no credit shall be allowed under this section unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains

all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.”.

(2) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—Section 25A(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a statement described in paragraph (8) and received by such individual shall be treated as received by the taxpayer.”.

(b) DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—Section 222(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7), and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.

“(B) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—The receipt of the statement referred to in subparagraph (A) by an individual described in subsection (c)(3) shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as received by the taxpayer.”.

(c) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED ON PAYEE STATEMENT.—Section 6050S(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the information required by subsection (b)(2).”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 244. SPECIAL RULE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS UNABLE TO COLLECT TINS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—No penalty shall be imposed under section 6721 or 6722 solely by reason of failing to provide the TIN of an individual on a return or statement required by section 6050S(a)(1) if the eligible educational institution required to make such return contemporaneously makes a true and accurate certification under penalty of perjury (and in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary) that it has complied with standards promulgated by the Secretary for obtaining such individual’s TIN.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 245. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS AND PROVIDE PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6721(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(b) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(1) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6721(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”; and

(B) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(C) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(2) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6721(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”; and

(B) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$250”; and

(C) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(c) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6721(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(d) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6721(e) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”; and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(e) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6722(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(2) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(A) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6722(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”; and

(ii) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(iii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(B) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6722(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”; and

(ii) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by clause (i)) and inserting “\$250”; and

(iii) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(3) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6722(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(4) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6722(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to returns and statements required to be filed after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 246. CHILD TAX CREDIT NOT REFUNDABLE FOR TAXPAYERS ELECTING TO EXCLUDE FOREIGN EARNED INCOME FROM TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYERS EXCLUDING FOREIGN EARNED INCOME.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer elects to exclude any amount from gross income under section 911 for such taxable year.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 247. COVERAGE AND PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1861(s)(2)(F) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)(F)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, including such renal dialysis services furnished on or after January 1, 2017, by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under section 1881(b)(14) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in section 1834(r)(2)).”.

(b) PAYMENT.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(r) PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.—

“(1) PAYMENT RATE.—In the case of renal dialysis services (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1881(b)(14)) furnished under this part by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under such section during a year (beginning with 2017) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in paragraph (2)), the amount of payment under this part for such services shall be the base rate for renal dialysis services determined for such year under such section, as adjusted by any applicable geographic adjustment factor applied under subparagraph (D)(iv)(II) of such section and may be adjusted by the Secretary (on a budget neutral basis for payments under this paragraph) by any other adjustment factor under subparagraph (D) of such section.

“(2) INDIVIDUAL WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘individual with acute kidney injury’ means an individual who has acute loss of renal function and does not receive renal dialysis services for which payment is made under section 1881(b)(14).”.

SEC. 248. CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of Section 6501(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income;”;

(2) by inserting “(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)” in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after “In determining the amount omitted from gross income”; and

(3) by inserting “AMOUNT OMITTED FROM” after “DETERMINATION OF” in the heading thereof.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to—

(1) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

SA 2074. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) REPEAL OF SNAPBACK.—Section 233 of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–40; 125 Stat. 416) is repealed.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, the provisions of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on December 31, 2013, and as amended by this title, shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to petitions for certification filed under chapter 2, 3, or 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after such date of enactment.

(c) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of any such chapter, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

SEC. 203. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF TERMINATION PROVISIONS.—Section 285 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” each place it appears and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(b) TRAINING FUNDS.—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “shall not exceed” and all that follows and inserting “shall not exceed \$450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021.”

(c) REEMPLOYMENT TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.—Section 246(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2318(b)(1)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(d) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—Section 245(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2317(a)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(2) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—Section 255(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2345(a)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2012 and 2013” and all that follows through “December 31, 2013” and inserting “fiscal years 2015 through 2021”.

(3) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS.—Section 298(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401g(a)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2012 and 2013” and all that follows through “December 31, 2013” and inserting “fiscal years 2015 through 2021”.

SEC. 204. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND REPORTING.

(a) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—Section 239(j) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2311(j)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “DATA REPORTING” and inserting “PERFORMANCE MEASURES”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “a quarterly” and inserting “an annual”; and

(ii) by striking “data” and inserting “measures”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “core” and inserting “primary”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “that promote efficiency and effectiveness” after “assistance program”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “CORE INDICATORS DESCRIBED” and inserting “INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) PRIMARY INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE DESCRIBED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The primary indicators of performance referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall consist of—

“(I) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who are in unsubsidized employment during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program;

“(II) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program and who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth calendar quarter after exit from the program;

“(III) the median earnings of workers described in subclause (I);

“(IV) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, subject to clause (ii), obtain a recognized postsecondary credential or a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, during participation in the program or within one year after exit from the program; and

“(V) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, during a year while receiving such benefits, are in an education or training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential or employment and who are achieving measurable gains in skills toward such a credential or employment.

“(ii) INDICATOR RELATING TO CREDENTIAL.—For purposes of clause (i)(IV), a worker who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who obtained a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent shall be included in the percentage counted for purposes of that clause only if the worker, in addition to obtaining such a diploma or its recognized equivalent, has obtained or retained employment or is in an education or training program leading to a

recognized postsecondary credential within one year after exit from the program.”;

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “DATA” and inserting “MEASURES”;

(B) by striking “quarterly” and inserting “annual”; and

(C) by striking “data” and inserting “measures”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) ACCESSIBILITY OF STATE PERFORMANCE REPORTS.—The Secretary shall, on an annual basis, make available (including by electronic means), in an easily understandable format, the reports of cooperating States or cooperating State agencies required by paragraph (1) and the information contained in those reports.”.

(b) COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF DATA.—Section 249B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2323) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “enrolled in” and inserting “who received”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “complete” and inserting “exited”; and

(II) by striking “who were enrolled in” and inserting “, including who received”;

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “complete” and inserting “exited”;

(iv) in subparagraph (F), by striking “complete” and inserting “exit”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) The average cost per worker of receiving training approved under section 236.

“(H) The percentage of workers who received training approved under section 236 and obtained unsubsidized employment in a field related to that training.”; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking “quarterly” each place it appears and inserting “annual”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) The median earnings of workers described in section 239(j)(2)(A)(i)(III) during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program, expressed as a percentage of the median earnings of such workers before the calendar quarter in which such workers began receiving benefits under this chapter.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) the reports required under section 239(j);”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “a quarterly” and inserting “an annual”.

(c) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL DEFINED.—Section 247 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2319) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(19) The term ‘recognized postsecondary credential’ means a credential consisting of an industry-recognized certificate or certification, a certificate of completion of an apprenticeship, a license recognized by a State or the Federal Government, or an associate or baccalaureate degree.”.

SEC. 205. APPLICABILITY OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—

(1) PETITIONS FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014, AND BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CERTIFICATIONS OF WORKERS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(i) **CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.**—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) **RECONSIDERATION OF DENIALS OF CERTIFICATIONS.**—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall—

(I) reconsider that determination; and

(II) if the group of workers meets the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(iii) **PETITION DESCRIBED.**—A petition described in this clause is a petition for a certification of eligibility for a group of workers filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) **ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), a worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be eligible, on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to receive benefits only under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) **COMPUTATION OF MAXIMUM BENEFITS.**—Benefits received by a worker described in clause (i) under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be included in any determination of the maximum benefits for which the worker is eligible under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **PETITIONS FILED BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2014.**—A worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or before December 31, 2013, shall continue to be eligible to apply for and receive benefits under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of such Act, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

(3) **QUALIFYING SEPARATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PETITIONS FILED WITHIN 90 DAYS OF DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—Section 223(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be applied and administered by substituting “before January 1, 2014” for “more than one year before the date of the petition on which such certification was granted” for purposes of determining whether a worker is eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and on or before the date that is 90 days after such date of enactment.

(b) **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.**—

(1) **CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—

(A) **CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.**—If, as of the date of the enact-

ment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(B) **RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF CERTAIN PETITIONS.**—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall—

(i) reconsider that determination; and

(ii) if the firm meets the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(C) **PETITION DESCRIBED.**—A petition described in this subparagraph is a petition for a certification of eligibility filed by a firm or its representative under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS THAT DID NOT SUBMIT PETITIONS BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 2014, AND DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Commerce shall certify a firm described in subparagraph (B) as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, if the firm or its representative files a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 not later than 90 days after such date of enactment.

(B) **FIRM DESCRIBED.**—A firm described in this subparagraph is a firm that the Secretary determines would have been certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance if—

(i) the firm or its representative had filed a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on a date during the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) the provisions of chapter 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, had been in effect on that date during the period described in clause (i).

SEC. 206. SUNSET PROVISIONS.

(a) **APPLICATION OF PRIOR LAW.**—Subject to subsection (b), beginning on July 1, 2021, the provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.), as in effect on January 1, 2014, shall be in effect and apply, except that in applying and administering such chapters—

(1) paragraph (1) of section 231(c) of that Act shall be applied and administered as if subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of that paragraph were not in effect;

(2) section 233 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by substituting “104-week period” for “104-week period” and all that follows through “130-week period”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by substituting “65” for “52”; and

(II) by substituting “78-week period” for “52-week period” each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (g) as if it read as follows:

“(g) **PAYMENT OF TRADE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES TO COMPLETE TRAINING.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in order to assist an adversely affected worker to complete training approved for the worker under section 236 that leads to the completion of a degree or industry-recognized credential, payments may be made as trade readjustment allowances for not more than 13 weeks within such period of eligibility as the Secretary may prescribe to account for a break in training or for justifiable cause that follows the last week for which the worker is otherwise entitled to a trade readjustment allowance under this chapter if—

“(1) payment of the trade readjustment allowance for not more than 13 weeks is necessary for the worker to complete the training;

“(2) the worker participates in training in each such week; and

“(3) the worker—

“(A) has substantially met the performance benchmarks established as part of the training approved for the worker;

“(B) is expected to continue to make progress toward the completion of the training; and

“(C) will complete the training during that period of eligibility.”;

(3) section 245(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “December 31, 2007”;

(4) section 246(b)(1) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “the date that is 5 years” and all that follows through “State”;

(5) section 256(b) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021” for “each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and \$4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning on October 1, 2007”;

(6) section 298(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021” for “each of the fiscal years” and all that follows through “October 1, 2007”; and

(7) section 285 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a), by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “December 31, 2007” each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (b) as if it read as follows:

“(b) **OTHER ASSISTANCE.**—

“(1) **ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 3 after June 30, 2022.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 3 pursuant to a petition filed under section 251 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

“(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

“(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.

“(2) **FARMERS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 6 after June 30, 2022.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 6 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

“(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

“(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.”.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply on and after July 1, 2021, with respect to—

(1) workers certified as eligible for trade adjustment assistance benefits under chapter 2 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 221 of that Act before July 1, 2021;

(2) firms certified as eligible for technical assistance or grants under chapter 3 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 251 of that Act before July 1, 2021; and

(3) agricultural commodity producers certified as eligible for technical or financial assistance under chapter 6 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 292 of that Act before July 1, 2021.

SEC. 207. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF HEALTH COVERAGE TAX CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subparagraph (B) of section 35(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “before January 1, 2014” and inserting “before January 1, 2020”.

(b) COORDINATION WITH CREDIT FOR COVERAGE UNDER A QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN.—Subsection (g) of section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (13), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraphs:

“(11) ELECTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to any taxpayer for any eligible coverage month unless such taxpayer elects the application of this section for such month.

“(B) TIMING AND APPLICABILITY OF ELECTION.—Except as the Secretary may provide—

“(i) an election to have this section apply for any eligible coverage month in a taxable year shall be made not later than the due date (including extensions) for the return of tax for the taxable year, and

“(ii) any election for this section to apply for an eligible coverage month shall apply for all subsequent eligible coverage months in the taxable year and, once made, shall be irrevocable with respect to such months.

“(12) COORDINATION WITH PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible coverage month to which the election under paragraph (11) applies shall not be treated as a coverage month (as defined in section 36B(c)(2)) for purposes of section 36B with respect to the taxpayer.

“(B) COORDINATION WITH ADVANCE PAYMENTS OF PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—In the case of a taxpayer who makes the election under paragraph (11) with respect to any eligible coverage month in a taxable year or on behalf of whom any advance payment is made under section 7527 with respect to any month in such taxable year—

“(i) the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year shall be increased by the excess, if any, of—

“(I) the sum of any advance payments made on behalf of the taxpayer under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and section 7527 for months during such taxable year, over

“(II) the sum of the credits allowed under this section (determined without regard to paragraph (1)) and section 36B (determined without regard to subsection (f)(1) thereof) for such taxable year, and

“(ii) section 36B(f)(2) shall not apply with respect to such taxpayer for such taxable

year, except that if such taxpayer received any advance payments under section 7527 for any month in such taxable year and is later allowed a credit under section 36B for such taxable year, then section 36B(f)(2)(B) shall be applied by substituting the amount determined under clause (i) for the amount determined under section 36B(f)(2)(A).”.

(c) EXTENSION OF ADVANCE PAYMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 7527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “August 1, 2003” and inserting “the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 7527(e) of such Code is amended by striking “occurring” and all that follows and inserting “occurring—

“(A) after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015, and

“(B) prior to the first month for which an advance payment is made on behalf of such individual under subsection (a).”.

(d) INDIVIDUAL INSURANCE TREATED AS QUALIFIED HEALTH INSURANCE WITHOUT REGARD TO ENROLLMENT DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “insurance if the eligible individual” and all that follows through “For purposes of” and inserting “insurance. For purposes of”.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of such Code, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by striking “insurance.” and inserting “insurance (other than coverage enrolled in through an Exchange established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).”.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (m) of section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “, 35(g)(11)” after “30D(e)(4)”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) PLANS AVAILABLE ON INDIVIDUAL MARKET FOR USE OF TAX CREDIT.—The amendment made by subsection (d)(2) shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(3) TRANSITION RULE.—Notwithstanding section 35(g)(11)(B)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this title), an election to apply section 35 of such Code to an eligible coverage month (as defined in section 35(b) of such Code) (and not to claim the credit under section 36B of such Code with respect to such month) in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2013, and before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) may be made at any time on or after such date of enactment and before the expiration of the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 6511(a) with respect to such taxable year; and

(B) may be made on an amended return.

(g) AGENCY OUTREACH.—As soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Health and Human Services, and Labor (or such Secretaries’ delegates) and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (or the Director’s delegate) shall carry out programs of public outreach, including on the Internet, to inform potential eligible individuals (as defined in section 35(c)(1) of the In-

ternal Revenue Code of 1986) of the extension of the credit under section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the availability of the election to claim such credit retroactively for coverage months beginning after December 31, 2013.

TITLE III—IMPROVEMENTS TO ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “American Trade Enforcement Effectiveness Act”.

SEC. 302. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO CO-OPERATE WITH A REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IN A PROCEEDING.

Section 776 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(B) by striking “ADVERSE INFERENCES.—If” and inserting the following: “ADVERSE INFERENCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If”;

(C) by striking “under this title, may use” and inserting the following: “under this title—

“(A) may use”; and

(D) by striking “facts otherwise available. Such adverse inference may include” and inserting the following: “facts otherwise available; and

“(B) is not required to determine, or make any adjustments to, a countervailable subsidy rate or weighted average dumping margin based on any assumptions about information the interested party would have provided if the interested party had complied with the request for information.

“(2) POTENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR ADVERSE INFERENCES.—An adverse inference under paragraph (1)(A) may include”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—When the” and inserting the following: “CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The administrative authority and the Commission shall not be required to corroborate any dumping margin or countervailing duty applied in a separate segment of the same proceeding.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SUBSIDY RATES AND DUMPING MARGINS IN ADVERSE INFERENCE DETERMINATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority uses an inference that is adverse to the interests of a party under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority may—

“(A) in the case of a countervailing duty proceeding—

“(i) use a countervailable subsidy rate applied for the same or similar program in a countervailing duty proceeding involving the same country, or

“(ii) if there is no same or similar program, use a countervailable subsidy rate for a subsidy program from a proceeding that the administering authority considers reasonable to use, and

“(B) in the case of an antidumping duty proceeding, use any dumping margin from any segment of the proceeding under the applicable antidumping order.

“(2) DISCRETION TO APPLY HIGHEST RATE.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the administering authority may apply any of the

countervailable subsidy rates or dumping margins specified under that paragraph, including the highest such rate or margin, based on the evaluation by the administering authority of the situation that resulted in the administering authority using an adverse inference in selecting among the facts otherwise available.

“(3) NO OBLIGATION TO MAKE CERTAIN ESTIMATES OR ADDRESS CERTAIN CLAIMS.—If the administering authority uses an adverse inference under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority is not required, for purposes of subsection (c) or for any other purpose—

“(A) to estimate what the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin would have been if the interested party found to have failed to cooperate under subsection (b)(1) had cooperated, or

“(B) to demonstrate that the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin used by the administering authority reflects an alleged commercial reality of the interested party.”.

SEC. 303. DEFINITION OF MATERIAL INJURY.

(a) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES.—Section 771(7) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(J) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY.—The Commission may not determine that there is no material injury or threat of material injury to an industry in the United States merely because that industry is profitable or because the performance of that industry has recently improved.”.

(b) EVALUATION OF IMPACT ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IN DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL INJURY.—Subclause (I) of section 771(7)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(I) actual and potential decline in output, sales, market share, gross profits, operating profits, net profits, ability to service debt, productivity, return on investments, return on assets, and utilization of capacity.”.

(c) CAPTIVE PRODUCTION.—Section 771(7)(C)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking the comma and inserting “, and”; and

(2) in subclause (II), by striking “, and” and inserting a comma; and

(3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 304. PARTICULAR MARKET SITUATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF ORDINARY COURSE OF TRADE.—Section 771(15) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(15)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) Situations in which the administering authority determines that the particular market situation prevents a proper comparison with the export price or constructed export price.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF NORMAL VALUE.—Section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking “in such other country.”.

(c) DEFINITION OF CONSTRUCTED VALUE.—Section 773(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “business” and inserting “trade”; and

(2) by striking the flush text at the end and inserting the following:

“For purposes of paragraph (1), if a particular market situation exists such that the cost of materials and fabrication or other processing of any kind does not accurately reflect the cost of production in the ordinary course of trade, the administering authority may use another calculation methodology

under this subtitle or any other calculation methodology. For purposes of paragraph (1), the cost of materials shall be determined without regard to any internal tax in the exporting country imposed on such materials or their disposition that is remitted or refunded upon exportation of the subject merchandise produced from such materials.”.

SEC. 305. DISTORTION OF PRICES OR COSTS.

(a) INVESTIGATION OF BELOW-COST SALES.—Section 773(b)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE OR SUSPECT.—

“(i) REVIEW.—In a review conducted under section 751 involving a specific exporter, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that are less than the cost of production of the product if the administering authority disregarded some or all of the exporter’s sales pursuant to paragraph (1) in the investigation or, if a review has been completed, in the most recently completed review.

“(ii) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—In an investigation initiated under section 732 or a review conducted under section 751, the administering authority shall request information necessary to calculate the constructed value and cost of production under subsections (e) and (f) to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that represent less than the cost of production of the product.”.

(b) PRICES AND COSTS IN NONMARKET ECONOMIES.—Section 773(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) DISCRETION TO DISREGARD CERTAIN PRICE OR COST VALUES.—In valuing the factors of production under paragraph (1) for the subject merchandise, the administering authority may disregard price or cost values without further investigation if the administering authority has determined that broadly available export subsidies existed or particular instances of subsidization occurred with respect to those price or cost values or if those price or cost values were subject to an antidumping order.”.

SEC. 306. REDUCTION IN BURDEN ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF VOLUNTARY RESPONDENTS.

Section 782(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677m(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and by moving such clauses, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking “INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—In” and inserting the following: “INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In”;

(4) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (3), by amending subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), to read as follows:

“(B) the number of exporters or producers subject to the investigation or review is not so large that any additional individual examination of such exporters or producers would be unduly burdensome to the administering authority and inhibit the timely completion of the investigation or review.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DETERMINATION OF UNDULY BURDENSOME.—In determining if an individual examination under paragraph (1)(B) would be unduly burdensome, the administering authority may consider the following:

“(A) The complexity of the issues or information presented in the proceeding, including questionnaires and any responses thereto.

“(B) Any prior experience of the administering authority in the same or similar proceeding.

“(C) The total number of investigations under subtitle A or B and reviews under section 751 being conducted by the administering authority as of the date of the determination.

“(D) Such other factors relating to the timely completion of each such investigation and review as the administering authority considers appropriate.”.

SEC. 307. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

TITLE IV—OFFSETS

SEC. 401. CUSTOMS USER FEES EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “July 7, 2025”.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking “June 30, 2021” and inserting “June 30, 2025”.

SEC. 402. ADDITIONAL CUSTOMS USER FEES EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) Fees may be charged under paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) during the period beginning on July 29, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025.”.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) FURTHER ADDITIONAL PERIOD.—For the period beginning on July 15, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

“(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’; and

“(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’.”.

SEC. 403. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 8 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any

increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 404. PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIRED TO CLAIM CERTAIN EDUCATION TAX BENEFITS.

(a) AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY CREDIT, HOPE SCHOLARSHIP CREDIT, AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 25A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no credit shall be allowed under this section unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.”.

(2) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—Section 25A(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a statement described in paragraph (8) and received by such individual shall be treated as received by the taxpayer.”.

(b) DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—Section 222(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7), and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.

“(B) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—The receipt of the statement referred to in subparagraph (A) by an individual described in subsection (c)(3) shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as received by the taxpayer.”.

(c) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED ON PAYEE STATEMENT.—Section 6050S(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the information required by subsection (b)(2).”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 405. SPECIAL RULE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS UNABLE TO COLLECT TINS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—No penalty shall be imposed under section 6721 or 6722 solely by reason of failing to provide the TIN of an individual on a return or statement required by section 6050S(a)(1) if the eligible educational institution required to make such return contemporaneously makes a true and accurate certification under penalty of perjury (and in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary) that it has complied with standards promulgated by the Secretary for obtaining such individual's TIN.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns

required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 406. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS AND PROVIDE PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6721(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(b) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(1) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6721(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”; and

(B) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(C) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(2) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6721(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”; (B) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$250”; and

(C) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(c) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6721(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(d) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6721(e) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”; and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(e) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6722(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(2) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(A) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6722(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”; and

(ii) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(iii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(B) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6722(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”; (ii) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by clause (i)) and inserting “\$250”; and

(iii) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(3) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6722(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(4) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6722(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to returns and statements required to be filed after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 407. CHILD TAX CREDIT NOT REFUNDABLE FOR TAXPAYERS ELECTING TO EXCLUDE FOREIGN EARNED INCOME FROM TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYERS EXCLUDING FOREIGN EARNED INCOME.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer elects to exclude any amount from gross income under section 911 for such taxable year.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 408. COVERAGE AND PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1861(s)(2)(F) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)(F)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, including such renal dialysis services furnished on or after January 1, 2017, by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under section 1881(b)(14) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in section 1834(r)(2)).”.

(b) PAYMENT.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(r) PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.—

“(1) PAYMENT RATE.—In the case of renal dialysis services (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1881(b)(14)) furnished under this part by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under such section during a year (beginning with 2017) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in paragraph (2)), the amount of payment under this part for such services shall be the base rate for renal dialysis services determined for such year under such section, as adjusted by any applicable geographic adjustment factor applied under subparagraph (D)(iv)(II) of such section and may be adjusted by the Secretary (on a budget neutral basis for payments under this paragraph) by any other adjustment factor under subparagraph (D) of such section.

“(2) INDIVIDUAL WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘individual with acute kidney injury’ means an

individual who has acute loss of renal function and does not receive renal dialysis services for which payment is made under section 1881(b)(14).”.

SA 2075. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 25, strike line 18, and all that follows through page 26, line 16, and insert the following:

(11) CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency exchange practices is to target protracted large-scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets by a party to a trade agreement to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to the agreement, by establishing strong and enforceable rules against exchange rate manipulation that are subject to the same dispute settlement procedures and remedies as other enforceable obligations under the agreement and are consistent with existing principles and agreements of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization. Nothing in the previous sentence shall be construed to restrict the exercise of domestic monetary policy.

SA 2076. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BLUMENTHAL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 91, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Veterans Identification Card Act 2015”.

SEC. 2. VETERANS IDENTIFICATION CARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Effective on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, veteran identification cards were issued to veterans who have either completed the statutory time-in-service requirement for retirement from the Armed Forces or who have received a medical-related discharge from the Armed Forces.

(2) Effective on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, a veteran who served a minimum obligated time in service, but who did not meet the criteria described in paragraph (1), did not receive a means of identifying the veteran’s status as a veteran other than using the Department of Defense form DD-214 discharge papers of the veteran.

(3) Goods, services, and promotional activities are often offered by public and private institutions to veterans who demonstrate proof of service in the military, but it is impractical for a veteran to always carry Department of Defense form DD-214 discharge papers to demonstrate such proof.

(4) A general purpose veteran identification card made available to veterans would be useful to demonstrate the status of the veterans without having to carry and use of-

ficial Department of Defense form DD-214 discharge papers.

(5) On the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department of Veterans Affairs had the infrastructure in place across the United States to produce photographic identification cards and accept a small payment to cover the cost of these cards.

(b) PROVISION OF VETERAN IDENTIFICATION CARDS.—Chapter 57 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 5705 the following new section:

“§ 5706. Veterans identification card

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall issue an identification card described in subsection (b) to each veteran who—

“(1) requests such card;

“(2) presents a copy of Department of Defense form DD-214 or other official document from the official military personnel file of the veteran that describes the service of the veteran; and

“(3) pays the fee under subsection (c)(1).

“(b) IDENTIFICATION CARD.—An identification card described in this subsection is a card issued to a veteran that—

“(1) displays a photograph of the veteran;

“(2) displays the name of the veteran;

“(3) explains that such card is not proof of any benefits to which the veteran is entitled to;

“(4) contains an identification number that is not a social security number; and

“(5) serves as proof that such veteran—

“(A) served in the Armed Forces; and

“(B) has a Department of Defense form DD-214 or other official document in the official military personnel file of the veteran that describes the service of the veteran.

“(c) COSTS OF CARD.—(1) The Secretary shall charge a fee to each veteran who receives an identification card issued under this section, including a replacement identification card.

“(2)(A) The fee charged under paragraph (1) shall equal such amount as the Secretary determines is necessary to issue an identification card under this section.

“(B) In determining the amount of the fee under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall ensure that the total amount of fees collected under paragraph (1) equals an amount necessary to carry out this section, including costs related to any additional equipment or personnel required to carry out this section.

“(C) The Secretary shall review and reassess the determination under subparagraph (A) during each five-year period in which the Secretary issues an identification card under this section.

“(3) Amounts collected under this subsection shall be deposited in an account of the Department available to carry out this section. Amounts so deposited shall be—

“(A) merged with amounts in such account;

“(B) available in such amounts as may be provided in appropriation Acts; and

“(C) subject to the same conditions and limitations as amounts otherwise in such account.

“(d) EFFECT OF CARD ON BENEFITS.—(1) An identification card issued under this section shall not serve as proof of any benefits that the veteran may be entitled to under this title.

“(2) A veteran who is issued an identification card under this section shall not be entitled to any benefits under this title by reason of possessing such card.

“(e) ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES.—(1) The Secretary shall ensure that any information

collected or used with respect to an identification card issued under this section is appropriately secured.

“(2) The Secretary may determine any appropriate procedures with respect to issuing a replacement identification card.

“(3) In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with the National Personnel Records Center.

“(4) The Secretary may conduct such outreach to advertise the identification card under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(f) CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to affect identification cards otherwise provided by the Secretary to veterans enrolled in the health care system established under section 1705(a) of this title.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5705 the following new item:

“5706. Veterans identification card.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Benjamin Canavan, a State Department fellow in my office, receive Senate floor privileges for the duration of his current fellowship in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

On Thursday, June 18, 2015, the Senate passed H.R. 1735, as amended, as follows:

H.R. 1735

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 1735) entitled “An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.”, do pass with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016”.

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) DIVISIONS.—This Act is organized into four divisions as follows:

(1) Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations.

(2) Division B—Military Construction Authorizations.

(3) Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations.

(4) Division D—Funding tables.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Organization of Act into divisions; table of contents.

Sec. 3. Congressional defense committees.

Sec. 4. Budgetary effects of this Act.

**DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATIONS**

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Navy Programs

Sec. 111. Amendment to cost limitation baseline for CVN-78 class aircraft carrier program.

Sec. 112. Limitation on availability of funds for USS JOHN F. KENNEDY (CVN-79).

Sec. 113. Limitation on availability of funds for USS ENTERPRISE (CVN-80).

Sec. 114. Modification of CVN-78 class aircraft carrier program.

Sec. 115. Limitation on availability of funds for Littoral Combat Ship.

Sec. 116. Extension and modification of limitation on availability of funds for Littoral Combat Ship.

Sec. 117. Construction of additional Arleigh Burke destroyer.

Sec. 118. Fleet Replenishment Oiler Program.

Sec. 119. Reporting requirement for Ohio-class replacement submarine program.

Sec. 120. Stationing of C-130 H aircraft avionics previously modified by the Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) in support of daily training and contingency requirements for Airborne and Special Operations Forces.

Subtitle C—Air Force Programs

Sec. 131. Limitations on retirement of B-1, B-2, and B-52 bomber aircraft.

Sec. 132. Limitation on retirement of Air Force fighter aircraft.

Sec. 133. Limitation on availability of funds for F-35A aircraft procurement.

Sec. 134. Prohibition on retirement of A-10 aircraft.

Sec. 135. Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of EC-130H Compass Call aircraft.

Sec. 136. Limitation on transfer of C-130 aircraft.

Sec. 137. Limitation on use of funds for T-1A Jayhawk aircraft.

Sec. 138. Restriction on retirement of the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS), EC-130H Compass Call, and Airborne Early Warning and Control (AWACS) Aircraft.

Sec. 139. Sense of Congress regarding the OCONUS basing of the F-35A aircraft.

Sec. 140. Sense of Congress on F-16 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar upgrade.

**Subtitle D—Defense-wide, Joint, and
Multiservice Matters**

Sec. 151. Report on Army and Marine Corps modernization plan for small arms.

Subtitle E—Army Programs

Sec. 161. Stryker Lethality Upgrades.

**TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT,
TEST, AND EVALUATION**

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

**Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions,
and Limitations**

Sec. 211. Centers for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership.

Sec. 212. Department of Defense technology offset program to build and maintain the military technological superiority of the United States.

Sec. 213. Reauthorization of defense research and development rapid innovation program.

Sec. 214. Reauthorization of Global Research Watch program.

Sec. 215. Science and technology activities to support business systems information technology acquisition programs.

Sec. 216. Expansion of eligibility for financial assistance under Department of Defense Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation program to include citizens of countries participating in The Technical Cooperation Program.

Sec. 217. Streamlining the Joint Federated Assurance Center.

Sec. 218. Limitation on availability of funds for development of the Shallow Water Combat Submersible.

Sec. 219. Limitation on availability of funds for distributed common ground system of the Army.

Sec. 220. Limitation on availability of funds for distributed common ground system of the United States Special Operations Command.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Sec. 231. Assessment of air-land mobile tactical communications and data network requirements and capabilities.

Sec. 232. Study of field failures involving counterfeit electronic parts.

Sec. 233. Demonstration of Persistent Close Air Support capabilities.

Sec. 234. Airborne data link plan.

Sec. 235. Report on Technology Readiness Levels of the technologies and capabilities critical to the Long Range Strike Bomber aircraft.

**TITLE III—OPERATION AND
MAINTENANCE**

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Energy and Environment

Sec. 311. Modification of energy management reporting requirements.

Sec. 312. Report on efforts to reduce high energy costs at military installations.

Sec. 313. Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

Sec. 321. Repeal of limitation on authority to enter into a contract for the sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul of the F117 engine.

Subtitle D—Reports

Sec. 331. Modification of annual report on prepositioned materiel and equipment.

**Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of
Authority**

Sec. 341. Modification of requirements for transferring aircraft within the Air Force inventory.

Sec. 342. Limitation on use of funds for Department of Defense sponsorships, advertising, or marketing associated with sports-related organizations or sporting events.

Sec. 342A. Prohibition on contracts to facilitate payments for honoring members of the Armed Forces at sporting events.

Sec. 343. Temporary authority to extend contracts and leases under ARMS initiative.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Sec. 351. Streamlining of Department of Defense management and operational headquarters.

Sec. 352. Adoption of retired military working dogs.

Sec. 353. Modification of required review of projects relating to potential obstructions to aviation.

Sec. 354. Pilot program on intensive instruction in certain Asian languages.

**TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL
AUTHORIZATIONS**

Subtitle A—Active Forces

Sec. 401. End strengths for active forces.

Sec. 402. Enhancement of authority for management of end strengths for military personnel.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

Sec. 411. End strengths for Selected Reserve.

Sec. 412. End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves.

Sec. 413. End strengths for military technicians (dual status).

Sec. 414. Fiscal year 2016 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians.

Sec. 415. Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support.

Sec. 416. Chief of the National Guard Bureau authority to increase certain end strengths applicable to the Army National Guard.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 421. Military personnel.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

Sec. 501. Authority of promotion boards to recommend officers of particular merit be placed at the top of the promotion list.

Sec. 502. Minimum grades for certain corps and related positions in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Sec. 503. Enhancement of military personnel authorities in connection with the defense acquisition workforce.

Sec. 504. Enhanced flexibility for determination of officers to continue on active duty and for selective early retirement and early discharge.

Sec. 505. Authority to defer until age 68 mandatory retirement for age of a general or flag officer serving as Chief or Deputy Chief of Chaplains of the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

Sec. 506. Reinstatement of enhanced authority for selective early discharge of warrant officers.

Sec. 507. Authority to conduct warrant officer retired grade determinations.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management

Sec. 511. Authority to designate certain reserve officers as not to be considered for selection for promotion.

Sec. 512. Clarification of purpose of reserve component special selection boards as limited to correction of error at a mandatory promotion board.

Sec. 513. Reconciliation of contradictory provisions relating to citizenship qualifications for enlistment in the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 514. Authority for certain Air Force reserve component personnel to provide training and instruction regarding pilot instructor training.

Subtitle C—General Service Authorities

- Sec. 521. Duty required for eligibility for pre-separation counseling for members being discharged or released from active duty.
- Sec. 522. Expansion of pilot programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 523. Sense of Senate on development of gender-neutral occupational standards for occupational assignments in the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 524. Sense of Congress recognizing the diversity of the members of the Armed Forces.

*Subtitle D—Member Education and Training**PART I—EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE REFORM*

- Sec. 531. Limitation on tuition assistance for off-duty training or education.
- Sec. 532. Termination of program of educational assistance for reserve component members supporting contingency operations and other operations.
- Sec. 533. Reports on educational levels attained by certain members of the Armed Forces at time of separation from the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 534. Sense of Congress on transferability of unused education benefits to family members.
- Sec. 535. No entitlement to unemployment insurance while receiving Post-9/11 Education Assistance.

PART II—OTHER MATTERS

- Sec. 536. Repeal of statutory specification of minimum duration of in-resident instruction for courses of instruction offered as part of Phase II joint professional military education.
- Sec. 537. Quality assurance of certification programs and standards for professional credentials obtained by members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 538. Support for athletic programs of the United States Military Academy.
- Sec. 539. Online access to the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program.

Subtitle E—Military Justice

- Sec. 546. Modification of Rule 304 of the Military Rules of Evidence relating to the corroboration of a confession or admission.
- Sec. 547. Modification of Rule 104 of the Rules for Courts-Martial to establish certain prohibitions concerning evaluations of Special Victims' Counsel.
- Sec. 548. Right of victims of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice to timely disclosure of certain materials and information in connection with prosecution of offenses.
- Sec. 549. Enforcement of certain crime victims' rights by the Court of Criminal Appeals.
- Sec. 550. Release to victims upon request of complete record of proceedings and testimony of courts-martial in cases in which sentences adjudged could include punitive discharge.
- Sec. 551. Representation and assistance of victims by Special Victims' Counsel in questioning by military criminal investigators.
- Sec. 552. Authority of Special Victims' Counsel to provide legal consultation and assistance in connection with various Government proceedings.
- Sec. 553. Enhancement of confidentiality of restricted reporting of sexual assault in the military.

Sec. 554. Establishment of Office of Complex Investigations within the National Guard Bureau.

Sec. 555. Modification of deadline for establishment of Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces.

Sec. 556. Comptroller General of the United States reports on prevention and response to sexual assault by the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve.

Sec. 557. Sense of Congress on the service of military families and on sentencing retirement-eligible members of the Armed Forces.

Subtitle F—Defense Dependents Education and Military Family Readiness

- Sec. 561. Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees.
- Sec. 562. Impact aid for children with severe disabilities.
- Sec. 563. Authority to use appropriated funds to support Department of Defense student meal programs in domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools located outside the United States.
- Sec. 564. Biennial surveys of military dependents on military family readiness matters.

Subtitle G—Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements

- Sec. 571. Extension of semiannual reports on the involuntary separation of members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 572. Remotely piloted aircraft career field manning shortfalls.

*Subtitle H—Other Matters**PART I—FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES*

- Sec. 581. Improvement of financial literacy and preparedness of members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 582. Financial literacy training with respect to certain financial services for members of the uniformed services.
- Sec. 583. Sense of Congress on financial literacy and preparedness of members of the Armed Forces.

PART II—OTHER MATTERS

- Sec. 586. Authority for applications for correction of military records to be initiated by the Secretary concerned.
- Sec. 587. Recordation of obligations for installment payments of incentive pays, allowances, and similar benefits when payment is due.
- Sec. 588. Enhancements to Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program.
- Sec. 589. Priority processing of applications for Transportation Worker Identification Credentials for members undergoing discharge or release from the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 590. Issuance of Recognition of Service ID Cards to certain members separating from the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 591. Revised policy on network services for military services.
- Sec. 592. Increase in number of days of active duty required to be performed by reserve component members for duty to be considered Federal service for purposes of unemployment compensation for ex-servicemembers.

Sec. 593. Improved enumeration of members of the Armed Forces in any tabulation of total population by Secretary of Commerce.

*TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS**Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances*

- Sec. 601. Fiscal year 2016 increase in military basic pay.
- Sec. 602. Modification of percentage of national average monthly cost of housing usable in computation of basic allowance for housing inside the United States.
- Sec. 603. Extension of authority to provide temporary increase in rates of basic allowance for housing.
- Sec. 604. Basic allowance for housing for married members of the uniformed services assigned for duty within normal commuting distance and for other members living together.
- Sec. 605. Repeal of inapplicability of modification of basic allowance for housing to benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 606. Limitation on eligibility for supplemental subsistence allowances to members serving outside the United States and associated territory.
- Sec. 607. Availability of information.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

- Sec. 611. One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces.
- Sec. 612. One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals.
- Sec. 613. One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers.
- Sec. 614. One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities.
- Sec. 615. One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays.
- Sec. 616. Increase in maximum annual amount of nuclear officer bonus pay.
- Sec. 617. Repeal of obsolete authority to pay bonus to encourage Army personnel to refer persons for enlistment in the Army.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

- Sec. 621. Repeal of obsolete special travel and transportation allowance for survivors of deceased members from the Vietnam conflict.
- Sec. 622. Study and report on policy changes to the Joint Travel Regulations.
- Sec. 623. Transportation to transfer ceremonies for family and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who die overseas during humanitarian operations.
- Sec. 624. Policies of the Department of Defense on travel of next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas.

*Subtitle D—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits**PART I—RETIRED PAY REFORM*

- Sec. 631. Thrift Savings Plan participation for members of the uniformed services.

Sec. 632. Modernized retirement system for members of the uniformed services.

Sec. 633. Lump sum payments of certain retired pay.

Sec. 634. Continuation pay after 12 years of service for members of the uniformed services participating in the modernized retirement systems.

Sec. 635. Authority for retirement flexibility for members of the uniformed services.

Sec. 636. Treatment of Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund as a qualified trust.

PART II—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 641. Death of former spouse beneficiaries and subsequent remarriages under Survivor Benefit Plan.

Sec. 642. Transitional compensation and other benefits for dependents of members of the Armed Forces ineligible to receive retired pay as a result of court-martial sentence.

Subtitle E—Commissary and Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations

Sec. 651. Commissary system matters.

Sec. 652. Plan on privatization of the defense commissary system.

Sec. 653. Comptroller General of the United States report on the Commissary Surcharge, Non-appropriated Fund, and Privately-Financed Major Construction Program.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits

Sec. 701. Urgent care authorization under the TRICARE program.

Sec. 702. Modifications of cost-sharing requirements for the TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program.

Sec. 703. Expansion of continued health benefits coverage to include discharged and released members of the Selected Reserve.

Sec. 704. Expansion of reimbursement for smoking cessation services for certain TRICARE beneficiaries.

Sec. 705. Pilot program on treatment of members of the Armed Forces for post-traumatic stress disorder related to military sexual trauma.

Subtitle B—Health Care Administration

Sec. 711. Access to health care under the TRICARE program.

Sec. 712. Portability of health plans under the TRICARE program.

Sec. 713. Improvement of mental health care provided by health care providers of the Department of Defense.

Sec. 714. Comprehensive standards and access to contraception counseling for members of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 715. Waiver of recoupment of erroneous payments due to administrative error under the TRICARE program.

Sec. 716. Designation of certain non-Department mental health care providers with knowledge relating to treatment of members of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 717. Limitation on conversion of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions.

Sec. 718. Extension of authority for joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund.

Sec. 719. Extension of authority for DOD-VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund.

Sec. 720. Pilot program on incentive programs to improve health care provided under the TRICARE program.

Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters

Sec. 731. Publication of certain information on health care provided by the Department of Defense through the Hospital compare website of the Department of Health and Human Services.

Sec. 732. Publication of data on patient safety, quality of care, satisfaction, and health outcome measures under the TRICARE program.

Sec. 733. Annual report on patient safety, quality of care, and access to care at military medical treatment facilities.

Sec. 734. Report on plans to improve experience with and eliminate performance variability of health care provided by the Department of Defense.

Sec. 735. Report on plan to improve pediatric care and related services for children of members of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 736. Report on preliminary mental health screenings for individuals becoming members of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 737. Comptroller General report on use of quality of care metrics at military treatment facilities.

Sec. 738. Report on interoperability between electronic health records systems of Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 739. Submittal of information to Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to exposure to airborne hazards and open burn pits.

Sec. 740. Comptroller General study on gambling and problem gambling behavior among members of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 741. Report on implementation of data security and transmission standards for electronic health records.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management

Sec. 801. Role of service chiefs in the acquisition process.

Sec. 802. Expansion of rapid acquisition authority.

Sec. 803. Middle tier of acquisition for rapid prototyping and rapid fielding.

Sec. 804. Amendments to other transaction authority.

Sec. 805. Use of alternative acquisition paths to acquire critical national security capabilities.

Sec. 806. Secretary of Defense waiver of acquisition laws to acquire vital national security capabilities.

Sec. 807. Acquisition authority of the Commander of United States Cyber Command.

Sec. 808. Advisory panel on streamlining and codifying acquisition regulations.

Sec. 809. Review of time-based requirements process and budgeting and acquisition systems.

Sec. 810. Improvement of program and project management by the Department of Defense.

Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

Sec. 821. Preference for fixed-price contracts in determining contract type for development programs.

Sec. 822. Applicability of cost and pricing data and certification requirements.

Sec. 823. Risk-based contracting for smaller contract actions under the Truth in Negotiations Act.

Sec. 824. Limitation on use of reverse auction and lowest price technically acceptable contracting methods.

Sec. 825. Rights in technical data.

Sec. 826. Procurement of supplies for experimental purposes.

Sec. 827. Extension of authority to acquire products and services produced in countries along a major route of supply to Afghanistan.

Sec. 828. Reporting related to failure of contractors to meet goals under negotiated comprehensive small business subcontracting plans.

Sec. 829. Competition for religious services contracts.

Sec. 830. Treatment of interagency and State and local purchases when the Department of Defense acts as contract intermediary for the General Services Administration.

Sec. 831. Pilot program for streamlining awards for innovative technology projects.

Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs

Sec. 841. Acquisition strategy required for each major defense acquisition program.

Sec. 842. Risk reduction in major defense acquisition programs.

Sec. 843. Designation of milestone decision authority.

Sec. 844. Revision of Milestone A decision authority responsibilities for major defense acquisition programs.

Sec. 845. Revision of Milestone B decision authority responsibilities for major defense acquisition programs.

Sec. 846. Tenure and accountability of program managers for program development periods.

Sec. 847. Tenure and accountability of program managers for program execution periods.

Sec. 848. Repeal of requirement for stand-alone manpower estimates for major defense acquisition programs.

Sec. 849. Penalty for cost overruns.

Sec. 850. Streamlining of reporting requirements applicable to Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering regarding major defense acquisition programs.

Sec. 851. Configuration Steering Boards for cost control under major defense acquisition programs.

Sec. 852. Sustainment enhancement.

Subtitle D—Provisions Relating to Commercial Items

Sec. 861. Inapplicability of certain laws and regulations to the acquisition of commercial items and commercially available off-the-shelf items.

Sec. 862. Market research and preference for commercial items.

Sec. 863. Continuing validity of commercial item determinations.

Sec. 864. Treatment of commercial items purchased as major weapon systems.

Sec. 865. Limitation on conversion of procurements from commercial acquisition procedures.

Sec. 866. Treatment of goods and services provided by nontraditional contractors as commercial items.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Sec. 871. Streamlining of requirements relating to defense business systems.

- Sec. 872. Acquisition workforce.
 Sec. 873. Unified information technology services.
 Sec. 874. Cloud strategy for Department of Defense.
 Sec. 875. Development period for Department of Defense information technology systems.
 Sec. 876. Revisions to pilot program on acquisition of military purpose non-developmental items.
 Sec. 877. Extension of the Department of Defense Mentor-Protégé pilot program.
 Sec. 878. Improved auditing of contracts.
 Sec. 879. Survey on the costs of regulatory compliance.
 Sec. 880. Government Accountability Office report on bid protests.
 Sec. 881. Steps to identify and address potential unfair competitive advantage of technical advisors to acquisition officials.
 Sec. 882. HUBZone qualified disaster areas.
 Sec. 883. Base closure HUBZones.
 Sec. 884. Exception for AbilityOne goods from authority to acquire goods and services manufactured in Afghanistan, and central Asian states.
 Sec. 885. Small business procurement ombudsman.
 Sec. 886. Annual report on foreign procurements.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

- Sec. 901. Update of statutory specification of functions of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relating to advice on requirements, programs, and budget.
 Sec. 902. Reorganization and redesignation of Office of Family Policy and Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs.
 Sec. 903. Repeal of requirement for annual Department of Defense funding for Ocean Research Advisory Panel.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

- Sec. 1001. General transfer authority.
 Sec. 1002. Annual audit of financial statements of Department of Defense components by independent external auditors.
 Sec. 1003. Treatment as part of the base budget of certain amounts authorized for overseas contingency operations upon enactment of an Act revising the Budget Control Act discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2016.
 Sec. 1004. Sense of Senate on sequestration.
 Sec. 1005. Sense of Senate on finding efficiencies within the working capital fund activities of the Department of Defense.

Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

- Sec. 1011. Extension of authority to support unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia.
 Sec. 1012. Extension and expansion of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments.

Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

- Sec. 1021. Studies of fleet platform architectures for the Navy.
 Sec. 1022. Amendment to National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund.
 Sec. 1023. Extension of authority for reimbursement of expenses for certain Navy mess operations afloat.

- Sec. 1024. Additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.
 Sec. 1025. Report and assessment of potential costs and benefits of privatizing Department of Defense commissaries.
 Sec. 1026. Report on Department of Defense definition of and policy regarding software sustainment.

Subtitle D—Counterterrorism

- Sec. 1031. Prohibition on use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the United States to house detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.
 Sec. 1032. Limitation on the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.
 Sec. 1033. Reenactment and modification of certain prior requirements for certifications relating to transfer of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to foreign countries and other foreign entities.
 Sec. 1034. Authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States for emergency or critical medical treatment.
 Sec. 1035. Prohibition on use of funds for transfer or release to Yemen of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.
 Sec. 1036. Report on current detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, determined or assessed to be high risk or medium risk.
 Sec. 1037. Report to Congress on memoranda of understanding with foreign countries regarding transfer of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.
 Sec. 1038. Semiannual reports on use of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and any other Department of Defense or Bureau of Prisons prison or other detention or disciplinary facility in recruitment and other propaganda of terrorist organizations.
 Sec. 1039. Extension and modification of authority to make rewards for combating terrorism.
 Sec. 1040. Reaffirmation of the prohibition on torture.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

- Sec. 1041. Assistance to secure the southern land border of the United States.
 Sec. 1042. Protection of Department of Defense installations.
 Sec. 1043. Strategy to protect United States national security interests in the Arctic region.
 Sec. 1044. Extension of limitations on the transfer to the regular Army of AH-64 Apache helicopters assigned to the Army National Guard.
 Sec. 1045. Treatment of certain previously transferred Army National Guard helicopters as counting against number transferrable under exception to limitation on transfer of Army National Guard helicopters.
 Sec. 1046. Management of military technicians.

- Sec. 1047. Sense of Congress on consideration of the full range of Department of Defense manpower worldwide in decisions on the proper mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel to accomplish the National Defense Strategy.
 Sec. 1048. Sense of Senate on the United States Marine Corps.

Subtitle F—Studies and Reports

- Sec. 1061. Repeal of reporting requirements.
 Sec. 1062. Termination of requirement for submittal to Congress of reports required of the Department of Defense by statute.
 Sec. 1063. Annual submittal to Congress of munitions assessments.
 Sec. 1064. Potential role for United States ground forces in the Pacific theater.
 Sec. 1065. Report on plans for the use of domestic airfields for homeland defense and disaster response.
 Sec. 1066. Annual reports of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau on the ability of the National Guard to meet its missions.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

- Sec. 1081. Technical and clerical amendments.
 Sec. 1082. Authority to provide training and support to personnel of foreign ministries of defense.
 Sec. 1083. Expansion of outreach for veterans transitioning from serving on active duty.
 Sec. 1084. Modification of certain requirements applicable to major medical facility lease for a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic in Tulsa, Oklahoma.
 Sec. 1085. Comptroller General briefing and report on major medical facility projects of Department of Veterans Affairs.
 Sec. 1086. Sense of Senate.
 Sec. 1087. Melville Hall of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.
 Sec. 1088. Conflict of interest certification for investigations relating to whistleblower retaliation.
 Sec. 1089. Authorization of certain major medical facility projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs for which amounts have been appropriated.
 Sec. 1090. Reform and improvement of personnel security, insider threat detection and prevention, and physical security.
 Sec. 1091. Designation of construction agent for certain construction projects by Department of Veterans Affairs.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

- Sec. 1101. Required probationary period for new employees of the Department of Defense.
 Sec. 1102. Delay of periodic step increase for civilian employees of the Department of Defense based upon unacceptable performance.
 Sec. 1103. Procedures for reduction in force of Department of Defense civilian personnel.
 Sec. 1104. United States Cyber Command workforce.
 Sec. 1105. One-year extension of authority to waive annual limitation on premium pay and aggregate limitation on pay for Federal civilian employees working overseas.
 Sec. 1106. Five-year extension of expedited hiring authority for designated defense acquisition workforce positions.

Sec. 1107. One-year extension of discretionary authority to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities to civilian personnel on official duty in a combat zone.

Sec. 1108. Extension of rate of overtime pay for Department of the Navy employees performing work aboard or dockside in support of the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier forward deployed in Japan.

Sec. 1109. Expansion of temporary authority to make direct appointments of candidates possessing bachelor's degrees to scientific and engineering positions at science and technology reinvention laboratories.

Sec. 1110. Extension of authority for the civilian acquisition workforce personnel demonstration project.

Sec. 1111. Pilot program on dynamic shaping of the workforce to improve the technical skills and expertise at certain Department of Defense laboratories.

Sec. 1112. Pilot program on temporary exchange of financial management and acquisition personnel.

Sec. 1113. Pilot program on enhanced pay authority for certain acquisition and technology positions in the Department of Defense.

Sec. 1114. Pilot program on direct hire authority for veteran technical experts into the defense acquisition workforce.

Sec. 1115. Direct hire authority for technical experts into the defense acquisition workforce.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Training and Assistance

Sec. 1201. One-year extension of funding limitations for authority to build the capacity of foreign security forces.

Sec. 1202. Extension and expansion of authority for reimbursement to the Government of Jordan for border security operations.

Sec. 1203. Extension of authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction.

Sec. 1204. Permanence and modification of authorities relating to National Guard State Partnership Program.

Sec. 1205. Authority to provide support to national military forces of allied countries for counterterrorism operations in Africa.

Sec. 1206. Authority to build the capacity of foreign military intelligence forces.

Sec. 1207. Prohibition on assistance to entities in Yemen controlled by the Houthi movement.

Sec. 1208. Report on potential support for the vetted Syrian opposition.

Sec. 1209. Support for security of afghan women and girls.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq

Sec. 1221. Drawdown of United States forces in Afghanistan.

Sec. 1222. Extension and modification of Commanders' Emergency Response Program.

Sec. 1223. Extension of authority to transfer defense articles and provide defense services to the military and security forces of Afghanistan.

Sec. 1224. Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations.

Sec. 1225. Prohibition on transfer to violent extremist organizations of equipment or supplies provided by the United States to the Government of Iraq.

Sec. 1226. Report on lines of communication of Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and other foreign terrorist organizations.

Sec. 1227. Modification of protection for Afghan allies.

Sec. 1228. Extension of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq.

Sec. 1229. Sense of Senate on support for the Kurdistan Regional Government.

Sec. 1230. Sense of Congress on the security and protection of Iranian dissidents living in Camp Liberty, Iraq.

Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Iran

Sec. 1241. Modification and extension of annual report on the military power of Iran.

Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation

Sec. 1251. Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative.

Sec. 1252. Eastern European Training Initiative.

Sec. 1253. Increased presence of United States ground forces in Eastern Europe to deter aggression on the border of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Sec. 1254. Sense of Congress on European defense and North Atlantic Treaty Organization spending.

Sec. 1255. Additional matters in annual report on military and security developments involving the Russian Federation.

Sec. 1256. Report on alternative capabilities to procure and sustain nonstandard rotary wing aircraft historically procured through Rosoboron-export.

Subtitle E—Matters Relating to the Asia-Pacific Region

Sec. 1261. South China Sea Initiative.

Sec. 1262. Sense of Congress reaffirming the importance of implementing the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region.

Sec. 1263. Sense of Senate on Taiwan asymmetric military capabilities and bilateral training activities.

Sec. 1264. Military exchanges between senior officers and officials of the United States and Taiwan.

Sec. 1265. Strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

Subtitle F—Reports and Related Matters

Sec. 1271. Item in quarterly reports on assistance to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant on forces ineligible to receive assistance due to a gross violation of human rights.

Sec. 1272. United States-Israel anti-tunnel cooperation.

Sec. 1273. Sense of Senate and report on Qatar fighter aircraft capability contribution to regional security.

Sec. 1274. Report on the security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

Sec. 1281. NATO Special Operations Headquarters.

Sec. 1282. Two-year extension and modification of authorization for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

Sec. 1301. Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds.

Sec. 1302. Funding allocations.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Military Programs

Sec. 1401. Working capital funds.

Sec. 1402. National Defense Sealift Fund.

Sec. 1403. Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense.

Sec. 1404. Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide.

Sec. 1405. Defense Inspector General.

Sec. 1406. Defense Health Program.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Sec. 1411. Authority for transfer of funds to joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois.

Sec. 1412. Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Sec. 1413. Inspections of the Armed Forces Retirement Home by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 1501. Purpose.

Sec. 1502. Overseas contingency operations.

Sec. 1503. Procurement.

Sec. 1504. Research, development, test, and evaluation.

Sec. 1505. Operation and maintenance.

Sec. 1506. Military personnel.

Sec. 1507. Working capital funds.

Sec. 1508. Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide.

Sec. 1509. Defense Inspector General.

Sec. 1510. Defense Health Program.

Sec. 1511. Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund.

Subtitle B—Financial Matters

Sec. 1521. Treatment as additional authorizations.

Sec. 1522. Special transfer authority.

Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters

Sec. 1531. Afghanistan Security Forces Fund.

Sec. 1532. Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund.

Sec. 1533. Availability of Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund funds for training of foreign security forces to defeat improvised explosive devices.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

Subtitle A—Space Activities

Sec. 1601. Integrated policy to deter adversaries in space.

Sec. 1602. Principal advisor on space control.

Sec. 1603. Exception to the prohibition on contracting with Russian suppliers of rocket engines for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

Sec. 1604. Elimination of launch capabilities contracts under evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

Sec. 1605. Allocation of funding for evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

Sec. 1606. Inclusion of plan for development and fielding of a full-up engine in rocket propulsion system development program.

Sec. 1607. Limitations on availability of funds for the Defense Meteorological Satellite program.

Sec. 1608. Quarterly reports on Global Positioning System III space segment, Global Positioning System operational control segment, and Military Global Positioning System user equipment acquisition programs.

Sec. 1609. Plan for consolidation of acquisition of commercial satellite communications services.

Sec. 1610. Council on Oversight of the Department of Defense Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Enterprise.

Sec. 1611. Analysis of alternatives for wide-band communications.

Sec. 1612. Expansion of goals for pilot program for acquisition of commercial satellite communication services.

Sec. 1613. Streamline commercial space launch activities.

Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-related Activities

Sec. 1621. Report on Air National Guard contributions to the RQ-4 Global Hawk mission.

Subtitle C—Cyber Warfare, Cyber Security, and Related Matters

Sec. 1631. Authorization of military cyber operations.

Sec. 1632. Designation of Department of Defense entity responsible for acquisition of critical cyber capabilities.

Sec. 1633. Incentive for submittal to Congress by President of integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyberspace.

Sec. 1634. Authorization for procurement of relocatable Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility.

Sec. 1635. Evaluation of cyber vulnerabilities of major weapon systems of the Department of Defense.

Sec. 1636. Assessment of capabilities of United States Cyber Command to defend the United States from cyber attacks.

Sec. 1637. Biennial exercises on responding to cyber attacks against critical infrastructure.

Sec. 1638. Comprehensive plan of Department of Defense to support civil authorities in response to cyber attacks by foreign powers.

Sec. 1639. Sense of Congress on reviewing and considering findings and recommendations of Council of Governors on cyber capabilities of the Armed Forces.

Subtitle D—Nuclear Forces

Sec. 1641. Designation of Air Force officials to be responsible for policy on and procurement of nuclear command, control, and communications systems.

Sec. 1642. Comptroller General of the United States review of recommendations relating to the nuclear security enterprise.

Sec. 1643. Assessment of global nuclear environment.

Sec. 1644. Deadline for Milestone A decision on long-range standoff weapon.

Sec. 1645. Availability of Air Force procurement funds for certain commercial off-the-shelf parts for intercontinental ballistic missile fuzes.

Sec. 1646. Sense of Congress on policy on the nuclear triad.

Sec. 1647. Sense of Senate on the nuclear force improvement program of the Air Force.

Subtitle E—Missile Defense Programs

Sec. 1651. Plan for expediting deployment time of continental United States interceptor site.

Sec. 1652. Additional missile defense sensor coverage for the protection of the United States homeland.

Sec. 1653. Air defense capability at North Atlantic Treaty Organization missile defense sites.

Sec. 1654. Availability of funds for Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

Sec. 1655. Israeli cooperative missile defense program codevelopment and potential coproduction.

Sec. 1656. Development and deployment of multiple-object kill vehicle for missile defense of the United States homeland.

Sec. 1657. Requirement to replace capability enhancement I exoatmospheric kill vehicles.

Sec. 1658. Airborne boost phase defense system.

Sec. 1659. Extension of limitation on providing certain sensitive missile defense information to the Russian Federation.

Sec. 1660. Extension of requirement for Comptroller General of the United States review and assessment of missile defense acquisition programs.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Sec. 1671. Measures in response to violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty by the Russian Federation.

Sec. 1672. Modification of notification and assessment of proposal to modify or introduce new aircraft or sensors for flight by the Russian Federation under the Open Skies Treaty.

Sec. 1673. Milestone A decision for the Conventional Prompt Global Strike Weapons System.

Sec. 1674. Sense of Congress on maintaining and enhancing military intelligence support to force protection for installations, facilities, and personnel of the Department of Defense.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 2001. Short title.

Sec. 2002. Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 2101. Authorized army construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2102. Family housing.

Sec. 2103. Improvements to military family housing units.

Sec. 2104. Authorization of appropriations, Army.

Sec. 2105. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project.

Sec. 2106. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects.

Sec. 2107. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2013 projects.

Sec. 2108. Additional authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2016 project.

Sec. 2109. Limitation on construction of new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 2201. Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2202. Family housing.

Sec. 2203. Improvements to military family housing units.

Sec. 2204. Authorization of appropriations, Navy.

Sec. 2205. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects.

Sec. 2206. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2013 projects.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 2301. Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2302. Family housing.

Sec. 2303. Improvements to military family housing units.

Sec. 2304. Authorization of appropriations, Air Force.

Sec. 2305. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2010 project.

Sec. 2306. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project.

Sec. 2307. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2015 project.

Sec. 2308. Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2012 project.

Sec. 2309. Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2013 project.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 2401. Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2402. Authorized energy conservation projects.

Sec. 2403. Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies.

Sec. 2404. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 project.

Sec. 2405. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects.

Sec. 2406. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2013 projects.

Sec. 2407. Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Sec. 2501. Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2502. Authorization of appropriations, NATO.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 2601. Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2602. Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2603. Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2604. Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2605. Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2606. Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve.

Subtitle B—Others Matters

- Sec. 2611. Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project.
- Sec. 2612. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2015 projects.
- Sec. 2613. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects.
- Sec. 2614. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2013 projects.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

- Sec. 2701. Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account.
- Sec. 2702. Prohibition on conducting additional base realignment and closure (BRAC) round.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS*Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes*

- Sec. 2801. Authority for acceptance and use of contributions for certain mutually beneficial projects.
- Sec. 2802. Change in authorities relating to scope of work variations for military construction projects.
- Sec. 2803. Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects outside the United States.
- Sec. 2804. Modification of reporting requirement on in-kind construction and renovation payments.
- Sec. 2805. Lab modernization pilot program.
- Sec. 2806. Conveyance to Indian tribes of certain housing units.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

- Sec. 2811. Utility system conveyance authority.
- Sec. 2812. Leasing of non-excess property of military departments and Defense Agencies; treatment of value provided by local education agencies and elementary and secondary schools.
- Sec. 2813. Modification of facility repair notification requirement.
- Sec. 2814. Increase of threshold of notice and wait requirement for certain facilities for reserve components and parity with authority for unspecified minor military construction and repair projects.
- Sec. 2815. Sense of Congress on coordination of hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities on military land.
- Sec. 2816. Exemption of Army off-site use and off-site removal only non-mobile properties from certain excess property disposal requirements.

Subtitle C—Land Conveyances

- Sec. 2821. Release of reversionary interest retained as part of conveyance to the Economic Development Alliance of Jefferson County, Arkansas.
- Sec. 2822. Land exchange, Navy Outlying Landing Field, Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS***Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations*

- Sec. 3101. National Nuclear Security Administration.
- Sec. 3102. Defense environmental cleanup.
- Sec. 3103. Other defense activities.
- Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations*
- Sec. 3111. Responsive capabilities program.
- Sec. 3112. Long-term plan for meeting national security requirements for unencumbered uranium.
- Sec. 3113. Defense nuclear nonproliferation management plan.
- Sec. 3114. Plan for deactivation and decommissioning of nonoperational defense nuclear facilities.
- Sec. 3115. Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant contract oversight.
- Sec. 3116. Assessment of emergency preparedness of defense nuclear facilities.
- Sec. 3117. Laboratory- and facility-directed research and development programs.
- Sec. 3118. Limitation on bonuses for employees of the National Nuclear Security Administration who engage in improper program management.
- Sec. 3119. Modification of authorized personnel levels of the Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security.
- Sec. 3120. Modification of submission of assessments of certain budget requests relating to the nuclear weapons stockpile.
- Sec. 3121. Repeal of phase three review of certain defense environmental cleanup projects.
- Sec. 3122. Modifications to cost-benefit analyses for competition of management and operating contracts.
- Sec. 3123. Review of implementation of recommendations of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

- Sec. 3201. Authorization.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

- Sec. 3501. Cadet commitment agreements.
- Sec. 3502. Student incentive payment agreements.
- Sec. 3503. Federal Unemployment Tax Act.
- Sec. 3504. Short sea transportation defined.
- Sec. 3505. Authorization of appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

- Sec. 4001. Authorization of amounts in funding tables.
- Sec. 4002. Clarification of applicability of undistributed reductions of certain operation and maintenance funding among all operation and maintenance funding.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

- Sec. 4101. Procurement.
- Sec. 4102. Procurement for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

- Sec. 4201. Research, development, test, and evaluation.

- Sec. 4202. Research, development, test, and evaluation for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

- Sec. 4301. Operation and maintenance.
- Sec. 4302. Operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

- Sec. 4401. Military personnel.
- Sec. 4402. Military personnel for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

- Sec. 4501. Other authorizations.
- Sec. 4502. Other authorizations for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

- Sec. 4601. Military construction.

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

- Sec. 4701. Department of Energy national security programs.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.

In this Act, the term “congressional defense committees” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF THIS ACT.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purposes of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, jointly submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage in the House acting first on the conference report or amendment between the Houses.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS**TITLE I—PROCUREMENT***Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations***SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for procurement for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and Defense-wide activities, as specified in the funding table in section 4101.

*Subtitle B—Navy Programs***SEC. 111. AMENDMENT TO COST LIMITATION BASELINE FOR CVN-78 CLASS AIRCRAFT CARRIER PROGRAM.**

Section 122(a)(2) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364; 120 Stat. 2104), as amended by section 121(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 691), is further amended by striking “\$11,498,000,000” and inserting “\$11,398,000,000”.

SEC. 112. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR USS JOHN F. KENNEDY (CVN-79).

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for procurement for the USS JOHN F. KENNEDY (CVN-79), \$100,000,000 may not be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of the Navy submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives the certification required under subsection (b) and the reports required under subsection (c) and (d).

(b) **CERTIFICATION REGARDING FULL SHIP SHOCK TRIALS.**—The Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a certification that the Navy will conduct by not

later than September 30, 2017, full ship shock trials on the USS GERALD R. FORD (CVN-78).

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a report that evaluates cost issues related to the USS JOHN F. KENNEDY (CVN-79) and the USS ENTERPRISE (CVN-80).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) Options to achieve ship end cost of no more than \$10,000,000,000.

(B) Options to freeze the design of CVN-79 for CVN-80, with exceptions only for changes due to full ship shock trials or other significant test and evaluation results.

(C) Options to reduce the plans cost for CVN-80 to less than 50 percent of the CVN-79 plans cost.

(D) Options to transition all non-nuclear government furnished equipment, including launch and arresting equipment, to contractor furnished equipment.

(E) Options to build the ships at the most economic pace, such as four years between ships.

(F) A business case analysis for the Enterprise Air Search Radar modification to CVN-79 and CVN-80.

(G) A business case analysis for the two-phase CVN-79 delivery proposal and impact on fleet deployments.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2016, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a report on potential requirements, capabilities, and alternatives for future development of aircraft carriers that would replace or supplement the CVN-78 class aircraft carrier.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of fleet, sea-based tactical aviation capability requirements for a range of operational scenarios beginning in the 2025 timeframe.

(B) A description of alternative aircraft carrier designs that meet the requirements described under subparagraph (A).

(C) A description of nuclear and non-nuclear propulsion options.

(D) A description of tonnage options ranging from less than 20,000 tons to greater than 100,000 tons.

(E) Requirements for unmanned systems integration from inception.

(F) Developmental, procurement, and lifecycle cost assessment of alternatives.

(G) A notional acquisition strategy for development and construction of alternatives.

(H) A description of shipbuilding industrial base considerations and a plan to ensure opportunity for competition among alternatives.

(I) A description of funding and timing considerations related to developing the Annual Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels required under section 231 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 113. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR USS ENTERPRISE (CVN-80).

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for advance procurement for the USS ENTERPRISE (CVN-80), \$191,400,000 may not be obligated or expended until the Secretary of the Navy submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives the certification

required under subsection (b) and the report required under subsection (c).

(b) CERTIFICATION REGARDING CVN-80 DESIGN.—The Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a certification that the design of CVN-80 will repeat that of CVN-79, with modifications only for significant test and evaluation results or significant cost reduction initiatives that still meet threshold requirements.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that details the plans costs related to the USS ENTERPRISE (CVN-80).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements, reported by total cost and cost by fiscal year, with a detailed description and a justification for why each cost is recurring and attributable to CVN-80:

(A) Overall plans.

(B) Propulsion plant detail design.

(C) Platform detail design.

(D) Lead yard services and hull planning yard.

(E) Platform detail design (Steam and Electric Plant Planning Yard).

(F) Other.

SEC. 114. MODIFICATION OF CVN-78 CLASS AIRCRAFT CARRIER PROGRAM.

Subsection (f) of section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364; 120 Stat. 2104), as added by section 121(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 692), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) As part of the report required under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Navy shall include a description of new design and engineering changes to CVN-78 class aircraft carriers if applicable.

“(B) The additional reporting requirement in subparagraph (A) shall include, with respect to CVN-78 class aircraft carriers in each reporting period—

“(i) any design or engineering change with an associated cost greater than \$5,000,000;

“(ii) program or ship cost increases for each design or engineering change identified in subparagraph (A); and

“(iii) cost reduction achieved.

“(C) The Secretary of the Navy and Chief of Naval Operations shall each personally sign (not autopen) the additional reporting requirement in subparagraph (A). This certification may not be delegated. The certification shall include a determination that each change—

“(i) serves the national security interests of the United States;

“(ii) cannot be deferred to a future ship due to operational necessity, safety, or substantial cost reduction that still meets threshold requirements; and

“(iii) was personally reviewed and endorsed by the Secretary of the Navy and Chief of Naval Operations.”.

SEC. 115. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research and development, design, construction, procurement or advanced procurement of materials for the Littoral Combat Ships designated as LCS 33 or subsequent, not more than 25 percent may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of the Navy submits to the

Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives each of the following:

(1) A Capabilities Based Assessment to assess capability gaps and associated capability requirements and risks for the upgraded Littoral Combat Ship, which is proposed to commence with LCS 33. This assessment shall conform with the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System, including Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3170.01H.

(2) A certification that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council has validated an updated Capabilities Development Document for the upgraded Littoral Combat Ship.

(3) A report describing the upgraded Littoral Combat Ship modernization, which shall, at a minimum, include the following elements:

(A) A description of capabilities that the LCS program delivers, and a description of how these relate to the characteristics of the future joint force identified in the Capstone Concept for Joint Operations, concept of operations, and integrated architecture documents.

(B) A summary of analyses and studies conducted on LCS modernization.

(C) A concept of operations for LCS modernization ships at the operational level and tactical level describing how they integrate and synchronize with joint and combined forces to achieve the Joint Force Commander's intent.

(D) A description of threat systems of potential adversaries that are projected or assessed to reach initial operational capability within 15 years against which the lethality and survivability of the LCS should be determined.

(E) A plan and timeline for LCS modernization program execution.

(F) A description of system capabilities required for LCS modernization, including key performance parameters and key system attributes.

(G) A plan for family of systems or systems of systems synchronization.

(H) A plan for information technology and national security systems supportability.

(I) A plan for intelligence supportability.

(J) A plan for electromagnetic environmental effects (E3) and spectrum supportability.

(K) A description of assets required to achieve initial operational capability (IOC) of an LCS modernization increment.

(L) A schedule and initial operational capability and full operational capability definitions.

(M) A description of doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership, education, personnel, facilities, and policy considerations.

(N) A description of other system attributes.

(4) A plan for future periodic combat systems upgrades, which are necessary to ensure relevant capability throughout the Littoral Combat Ship or Frigate class service lives, using the process described in paragraph (3).

SEC. 116. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP.

Section 124(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 693), as amended by section 123 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3314), is further amended—

(1) by striking “this Act, the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, or otherwise made available for fiscal years 2014 or 2015” and inserting “this Act, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, or otherwise made available for fiscal years 2014, 2015, or 2016”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(6) A Littoral Combat Ship seaframe acquisition strategy for the Littoral Combat Ships designated as LCS 25 through LCS 32, including

upgrades to be installed on these ships that were identified for the upgraded Littoral Combat Ship, which is proposed to commence with LCS 33.

“(7) A Littoral Combat Ship mission module acquisition strategy to reach the total acquisition quantity of each mission module.

“(8) A cost and schedule plan to outfit Flight 0 and Flight 0+ Littoral Combat Ships with capabilities identified for the upgraded Littoral Combat Ship.

“(9) A current Test and Evaluation Master Plan for the Littoral Combat Ship Mission Modules, approved by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, which includes the performance levels expected to be demonstrated during developmental testing for each component and mission module prior to commencing the associated operational test phase.”.

SEC. 117. CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL ARLEIGH BURKE DESTROYER.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Navy may enter into a contract beginning with the fiscal year 2016 program year for the procurement of one Arleigh Burke class destroyer in addition to the ten DDG-51s in the fiscal year 2013 through 2017 multiyear procurement contract or for one DDG-51 in fiscal year 2018. The Secretary may employ incremental funding for such procurement.

(b) *CONDITION ON OUT-YEAR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.*—A contract entered into under subsection (a) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under such contract for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2016 is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose for such fiscal year.

SEC. 118. FLEET REPLENISHMENT OILER PROGRAM.

(a) *CONTRACT AUTHORITY.*—The Secretary of the Navy may enter into one or more contracts to procure up to six Fleet Replenishment Oilers. Such procurements may also include advance procurement for Economic Order Quantity (EOQ) and long lead time materials, beginning with the lead ship, commencing not earlier than fiscal year 2016.

(b) *LIABILITY.*—Any contract entered into under subsection (a) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose, and that total liability to the government for termination of any contract entered into shall be limited to the total amount of funding obligated at the time of termination.

SEC. 119. REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR OHIO-CLASS REPLACEMENT SUBMARINE PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Defense shall include in the budget justification materials for the Ohio-class replacement submarine program submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Defense budget for that fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) a report including the following elements, described in terms of both fiscal 2010 and current fiscal year dollars:

- (1) Lead ship end cost (with plans).
- (2) Lead ship end cost (less plans).
- (3) Lead ship non-recurring engineering cost.
- (4) Average follow-on ship cost.
- (5) Average operations and sustainment cost per hull per year.
- (6) Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics average follow-on ship affordability target.
- (7) Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics operations and sustainment cost per hull per year affordability target.

SEC. 120. STATIONING OF C-130 H AIRCRAFT AVIONICS PREVIOUSLY MODIFIED BY THE AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (AMP) IN SUPPORT OF DAILY TRAINING AND CONTINGENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR AIRBORNE AND SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall station aircraft previously modified by the C-130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) to support United States Army Airborne and United States Army Special Operations Command daily training and contingency requirements in fiscal year 2017, and such aircraft shall not be required to deploy in the normal rotation of C-130 H units. The Secretary shall provide such personnel as required to maintain and operate the aircraft.

Subtitle C—Air Force Programs

SEC. 131. LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF B-1, B-2, AND B-52 BOMBER AIRCRAFT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Except as provided in subsection (b), no B-1, B-2, or B-52 bomber aircraft may be retired during a fiscal year prior to initial operational capability (IOC) of the LRS-B unless the Secretary of Defense certifies, in the materials submitted in support of the budget of the President for that fiscal year (as submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code), that—

(1) the retirement of the aircraft is required to reallocate funding and manpower resources to enable LRS-B to reach IOC and full operational capability (FOC); and

(2) the Secretary has concluded that retirements of B-1, B-2, and B-52 bomber aircraft in the near-term will not detrimentally affect operational capability.

(b) *EXCEPTION.*—A certification described in subsection (a) is not required with respect to the retirement of B-1 bomber aircraft carried out in accordance with section 132(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1320).

SEC. 132. LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT OF AIR FORCE FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.

(a) *INVENTORY REQUIREMENT.*—Section 8062 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) *INVENTORY REQUIREMENT.*—(1) Effective October 1, 2015, the Secretary of the Air Force shall maintain a total aircraft inventory of fighter aircraft of not less than 1,950 aircraft, and a total primary mission aircraft inventory (combat-coded) of not less than 1,116 fighter aircraft.

“(2) In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘fighter aircraft’ means an aircraft that—

“(i) is designated by a mission design series prefix of F- or A-;

“(ii) is manned by one or two crewmembers; and

“(iii) executes single-role or multi-role missions, including air-to-air combat, air-to-ground attack, air interdiction, suppression or destruction of enemy air defenses, close air support, strike control and reconnaissance, combat search and rescue support, or airborne forward air control.

“(B) The term ‘primary mission aircraft inventory’ means aircraft assigned to meet the primary aircraft authorization to a unit for the performance of its wartime mission.”.

(b) *LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT OF AIR FORCE FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.*—

(1) *LIMITATION.*—The Secretary of the Air Force may not proceed with a decision to retire fighter aircraft in any number that would reduce the total number of such aircraft in the Air Force total active inventory (TAI) below 1,950, and shall maintain a minimum of 1,116 fighter aircraft designated as primary mission aircraft inventory (PMAI).

(2) *ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.*—The Secretary of the Air

Force may not retire fighter aircraft from the total active inventory as of the date of the enactment of this Act until the later of the following:

(A) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report required under paragraph (3).

(B) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(i) the retirement of such fighter aircraft will not increase the operational risk of meeting the National Defense Strategy; and

(ii) the retirement of such aircraft will not reduce the total fighter force structure below 1,950 fighter aircraft or the primary mission aircraft inventory below 1,116.

(3) *REPORT ON RETIREMENT OF AIRCRAFT.*—The Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(A) The rationale for the retirement of existing fighter aircraft and an operational analysis of replacement fighter aircraft that demonstrates performance of the designated mission at an equal or greater level of effectiveness as the retiring aircraft.

(B) An assessment of the implications for the Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force Reserve of the force mix ratio of fighter aircraft.

(C) Such other matters relating to the retirement of fighter aircraft as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) *REPORTS ON FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—At least 90 days before the date on which a fighter aircraft is retired, the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with (where applicable) the Director of the Air National Guard or Chief of the Air Force Reserve, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the proposed force structure and basing of fighter aircraft.

(2) *ELEMENTS.*—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A list of each aircraft in the inventory of fighter aircraft, including for each such aircraft—

(i) the mission design series type;

(ii) the variant; and

(iii) the assigned unit and military installation where such aircraft is based.

(B) A list of each fighter aircraft proposed for retirement, including for each such aircraft—

(i) the mission design series type;

(ii) the variant; and

(iii) the assigned unit and military installation where such aircraft is based.

(C) A list of each unit affected by a proposed retirement listed under subparagraph (B) and a description of how such unit is affected.

(D) For each military installation and unit listed under subparagraph (B)(iii), a description of changes, if any, to the designed operational capability (DOC) statement of the unit as a result of a proposed retirement.

(E) A description of any anticipated changes in manpower authorizations as a result of a proposed retirement listed under subparagraph (B).

(d) *FIGHTER AIRCRAFT DEFINED.*—In this section, the term “fighter aircraft” has the meaning given the term in subsection (i)(2)(A) of section 8062 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 133. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR F-35A AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for aircraft procurement, Air Force, not more than \$4,285,000,000 may be made available for the procurement of F-35A aircraft until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that F-35A aircraft

delivered in fiscal year 2018 will have full combat capability as currently planned with Block 3F hardware, software, and weapons carriage.

SEC. 134. PROHIBITION ON RETIREMENT OF A-10 AIRCRAFT.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status any A-10 aircraft.

(b) **ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to the limitation in subsection (a), during the period before December 31, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force may not retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on backup flying status any A-10 aircraft.

(2) **MINIMUM INVENTORY REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary of the Air Force shall ensure the Air Force maintains a minimum of 171 A-10 aircraft designated as primary mission aircraft inventory (PMAI).

(c) **PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS IN MANNING LEVELS.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to make significant reductions to manning levels with respect to any A-10 aircraft squadrons or divisions.

(d) **ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS IN MANNING LEVELS.**—In addition to the limitation in subsection (c), during the period before December 31, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force may not make significant reductions to manning levels with respect to any A-10 aircraft squadrons or divisions.

(e) **STUDY ON REPLACEMENT CAPABILITY REQUIREMENTS OR MISSION PLATFORM FOR THE A-10 AIRCRAFT.**—

(1) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Air Force shall commission an appropriate entity outside the Department of Defense to conduct an assessment of the required capabilities or mission platform to replace the A-10 aircraft. This assessment would represent preparatory work to inform an analysis of alternatives.

(B) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required under subparagraph (A) shall include each of the following:

(i) Future needs analysis for the current A-10 aircraft mission set to include troops-in-contact/close air support, air interdiction, strike control and reconnaissance, and combat search and rescue support in both contested and uncontested battle environments. At a minimum, the needs analysis should specifically address the following areas:

(I) The ability to safely and effectively conduct troops-in-contact/danger close missions or missions in close proximity to civilians in the presence of the air defenses found with enemy ground maneuver units.

(II) The ability to effectively target and destroy moving, camouflaged, or dug-in troops, artillery, armor, and armored personnel carriers.

(III) The ability to remain within visual range of friendly forces and targets to facilitate responsiveness to ground forces and minimize re-attack times.

(IV) The ability to safely conduct close air support beneath low cloud ceilings and in reduced visibilities at low airspeeds in the presence of the air defenses found with enemy ground maneuver units.

(V) The capability to enable the pilot and aircraft to survive attacks stemming from small arms, machine guns, MANPADs, and lower caliber anti-aircraft artillery organic or attached to enemy ground forces and maneuver units.

(VI) The ability to communicate effectively with ground forces and downed pilots, including in communications jamming or satellite-denied environments.

(VII) The ability to execute the missions described in subclauses (I), (II), (III), and (IV) in a GPS- or satellite-denied environment with or without sensors.

(VIII) The ability to deliver multiple lethal firing passes and sustain long loiter endurance to support friendly forces throughout extended ground engagements.

(IX) The ability to operate from unprepared dirt, grass, and narrow road runways and to generate high sortie rates under these austere conditions.

(ii) Identification and assessment of gaps in the ability of existing and programmed mission platforms in providing required capabilities to conduct missions specified in clause (i) in both contested and uncontested battle environments.

(iii) Assessment of operational effectiveness of existing and programmed mission platforms to conduct missions specified in clause (i) in both contested and uncontested battle environments.

(iv) Assessment of probability of likelihood of conducting missions requiring troops-in-contact/close air support operations specified in clause (i) in contested environments as compared to uncontested environments.

(v) Any other matters the independent entity or the Secretary of the Air Force determines to be appropriate.

(2) **REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the assessment required under paragraph (1).

(B) **FORM.**—The report required under subparagraph (A) may be submitted in classified form, but shall also contain an unclassified executive summary and may contain an unclassified annex.

(3) **NONDUPLICATION OF EFFORT.**—If any information required under paragraph (1) has been included in another report or notification previously submitted to Congress by law, the Secretary of the Air Force may provide a list of such reports and notifications at the time of submitting the report required under paragraph (2) in lieu of including such information in the report required under paragraph (2).

SEC. 135. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF EC-130H COMPASS CALL AIRCRAFT.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON RETIREMENT.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or backup aircraft inventory status any EC-130H Compass Call aircraft.

(b) **ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF EC-130H COMPASS CALL AIRCRAFT.**—In addition to the limitation in subsection (a), during the period preceding December 31, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force may not retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on backup flying status any EC-130H Compass Call aircraft.

(c) **REPORT ON RETIREMENT OF EC-130H COMPASS CALL AIRCRAFT.**—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) The rationale for the retirement of existing EC-130H Compass Call aircraft, including an operational analysis of the impact of such retirements on combatant commander warfighting requirements.

(2) A plan for how the Air Force will fulfill the capability requirement of the EC-130H mission, transition the mission capabilities of the EC-130H into a replacement platform, or inte-

grate the required capabilities into other mission platforms.

(3) Such other matters relating to the required mission capabilities and transition of the EC-130H Compass Call fleet as the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 136. LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF C-130 AIRCRAFT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to transfer from one facility of the Department of Defense to another any C-130H aircraft, initiate any C-130 manpower authorization adjustments, retire or prepare to retire any C-130H aircraft, or close any C-130H unit until 90 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, and after certification by the commanders of the XVIII Airborne Corps, 82nd Airborne Division and United States Army Special Operations Command, certifies to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the United States Air Force will maintain dedicated C-130 wings to support the daily training and contingency requirements of the XVIII Airborne Corps, 82nd Airborne Division, and United States Army Special Operations Command at manning levels required to support and operate the number of aircraft that existed as part of regular and reserve Air Force operations in support of such units as of September 30, 2014; and

(2) failure to maintain such Air Force operations will not adversely impact the daily training requirement of those airborne and special operations units.

SEC. 137. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR T-1A JAYHAWK AIRCRAFT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for avionics modification to the T-1A Jayhawk aircraft may be obligated or expended until 30 days after the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees the report required under section 142 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3320).

SEC. 138. RESTRICTION ON RETIREMENT OF THE JOINT SURVEILLANCE TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS), EC-130H COMPASS CALL, AND AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING AND CONTROL (AWACS) AIRCRAFT.

The Secretary of the Air Force may not retire any operational Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS), EC-130H Compass Call, or Airborne Early Warning and Control (AWACS) aircraft until the follow-on replacement aircraft program enters Low-Rate Initial Production.

SEC. 139. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE OCONUS BASING OF THE F-35A AIRCRAFT.

(a) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that the Department of Defense is continuing its process of permanently stationing the F-35 aircraft at installations in the Continental United States (in this section referred to as “CONUS”) and forward-basing Outside the Continental United States (in this section referred to as “OCONUS”).

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force, in the strategic basing process for the F-35A aircraft, should continue to consider the benefits derived from sites that—

(1) are capable of hosting fighter-based bilateral and multilateral training opportunities with international partners;

(2) have sufficient airspace and range capabilities and capacity to meet the training requirements;

(3) have existing facilities to support personnel, operations, and logistics associated with the flying mission;

(4) have limited encroachment that would adversely impact training or operations; and

(5) minimize the overall construction and operational costs.

SEC. 140. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON F-16 ACTIVE ELECTRONICALLY SCANNED ARRAY (AESA) RADAR UPGRADE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) National Guard F-16 aircraft are protecting the United States from terrorist air attack from inside or outside the contiguous United States 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

(2) These aircraft, stationed throughout the United States, are tasked with the zero-fail mission of guarding and securing United States airspace.

(3) The United States is facing an increased threat from both state and non-state actors.

(4) The National Guard F-16 aircraft performing the Aerospace Control Alert (ACA) mission are operating legacy radar systems.

(5) Air Force Chief of Staff General Mark Welsh testified to Congress in March 2015, stating, “We need to develop an AESA radar plan for our F-16s who are conducting the homeland defense mission in particular.”

(6) First Air Force, United States Northern Command, issued a Joint Urgent Operational Need (JUON) request in March 2015 for radar upgrades to its F-16 fleet.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is essential to our Nation’s defense that Air Force aircraft modification funding is made available to purchase these Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radars as the United States Air Force bridges the gap between 4th and 5th generation fighters;

(2) the United States Government must invest in radar upgrades which ensure that 4th generation aircraft succeed at this zero-fail mission; and

(3) the First Air Force JUON request should be met as soon as possible.

Subtitle D—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters

SEC. 151. REPORT ON ARMY AND MARINE CORPS MODERNIZATION PLAN FOR SMALL ARMS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the plan of the Army and the Marine Corps to modernize small arms for the Army and the Marine Corps during the 15-year period beginning on the date of such plan, including the mechanisms to be used to promote competition among suppliers of small arms and small arms parts in achieving the plan.

(b) SMALL ARMS.—The small arms covered by the plan under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Pistols.

(2) Carbines.

(3) Rifles and automatic rifles.

(4) Light machine guns.

(5) Such other small arms as the Secretaries consider appropriate for purposes of the report required by subsection (a).

(c) NON-STANDARD SMALL ARMS.—In addition to the arms specified in subsection (b), the plan under subsection (a) shall also address non-standard small arms not currently in the small arms inventory of the Army or the Marine Corps.

Subtitle E—Army Programs

SEC. 161. STRYKER LETHALITY UPGRADES.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR PROCUREMENT, ARMY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 101 for procurement is hereby increased by \$314,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for procurement for the Army for Wheeled and Tracked Combat Vehicles for Stryker (mod) Lethality Upgrades.

(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for procurement for Stryker (mod) Lethality Upgrades is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for procurement for the Army for Stryker (mod) Lethality Upgrades.

(b) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RDT&E, ARMY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation is hereby increased by \$57,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army for the Combat Vehicle Improvement Program for Stryker Lethality Upgrades.

(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Stryker Lethality Upgrades is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army for Stryker Lethality Upgrades.

(c) OFFSET.—The aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by division A is hereby reduced by \$371,000,000, with the amount of the reduction to be achieved through anticipated foreign currency gains in addition to any other anticipated foreign currency gains specified in the funding tables in division D.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation as specified in the funding table in section 4201.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 211. CENTERS FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND ENGINEERING PARTNERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 139 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2367 the following new section:

“§2368. Centers for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership

“(a) DESIGNATION.—(1) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall designate each science and technology reinvention laboratory as a Center for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership in the recognized core competencies of the designee.

“(2) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a policy to encourage the Secretary of each military department to reengineer management and business processes and adopt best-business and personnel practices at their Centers for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership in connection with their core competency requirements, so as to serve as recognized leaders in their core competencies throughout the Department of Defense and in the national technology and industrial base (as defined in section 2500 of this title).

“(3) The Secretary of Defense, acting through the directors of the Centers for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership, may conduct one or more pilot programs, consistent with applicable requirements of law, to test any practices referred to in paragraph (2) that the Directors determine could—

“(A) improve the efficiency and effectiveness of operations at Centers for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership;

“(B) improve the support provided by the Centers for the Department of Defense users of the services of the Centers; and

“(C) enhance capabilities by reducing the cost and improving the performance and efficiency of executing laboratory missions.

“(4) In this subsection, the term ‘science and technology reinvention laboratory’ means a science and technology reinvention laboratory designated under section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note).

“(b) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.—(1) To achieve one or more objectives set forth in paragraph (2), the Secretary may authorize and establish incentives for the Director of a Center for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership to enter into public-private cooperative arrangements (in this section referred to as a ‘public-private partnership’) to provide for any of the following:

“(A) For employees of the Center, private industry, or other entities outside the Department of Defense to perform (under contract, subcontract, or otherwise) work related to the core competencies of the Center, including any work that involves one or more core competencies of the Center.

“(B) For private industry or other entities outside the Department of Defense to use, for any period of time determined to be consistent with the needs of the Department of Defense, any facilities or equipment of the Center that are not fully used for Department of Defense activities.

“(2) The objectives for exercising the authority provided in paragraph (1) are as follows:

“(A) To maximize the use of the capacity of a Center for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership.

“(B) To reduce or eliminate the cost of ownership and maintenance of a Center by the Department of Defense.

“(C) To reduce the cost of research and testing activities of the Department of Defense.

“(D) To leverage private sector investment in—

“(i) such efforts as research and equipment recapitalization for a Center; and

“(ii) the promotion of the undertaking of commercial business ventures based on the core competencies of a Center, as determined by the director of the Center.

“(E) To foster cooperation between the armed forces, academia, and private industry.

“(F) To increase access by a Center to a skilled technical workforce that can contribute to the effective and efficient execution of Department of Defense missions.

“(c) PRIVATE SECTOR USE OF EXCESS CAPACITY.—Any facilities or equipment of a Center for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership made available to private industry may be used to perform research and testing activities in order to make more efficient and economical use of Government-owned facilities and encourage the creation and preservation of jobs to ensure the availability of a workforce with the necessary research and technical skills to meet the needs of the armed forces.

“(d) CREDITING OF AMOUNTS FOR PERFORMANCE.—Amounts received by a Center for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership for work performed under a public-private partnership may—

“(1) be credited to the appropriation or fund, including a working-capital fund, that incurs the cost of performing the work; or

“(2) be used by the Director of the Center as the Director considers appropriate and consistent with section 219 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note).

“(e) AVAILABILITY OF EXCESS EQUIPMENT TO PRIVATE-SECTOR PARTNERS.—Equipment or facilities of a Center for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership may be made available for use by a private-sector entity under this section only if—

“(1) the use of the equipment or facilities will not have a significant adverse effect on the performance of the Center or the ability of the Center to achieve its mission, as determined by the Director of the Center; and

“(2) the private-sector entity agrees—

“(A) to reimburse the Department of Defense for the direct and indirect costs (including any rental costs) that are attributable to the entity’s use of the equipment or facilities, as determined by that Secretary; and

“(B) to hold harmless and indemnify the United States from—

“(i) any claim for damages or injury to any person or property arising out of the use of the equipment or facilities, except under the circumstances described in section 2563(c)(3) of title 10, United States Code; and

“(ii) any liability or claim for damages or injury to any person or property arising out of a decision by the Secretary to suspend or terminate that use of equipment or facilities during a war or national emergency.

“(f) CONSTRUCTION OF PROVISION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize a change, otherwise prohibited by law, from the performance of work at a Center for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership by Department of Defense personnel to performance by a contractor.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 139 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2367 the following new item:

“2368. Centers for Science, Technology, and Engineering Partnership.”.

SEC. 212. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY OFFSET PROGRAM TO BUILD AND MAINTAIN THE MILITARY TECHNOLOGICAL SUPERIORITY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a technology offset program to build and maintain the military technological superiority of the United States by—

(A) accelerating the fielding of offset technologies that would help counter technological advantages of potential adversaries of the United States, including directed energy, low-cost, high-speed munitions, autonomous systems, undersea warfare, cyber technology, and intelligence data analytics, developed using Department of Defense research funding and accelerating the commercialization of such technologies; and

(B) developing and implementing new policies and acquisition and business practices.

(2) GUIDELINES.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidelines for the operation of the program, including—

(A) criteria for an application for funding by a military department, defense agency, or a combatant command;

(B) the purposes for which such a department, agency, or command may apply for funds and appropriate requirements for technology development or commercialization to be supported using program funds;

(C) the priorities, if any, to be provided to field or commercialize offset technologies developed by certain types of Department research funding; and

(D) criteria for evaluation of an application for funding or changes to policies or acquisition and business practices by a department, agency, or command for purposes of the program.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF DIRECTED ENERGY STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with such officials and third-party experts as the Secretary considers appropriate, shall develop a directed energy strategy to ensure that the United States directed energy technologies are being developed and deployed at an accelerated pace.

(2) COMPONENTS OF STRATEGY.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A technology roadmap for directed energy that can be used to manage and assess investments and policies of the Department in this high priority technology area.

(B) Proposals for legislative and administrative action to improve the ability of the Department to develop and deploy technologies and capabilities consistent with the directed energy strategy.

(C) An approach to program management that is designed to accelerate operational prototyping of directed energy technologies and develop cost-effective, real-world military applications for such technologies.

(3) BIENNIAL REVISIONS.—Not less frequently than once every 2 years, the Secretary shall revise the strategy required by paragraph (1).

(4) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—(A) Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary completes the development of the strategy required by paragraph (1) and not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary completes a revision to such strategy under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a copy of such strategy.

(B) The strategy submitted under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Under the program, the Secretary shall, not less frequently than annually, solicit from the heads of the military departments, the defense agencies, and the combatant commands applications for funding to be used to enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, or other transaction agreements entered into pursuant to section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160; 10 U.S.C. 2371 note) with appropriate entities for the fielding or commercialization of technologies.

(2) TREATMENT PURSUANT TO CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL RULES.—Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to require any official of the Department of Defense to provide funding under this section to any earmark as defined pursuant to House Rule XXI, clause 9, or any congressionally directed spending item as defined pursuant to Senate Rule XLIV, paragraph 5.

(d) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide for fiscal year 2016, not more than \$400,000,000 may be used for any such fiscal year for the program established under subsection (a).

(2) AMOUNT FOR DIRECTED ENERGY.—Of this amount, not more than \$200,000,000 may be used for activities in the field of directed energy.

(e) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may transfer funds available for the program to the research, development, test, and evaluation accounts of a military department, defense agency, or a combatant command pursuant to an application, or any part of an application, that the Secretary determines would support the purposes of the program.

(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The transfer authority provided in this subsection is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense.

(f) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority to carry out a program under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2020.

(2) TRANSFER AFTER TERMINATION.—Any amounts made available for the program that remain available for obligation on the date the program terminates may be transferred under subsection (e) during the 180-day period beginning on the date of the termination of the program.

SEC. 213. REAUTHORIZATION OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 1073 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 10 U.S.C. 2359a note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2020”.

(b) MODIFICATION OF GUIDELINES FOR OPERATION OF PROGRAM.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) The issuance of an annual broad agency announcement or the use of any other competitive or merit-based processes by the Department of Defense for candidate proposals in support of defense acquisition programs as described in subsection (a).”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the second sentence;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “be funded under the program for more than two years” and inserting “receive more than a total of two years of funding under the program”; and

(B) by striking the second sentence; and

(4) by adding at the end, the following new paragraphs:

“(5) Mechanisms to facilitate transition of follow-on or current projects carried out under the program into defense acquisition programs, through the use of the authorities of section 819 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) or such other authorities as may be appropriate to conduct further testing, low rate production, or full rate production of technologies developed under the program.

“(6) Projects are selected using merit based selection procedures and the selection of projects is not subject to undue influence by Congress or other Federal agencies.”.

(c) REPEAL OF REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (f); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

SEC. 214. REAUTHORIZATION OF GLOBAL RESEARCH WATCH PROGRAM.

Section 2365 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), by inserting “and private sector persons” after “foreign nations” both places it appears; and

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

SEC. 215. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT BUSINESS SYSTEMS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Undersecretary of Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the Deputy Chief Management Officer, and the Chief Information Officer shall establish a set of science,

technology, and innovation activities to improve the acquisition outcomes of major automated information systems through improved performance and reduced developmental and life cycle costs.

(b) **EXECUTION OF ACTIVITIES.**—The activities established under subsection (a) shall be carried out by such military departments and defense agencies as the Under Secretary and the Deputy Chief Management Officer consider appropriate.

(c) **ACTIVITIES.**—The set of activities established under subsection (a) may include the following:

(1) Development of capabilities in Department of Defense laboratories, test centers, and Federally-funded research and development centers to provide technical support for acquisition program management and business process re-engineering activities.

(2) Funding of intramural and extramural research and development activities as described in subsection (d).

(d) **FUNDING OF INTRAMURAL AND EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the set of activities required by subsection (a), the Secretary may award grants or contracts to eligible entities to carry out intramural or extramural research and development in areas of interest described in paragraph (3).

(2) **ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.**—For purposes of this subsection, an eligible entity includes the following:

- (A) Entities in the defense industry.
- (B) Institutions of higher education.
- (C) Small businesses.

(D) Nontraditional defense contractors (as defined in section 2302 of title 10, United States Code).

(E) Federally-funded research and development centers, primarily for the purpose of improving technical expertise to support acquisition efforts.

(F) Nonprofit research institutions.

(G) Government laboratories and test centers, primarily for the purpose of improving technical expertise to support acquisition efforts.

(3) **AREAS OF INTEREST.**—The areas of interest described in this paragraph are the following:

- (A) Management innovation, including personnel and financial management policy innovation.
- (B) Business process re-engineering.
- (C) Systems engineering of information technology business systems.
- (D) Cloud computing to support business systems and business processes.
- (E) Software development, including systems and techniques to limit unique interfaces and simplify processes to customize commercial software to meet the needs of the Department of Defense.
- (F) Hardware development, including systems and techniques to limit unique interfaces and simplify processes to customize commercial hardware to meet the needs of the Department of Defense.
- (G) Development of methodologies and tools to support development and operational test of large and complex business systems.
- (H) Analysis tools to allow decision makers to balance between requirements, costs, technical risks, and schedule in major automated information system acquisition programs
- (I) Information security in major automated information system systems.
- (J) Innovative acquisition policies and practices to streamline acquisition of information technology systems.
- (K) Such other areas as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(e) **PRIORITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the set of activities required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to—

(A) projects that—

(i) address the innovation and technology needs of the Department of Defense; and

(ii) support activities of initiatives, programs and offices identified by the Under Secretary and Deputy Chief Management Officer; and

(B) the projects and programs identified in paragraph (2).

(2) **PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS IDENTIFIED.**—The projects and programs identified in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Major automated information system programs.

(B) Projects and programs under the oversight of the Deputy Chief Management Officer.

(C) Projects and programs relating to defense procurement acquisition policy.

(D) Projects and programs of the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

(E) Military and civilian personnel policy development for information technology workforce.

SEC. 216. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE UNDER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND RESEARCH FOR TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM TO INCLUDE CITIZENS OF COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE TECHNICAL COOPERATION PROGRAM.

Section 2192a(b)(1)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or a country the government of which is a party to The Technical Cooperation Program (TTCP) memorandum of understanding of October 24, 1995” after “United States”.

SEC. 217. STREAMLINING THE JOINT FEDERATED ASSURANCE CENTER.

Section 937(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “, in coordination with the Center for Assured Software of the National Security Agency,”; and

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking “, in coordination with the Defense Microelectronics Activity,”.

SEC. 218. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE SHALLOW WATER COMBAT SUBMERSIBLE.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for Special Operations Command for development of the Shallow Water Combat Submersible, not more than 25 percent may be obligated or expended until the date that is 15 days after the later of the date on which—

(1) the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics designates a civilian official responsible for oversight and assistance to Special Operations Command for all undersea mobility programs; and

(2) the Under Secretary, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, submits to the congressional defense committees the report described in subsection (b).

(b) **REPORT DESCRIBED.**—The report described in this subsection is a report on the Shallow Water Combat Submersible that includes the following:

(1) An analysis of the reasons for cost and schedule overruns associated with the Shallow Water Combat Submersible program.

(2) A revised timeline for initial and full operational capability of the Shallow Water Combat Submersible.

(3) The projected cost to meet the total unit acquisition objective.

(4) A plan to prevent, identify, and mitigate any additional cost and schedule overruns.

(5) A description of such opportunities as may be to recover cost or schedule.

(6) A description of such lessons as the Under Secretary may have learned from the Shallow Water Combat Submersible program that could be applied to future undersea mobility acquisition programs.

(7) Such other matters as the Under Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 219. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEM OF THE ARMY.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense by section 201 and available for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army, for the distributed common ground system of the Army as specified in the funding tables in title XLII, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of the Army—

(1) conducts a review of the program planning for the distributed common ground system of the Army; and

(2) submits to the appropriate congressional committees the report required by subsection (b)(1).

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the review of the distributed common ground system of the Army conducted under subsection (a)(1).

(2) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A review of the segmentation of Increment 2 of the distributed common ground system program of the Army into discrete software components with the associated requirements of each component.

(B) Identification of each component of Increment 2 of the distributed common ground system of the Army for which commercial software exists that is capable of fulfilling most or all of the system requirements for each such component.

(C) A cost analysis of each such commercial software that compares performance with projected cost.

(D) Determination of the degree to which commercial software solutions are compliant with the standards required by the framework and guidance for the Intelligence Community Information Technology Enterprise, the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise, and the Joint Information Environment.

(E) Identification of each component of Increment 2 of the distributed common ground system of the Army that the Secretary determines may be acquired through competitive means.

(F) An acquisition plan for Increment 2 of the distributed common ground system of the Army that prioritizes the acquisition of commercial software components, including a data integration layer, in time to meet the projected deployment schedule for Increment 2.

(G) A review of the timetable for the distributed common ground system program of the Army in order to determine whether there is a practical, executable acquisition strategy, including the use of operational capability demonstrations, that could lead to an initial operating capability of Increment 2 of the distributed common ground system of the Army prior to fiscal year 2017.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

- (1) the congressional defense committees; and
- (2) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 220. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the

Department of Defense by section 201 and available for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, for the United States Special Operations Command for the distributed common ground system, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the Commander of the United States Special Operations Command submits to the congressional defense committees the report required by subsection (b).

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—The Commander shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the distributed common ground system. Such report shall include the following:

(1) A review of the segmentation of the distributed common ground system special operations forces program into discrete software components with the associated requirements of each component.

(2) Identification of each component of the distributed common ground system special operations forces program for which commercial software exists that is capable of fulfilling most or all of the system requirements for each such component.

(3) A cost analysis of each such commercial software that compares performance with projected cost.

(4) A determination of the degree to which commercial software solutions are compliant with the standards required by the framework and guidance for the Intelligence Community Information Technology Enterprise, the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise, and the Joint Information Environment.

(5) Identification of each component of the distributed common ground system special operations forces program that the Commander determines may be acquired through competitive means.

(6) An assessment of the extent to which elements of the distributed common ground system special operations forces program could be modified to increase commercial acquisition opportunities.

(7) An acquisition plan that leads to full operational capability prior to fiscal year 2019.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

SEC. 231. ASSESSMENT OF AIR-LAND MOBILE TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND DATA NETWORK REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES.

(a) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, in consultation with the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, shall contract with an independent entity to conduct a comprehensive assessment of current and future requirements and capabilities of the Department of Defense with respect to an air-land ad hoc, mobile tactical communications, and data network, including the technological feasibility, suitability, and survivability of such a network.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) Concepts, capabilities, and capacities of current or future communications and data network systems to meet the requirements of current or future tactical operations effectively, efficiently, and affordably.

(2) Software requirements and capabilities, particularly with respect to communications and data network waveforms.

(3) Hardware requirements and capabilities, particularly with respect to receiver/transmission technology, tactical communications, and data radios at all levels and on all platforms, all associated technologies, and their integration, compatibility, and interoperability.

(4) Any other matters that in the judgment of the independent entity are relevant or necessary to a comprehensive assessment of tactical networks or networking.

(c) **INDEPENDENT ENTITY.**—The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall

select an independent entity with direct, long-standing, and demonstrated experience and expertise in program test and evaluation of concepts, requirements, and technologies for joint tactical communications and data networking to perform the assessment under subsection (a).

(d) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than April 30, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report including the findings and recommendations of the assessment conducted under subsection (a), together with the Secretary's comments.

(e) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall use funds authorized by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide to carry out activities under this section.

(f) **LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.**—The Secretary of the Army may not obligate or expend more than 50 percent of the funds authorized by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for Other Procurement, Army and available for the Warfighter Information Network—Tactical (Increment 2) until the Secretary of Defense submits the report required under subsection (d).

SEC. 232. STUDY OF FIELD FAILURES INVOLVING COUNTERFEIT ELECTRONIC PARTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a hardware assurance study to assess the presence, scope, and effect on Department of Defense operations of counterfeit electronic parts that have passed through the Department supply chain and into field systems.

(b) **EXECUTION AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall direct the federation established under section 937(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) to coordinate execution of the study required by subsection (a) using capabilities of the Department in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to conduct technical analysis on a sample of failed electronic parts in field systems.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The technical analysis required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Selection of a representative sample of electronic component types, including digital, mixed-signal, and analog integrated circuits.

(B) An assessment of the presence of counterfeit parts, including causes and attributes of failures of any identified counterfeit part.

(C) For components found to have counterfeit parts present, an assessment of the impact of the counterfeit part in the failure mechanism.

(D) For cases with counterfeit parts contributing to the failure, a determination of the failure attributes, factors, and effects on subsystem and system level reliability, readiness, and performance.

(c) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—As part of the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop recommendations for such legislative and administrative action, including budget requirements, as the Secretary considers necessary to conduct sampling and technical hardware analysis of counterfeit parts in identified areas of high concern.

(d) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 540 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the study carried out under subsection (a).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The findings of the Secretary with respect to the study conducted under subsection (a).

(B) The recommendations developed under subsection (c).

SEC. 233. DEMONSTRATION OF PERSISTENT CLOSE AIR SUPPORT CAPABILITIES.

(a) **JOINT DEMONSTRATION REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the

Army, and the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency shall jointly conduct a demonstration of the Persistent Close Air Support (PCAS) capability in fiscal year 2016.

(b) **PARAMETERS OF DEMONSTRATION.**—

(1) **SELECTION AND EQUIPMENT OF AIRCRAFT.**—As part of the demonstration required by subsection (a), the Secretary of the Air Force shall select and equip at least two aircraft for use in the demonstration that the Secretary otherwise intends to use for close air support, as identified by the United States Air Force Close Air Support Forum.

(2) **CLOSE AIR SUPPORT OPERATIONS.**—The demonstration required by subsection (a) shall include close air support operations that involve the following:

(A) Multiple tactical radio networks representing diverse ground force user communities.

(B) Two-way digital exchanges of situational awareness data, video, and calls for fire between aircraft and ground users without modification to aircraft operational flight profiles.

(C) Real-time sharing of blue force, aircraft, and target location data to reduce risks of fratricide.

(D) Lightweight digital tools based on commercial-off-the-shelf technology for pilots and joint tactical air controllers.

(E) Operations in simple and complex operating environments.

(c) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Army, and the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency shall jointly—

(1) assess the effect of the capabilities demonstrated as part of the demonstration required by subsection (a) on—

(A) the time required to conduct close air support operations;

(B) the effectiveness of blue force in achieving tactical objectives; and

(C) the risk of fratricide and collateral damage; and

(2) estimate the costs that would be incurred in transitioning the technology used in the Persistent Close Air Support capability to the Army and the Air Force.

SEC. 234. AIRBORNE DATA LINK PLAN.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall jointly, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy, develop a plan—

(1) to provide objective survivable communications gateways to enable—

(A) the secure dissemination of national and tactical intelligence information to fourth-generation fighter aircraft and supporting airborne platforms and to low-observable penetrating platforms such as the F-22 and F-35; and

(B) the secure reception and dissemination of sensor data from low-observable penetrating aircraft, such as the F-22 and F-35;

(2) to provide secure data sharing between the fifth-generation fighter aircraft of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, with minimal changes to the outer surfaces of the aircraft and to aircraft operational flight programs; and

(3) to enable secure data sharing between fifth-generation and fourth-generation aircraft in jamming environments.

(b) **ADDITIONAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS.**—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include non-proprietary and open systems approaches that are compatible with the Rapid Capabilities Office Open Mission Systems initiative of the Air Force and the Future Airborne Capability Environment initiative of the Navy.

(c) **PROHIBITION.**—No funds may be obligated or expended by the Department of Defense on the interim communications initiatives identified

as Talon Hate and Multi-Domain Adaptable Processing System until the congressional defense committees are briefed by the Under Secretary or the Vice Chairman about the plan required by subsection (a).

SEC. 235. REPORT ON TECHNOLOGY READINESS LEVELS OF THE TECHNOLOGIES AND CAPABILITIES CRITICAL TO THE LONG RANGE STRIKE BOMBER AIRCRAFT.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs) of the technologies and capabilities critical to the Long Range Strike Bomber aircraft.

(b) **REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.**—Not later than 60 days after the report of the Secretary is submitted under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the report and submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the matters contained in the report.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4301.

Subtitle B—Energy and Environment

SEC. 311. MODIFICATION OF ENERGY MANAGEMENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 2925(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by striking paragraphs (4) and (7);
- (2) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12) as paragraphs (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10), respectively;
- (3) by amending paragraph (7), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this section, to read as follows:

“(7) A description and estimate of the progress made by the military departments in meeting

current high performance and sustainable building standards under the Unified Facilities Criteria.”;

(4) by amending paragraph (9), as redesignated by such paragraph (2), to read as follows:

“(9) Details of all commercial utility outages caused by threats and those caused by hazards at military installations that last eight hours or longer, whether or not the outage was mitigated by backup power, including non-commercial utility outages and Department of Defense-owned infrastructure, including the total number and location of outages, the financial impact of the outages, and measure taken to mitigate outages in the future at the affected locations and across the Department of Defense.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) At the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, a classified annex, as appropriate.”.

SEC. 312. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO REDUCE HIGH ENERGY COSTS AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) **REPORT.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in conjunction with the assistant secretaries responsible for installations and environment for the military services and the Defense Logistics Agency, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the efforts to achieve cost savings at military installations with high energy costs.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A comprehensive, installation-specific assessment of feasible and mission-appropriate energy initiatives supporting energy production and consumption at military installations with high energy costs.

(B) An assessment of current sources of energy in areas with high energy costs and potential future sources that are technologically feasible, cost-effective, and mission-appropriate for military installations.

(C) A comprehensive implementation strategy to include required investment for feasible en-

ergy efficiency options determined to be the most beneficial and cost-effective, where appropriate, and consistent with Department of Defense priorities.

(D) An explanation on how military services are working collaboratively in order to leverage lessons learned on potential energy efficiency solutions.

(E) An assessment of extent of which activities administered under the Federal Energy Management Program could be used to assist with the implementation strategy.

(F) An assessment of State and local partnership opportunities that could achieve efficiency and cost savings, and any legislative authorities required to carry out such partnerships or agreements.

(3) **COORDINATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL AND OTHER ENTITIES.**—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the Under Secretary may work in conjunction and coordinate with the States containing areas of high energy costs, local communities, and other Federal departments and agencies.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the term “high energy costs” means costs for the provision of energy by kilowatt of electricity or British Thermal Unit of heat or steam for a military installation in the United States that is in the highest 20 percent of all military installations for a military department.

SEC. 313. SOUTHERN SEA OTTER MILITARY READINESS AREAS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SOUTHERN SEA OTTER MILITARY READINESS AREAS.**—Chapter 631 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§7235. Establishment of the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of the Navy shall establish areas, to be known as ‘Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas’, for national defense purposes. Such areas shall include each of the following:

“(1) The area that includes Naval Base Ventura County, San Nicolas Island, and Begg Rock and the adjacent and surrounding waters within the following coordinates:

“N. Latitude/W. Longitude

33°27.8’/119°34.3’
33°20.5’/119°15.5’
33°13.5’/119°11.8’
33°06.5’/119°15.3’
33°02.8’/119°26.8’
33°08.8’/119°46.3’
33°17.2’/119°56.9’
33°30.9’/119°54.2’.

“(2) The area that includes Naval Base Coronado, San Clemente Island and the adjacent and surrounding waters running parallel to shore to 3 nautical miles from the high tide line designated by part 165 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, on May 20, 2010, as the San Clemente Island 3NM Safety Zone.

“(b) **ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE SOUTHERN SEA OTTER MILITARY READINESS AREAS.**—

“(1) **INCIDENTAL TAKINGS UNDER ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973.**—Sections 4 and 9 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533, 1538) shall not apply with respect to the incidental taking of any southern sea otter in the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas in the course of conducting a military readiness activity.

“(2) **INCIDENTAL TAKINGS UNDER MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1972.**—Sections 101 and 102 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1371, 1372) shall not apply with respect to the incidental taking of any southern

sea otter in the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas in the course of conducting a military readiness activity.

“(3) **TREATMENT AS SPECIES PROPOSED TO BE LISTED.**—For purposes of conducting a military readiness activity, any southern sea otter while within the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas shall be treated for the purposes of section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) as a member of a species that is proposed to be listed as an endangered species or a threatened species under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533).

“(c) **REMOVAL.**—Nothing in this section or any other Federal law shall be construed to require that any southern sea otter located within the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas be removed from the Areas.

“(d) **REVISION OR TERMINATION OF EXCEPTIONS.**—The Secretary of the Interior may revise or terminate the application of subsection (b) if the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation

with the Secretary of the Navy and the Marine Mammal Commission, determines that military activities occurring in the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas are impeding the southern sea otter conservation or the return of southern sea otters to optimum sustainable population levels.

“(e) **MONITORING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Navy shall conduct monitoring and research within the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas to determine the effects of military readiness activities on the growth or decline of the southern sea otter population and on the near-shore ecosystem. Monitoring and research parameters and methods shall be determined in consultation with the Service and the Marine Mammal Commission.

“(2) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section and every three years thereafter, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to Congress and the public on

monitoring undertaken pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) SOUTHERN SEA OTTER.—The term ‘southern sea otter’ means any member of the subspecies *Enhydra lutris nereis*.

“(2) TAKE.—The term ‘take’—

“(A) when used in reference to activities subject to regulation by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), shall have the meaning given such term in that Act; and

“(B) when used in reference to activities subject to regulation by the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) shall have the meaning given such term in that Act.

“(3) INCIDENTAL TAKING.—The term ‘incidental taking’ means any take of a southern sea otter that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity.

“(4) MILITARY READINESS ACTIVITY.—The term ‘military readiness activity’ has the meaning given that term in section 315(f) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (16 U.S.C. 703 note) and includes all training and operations of the armed forces that relate to combat and the adequate and realistic testing of military equipment, vehicles, weapons, and sensors for proper operation and suitability for combat use.

“(5) OPTIMUM SUSTAINABLE POPULATION.—The term ‘optimum sustainable population’ means, with respect to any population stock, the number of animals that will result in the maximum productivity of the population or the species, keeping in mind the carrying capacity of the habitat and the health of the ecosystem of which they form a constituent element.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item: “7235. Establishment of the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1 of Public Law 99-625 (16 U.S.C. 1536 note) is repealed.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

SEC. 321. REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE SUSTAINMENT, MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, OR OVERHAUL OF THE F117 ENGINE.

Section 341 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3345) is repealed.

Subtitle D—Reports

SEC. 331. MODIFICATION OF ANNUAL REPORT ON PREPOSITIONED MATERIEL AND EQUIPMENT.

Section 2229a(a)(8) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(8) A list of any equipment used in support of contingency operations slated for retrograde and subsequent inclusion in the prepositioned stocks.”.

Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority

SEC. 341. MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSFERRING AIRCRAFT WITHIN THE AIR FORCE INVENTORY.

(a) MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—Section 345 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 10 U.S.C. 8062 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “Before making an aircraft transfer described in subsection (c), the Secretary of the Air Force shall ensure that a written agreement regarding such transfer has been entered into between the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Director of the Air National Guard or the Chief of Air Force Reserve.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “depot”;

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) SUBMITTAL OF AGREEMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND CONGRESS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may not take any action to transfer an aircraft until the Secretary ensures that the Air Force has complied with applicable Department of Defense regulations and, for a transfer described in subsection (c)(1), until the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees an agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (a) regarding the transfer of the aircraft.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(c) COVERED AIRCRAFT TRANSFERS.—(1) An aircraft transfer described in this subsection is the transfer (other than as specified in paragraph (2)) from a reserve component of the Air Force to the regular component of the Air Force of—

“(A) the permanent assignment of an aircraft that terminates a reserve component’s equitable interest in the aircraft; or

“(B) possession of an aircraft for a period in excess of 90 days.

“(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to the following:

“(A) A routine temporary transfer of possession of an aircraft from a reserve component that is made solely for the benefit of the reserve component for the purpose of maintenance, upgrade, conversion, modification, or testing and evaluation.

“(B) A routine permanent transfer of assignment of an aircraft that terminates a reserve component’s equitable interest in the aircraft if notice of the transfer has previously been provided to the congressional defense committees and the transfer has been approved by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to Department of Defense regulations.

“(C) A transfer described in paragraph (1)(A) when there is a reciprocal permanent assignment of an aircraft from the regular component of the Air Force to the reserve component that does not degrade the capability of, or reduce the total number of, aircraft assigned to the reserve component.

“(d) RETURN OF AIRCRAFT AFTER ROUTINE TEMPORARY TRANSFER.—In the case of an aircraft transferred from a reserve component of the Air Force to the regular component of the Air Force for which an agreement under subsection (a) is not required by reason of subparagraph (A) of subsection (c)(2), possession of the aircraft shall be transferred back to the reserve component upon completion of the work described in such subparagraph.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a)(7) of such section is amended by striking “Commander of the Air Force Reserve Command” and inserting “Chief of Air Force Reserve”.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO DELETE REFERENCES TO AIRCRAFT OWNERSHIP.—Subsection (a) of such section is further amended by striking “the ownership of” each place it appears.

SEC. 342. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SPONSORSHIPS, ADVERTISING, OR MARKETING ASSOCIATED WITH SPORTS-RELATED ORGANIZATIONS OR SPORTING EVENTS.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department may be used for any sponsorship, advertising, or marketing associated with a sports-related organization or sporting event until the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, in consultation with the Director of Accessions Policy—

(1) conducts a review of current contracts and task orders for such sponsorships, advertising,

and marketing (as awarded by the regular and reserve components of the Armed Forces) in order to assess—

(A) whether such sponsorships, advertising, and marketing are effective in meeting the recruiting objectives of the Department;

(B) whether consistent metrics are used to evaluate the effectiveness of each such activity in generating leads and recruit accessions; and

(C) whether the return on investment for such activities is sufficient to warrant continuing use of Department funds for such activities; and

(2) submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(A) a description of the actions being taken to coordinate efforts of the Department relating to such sponsorships, advertising, and marketing, and to minimize duplicative contracts for such sponsorships, advertising, and marketing, as applicable; and

(B) the results of the review required by paragraph (1), including an assessment of the extent to which continuing use of Department funds for such sponsorships, advertising, and marketing is warranted in light of the review and the actions described pursuant to subparagraph (A).

SEC. 342A. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS TO FACILITATE PAYMENTS FOR HONORING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AT SPORTING EVENTS.

(a) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Army National Guard has paid professional sports organizations to honor members of the Armed Forces;

(2) any organization wishing to honor members of the Armed Forces should do so on a voluntary basis, and the Department of Defense should take action to ensure that no payments be made for such activities in the future; and

(3) any organization, including the National Football League, that has accepted taxpayer funds to honor members of the Armed Forces should consider directing an equivalent amount of funding in the form of a donation to a charitable organization that supports members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families.

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2241a the following new section:

“§2241b. Prohibition on contracts providing payments for activities to honor members of the armed forces

“(a) PROHIBITION.—The Department of Defense may not enter into any contract or other agreement under which payments are to be made in exchange for activities by the contractor intended to honor, or giving the appearance of honoring, members of the armed forces (whether members of the regular components or the reserve components) at any form of sporting event.

“(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed as prohibiting the Department from taking actions to facilitate activities intended to honor members of the armed forces at sporting events that are provided on a pro bono basis or otherwise funded with non-Federal funds if such activities are provided and received in accordance with applicable rules and regulations regarding the acceptance of gifts by the military departments, the armed forces, and members of the armed forces.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 134 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2241a the following new item:

“2241b. Prohibition on contracts providing payments for activities to honor members of the armed forces at sporting events.”.

SEC. 343. TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO EXTEND CONTRACTS AND LEASES UNDER ARMS INITIATIVE.

Contracts or subcontracts entered into pursuant to section 4554(a)(3)(A) of title 10, United States Code, on or before the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act may include an option to extend the term of the contract or subcontract for an additional 25 years.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

SEC. 351. STREAMLINING OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS.

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF HEADQUARTERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a comprehensive review of the management and operational headquarters of the Department of Defense for purposes of consolidating and streamlining headquarters functions.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The review required by paragraph (1) shall address the following:

(A) The extent, if any, to which the staff of the Secretaries of the military departments and the Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces have duplicative staff functions and services and could be consolidated into a single service staff.

(B) The extent, if any, to which the staff of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the military departments, the Defense Agencies, and temporary organizations have duplicative staff functions and services and could be streamlined with respect to—

- (i) performing oversight and making policy;
- (ii) performing staff functions and services specific to the military department concerned;
- (iii) performing multi-department staff functions and services; and
- (iv) performing functions and services across the Department of Defense with respect to intelligence collection and analysis.

(C) The extent, if any, to which the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, and their subordinate service component commands have duplicative staff functions and services that could be shared, consolidated, eliminated, or otherwise streamlined with—

- (i) the Joint Staff performing oversight and execution;
- (ii) the staff of the combatant commands performing only staff functions and services specific to the combatant command concerned; and
- (iii) the staff of the service component commands of the combatant commands performing only staff functions and services specific to the service component command concerned.

(D) The extent, if any, to which reductions in military and civilian end-strength in management or operational headquarters could be used to create, build, or fill shortages in force structure for operational units.

(E) The extent, if any, to which revisions are required to the Defense Officers Personnel Management Act, including requirements for officers to serve in joint billets, the number of qualifying billets, the rank structure in the joint billets, and the joint qualification requirement for officers to be promoted while serving for extensive periods in critical positions such as program managers of major defense acquisition programs, and officers in units of component forces supporting joint commands, in order to achieve efficiencies, provide promotion fairness and equity, and obtain effective governance in the management of the Department of Defense.

(F) The structure and staffing of the Joint Staff, and the number, structure, and staffing of the combatant commands and their subordinate

service component commands, including, in particular—

(i) whether or not the staff organization of each such entity has documented and periodically validated requirements for such entity;

(ii) whether or not there are an appropriate number of combatant commands relative to the requirements of the National Security Strategy, the Quadrennial Defense Review, and the National Military Strategy; and

(iii) whether or not opportunities exist to consolidate staff functions and services common to the Joint Staff and the service component commands into a single staff organization that provides the required functions, services, capabilities, and capacities to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and supported combatant commanders, and if so—

(I) where in the organizational structure such staff functions, services, capabilities, and capacities would be established; and

(II) whether or not the military departments could execute such staff functions, services, capabilities, and capacities while executing their requirements to organize, train, and equip the Armed Forces.

(G) The statutory and regulatory authority of the combatant commands to establish subordinate joint commands or headquarters, including joint task forces, led by a general or flag officer, and the extent, if any, to which the combatant commands have used such authority—

(i) to establish temporary or permanent subordinate joint commands or headquarters, including joint task forces, led by general or flag officers;

(ii) to disestablish temporary or permanent subordinate joint commands or headquarters, including joint task forces, led by general or flag officers;

(iii) to increase requirements for general and flag officers in the joint pool which are exempt from the end strength limitations otherwise applicable to general and flag officers in the Armed Forces;

(iv) to participate in the management of joint officer qualification in order to ensure the efficient and effective quality and quantity of officers needed to staff headquarters functions and services and return to the services officers with required professional experience and skills necessary to remain competitive for increased responsibility and authority through subsequent assignment or promotion, including by identifying—

(I) circumstances, if any, in which officers spend a disproportionate amount of time in their careers to attain joint officer qualifications with corresponding loss of opportunities to develop in the service-specific assignments needed to gain the increased proficiency and experience to qualify for service and command assignments; and

(II) circumstances, if any, in which the military departments detail officers to joint headquarters staffs in order to maximize the number of officers receiving joint duty credit with a focus on the quantity, instead of the quality, of officers achieving joint duty credit;

(v) to establish commanders' strategic planning groups, advisory groups, or similar parallel personal staff entities that could risk isolating function and staff processes, including an assessment of the justification used to establish such personal staff organizations and their impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of organizational staff functions, services, capabilities, and capacities; and

(vi) to ensure the identification and management of officers serving or having served in units in subordinate service component or joint commands during combat operations and did not receive joint credit for such service.

(3) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable and as the Secretary con-

siders appropriate, conduct the review required by paragraph (1) in consultation with such experts on matters covered by the review who are independent of the Department of Defense.

(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the results of the review required by paragraph (1).

(b) **PLAN ON REDUCTION IN AMOUNTS USED FOR ADMINISTRATION IN FISCAL YEARS 2016 THROUGH 2019.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than January 31, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees, and implement, a plan designed to ensure that the amount used by the Department of Defense for administration from amounts authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for operation and maintenance shall be as follows:

(A) In fiscal year 2016, an amount that is 7.5 percent less than the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, and available for administration (in this paragraph referred to as the “fiscal year 2015 administration amount”).

(B) In fiscal year 2017, an amount that is 15 percent less than the fiscal year 2015 administration amount.

(C) In fiscal year 2018, an amount that is 22.5 percent less than the fiscal year 2015 administration amount.

(D) In fiscal year 2019, an amount that is 30 percent less than the fiscal year 2015 administration amount.

(2) **ACHIEVEMENT OF REDUCTIONS.**—As part of meeting the requirements in paragraph (1), the plan shall provide for reductions in personnel (including military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense and contract personnel in support of the Department) in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the secretariats and military staffs of the military departments, the staffs of the Defense Agencies, the staffs of the Joint Staff, the staffs of the combatant commands, and the staffs of their subordinate service component commands.

(3) **EXCLUSION.**—The plan may not meet the requirements in paragraph (1) through reductions in funding for administration for the following:

(A) The United States Special Operations Command.

(B) The Department of Defense Education Activity.

(C) Any classified program.

(D) Any program relating to sexual assault prevention and response.

(c) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORTS.**—Not later than 90 days after the end of each of fiscal years 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the assessment of the Comptroller General of the extent to which the Department of Defense met the applicable requirement in subsection (b)(1) during such fiscal year.

(d) **LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CONTRACT PERSONNEL SUPPORT FOR OSD.**—In each of fiscal years 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense and available for the Office of the Secretary of Defense may not be obligated or expended for contract personnel in support of the Office of the Secretary of Defense until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the applicable requirement in subsection (b)(1) was met during the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 352. ADOPTION OF RETIRED MILITARY WORKING DOGS.

(a) **TRANSFER FOR ADOPTION.**—Subsection (f) of section 2583 of title 10, United States Code, is

amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “may transfer” and inserting “shall transfer”.

(b) LOCATION OF RETIREMENT.—Subsection (f) of such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(2) by inserting “(1)” before “If the Secretary”;

(3) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

(A) by striking “, and no suitable adoption is available at the military facility where the dog is location,”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting “within the United States” after “to another location”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply if a United States citizen living abroad adopts the dog at the time of retirement.”.

(c) PREFERENCE IN ADOPTION FOR FORMER HANDLERS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection (g):

“(g) PREFERENCE IN ADOPTION OF RETIRED MILITARY WORKING DOGS FOR FORMER HANDLERS.—(1) In providing for the adoption under this section of a retired military working dog described in paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a), the Secretary of the military department concerned shall accord a preference to the former handler of the dog unless the Secretary determines that adoption of the dog by the former handler would not be in the best interests of the dog.

“(2) In the case of a dog covered by paragraph (1) with more than one former handler seeking adoption of the dog at the time of adoption, the Secretary shall provide for the adoption of the dog by such former handler whose adoption of the dog will best serve the interests of the dog and such former handlers. The Secretary shall make any determination required by this paragraph with respect to a dog following consultation with the kennel master of the unit at which the dog was last located before adoption under this section.

“(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as altering, revising, or overriding any policy of a military department for the adoption of military working dogs by law enforcement agencies before the end of the dogs’ useful lives.”.

SEC. 353. MODIFICATION OF REQUIRED REVIEW OF PROJECTS RELATING TO POTENTIAL OBSTRUCTIONS TO AVIATION.

Section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4200; 49 U.S.C. 44718 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “from State and local officials or the developer of a renewable energy development or other energy project” and inserting “from a State government, an Indian tribal government, a local government, a landowner, or the developer of an energy project”; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “readiness, and” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “readiness and to clearly communicate actions being taken by the Department of Defense to the party requesting an early project review under this section.”;

(2) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by striking “as high, medium, or low”; and

(3) in subsection (j), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The term ‘landowner’ means a person or other legal entity that owns a fee interest in real

property on which a proposed energy project is planned to be located.”.

SEC. 354. PILOT PROGRAM ON INTENSIVE INSTRUCTION IN CERTAIN ASIAN LANGUAGES.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may, in consultation with the National Security Education Board, carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing scholarships in accordance with the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) to individuals otherwise eligible for scholarships under that Act for intensive language instruction in a covered Asian language.

(b) COVERED ASIAN LANGUAGE.—For purposes of this section, a covered Asian language is any of the five Asian languages that would be treated as a language in which deficiencies exist for purposes of section 802(a)(1)(A) of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1902(a)(2)(A)) if the National Security Education Board could treat an additional five Asian languages as a language in which such deficiencies exist.

(c) USE OF SCHOLARSHIPS.—Notwithstanding any provision of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991, a scholarship awarded pursuant to the pilot program may be used for intensive language instruction in—

(1) the United States; or

(2) a country in which the covered Asian language concerned is spoken by a significant portion of the population (as determined by the Secretary for purposes of the pilot program).

(d) NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION BOARD DEFINED.—In this section, the term “National Security Education Board” means the National Security Education Board established pursuant to section 803 of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1903).

(e) TERMINATION.—No scholarship may be awarded under the pilot program after the date that is five years after the date on which the pilot program is established.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

SEC. 401. END STRENGTHS FOR ACTIVE FORCES.

The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 2016, as follows:

(1) The Army, 475,000.

(2) The Navy, 329,200.

(3) The Marine Corps, 184,000.

(4) The Air Force, 317,000.

SEC. 402. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY FOR MANAGEMENT OF END STRENGTHS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL.

(a) REPEAL OF SPECIFICATION OF PERMANENT END STRENGTHS TO SUPPORT TWO MAJOR REGIONAL CONTINGENCIES.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 691 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 39 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 691.

(b) ENHANCED AUTHORITY FOR END STRENGTH MANAGEMENT.—

(1) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AUTHORITY.—Subsection (f) of section 115 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “increase” each place it appears and inserting “vary”.

(2) SERVICE SECRETARY AUTHORITY.—Subsection (g) of such section is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “increase” each place it appears and inserting “vary”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “increase” each place it appears and inserting “variance”.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

SEC. 411. END STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for Selected Reserve per-

sonnel of the reserve components as of September 30, 2016, as follows:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 342,000.

(2) The Army Reserve, 198,000.

(3) The Navy Reserve, 57,400.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 38,900.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 105,500.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 69,200.

(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 7,000.

(b) END STRENGTH REDUCTIONS.—The end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by—

(1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at the end of the fiscal year; and

(2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at the end of the fiscal year.

(c) END STRENGTH INCREASES.—Whenever units or individual members of the Selected Reserve of any reserve component are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the end strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be increased proportionately by the total authorized strengths of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

SEC. 412. END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Several States routinely recruit and retain members of the Army National Guard of the United States in excess of State authorizations to offset States that do not recruit to State authorizations.

(2) The States that routinely recruit and retain members of the Army National Guard of the United States in excess of authorizations do not receive any extra full-time operational support duty personnel to support excess members.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the National Guard Bureau should account for States that routinely recruit and retain members in excess of State authorizations when allocating full-time operational support duty personnel.

(c) END STRENGTHS.—Within the end strengths prescribed in section 411(a), the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 2016, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 30,770.

(2) The Army Reserve, 16,261.

(3) The Navy Reserve, 9,934.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,260.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 14,748.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 3,032.

(d) ALLOCATION AMONG STATES.—In allocating Reserves on full-time duty in the Army National Guard of the United States authorized by subsection (c)(1) among the States, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall take into account the actual number of members of the Army National Guard of the United States serving in each State as of September 30 each year.

SEC. 413. END STRENGTHS FOR MILITARY TECHNICIANS (DUAL STATUS).

The minimum number of military technicians (dual status) as of the last day of fiscal year

2016 for the reserve components of the Army and the Air Force (notwithstanding section 129 of title 10, United States Code) shall be the following:

(1) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 26,099.

(2) For the Army Reserve, 7,395.

(3) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 22,104.

(4) For the Air Force Reserve, 9,814.

SEC. 414. FISCAL YEAR 2016 LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS.

(a) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) NATIONAL GUARD.—Within the limitation provided in section 10217(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, the number of non-dual status technicians employed by the National Guard as of September 30, 2016, may not exceed the following:

(A) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 1,600.

(B) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 350.

(2) ARMY RESERVE.—The number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Army Reserve as of September 30, 2016, may not exceed 595.

(3) AIR FORCE RESERVE.—The number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Air Force Reserve as of September 30, 2016, may not exceed 90.

(b) NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “non-dual status technician” has the meaning given that term in section 10217(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 415. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF RESERVE PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR OPERATIONAL SUPPORT.

During fiscal year 2016, the maximum number of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who may be serving at any time on full-time operational support duty under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, is the following:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 17,000.

(2) The Army Reserve, 13,000.

(3) The Navy Reserve, 6,200.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 3,000.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 16,000.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 14,000.

SEC. 416. CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AUTHORITY TO INCREASE CERTAIN END STRENGTHS APPLICABLE TO THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subject to subsection (b), the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may increase each of the end strengths for fiscal year 2016 applicable to the Army National Guard as follows:

(1) The end strength for Selected Reserve personnel of the Army National Guard of the United States in section 411(a)(1) by up to 3,000 members in addition to the number specified in section 411(a)(1).

(2) The end strength for Reserves serving on full-time duty for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training for the Army National Guard of the United States specified in section 412(1) by up to 615 Reserves in addition to the number specified in section 412(1).

(3) The end strength for military technicians (dual status) for the Army National Guard of the United States specified in section 413(1) by up to 1,111 technicians in addition to the number specified in section 413(1).

(b) LIMITATION.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau may increase an end strength using the authority in subsection (a) only if

such increase is paid for out of funds appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 421. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for military personnel, as specified in the funding table in section 4401.

(b) CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION.—The authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) supersedes any other authorization of appropriations (definite or indefinite) for such purpose for fiscal year 2016.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

SEC. 501. AUTHORITY OF PROMOTION BOARDS TO RECOMMEND OFFICERS OF PARTICULAR MERIT BE PLACED AT THE TOP OF THE PROMOTION LIST.

(a) AUTHORITY OF PROMOTION BOARDS TO RECOMMEND OFFICERS OF PARTICULAR MERIT BE PLACED AT TOP OF PROMOTION LIST.—Section 616 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g)(1) In selecting the officers to be recommended for promotion, a selection board may, when authorized by the Secretary of the military department concerned, recommend officers of particular merit, from among those officers selected for promotion, to be placed at the top of the promotion list promulgated by the Secretary under section 624(a)(1) of this title.

“(2) The determination whether an officer is an officer of particular merit for purposes of this subsection shall be made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned for such purposes.

“(3) The number of such officers placed at the top of the promotion list may not exceed the number equal to 10 percent of the maximum number of officers that the board is authorized to recommend for promotion in such competitive category. If the number determined under this subsection is less than one, the board may recommend one such officer.

“(4) No officer may be recommended to be placed at the top of the promotion list unless the officer receives the recommendation of at least three-quarters of the members of a board for such placement.

“(5) For the officers recommended to be placed at the top of the promotion list, the board shall recommend the order in which these officers should be promoted.”.

(b) OFFICERS OF PARTICULAR MERIT APPEARING AT TOP OF PROMOTION LIST.—Section 624(a)(1) of such title is amended by inserting “, except such officers of particular merit who were approved by the President and recommended by the board to be placed at the top of the promotion list under section 616(g) of this title as these officers shall be placed at the top of the promotion list in the order recommended by the board” after “officers on the active-duty list”.

SEC. 502. MINIMUM GRADES FOR CERTAIN CORPS AND RELATED POSITIONS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE.

(a) ARMY.—

(1) CHIEF OF LEGISLATIVE LIAISON.—Section 3023(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended in the second sentence by striking “the grade of major general” and inserting “a grade above the grade of colonel”.

(2) ASSISTANT SURGEON GENERAL.—Section 3039(b) of such title is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting the following new sentence: “An officer appointed to that position

shall be an officer in a grade above the grade of colonel.”.

(3) CHIEF OF THE NURSE CORPS.—Section 3069(b) of such title is amended by striking “whose regular grade” and all that follows through “major general.” and inserting “. An officer appointed to that position shall be an officer in a grade above the grade of colonel.”.

(4) CHIEF OF THE VETERINARY CORPS.—Section 3084 of such title is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting the following new sentence: “An officer appointed to that position shall be an officer in a grade above the grade of lieutenant colonel.”.

(b) NAVY.—

(1) CHIEF OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS.—Section 5027(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “the grade of rear admiral” and inserting “a grade above the grade of captain”.

(2) CHIEF OF THE DENTAL CORPS.—Section 5138 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following new subsection (a):

“(a) There is a Chief of the Dental Corps in the Department of the Navy. An officer assigned to that position shall be an officer in a grade above the grade of captain.”; and

(B) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(3) DIRECTORS OF MEDICAL CORPS.—Section 5150(c) of such title is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “for promotion” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting a period; and

(B) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: “An officer so selected shall be an officer in a grade above the grade of captain.”.

(c) AIR FORCE.—

(1) CHIEF OF LEGISLATIVE LIAISON.—Section 8023(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended in the second sentence by striking “the grade of major general” and inserting “a grade above the grade of colonel”.

(2) CHIEF OF THE NURSE CORPS.—Section 8069(b) of such title is amended by striking “whose regular grade” and all that follows through “major general.” and inserting “. An officer appointed to that position shall be an officer in a grade above the grade of colonel.”.

(3) ASSISTANT SURGEON GENERAL FOR DENTAL SERVICES.—Section 8081 of such title is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following new sentence: “An officer appointed to that position shall be an officer in a grade above the grade of colonel.”.

(d) TRANSITION.—In the case of an officer who on the date of the enactment of this Act is serving in a position that is covered by an amendment made by this section, the continued service of that officer in such position after the date of the enactment of this Act shall not be affected by that amendment.

SEC. 503. ENHANCEMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.

(a) INCLUSION OF ACQUISITION MATTERS WITHIN JOINT MATTERS FOR OFFICER MANAGEMENT.—

(1) JOINT MATTERS.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 688 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) acquisition addressed by military personnel acting under chapter 87 of this title.”.

(2) JOINT DUTY ASSIGNMENT.—Subsection (b)(1)(A) of such section is amended by striking “limited to assignments in which” and all that follows and inserting “limited to—

“(i) assignments in which the officer gains significant experience in joint matters; and

“(ii) assignments pursuant to chapter 87 of this title; and”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE ACQUISITION FIELD.—

(1) CONSULTATION OF SERVICE CHIEFS IN POLICIES AND GUIDANCE.—Subsection (a) of section 1722a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “such military department)” the following: “, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps (with respect to the armed force under the jurisdiction of each),”.

(2) ENHANCED CAREER PATHS FOR PERSONNEL.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “single-tracked” before “career path”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) A dual-tracked career path that attracts the highest quality officers and enlisted personnel and allows them to gain experience in, and receive credit for, a primary career in combat arms and a functional secondary career in the acquisition field in order to more closely align the military operational requirements and acquisition workforces of each armed force.”.

(c) JOINT PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION.—

(1) INCLUSION OF BUSINESS AND COMMERCIAL TRAINING IN JOINT PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION.—Subsection (a) of section 2151 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “Joint professional military education”; and

(B) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(2) The subject matter to be covered by joint professional military education shall include at least the following:

“(A) National Military Strategy.

“(B) Joint planning at all levels of war.

“(C) Joint doctrine.

“(D) Joint command and control.

“(E) Joint force and joint requirements development.

“(F) Operational contract support.

“(3) In lieu of the subject matters covered by paragraph (2), or in supplement to one or more of such matters, the subject matter to be covered by joint professional military education may include subjects addressed in training programs under section 2013(a) of this title by, in, or through organizations described in paragraph (2)(D) of that section.”.

(2) SENIOR LEVEL SERVICE SCHOOLS.—Subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) A training program section 2013(a) of this title by, in, or through an organization described in paragraph (2)(D) of that section.”.

(3) THREE-PHASE APPROACH.—Section 2154(a)(2) of such title is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “in residence at”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph (A):

“(A) in residence at the Joint Forces Staff College;”;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “a senior level service school” and inserting “in residence at a senior level service school, or by, in, or through a senior level service school described in section 2151(b)(1)(E) of this title.”.

(4) JOINT PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION PHASE II.—Section 2155 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the subsection caption, by inserting “FOR JOINT MILITARY SUBJECTS” after “PHASE II REQUIREMENTS”; and

(ii) by inserting “described in section 2151(a)(2) of this title” after “joint professional military education”;

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the subsection caption, by inserting “FOR JOINT MILITARY SUBJECTS” after “CURRICULUM CONTENT”;

(ii) by striking “section 2151(a)” and inserting “section 2151(a)(2)”; and

(iii) by inserting “described in such section” after “joint professional military education”;

(C) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

(D) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) CURRICULUM CONTENT FOR BUSINESS AND COMMERCIAL TRAINING.—The curriculum for Phase II joint professional military education described in section 2151(a)(3) of this title shall include such matters as the Secretary shall specify in connection with training programs described in that section in order to satisfy requirements for successful performance in the acquisition or acquisition-related field.”; and

(E) in subsection (e), as redesignated by subparagraph (C), by inserting “(other than a service school described in section 2151(b)(1)(E) of this title)” after “senior level service school”.

(d) ACQUISITION-RELATED FUNCTIONS OF SERVICE CHIEFS.—Section 2547 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “this subsection” the first place it appears and inserting “subsection (a)”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) ANNUAL REPORT ON PROMOTION RATES FOR OFFICERS IN ACQUISITION POSITIONS.—(1) Not later than January 1 each year, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall each submit to Congress a report on the promotion rates during the preceding fiscal year of officers who are serving in, or have served in, positions covered by chapter 87 of this title, and officers who have been certified under that chapter, in the grades specified in paragraph (2). If promotion rates for any such grade of officers failed to meet objectives for the fiscal year concerned for promotion rates for such grade, the chief of the armed force concerned shall include in the report for such fiscal year information on such failure and on the actions taken or to be taken by such chief to prevent further such failures.

“(2) The grades specified in this paragraph are as follows:

“(A) The grade of colonel (or captain, in the case of the Navy).

“(B) The grade of lieutenant colonel (or commander, in the case of the Navy).

“(C) The grade of major (or lieutenant commander, in the case of the Navy).”.

SEC. 504. ENHANCED FLEXIBILITY FOR DETERMINATION OF OFFICERS TO CONTINUE ON ACTIVE DUTY AND FOR SELECTIVE EARLY RETIREMENT AND EARLY DISCHARGE.

Section 638a(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “officers considered—” and all that follows and inserting “officers considered.”.

SEC. 505. AUTHORITY TO DEFER UNTIL AGE 68 MANDATORY RETIREMENT FOR AGE OF A GENERAL OR FLAG OFFICER SERVING AS CHIEF OR DEPUTY CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, OR AIR FORCE.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 1253 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) EXCEPTION FOR CHIEFS OF CHAPLAINS AND DEPUTY CHIEFS OF CHAPLAINS.—The Sec-

retary of the military department concerned may defer the retirement under subsection (a) of an officer serving in a general or flag officer grade who is the Chief of Chaplains or Deputy Chief of Chaplains of that officer's armed force. Such a deferment may not extend beyond the first day of the month following the month in which the officer becomes 68 years of age.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) HEADING.—The heading of such section is amended by striking “exception” and inserting “exceptions”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 63 of such title is amended in the item relating to section 1253 by striking “exception” and inserting “exceptions”.

SEC. 506. REINSTATEMENT OF ENHANCED AUTHORITY FOR SELECTIVE EARLY DISCHARGE OF WARRANT OFFICERS.

Section 580a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “November 30, 1993, and ending on October 1, 1999” and inserting “October 1, 2015, and ending on October 1, 2019”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

SEC. 507. AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT WARRANT OFFICER RETIRED GRADE DETERMINATIONS.

Section 1371 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “highest” after “in the”; and

(2) by striking “that he held on the day before the date of his retirement, or in any higher warrant officer grade”.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management

SEC. 511. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN RESERVE OFFICERS AS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED FOR SELECTION FOR PROMOTION.

Section 14301 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) CERTAIN OFFICERS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED FOR SELECTION FOR PROMOTION.—The Secretary of the military department concerned may provide that an officer who is in an active status, but is in a duty status in which the only points the officer accrues under section 12732(a)(2) of this title are pursuant to subparagraph (C)(i) of that section (relating to membership in a reserve component), shall not be considered for selection for promotion at any time the officer otherwise would be so considered. Any such officer may remain on the reserve active-status list.”.

SEC. 512. CLARIFICATION OF PURPOSE OF RESERVE COMPONENT SPECIAL SELECTION BOARDS AS LIMITED TO CORRECTION OF ERROR AT A MANDATORY PROMOTION BOARD.

Section 14502(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “a selection board” and inserting “a mandatory promotion board convened under section 14101(a) of this title”; and

(B) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking “selection board” and inserting “mandatory promotion board”; and

(2) in the first sentence of paragraph (3), by striking “selection board” and inserting “mandatory promotion board”.

SEC. 513. RECONCILIATION OF CONTRADICTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO CITIZENSHIP QUALIFICATIONS FOR ENLISTMENT IN THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 12102(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(1) that person has met the citizenship or residency requirements established in section 504(b)(1) of this title; or

“(2) that person is authorized to enlist by the Secretary concerned under section 504(b)(2) of this title.”.

SEC. 514. AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN AIR FORCE RESERVE COMPONENT PERSONNEL TO PROVIDE TRAINING AND INSTRUCTION REGARDING PILOT INSTRUCTOR TRAINING.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—During fiscal year 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force may authorize personnel described in paragraph (2) to provide training and instruction regarding pilot instructor training to the following:

(A) Members of the Armed Forces on active duty.

(B) Members of foreign military forces who are in the United States.

(2) **PERSONNEL.**—The personnel described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Members of the reserve components of the Air Force on active Guard and Reserve duty (as that term is defined in section 101(d) of title 10, United States Code) who are not otherwise authorized to conduct the training described in paragraph (1) due to the limitations in section 10216 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) Members of the Air Force who are military technicians (dual status) who are not otherwise authorized to conduct the training described in paragraph (1) due to the limitations in section 328(b) of title 32, United States Code

(3) **LIMITATION.**—The total number of personnel described in paragraph (2) who may provide training and instruction under the authority in paragraph (1) at any one time may not exceed 50.

(4) **FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT.**—Members of the uniformed services described in paragraph (2) who provide training and instruction pursuant to the authority in paragraph (1) shall be covered by the Federal Tort Claims Act for purposes of any claim arising from the employment of such individuals under that authority.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan to eliminate pilot instructor shortages within the Air Force using authorities available to the Secretary under current law.

Subtitle C—General Service Authorities

SEC. 521. DUTY REQUIRED FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR PRESEPARATION COUNSELING FOR MEMBERS BEING DISCHARGED OR RELEASED FROM ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) **REQUIREMENT FOR 180 CONTINUOUS DAYS OF ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE FOR ELIGIBILITY.**—Subparagraph (A) of section 1142(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “continuous” after “first 180”.

(b) **EXCLUSION OF TRAINING FROM PERIODS OF ACTIVE DUTY.**—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘active duty’ does not include full-time training duty, annual training duty, and attendance, while in the active military service, at a school designated as a service school by law or by the Secretary of the military department concerned.”.

SEC. 522. EXPANSION OF PILOT PROGRAMS ON CAREER FLEXIBILITY TO ENHANCE RETENTION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 533 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (10 U.S.C. prec. 701 note) is amended by striking subsections (b) and (c).

SEC. 523. SENSE OF SENATE ON DEVELOPMENT OF GENDER-NEUTRAL OCCUPATIONAL STANDARDS FOR OCCUPATIONAL ASSIGNMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **FINDING.**—The Senate remains interested in the integration of women into the combat arms of the Armed Forces and the development of gender-neutral occupational standards for occupational assignments in the Armed Forces.

(b) **SENSE OF SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the development of gender-neutral occupational standards is vital in determining the occupational assignments of all members of the Armed Forces;

(2) studies being conducted by the Armed Forces are important to the development of these standards and should incorporate the best scientific practices available; and

(3) the Armed Forces should consider such studies on these standards carefully in order to ensure that—

(A) such studies do not result in unnecessary barriers to service in the Armed Forces; and

(B) all decisions on occupational assignments in the Armed Forces—

(i) are based on an objective analysis of the tasks required to perform the occupational assignment concerned; and

(ii) do not negatively impact the required combat capabilities of the Armed Forces, including units whose primary mission is to engage in direct combat at the tactical level.

SEC. 524. SENSE OF CONGRESS RECOGNIZING THE DIVERSITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States military includes individuals with a variety of national, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds that have roots all over the world.

(2) In addition to diverse backgrounds, members of the Armed Forces come from numerous religious traditions, including Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh, non-denominational, nonpracticing, and many more.

(3) Members of the Armed Forces from diverse backgrounds and religious traditions have lost their lives or been injured defending the national security of the United States.

(4) Diversity contributes to the strength of the Armed Forces, and service members from different backgrounds and religious traditions share the same goal of defending the United States.

(5) The unity of the Armed Forces reflects the strength in diversity that makes the United States a great Nation.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue to recognize and promote diversity in the Armed Forces; and

(2) honor those from all diverse backgrounds and religious traditions who have made sacrifices in serving the United States through the Armed Forces.

**Subtitle D—Member Education and Training
PART I—EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE
REFORM**

SEC. 531. LIMITATION ON TUITION ASSISTANCE FOR OFF-DUTY TRAINING OR EDUCATION.

Section 2007(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, but only if the Secretary determines that such education or training is likely to contribute to the member’s professional development” after “during the member’s off-duty periods”.

SEC. 532. TERMINATION OF PROGRAM OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS SUPPORTING CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND OTHER OPERATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 1607 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 16167. Sunset

“(a) **SUNSET.**—The authority to provide educational assistance under this chapter shall terminate on the date that is four years after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

“(b) **LIMITATION ON PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE PENDING SUNSET.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and ending on the date that is four years after the date of the enactment of that Act, educational assistance may be provided under this chapter only to a member otherwise eligible for educational assistance under this chapter who received educational assistance under this chapter for a course of study at an educational institution for the enrollment period at the educational institution that immediately preceded the date of the enactment of that Act.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1607 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“16167. Sunset.”.

SEC. 533. REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL LEVELS ATTAINED BY CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AT TIME OF SEPARATION FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORTS REQUIRED.**—Each Secretary concerned shall submit to Congress each year a report on the educational levels attained by members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (b) under the jurisdiction of such Secretary who separated from the Armed Forces during the preceding year.

(b) **COVERED MEMBERS.**—The members of the Armed Forces described in this subsection are members of the Armed Forces who transferred unused education benefits to family members pursuant to section 3319 of title 38, United States Code, while serving as members of the Armed Forces.

(c) **SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Secretary concerned” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 534. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TRANSFERABILITY OF UNUSED EDUCATION BENEFITS TO FAMILY MEMBERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It is the sense of Congress that each Secretary concerned should—

(1) exercise the authority in section 3319(a) of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transferability of unused education benefits to family members, in a manner that encourages the retention of individuals in the Armed Forces; and

(2) be more selective in permitting such transferability.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “Armed Forces” and “Secretary concerned” have the meaning given such terms in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 535. NO ENTITLEMENT TO UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE WHILE RECEIVING POST-9/11 EDUCATION ASSISTANCE.

Section 8525(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) an educational assistance allowance under chapter 33 of title 38.”.

PART II—OTHER MATTERS**SEC. 536. REPEAL OF STATUTORY SPECIFICATION OF MINIMUM DURATION OF IN-RESIDENT INSTRUCTION FOR COURSES OF INSTRUCTION OFFERED AS PART OF PHASE II JOINT PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION.**

(a) **REPEAL OF STATUTORY REQUIREMENT FOR IN-RESIDENT INSTRUCTION.**—Section 2154(a)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “taught in residence at” and inserting “offered through”.

(b) **REPEAL OF STATUTORY DURATIONAL MINIMUM.**—

(1) **REPEAL.**—Section 2156 of such title is repealed.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 107 of such title amended by striking the item relating to section 2156.

SEC. 537. QUALITY ASSURANCE OF CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS AND STANDARDS FOR PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS OBTAINED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 551 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3376), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) **QUALITY ASSURANCE OF CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS AND STANDARDS.**—(1) Commencing not later than three years after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, each Secretary concerned shall ensure that any credentialing program used in connection with the program under subsection (a) is accredited by an accreditation body that meets the requirements specified in paragraph (2).

“(2) The requirements for accreditation bodies specified in this paragraph are requirements that an accreditation body—

“(A) be an independent body that has in place mechanisms to ensure objectivity and impartiality in its accreditation activities;

“(B) meet a recognized national or international standard that directs its policy and procedures regarding accreditation;

“(C) apply a recognized national or international certification standard in making its accreditation decisions regarding certification bodies and programs;

“(D) conduct on-site visits, as applicable, to verify the documents and records submitted by credentialing bodies for accreditation;

“(E) have in place policies and procedures to ensure due process when addressing complaints and appeals regarding its accreditation activities;

“(F) conduct regular training to ensure consistent and reliable decisions among reviewers conducting accreditations; and

“(G) meet such other criteria as the Secretary concerned considers appropriate in order to ensure quality in its accreditation activities.”.

SEC. 538. SUPPORT FOR ATHLETIC PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 403 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§4362. Support of athletic and physical fitness programs

“(a) **AUTHORITY.**—

“(1) **CONTRACTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary of the Army may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with the Army West Point Athletic Association for

the purpose of supporting the athletic and physical fitness programs of the Academy. Notwithstanding section 2304(k) of this title, the Secretary may enter such contracts or cooperative agreements on a sole source basis pursuant to section 2304(c)(5) of this title. Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, a cooperative agreement under this section may be used to acquire property or services for the direct benefit or use of the Academy.

“(2) **FINANCIAL CONTROLS.**—(A) Before entering into a contract or cooperative agreement under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure that such contract or agreement includes appropriate financial controls to account for Academy and Association resources in accordance with accepted accounting principles.

“(B) Any such contract or cooperative agreement shall contain a provision that allows the Secretary, at the Secretary’s discretion, to review the financial accounts of the Association to determine whether the operations of the Association—

“(i) are consistent with the terms of the contract or cooperative agreement; and

“(ii) will not compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of any program of the Department of the Army.

“(3) **LEASES.**—Section 2667(h) of this title shall not apply to any leases the Secretary may enter into with the Association for the purpose of supporting the athletic and physical fitness programs of the Academy.

“(b) **SUPPORT SERVICES.**—

“(1) **AUTHORITY.**—To the extent required by a contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a), the Secretary may provide support services to the Association while the Association conducts its support activities at the Academy. The Secretary may provide support services described in paragraph (2) only if the Secretary determines that the provision of such services is essential for the support of the athletic and physical fitness programs of the Academy.

“(2) **SUPPORT SERVICES DEFINED.**—(A) In this subsection, the term ‘support services’ includes utilities, office furnishings and equipment, communications services, records staging and archiving, audio and video support, and security systems in conjunction with the leasing or licensing of property.

“(B) Such term includes—

“(i) housing for Association personnel on United States Army Garrison, West Point, New York; and

“(ii) enrollment of dependents of Association personnel in elementary and secondary schools under the same criteria applied to dependents of Federal employees under section 2164(a) of this title, except that educational services provided pursuant to this clause shall be provided on a reimbursable basis.

“(3) **NO LIABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES.**—Any such support services may only be provided without any liability of the United States to the Association.

“(c) **ACCEPTANCE OF SUPPORT.**—

“(1) **SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM THE ASSOCIATION.**—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, the Secretary may accept from the Association funds, supplies, and services for the support of the athletic and physical fitness programs of the Academy. For the purposes of this section, employees or personnel of the Association may not be considered to be employees of the United States.

“(2) **FUNDS RECEIVED FROM NCAA.**—The Secretary may accept funds from the National Collegiate Athletic Association to support the athletic and physical fitness programs of the Academy.

“(3) **LIMITATION.**—The Secretary shall ensure that contributions under this subsection and expenditure of funds pursuant to subsection (e) do

not reflect unfavorably on the ability of the Department of the Army, any of its employees, or any member of the armed forces to carry out any responsibility or duty in a fair and objective manner, or compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of any program of the Department of the Army, or any individual involved in such a program.

“(d) **TRADEMARKS AND SERVICE MARKS.**—

“(1) **LICENSING, MARKETING, AND SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—An agreement under subsection (a) may, consistent with section 2260 of this title (other than subsection (d) of such section), authorize the Association to enter into licensing, marketing, and sponsorship agreements relating to trademarks and service marks identifying the Academy, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Army.

“(2) **LIMITATIONS.**—No licensing, marketing, or sponsorship agreement may be entered into under paragraph (1) if—

“(A) such agreement would reflect unfavorably on the ability of the Department of the Army, any of its employees, or any member of the armed forces to carry out any responsibility or duty in a fair and objective manner; or

“(B) the Secretary determines that the use of the trademark or service mark would compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of any program of the Department of the Army, or any individual involved in such a program.

“(e) **RETENTION AND USE OF FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any funds received by the Secretary under this section other than money rentals received for property leased pursuant to section 2667 of this title shall be used by the Academy for one or more of the following purposes:

“(A) To benefit participating cadets.

“(B) To enhance the ability of the Academy to compete against other colleges and universities.

“(2) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Funds described in paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

“(f) **SERVICE ON ASSOCIATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS.**—The Association is a designated entity for which authorization under sections 1033(a) and 1589(a) of this title may be provided.

“(g) **CONDITIONS.**—The authority provided in this section with respect to the Association is available only so long as the Association continues—

“(1) to qualify as a nonprofit organization under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and operates in accordance with this section, the law of the State of New York, and the constitution and bylaws of the Association; and

“(2) to operate exclusively to support the athletic and physical fitness programs of the Academy.

“(h) **ASSOCIATION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘Association’ means the Army West Point Athletic Association.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 403 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“4362. Support of athletic and physical fitness programs.”.

SEC. 539. ONLINE ACCESS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION COMPONENT OF THE TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **NOTICE TO PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS OF AVAILABILITY OF COMPONENT ONLINE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**—If a member of the Armed Forces, veteran, or dependent requests a certificate of eligibility from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to prove the eligibility of the member, veteran, or dependent, as the case may be, for educational assistance under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary shall notify the member, veteran, or dependent of the availability of the higher education component of the Transition Assistance

Program (TAP) on the Transition GPS Stand-alone Training Internet website of the Department of Defense.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF COMPONENT ONLINE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in collaboration with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, assess the feasibility of—

(A) providing access for veterans and dependents to the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program on the eBenefits Internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(B) tracking the completion of that component through that Internet website.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a description of the cost and length of time required to provide access and begin tracking completion of the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program as described in paragraph (1).

Subtitle E—Military Justice

SEC. 546. MODIFICATION OF RULE 304 OF THE MILITARY RULES OF EVIDENCE RELATING TO THE CORROBORATION OF A CONFESSION OR ADMISSON.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, Rule 304(c) of the Military Rules of Evidence shall be modified as follows:

(1) To provide that an admission or a confession of the accused may be considered as evidence against the accused on the question of guilt or innocence only if independent evidence, either direct or circumstantial, has been admitted into evidence which would tend to establish the trustworthiness of the admission or confession.

(2) To provide that not every element or fact contained in the admission or confession must be independently proven for the admission or confession to be admitted into evidence in its entirety.

(3) To strike the rule that if independent evidence raises an inference of the truth of some but not all of the essential facts admitted, the confession or admission may be considered as evidence against the accused only with respect to those essential facts stated in the confession or admission that are corroborated by the independent evidence.

(4) With respect to the quantum of evidence needed to establish corroboration, to provide that the independent evidence need raise only an inference of the truth of the admission or confession.

SEC. 547. MODIFICATION OF RULE 104 OF THE RULES FOR COURTS-MARTIAL TO ESTABLISH CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS CONCERNING EVALUATIONS OF SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, Rule 104(b) of the Rules for Courts-Martial shall be modified to provide that the prohibitions concerning evaluations established by that Rule shall apply to the giving of a less favorable rating or evaluation to any member of the Armed Forces serving as a Special Victims' Counsel because of the zeal with which such counsel represented a victim.

SEC. 548. RIGHT OF VICTIMS OF OFFENSES UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE TO TIMELY DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN MATERIALS AND INFORMATION IN CONNECTION WITH PROSECUTION OF OFFENSES.

Section 806b(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 6b(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (8) as paragraphs (4) through (9), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

“(3) The right to the timely disclosure by trial counsel to the victim (or the Special Victims' Counsel of the victim if the victim is so represented) of the following:

“(A) Any charges and specifications related to the offense.

“(B) Any motions filed by trial counsel or defense counsel in connection with the court-martial of the offense, unless otherwise protected from disclosure.

“(C) All statements by the accused related to the offense.

“(D) Any statement by the victim in connection with the offense that is in the possession of the government.

“(E) Any portions relating to the victim in any report of an investigation of the offense that is in the possession of the government.

“(F) In the event the staff judge advocate advises pursuant to section 834 of this title (article 34) that any charge or specification in connection with the offense not be referred for trial, the advice making such recommendation, with such advice to be so provided before the convening authority acts on the advice.”.

SEC. 549. ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS BY THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS.

Section 806b of title 10, United States Code (article 6b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN RIGHTS BY COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS.—(1)(A) If the victim of an offense under this chapter believes that a preliminary hearing ruling under section 832 of this title (article 32), or a court-martial ruling, violates the victim's rights afforded by a section (article) or rule specified in paragraph (2), the victim may file an interlocutory appeal of such ruling by petitioning the Court of Criminal Appeals for an order to require the judge advocate conducting such preliminary hearing, or the court-martial, as the case may be, to comply with the section (article) or rule, as applicable.

“(B) A victim of an offense under this chapter who is subject to an order to submit to a deposition notwithstanding the fact that the victim shall be available to testify at the court-martial of the offense may file an interlocutory appeal of such order by petitioning the Court of Criminal Appeals for an order to quash such order.

“(C) The Court of Criminal Appeals shall provide a de novo review of the question or questions raised by a petition filed under this paragraph. A single judge or panel of judges shall take up and decide the petition within 72 hours after the petition is filed.

“(2) Paragraph (1)(A) applies with respect to the protections afforded by the following:

“(A) This section (article).

“(B) Military Rule of Evidence 412, relating to the admission of evidence regarding a victim's sexual background.

“(C) Military Rule of Evidence 513, relating to the psychotherapist-patient privilege.

“(D) Military Rule of Evidence 514, relating to the victim advocate-victim privilege.

“(E) Military Rule of Evidence 615, relating to the exclusion of witnesses.

“(3) The proceedings of a preliminary hearing under section 832 of this title (article 32), or a court-martial, may not be stayed or subject to a continuance of more than five days for purposes of enforcing this subsection. If the Court of Criminal Appeals denies the relief sought, the reasons for the denial shall be clearly stated on the record in a written opinion.”.

SEC. 550. RELEASE TO VICTIMS UPON REQUEST OF COMPLETE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS AND TESTIMONY OF COURTS-MARTIAL IN CASES IN WHICH SENTENCES ADJUDGED COULD INCLUDE PUNITIVE DISCHARGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 854(e) of title 10, United States Code (article 54(e) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(e)”; and

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by inserting “or the victim requests such records” before the period at the end of the first sentence; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) In the case of a general or special court-martial involving an offense (other than an offense covered by paragraph (1)) for which the sentence as adjudged could include punitive discharge from the armed forces, a copy of all prepared records of the proceedings of the court-martial shall be given to the victim of the offense if the victim requests such records.

“(3) Records given to a victim under this subsection at the request of the victim in a case where the court-martial concerned resulted in the acquittal of the accused may include restrictions on release or use of such records or information in such records in order to protect the privacy or other interests of the accused.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to courts-martial first convened on or after that date.

SEC. 551. REPRESENTATION AND ASSISTANCE OF VICTIMS BY SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL IN QUESTIONING BY MILITARY CRIMINAL INVESTIGATORS.

Section 1044e(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) In carrying out paragraph (1), a military criminal investigator seeking to question an individual eligible for the assistance of a Special Victims' Counsel under this section shall inform the individual of the individual's right to be represented by a Special Victims' Counsel in connection with such questioning.

“(B) If an individual described in subparagraph (A) requests representation by a Special Victims' Counsel in connection with questioning described in that subparagraph—

“(i) a Special Victims' Counsel shall represent and assist the individual during and in connection with such questioning;

“(ii) the military criminal investigator shall contact and question the individual only through the Special Victims' Counsel representing the individual; and

“(iii) the military criminal investigation may not contact or question the individual without the consent of such Special Victims' Counsel.

“(C) Nothing in this paragraph confers any right on an accused under investigation.

“(D) A violation of this paragraph shall not be a basis for the suppression of any statement of an individual described in subparagraph (A), or derivative evidence of such a statement, in a proceeding against a person accused with committing an offense against such individual.”.

SEC. 552. AUTHORITY OF SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL TO PROVIDE LEGAL CONSULTATION AND ASSISTANCE IN CONNECTION WITH VARIOUS GOVERNMENT PROCEEDINGS.

Section 1044e(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph (9):

“(9) Legal consultation and assistance in connection with—

“(A) any complaint against the Government, including an allegation under review by an inspector general and a complaint regarding equal employment opportunities;

“(B) any request to the Government for information, including a request under section 552a of title 5 (commonly referred to as a ‘Freedom of Information Act request’); and

“(C) any correspondence or other communications with Congress.”.

SEC. 553. ENHANCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY OF RESTRICTED REPORTING OF SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY.

(a) **PREEMPTION OF STATE LAW TO ENSURE CONFIDENTIALITY OF REPORTING.**—Subsection (b) of section 1565b of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) In the case of information disclosed pursuant to paragraph (1), any State law or regulation that would require an individual specified in paragraph (2) to disclose the personally identifiable information of the adult victim or alleged perpetrator of the sexual assault to a State or local law enforcement agency shall not apply, except when reporting is necessary to prevent or mitigate a serious and imminent threat to the health or safety of an individual.”.

(b) **CLARIFICATION OF SCOPE.**—Paragraph (1) of such subsection is amended by striking “a dependent” and inserting “an adult dependent”.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **SEXUAL ASSAULT.**—The term ‘sexual assault’ includes the offenses of rape, sexual assault, forcible sodomy, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, and attempts to commit such offenses, as punishable under applicable Federal or State law.

“(2) **STATE.**—The term ‘State’ includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any territory or possession of the United States.”.

SEC. 554. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF COMPLEX INVESTIGATIONS WITHIN THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 1101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 10509. Office of Complex Investigations

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is in the National Guard Bureau an Office of Complex Investigations (in this section referred to as the ‘Office’) under the authority, direction, and control of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

“(b) **DISPOSITION AND FUNCTIONS.**—The Office shall be organized, trained, equipped, and managed to conduct administrative investigations in order to assist the States in the organization, maintenance, and operation of the National Guard as follows:

“(1) In investigations of allegations of sexual assault involving members of the National Guard.

“(2) In investigations in circumstances involving members of the National Guard in which other law enforcement agencies within the Department of Defense do not have, or have limited, jurisdiction or authority to investigate.

“(3) In investigations in such other circumstances involving members of the National Guard as the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may direct.

“(c) **SCOPE OF INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY.**—Individuals performing investigations described in subsection (b)(1) are authorized—

“(1) to have access to all records, reports, audits, reviews, documents, papers, recommendations, or other material available to the applicable establishment which relate to programs and operations with respect to the National Guard; and

“(2) to request such information or assistance as may be necessary for carrying out those duties from any Federal, State, or local governmental agency or unit thereof.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1101 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“10509. Office of Complex Investigations.”.

SEC. 555. MODIFICATION OF DEADLINE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF DEFENSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION, PROSECUTION, AND DEFENSE OF SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 546(a)(2) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3374; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by striking “not later than” and all that follows and inserting “not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.”.

SEC. 556. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORTS ON PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TO SEXUAL ASSAULT BY THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND THE ARMY RESERVE.

(a) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than April 1, 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the preliminary assessment of the Comptroller General (made pursuant to a review conducted by the Comptroller General for purposes of this section) of the extent to which the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve—

(1) have in place policies and programs to prevent and respond to incidents of sexual assault involving members of the Army National Guard or the Army Reserve, as applicable;

(2) provide medical and mental health care services to members of the Army National Guard or the Army Reserve, as applicable, following a sexual assault; and

(3) have identified whether the nature of service in the Army National Guard or the Army Reserve, as the case may be, poses challenges to the prevention of or response to sexual assault.

(b) **ADDITIONAL REPORTS.**—If after submitting the report required by subsection (a) the Comptroller General makes additional assessments as a result of the review described in that subsection, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress such reports on such additional assessments as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

SEC. 557. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE SERVICE OF MILITARY FAMILIES AND ON SENTENCING RETIREMENT-ELIGIBLE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Military families serve alongside their member of the Armed Forces, enduring hardships, lending support, and contributing to the member’s career. These family members endure frequent moves, long periods of separation, and other unique hardships associated with military life.

(2) Innocent family members are sometimes inadvertently punished when the member they depend on forfeits retirement benefit eligibility due to a court-martial sentence.

(3) When a retirement-eligible member forfeits retirement eligibility, that member’s innocent family members lose the security of benefits they had planned for and helped earn.

(4) Military juries may choose to impose unjustly light sentences on convicted members out of concern for the innocent family members when a just sentence would require stripping the member of retirement eligibility.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress—

(1) that military juries should not face the difficult choice between imposing a fair sentence or protecting the benefits of a member of the Armed Forces for the sake of innocent family members;

(2) that innocent military family members of retirement-eligible members should not be made to forgo benefits they have sacrificed for and helped to earn; and

(3) to welcome the opportunity to work with the Department of Defense to develop the necessary laws and regulations to improve the military justice system and to protect the benefits that military families have helped earn.

Subtitle F—Defense Dependents Education and Military Family Readiness

SEC. 561. CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO ASSIST LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES THAT BENEFIT DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) **ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOLS WITH SIGNIFICANT NUMBERS OF MILITARY DEPENDENT STUDENTS.**—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities as specified in the funding table in section 4301, \$25,000,000 shall be available only for the purpose of providing assistance to local educational agencies under subsection (a) of section 572 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 20 U.S.C. 7703b).

(b) **LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “local educational agency” has the meaning given that term in section 8013(9) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7713(9)).

SEC. 562. IMPACT AID FOR CHILDREN WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 pursuant to section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities as specified in the funding table in section 4301, \$5,000,000 shall be available for payments under section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 114 Stat. 1654A–77; 20 U.S.C. 7703a).

SEC. 563. AUTHORITY TO USE APPROPRIATED FUNDS TO SUPPORT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STUDENT MEAL PROGRAMS IN DOMESTIC DEPENDENT ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS LOCATED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—Section 2243 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “the defense dependents’ education system” and inserting “overseas defense dependents’ schools”; and

(B) by striking “students enrolled in that system” and inserting “students enrolled in such a school”;

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “Department of Defense dependents’ schools which are located outside the United States” and inserting “overseas defense dependents’ schools”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **OVERSEAS DEFENSE DEPENDENTS’ SCHOOL DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘overseas defense dependents’ school’ means the following:

“(1) A school established as part of the defense dependents’ education system provided for under the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.).

“(2) An elementary or secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of this title that is located in a territory, commonwealth, or possession of the United States.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **HEADING AMENDMENT.**—The heading of such section is amended by inserting “defense” after “overseas”.

(2) **TABLE OF SECTIONS.**—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 134 of such title is amended in the item relating to section 2243 by inserting “defense” after “over-seas”.

SEC. 564. BIENNIAL SURVEYS OF MILITARY DEPENDENTS ON MILITARY FAMILY READINESS MATTERS.

(a) **BIENNIAL SURVEYS REQUIRED.**—The Director of the Office of Family Policy of the Department of Defense shall undertake every other year a survey of adult dependents of members of the Armed Forces on the matters specified in subsection (b). Participation by dependents in the survey shall be voluntary.

(b) **MATTERS.**—The matters specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) Mental health of dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

(2) Incidence of suicide and suicidal ideation among dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

(3) Incidence of divorce among dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

(4) Incidence of spousal abuse, child abuse, sexual assault, and harassment among dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

(5) Financial health and financial literacy of military families.

(6) Employment and education of dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

(7) Adequacy and availability of child care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

(8) Quality of programs for military families.

(9) Such other matters relating to military family readiness as the Director considers appropriate.

Subtitle G—Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements

SEC. 571. EXTENSION OF SEMIANNUAL REPORTS ON THE INVOLUNTARY SEPARATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 525(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1724) is amended by striking “calendar years 2013 and 2014” and “each of calendar years 2013 through 2017”.

SEC. 572. REMOTELY PILOTED AIRCRAFT CAREER FIELD MANNING SHORTFALLS.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for operation and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, not more than 85 percent may be obligated or expended until a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees the report described in subsection (b).

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on remotely piloted aircraft career field manning levels and actions the Air Force will take to rectify personnel shortfalls.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of current and projected manning requirements and inventory levels for remotely piloted aircraft systems.

(B) A description of rated and non-rated officer and enlisted manning policies for authorization and inventory levels in effect for remotely piloted aircraft systems and units, to include whether remotely piloted aircraft duty is considered as a permanent Air Force Specialty Code or treated as an ancillary single assignment duty, and if both are used, the division of authorizations between permanently assigned personnel and those who will return to a different primary career field.

(C) Comparisons to other Air Force manned combat aircraft systems and units with respect to personnel policies, manpower authorization levels, and projected personnel inventory.

(D) Identification and assessment of mitigation actions to increase unit manning levels, including recruitment and retention bonuses, incentive pay, use of enlisted personnel, and increased weighting to remotely piloted aircraft personnel on promotion boards, and to ensure the school house for remotely piloted aircraft personnel is sufficient to meet increased manning demands.

(E) Analysis demonstrating the requirements determination for how remotely piloted aircraft pilot and sensor operators are selected, including whether individuals are prior rated or non-rated qualified, what prerequisite training or experience is necessary, and required and types of basic and advanced qualification training for each mission design series of remotely piloted aircraft in the Air Force inventory.

(F) Recommendations for changes to existing legislation required to implement mitigation actions.

(G) An assessment of the authorization levels of government civilian and contractor support required for sufficiency of remotely piloted aircraft career field manning.

(H) A description and associated timeline of actions the Air Force will take to increase remotely piloted aircraft career field manpower authorizations and manning levels to at least the equal of the normative levels of manning and readiness of all other combat aircraft career fields.

(I) A description of any other matters concerning remotely piloted aircraft career field manning levels the Secretary of the Air Force determines to be appropriate.

(3) **FORM.**—The report required under paragraph (1) may be submitted in classified form, but shall also contain an unclassified executive summary and may contain an unclassified annex.

(4) **NONDUPLICATION OF EFFORT.**—If any information required under paragraph (1) has been included in another report or notification previously submitted to Congress by law, the Secretary of the Air Force may provide a list of such reports and notifications at the time of submitting the report required under this subsection in lieu of including such information in the report.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

PART I—FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 581. IMPROVEMENT OF FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 992 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “CONSUMER EDUCATION” and inserting “FINANCIAL LITERACY TRAINING”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “education” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting “financial literacy training”;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “as”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “as” before “a component”;

(II) by striking “orientation”;

(III) by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (J); and

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) upon arrival at the first duty station;

“(C) upon arrival at each duty station following the first duty station in the case of each

member in pay grade E-4 or below or in pay grade O-3 or below;

“(D) on the date of promotion, in the case of each member in pay grade E-5 or below or in pay grade O-4 or below;

“(E) when the member vests in the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP);

“(F) at each major life event during the member’s service, such as—

“(i) marriage;

“(ii) divorce;

“(iii) birth of first child; or

“(iv) disabling sickness or condition;

“(G) during leadership training;

“(H) during pre-deployment training and during post-deployment training;

“(I) at transition points in military service, such as—

“(i) transition from a regular component to a reserve component;

“(ii) separation from service; or

“(iii) retirement; and”;

(v) in subparagraph (J), as redesignated by clause (iii), by inserting “as” before “a component”;

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking “(2)(B)” and inserting “(2)(J)”;

(E) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations setting forth any additional events and circumstances (other than those described in paragraph (2)) for which the Secretary determines that training under this subsection shall be required.”.

(b) **FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS SURVEY.**—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) **FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS SURVEY.**—(1) The Director of the Defense Manpower Data Center shall annually include in the status of forces survey a survey of the status of the financial literacy and preparedness of members of the armed forces.

“(2) The results of the annual financial literacy and preparedness survey—

“(A) shall be used by each of the Secretaries concerned as a benchmark to evaluate and update training provided under this section; and

“(B) shall be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.”.

(c) **ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL SERVICES COVERED BY LITERACY TRAINING.**—Subsection (e) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (b)(1) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Health insurance, budget management, Thrift Savings Plan (TSP), retirement lump sum payments (including rollover options and tax consequences), and Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP).”.

(d) **CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **SECTION HEADING.**—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§992. Financial literacy training: financial services”.

(2) **TABLE OF SECTIONS.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 50 of such title is amended by striking the item related to section 992 and inserting the following new item:

“992. Financial literacy training: financial services.”.

SEC. 582. FINANCIAL LITERACY TRAINING WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN FINANCIAL SERVICES FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary concerned shall provide the financial literacy training under section 992 of title 10, United States Code,

for the financial services described in paragraph (4) of section 992(e) of such title (as amended and added by section 581 of this Act) to members of the uniformed services under the jurisdiction of such Secretary commencing not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “uniformed services” and “Secretary concerned” have the meaning given such terms in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 583. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should strengthen arrangements with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as well as with nonprofit organizations, in order to improve the financial literacy and preparedness of members of the Armed Forces; and

(2) the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces should provide support for the financial literacy and preparedness training carried out under section 992 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by section 581 of this Act).

PART II—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 586. AUTHORITY FOR APPLICATIONS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS TO BE INITIATED BY THE SECRETARY CONCERNED.

Section 1552(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “or his heir or legal representative” and inserting “(or the claimant’s heir or legal representative) or the Secretary concerned”; and

(2) by striking “he discovers” and inserting “discovering”.

SEC. 587. RECORDATION OF OBLIGATIONS FOR INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS OF INCENTIVE PAYS, ALLOWANCES, AND SIMILAR BENEFITS WHEN PAYMENT IS DUE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 19 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§1015. Recordation of installment payment obligations for incentive pays and similar benefits

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of any pay, allowance, bonus, or other benefit described in subsection (b) that is paid to a member of the uniformed services on an installment basis, each installment payment shall be charged to appropriations that are available for obligation at the time such payment is payable.

“(b) **COVERED PAY AND BENEFITS.**—Subsection (a) applies to any incentive pay, special pay, or bonus, or similar periodic payment of pay or allowances, or of educational benefits or stipends, that is paid to a member of the uniformed services under this title or title 10.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 19 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1015. Recordation of installment payment obligations for incentive pays and similar benefits.”.

SEC. 588. ENHANCEMENTS TO YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM.

(a) **SCOPE AND PURPOSE.**—Section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “combat veteran”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “informational events and activities” and inserting “information, events, and activities”.

(b) **ELIGIBILITY.**—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “National Guard and Reserve members and their families” and inserting “eligible individuals”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, their families,” and inserting “eligible individuals”;

(3) in subsection (d)(2)(C), by striking “members of the Armed Forces and their families” and inserting “eligible individuals”;

(4) in subsection (h), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “members of the Armed Forces and their family members” and inserting “eligible individuals”; and

(B) by striking “such members and their family members” and inserting “such eligible individuals”;

(5) in subsection (j), by striking “members of the Armed Forces and their families” and inserting “eligible individuals”;

(6) in subsection (k), by striking “individual members of the Armed Forces and their families” and inserting “eligible individuals”; and

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(l) **ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.**—For the purposes of this section, the term ‘eligible individual’ means a member of a reserve component, a member of their family, or a designated representative who the Secretary of Defense determines to be eligible for the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program.”.

(c) **OFFICE FOR REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **OVERSIGHT OF YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM.**—Paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (d) of such section is amended by striking the second and third sentence and inserting “The office shall exercise oversight over the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program, and shall be responsible for coordination with State National Guard and Reserve organizations, including existing family and support programs.”.

(2) **PARTNERSHIPS TO PROVIDE QUALITY OF LIFE SERVICES.**—Paragraph (1)(B) of such subsection is amended by striking “substance abuse and mental health treatment services” and inserting “substance abuse, mental health treatment, and other quality of life services”.

(3) **GRANT AUTHORITY.**—Such subsection is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **GRANTS.**—The Office for Reintegration Programs may make grants to conduct data collection, trend analysis, and curriculum development, and to prepare reports, in support of activities under this section.”.

(d) **COORDINATION WITH COAST GUARD RESERVE.**—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(A), by striking “and Air Force Reserve” and inserting “Air Force Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “and Air Force Reserve” and inserting “Air Force Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve”.

(e) **DUE DATE OF ADVISORY BOARD ANNUAL REPORT.**—Subsection (e)(4) of such section is amended by striking “March” and inserting “April”.

(f) **SUPPORT TEAMS.**—Subsection (f) of such section is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “administer the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program at the State level” and inserting “support and assist State National Guard and Reserve organization reintegration efforts”; and

(2) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) to provide reintegration curriculum and information;”.

(g) **OPERATION OF PROGRAM.**—

(1) **ENHANCED FLEXIBILITY.**—Subsection (g) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(g) **OPERATION OF PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Office for Reintegration Programs shall assist State National Guard

and Reserve organizations with the development and provision of information, events, and activities to support the health and well-being of eligible individuals before, during, and after periods of activation, mobilization, or deployment.

“(2) **FOCUS OF INFORMATION, EVENTS, AND ACTIVITIES.**—

“(A) **BEFORE ACTIVATION, MOBILIZATION, OR DEPLOYMENT.**—Before such a period, the information, events, and activities described in paragraph (1) should focus on preparing eligible individuals and affected communities for the rigors of activation, mobilization, and deployment.

“(B) **DURING ACTIVATION, MOBILIZATION, OR DEPLOYMENT.**—During such a period, the information, events, and activities described in paragraph (1) should focus on—

“(i) helping eligible individuals cope with the challenges and stress associated with such period;

“(ii) decreasing the isolation of eligible individuals during such period; and

“(iii) preparing eligible individuals for the challenges associated with reintegration.

“(C) **AFTER ACTIVATION, MOBILIZATION, OR DEPLOYMENT.**—After such a period, the information, events, and activities described in paragraph (1) should focus on—

“(i) reconnecting the member with their families, friends, and communities;

“(ii) providing information on employment opportunities;

“(iii) helping eligible individuals deal with the challenges of reintegration;

“(iv) ensuring that eligible individuals understand what benefits they are entitled to and what resources are available to help them overcome the challenges of reintegration; and

“(v) providing a forum for addressing negative behaviors related to operational stress and reintegration.

“(3) **MEMBER PAY.**—Members shall receive appropriate pay for days spent attending such events and activities.

“(4) **MINIMUM NUMBER OF EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES.**—State National Guard and Reserve organizations shall provide to eligible individuals—

“(A) one event or activity before a period of activation, mobilization, or deployment;

“(B) one event or activity during a period of activation, mobilization, or deployment; and

“(C) two events or activities after a period of activation, mobilization, or deployment.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Such section is further amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “throughout the entire deployment cycle”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “; DEPLOYMENT CYCLE”; and

(ii) by striking “well-being through the 4 phases” through the end of the subsection and inserting “well-being.”;

(C) in subsection (d)(2)(C), by striking “throughout the deployment cycle described in subsection (g)”;

(D) in subsection (f), by striking “STATE DEPLOYMENT CYCLE” in the subsection heading.

(h) **ADDITIONAL PERMITTED OUTREACH SERVICE.**—Subsection (h) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(16) Stress management and positive coping skills.”.

(i) **SUPPORT OF DEPARTMENT-WIDE SUICIDE PREVENTION EFFORTS.**—Such section is further amended by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

“(i) **SUPPORT OF SUICIDE PREVENTION EFFORTS.**—The Office for Reintegration Programs shall assist the Defense Suicide Prevention Office and the Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury to collect and analyze information, suggestions, and best practices from State National

Guard and Reserve organizations with respect to suicide prevention and community response programs.”.

(j) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking “Substance Abuse and the Mental Health Services Administration” and inserting “Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(3)(C), by striking “Office of Reintegration Programs” and inserting “Office for Reintegration Programs”.

SEC. 589. PRIORITY PROCESSING OF APPLICATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIALS FOR MEMBERS UNDERGOING DISCHARGE OR RELEASE FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **PRIORITY PROCESSING.**—The Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security to afford a priority in the processing of applications for a Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) to applications submitted by members of the Armed Forces who are undergoing separation, discharge, or release from the Armed Forces under honorable conditions, with such priority to provide for the review and adjudication of such an application by not later than 14 days after submittal, unless an appeal or waiver applies or further application documentation is necessary. The priority shall be so afforded commencing not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act to members who undergo separation, discharge, or release from the Armed Forces after the date on which the priority so commences being afforded.

(b) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall enter into a memorandum of understanding in connection with achieving the requirement in subsection (a).

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of the requirements of this section. The report shall set forth the following:

(1) The memorandum of understanding required pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) A description of the number of individuals who applied for, and the number of individuals who have been issued, a Transportation Worker Identification Credential pursuant to the memorandum of understanding as of the date of the report.

(3) If any applications for a Transportation Worker Identification Credential covered by paragraph (2) were not reviewed and adjudicated within the deadline specified in subsection (a), a description of the reasons for the failure and of the actions being taken to assure that future applications for a Credential are reviewed and adjudicated within the deadline.

SEC. 590. ISSUANCE OF RECOGNITION OF SERVICE ID CARDS TO CERTAIN MEMBERS SEPARATING FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **ISSUANCE REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall issue to each covered individual a card that identifies such individual as a veteran and includes a photo of the individual and the name of the individual.

(2) **DESIGNATION.**—A card issued under paragraph (1) may be known as a “Recognition of Service ID Card”.

(b) **COVERED INDIVIDUALS.**—For purposes of this section, a “covered individual” is an individual who is undergoing discharge or release from the Armed Forces (other than as the result of a punitive discharge adjudicated as part of a

sentence at a court-martial after the effective date of this section) on or after the effective date provided for in subsection (e).

(c) **COLLECTION OF AMOUNTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may collect from civilian employees of the Department of Defense and contractor personnel of the Department who are issued a replacement card for a lost or stolen Department of Defense identification card such amount as the Secretary considers appropriate to defray the cost of the issuance of cards under subsection (a), and to implement the issuance of cards without the assignment of additional personnel for that purpose.

(2) **TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS.**—The Secretary shall deposit amounts collected under this subsection to the account or accounts providing funds for the issuance of cards under subsection (a).

(d) **RECOGNITION OF SERVICE ID CARDS FOR REDUCED PRICES OF SERVICES, CONSUMER PRODUCTS, AND PHARMACEUTICALS.**—The Secretary of Defense may work with national retail chains that offer reduced prices on services, consumer products, and pharmaceuticals to veterans to ensure that such retail chains recognize cards issued under subsection (a) for purposes of offering reduced prices on services, consumer products, and pharmaceuticals.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 591. REVISED POLICY ON NETWORK SERVICES FOR MILITARY SERVICES.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States that the Secretary of Defense shall minimize and reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, the number of uniformed military personnel providing network services to military installations within the United States.

(b) **PROHIBITION.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), each military service shall be prohibited from using uniform military personnel to provide network services to military installations within the United States 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **EXCEPTION.**—Nothing in subsection (b) shall be construed as prohibiting the use of military personnel providing network services in support of combatant commands, special operations, the intelligence community, or the United States Cyber Command, including training for these organizations.

(d) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary of Defense or the Chief Information Officer may waive the prohibition in subsection (b) if necessary for the safety of human life, protection of property, or providing network services in support of a combat operation.

(e) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 30, 2016, the Chief Information Officer shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the transition of the current performance of network services from military personnel to other means.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) An assessment of the costs of using military personnel versus other means to provide network services for the military services.

(B) An estimate of the savings of transitioning the current performance of network services from military personnel to other means.

(C) An estimate of the number of military personnel that could be reallocated for military-unique missions.

(f) **VALIDATION OF COST AND SAVINGS ESTIMATES.**—The report required under subsection (e) shall be validated by the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation.

SEC. 592. INCREASE IN NUMBER OF DAYS OF ACTIVE DUTY REQUIRED TO BE PERFORMED BY RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS FOR DUTY TO BE CONSIDERED FEDERAL SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR EX-SERVICEMEMBERS.

(a) **INCREASE OF NUMBER OF DAYS.**—Section 8521(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “90 days” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting “180 days”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to periods of Federal service commencing on or after that date.

SEC. 593. IMPROVED ENUMERATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN ANY TABULATION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) Effective beginning with the 2020 decennial census of population, in taking any tabulation of total population by States, the Secretary shall take appropriate measures to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that all members of the Armed Forces deployed abroad on the date of taking such tabulation are—

“(1) fully and accurately counted; and

“(2) properly attributed to the State in which their permanent duty station or homeport is located on such date.”.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not be construed to affect the residency status of any member of the Armed Forces under any provision of law other than title 13, United States Code.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

SEC. 601. FISCAL YEAR 2016 INCREASE IN MILITARY BASIC PAY.

(a) **WAIVER OF SECTION 1009 ADJUSTMENT.**—The adjustment to become effective during fiscal year 2016 required by section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, in the rates of monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services shall not be made.

(b) **INCREASE IN BASIC PAY.**—Effective on January 1, 2016, the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services are increased by 1.3 percent for enlisted member pay grades, warrant officer pay grades, and commissioned officer pay grades below pay grade O-7.

(c) **APPLICATION OF EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE LEVEL II CEILING ON PAYABLE RATES FOR GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS.**—Section 203(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, shall be applied for rates of basic pay payable for commissioned officers in pay grades O-7 through O-10 during calendar year 2016 by using the rate of pay for level II of the Executive Schedule in effect during 2014.

SEC. 602. MODIFICATION OF PERCENTAGE OF NATIONAL AVERAGE MONTHLY COST OF HOUSING USABLE IN COMPUTATION OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **MODIFICATION OF PERCENTAGE USABLE.**—Section 403(b)(3)(B) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking “one percent” and inserting “five percent”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2016, and shall apply with respect to computations of monthly amounts of basic allowance for housing inside the United States that occur for years beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 603. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE TEMPORARY INCREASE IN RATES OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.

Section 403(b)(7)(E) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”.

SEC. 604. BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING FOR MARRIED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES ASSIGNED FOR DUTY WITHIN NORMAL COMMUTING DISTANCE AND FOR OTHER MEMBERS LIVING TOGETHER.

(a) BAH FOR MARRIED MEMBERS ASSIGNED FOR DUTY WITHIN NORMAL COMMUTING DISTANCE.—Section 403 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(p) SINGLE ALLOWANCE FOR MARRIED MEMBERS ASSIGNED FOR DUTY WITHIN NORMAL COMMUTING DISTANCE.—In the event two members of the uniformed services entitled to receive a basic allowance for housing under this section are married to one another and are each assigned for duty within normal commuting distance, basic allowance for housing under this section shall be paid only to the member having the higher pay grade, or to the member having rank in grade if both members have the same pay grade, and at the rate payable for a member of such pay grade with dependents (regardless of whether or not such members have dependents).”.

(b) BAH FOR OTHER MEMBERS LIVING TOGETHER.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(q) REDUCED ALLOWANCE FOR MEMBERS LIVING TOGETHER.—(1) In the event two or more members of the uniformed services who are entitled to receive a basic allowance for housing under this section live together, basic allowance for housing under this section shall be paid to each such member at the rate as follows:

“(A) In the case of such a member in a pay grade below pay grade E-4, the rate otherwise payable to such member under this section.

“(B) In the case of such a member in a pay grade above pay grade E-3, the rate equal to the greater of—

“(i) 75 percent of the rate otherwise payable to such member under this section; or

“(ii) the rate payable for a member in pay grade E-4 without dependents.

“(2) This subsection does not apply to members covered by subsection (p).”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2015, and shall, except as provided in paragraph (2), apply with respect to allowances for basic housing payable for months beginning on or after that date.

(2) PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BAH FOR MEMBERS WITH UNINTERRUPTED ELIGIBILITY FOR BAH.—Notwithstanding any amendment made by this section, the monthly amount of basic allowance for housing payable to a member of the uniformed services under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, shall not be reduced by reason of such amendment so long as the member retains uninterrupted eligibility for such basic allowance for housing within an area of the United States or within an overseas location (as applicable).

(3) PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BAH FOR CERTAIN OTHER MARRIED MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the amount of basic allowance for housing payable to a member of the uniformed services under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, shall not be reduced by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) unless—

(A) the member and the member's spouse undergo a permanent change of station requiring a change of residence;

(B) the member and the member's spouse move into or commence living in on-base housing;

SEC. 605. REPEAL OF INAPPLICABILITY OF MODIFICATION OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING TO BENEFITS UNDER THE LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) REPEAL.—Subsection (b) of section 604 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2016.

SEC. 606. LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR SUPPLEMENTAL SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES TO MEMBERS SERVING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES AND ASSOCIATED TERRITORY.

Section 402a(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and paragraph (4)” after “subsection (d)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) After September 30, 2016, a member is eligible for a supplemental subsistence allowance under this section only if the member is serving outside the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, or Guam.”.

SEC. 607. AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.

In administering the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), the Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure that any safeguards that prevent the use or disclosure of information obtained from applicant households shall not prevent the use of that information by, or the disclosure of that information to, the Secretary of Defense for purposes of determining the number of applicant households that contain one or more members of a regular component or reserve component of the Armed Forces.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

SEC. 611. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES FOR RESERVE FORCES.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”:

(1) Section 308b(g), relating to Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus.

(2) Section 308c(i), relating to Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus.

(3) Section 308d(c), relating to special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units.

(4) Section 308g(f)(2), relating to Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service.

(5) Section 308h(e), relating to Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

(6) Section 308i(f), relating to Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

(7) Section 478a(e), relating to reimbursement of travel expenses for inactive-duty training outside of normal commuting distance.

(8) Section 910(g), relating to income replacement payments for reserve component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service.

SEC. 612. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES FOR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS.

(a) TITLE 10 AUTHORITIES.—The following sections of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”:

(1) Section 2130a(a)(1), relating to nurse officer candidate accession program.

(2) Section 16302(d), relating to repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve.

(b) TITLE 37 AUTHORITIES.—The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”:

(1) Section 302c-1(f), relating to accession and retention bonuses for psychologists.

(2) Section 302d(a)(1), relating to accession bonus for registered nurses.

(3) Section 302e(a)(1), relating to incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists.

(4) Section 302g(e), relating to special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties.

(5) Section 302h(a)(1), relating to accession bonus for dental officers.

(6) Section 302j(a), relating to accession bonus for pharmacy officers.

(7) Section 302k(f), relating to accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties.

(8) Section 302l(g), relating to accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

SEC. 613. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF SPECIAL PAY AND BONUS AUTHORITIES FOR NUCLEAR OFFICERS.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”:

(1) Section 312(f), relating to special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service.

(2) Section 312b(c), relating to nuclear career accession bonus.

(3) Section 312c(d), relating to nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

SEC. 614. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO TITLE 37 CONSOLIDATED SPECIAL PAY, INCENTIVE PAY, AND BONUS AUTHORITIES.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”:

(1) Section 331(h), relating to general bonus authority for enlisted members.

(2) Section 332(g), relating to general bonus authority for officers.

(3) Section 333(i), relating to special bonus and incentive pay authorities for nuclear officers.

(4) Section 334(i), relating to special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities for officers.

(5) Section 335(k), relating to special bonus and incentive pay authorities for officers in health professions.

(6) Section 336(g), relating to contracting bonus for cadets and midshipmen enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(7) Section 351(h), relating to hazardous duty pay.

(8) Section 352(g), relating to assignment pay or special duty pay.

(9) Section 353(i), relating to skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus.

(10) Section 355(h), relating to retention incentives for members qualified in critical military skills or assigned to high priority units.

SEC. 615. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO PAYMENT OF OTHER TITLE 37 BONUSES AND SPECIAL PAYS.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”:

(1) Section 301b(a), relating to aviation officer retention bonus.

(2) Section 307a(g), relating to assignment incentive pay.

(3) Section 308(g), relating to reenlistment bonus for active members.

(4) Section 309(e), relating to enlistment bonus.

(5) Section 316a(g), relating to incentive pay for members of precommissioning programs pursuing foreign language proficiency.

(6) Section 324(g), relating to accession bonus for new officers in critical skills.

(7) Section 326(g), relating to incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage.

(8) Section 327(h), relating to incentive bonus for transfer between Armed Forces.

(9) Section 330(f), relating to accession bonus for officer candidates.

SEC. 616. INCREASE IN MAXIMUM ANNUAL AMOUNT OF NUCLEAR OFFICER BONUS PAY.

(a) INCREASE.—Section 333(d)(1)(A) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$35,000” and inserting “\$50,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2016, and shall apply with respect to agreements entered into under section 333 of title 37, United States Code, on or after that date.

SEC. 617. REPEAL OF OBSOLETE AUTHORITY TO PAY BONUS TO ENCOURAGE ARMY PERSONNEL TO REFER PERSONS FOR ENLISTMENT IN THE ARMY.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 3252 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 333 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 3252.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

SEC. 621. REPEAL OF OBSOLETE SPECIAL TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCE FOR SURVIVORS OF DECEASED MEMBERS FROM THE VIETNAM CONFLICT.

Section 481f of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 622. STUDY AND REPORT ON POLICY CHANGES TO THE JOINT TRAVEL REGULATIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the impact of the policy changes to the Joint Travel Regulations for the Uniformed Service Members and Department of Defense Civilian Employees related to flat rate per diem for long term temporary duty travel that took effect on November 1, 2014. The study shall assess the following:

(1) The impact of such changes on shipyard workers who travel on long-term temporary duty assignments.

(2) Whether such changes have discouraged employees of the Department of Defense, including civilian employees at shipyards and depots, from volunteering for important temporary duty travel assignments.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the study required by subsection (a).

SEC. 623. TRANSPORTATION TO TRANSFER CEREMONIES FOR FAMILY AND NEXT OF KIN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO DIE OVERSEAS DURING HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS.

Section 481f(e)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting “(including during a humanitarian relief operation)” after “located or serving overseas”.

SEC. 624. POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON TRAVEL OF NEXT OF KIN TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DIGNIFIED TRANSFER OF REMAINS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WHO DIE OVERSEAS.

(a) REVIEW OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a review of the current policies of the Department of Defense on the travel for

next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The review required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the changes to Department instructions and Federal regulations necessary to provide Government funded travel to the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurred in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(B) An action plan and timeline for making the changes described in subparagraph (A).

(b) MODIFICATION OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to modify the policies of the Department in order to provide Government funded travel for the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurs in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary is not required to modify the policies of the Department as described in paragraph (1) if, by not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary certifies, in writing, to the congressional defense committees that such action is not in the best interest of the United States. The certification shall include the following:

(A) An assessment and reevaluation by the Secretary of the rational for excluding the next of kin from Government funded travel if the death of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the Department overseas occurs in a non-combat area.

(B) Recommendations for alternative plans to ensure that the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas in a non-combat area may participate in the dignified transfer of the remains of the deceased at Dover Port Mortuary, including through the actions of appropriate non-governmental organizations.

Subtitle D—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits

PART I—RETIRED PAY REFORM

SEC. 631. THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN PARTICIPATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8440e of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

“(1) TSP CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary concerned shall make contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund, in accordance with section 8432, except to the extent the requirements under such section are modified by this subsection, for the benefit of a member who—

“(A) first enters a uniformed service on or after January 1, 2018; or

“(B) makes an election described in section 1409(b)(4)(B) or 12739(f) of title 10.

“(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount contributed under this subsection by the Secretary concerned for the benefit of a member described in paragraph (1) for any pay period shall be not more than 5 percent of such member’s basic pay for such pay period.

“(3) TIMING AND DURATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(A) AUTOMATIC CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary concerned shall make a contribution described in section 8432(c)(1) under this subsection for the benefit of a member described in

paragraph (1) for any pay period during the period that—

“(i) begins on or after the day that is 60 days after the date the member first enters a uniformed service; and

“(ii) ends on the day such member completes 20 years of service as a member of the uniformed services.

“(B) MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary concerned shall make a contribution described in section 8432(c)(2) under this subsection for the benefit of a member described in paragraph (1) for any pay period during the period that—

“(i) begins on or after the day that is 2 years and 1 day after the date the member first enters a uniformed service; and

“(ii) ends on the day such member completes 20 years of service as a member of the uniformed services.

“(4) PROTECTIONS FOR SPOUSES AND FORMER SPOUSES.—Section 8435 shall apply to a member described in paragraph (1) in the same manner as such section is applied to an employee or Member under such section.

“(5) DEFINITION OF SECRETARY CONCERNED.—In this subsection the term ‘Secretary concerned’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 37.”

(b) AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT IN TSP.—Section 8432(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D)(ii)—

(A) by striking “(ii) Members” and inserting “(ii)(I) Except as provided in subclause (II), members”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) A member described in section 8440e(e)(1) shall be an eligible individual for purposes of this paragraph.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, a member described in section 8440e(e)(1) who has declined automatic enrollment into the Thrift Savings Plan shall be automatically reenrolled, on January 1 of the year succeeding the year for which the determination is made, to make contributions under subsection (a) at the default percentage of basic pay.

“(G) In this paragraph the term ‘member’ has the meaning given the term in section 211 of title 37.”

(c) VESTING.—Section 8432(g) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) 2 years of service in the case of a member of the uniformed services.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) For purposes of this subsection, a member of the uniformed services shall be considered to have separated from Government employment if the member is discharged or released from service in the uniformed services.”

(d) THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN DEFAULT INVESTMENT FUND.—Section 8438(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 2(a) of the Smarter Savings Act (Public Law 113–255), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(A) Consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (B), if an” and inserting “If an”; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B).

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 211 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(2) Section 8432b(c)(2)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “(including

pursuant to an agreement under section 211(d) of title 37)".

(f) ACTIONS TO ASSURE IMPLEMENTATION BY EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries concerned, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board shall each and jointly take appropriate actions to ensure the full and effective commencement of the implementation of the amendments made by this section as of January 1, 2018.

(2) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "Secretary concerned" has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 37, United States Code.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) OTHER AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by subsections (b) through (e) shall take effect on January 1, 2018.

SEC. 632. MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1409(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

"(A) REDUCED MULTIPLIERS FOR MEMBERS RECEIVING TSP MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), in the case of a member who first becomes a member of the uniformed services after January 1, 2018, or a member who makes the election described in subparagraph (B)—

"(i) subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall be applied by substituting '2' for '2½';

"(ii) clause (i) of paragraph (3)(B) shall be applied by substituting '60 percent' for '75 percent'; and

"(iii) subclause (I) of paragraph (3)(B)(ii) shall be applied by substituting '2' for '2½'.

"(B) ELECTION TO PARTICIPATE IN MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

"(i) ELECTION.—A member of a uniformed service serving on January 1, 2018, may elect to accept the reduced multipliers described in subparagraph (A) for purposes of calculating the retired pay of the member.

"(ii) EFFECT OF ELECTION.—A member making the election described in clause (i) shall—

"(I) have the retired pay of the member calculated using the reduced multipliers described in subparagraph (A);

"(II) receive Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) matching contributions pursuant to section 8440(e) of title 5 for periods of service between the completion of 2 years of service and the completion of 20 years of service in accordance with paragraph (3)(B) of such section; and

"(III) be eligible for lump sum payments under section 1415 of this title.

"(iii) ELECTION PERIOD.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclauses (II) and (III), a member of a uniformed service may make the election described in clause (i) during the period that begins on July 1, 2018, and ends on December 31, 2018.

"(II) HARDSHIP EXTENSION.—The Secretary concerned may extend the election period described in subclause (I) for a member who experiences a hardship as determined by the Secretary concerned.

"(III) MEMBERS EXPERIENCING BREAK IN SERVICE.—A member of a uniformed service returning to service after a break in service in which falls the election period specified in subclause (I) shall make the election described in clause (i) on the date of the reentry into service of the member.

"(iv) NO RETROACTIVE MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS PURSUANT TO ELECTION.—Thrift Savings

Plan matching contributions may not be made for a member under this subparagraph for any pay period beginning before the date of the member's election under clause (i).

"(C) REGULATIONS.—Each Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations to implement this paragraph."

(2) NON-REGULAR SERVICE.—Section 12739 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

"(1) REDUCED MULTIPLIERS FOR PERSONS RECEIVING TSP MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—In the case of a person who first performs reserve component service after January 1, 2018, after not having performed regular or reserve component service on or before that date, or a person who makes the election described in paragraph (2)—

"(A) paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall be applied by substituting '2 percent' for '2½ percent';

"(B) subparagraph (A) of subsection (c)(2) shall be applied by substituting '60 percent' for '75 percent'; and

"(C) clause (ii) of subsection (c)(2)(B) shall be applied by substituting '2 percent' for '2½ percent'.

"(2) ELECTION TO PARTICIPATE IN MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

"(A) ELECTION.—A person performing reserve component service on January 1, 2018, may elect to accept the reduced multipliers described in paragraph (1) for purposes of calculating the retired pay of the person.

"(B) EFFECT OF ELECTION.—A person making the election described in subparagraph (A) shall—

"(i) have the retired pay of the person calculated using the reduced multipliers described in paragraph (1);

"(ii) receive Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) matching contributions pursuant to section 8440(e) of title 5 for periods of service between the completion of 2 years of service and the completion of 20 years of service in accordance with paragraph (3)(B) of such section; and

"(iii) be eligible for lump sum payments under section 1415 of this title.

"(C) ELECTION PERIOD.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), a person performing reserve component service may make the election described in subparagraph (A) during the period that begins on July 1, 2018, and ends on December 31, 2018.

"(ii) HARDSHIP EXTENSION.—The Secretary concerned may extend the election period described in clause (i) for a person who experiences a hardship as determined by the Secretary concerned.

"(iii) PERSONS EXPERIENCING BREAK IN SERVICE.—A person returning to reserve component service after a break in reserve component service in which falls the election period specified in clause (i) shall make the election described in subparagraph (A) on the date of the reentry into service of the person.

"(iv) NO RETROACTIVE MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS PURSUANT TO ELECTION.—Thrift Savings Plan matching contributions may not be made for a person under this paragraph for any pay period beginning before the date of the person's election under subparagraph (A).

"(3) REGULATIONS.—Each Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations to implement this subsection."

(b) COORDINATING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER RETIREMENT AUTHORITIES.—

(1) DISABILITY, WARRANT OFFICERS, AND DOPMA RETIRED PAY.—

(A) COMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY.—The table in section 1401(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1) in column 2 of formula number 1, by striking "2½% of years of service

credited to him under section 1208" and inserting "the retired pay multiplier determined for the member under section 1409 of this title";

(ii) in paragraph (1) in column 2 of formula number 2, by striking "2½% of years of service credited to him under section 1208" and inserting "the retired pay multiplier determined for the member under section 1409 of this title"; and

(iii) in column 2 of each of formula number 4 and formula number 5, by striking "section 1409(a)" and inserting "section 1409".

(B) CLARIFICATION REGARDING MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 1401a(b) of such title is amended—

(i) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

"(5) ADJUSTMENTS FOR PARTICIPANTS IN MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), if a member makes the election described in section 1409(b)(4) of this title, the Secretary shall increase the retired pay of such member in accordance with paragraph (2)."

(2) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION COMMISSIONED OFFICER CORPS ACT OF 2002.—Paragraph (2) of section 245(a) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002 (33 U.S.C. 3045(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the retired pay multiplier determined under section 1409 of such title for the number of years of service that may be credited to the officer under section 1405 of such title as if the officer's service were service as a member of the Armed Forces."

(3) TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(A) 15-YEAR CAREER STATUS BONUS REPAYMENT.—Subsection (f) of section 354 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking "If a" and inserting "(1) If a"; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) If a person who is paid a bonus under this section subsequently makes an election described in section 1409(b)(4) or 12739(f) of title 10, the person shall repay any bonus payments received under this section in the same manner as repayments are made under section 373 of this title."

(B) SUNSET AND CONTINUATION OF PAYMENTS.—Such section 354 is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) SUNSET AND CONTINUATION OF PAYMENTS.—(1) A Secretary concerned may not pay a new bonus under this section after December 31, 2017.

"(2) Subject to subsection (f)(2), the Secretary concerned may continue to make payments after December 31, 2017, for bonuses that were awarded under this section on or before that date."

(4) PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.—Paragraph (4) of section 211(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 212) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "at the rate of 2 ½ per centum of the basic pay of the highest grade held by him as such officer" and inserting "calculated by multiplying the retired pay base determined under section 1406 of title 10, United States Code, by the retired pay multiplier determined under section 1409 of such title for the numbers of years of service credited to the officer under this paragraph"; and

(B) in the matter following subparagraph (B)(iii)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking "such pay, and" and inserting "such pay,"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking "such basic pay," and inserting "such basic pay, and (E) in the case of any officer who makes the election described in section 1409(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, subparagraph (C) shall be

applied by substituting '40 per centum' for '50 per centum' each place the term appears and subparagraph (D) shall be applied by substituting '60 per centum' for '75 per centum'."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEMS.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) COORDINATING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendments made by subsection (b) shall take effect on January 1, 2018.

(B) TITLE 37 AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by paragraph (3) of subsection (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 633. LUMP SUM PAYMENTS OF CERTAIN RETIRED PAY.

(a) LUMP SUM PAYMENTS OF CERTAIN RETIRED PAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 1415. Lump sum payment of certain retired pay

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) COVERED RETIRED PAY.—The term 'covered retired pay' means retired pay under—

"(A) this title;

"(B) title 14;

"(C) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002 (33 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.); or

"(D) the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).

"(2) ELIGIBLE PERSON.—The term 'eligible person' means a person who—

"(A)(i) first becomes a member of a uniformed service on or after January 1, 2018; or

"(ii) makes the election described in section 1409(b)(4) or 12739(f) of this title; and

"(B) does not retire or separate under chapter 61 of this title.

"(3) RETIREMENT AGE.—The term 'retirement age' has the meaning given the term in section 216(l) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 416(l)).

"(b) ELECTION OF LUMP SUM PAYMENT OF CERTAIN RETIRED PAY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible person entitled to covered retired pay (including an eligible person who is entitled to such pay by reason of an election described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(ii)) may elect—

"(A) to receive a lump sum payment of the discounted present value at the time of the election of the amount of the covered retired pay that the eligible person is otherwise entitled to receive for the period beginning on the date of retirement and ending on the date the eligible person attains the eligible person's retirement age; or

"(B) to receive—

"(i) a lump sum payment of an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount otherwise receivable by the eligible person pursuant to subparagraph (A); and

"(ii) a monthly amount during the period described in subparagraph (A) equal to 50 percent of the amount of monthly covered retired pay the eligible person is otherwise entitled to receive during such period.

"(2) DISCOUNTED PRESENT VALUE.—The Secretary of Defense shall compute the discounted present value of amounts of covered retired pay that an eligible person is otherwise entitled to receive for a period for purposes of paragraph (1)(A) by—

"(A) estimating the aggregate amount of retired pay the person would receive for the period, taking into account cost-of-living adjustments under section 1401a of this title projected by the Secretary at the time the person separates from service and would otherwise begin receiving covered retired pay; and

"(B) reducing the aggregate amount estimated pursuant to subparagraph (A) by an appropriate percentage determined by the Secretary—

"(i) using average personal discount rates (as defined and calculated by the Secretary taking into consideration applicable and reputable studies of personal discount rates for military personnel and past actuarial experience in the calculation of personal discount rates under this paragraph); and

"(ii) in accordance with generally accepted actuarial principles and practices.

"(3) TIMING OF ELECTION.—An eligible person shall make the election under this subsection not later than 90 days before the date of the retirement of the eligible person from the uniformed services.

"(4) SINGLE PAYMENT OR COMBINATION OF PAYMENTS.—An eligible person may elect to receive a lump sum payment under this subsection in a single payment or in a combination of payments.

"(5) COMMENCEMENT OF PAYMENT.—An eligible person who makes an election under this subsection shall receive the lump sum payment, or the first installment of a combination of payments of the lump sum payment if elected under paragraph (4), as follows:

"(A) Not later than 60 days after the date of the retirement of the eligible person from the uniformed services.

"(B) In the case of an eligible person who is a member of a reserve component, not later than 60 days after the later of—

"(i) the date on which the eligible person attains 60 years of age; or

"(ii) the date on which the eligible person first becomes entitled to covered retired pay.

"(6) NO SUBSEQUENT ADJUSTMENT.—An eligible person who accepts payment of a lump sum under this subsection may not seek the review of or otherwise challenge the amount of the lump sum in light of any variation in cost-of-living adjustments under section 1401a of this title, actuarial assumptions, or other factors used by the Secretary in calculating the amount of the lump sum that occur after the Secretary pays the lump sum.

"(c) RESUMPTION OF MONTHLY ANNUITY.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—Subject to paragraph (2), an eligible person who makes an election described in subsection (b) shall be entitled to receive the eligible person's monthly covered retired pay calculated in accordance with paragraph (2) after the eligible person attains the eligible person's retirement age.

"(2) RESTORATION OF FULL RETIREMENT AMOUNT AT RETIREMENT AGE.—The retired pay of an eligible person who makes an election described in subsection (a) shall be recomputed, effective on the first day of the first month beginning after the person attains the eligible person's retirement age, so as to be an amount equal to the amount of covered retired pay to which the eligible person would otherwise be entitled on that date if the annual increases, in the retired pay of the eligible person made to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index, had been made in accordance with section 1401a of this title.

"(d) PAYMENT OF RETIRED PAY TO PERSONS NOT MAKING ELECTION.—An eligible person who does not make the election described in subsection (b) shall be paid the retired pay to which the eligible person is otherwise entitled under the applicable provisions of law referred to in subsection (a)(1).

"(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense concerned shall prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this section."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"1415. Lump sum payment of certain retired pay."

(3) PAYMENTS FROM DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY RETIREMENT FUND.—Section 1463(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking "or 1414" and inserting "1414, or 1415".

(b) OFFSET OF VETERANS PENSION AND COMPENSATION BY AMOUNT OF LUMP SUM PAYMENTS.—Section 5304 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Other than amounts payable under section 1413a or 1414 of title 10, the amount of pension and compensation benefits payable to a person under this title shall be reduced by the amount of any lump sum payment made to such person under section 1415 of title 10.

"(2) The Secretary shall collect any reduction under paragraph (1) from amounts otherwise payable to the person under this title, including pension and compensation payable under this title, before any pension and compensation payments under this title may be paid to the person."

SEC. 634. CONTINUATION PAY AFTER 12 YEARS OF SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES PARTICIPATING IN THE MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEMS.

(a) CONTINUATION PAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

"§ 356. Continuation pay after 12 years of service: members participating in modernized retirement systems

"(a) CONTINUATION PAY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned shall make a payment of continuation pay to each member of the uniformed services under the jurisdiction of the Secretary who—

"(A)(i) first becomes a member of a uniformed service after January 1, 2018; or

"(ii) subject to paragraph (2), makes the election described in section 1409(b)(4) or 12739(f) of title 10; and

"(B) after the date on which the member satisfies the applicable requirement in subparagraph (A)—

"(i) completes 12 years of service; and

"(ii) enters into an agreement with the Secretary to serve for an additional 4 years of obligated service.

"(2) ELIGIBILITY DEPENDENT ON ELECTION BEFORE COMPLETION OF 12 YEARS OF SERVICE.—A member who makes an election described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii) after the member completes 12 years of service is not eligible for continuation pay under this section.

"(b) AMOUNT.—The amount of continuation pay payable to a member under this section shall be the amount that is equal to—

"(1) in the case of a member of a regular component—

"(A) the monthly basic pay of the member at 12 years of service multiplied by 2.5; plus

"(B) at the discretion of the Secretary concerned, the monthly basic pay of the member at 12 years of service multiplied by such number of months (not to exceed 13 months) as the Secretary concerned shall specify in the agreement of the member under subsection (a); and

"(2) in the case of a member of a reserve component—

"(A) the amount of monthly basic pay to which the member would be entitled at 12 years of service if the member were a member of a regular component multiplied by 0.5; plus

"(B) at the discretion of the Secretary concerned, the amount of monthly basic pay described in subparagraph (A) multiplied by such number of months (not to exceed 6 months) as the Secretary concerned shall specify in the agreement of the member under subsection (a).

“(c) **TIMING OF PAYMENT.**—The Secretary concerned shall pay continuation pay under this section to a member when the member completes 12 years of service.

“(d) **LUMP SUM OR INSTALLMENTS.**—A member may elect to receive continuation pay under this section in a lump sum or in a series of not more than 4 payments.

“(e) **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PAY AND ALLOWANCES.**—Continuation pay under this section is in addition to any other pay or allowance to which the member is entitled.

“(f) **REPAYMENT.**—A member who receives continuation pay under this section and fails to complete the obligated service required under subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii) shall be subject to the repayment provisions of section 373 of this title.

“(g) **REGULATIONS.**—Each Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“356. Continuation pay after 12 years of service: members participating in modernized retirement systems.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2018, and shall apply with respect to agreements entered into under section 356 of title 37, United States Code, after that date.

SEC. 635. AUTHORITY FOR RETIREMENT FLEXIBILITY FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR RETIREMENT FLEXIBILITY.**—Chapter 63 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“§1276. Retirement flexibility: authority to modify years of service required for retirement for particular occupational specialties or other groupings

“(a) **AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned may modify the years of service required for an eligible member to retire, to greater than or fewer than 20 years of service, in order to facilitate management actions that shape the personnel profile or correct manpower shortages within an occupational specialty or other grouping of members of the uniformed services.

“(b) **ELIGIBLE MEMBER DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘eligible member’ means a member of the uniformed services working in an occupational specialty or other grouping designated by the Secretary concerned as in need of a management action described in subsection (a).

“(c) **NOTICE-AND-WAIT.**—

“(1) **NOTICE REQUIRED.**—The Secretary concerned shall submit to Congress notice of any proposed modification under subsection (a).

“(2) **LIMITATION.**—The Secretary concerned may not implement a proposed modification under subsection (a) until one year after the day on which the notice of the modification is submitted to Congress under paragraph (1).

“(d) **APPLICABILITY.**—The Secretary concerned may only modify the required years of service under subsection (a) for an eligible member who first becomes a member of a uniformed service on or after the date of the expiration of the one year period described in subsection (c)(2) that is applicable to the occupational specialty or other grouping in which the eligible member works.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 63 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1276. Retirement flexibility: authority to modify years of service required for retirement for particular occupational specialties or other groupings.”.

SEC. 636. TREATMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY RETIREMENT FUND AS A QUALIFIED TRUST.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 74 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§1468. Treatment as a qualified trust

“For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.)—

“(1) the Fund shall be treated as a trust described in section 401(a) of such Code (26 U.S.C. 401(a)) which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code (26 U.S.C. 501(a)); and

“(2) any contribution to, or distribution from, the Fund shall be treated in the same manner as contributions to or distributions from such a trust.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 74 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1468. Treatment as a qualified trust.”.

PART II—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 641. DEATH OF FORMER SPOUSE BENEFICIARIES AND SUBSEQUENT REMARRIAGES UNDER SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1448(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) **EFFECT OF DEATH OF FORMER SPOUSE BENEFICIARY.**—

“(A) **TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN PLAN.**—A person who elects to provide an annuity to a former spouse under paragraph (2) or (3) and whose former spouse subsequently dies is no longer a participant in the Plan, effective on the date of death of the former spouse.

“(B) **AUTHORITY FOR ELECTION OF NEW SPOUSE BENEFICIARY.**—If a person’s participation in the Plan is discontinued by reason of the death of a former spouse beneficiary, the person may elect to resume participation in the Plan and to elect a new spouse beneficiary as follows:

“(i) **MARRIED ON THE DATE OF DEATH OF FORMER SPOUSE.**—A person who is married at the time of the death of the former spouse beneficiary may elect to provide coverage to that person’s spouse. Such an election must be received by the Secretary concerned within one year after the date of death of the former spouse beneficiary.

“(ii) **MARRIAGE AFTER DEATH OF FORMER SPOUSE BENEFICIARY.**—A person who is not married at the time of the death of the former spouse beneficiary and who later marries may elect to provide spouse coverage. Such an election must be received by the Secretary concerned within one year after the date on which that person marries.

“(C) **EFFECTIVE DATE OF ELECTION.**—The effective date of election under this paragraph shall be as follows:

“(i) An election under subparagraph (B)(i) is effective as of the first day of the first calendar month following the death of the former spouse beneficiary.

“(ii) An election under subparagraph (B)(ii) is effective as of the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which the election is received by the Secretary concerned.

“(D) **LEVEL OF COVERAGE.**—A person making an election under subparagraph (B) may not reduce the base amount previously elected.

“(E) **PROCEDURES.**—An election under this paragraph shall be in writing, signed by the participant, and made in such form and manner as the Secretary concerned may prescribe.

“(F) **IRREVOCABILITY.**—An election under this paragraph is irrevocable.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Paragraph (7) of section 1448(b) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to any person whose former spouse bene-

ficiary dies on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **APPLICABILITY TO FORMER SPOUSE DEATHS BEFORE ENACTMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A person—

(A) who before the date of the enactment of this Act had a former spouse beneficiary under the Survivor Benefit Plan who died before that date; and

(B) who on the date of the enactment of this Act is married,

may elect to provide spouse coverage for such spouse under the Plan, regardless of whether the person married such spouse before or after the death of the former spouse beneficiary. Any such election may only be made during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE OF ELECTION IF MARRIED AT LEAST A YEAR AT DEATH FORMER SPOUSE.**—If the person providing the annuity was married to the spouse beneficiary for at least one year at the time of the death of the former spouse beneficiary, the effective date of such election shall be the first day of the first month after the death of the former spouse beneficiary.

(3) **OTHER EFFECTIVE DATE.**—If the person providing the annuity married the spouse beneficiary after (or during the one-year period preceding) the death of the former spouse beneficiary, the effective date of the election shall be the first day of the first month following the first anniversary of the person’s marriage to the spouse beneficiary.

(4) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR PREMIUMS.**—A person electing to participate in the Plan under this subsection shall be responsible for payment of all premiums due from the effective date of the election.

SEC. 642. TRANSITIONAL COMPENSATION AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES INELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE RETIRED PAY AS A RESULT OF COURT-MARTIAL SENTENCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1059 the following new section:

“§1059a. Dependents of members of the armed forces ineligible to receive retired pay as a result of court-martial sentence: transitional compensation and other benefits; commissary and exchange benefits

“(a) **AUTHORITY TO PAY COMPENSATION.**—The Secretary of Defense, with respect to the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy), and the Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, may each carry out a program under which the Secretary may pay monthly transitional compensation in accordance with this section to dependents or former dependents of a member of the armed forces described in subsection (b) who is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

“(b) **MEMBERS COVERED.**—This section applies in the case of a member of the armed forces eligible for retired or retainer pay under this title for years of service who—

“(1) is separated from the armed forces pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial as a result of misconduct while a member; and

“(2) has eligibility to receive retired pay terminated pursuant to such sentence.

“(c) **RECIPIENT OF PAYMENTS.**—(1) In the case of a member of the armed forces described in subsection (b), the Secretary may pay compensation under this section to dependents or former dependents of the member as follows:

“(A) If the member was married at the time of the commission of the offense resulting in separation from the armed forces, such compensation may be paid to the spouse or former spouse to

whom the member was married at that time, including an amount for each, if any, dependent child of the member who resides in the same household as that spouse or former spouse.

“(B) If there is a spouse or former spouse who is or, but for subsection (d)(2), would be eligible for compensation under this section and if there is a dependent child of the member who does not reside in the same household as that spouse or former spouse, compensation under this section may be paid to each such dependent child of the member who does not reside in that household.

“(C) If there is no spouse or former spouse who is or, but for subsection (d)(2), would be eligible under this section, compensation under this section may be paid to the dependent children of the member.

“(2) A dependent or former dependent of a member described in subsection (b) is not eligible for transitional compensation under this section if the Secretary concerned determines (under regulations prescribed under subsection (g)) that the dependent or former dependent either—

“(A) was an active participant in the conduct constituting the offense under chapter 47 of this title (the Uniform Code of Military Justice) for which the member was convicted and separated from the armed forces; or

“(B) did not cooperate with the investigation of such conduct.

“(d) COMMENCEMENT AND DURATION OF PAYMENT.—(1) Payment of transitional compensation under this section shall commence—

“(A) as of the date the court-martial sentence is adjudged if the sentence, as adjudged, includes—

“(i) a dismissal, dishonorable discharge, or bad conduct discharge; and

“(ii) forfeiture of all pay and allowances; or

“(B) if there is a pretrial agreement that provides for disapproval or suspension of the dismissal, dishonorable discharge, bad conduct discharge, or forfeiture of all pay and allowances, as of the date of the approval of the court-martial sentence by the person acting under section 860(c) of this title (article 60(c) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) if the sentence, as approved, includes—

“(i) an unsuspended dismissal, dishonorable discharge, or bad conduct discharge; and

“(ii) forfeiture of all pay and allowances.

“(2) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (e), paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (g), and subsections (f) and (h) of section 1059 of this title shall apply in determining—

“(A) the amount of transitional compensation to be paid under this section;

“(B) the period for which such compensation may be paid; and

“(C) the circumstances under which the payment of such compensation may or will cease.

“(e) COMMISSARY AND EXCHANGE BENEFITS.—A dependent or former dependent who receives transitional compensation under this section shall, while receiving such payments, be entitled to use commissary and exchange stores in the same manner as provided in subsection (j) of section 1059 of this title.

“(f) COORDINATION OF BENEFITS.—(1) The Secretary concerned may not make payments to a spouse or former spouse under both this section, on the one hand, and section 1059, 1408(h), or 1408(i) of this title, on the other hand. In the case of a spouse or former spouse for whom a court order provides for payments pursuant to section 1408(h) or 1408(i) of this title and to whom the Secretary offers payments under this section or section 1059 of this title, the spouse or former spouse shall elect which payments to receive.

“(2) Upon the cessation of payments of transitional compensation to a spouse or former spouse under this section pursuant to subsection (d)(2), a spouse or former spouse who elected

payments of transitional compensation under this section and either remains or becomes eligible for payments under section 1408(h) or 1408(i) of this title, as applicable, may commence receipt of payments under such section 1408(h) or 1408(i) in accordance with such section.

“(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section with respect to the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy). The Secretary of Homeland Security shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

“(h) DEPENDENT CHILD DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘dependent child’, with respect to a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in subsection (b), has the meaning given such term in subsection (l) of section 1059 of this title, except that status as a ‘dependent child’ shall be determined as of the date on which the member described in subsection (b) is convicted of the offense concerned.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 53 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1059 the following new item:

“1059a. Dependents of members of the armed forces ineligible to receive retired pay as a result of court-martial sentence: transitional compensation and other benefits; commissary and exchange benefits.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (i) of section 1059 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(i) COORDINATION OF BENEFITS.—The Secretary concerned may not make payments to a spouse or former spouse under both this section, on the one hand, and section 1059a, 1408(h), or 1408(i) of this title, on the other hand. In the case of a spouse or former spouse for whom a court order provides for payments pursuant to section 1408(h) or 1408(i) of this title and to whom the Secretary offers payments under this section or section 1059a of this title, the spouse or former spouse shall elect which payments to receive.”

Subtitle E—Commissary and Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations

SEC. 651. COMMISSARY SYSTEM MATTERS.

(a) OPERATING EXPENSES.—Section 2483 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking “supplies and”;

(B) by striking (5); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (5); and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(d) TRANSPORTATION COSTS FOR CERTAIN GOODS AND SUPPLIES.—Appropriated funds may be used to pay any costs associated with the transportation of commissary goods and supplies to overseas areas, but only to the extent that the working capital fund for commissary operations is reimbursed for the payment of such costs. The sales prices in commissary stores worldwide shall be adjusted in an equal percentage to the extent necessary to provide sufficient gross revenues from such sales to make such reimbursements.

“(e) UNIFORM SYSTEM-WIDE PRICING.—The defense commissary system shall be managed with the objective of attaining uniform system-wide pricing.”

(b) PRICING AND SURCHARGES.—Section 2484 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following new subsection (e):

“(e) SALES PRICE ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish the sales price

of merchandise sold in, at, or by commissary stores in amounts sufficient to finance operating expenses as prescribed in section 2483(b) of this title and the replenishment of inventories.”; and

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) in the subsection caption, by striking “AND MAINTENANCE” and inserting “MAINTENANCE, AND PURCHASE OF OPERATING SUPPLIES”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) to purchase operating supplies for commissary stores.”

(c) OVERSEAS TRANSPORTATION.—Section 2643(b) of such title is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following new sentence: “Defense working capital funds may be used to cover the transportation costs of commissary goods and supplies as provided in section 2483(d) of this title.”

SEC. 652. PLAN ON PRIVATIZATION OF THE DEFENSE COMMISSARY SYSTEM.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan for the privatization, in whole or in part, of the defense commissary system of the Department of Defense.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with major grocery retailers in the continental United States in developing the plan.

(b) ELEMENTS.—

(1) PLAN ELEMENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall ensure the provision of high quality grocery goods and products, discount savings to patrons, and high levels of customer satisfaction while achieving savings for the Department of Defense.

(2) REPORT ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) should include—

(A) an evaluation of the current rates of basic pay and basic allowance for subsistence payable to members of the Armed Forces, and an assessment whether such pay and allowance should be adjusted to ensure that members maintain purchasing power for grocery goods and products under the plan;

(B) an estimate of any initial and long-term costs or savings to the Department as a result of the implementation of the plan;

(C) an assessment whether the privatized defense commissary system under the plan can sustain the current savings to patrons of the defense commissary system;

(D) an assessment of the impact that privatization of the defense commissary system under the plan would have on all eligible beneficiaries;

(E) an assessment whether the privatized defense commissary system under the plan can sustain the continued operation of existing commissaries; and

(F) an assessment whether privatization of the defense commissary system is feasible for overseas commissaries.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION.—The plan shall include recommendations for such legislative action as the Secretary considers appropriate to implement the plan.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ASSESSMENT OF PLAN.—Not later than 120 days after the submittal of the report required by subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the committees of Congress referred to in that subsection a report setting forth an assessment by the Comptroller General of the plan set forth in the report required by that subsection.

(d) PILOT PROGRAM ON PRIVATIZATION.—

(1) **PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.**—Commencing as soon as practicable after the submittal to Congress of the report required by subsection (c), the Secretary shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of the plan set forth in the report required by subsection (a).

(2) **NUMBER AND LOCATION OF COMMISSARIES.**—The pilot program shall involve not fewer than five commissaries selected by the Secretary for purposes of the pilot program from among commissaries in the largest markets of the defense commissary system in the United States.

(3) **SCOPE OF PILOT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program in accordance with the plan described in paragraph (1) as modified by the Secretary in light of the assessment of the plan by the Comptroller General pursuant to subsection (c). The Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a notice on any modifications made to the plan for purposes of the pilot program in light of the assessment.

(4) **ADDITIONAL ELEMENT ON ONLINE PURCHASES.**—In an addition to any requirements under paragraph (3), the Secretary may include in the pilot program a component designed to permit eligible beneficiaries of the defense commissary system in the catchment areas of the commissaries selected for participation in the pilot program to order and purchase grocery goods and products otherwise available through the defense commissary system through the Internet and to receive items so ordered through home delivery.

(5) **DURATION.**—The duration of the pilot program shall be two years.

(6) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the pilot program, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program, including—

(A) an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of carrying out the plan described in

paragraph (1), as modified, if at all, as described in paragraph (3); and

(B) a description of any modifications to the plan the Secretary considers appropriate in light of the pilot program.

SEC. 653. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON THE COMMISSARY SURCHARGE, NON-APPROPRIATED FUND, AND PRIVATELY-FINANCED MAJOR CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the Commissary Surcharge, Non-appropriated Fund and Privately-Financed Major Construction Program of the Department of Defense.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment whether the Secretary of Defense has established policies and procedures to ensure the timely submittal to the committees of Congress referred to in subsection (a) of notice on construction projects proposed to be funded through the program referred to in that subsection.

(2) An assessment whether the Secretaries of the military departments have developed and implemented policies and procedures to comply with the policies and directives of the Department of Defense for the submittal to such committees of Congress of notice on such construction projects.

(3) An assessment whether the Secretary of Defense has established policies and procedures to notify such committees of Congress when such construction projects have been commenced without notice to Congress.

(4) An assessment whether construction projects described in paragraph (3) have been completed before submittal of notice to Congress as described in that paragraph and, if so, a list of such projects.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS
Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits

SEC. 701. URGENT CARE AUTHORIZATION UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) **URGENT CARE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with the regulations prescribed under this section, a covered beneficiary under the TRICARE program shall have access to up to four urgent care visits per year under that program without the need for preauthorization for such visits.

(2) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out paragraph (1).

(b) **PUBLICATION.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) publish information on any modifications made pursuant to subsection (a) to the authorization requirements for the receipt of urgent care under the TRICARE program—

(A) on the primary Internet website that is available to the public of the Department; and

(B) on the primary Internet website that is available to the public of each military medical treatment facility; and

(2) ensure that such information is made available on the primary Internet website that is available to the public of each current managed care contractor that has established a health care provider network under the TRICARE program.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “covered beneficiary” and “TRICARE program” have the meaning given such terms in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 702. MODIFICATIONS OF COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE TRICARE PHARMACY BENEFITS PROGRAM.

Paragraph (6) of section 1074g(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(6)(A) In the case of any of the years 2016 through 2025, the cost-sharing amounts under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

“For:	The cost-sharing amount for 30-day supply of a retail generic is:	The cost-sharing amount for 30-day supply of a retail formulary is:	The cost-sharing amount for a 90-day supply of a mail order generic is:	The cost-sharing amount for a 90-day supply of a mail order formulary is:	The cost-sharing amount for a 90-day supply of a mail order non-formulary is:
2016	\$8	\$28	\$0	\$28	\$54
2017	\$8	\$30	\$0	\$30	\$58
2018	\$8	\$32	\$0	\$32	\$62
2019	\$9	\$34	\$9	\$34	\$66
2020	\$10	\$36	\$10	\$36	\$70
2021	\$11	\$38	\$11	\$38	\$75
2022	\$12	\$40	\$12	\$40	\$80
2023	\$13	\$43	\$13	\$43	\$85
2024	\$14	\$45	\$14	\$45	\$90
2025	\$14	\$46	\$14	\$46	\$92

“(B) For any year after 2025, the cost-sharing amounts under this subsection shall be equal to the cost-sharing amounts for the previous year adjusted by an amount, if any, determined by the Secretary to reflect changes in the costs of pharmaceutical agents and prescription dispensing, rounded to the nearest dollar.

“(C) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the cost-sharing amounts under this subsection for any year for a dependent of a mem-

ber of the uniformed services who dies while on active duty, a member retired under chapter 61 of this title, or a dependent of such a member shall be equal to the cost-sharing amounts, if any, for 2015.”.

SEC. 703. EXPANSION OF CONTINUED HEALTH BENEFITS COVERAGE TO INCLUDE DISCHARGED AND RELEASED MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (b) of section 1078a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) A member of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of a reserve component of the armed forces who—

“(A) is discharged or released from service in the Selected Reserve, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, under other than adverse conditions, as characterized by the Secretary concerned;

“(B) immediately preceding that discharge or release, is eligible to enroll in TRICARE Standard coverage under section 1076d of this title; and

“(C) after that discharge or release, would not otherwise be eligible for any benefits under this chapter.”.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by inserting “or subsection (b)(2)” after “subsection (b)(1)”.

(c) ELECTION OF COVERAGE.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) In the case of a member described in subsection (b)(2), the written election shall be submitted to the Secretary concerned before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the later of—

“(A) the date of the discharge or release of the member from service in the Selected Reserve; and

“(B) the date the member receives the notification required pursuant to subsection (c).”.

(d) COVERAGE OF DEPENDENTS.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended by inserting “or subsection (b)(2)” after “subsection (b)(1)”.

(e) PERIOD OF CONTINUED COVERAGE.—Subsection (g)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (C) through (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph (B):

“(B) in the case of a member described in subsection (b)(2), the date which is 18 months after the date the member ceases to be eligible to enroll in TRICARE Standard coverage under section 1076d of this title;”.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “subsection (b)(2)” and inserting “subsection (b)(3)”; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “subsection (b)(3)” and inserting “subsection (b)(4)”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by subsection (c)(1), by striking “subsection (b)(2)” and inserting “subsection (b)(3)”; and

(B) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (b)(3)” and inserting “subsection (b)(4)”; and

(C) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (b)(4)” and inserting “subsection (b)(5)”; and

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “subsection (b)(2) or subsection (b)(3)” and inserting “subsection (b)(3) or subsection (b)(4)”; and

(4) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated by subsection (e)(1), by striking “subsection (b)(2)” and inserting “subsection (b)(3)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (b)(3)” and inserting “subsection (b)(4)”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (b)(4)” and inserting “subsection (b)(5)”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “paragraph (1)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(C)”; and

(ii) by striking “subsection (b)(2)” and inserting “subsection (b)(3)”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “paragraph (1)(C)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(D)”; and

(ii) by striking “subsection (b)(3)” and inserting “subsection (b)(4)”.

SEC. 704. EXPANSION OF REIMBURSEMENT FOR SMOKING CESSATION SERVICES FOR CERTAIN TRICARE BENEFICIARIES.

Section 713(f) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4503) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “during fiscal year 2009”; and

(2) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “during such period”; and

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking “during fiscal year 2009” and inserting “after September 30, 2008”.

SEC. 705. PILOT PROGRAM ON TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FOR POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER RELATED TO MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may conduct a pilot program to provide intensive outpatient programs to treat members of the Armed Forces suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder resulting from military sexual trauma, including treatment for substance abuse, depression, and other issues related to such conditions.

(b) GRANTS TO COMMUNITY PARTNERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out the pilot program through the award of grants to community partners described in paragraph (2).

(2) COMMUNITY PARTNERS.—A community partner described in this paragraph is a private health care organization or institution that—

(A) provides health care to members of the Armed Forces; and

(B) provides evidence-based treatment for psychological and neurological conditions that are common among members of the Armed Forces, including post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, substance abuse, and depression; and

(C) provides health care, support, and other benefits to family members of members of the Armed Forces; and

(D) provides health care under the TRICARE program (as that term is defined in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code).

(c) REQUIREMENTS OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—Each community partner awarded a grant under subsection (b) shall—

(1) carry out intensive outpatient programs of short duration to treat members of the Armed Forces suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder resulting from military sexual trauma, including treatment for substance abuse, depression, and other issues related to such conditions; and

(2) use evidence-based and evidence-informed treatment strategies in carrying out such programs; and

(3) share clinical and outreach best practices with other community partners participating in the pilot program; and

(4) annually assess outcomes for members of the Armed Forces individually and throughout the community partner with respect to the treatment of conditions described in paragraph (1).

(d) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of a program carried out by a community partner using a grant under this section may not exceed 50 percent.

(e) TERMINATION.—The Secretary of Defense may not carry out the conduct of the pilot program after the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle B—Health Care Administration

SEC. 711. ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program seeking an appointment for health care under such program at a military medical treatment facility obtain such an appointment at such facility within the wait-time goals specified for the receipt of such health care pursuant to the health care access standards established under subsection (b).

(2) USE OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—If a covered beneficiary is unable to obtain an appointment within the wait-time goals described in paragraph (1), such covered beneficiary shall be offered an appointment within such wait-time goals with a health care provider with which a contract has been entered into under the TRICARE program.

(b) STANDARDS FOR ACCESS TO CARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish health care access standards, including wait-time goals for appointments, for the receipt of health care under the TRICARE program, whether received at military medical treatment facilities or from health care providers with which a contract has been entered into under such program.

(2) CATEGORIES OF CARE.—The health care access standards established under paragraph (1) shall include standards with respect to the following categories of health care:

(A) Primary care, including pediatric care, maternity care, gynecological care, and other subcategories of primary care.

(B) Specialty care, including behavioral health care and other subcategories of specialty care.

(3) MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary may modify the health care access standards established under paragraph (1) whenever the Secretary considers the modification of such standards appropriate.

(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the health care access standards established under paragraph (1), and any modifications to such standards, in the Federal Register and on a publicly accessible Internet website of the Department of Defense.

(c) PUBLICATION OF APPOINTMENT WAIT TIMES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish on a publicly accessible Internet website of each military medical treatment facility that offers a category or subcategory of health care covered by the standards under subsection (b)(2) the average wait-time for a covered beneficiary for an appointment at such facility for the receipt of each such category and subcategory of health care.

(2) MODIFICATIONS.—Whenever there is a modification of a wait-time for a category or subcategory of health care published under this subsection, the Secretary shall publish on a publicly accessible Internet website of each military medical treatment facility that provides such category or subcategory of health care the modified wait-time for such category or subcategory of health care.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “covered beneficiary” and “TRICARE program” have the meaning given such terms in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 712. PORTABILITY OF HEALTH PLANS UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) HEALTH PLAN PORTABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program who are covered under a health plan under such program are able to

seamlessly access health care under such health plan in each TRICARE program region.

(2) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out paragraph (1).

(b) **MECHANISMS TO ENSURE PORTABILITY.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall do the following:

(1) Provide for the automatic electronic transfer of demographic, enrollment, and claims information between the contractors responsible for administering the TRICARE program in each TRICARE region when covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program relocate between such regions.

(2) Ensure such covered beneficiaries are able to obtain a new primary health care provider within ten days of undergoing such relocation.

(3) Develop a process for such covered beneficiaries to receive urgent care without preauthorization while undergoing such relocation.

(c) **PUBLICATION.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) publish information on any modifications made pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to the ability of covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program who are covered under a health plan under such program to access health care in each TRICARE region on the primary Internet website of the Department that is available to the public; and

(2) ensure that such information is made available on the primary Internet website that is available to the public of each current contractor responsible for administering the TRICARE program.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “covered beneficiary” and “TRICARE program” have the meaning given such terms in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 713. IMPROVEMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **TRAINING ON RECOGNITION AND MANAGEMENT OF RISK OF SUICIDE.**—

(1) **INITIAL TRAINING.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that all primary care and mental health care providers of the Department of Defense receive, or have already received, evidence-based training on the recognition and assessment of individuals at risk for suicide and the management of such risk.

(2) **ADDITIONAL TRAINING.**—The Secretary shall ensure that providers who receive, or have already received, training described in paragraph (1) receive such additional training thereafter as may be required based on evidence-based changes in health care practices.

(b) **ASSESSMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH WORKFORCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report assessing the mental health workforce of the Department of Defense and the long-term mental health care needs of members of the Armed Forces and their dependents for purposes of determining the long-term requirements of the Department for mental health care providers.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the following:

(A) The number of mental health care providers of the Department of Defense as of the date of the submittal of the report, disaggregated by specialty, including psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, mental health counselors, and marriage and family therapists.

(B) The number of mental health care providers that are anticipated to be needed by the Department.

(C) The types of mental health care providers that are anticipated to be needed by the Department.

(D) Locations in which mental health care providers are anticipated to be needed by the Department.

(c) **PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES TO MEASURE MENTAL HEALTH DATA.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a plan for the Department of Defense to develop procedures to compile and assess data relating to the following:

(1) Outcomes for mental health care provided by the Department.

(2) Variations in such outcomes among different medical facilities of the Department.

(3) Barriers, if any, to the implementation by mental health care providers of the Department of the clinical practice guidelines and other evidence-based treatments and approaches recommended for such providers by the Secretary.

SEC. 714. COMPREHENSIVE STANDARDS AND ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION COUNSELING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to ensure that all health care providers employed by the Department of Defense who provide care for members of the Armed Forces, including general practitioners, are provided, through clinical practice guidelines, the most current evidence-based and evidence-informed standards of care with respect to methods of contraception and counseling on methods of contraception.

(b) **CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall compile clinical practice guidelines for health care providers described in subsection (a) on standards of care with respect to methods of contraception and counseling on methods of contraception for members of the Armed Forces.

(2) **SOURCES.**—The Secretary shall compile clinical practice guidelines under this subsection from among clinical practice guidelines established by appropriate health agencies and professional organizations, including the following:

(A) The United States Preventive Services Task Force.

(B) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(C) The Office of Population Affairs of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(D) The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

(E) The Association of Reproductive Health Professionals.

(F) The American Academy of Family Physicians.

(G) The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

(3) **UPDATES.**—The Secretary shall from time to time update the list of clinical practice guidelines compiled under this subsection to incorporate into such guidelines new or updated standards of care with respect to methods of contraception and counseling on methods of contraception.

(4) **DISSEMINATION.**—

(A) **INITIAL DISSEMINATION.**—As soon as practicable after the compilation of clinical practice guidelines pursuant to paragraph (1), but commencing not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide for rapid dissemination of the clinical practice guidelines to health care providers described in subsection (a).

(B) **UPDATES.**—As soon as practicable after the adoption under paragraph (3) of any update to the clinical practice guidelines compiled pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary shall provide for the rapid dissemination of such clinical practice guidelines, as so updated, to health care providers described in subsection (a).

(C) **PROTOCOLS.**—Clinical practice guidelines, and any updates to such guidelines, shall be disseminated under this paragraph in accordance with administrative protocols developed by the Secretary for that purpose.

(c) **CLINICAL DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in order to assist health care providers described in subsection (a), develop and implement clinical decision support tools that reflect, through the clinical practice guidelines compiled pursuant to subsection (b), the most current evidence-based and evidence-informed standards of care with respect to methods of contraception and counseling on methods of contraception.

(2) **UPDATES.**—The Secretary shall from time to time update the clinical decision support tools developed under this subsection to incorporate into such tools new or updated guidelines on methods of contraception and counseling on methods of contraception.

(3) **DISSEMINATION.**—Clinical decision support tools, and any updates to such tools, shall be disseminated under this subsection in accordance with administrative protocols developed by the Secretary for that purpose. Such protocols shall be similar to the administrative protocols developed under subsection (b)(4)(C).

(d) **ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION COUNSELING.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall ensure that women members of the Armed Forces have access to comprehensive counseling on the full range of methods of contraception provided by health care providers described in subsection (a) during health care visits, including visits as follows:

(1) During predeployment health care visits, including counseling that provides specific information women need regarding the interaction between anticipated deployment conditions and various methods of contraception.

(2) During health care visits during deployment.

(3) During annual physical examinations.

(e) **INCORPORATION INTO SURVEYS OF QUESTIONS ON SERVICEMEN'S EXPERIENCES WITH FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES AND COUNSELING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall integrate into the surveys by the Department of Defense specified in paragraph (2) questions designed to obtain information on the experiences of women members of the Armed Forces—

(A) in accessing family planning services and counseling;

(B) in using family planning methods, including information on which method was preferred and whether deployment conditions affected the decision on which family planning method or methods to be used; and

(C) with respect to women members of the Armed Forces who are pregnant, whether the pregnancy was intended.

(2) **COVERED SURVEYS.**—The surveys into which questions shall be integrated as described in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) The Health Related Behavior Survey of Active Duty Military Personnel.

(B) The Health Care Survey of Department of Defense Beneficiaries.

(f) **EDUCATION ON FAMILY PLANNING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.**—

(1) **EDUCATION PROGRAMS.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of Defense shall establish a uniform standard curriculum to be used in education programs on family planning for all members of the Armed Forces, including both men and women members.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the education programs described in paragraph (1) should use the latest technology available to efficiently and effectively deliver information to members of the Armed Forces.

(3) **ELEMENTS.**—The uniform standard curriculum under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Information for members of the Armed Forces on active duty to make informed decisions regarding family planning.

(B) Information about the prevention of unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections, including human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

(C) Information on the importance of providing comprehensive family planning for members of the Armed Forces, and their commanding officers, and on the positive impact family planning can have on the health and readiness of the Armed Forces.

(D) Current, medically accurate information.

(E) Clear, user-friendly information on the full range of methods of contraception and where members of the Armed Forces can access their chosen method of contraception.

(F) Information on all applicable laws and policies so that members are informed of their rights and obligations.

(G) Information on patients' rights to confidentiality.

(H) Information on the unique circumstances encountered by members of the Armed Forces, and the effects of such circumstances on the use of contraception.

SEC. 715. WAIVER OF RECOUPMENT OF ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS DUE TO ADMINISTRATIVE ERROR UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1095f the following new section:

“§1095g. TRICARE program: waiver of recoupment of erroneous payments due to administrative error

“(a) **WAIVER OF RECOUPMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense may waive recoupment from a covered beneficiary who has benefitted from an erroneous TRICARE payment in a case in which each of the following applies:

“(1) The payment was made due to an administrative error by an employee of the Department of Defense or a contractor under the TRICARE program.

“(2) The covered beneficiary (or in the case of a minor, the parent or guardian of the covered beneficiary) had a good faith, reasonable belief that the covered beneficiary was entitled to the benefit of such payment under this chapter.

“(3) The covered beneficiary relied on the expectation of such entitlement.

“(4) The Secretary determines that a waiver of recoupment of such payment is necessary to prevent an injustice.

“(b) **RESPONSIBILITY OF CONTRACTOR.**—In any case in which the Secretary waives recoupment under subsection (a) and the administrative error was on the part of a contractor under the TRICARE program, the Secretary shall, consistent with the requirements and procedures of the applicable contract, impose financial responsibility on the contractor for the erroneous payment.

“(c) **FINALITY OF DETERMINATIONS.**—Any determination by the Secretary under this section to waive or decline to waive recoupment under subsection (a) is a final determination and shall not be subject to appeal or judicial review.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1095f the following new item:

“1095g. TRICARE program: waiver of recoupment of erroneous payments due to administrative error.”.

SEC. 716. DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN NON-DEPARTMENT MENTAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS WITH KNOWLEDGE RELATING TO TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **MENTAL HEALTH PROVIDER READINESS DESIGNATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a system by which any non-Department mental health care provider that meets eligibility criteria established by the Secretary relating to the knowledge described in paragraph (2) receives a mental health provider readiness designation from the Department of Defense.

(2) **KNOWLEDGE DESCRIBED.**—The knowledge described in this paragraph is the following:

(A) Knowledge and understanding with respect to the culture of members of the Armed Forces and family members and caregivers of members of the Armed Forces.

(B) Knowledge with respect to evidence-based treatments that have been approved by the Department for the treatment of mental health issues among members of the Armed Forces.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ON DESIGNATION.**—

(1) **REGISTRY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and update as necessary a registry that is available to the public of all non-Department mental health care providers that are currently designated under subsection (a)(1).

(2) **PROVIDER LIST.**—The Secretary shall update all lists maintained by the Secretary of non-Department mental health care providers that provide mental health care under the laws administered by the Secretary by indicating the providers that are currently designated under subsection (a)(1).

(c) **NON-DEPARTMENT MENTAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDER DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “non-Department mental health care provider”

(1) means a health care provider that—

(A) specializes in mental health;

(B) is not a health care provider of the Department of Defense; and

(C) provides health care to members of the Armed Forces; and

(2) includes psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric nurses, social workers, mental health counselors, marriage and family therapists, and other mental health care providers designated by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 717. LIMITATION ON CONVERSION OF MILITARY MEDICAL AND DENTAL POSITIONS TO CIVILIAN MEDICAL AND DENTAL POSITIONS.

(a) **LIMITED AUTHORITY FOR CONVERSION.**—Chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 976 the following new section:

“§977. Conversion of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions: limitation

“(a) **REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CONVERSION.**—A military medical or dental position within the Department of Defense may not be converted to a civilian medical or dental position unless the Secretary of Defense determines that—

“(1) the position is not a military essential position;

“(2) conversion of the position would not result in the degradation of medical or dental care

or the medical or dental readiness of the armed forces; and

“(3) conversion of the position to a civilian medical or dental position is more cost effective than retaining the position as a military medical or dental position, consistent with Department of Defense Instruction 7041.04.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘military medical or dental position’ means a position for the performance of health care functions within the armed forces held by a member of the armed forces.

“(2) The term ‘civilian medical or dental position’ means a position for the performance of health care functions within the Department of Defense held by an employee of the Department or of a contractor of the Department.

“(3) The term ‘military essential’, with respect to a position, means that the position must be held by a member of the armed forces, as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

“(4) The term ‘conversion’, with respect to a military medical or dental position, means a change of the position to a civilian medical or dental position, effective as of the date of the manning authorization document of the military department making the change (through a change in designation from military to civilian in the document, the elimination of the listing of the position as a military position in the document, or through any other means indicating the change in the document or otherwise).”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 49 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 976 the following new item:

“977. Conversion of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions: limitation.”.

(c) **REPEAL OF RELATED PROHIBITION.**—Section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 129c note) is repealed.

SEC. 718. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR JOINT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL FACILITY DEMONSTRATION FUND.

Section 1704(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2573), as amended by section 722 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), is further amended by striking “September 30, 2016” and inserting “September 30, 2017”.

SEC. 719. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR DODVA HEALTH CARE SHARING INCENTIVE FUND.

Section 8111(d)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2020”.

SEC. 720. PILOT PROGRAM ON INCENTIVE PROGRAMS TO IMPROVE HEALTH CARE PROVIDED UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) **PILOT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to assess whether a reduction in the rate of increase in health care spending by the Department of Defense and an enhancement of the operation of the military health system may be achieved by developing and implementing value-based incentive programs to encourage health care providers under the TRICARE program (including physicians, hospitals, and others involved in providing health care to patients) to improve the following:

(1) The quality of health care provided to covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program.

(2) The experience of covered beneficiaries in receiving health care under the TRICARE program.

(3) The health of covered beneficiaries.

(b) **INCENTIVE PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **DEVELOPMENT.**—In developing an incentive program under this section, the Secretary shall—

(A) consider the characteristics of the population of covered beneficiaries affected by the incentive program;

(B) consider how the incentive program would impact the receipt of health care under the TRICARE program by such covered beneficiaries;

(C) establish or maintain a reasonable assurance that such covered beneficiaries will have timely access to health care during operation of the incentive program;

(D) ensure that there are no additional financial costs to such covered beneficiaries of implementing the incentive program; and

(E) consider such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—With respect to an incentive program developed and implemented under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(A) the size, scope, and duration of the incentive program is reasonable in relation to the purpose of the incentive program; and

(B) appropriate criteria and data collection are used to ensure adequate evaluation of the feasibility and advisability of implementing the incentive program throughout the TRICARE program.

(3) **USE OF EXISTING MODELS.**—In developing an incentive program under this section, the Secretary may adapt a value-based incentive program conducted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services or any other governmental or commercial health care program.

(c) **TERMINATION.**—The authority of the Secretary to carry out the pilot program under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2019.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than March 15, 2019, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the pilot program that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of each incentive program developed and implemented under this section, including whether such incentive program—

(A) improves the quality of health care provided to covered beneficiaries, the experience of covered beneficiaries in receiving health care under the TRICARE program, or the health of covered beneficiaries;

(B) reduces the rate of increase in health care spending by the Department of Defense; or

(C) enhances the operation of the military health system.

(2) Such recommendations for administrative or legislative action as the Secretary considers appropriate in light of the pilot program, including to implement any such incentive program or programs throughout the TRICARE program.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “covered beneficiary” and “TRICARE program” have the meanings given those terms in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters

SEC. 731. PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION ON HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE THROUGH THE HOSPITAL COMPARE WEBSITE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

(a) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Secretary of Health and Human Services for the provision by the Secretary of Defense of such information as the Secretary of Health and Human Services may require to report and make publicly available information on quality of care and health outcomes regarding patients at military medical

treatment facilities through the Hospital Compare Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services, or any successor Internet website.

(b) **INFORMATION PROVIDED.**—The information provided by the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of Health and Human Services under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Measures of the timeliness and effectiveness of the health care provided by the Department of Defense.

(2) Measures of the prevalence of—

(A) readmissions, including the 30-day readmission rate;

(B) complications resulting in death, including the 30-day mortality rate;

(C) surgical complications; and

(D) health care related infections.

(3) Survey data of patient experiences, including the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems or any similar survey developed by the Department of Defense.

(4) Any other measures or data required of or reported with respect to hospitals participating in the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.).

SEC. 732. PUBLICATION OF DATA ON PATIENT SAFETY, QUALITY OF CARE, SATISFACTION, AND HEALTH OUTCOME MEASURES UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall publish on an Internet website of the Department of Defense that is available to the public data on all measures used by the Department to assess patient safety, quality of care, patient satisfaction, and health outcomes for health care provided under the TRICARE program at each military medical treatment facility.

(b) **UPDATES.**—The Secretary shall publish an update to the data published under subsection (a) not less frequently than once each quarter during each fiscal year.

(c) **ACCESSIBILITY.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the data published under subsection (a) and updated under subsection (b) is accessible to the public through the primary Internet website of the Department and the primary Internet website of the military medical treatment facility with respect to which such data applies.

(d) **TRICARE PROGRAM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “TRICARE program” has the meaning given such terms in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 733. ANNUAL REPORT ON PATIENT SAFETY, QUALITY OF CARE, AND ACCESS TO CARE AT MILITARY MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 1 each year beginning in 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a comprehensive report on patient safety, quality of care, and access to care at military medical treatment facilities.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The number of sentinel events, as defined by the Joint Commission, that occurred at military medical treatment facilities during the year preceding the submittal of the report, disaggregated by—

(A) military medical treatment facility; and

(B) military department with jurisdiction over such facilities.

(2) With respect to each sentinel event described in paragraph (1)—

(A) a synopsis of such event; and

(B) a description of any actions taken by the Secretary of the military department concerned in response to such event, including any actions taken to hold individuals accountable.

(3) The number of practitioners providing health care in military medical treatment facilities that were reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank during the year preceding the submittal of the report.

(4) The results of any internal analyses conducted by the Patient Safety Center of the Department of Defense during such year on matters relating to patient safety at military medical treatment facilities.

(5) With respect to each military medical treatment facility—

(A) the current accreditation status of such facility, including any recommendations for corrective action made by the relevant accrediting body;

(B) any policies or procedures implemented during such year by the Secretary of the military department concerned that were designed to improve patient safety, quality of care, and access to care at such facility;

(C) data on surgical and maternity care outcomes during such year;

(D) data on appointment wait times during such year; and

(E) data on patient safety, quality of care, and access to care as compared to standards established by the Department with respect to patient safety, quality of care, and access to care.

SEC. 734. REPORT ON PLANS TO IMPROVE EXPERIENCE WITH AND ELIMINATE PERFORMANCE VARIABILITY OF HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a comprehensive report setting forth the current and future plans of the Secretary, with estimated dates of completion, to carry out the following:

(A) To improve the experience of beneficiaries with health care provided in military medical treatment facilities and through purchased care.

(B) To eliminate performance variability with respect to the provision of such health care.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The comprehensive report required by paragraph (1) shall include the plans of the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, as follows:

(A) To align performance measures for health care provided in military medical treatment facilities with performance measures for health care provided through purchased care.

(B) To improve underperformance in the provision of health care by the Department of Defense by eliminating performance variability with respect to the provision of health care in military medical treatment facilities and through purchased care.

(C) To use innovative, high-technology services to improve access to care, coordination of care, and the experience of care in military medical treatment facilities and through purchased care.

(D) To collect and analyze data throughout the Department with respect to health care provided in military medical treatment facilities and through purchased care to improve the quality of such care, patient safety, and patient satisfaction.

(E) To develop a performance management system, including by adoption of common measures for access to care, quality of care, safety, and patient satisfaction, that holds medical leadership throughout the Department personally accountable for sustained improvement of performance.

(F) To use such other methods as the Secretary considers appropriate to improve the experience of beneficiaries with and eliminate performance variability with respect to health care received from the Department.

(b) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the submittal of the comprehensive report required by subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the plans of the Secretary of Defense set forth in the comprehensive report submitted under such subsection.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment whether the plans included in the comprehensive report submitted under subsection (a) will, with respect to members of the Armed Forces and covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program—

- (i) improve health outcomes;
- (ii) create lasting health value; and
- (iii) ensure that such individuals are able to equitably obtain quality health care in all military medical treatment facilities and through purchased care.

(B) An assessment whether such plans can be reasonably achieved within the estimated dates of completion set forth by the Department under such subsection.

(C) An assessment whether any such plan would require legislative action for the implementation of such plan.

(D) An assessment whether the Department of Defense has adequately budgeted amounts to fund the carrying out of such plans.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “purchased care” means health care provided pursuant to a contract entered into under the TRICARE program.

(2) The terms “covered beneficiary” and “TRICARE program” have the meaning given such terms in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 735. REPORT ON PLAN TO IMPROVE PEDIATRIC CARE AND RELATED SERVICES FOR CHILDREN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan of the Department of Defense to improve pediatric care and related services for children of members of the Armed Forces.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) In order to ensure that children receive developmentally-appropriate and age-appropriate health care services from the Department, a plan to align preventive pediatric care under the TRICARE program with—

(A) standards for such care as required by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148);

(B) guidelines established for such care by the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment program under the Medicaid program carried out under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.); and

(C) recommendations by organizations that specialize in pediatrics.

(2) A plan to develop a uniform definition of “pediatric medical necessity” for the Department that aligns with recommendations of organizations that specialize in pediatrics in order to ensure that a consistent definition of such term is used in providing health care in military medical treatment facilities and by health care providers under the TRICARE program.

(3) A plan to revise certification requirements for residential treatment centers of the Department to expand the access of children of members of the Armed Forces to services at such centers.

(4) A plan to develop measures to evaluate and improve access to pediatric care, coordina-

tion of pediatric care, and health outcomes for such children.

(5) A plan to include an assessment of access to pediatric specialty care in the annual report to Congress on the effectiveness of the TRICARE program.

(6) A plan to improve the quality of and access to behavioral health care under the TRICARE program for such children, including intensive outpatient and partial hospitalization services.

(7) A plan to mitigate the impact of permanent changes of station and other service-related relocations of members of the Armed Forces on the continuity of health care services received by such children who have special medical or behavioral health needs.

(8) A plan to mitigate deficiencies in data collection, data utilization, and data analysis to improve pediatric care and related services for children of members of the Armed Forces.

(c) **TRICARE PROGRAM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “TRICARE program” has the meaning given such term in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 736. REPORT ON PRELIMINARY MENTAL HEALTH SCREENINGS FOR INDIVIDUALS BECOMING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH SCREENINGS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on mental health screenings of individuals enlisting or accessioning into the Armed Forces before enlistment or accession.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Recommendations with respect to establishing a secure, electronically-based preliminary mental health screening of members of the Armed Forces to bring mental health screenings to parity with physical screenings of members.

(2) Recommendations with respect to the composition of the mental health screening, evidenced-based best practices, and how to track changes in mental health screenings relating to traumatic brain injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and other conditions.

(c) **COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall prepare the report under subsection (a)—

(1) in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the surgeons general of the military departments; and

(2) in consultation with experts in the field, including the National Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health.

SEC. 737. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON USE OF QUALITY OF CARE METRICS AT MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the use by the Department of Defense of metrics with respect to the quality of care provided at military treatment facilities.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The extent to which the Department of Defense and each military department use metrics to monitor and assess the quality of care provided at military treatment facilities.

(2) How, if at all, the use of such metrics varies among the Department of Defense and each military department.

(3) The extent to which the Department of Defense and each military department use the information from such metrics to identify and ad-

dress issues such as the performance of individual health care providers and areas in need of improvement system-wide.

(4) The extent to which the Department of Defense and each military department oversee the process of using metrics to monitor and assess the quality of care provided at military treatment facilities.

SEC. 738. REPORT ON INTEROPERABILITY BETWEEN ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS SYSTEMS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report that sets forth a timeline with milestones for achieving interoperability between the electronic health records systems of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 739. SUBMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS RELATING TO EXPOSURE TO AIRBORNE HAZARDS AND OPEN BURN PITS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs such information in the possession of the Secretary of Defense as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs considers necessary to supplement and support—

(1) the development of information to be included in the Airborne Hazards and Open Burn Pit Registry established by the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 201 of the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–260; 38 U.S.C. 527 note); and

(2) research and development activities conducted by the Department of Veterans Affairs to explore the potential health risks of exposure by members of the Armed Forces to environmental factors in Iraq and Afghanistan, in particular the connection of such exposure to respiratory illnesses such as chronic cough, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, constrictive bronchiolitis, and pulmonary fibrosis.

(b) **INCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—The Secretary of Defense shall include in the information submitted to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under subsection (a) information on any research and surveillance efforts conducted by the Department of Defense to evaluate the incidence and prevalence of respiratory illnesses among members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to open burn pits while deployed overseas.

SEC. 740. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON GAMBLING AND PROBLEM GAMBLING BEHAVIOR AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on gaming facilities at military installations and problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces.

(b) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) With respect to gaming facilities at military installations, disaggregated by each branch of the Armed Forces—

(A) the number, type, and location of such gaming facilities;

(B) the total amount of cash flow through such gaming facilities; and

(C) the amount of revenue generated by such gaming facilities for morale, welfare, and recreation programs of the Department of Defense.

(2) An assessment of the prevalence of and particular risks for problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces, including such recommendations for policies and programs to be

carried out by the Department to address problem gambling as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) An assessment of the ability and capacity of military health care personnel to adequately diagnose and provide dedicated treatment for problem gambling, including—

(A) a comparison of treatment programs of the Department for alcohol abuse, illegal substance abuse, and tobacco addiction with treatment programs of the Department for problem gambling; and

(B) an assessment of whether additional training for military health care personnel on providing treatment for problem gambling would be beneficial.

(4) An assessment of the financial counseling and related services that are available to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents who are impacted by problem gambling.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 741. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF DATA SECURITY AND TRANSMISSION STANDARDS FOR ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the standards for security and transmission of data to be implemented by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs in deploying the new or updated, as the case may be, electronic health record system of each such Department (required to be deployed by each such Department under section 713 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note)) at military installations and in field environments.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF DATA.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include information on standards for transmission of data between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs and standards for transmission of data between each such Department and private sector entities.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management

SEC. 801. ROLE OF SERVICE CHIEFS IN THE ACQUISITION PROCESS.

(a) SERVICE CHIEFS AS CUSTOMER OF ACQUISITION PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 149 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2546 the following new section:

“§2546a. Customer-oriented acquisition system

“(a) OBJECTIVE.—It shall be the objective of the defense acquisition system to meet the needs of its customers in the most cost-effective manner practicable. The acquisition policies, directives, and regulations of the Department of Defense shall be modified as necessary to ensure the development and implementation of a customer-oriented acquisition system.

“(b) CUSTOMER.—The customer of the defense acquisition system is the military service that

will have primary responsibility for fielding the system or systems acquired. The customer is represented with regard to a major defense acquisition program by the Secretary of the relevant military department and the Chief of the relevant military service.

“(c) ROLE OF CUSTOMER.—The customer of a major defense acquisition program shall be responsible for balancing resources against priorities on the acquisition program and ensuring that appropriate trade-offs are made among cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance on a continuing basis throughout the life of the acquisition program.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 149 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2546 the following new item:

“2546a. Customer-oriented acquisition system.”.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHIEFS.—Section 2547(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) Decisions regarding the balancing of resources and priorities, and associated trade-offs among cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance on major defense acquisition programs.”; and

(3) in paragraph (6), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by striking “The development” and inserting “The development and management”.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF MILITARY DEPUTIES.—Section 908(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 278; 10 U.S.C. 2430 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) DUTIES OF PRINCIPAL MILITARY DEPUTIES.—Each Principal Military Deputy to a service acquisition executive shall be responsible for—

“(1) keeping the Chief of Staff of the Armed Force concerned informed of the progress of major defense acquisition programs;

“(2) informing the Chief of Staff on a continuing basis of any developments on major defense programs, which may require new or revisited trade-offs among cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance, including—

“(A) significant cost growth or schedule slippage; and

“(B) requirements creep (as defined in section 2547(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code); and

“(3) ensuring that the views of the Chief of Staff on cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance trade-offs are strongly considered by program managers and program executive officers in all phases of the acquisition process.”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) JOINT REQUIREMENTS OVERSIGHT COUNCIL.—Section 181(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) The Council shall seek, and strongly consider, the views of the Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces, in their roles as customers of the acquisition system, on matters pertaining to trade-offs among cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance under subsection (b)(1)(C) and the balancing of resources with priorities pursuant to subsection (b)(3).”.

(2) MILESTONE A DECISIONS.—The chief of the relevant military service shall advise the milestone decision authority for a major defense acquisition program of the chief's views on cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance trade-offs that have been made with regard to the program, as provided in section 2366a(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 844 of this Act, prior to a Milestone A decision on the program.

(3) MILESTONE B DECISIONS.—The chief of the relevant military service shall advise the milestone decision authority for a major defense acquisition program of the chief's views on cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance trade-offs that have been made with regard to the program, as provided in section 2366b(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 845 of this Act, prior to a Milestone B decision on the program.

(4) DUTIES OF CHIEFS.—

(A) Section 3033(d)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 171” and inserting “sections 171 and 2547”.

(B) Section 5033(d)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 171” and inserting “sections 171 and 2547”.

(C) Section 5043(e)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 171” and inserting “sections 171 and 2547”.

(D) Section 8033(d)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 171” and inserting “sections 171 and 2547”.

SEC. 802. EXPANSION OF RAPID ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.

Section 806(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) RESPONSE TO COMBAT EMERGENCIES AND CERTAIN URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS.—

“(1) DETERMINATION OF NEED FOR RAPID ACQUISITION AND DEPLOYMENT.—(A) In the case of any supplies and associated support services that, as determined in writing by the Secretary of Defense, are urgently needed to eliminate a documented deficiency that has resulted in combat casualties, or is likely to result in combat casualties, the Secretary may use the procedures developed under this section in order to accomplish the rapid acquisition and deployment of the needed supplies and associated support services.

“(B) In the case of any supplies and associated support services that, as determined in writing by the Secretary of Defense, are urgently needed to eliminate a documented deficiency that impacts an ongoing or anticipated contingency operation and that, if left unfulfilled, could potentially result in loss of life or critical mission failure, the Secretary may use the procedures developed under this section in order to accomplish the rapid acquisition and deployment of the needed supplies and associated support services.

“(C)(i) In the case of any supplies and associated support services that, as determined in writing by the Secretary of Defense without delegation, are urgently needed to eliminate a deficiency that as the result of a cyber attack has resulted in critical mission failure, the loss of life, property destruction, or economic effects, or if left unfulfilled is likely to result in critical mission failure, the loss of life, property destruction, or economic effects, the Secretary may use the procedures developed under this section in order to accomplish the rapid acquisition and deployment of the needed offensive or defensive cyber capabilities, supplies, and associated support services.

“(ii) In this subparagraph, the term ‘cyber attack’ means a deliberate action to alter, disrupt, deceive, degrade, or destroy computer systems or networks or the information or programs resident in or transiting these systems or networks.

“(2) DESIGNATION OF SENIOR OFFICIAL RESPONSIBLE.—(A) Whenever the Secretary makes a determination under subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1) that certain supplies and associated support services are urgently needed to eliminate a deficiency described in that subparagraph, the Secretary shall designate a senior official of the Department of Defense to ensure that the needed supplies and associated

support services are acquired and deployed as quickly as possible, with a goal of awarding a contract for the acquisition of the supplies and associated support services within 15 days.

“(B) Upon designation of a senior official under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall authorize that official to waive any provision of law, policy, directive, or regulation described in subsection (d) that such official determines in writing would unnecessarily impede the rapid acquisition and deployment of the needed supplies and associated support services. In a case in which the needed supplies and associated support services cannot be acquired without an extensive delay, the senior official shall require that an interim solution be implemented and deployed using the procedures developed under this section to minimize adverse consequences resulting from the urgent need.

“(3) **USE OF FUNDS.**—(A) In any fiscal year in which the Secretary makes a determination described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1), the Secretary may use any funds available to the Department of Defense for acquisitions of supplies and associated support services if the determination includes a written finding that the use of such funds is necessary to address the deficiency in a timely manner.

“(B) The authority of this section may only be used to acquire supplies and associated support services—

“(i) in the case of determinations by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(A), in an amount aggregating not more than \$200,000,000 during any fiscal year;

“(ii) in the case of determinations by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(B), in an amount aggregating not more than \$200,000,000 during any fiscal year; and

“(iii) in the case of determinations by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(C), in an amount aggregating not more than \$200,000,000 during any fiscal year.

“(4) **NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.**—(A) In the case of a determination by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees of the determination within 15 days after the date of the determination.

“(B) In the case of a determination by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(B) the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees of the determination at least 10 days before the date on which the determination is effective.

“(C) A notice under this paragraph shall include the following:

“(i) The supplies and associated support services to be acquired.

“(ii) The amount anticipated to be expended for the acquisition.

“(iii) The source of funds for the acquisition.

“(D) A notice under this paragraph shall be sufficient to fulfill any requirement to provide notification to Congress for a new start program.

“(E) A notice under this paragraph shall be provided in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(5) **TIME FOR TRANSITIONING TO NORMAL ACQUISITION SYSTEM.**—Any acquisition initiated under this subsection shall transition to the normal acquisition system not later than two years after the date on which the Secretary makes the determination described in paragraph (1) with respect to the supplies and associated support services concerned.

“(6) **LIMITATION ON OFFICERS WITH AUTHORITY TO MAKE A DETERMINATION.**—The authority to make a determination under subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1) may be exercised only by the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Defense.”.

SEC. 803. MIDDLE TIER OF ACQUISITION FOR RAPID PROTOTYPING AND RAPID FIELDING.

(a) **GUIDANCE REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in consultation with the Comptroller of the Department of Defense and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall establish guidance for a “middle tier” of acquisition programs that are intended to be completed in a period of two to five years.

(b) **ACQUISITION PATHWAYS.**—The guidance required by subsection (a) shall cover the following two acquisition pathways:

(1) **RAPID PROTOTYPING.**—The rapid prototyping pathway shall provide for the use of innovative technologies to rapidly develop fieldable prototypes to demonstrate new capabilities and meet emerging military needs. The objective of an acquisition program under this pathway shall be to field a prototype that can be demonstrated in an operational environment and provide for a residual operational capability within five years of the development of an approved requirement.

(2) **RAPID FIELDING.**—The rapid fielding pathway shall provide for the use of proven technologies to field production quantities of new or upgraded systems with minimal development required. The objective of an acquisition program under this pathway shall be to begin production within six months and complete fielding within five years of the development of an approved requirement.

(c) **EXPEDITED PROCESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The guidance required by subsection (a) shall provide for a streamlined and coordinated requirements, budget, and acquisition process that results in the development of an approved requirement for each program in a period of not more than six months from the time that the process is initiated. Programs that are subject to the guidance shall not be subject to the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System Manual and Department of Defense Directive 5000.01, except to the extent specifically provided in the guidance.

(2) **RAPID PROTOTYPING.**—With respect to the rapid prototyping pathway, the guidance shall include—

(A) a merit-based process for the consideration of innovative technologies and new capabilities to meet needs communicated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the combatant commanders;

(B) a process for developing and implementing acquisition and funding strategies for the program;

(C) a process for cost-sharing with the military departments on rapid prototype projects, to ensure an appropriate commitment to the success of such projects;

(D) a process for demonstrating and evaluating the performance of fieldable prototypes developed pursuant to the program in an operational environment; and

(E) a process for transitioning successful prototypes to new or existing acquisition programs for production and fielding under the rapid fielding pathway or the traditional acquisition system.

(3) **RAPID FIELDING.**—With respect to the rapid fielding pathway, the guidance shall include—

(A) a merit-based process for the consideration of existing products and proven technologies to meet needs communicated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the combatant commanders;

(B) a process for demonstrating performance and evaluating for current operational purposes the proposed products and technologies;

(C) a process for developing and implementing acquisition and funding strategies for the program; and

(D) a process for considering lifecycle costs and addressing issues of logistics support and system interoperability.

(4) **STREAMLINED PROCEDURES.**—The guidance for the programs may provide for any of the following streamlined procedures:

(A) The service acquisition executive of the military department concerned shall appoint a program manager for such program from among candidates from among civilian employees or members of the armed forces who have significant and relevant experience managing large and complex programs.

(B) The program manager for each program shall report with respect to such program directly, without intervening review or approval, to the service acquisition executive of the military department concerned.

(C) The service acquisition executive of the military department concerned shall evaluate the job performance of such manager on an annual basis. In conducting an evaluation under this paragraph, a service acquisition executive shall consider the extent to which the manager has achieved the objectives of the program for which the manager is responsible, including quality, timeliness, and cost objectives.

(D) The program manager of a defense streamlined program shall be authorized staff positions for a technical staff, including experts in business management, contracting, auditing, engineering, testing, and logistics, to enable the manager to manage the program without the technical assistance of another organizational unit of an agency to the maximum extent practicable.

(E) The program manager of a defense streamlined program shall be authorized, in coordination with the users of the equipment and capability to be acquired and the test community, to make trade-offs among life-cycle costs, requirements, and schedules to meet the goals of the program.

(F) The service acquisition executive, acting in coordination with the defense acquisition executive, shall serve as the milestone decision authority for the program.

(G) The program manager of a defense streamlined program shall be provided a process to expeditiously seek a waiver from Congress from any statutory or regulatory requirement that the program manager determines adds little or no value to the management of the program.

(d) **RAPID PROTOTYPING FUND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a fund to be known as the “Department of Defense Rapid Prototyping Fund” to provide funds, in addition to other funds that may be available for acquisition programs under the rapid prototyping pathway established pursuant to this section. The Fund shall be managed by a senior official of the Department of Defense designated by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. The Fund shall consist of amounts appropriated to the Fund and amounts credited to the Fund pursuant to section 849 of this Act.

(2) **TRANSFER AUTHORITY.**—Amounts available in the Fund may be transferred to a military department for the purpose of carrying out an acquisition program under the rapid prototyping pathway established pursuant to this section. Any amount so transferred shall be credited to the account to which it is transferred. The transfer authority provided in this subsection is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense.

(3) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE.**—The senior official designated to manage the Fund shall notify the congressional defense committees of all transfers under paragraph (2). Each notification shall specify the amount transferred, the purpose of the transfer, and the total projected cost and estimated cost to complete the acquisition program to which the funds were transferred.

SEC. 804. AMENDMENTS TO OTHER TRANSACTION AUTHORITY.

(a) **AUTHORITY OF THE DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 193 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2371a the following new section:

“§2371b. Authority of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to carry out certain prototype projects

“(a) **AUTHORITY.**—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Secretary of a military department, or any other official designated by the Secretary of Defense may, under the authority of section 2371 of this title, carry out prototype projects that are directly relevant to enhancing the mission effectiveness of military personnel and the supporting platforms, systems, components, or materials proposed to be acquired or developed by the Department of Defense, or to improvement of platforms, systems, components, or materials in use by the armed forces.

“(2) The authority of this section—

“(A) may be exercised for a prototype project that is expected to cost the Department of Defense in excess of \$50,000,000 but not in excess of \$250,000,000 (including all options) only upon a written determination by the senior procurement executive for the agency as designated for the purpose of section 1702(c) of title 41, or, for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency or the Missile Defense Agency, the director of the agency that—

“(i) the requirements of subsection (d) will be met; and

“(ii) the use of the authority of this section is essential to promoting the success of the prototype project; and

“(B) may be exercised for a prototype project that is expected to cost the Department of Defense in excess of \$250,000,000 (including all options) only if—

“(i) the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics determines in writing that—

“(I) the requirements of subsection (d) will be met; and

“(II) the use of the authority of this section is essential to meet critical national security objectives; and

“(ii) the congressional defense committees are notified in writing at least 30 days before such authority is exercised.

“(3) The authority of a senior procurement executive or director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency or Missile Defense Agency under paragraph (2)(A), and the authority of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics under paragraph (2)(B), may not be delegated.

“(b) **EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.**—

“(1) Subsections (e)(1)(B) and (e)(2) of such section 2371 shall not apply to projects carried out under subsection (a).

“(2) To the maximum extent practicable, competitive procedures shall be used when entering into agreements to carry out projects under subsection (a).

“(c) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL ACCESS TO INFORMATION.**—(1) Each agreement entered into by an official referred to in subsection (a) to carry out a project under that subsection that provides for payments in a total amount in excess of \$5,000,000 shall include a clause that provides for the Comptroller General, in the discretion of the Comptroller General, to examine the records of any party to the agreement or any entity that participates in the performance of the agreement.

“(2) The requirement in paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a party or entity, or

a subordinate element of a party or entity, that has not entered into any other agreement that provides for audit access by a Government entity in the year prior to the date of the agreement.

“(3)(A) The right provided to the Comptroller General in a clause of an agreement under paragraph (1) is limited as provided in subparagraph (B) in the case of a party to the agreement, an entity that participates in the performance of the agreement, or a subordinate element of that party or entity if the only agreements or other transactions that the party, entity, or subordinate element entered into with Government entities in the year prior to the date of that agreement are cooperative agreements or transactions that were entered into under this section or section 2371 of this title.

“(B) The only records of a party, other entity, or subordinate element referred to in subparagraph (A) that the Comptroller General may examine in the exercise of the right referred to in that subparagraph are records of the same type as the records that the Government has had the right to examine under the audit access clauses of the previous agreements or transactions referred to in such subparagraph that were entered into by that particular party, entity, or subordinate element.

“(4) The head of the contracting activity that is carrying out the agreement may waive the applicability of the requirement in paragraph (1) to the agreement if the head of the contracting activity determines that it would not be in the public interest to apply the requirement to the agreement. The waiver shall be effective with respect to the agreement only if the head of the contracting activity transmits a notification of the waiver to Congress and the Comptroller General before entering into the agreement. The notification shall include the rationale for the determination.

“(5) The Comptroller General may not examine records pursuant to a clause included in an agreement under paragraph (1) more than three years after the final payment is made by the United States under the agreement.

“(d) **APPROPRIATE USE OF AUTHORITY.**—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that no official of an agency enters into a transaction (other than a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement) for a prototype project under the authority of this section unless one of following conditions is met:

“(A) There is at least one nontraditional defense contractor participating to a significant extent in the prototype project.

“(B) All parties to the transaction other than the Federal Government are innovative small businesses and non-traditional contractors with unique capabilities relevant to the prototype project.

“(C) At least one third of the total cost of the prototype project is to be paid out of funds provided by parties to the transaction other than the Federal Government.

“(D) The senior procurement executive for the agency determines in writing that exceptional circumstances justify the use of a transaction that provides for innovative business arrangements or structures that would not be feasible or appropriate under a contract.

“(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amounts counted for the purposes of this subsection as being provided, or to be provided, by a party to a transaction with respect to a prototype project that is entered into under this section other than the Federal Government do not include costs that were incurred before the date on which the transaction becomes effective.

“(B) Costs that were incurred for a prototype project by a party after the beginning of negotiations resulting in a transaction (other than a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement) with

respect to the project before the date on which the transaction becomes effective may be counted for purposes of this subsection as being provided, or to be provided, by the party to the transaction if and to the extent that the official responsible for entering into the transaction determines in writing that—

“(i) the party incurred the costs in anticipation of entering into the transaction; and

“(ii) it was appropriate for the party to incur the costs before the transaction became effective in order to ensure the successful implementation of the transaction.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘nontraditional defense contractor’ has the meaning given the term under section 2302(9) of this title.

“(2) The term ‘small business’ means a small business concern as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

“(f) **FOLLOW-ON PRODUCTION CONTRACTS OR TRANSACTIONS.**—(1) A transaction entered into under this section for a prototype project may provide for the award of a follow-on production contract or transactions to the participants in the transaction.

“(2) A follow-on production contract or transaction provided for in a transaction under paragraph (1) may be awarded to the participants in the transaction without the use of competitive procedures, notwithstanding the requirements of section 2304 of this title, if—

“(A) competitive procedures were used for the selection of parties for participation in the transaction; and

“(B) the participants in the transaction successfully completed the prototype project provided for in the transaction.

“(3) Contracts and transactions entered into pursuant to this subsection may be awarded using the authority in subsection (a), under the authority of chapter 137 of this title, or under such procedures, terms, and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may establish by regulation.

“(g) **AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE PROTOTYPES AND FOLLOW-ON PRODUCTION ITEMS AS GOVERNMENT FURNISHED EQUIPMENT.**—An agreement entered pursuant to the authority of subsection (a) or a follow-on contract entered pursuant to the authority of subsection (f) may provide for prototypes or follow-on production items to be provided to another contractor as government-furnished equipment.

“(h) **APPLICABILITY OF PROCUREMENT ETHICS REQUIREMENTS.**—An agreement entered into under the authority of this section shall be treated as a Federal agency procurement for the purposes of chapter 21 of title 41.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 139 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2371a the following new item:

“2371b. Authority of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to carry out certain prototype projects.”.

(b) **MODIFICATION TO DEFINITION OF NON-TRADITIONAL CONTRACTOR.**—Section 2302(9) of such title is amended to read as follows:

“(9) The term ‘nontraditional defense contractor’, with respect to a procurement or with respect to a transaction authorized under section 2371(a) of this title, means an entity that—

“(A) is not currently performing and has not performed, for at least the one-year period preceding the solicitation of sources by the Department of Defense for the procurement or transaction, any contract or subcontract that is subject to full coverage under the cost accounting standards prescribed pursuant to 1502 of title 41 and the regulations implementing such section; and

“(B) has not been awarded, for at least the one-year period preceding the solicitation of

sources by the Department of Defense for the procurement or transaction, any other contract under which the contractor was required to submit certified cost or pricing data under section 2306a of this title.”.

(c) **REPEAL OF OBSOLETE AUTHORITY.**—Section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160; 10 U.S.C. 2371 note) is hereby repealed.

(d) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1601(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136; 10 U.S.C. 2370a note) is amended by restating subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) sections 2371 and 2371b of title 10, United States Code.”.

SEC. 805. USE OF ALTERNATIVE ACQUISITION PATHS TO ACQUIRE CRITICAL NATIONAL SECURITY CAPABILITIES.

(a) **GUIDELINES.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures and guidelines for alternative acquisition pathways to acquire capital assets and services that meet critical national security needs. The guidelines shall—

(1) be separate from existing acquisition procedures and guidelines;

(2) be supported by streamlined contracting, budgeting, and requirements processes;

(3) establish alternative acquisition paths based on the capabilities being bought and the time needed to deploy these capabilities; and

(4) maximize the use of flexible authorities in existing law and regulation.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes a summary of the guidelines established under subsection (a) and recommendations for any legislation necessary to meet the objectives set forth in subsection (a) and to implement the guidelines established under such subsection.

SEC. 806. SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WAIVER OF ACQUISITION LAWS TO ACQUIRE VITAL NATIONAL SECURITY CAPABILITIES.

(a) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to waive any provision of acquisition law or regulation described in subsection (c) for the purpose of acquiring a capability that would not otherwise be available to the Armed Forces of the United States, upon a determination that—

(1) the acquisition of the capability is in the vital national security interest of the United States;

(2) the application of the law or regulation to be waived would impede the acquisition of the capability in a manner that would undermine the national security of the United States; and

(3) the underlying purpose of the law or regulation to be waived can be addressed in a different manner or at a different time.

(b) **DESIGNATION OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL.**—Whenever the Secretary of Defense makes a determination under subsection (a)(1) that the acquisition of a capability is in the vital national security interest of the United States, the Secretary shall designate a senior official of the Department of Defense who shall be personally responsible and accountable for the rapid and effective acquisition and deployment of the needed capability. The Secretary shall provide the designated official such authority as the Secretary determines necessary to achieve this objective, and may use the waiver authority in subsection (a) for this purpose.

(c) **ACQUISITION LAWS AND REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon a determination described in subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense is authorized to waive any provision of law or regulation addressing—

(A) the establishment of a requirement or specification for the capability to be acquired;

(B) research, development, test, and evaluation of the capability to be acquired;

(C) production, fielding, and sustainment of the capability to be acquired; or

(D) solicitation, selection of sources, and award of contracts for the capability to be acquired.

(2) **LIMITATIONS.**—Nothing in this subsection authorizes the waiver of—

(A) the requirements of this section;

(B) any provision of law imposing civil or criminal penalties; or

(C) any provision of law governing the proper expenditure of appropriated funds.

(d) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees at least 30 days before exercising the waiver authority under subsection (a). Each such notice shall include—

(1) an explanation of the basis for determining that the acquisition of the capability is in the vital national security interest of the United States;

(2) an identification of each provision of law or regulation to be waived; and

(3) for each provision identified pursuant to paragraph (2)—

(A) an explanation of why the application of the provision would impede the acquisition in a manner that would undermine the national security of the United States; and

(B) a description of the time or manner in which the underlying purpose of the law or regulation to be waived will be addressed.

(e) **NON-DELEGATION.**—The authority of the Secretary to waive provisions of laws and regulations under subsection (a) is non-delegable.

SEC. 807. ACQUISITION AUTHORITY OF THE COMMANDER OF UNITED STATES CYBER COMMAND.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commander of the United States Cyber Command shall be responsible for, and shall have the authority to conduct, the following acquisition activities:

(A) Development and acquisition of cyber operations-peculiar equipment and capabilities.

(B) Acquisition of cyber capability-peculiar equipment, capabilities, and services.

(2) **ACQUISITION FUNCTIONS.**—Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, the Commander shall have authority to exercise the functions of the head of an agency under chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) **COMMAND ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The staff of the Commander shall include a command acquisition executive, who shall be responsible for the overall supervision of acquisition matters for the United States Cyber Command. The command acquisition executive shall have the authority—

(A) to negotiate memoranda of agreement with the military departments to carry out the acquisition of equipment, capabilities, and services described in subsection (a)(1) on behalf of the Command;

(B) to supervise the acquisition of equipment, capabilities, and services described in subsection (a)(1);

(C) to represent the Command in discussions with the military departments regarding acquisition programs for which the Command is a customer; and

(D) to work with the military departments to ensure that the Command is appropriately represented in any joint working group or integrated product team regarding acquisition programs for which the Command is a customer.

(2) **DELIVERY OF ACQUISITION SOLUTIONS.**—The command acquisition executive of the United States Cyber Command shall be—

(A) responsible to the Commander for rapidly delivering acquisition solutions to meet validated cyber operations-peculiar requirements;

(B) subordinate to the defense acquisition executive in matters of acquisition;

(C) subject to the same oversight as the service acquisition executives; and

(D) included on the distribution list for acquisition directives and instructions of the Department of Defense.

(c) **ACQUISITION PERSONNEL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide the United States Cyber Command with the personnel or funding equivalent to ten full-time equivalent personnel to support the Commander in fulfilling the acquisition responsibilities provided for under this section with experience in—

(A) program acquisition;

(B) the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System Process;

(C) program management;

(D) system engineering; and

(E) costing.

(2) **EXISTING PERSONNEL.**—The personnel provided under this subsection shall be provided from among the existing personnel of the Department of Defense.

(d) **INSPECTOR GENERAL ACTIVITIES.**—The staff of the Commander of the United States Cyber Command shall on a periodic basis include a representative from the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General who shall conduct internal audits and inspections of purchasing and contracting actions through the United States Cyber Command and such other Inspector General functions as may be assigned.

(e) **BUDGET.**—In addition to the activities of a combatant command for which funding may be requested under section 166(b) of title 10, United States Code, the budget proposal of the United States Cyber Command shall include requests for funding for—

(1) development and acquisition of cyber operations-peculiar equipment; and

(2) acquisition of other capabilities or services that are peculiar to offensive cyber operations activities.

(f) **CYBER OPERATIONS PROCUREMENT FUND.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, out of funds made available for procurement, Defense-wide, \$75,000,000 for a Cyber Operations Procurement Fund to support acquisition activities provided for under this section.

(g) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING INTELLIGENCE AND SPECIAL ACTIVITIES.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute authority to conduct any activity which, if carried out as an intelligence activity by the Department of Defense, would require a notice to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.).

(h) **SUNSET.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The authority under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2021.

(2) **LIMITATION ON DURATION OF ACQUISITIONS.**—The authority under this section does not include major defense acquisitions or acquisitions of foundational infrastructure or software architectures the duration of which is expected to last more than five years.

SEC. 808. ADVISORY PANEL ON STREAMLINING AND CODIFYING ACQUISITION REGULATIONS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish under the sponsorship of the Defense Acquisition University and the National Defense University an advisory panel on streamlining acquisition regulations.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The panel shall be composed of at least nine individuals who are recognized experts in acquisition and procurement

policy. In making appointments to the advisory panel, the Under Secretary shall ensure that the members of the panel reflect diverse experiences in the public and private sectors.

(c) **DUTIES.**—The panel shall—

(1) review the acquisition regulations applicable to the Department of Defense with a view toward streamlining and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the defense acquisition process and maintaining defense technology advantage; and

(2) make any recommendations for the amendment or repeal of such regulations that the panel considers necessary, as a result of such review, to—

(A) establish and administer appropriate buyer and seller relationships in the procurement system;

(B) improve the functioning of the acquisition system;

(C) ensure the continuing financial and ethical integrity of defense procurement programs;

(D) protect the best interests of the Department of Defense; and

(E) eliminate any regulations that are unnecessary for the purposes described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(d) **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide the advisory panel established pursuant to subsection (a) with timely access to appropriate information, data, resources, and analysis so that the advisory panel may conduct a thorough and independent assessment as required under such subsection.

(2) **INAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.**—The requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the advisory panel established pursuant to subsection (a).

(e) **REPORT.**—

(1) **PANEL REPORT.**—Not later than two years after the date on which the Secretary of Defense establishes the advisory panel, the panel shall transmit a final report to the Secretary.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the panel, including—

(A) a history of each current acquisition regulation and a recommendation as to whether the regulation and related law (if applicable) should be retained, modified, or repealed; and

(B) such additional recommendations for legislation as the panel considers appropriate.

(3) **INTERIM REPORTS.**—(A) Not later than 6 months and 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to or brief the congressional defense committees on the interim findings of the panel with respect to the elements set forth in paragraph (2).

(B) The panel shall provide regular updates to the Secretary of Defense for purposes of providing the interim reports required under this paragraph.

(4) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after receiving the final report of the advisory panel, the Secretary of Defense shall transmit the final report, together with such comments as the Secretary determines appropriate, to the congressional defense committees.

(f) **DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND SUPPORT.**—The Secretary of Defense may use amounts available in the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund established under section 1705 of title 10, United States Code, to support activities of the advisory panel under this section.

SEC. 809. REVIEW OF TIME-BASED REQUIREMENTS PROCESS AND BUDGETING AND ACQUISITION SYSTEMS.

(a) **TIME-BASED REQUIREMENTS PROCESS.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall review the requirements process with the goal of establishing an

agile and streamlined system that develops requirements that provide stability and foundational direction for acquisition programs. The requirements system should be informed by technological market research and provide a time-based or phased distinction between capabilities needed to be deployed urgently, within 2 years, within 5 years, and longer than 5 years.

(b) **BUDGETING AND ACQUISITION SYSTEMS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall review and ensure that the acquisition and budgeting systems are structured to meet time-based or phased requirements in a manner that is predictable, cost effective, and efficient and takes advantage of emerging technological developments. The Secretary shall make all necessary changes in regulation and policy to achieve a time-based requirements, budgeting, and acquisition system and shall identify and report to Congress within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on any statutory impediments to achieving such a system.

SEC. 810. IMPROVEMENT OF PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **DEPARTMENT-WIDE RESPONSIBILITIES OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.**—In fulfilling the responsibilities under chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) develop Department-wide standards, policies, and guidelines for program and project management for the Department of Defense based on appropriate and applicable nationally accredited standards for program and project management;

(2) develop policies to monitor compliance with the standards, policies, and guidelines developed under paragraph (1); and

(3) engage with the private sector on matters relating to program and project management for the Department.

(b) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF USD (ATL).**—In fulfilling the responsibilities under chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code, for the military departments and the Defense Agencies, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall—

(1) advise and assist Secretary of Defense with respect Department of Defense practices related to program and project management;

(2) review programs identified as high-risk in program and project management by the Government Accountability Office, and make recommendations for actions to be taken by the Secretary to mitigate such risks;

(3) assess matters of importance to the workforce in program and project management, including—

(A) career development and workforce development;

(B) policies to support continuous improvement in program and project management; and

(C) major challenges of the Department in managing programs and projects; and

(4) advise on the development and applicability of standards Department-wide for program and project management transparency.

(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACQUISITION EXECUTIVES.**—In fulfilling the responsibilities under chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code, for the military departments, the service acquisition executives (in consultation with the Chiefs of the Armed Forces with respect to military program managers), and the component acquisition executives for the Defense Agencies, shall—

(1) ensure the compliance of the department or Agency concerned with standards, policies, and guidelines for program and project management for the Department of Defense developed by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) ensure the effective career development of program managers through—

(A) training and educational opportunities for program managers, including exchange programs with the private sector;

(B) mentoring of current and future program managers by experienced public and private sector senior executives and program managers;

(C) continued refinement of career paths and career opportunities for program managers;

(D) incentives for the recruitment of highly qualified individuals to serve as program managers;

(E) improved means of collecting and disseminating best practices and lessons learned to enhance program management; and

(F) improved methods to support improved data gathering and analysis for program management and oversight purposes.

(d) **DEADLINE FOR STANDARDS, POLICIES, AND GUIDELINES.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall issue the standards, policies, and guidelines required by subsection (a)(1). The Secretary shall provide Congress an interim update on the progress made in implementing this section not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

SEC. 821. PREFERENCE FOR FIXED-PRICE CONTRACTS IN DETERMINING CONTRACT TYPE FOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PREFERENCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement shall be revised to establish a preference for fixed-price contracts, including fixed-price incentive fee contracts, in the determination of contract type for development programs.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CHANGES.**—Section 818(c) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364; 120 Stat. 2329) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “or major automated information system” after “major defense acquisition program”; and

(2) by striking the second sentence.

SEC. 822. APPLICABILITY OF COST AND PRICING DATA AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

Section 2306a(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) to the extent such data relates to an off-set agreement in connection with a contract for the sale of a weapon system or defense-related item to a foreign country or foreign firm.”.

SEC. 823. RISK-BASED CONTRACTING FOR SMALLER CONTRACT ACTIONS UNDER THE TRUTH IN NEGOTIATIONS ACT.

(a) **INCREASE IN THRESHOLDS.**—Subsection (a) of section 2306a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “December 5, 1990” each place it appears and inserting “January 15, 2016”; and

(B) by striking “\$500,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$5,000,000”; and

(C) by striking “\$100,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$750,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking “fiscal year 1994 constant dollar value” and inserting “fiscal year 2016 constant dollar value”.

(b) **RISK-BASED CONTRACTING.**—Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **COST OR PRICING DATA ON BELOW-THRESHOLD CONTRACTS.**—

“(1) **AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE SUBMISSION.**—Subject to paragraph (4), when certified cost or

pricing data are not required to be submitted by subsection (a) for a contract, subcontract, or modification of a contract or subcontract, such data may nevertheless be required to be submitted by the head of the procuring activity, if the head of the procuring activity—

“(A) determines that such data are necessary for the evaluation by the agency of the reasonableness of the price of the contract, subcontract, or modification of a contract or subcontract; or

“(B) requires the submission of such data in accordance with a risk-based contracting approach established pursuant to paragraph (3).

“(2) WRITTEN DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—In any case in which the head of the procuring activity requires certified cost or pricing data to be submitted under paragraph (1)(A), the head of the procuring activity shall justify in writing the reason for such requirement.

“(3) RISK-BASED CONTRACTING.—The head of an agency shall establish a risk-based sampling approach under which the submission of certified cost or pricing data may be required for a risk-based sample of contracts, the price of which is expected to exceed the dollar amount in subsection (a)(1)(A)(ii), but not the amount in subsection (a)(1)(A)(i). The authority to require certified cost or pricing data under this paragraph shall not apply to any contract of an offeror that has not been awarded, for at least the one-year period preceding the issuance of a solicitation for the contract, any other contract in excess of the amount in subsection (a)(1)(A)(i) under which the offeror was required to submit certified cost or pricing data under this section.

“(4) EXCEPTION.—The head of the procuring activity may not require certified cost or pricing data to be submitted under this subsection for any contract or subcontract, or modification of a contract or subcontract, covered by the exceptions in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1).

“(5) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY PROHIBITED.—The head of a procuring activity may not delegate functions under this subsection.”

SEC. 824. LIMITATION ON USE OF REVERSE AUCTION AND LOWEST PRICE TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE CONTRACTING METHODS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended—

(1) to prohibit the use by the Department of Defense of reverse auction or lowest price technically acceptable contracting methods for the procurement of personal protective equipment where the level of quality or failure of the item could result in combat casualties; and

(2) to establish a preference for the use of best value contracting methods for the procurement of such equipment.

SEC. 825. RIGHTS IN TECHNICAL DATA.

(a) RIGHTS IN TECHNICAL DATA RELATING TO MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEMS.—Paragraph (2) of section 2321(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) In the case of a challenge to a use or release restriction that is asserted with respect to technical data of a contractor or subcontractor for a major system or a subsystem or component thereof on the basis that the major weapon system, subsystem, or component was developed exclusively at private expense—

“(A) the presumption in paragraph (1) shall apply—

“(i) with regard to a commercial subsystem or component of a major system, if the major system was acquired as a commercial item in accordance with section 2379(a) of this title;

“(ii) with regard to a component of a subsystem, if the subsystem was acquired as a com-

mercial item in accordance with section 2379(b) of this title; and

“(iii) with regard to any other component, if the component is a commercially available off-the-shelf item or a commercially available off-the-shelf item with modifications of a type customarily available in the commercial marketplace or minor modifications made to meet Federal Government requirements; and

“(B) in all other cases, the challenge to the use or release restriction shall be sustained unless information provided by the contractor or subcontractor demonstrates that the item was developed exclusively at private expense.”

(b) GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY ADVISORY PANEL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, shall establish a government-industry advisory panel for the purpose of reviewing sections 2320 and 2321 of title 10, United States Code, regarding rights in technical data and the validation of proprietary data restrictions and the regulations implementing such sections, for the purpose of ensuring that such statutory and regulatory requirements are best structured to serve the interests of the taxpayers and the national defense.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The panel shall be chaired by an individual selected by the Under Secretary, and the Under Secretary shall ensure that—

(A) the government members of the advisory panel are knowledgeable about technical data issues and appropriately represent the three military departments, as well as the legal, acquisition, logistics, and research and development communities in the Department of Defense; and

(B) the private sector members of the advisory panel include independent experts and individuals appropriately representative of the diversity of interested parties, including large and small businesses, traditional and non-traditional government contractors, prime contractors and subcontractors, suppliers of hardware and software, and institutions of higher education.

(3) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—In conducting the review required by paragraph (1), the advisory panel shall give appropriate consideration to the following factors:

(A) Ensuring that the Department of Defense does not pay more than once for the same work.

(B) Ensuring that Department of Defense contractors are appropriately rewarded for their innovation and invention.

(C) Providing for cost-effective repurchase, sustainment, modification, and upgrades to Department of Defense systems.

(D) Encouraging the private sector to invest in new products, technologies, and processes relevant to the missions of the Department of Defense.

(E) Ensuring that the Department of Defense has appropriate access to innovative products, technologies, and processes developed by the private sector for commercial use.

(4) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the advisory panel shall submit its final report and recommendations to the Secretary of Defense. Not later than 60 days after receiving the report, the Secretary shall submit a copy of the report, together with any comments or recommendations, to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 826. PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES FOR EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES.

(a) ADDITIONAL PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 2373 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “transportation, energy, medical, space-flight,” before “and aeronautical supplies”.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CHAPTER 137 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking “only when such purchases are made in quantity” and inserting “only when such purchases are made in quantities greater than necessary for experimentation, technical evaluation, assessment of operational utility, or safety or to provide a residual operational capability”.

SEC. 827. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE PRODUCTS AND SERVICES PRODUCED IN COUNTRIES ALONG A MAJOR ROUTE OF SUPPLY TO AFGHANISTAN.

Section 801(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2399), as most recently amended by section 832(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 814), is further amended by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”.

SEC. 828. REPORTING RELATED TO FAILURE OF CONTRACTORS TO MEET GOALS UNDER NEGOTIATED COMPREHENSIVE SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLANS.

Paragraph (2) of section 834(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (15 U.S.C. 637 note), as added by section 821(d)(2) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3434) is amended by striking “may not negotiate” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “shall report to Congress on any negotiated comprehensive subcontracting plan that the Secretary determines did not meet the subcontracting goals negotiated in the plan for the prior fiscal year.”

SEC. 829. COMPETITION FOR RELIGIOUS SERVICES CONTRACTS.

The Department of Defense may not preclude a non-profit organization from competing for a contract for religious related services on a United States military installation.

SEC. 830. TREATMENT OF INTERAGENCY AND STATE AND LOCAL PURCHASES WHEN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTS AS CONTRACT INTERMEDIARY FOR THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

Contracts executed by the Department of Defense as a result of the transfer of contracts from the General Services Administration or for which the Department serves as an item manager for products on behalf of the General Services Administration shall not be subject to requirements under chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code, to the extent such contracts are for purchases of products by other Federal agencies or State or local governments.

SEC. 831. PILOT PROGRAM FOR STREAMLINING AWARDS FOR INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS.

(a) EXCEPTION FROM CERTIFIED COST AND PRICING DATE REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements under section 2306a(a) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to a contract, subcontract, or modification of a contract or subcontract valued at less than \$7,500,000 awarded to a small business or non-traditional defense contractor pursuant to—

(1) a technical merit based selection procedure, such as a broad agency announcement; or

(2) the Small Business Innovation Research Program, unless the head of the agency determines that submission of cost and pricing data should be required based on past performance of the specific small business or non-traditional defense contractor, or based on analysis of other information specific to the award.

(b) EXCEPTION FROM RECORDS EXAMINATION REQUIREMENT.—The requirements under section

2313 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to a contract valued at less than \$7,500,000 awarded to a small business or non-traditional defense contractor pursuant to—

(1) a technical merit based selection procedure, such as a broad agency announcement; or

(2) the Small Business Innovation Research Program,

unless the head of the agency determines that auditing of records should be required based on past performance of the specific small business or non-traditional defense contractor, or based on analysis of other information specific to the award.

(c) SUNSET.—The exceptions under subsections (a) and (b) shall terminate on October 1, 2020.

Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs

SEC. 841. ACQUISITION STRATEGY REQUIRED FOR EACH MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAM.

(a) CONSOLIDATION OF REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ACQUISITION STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2431 the following new section:

“§2431a. Acquisition strategy

“(A) REQUIREMENT.—(1) There shall be an acquisition strategy for each major defense acquisition program. The acquisition strategy, which includes a sustainment strategy, for a major defense acquisition program shall be reviewed by the milestone decision authority for the program at each time specified in paragraph (2). The milestone decision authority may approve, disapprove, or revise the acquisition strategy at any such time.

“(2) The times at which the acquisition strategy for a major defense acquisition program shall be reviewed by the milestone decision authority for the program under paragraph (1) are the following:

“(A) Program initiation.

“(B) Each subsequent milestone.

“(C) Full-Rate Production Decision Review.

“(D) Any other time considered relevant by the milestone decision authority.

“(b) GUIDANCE.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall issue policies and procedures governing the contents of, and the review and approval process for, the acquisition strategy for a major defense acquisition program.

“(c) CONTENTS.—The acquisition strategy for a major defense acquisition program shall present a top-level description of the business and technical management approach designed to achieve the objectives of the program within the resource constraints imposed. The strategy shall be tailored to address program requirements and constraints, and shall express the program manager's approach to the program in sufficient detail to allow the milestone decision authority to assess the viability of approach, method of implementation of laws and policies, and program objectives. Subject to guidance issued pursuant to subsection (b), each acquisition strategy shall address the following:

“(1) An acquisition approach, including industrial base considerations in accordance with section 2440 of this title, and consideration of alternative acquisition approaches.

“(2) A risk management strategy, addressing cost, schedule, and technical risk.

“(3) An approach to ensuring the maturity of technologies and avoiding unnecessary or excessive concurrency.

“(4) A strategy for dividing the acquisition into increments or spirals, and continuously adopting commercial and defense technologies, where appropriate.

“(5) A business strategy, including measures to ensure continuing competition in through the life of the acquisition program.

“(6) A contracting strategy addressing the selection of sources, contract types, and small business participation.

“(7) An intellectual property strategy, in accordance with section 2320 of this title.

“(8) An approach to international involvement, including foreign military sales and cooperative opportunities, in accordance with section 2350a of this title.

“(9) A sustainment strategy which includes all aspects of the total life cycle management of the weapon system, including product support, logistics, product support engineering, supply chain integration, maintenance, acquisition logistics, and all aspects of software sustainment.

“(d) INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATE.—The Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation shall perform an evaluation of the sustainment portion of the acquisition strategy required by subsection (c)(9) prior to the Milestone B decision.

“(e) In this section, the term ‘milestone decision authority’, with respect to a major defense acquisition program, means the official within the Department of Defense designated with the overall responsibility and authority for acquisition decisions for the program, including authority to approve entry of the program into the next phase of the acquisition process.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2431 the following new item:

“2431a. Acquisition strategy.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 2350a(e) of such title is amended—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “DOCUMENT”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “the Under Secretary of Defense for” and all that follows through “of the Board” and inserting “opportunities for such cooperative research and development shall be addressed in the acquisition strategy for the project”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “document” and inserting “discussion”; and

(II) by striking “include” and inserting “consider”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “A statement indicating whether” and inserting “Whether”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics”; and

(II) by striking “of the United States under consideration by the Department of Defense”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking “The” and inserting “A”; and

(II) by striking “of the Under Secretary” and inserting “to the milestone decision authority”.

(2) Section 803 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314; 10 U.S.C. 2430 note) is repealed.

SEC. 842. RISK REDUCTION IN MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) GUIDANCE ON RISK REDUCTION IN MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the acquisition strategy developed pursuant to section 2431a of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 841, for each major defense acquisition program for which development activities are required includes the following elements:

(1) A comprehensive approach to continuously identifying and addressing risk (including technical, cost, and schedule risk) beginning at program initiation and continuing until the start of full rate production as a means to improve pro-

grammatic decision making and appropriately minimize and manage program concurrency.

(2) Documentation of the major sources of risk identified and the approach to retiring that risk.

(b) ELEMENTS OF COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO RISK REDUCTION.—The comprehensive approach to identifying and addressing risk for purposes of subsection (a)(1) shall include some combination of the following elements as appropriate for the item or system being acquired:

(1) Development planning.

(2) Systems engineering.

(3) Integrated developmental and operational testing.

(4) Preliminary and critical design reviews and technical reviews.

(5) Prototyping (including prototyping at the system or subsystem level and competitive prototyping, where appropriate).

(6) Modeling and simulation.

(7) Technology demonstrations and technology off ramps.

(8) Manufacturability and industrial base availability.

(9) Multiple design approaches.

(10) Alternative, lower risk reduced performance designs.

(11) Schedule and funding margins for or specific risks.

(12) Independent risk element assessments by outside subject matter experts.

(13) Program phasing to address high risk areas as early as possible.

(c) PREFERENCE FOR PROTOTYPING.—To the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the economical use of available financial resources, the milestone decision authority for each major defense acquisition program shall ensure that the acquisition strategy for the program provides for—

(1) the production of competitive prototypes at the system or subsystem level before Milestone B approval; or

(2) if the production of competitive prototypes is not practicable, the production of single prototypes at the system or subsystem level.

(d) REPEAL OF MANDATORY PROTOTYPING PROVISION.—Section 203 of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23; 10 U.S.C. 2430 note) is repealed.

SEC. 843. DESIGNATION OF MILESTONE DECISION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2430 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d)(1) The milestone decision authority for major defense acquisition programs shall be the service acquisition executive of the military service that is managing the program, unless the Secretary of Defense designates another official to serve as the milestone decision authority.

“(2) The Secretary of Defense may designate an alternate milestone decision authority in programs where—

“(A) the Secretary determines that the program is addressing a joint requirement;

“(B) the Secretary determines that the program is best managed by a defense agency;

“(C) the program has incurred a unit cost increase greater than the significant cost threshold or critical cost threshold under section 2433 of this title;

“(D) the program has failed to develop an acquisition program baseline within 2 years of program initiation;

“(E) the program is critical to a major inter-agency requirement or technology development effort, or has significant international partner involvement; or

“(F) the Secretary certifies that an alternate official serving as the milestone decision authority will best position the program to achieve desired cost, schedule, and performance outcomes.

“(3)(A) The Secretary of Defense may redelegate the position of milestone decision authority

for a program designated above upon request of the Secretary of the military department concerned. A decision on redelegation must be made within 180 days of the request of the Secretary of the military department concerned.

“(B) If the Secretary of Defense denies the request for redelegation, the Secretary shall certify to the congressional defense committees that an alternate official serving as milestone decision authority will best position the program to achieve desired cost, schedule, and performance outcomes. No such redelegation is authorized after a program has incurred a unit cost increase greater than the significant cost threshold or critical cost threshold under section 2433 of this title, except for exceptional circumstances.

“(4) For major defense acquisition programs where the service acquisition executive of the military service that is managing the program is the milestone decision authority—

“(A) the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that no documentation is required outside of the military service organization, without a determination by the Deputy Chief Management Officer that the documentation supports a specific statutory requirement and is implemented in a manner that will not result in program delays or increased costs, and no acquisition programmatic approvals shall be required outside of the military service organization, with the exception of approval of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Test and Evaluation Master Plan; and

“(B) the Secretary of the military department concerned and the chief of the Armed Force concerned shall, in each Selected Acquisition Report required under section 2432 of this title, certify that program requirements are stable and funding is adequate to meet cost, schedule, and performance objectives for the program and identify and report to the congressional defense committees on any increased risk to the program since the last report.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 133(b)(5) of such title is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that the Under Secretary shall exercise only advisory authority over service acquisition programs for which the service acquisition executive is the milestone decision authority”.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for implementing subsection (d) of section 2430 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) GUIDANCE.—The Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and the service acquisition executives, shall issue guidance to ensure that by not later than October 1, 2016, the acquisition policy, guidance, and practices of the Department of Defense conform to the requirements of subsection (d) of section 2430 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section. The guidance shall be designed to ensure a streamlined decision-making and approval process and to minimize any information requests, consistent with the requirement of paragraph (4)(A) of such subsection (d).

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on October 1, 2016.

SEC. 844. REVISION OF MILESTONE A DECISION AUTHORITY RESPONSIBILITIES FOR MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) REVISION TO MILESTONE A REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2366a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2366a. Major defense acquisition programs: responsibilities at Milestone A approval

“(a) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Before granting Milestone A approval for a major defense acquisition program or a major subprogram, the milestone decision authority for the program or subprogram shall ensure that—

“(1) information about the program or subprogram is sufficient to warrant entry of the program or subprogram into the risk reduction phase;

“(2) the Secretary of the relevant military department and the chief of the relevant military service concur in cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance trade-offs that have been made with regard to the program; and

“(3) there are sound plans for progression of the program or subprogram to the development phase.

“(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the milestone decision authority shall take appropriate action to ensure that—

“(1) the program or subprogram—

“(A) meets a joint military requirement and responds to an anticipated or likely threat;

“(B) has been developed in light of appropriate market research and a review of alternative approaches and does not unnecessarily duplicate a capability already provided by an existing system; and

“(C) is affordable in light of cost estimates developed pursuant to the guidance of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation; and

“(2) the acquisition strategy for the program or subprogram—

“(A) identifies areas of risk and, for each such identified area of risk, includes a plan to reduce the risk;

“(B) addresses planning for sustainment; and

“(C) complies with the requirements of section 2431a of this title and the policies and procedures implementing such section; and

“(3) the program or subprogram meets any other considerations the milestone decision authority considers relevant.

“(c) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after granting Milestone A approval for a major defense acquisition program or major subprogram, the milestone decision authority for that program or subprogram shall submit to the congressional defense committees notice of the approval in writing. The milestone decision authority’s decision memorandum with respect to such approval shall be available to the congressional defense committees upon request, consistent with any relevant classification requirements.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘major defense acquisition program’ means a Department of Defense acquisition program that is a major defense acquisition program for purposes of section 2430 of this title.

“(2) The term ‘major subprogram’ means a major subprogram of a major defense acquisition program designated under section 2430a(a)(1) of this title.

“(3) The term ‘milestone decision authority’, with respect to a major defense acquisition program or a major subprogram, means the official within the Department of Defense designated with the overall responsibility and authority for acquisitions decisions for the program or subprogram, including authority to approve entry of the program or subprogram into the next phase of the acquisition process.

“(4) The term ‘Milestone A approval’ means a decision to enter into a risk reduction phase pursuant to guidance prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for the management of Department of Defense acquisition programs.

“(5) The term ‘joint military requirement’ has the meaning given that term in section 181(g)(1) of this title.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 139 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2366a and inserting the following:

“2366a. Major defense acquisition programs: responsibilities at Milestone A approval.”.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS IN MAKING MILESTONE A DETERMINATIONS.—In making a Milestone A determination pursuant to section 2366a of title 10, United States Code, the milestone decision authority shall include consideration of the following:

(1) With respect to joint military requirements, the factors outlined under section 181(b) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) With respect to alternative approaches, the factors outlined under section 201(a) of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note).

(3) With respect to affordability and cost estimates and analyses, the factors outlined under section 2334(a) of title 10, United States Code.

(4) With respect to risk, the factors outlined under—

(A) section 138b(b) of title 10, United States Code; and

(B) section 842.

(5) With respect to sustainment, the factors outlined under section 2337 and section 2464 of this title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 845. REVISION OF MILESTONE B DECISION AUTHORITY RESPONSIBILITIES FOR MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) REVISION TO MILESTONE B REQUIREMENTS.—Section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2366b. Major defense acquisition programs: certification required before Milestone B approval

“(a) CERTIFICATION.—A major defense acquisition program may not receive Milestone B approval until the milestone decision authority certifies that the technology in the program has been demonstrated in a relevant environment, as determined by the Milestone Decision Authority on the basis of an independent review and assessment by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, in consultation with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation.

“(b) DETERMINATION.—A major defense acquisition program may not receive Milestone B approval until the milestone decision authority determines that appropriate steps have been taken to ensure that—

“(1) the program is affordable when considering the ability of the Department of Defense to accomplish the program’s mission using alternative systems;

“(2) trade-offs among cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance objectives have been made to ensure that the program is affordable when considering the per unit cost and the total acquisition cost in the context of the total resources available during the period covered by the future-years defense program submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made;

“(3) the Secretary of the relevant military department and the chief of the relevant military service concur in the trade-offs made in accordance with paragraph (2);

“(4) reasonable cost and schedule estimates have been developed to execute, with the concurrence of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, the product development and production plan under the program;

“(5) funding is available to execute the product development and production plan under the

program, through the period covered by the future-years defense program submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made, consistent with the estimates described in paragraph (4) for the program;

“(6) market research has been conducted prior to technology development to reduce duplication of existing technology and products;

“(7) the Department of Defense has completed an analysis of alternatives and a business case analysis with respect to the program;

“(8) the Joint Requirements Oversight Council has accomplished its duties with respect to the program pursuant to section 181(b) of this title, including an analysis of the operational requirements for the program;

“(9) life-cycle sustainment planning, including corrosion prevention and mitigation planning, has identified and evaluated relevant sustainment costs throughout development, production, operation, sustainment, and disposal of the program, and any alternatives, and that such costs are reasonable and have been accurately estimated;

“(10) an estimate has been made of the requirements for core logistics capabilities and the associated sustaining workloads required to support such requirements;

“(11) there is a plan to mitigate and account for any costs in connection with any anticipated de-certification of cryptographic systems and components during the production and procurement of the major defense acquisition program to be acquired;

“(12) a preliminary design review or assessment of engineering design knowledge of the system has been satisfactorily completed; and

“(13) the program complies with all relevant policies, regulations, and directives of the Department of Defense.

“(c) **CHANGES TO CERTIFICATION.**—(1) The program manager for a major defense acquisition program that has received milestone B approval under this section shall immediately notify the milestone decision authority of any changes to the program or a designated major subprogram of such program that—

“(A) alter the substantive basis for the certification of the milestone decision authority under subsection (a) or any element of the determination of the milestone decision authority under subsection (b); or

“(B) otherwise cause the program or subprogram to deviate significantly from the material provided to the milestone decision authority in support of such certification or determination.

“(2) Upon receipt of information under paragraph (1), the milestone decision authority may withdraw the certification or determination concerned or rescind Milestone B approval if the milestone decision authority determines that such certification, determination, or approval is no longer valid.

“(d) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—(1) The certification required under subsection (a) and the determination under subsection (b) with respect to a major defense acquisition program shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees with the first Selected Acquisition Report submitted under section 2432 of this title after completion of the certification.

“(2) A summary of any information provided to the milestone decision authority pursuant to subsection (c) and a description of the actions taken as a result of such information shall be submitted with the first Selected Acquisition Report submitted under section 2432 of this title after receipt of such information by the milestone decision authority.

“(e) **WAIVER FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.**—(1) The milestone decision authority may waive the applicability to a major defense acquisition program of the certification requirement in subsection (a) or one or more components of the de-

termination requirement in subsection (b) if the milestone decision authority determines that, but for such a waiver, the Department would be unable to meet critical national security objectives.

“(2) Whenever the milestone decision authority makes such a determination and authorizes such a waiver the waiver, the determination, and the reasons for the determination shall be submitted in writing to the congressional defense committees within 30 days after the waiver is authorized.

“(f) **NONDELEGATION.**—The milestone decision authority may not delegate the certification requirement under subsection (a), the determination requirement under subsection (b), or the authority to waive any component of such requirement under subsection (e).

“(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘major defense acquisition program’ means a Department of Defense acquisition program that is a major defense acquisition program for purposes of section 2430 of this title.

“(2) The term ‘designated major subprogram’ means a major subprogram of a major defense acquisition program designated under section 2430a(a)(1) of this title.

“(3) The term ‘milestone decision authority’, with respect to a major defense acquisition program, means the individual within the Department of Defense designated with overall responsibility for the program.

“(4) The term ‘Milestone B approval’ has the meaning provided that term in section 2366(e)(7) of this title.

“(5) The term ‘core logistics capabilities’ means the core logistics capabilities identified under section 2464(a) of this title.”.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS IN MAKING MILESTONE B DETERMINATIONS.**—In making a Milestone B determination pursuant to section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, the milestone decision authority shall review the acquisition strategy required by section 2431a of title 10, as added by section 841 of this Act and include consideration of the following:

(1) With respect to affordability, the factors outlined under section 2334 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) With respect to risk, the factors outlined under—

(A) section 842; and
(B) section 138b(b) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) With respect to fulfilling a joint military requirement, the factors outlined under section 181 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) With respect to competition—

(A) the factors outlined under section 202 of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23; 10 U.S.C. 2430 note); and

(B) the requirements of section 2304 of title 10, United States Code.

(5) With respect to sustainment, the factors outlined under section 2337 and section 2464 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) **CONFORMING CHANGE.**—Section 2334(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (6)(A)(i) by striking “any certification under” and inserting in lieu thereof “any decision to grant milestone approval pursuant to”.

SEC. 846. TENURE AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF PROGRAM MANAGERS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT PERIODS.

(a) **REVISED GUIDANCE REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall revise Department of Defense guidance for defense acquisition programs to address the tenure and accountability of program managers for the program development period of defense acquisition programs.

(b) **PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT PERIOD.**—For the purpose of this section, the term “program de-

velopment period” refers to the period before a decision on Milestone B approval (or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program).

(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The revised guidance required by subsection (a) shall provide that the program manager for the program development period of a defense acquisition program is responsible for—

(1) bringing to maturity the technologies and manufacturing processes that will be needed to carry out the program;

(2) ensuring continuing focus during program development on meeting stated mission requirements and other requirements of the Department of Defense;

(3) making trade-offs between program cost, schedule, and performance for the life-cycle of the program;

(4) developing a business case for the program; and

(5) ensuring that appropriate information is available to the milestone decision authority to make a decision on Milestone B approval (or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program), including information necessary to make the certification required by section 2366a of title 10, United States Code.

(d) **QUALIFICATIONS, RESOURCES, AND TENURE.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each program manager for the program development period of a defense acquisition program—

(1) has the appropriate management, engineering, technical, and financial expertise needed to meet the responsibilities assigned pursuant to subsection (c);

(2) is provided the resources and support (including systems engineering expertise, cost estimating expertise, and software development expertise) needed to meet such responsibilities; and

(3) is assigned to the program manager position for such program until such time as such program is ready for a decision on Milestone B approval (or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program), unless removed for cause or due to exceptional circumstances.

SEC. 847. TENURE AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF PROGRAM MANAGERS FOR PROGRAM EXECUTION PERIODS.

(a) **REVISED GUIDANCE REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall revise Department of Defense guidance for defense acquisition programs to address the tenure and accountability of program managers for the program execution period of defense acquisition programs.

(b) **PROGRAM EXECUTION PERIOD.**—For purposes of this section, the term “program execution period” refers to the period after Milestone B approval (or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program).

(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The revised guidance required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) require the program manager for the program execution period of a defense acquisition program to enter into a performance agreement with the milestone decision authority for such program within six months of assignment, that—

(A) establishes expected parameters for the cost, schedule, and performance of the program consistent with the business case for the program;

(B) provides the commitment of the milestone decision authority to provide the level of funding and resources required to meet such parameters; and

(C) provides the assurance of the program manager that such parameters are achievable and that the program manager will be accountable for meeting such parameters; and

(2) provide the program manager with the authority to—

(A) veto the addition of new program requirements that would be inconsistent with the parameters established in the performance agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1), subject to the authority of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to override the veto based on critical national security reasons;

(B) make trade-offs between cost, schedule, and performance, provided that such trade-offs are consistent with the parameters established in the performance agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1);

(C) redirect funding within such program, to the extent necessary to achieve the parameters established in the performance agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1);

(D) develop such interim goals and milestones as may be required to achieve the parameters established in the performance agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(E) use program funds to recruit and hire such technical experts as may be required to carry out the program, if necessary expertise is not otherwise provided by the Department of Defense.

(d) **QUALIFICATIONS, RESOURCES, AND TENURE.**—The Secretary shall ensure that each program manager for the program execution period of a defense acquisition program—

(1) has the appropriate management, engineering, technical, and financial expertise needed to meet the responsibilities assigned pursuant to subsection (c);

(2) is provided the resources and support (including systems engineering expertise, cost estimating expertise, and software development expertise) needed to meet such responsibilities; and

(3) is assigned to the program manager position for such program at the time of Milestone B approval (or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program) and continues in such position until the delivery of the first production units of the program, unless removed for cause or due to exceptional circumstances.

(e) **LIMITED WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may waive the requirement in paragraph (3) of subsection (d) that a program manager for the program execution period of a defense acquisition program serve in that position until the delivery of the first production units of such program upon submitting to the congressional defense committees a written determination that—

(1) the program is so complex, and the delivery of the first production units will take so long, that it would not be feasible for a single individual to serve as program manager for the entire period covered by such paragraph; and

(2) the complexity of the program, and length of time that will be required to deliver the first production units, are not the result of a failure to meet the certification requirements under section 2366a of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 848. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR STAND-ALONE MANPOWER ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) **REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT.**—Subsection (a)(1) of section 2434 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “and a manpower estimate for the program have” and inserting “has”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO REGULATIONS.**—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2);

(2) by striking “shall require—” and all that follows through “that the independent” and inserting “shall require that the independent”;

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, and moving those paragraphs, as so redesignated, two ems to the left; and

(4) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “and operations and support,” and inserting “operations and support, and manpower to operate, maintain, and support the program upon full operational deployment,”; and

(B) by striking “; and” and inserting a period.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **SECTION HEADING.**—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§2434. Independent cost estimates”.

(2) **TABLE OF SECTIONS.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 144 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2434 and inserting the following:

“2434. Independent cost estimates.”.

SEC. 849. PENALTY FOR COST OVERRUNS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 2015, the Secretary of each military department shall pay a penalty for cost overruns on the covered major defense acquisition programs of the military department.

(b) **CALCULATION OF PENALTY.**—For the purposes of this section:

(1) The amount of the cost overrun or underrun on any major defense acquisition program or subprogram in a fiscal year is the difference between the current program acquisition unit cost for the program or subprogram and the program acquisition unit cost for the program as shown in the original Baseline Estimate for the program or subprogram, multiplied by the quantity of items to be purchased under the program or subprogram, as reported in the final Selected Acquisition Report for the fiscal year in accordance with section 2432 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Cost overruns or underruns for covered major defense acquisition programs that are joint programs of more than one military department shall be allocated among the military departments in percentages determined by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

(3) The cumulative amount of cost overruns for a military department in a fiscal year is the sum of the cost overruns and cost underruns for all covered major defense acquisition programs of the department in the fiscal year (including cost overruns or underruns allocated to the military department in accordance with paragraph (2)).

(4) The cost overrun penalty for a military department in a fiscal year is three percent of the cumulative amount of cost overruns of the military department in the fiscal year, as determined pursuant to paragraph (3), except that the cost overrun penalty may not be a negative amount.

(c) **TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **REDUCTION OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION ACCOUNTS.**—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 2015, the Secretary of each military department shall reduce each research, development, test, and evaluation account of the military department by the percentage determined under paragraph (2), and remit such amount to the Secretary of Defense.

(2) **DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.**—The percentage reduction to research, development, test, and evaluation accounts of a military department referred to in paragraph (1) is the percentage reduction to such accounts necessary to equal the cost overrun penalty for the fiscal year for such department determined pursuant to subsection (b)(4).

(3) **CREDITING OF FUNDS.**—Any amount remitted under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the Rapid Prototyping Fund established pursuant to section 803 of this Act.

(d) **COVERED PROGRAMS.**—A major defense acquisition program is covered under this section

if the original Baseline Estimate was established for such program under section 2435(d) (1) or (2) on or after the date of the enactment of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23).

SEC. 850. STREAMLINING OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING REGARDING MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) **REPORTING TO UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ACQUISITION, TECHNOLOGY, AND LOGISTICS BEFORE MILESTONE B APPROVAL.**—Subparagraph (A) of paragraph (8) of section 138(b) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 901(h)(2) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3466), is further amended—

(1) by striking “periodically”;

(2) by striking “the major defense acquisition programs” and inserting “each major defense acquisition program”;

(3) by inserting “before the Milestone B approval for that program” after “Department of Defense”; and

(4) by striking “such reviews and assessments” and inserting “such review and assessment”.

(b) **ANNUAL REPORT TO SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.**—Subparagraph (B) of such paragraph is amended by inserting “for which a Milestone B approval occurred during the preceding fiscal year” after “Department of Defense”.

SEC. 851. CONFIGURATION STEERING BOARDS FOR COST CONTROL UNDER MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

Section 814(c)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4529) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after “for the following:” the following new subparagraph:

“(A) Monitoring changes in program requirements and ensuring all such changes receive the approval of the Chief of the relevant military service, in consultation with the Secretary of the relevant military department.”.

SEC. 852. SUSTAINMENT ENHANCEMENT.

(a) **ASSESSMENT EXPANSION OF FUNCTIONS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR LOGISTICS AND MATERIEL READINESS TO INCLUDE SUSTAINMENT FUNCTIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of—

(1) assigning to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness—

(A) functions relating to the sustainment strategy required under section 2431a(c)(9) of Title 10, United States Code, as added by section 841 of this Act; and

(B) functions relating to manufacturing and industrial base policy currently being carried out within the Office of the Secretary of Defense; and

(2) redesignating such Assistant Secretary (with such functions so assigned and together with the current logistics and materiel readiness functions of such Assistant Secretary) as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Department of Defense does not place sufficient emphasis on sustainment of a weapon system during the entire acquisition process; and

(2) the Department of Defense should address this deficiency and ensure that all aspect of

weapon system sustainment are carefully considered throughout the entire Integrated Defense Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics Life Cycle Management System.

Subtitle D—Provisions Relating to Commercial Items

SEC. 861. INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS AND REGULATIONS TO THE ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS AND COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE OFF-THE-SHELF ITEMS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 2375 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2375. Relationship of commercial item provisions to other provisions of law

“(a) APPLICABILITY OF GOVERNMENT-WIDE STATUTES.—(1) No contract for the procurement of a commercial item entered into by the head of an agency shall be subject to any law properly listed in the Federal Acquisition Regulation pursuant to section 1906(b) of title 41.

“(2) No subcontract under a contract for the procurement of a commercial item entered into by the head of an agency shall be subject to any law properly listed in the Federal Acquisition Regulation pursuant to section 1906(c) of title 41.

“(3) No contract for the procurement of a commercially available off-the-shelf item entered into by the head of an agency shall be subject to any law properly listed in the Federal Acquisition Regulation pursuant to section 1907 of title 41.

“(b) APPLICABILITY OF DEFENSE-UNIQUE STATUTES TO CONTRACTS FOR COMMERCIAL ITEMS.—(1) The Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement shall include a list of defense-unique provisions of law that are inapplicable to contracts for the procurement of commercial items. A provision of law properly included on the list pursuant to paragraph (2) does not apply to purchases of commercial items by the Department of Defense. This section does not render a provision of law not included on the list inapplicable to contracts for the procurement of commercial items.

“(2) A provision of law described in subsection (e) that is enacted after January 1, 2015, shall be included on the list of inapplicable provisions of law required by paragraph (1) unless the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics makes a written determination that it would not be in the best interest of the Department of Defense to exempt contracts for the procurement of commercial items from the applicability of the provision.

“(c) APPLICABILITY OF DEFENSE-UNIQUE STATUTES TO SUBCONTRACTS FOR COMMERCIAL ITEMS.—(1) The Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement shall include a list of provisions of law that are inapplicable to subcontracts under a Department of Defense contract or subcontract for the procurement of commercial items. A provision of law properly included on the list pursuant to paragraph (2) does not apply to those subcontracts. This section does not render a provision of law not included on the list inapplicable to subcontracts under a contract for the procurement of commercial items.

“(2) A provision of law described in subsection (e) shall be included on the list of inapplicable provisions of law required by paragraph (1) unless the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics makes a written determination that it would not be in the best interest of the Department of Defense to exempt subcontracts under a contract for the procurement of commercial items from the applicability of the provision.

“(3) In this subsection, the term ‘subcontract’ includes a transfer of commercial items between divisions, subsidiaries, or affiliates of a con-

tractor or subcontractor. The term does not include agreements entered into by a contractor for the supply of commodities that are intended for use in the performance of multiple contracts with the Department of Defense and other parties and are not identifiable to any particular contract.

“(4) This subsection does not authorize the waiver of the applicability of any provision of law with respect to any first-tier subcontract under a contract with a prime contractor reselling or distributing commercial items of another contractor without adding value.

“(d) APPLICABILITY OF DEFENSE-UNIQUE STATUTES TO CONTRACTS FOR COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE, OFF-THE-SHELF ITEMS.—(1) The Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement shall include a list of provisions of law that are inapplicable to contracts for the procurement of commercially available off-the-shelf items. A provision of law properly included on the list pursuant to paragraph (2) does not apply to Department of Defense contracts for the procurement of commercially available off-the-shelf items. This section does not render a provision of law not included on the list inapplicable to contracts for the procurement of commercially available off-the-shelf items.

“(2) A provision of law described in subsection (e) shall be included on the list of inapplicable provisions of law required by paragraph (1) unless the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics makes a written determination that it would not be in the best interest of the Department of Defense to exempt contracts for the procurement of commercially available off-the-shelf items from the applicability of the provision.

“(e) COVERED PROVISION OF LAW.—A provision of law referred to in subsections (b)(2), (c)(2), and (d)(2) is a provision of law that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics determines sets forth policies, procedures, requirements, or restrictions for the procurement of property or services by the Federal Government, except for a provision of law that—

“(1) provides for criminal or civil penalties; or

“(2) specifically refers to this section and provides that, notwithstanding this section, it shall be applicable to contracts for the procurement of commercial items.”

(b) CHANGES TO DEFENSE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION SUPPLEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall ensure that—

(A) the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement does not require the inclusion of contract clauses in contracts for the procurement of commercial items or contracts for the procurement of commercially available off-the-shelf items, unless such clauses are—

(i) required to implement provisions of law or executive orders applicable to such contracts; or

(ii) determined to be consistent with standard commercial practice; and

(B) the flow-down of contract clauses to subcontracts under contracts for the procurement of commercial items or commercially available off-the-shelf items is prohibited unless such flow-down is required to implement provisions of law or executive orders applicable to such subcontracts.

(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—In this subsection, the term “subcontract” includes a transfer of commercial items between divisions, subsidiaries, or affiliates of a contractor or subcontractor. The term does not include agreements entered into by a contractor for the supply of commodities that are intended for use in the performance of multiple contracts with the Department of Defense and other parties and are not identifiable to any particular contract.

(c) REPORT ON INCLUSION OF CONTRACT CLAUSES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report listing all standard contract clauses included in contracts awarded using commercial acquisition procedures under part 12 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, including a justification for the inclusion of each such clause.

SEC. 862. MARKET RESEARCH AND PREFERENCE FOR COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

(a) GUIDANCE REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall issue guidance to ensure that acquisition officials of the Department of Defense fully comply with the requirements of section 2377 of title 10, United States Code, regarding market research and commercial items. The guidance issued pursuant to this subsection shall, at a minimum—

(1) provide that the head of an agency may not enter into a contract in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold for information technology products or services that are not commercial items unless the head of the agency determines in writing that no commercial items are suitable to meet the agency's needs as provided in subsection (c)(2) of such section; and

(2) ensure that market research conducted in accordance with subsection (c) of such section is used, where appropriate, to inform price reasonableness determinations.

(b) REVIEW REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, shall review Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3170.01, the Manual for the Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System, and other documents governing the requirements development process and revise these documents as necessary to ensure that the Department of Defense fully complies with the requirement in section 2377(c) of title 10, United States Code, and section 10.001 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation for Federal agencies to conduct appropriate market research before developing new requirements.

(c) MARKET RESEARCH DEFINED.—For the purposes of this section, the term “market research” means a review of existing systems, subsystems, capabilities, and technologies that are available or could be made available to meet the needs of the Department of Defense in whole or in part. The review may include any of the techniques for conducting market research provided in section 10.002(b)(2) of the Federal Acquisition Regulation and shall include, at a minimum, contacting knowledgeable individuals in Government and industry regarding existing market capabilities.

SEC. 863. CONTINUING VALIDITY OF COMMERCIAL ITEM DETERMINATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement shall be modified to address the validity of commercial item determinations for multiple procurements.

(b) REQUIRED ELEMENTS.—The modification required by paragraph (1) shall, at a minimum—

(1) provide that a written determination by an authorized agency official that an item is a commercial item for the purposes of section 2306a of title 10, United States Code, shall be presumed to be valid for any subsequent procurement unless the contracting officer for such procurement determines in writing that the earlier determination was made in error or was based on inadequate information; and

(2) establish a process by which the contractor may appeal a determination by a contracting officer that an earlier determination was made in error or was based on inadequate information to the head of contracting for the agency.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the contracting officer for the procurement of a commercial item from requiring the contractor to supply information that is sufficient to determine the reasonableness of price, regardless whether or not the contractor was required to provide such information in connection with any earlier procurement.

SEC. 864. TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS PURCHASED AS MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEMS.

(a) **AMENDMENTS TO REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEMS.**—Section 2379 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) in paragraph (1)—
(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12))” and inserting “section 103 of title 41, United States Code”; and
(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “; and”;
(B) by striking paragraph (2); and
(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(2) in subsection (b)—
(A) by striking “section 35(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 431(c))” and inserting “section 104 of title 41, United States Code,”; and
(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “in writing that—” and all that follows through “(A) the subsystem” and inserting “in writing that the subsystem”;

(ii) by striking “section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12)); and” and inserting “section 103 of title 41, United States Code.”; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B);

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—
(A) by striking “section 35(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 431(c))” and inserting “section 104 of title 41, United States Code.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—
(i) by striking “in writing that—” and all that follows through “(i) the component” and inserting “in writing that the component”;

(ii) by striking “section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12)); and” and inserting “section 103 of title 41, United States Code.”; and

(iii) by striking clause (ii); and

(4) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) **INFORMATION SUBMITTED.**—(1) To the extent necessary to determine the reasonableness of the price for items acquired under this section, the contracting officer shall require the offeror to submit—

“(A) prices paid for the same or similar commercial items under comparable terms and conditions by both government and commercial customers;

“(B) if the contracting officer determines that the offeror does not have access to and cannot provide sufficient information described in subparagraph (A) to determine the reasonableness of price, information on—

“(i) prices for the same or similar items sold under different terms and conditions;

“(ii) prices for similar levels of work or effort on related products or services;

“(iii) prices for alternative solutions or approaches; and

“(iv) other relevant information that can serve as the basis for a price assessment; and

“(C) if the contracting officer determines that the information submitted pursuant to subpara-

graphs (A) and (B) is not sufficient to determine the reasonableness of price, other relevant information regarding the basis for price or cost, including information on labor costs, material costs, and overhead rates.

“(2) An offeror may not be required to submit information described in paragraph (1)(C) with regard to a commercially available off-the-shelf item or any other item that was developed exclusively at private expense.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO TRUTH IN NEGOTIATIONS ACT.**—Section 2306a(d)(1) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “If the contracting officer determines that the offeror does not have access to and cannot provide sufficient information on prices for the same or similar items to determine the reasonableness of price, the contracting officer shall require the submission of information on prices for similar levels or work or effort on related products or services, prices for alternative solutions or approaches, and other information that is relevant to the determination of a fair and reasonable price.”.

SEC. 865. LIMITATION ON CONVERSION OF PROCUREMENTS FROM COMMERCIAL ACQUISITION PROCEDURES.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense may not convert the procurement of commercial items or services from commercial acquisition procedures under part 12 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation to non-commercial acquisition procedures under part 15 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation unless the Secretary, in consultation with the head of the acquisition component, certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department of Defense will realize a significant cost savings compared to the cost of procuring a similar quantity or level of such item or service using commercial acquisition procedures.

(2) **CERTIFICATION FACTORS.**—In making a certification under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall consider the following factors:

(A) The estimated cost of foregone research and development to be performed by the existing contractor to improve future products or services.

(B) The transaction costs for the Department of Defense and the contractor in assessing and responding to data requests to support a conversion to non-commercial acquisition procedures.

(C) Changes in purchase quantities.

(D) Costs associated with potential procurement delays resulting from the conversion.

(b) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **INVENTORY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall prepare an inventory of all contracts and subcontracts converted from commercial acquisition procedures to non-commercial procedures during the previous five years.

(2) **REPORTS.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on each conversion identified in the inventory prepared under paragraph (1) that identifies and compares per unit costs and prices paid for the item or service under commercial acquisition procedures with those paid under non-commercial procurement procedures.

(c) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.**—

(1) **REVIEW OF REPORTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the Secretary of Defense submits a report under subsection (b)(2), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a review of the accuracy of the report.

(2) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Comptroller General shall submit to the congressional defense com-

mittees a report including any recommendations for additional costs and benefits that should be considered when the Department of Defense is planning to convert a procurement of items or services from commercial to non-commercial procurement procedures.

(B) **FACTORS.**—In making recommendations under subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General shall consider the following factors:

(i) Industrial base considerations.

(ii) The estimated cost of foregone research and development to be performed by existing contractors to improve future products or services.

(iii) The transaction costs for the Department of Defense and contractors in assessing and responding to data requests to support conversions to non-commercial acquisition procedures.

(iv) Costs associated with potential procurement delays resulting from conversions.

(d) **SUNSET.**—The requirements of this section shall terminate 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 866. TREATMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES PROVIDED BY NONTRADITIONAL CONTRACTORS AS COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 140 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**§2380. Treatment of goods and services provided by nontraditional contractors as commercial items**

“Notwithstanding section 2376(1) of this title, items and services provided by nontraditional contractors (as that term is defined in section 2302(9) of this title) may be treated by the head of an agency as commercial items for purposes of this chapter.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 140 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2379 the following new item:

“2380. Treatment of goods and services provided by nontraditional contractors as commercial items.”.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 871. STREAMLINING OF REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS.

(a) **STREAMLINING OF REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“**§2222. Defense business systems: business process reengineering; enterprise architecture; management**

“(a) **DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS GENERALLY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each covered defense business system developed, deployed, and operated by the Department of Defense—

“(1) is integrated into a comprehensive defense business enterprise architecture;

“(2) is managed in a manner that provides visibility into, and traceability of, expenditures for the system; and

“(3) uses an acquisition and sustainment strategy that prioritizes use of commercial software and business practices.

“(b) **DEFENSE BUSINESS PROCESSES GENERALLY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that defense business processes are reviewed, and as appropriate revised through business process reengineering to match best commercial practices, to the maximum extent practicable, so as to minimize customization of commercial business systems.

“(c) **ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.**—

“(1) **SECRETARY OF DEFENSE GUIDANCE.**—The Secretary shall issue guidance to provide for the coordination of, and decision making for, the planning, programming, and control of investments in covered defense business systems.

“(2) **SUPPORTING GUIDANCE.**—The Secretary shall direct the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the Chief Information Officer, and the Chief Management Officer of each of the military departments to issue and maintain supporting guidance for the guidance of the Secretary issued under paragraph (1), within their respective areas of responsibility, as necessary.

“(d) **GUIDANCE ELEMENTS.**—The guidance issued pursuant to subsection (c)(1) shall include the following elements:

“(1) Policy to ensure that the business processes of the Department of Defense are continuously evolved to—

“(A) implement the most streamlined and efficient business process practicable; and

“(B) eliminate or reduce the need to tailor commercial-off-the-shelf systems to meet unique requirements or incorporate unique requirements or incorporate unique interfaces to the maximum extent practicable.

“(2) A process to establish requirements for covered defense business systems.

“(3) Policy requiring the periodic review of covered defense business systems that have been fully deployed, by portfolio, to ensure that investments in such portfolios are appropriate.

“(4) Policy to ensure full consideration of sustainability and technological refreshment requirements, and the appropriate use of open architectures.

“(e) **DEFENSE BUSINESS COUNCIL.**—The Secretary shall establish a Defense Business Council to provide advice to the Secretary on reengineering the Department's business processes and developing and deploying defense business systems. The Council shall be chaired by the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, and shall include membership from the public sector, defense industry, and commercial industry.

“(f) **APPROVALS REQUIRED FOR DEVELOPMENT.**—(1) The Secretary shall ensure that a covered defense business system program cannot proceed into development (or, if no development is required, into production or fielding) unless the appropriate approval officials (as specified in paragraph (3)) have determined that—

“(A) a business process has been, or is being, reengineered to be as streamlined and efficient as practicable, and the implementation of the business process will maximize the elimination of unique software requirements and unique interfaces;

“(B) the system has valid, achievable requirements and a viable plan for implementing those requirements (including, as appropriate, market research, business process reengineering, and prototyping activities);

“(C) the system has an acquisition strategy designed to eliminate or reduce the need to tailor commercial-off-the-shelf systems to meet unique requirements or incorporate unique requirements or incorporate unique interfaces to the maximum extent practicable; and

“(D) the system is in compliance with the Department's auditability requirements.

“(2)(A) For any fiscal year in which funds are expended for development or sustainment pursuant to a covered defense business system program, the appropriate approval officials shall review the system and certify, certify with conditions, or decline to certify, as the case may be, that—

“(i) it continues to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (1);

“(ii) an acquisition program baseline has been established within two years of program initiation; and

“(iii) program requirements and have not changed in a manner that is increasing acquisition

costs or schedule, without sufficient cause and only after maximum efforts to reengineer business processes prior to changing requirements.

“(B) If an approval officially determines that full certification cannot be granted, the approval official shall notify the acquisition milestone decision authority for the program and provide a recommendation for corrective action, and provide a copy of such recommendations to the congressional defense committees within 60 days.

“(3) For purposes of paragraph (1), the appropriate approval officials with respect to a covered defense business system are the following:

“(A) In the case of a priority defense business system, the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

“(B) In the case of other covered business systems, an official designated under procedures established by the Secretary of Defense.

“(g) **RESPONSIBILITY OF MILESTONE DECISION AUTHORITY.**—The milestone decision authority for a covered defense business system program shall be responsible for the acquisition of such system and shall ensure that acquisition process approvals are not considered for such system until the relevant certifications and approvals have been made under this section.

“(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM.**—(A) The term ‘defense business system’ means an information system that is operated by, for, or on behalf of the Department of Defense, including any of the following:

“(i) A financial system.

“(ii) A financial data feeder system.

“(iii) A contracting system.

“(iv) A logistics system.

“(v) A planning and budgeting system.

“(vi) An installations management system.

“(vii) A human resources management system.

“(viii) A training and readiness system.

“(B) The term does not include—

“(i) a national security system; or

“(ii) an information system used exclusively by and within the defense commissary system or the exchange system or other instrumentality of the Department of Defense conducted for the morale, welfare, and recreation of members of the armed forces using nonappropriated funds.

“(2) **COVERED DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM.**—The term ‘covered defense business system’ means a defense business system that is expected to have a total amount of budget authority over the period of the current future-years defense program submitted to Congress under section 221 of this title, in excess of \$50,000,000.

“(3) **COVERED DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM PROGRAM.**—The term ‘covered defense business system program’ means a defense acquisition program to develop and field a covered defense business system or an increment of a covered defense business system.

“(4) **PRIORITY DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM PROGRAM.**—The term ‘priority defense business system’ means a defense business system that is—

“(A) expected to have a total amount of budget authority over the period of the current future-years defense program submitted to Congress under section 221 of this title in excess of \$250,000,000; or

“(B) designated by the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense as a priority defense business system, based on specific program analyses of factors including complexity, scope, and technical risk, and after notification to Congress of such designation.

“(5) **ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE.**—The term ‘enterprise architecture’ has the meaning given that term in section 3601(4) of title 44.

“(6) **INFORMATION SYSTEM.**—The term ‘information system’ has the meaning given that term in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

“(7) **NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM.**—The term ‘national security system’ has the meaning given that term in section 3552(b)(2) of title 44.

“(8) **MILESTONE DECISION AUTHORITY.**—The term ‘milestone decision authority’, with respect to a defense acquisition program, means the individual within the Department of Defense designated with the responsibility to grant milestone approvals for that program.

“(9) **BUSINESS PROCESS MAPPING.**—The term ‘business process mapping’ means a procedure in which the steps in a business process are clarified and documented in both written form and in a flow chart.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 131 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“2222. Defense business systems: business process reengineering; enterprise architecture; management.”

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION OF PREVIOUSLY ENACTED TITLE CHANGE.**—Effective February 1, 2017, section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by striking “the Deputy Chief Management Officer” each place that it appears and inserting “the Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information”.

(c) **DEADLINE FOR GUIDANCE.**—The guidance required by subsection (b)(1) of section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(1), shall be issued not later than December 31, 2016.

(d) **MODIFICATION OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT.**—Section 332(d) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375; 118 Stat. 1856) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT.**—In each odd-numbered year, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the extent to which the actions taken by the Department of Defense comply with the requirements of such section.”

SEC. 872. ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.

(a) **MODIFICATIONS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND.**—Section 1705 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the applicable percentage for a fiscal year is the percentage that results in the credit to the Fund of \$500,000,000 in each fiscal year.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “24-month period” and inserting “36-month period”;

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “60 days” and inserting “120 days”; and

(3) in subsection (g)(2), by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “September 30, 2023”.

(b) **MODIFICATIONS TO BIENNIAL STRATEGIC WORKFORCE PLAN.**—Section 115b(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the defense acquisition workforce, including both military and civilian personnel” and inserting “the military, civilian, and contractor personnel that directly support the acquisition processes of the Department of Defense, including persons serving in acquisition-related positions designated by the Secretary of Defense under section 1721 of this title”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(D)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(C) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) a description of steps that will be taken to address any new or expanded critical skills

and competencies the civilian employee workforce will need to address recent trends in defense acquisition, emerging best practices, changes in the government and commercial marketplace, and new requirements established in law or regulation; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) For the purposes of paragraph (1), contractor personnel shall be treated as directly supporting the acquisition processes of the Department if, and to the extent that, such contractor personnel perform functions in support of personnel in Department of Defense positions designated by the Secretary of Defense under section 1721 of this title."

SEC. 873. UNIFIED INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES.

(a) BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Deputy Chief Management Officer, the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics shall jointly complete a business case analysis, using the resources of the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation, to determine the most effective and efficient way to procure and deploy information technology services.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The business case analysis required by paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of whether the Department of Defense should—

(A)(i) acquire a unified set of commercially provided common or enterprise information technology services, including such services as messaging, collaboration, directory, security, and content delivery; or

(ii) allow the military departments and other components of the Department to acquire such services separately;

(B)(i) acquire such services from a single provider that bundles all of the services; or

(ii) require that each common service be independently defined and use open standards to enable continuous adoption of best commercial technology; and

(C) enable availability of multiple versions of each type of service and application to enable choice and competition while supporting interoperability where necessary.

(b) GOVERNANCE MECHANISM AND PROCESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Management Officer and the Chief Information Officer, establish a governance mechanism and process to ensure essential interoperability across Department networks through the imposition of a minimum set of standards or common solutions.

SEC. 874. CLOUD STRATEGY FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) CLOUD STRATEGY FOR SECRET INTERNET PROTOCOL NETWORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense shall, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Director of National Intelligence, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the chief information officers of the military departments, develop a cloud strategy for the Secret Internet Protocol Network (SIPRNet) of the Department.

(2) MATTERS ADDRESSED.—This strategy required by paragraph (1) shall address the following:

(A) Security requirements.

(B) The compatibility of applications currently utilized within the Secret Internet Protocol Network with a cloud computing environment.

(C) How a Secret Internet Protocol Network cloud capability should be competitively acquired.

(D) How a Secret Internet Protocol Network cloud system would achieve interoperability with the cloud systems of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)) operating at the security level Sensitive Compartmented Information.

(b) PRICING POLICY AND COST RECOVERY PROCESS FOR CERTAIN CLOUD SERVICES.—The Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense shall, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, develop a consistent pricing policy and cost recovery process for the use by Department of Defense components of the cloud services provided through the Intelligence Community Information Technology Environment.

(c) ASSESSMENT OF FEASIBILITY AND ADVISABILITY OF IMPOSING MINIMUM STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense shall assess the feasibility and advisability of imposing a minimum set of open standards for cloud infrastructure, middle-ware, metadata, and application programming interfaces to promote interoperability, information sharing, and ease of access to data, and competition across all of the cloud computing systems and services utilized by components of the Department of Defense.

(2) COORDINATION.—The Chief Information Officer shall coordinate the assessment required by paragraph (1) with the Director of National Intelligence with respect to the cloud services offered through the Intelligence Community Information Technology Environment.

SEC. 875. DEVELOPMENT PERIOD FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

(a) FLEXIBLE LIMITATION ON DEVELOPMENT PERIOD.—Section 2445b of title 10, United States Code is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) TIME-CERTAIN DEVELOPMENT.—If the baseline documents prepared under subsection (c) for a major automated information system that is not a national security system provide for a period in excess of five years from the time of program initiation to the time of a full deployment decision, the documents submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include a written determination by the senior Department of Defense official responsible for the program justifying the need for the longer period."

(b) REPEAL OF INCONSISTENT REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) Section 2445c(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting "; or";

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking "; or" and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (D), as added by section 802(a)(3) of the Carl Levin and Howard "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3427).

(2) Section 811 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2316) is repealed.

SEC. 876. REVISIONS TO PILOT PROGRAM ON ACQUISITION OF MILITARY PURPOSE NON-DEVELOPMENTAL ITEMS.

Section 866 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking "with non-traditional defense contractors"; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "awarded using competitive procedures in accordance with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "\$50,000,000" and inserting "\$100,000,000".

SEC. 877. EXTENSION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MENTOR-PROTÉGÉ PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 831(j) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "September 30, 2015" and inserting "September 30, 2016"; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "September 30, 2018" and inserting "September 30, 2019".

SEC. 878. IMPROVED AUDITING OF CONTRACTS.

(a) ADDRESSING AUDIT BACKLOG.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning October 1, 2016, the Defense Contract Audit Agency may provide audit support for non-Defense Agencies once the Secretary of Defense certifies that the backlog for incurred cost audits is less than 12 months of incurred cost inventory.

(2) ADJUSTMENT IN FUNDING FOR REIMBURSEMENTS FROM NON-DEFENSE AGENCIES.—The amount appropriated and otherwise available to the Defense Contract Audit Agency for a fiscal year beginning after September 30, 2016, shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to any reimbursements received by the Agency from non-Defense Agencies for support provided in violation of the limitation under paragraph (1).

(b) USE OF THIRD PARTY AUDITS.—The Secretary of Defense shall use up to 5 percent of the auditing staff of the service audit agencies augmented by private sector auditors to help eliminate the audit backlog in incurred cost, pre-award accounting systems audits and to reduce the time to complete pre-award audits.

(c) USE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL AUDITING STAFF.—The Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall make available 5 percent of its auditing staff to the Defense Contract Audit Agency to help eliminate the audit backlog in incurred cost, pre-award accounting systems audits and to reduce the time to complete pre-award audits.

(d) DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 2313a(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

"(D) the total costs of sustained or recovered costs both as a total number and as a percentage of questioned costs; and";

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking "; and" and inserting a semicolon;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraphs:

"(4) a description of actions taken to ensure alignment of policies and practices across the Defense Contract Audit Agency regional organizations, offices, and individual auditors;

"(5) a description of outreach actions toward industry to promote more effective use of audit resources; and"

(e) ACQUISITION OVERSIGHT AND AUDITS.—The Secretary of Defense shall review the oversight and audit structure of the Department of Defense with the goal of enhancing the productivity of oversight and program and contract auditing to avoid duplicative audits and the streamlining of oversight reviews. The Secretary shall take all necessary measures to streamline oversight reviews and avoid duplicative audits and make recommendation for any necessary changes in law.

(f) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on actions

taken to avoid duplicative audits and streamline oversight reviews.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of actions taken to avoid duplicative audits and streamline oversight reviews based on the review conducted under subsection (e).

(B) A comparison of commercial industry accounting practices, including requirements under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-204), with the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) to determine if some portions of CAS compliance can be met through such practices or requirements.

(C) A description of standards of materiality used by the Defense Contract Audit Agency and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense for defense contract audits.

(D) An estimate of average delay and range of delays in contract awards due to time necessary for the Defense Contract Audit Agency to complete pre-award audits.

(g) **INCURRED COST INVENTORY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “incurred cost inventory” means the level of contractor incurred cost proposals in inventory from prior fiscal years that are currently being audited by the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

SEC. 879. SURVEY ON THE COSTS OF REGULATORY COMPLIANCE.

(a) **SURVEY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a survey of the top ten contractors with the highest level of reimbursements for cost type contracts with the Department of Defense during fiscal year 2014 to estimate industry's cost of regulatory compliance (as a percentage of total costs) with government unique acquisition regulations and requirements in the categories of quality assurance, accounting and financial management, contracting and purchasing, program management, engineering, logistics, material management, property administration, and other unique requirements not imposed on contracts for commercial items.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the findings of the survey conducted under subsection (a). The data received as a result of the survey and included in the report shall be aggregated to protect against the public release of proprietary information.

SEC. 880. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT ON BID PROTESTS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the prevalence and impact of bid protests on Department of Defense acquisitions over the previous 10 years, including both protests to the Government Accountability Office and protests filed in Federal court.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

(1) A description of trends in the number of bid protests filed, and the rate of such bid protests compared to the number of procurements.

(2) A description of comparative rates for bid protests filed by incumbent contractors and bid protests filed by non-incumbent contractors.

(3) An assessment of the cost and schedule impact of successful and unsuccessful bid protests filed by incumbent contractors on contracts for services with a value in excess of \$100,000,000.

(4) A description of trends in the number of bid protests filed and the rate of such bid protests on contracts for the procurement of major defense acquisition programs.

(5) An assessment of the cost and schedule impact of successful and unsuccessful bid protests

filed on contracts for the procurement of major defense acquisition programs.

(6) A description of any views the Comptroller General may have on the likely impact of a provision requiring a losing protester on a contract for the procurement of a major defense acquisition program to pay the legal fees of the government.

SEC. 881. STEPS TO IDENTIFY AND ADDRESS POTENTIAL UNFAIR COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE OF TECHNICAL ADVISORS TO ACQUISITION OFFICIALS.

(a) **GUIDANCE REQUIRED.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall issue guidance on steps that should be taken to identify and evaluate, and to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate, any potentially unfair competitive advantage of entities providing technical advice to acquisition officials in the award of research and development work by such officials.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—For the purposes of this section—

(1) the term “potentially unfair competitive advantage” means unequal access to acquisition officials responsible for award decisions or allocation of resources or to acquisition information relevant to award decisions or allocation of resources; and

(2) the term “entity providing technical advice to acquisition officials” means a contractor, Federally-funded research and development center and other non-profit entity, or Federal laboratory that provides systems engineering and technical direction, participates in technical evaluations, helps prepare specifications or work statements, or otherwise provides technical advice to acquisition officials on the conduct of defense acquisition programs.

SEC. 882. HUBZONE QUALIFIED DISASTER AREAS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(p) (15 U.S.C. 632(p))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or”;

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) qualified disaster areas.”; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following:

“(E) QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA.—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualified disaster area’ means any census tract or nonmetropolitan county located in an area for which the President has declared a major disaster under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170) or located in an area in which a catastrophic incident has occurred, if—

“(I) in the case of a census tract, the census tract ceased to be a qualified census tract during the period beginning 5 years before and ending 2 years after the date on which—

“(aa) the President declared the major disaster; or

“(bb) the catastrophic incident occurred; or

“(II) in the case of a nonmetropolitan county, the nonmetropolitan county ceased to be a qualified nonmetropolitan county during the period beginning 5 years before and ending 2 years after the date on which—

“(aa) the President declared the major disaster; or

“(bb) the catastrophic incident occurred.

“(ii) **TREATMENT.**—A qualified disaster area shall only be treated as a HUBZone—

“(I) in the case of a major disaster declared by the President, during the 5-year period beginning on the date on which the President declared the major disaster for the area in which the census tract or nonmetropolitan county, as applicable, is located; and

“(II) in the case of a catastrophic incident, during the 10-year period beginning on the date on which the catastrophic incident occurred in the area in which the census tract or nonmetropolitan county, as applicable, is located.”; and

(2) in section 31(c)(3) (15 U.S.C. 657a(c)(3)), by inserting “the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency,” after “the Secretary of Labor.”

SEC. 883. BASE CLOSURE HUBZONES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3(p)(5)(A)(i)(I) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(5)(A)(i)(I)) is amended—

(1) in item (aa), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) by redesignating item (bb) as item (cc); and

(3) by inserting after item (aa) the following: “(bb) pursuant to subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of paragraph (3), that its principal office is located in a HUBZone described in paragraph (1)(E) (relating to base closure areas) (in this item referred to as the ‘base closure HUBZone’), and that not fewer than 35 percent of its employees reside in—

“(AA) a HUBZone;

“(BB) the census tract in which the base closure HUBZone is wholly contained;

“(CC) a census tract the boundaries of which intersect the boundaries of the base closure HUBZone; or

“(DD) a census tract the boundaries of which are contiguous to a census tract described in subitem (BB) or (CC); or”.

(b) **PERIOD FOR BASE CLOSURE AREAS.**—

(1) **AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 152(a)(2) of title I of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (15 U.S.C. 632 note) is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “8 years”.

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1698(b)(2) of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (15 U.S.C. 632 note) is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “8 years”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.**—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall—

(A) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) apply to—

(i) a base closure area (as defined in section 3(p)(4)(D) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(4)(D))) that, on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, is treated as a HUBZone described in section 3(p)(1)(E) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(1)(E)) under—

(I) section 152(a)(2) of title I of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (15 U.S.C. 632 note); or

(II) section 1698(b)(2) of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (15 U.S.C. 632 note); and

(ii) a base closure area relating to the closure of a military installation under the authority described in clauses (i) through (iv) of section 3(p)(4)(D) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(4)(D)) that occurs on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 884. EXCEPTION FOR ABILITYONE GOODS FROM AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE GOODS AND SERVICES MANUFACTURED IN AFGHANISTAN, AND CENTRAL ASIAN STATES.

(a) **EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN ITEMS NOT MANUFACTURED IN AFGHANISTAN.**—Section 886 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (d),” after “subsection (b),”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **EXCLUSION OF ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT CATALOG.**—The authority under subsection (a) shall not be available for the procurement of any good that is contained in the procurement catalog described in section 8503(a) of title 41 in Afghanistan if such good can be produced and delivered by a qualified non-profit agency for the blind or a non-profit agency for other severely disabled in a timely fashion to support mission requirements.”.

(b) **EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN ITEMS NOT MANUFACTURED IN CENTRAL ASIAN STATES.**—Section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2399) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (h),” after “subsection (b),”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) **EXCLUSION OF ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT CATALOG.**—The authority under subsection (a) shall not be available for the procurement of any good that is contained in the procurement catalog described in section 8503(a) of title 41 if such good can be produced and delivered by a qualified non-profit agency for the blind or a non-profit agency for other severely disabled in a timely fashion to support mission requirements.”.

SEC. 885. SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT OM-BUDSMAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The small business offices in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military departments shall serve as intermediaries between small businesses and contracting officials prior to the award of contracts in cases where a small business prospective contractor notifies the small business office that it has reason to believe that the contracting process has been modified to preclude a small business from bidding on the contract or would give another contractor an unfair competitive advantage.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude a contractor from exercising the right to initiate a bid protest under a contract.

SEC. 886. ANNUAL REPORT ON FOREIGN PROCUREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2338. Reporting on foreign purchases

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the end of fiscal year 2016, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional defense committees a report listing specific procurements by the Department of Defense in that fiscal year of articles, materials, or supplies valued greater than \$5,000,000, indexed to inflation, using the exception under section 8302(a)(2)(A) of title 41. This report may be submitted as part of the report required under section 8305 of such title.

“(b) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2337 the following new item:

“2338. Reporting on foreign purchases.”.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

SEC. 901. UPDATE OF STATUTORY SPECIFICATION OF FUNCTIONS OF CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF RELATING TO ADVICE ON REQUIREMENTS, PROGRAMS, AND BUDGET.

Section 153(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(H) Advising the Secretary on development of joint command, control, communications, and cyber capabilities, including integration and interoperability of such capabilities, through requirements, integrated architectures, data standards, and assessments.”.

SEC. 902. REORGANIZATION AND REDESIGNATION OF OFFICE OF FAMILY POLICY AND OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR MILITARY FAMILIES WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.

(a) **OFFICE OF FAMILY POLICY.**—

(1) **REDESIGNATION AS OFFICE OF MILITARY FAMILY READINESS POLICY.**—Section 1781(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “Office of Family Policy” and inserting “Office of Military Family Readiness Policy”; and

(B) by striking “Director of Family Policy” and inserting “Director of Military Family Readiness Policy”.

(2) **REQUIREMENT FOR DIRECTOR TO BE MEMBER OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE OR GENERAL OR FLAG OFFICER.**—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Director shall be a member of the Senior Executive Service or a general officer or flag officer.”.

(3) **INCLUSION OF DIRECTOR ON MILITARY FAMILY READINESS COUNCIL.**—Subsection (b)(1)(E) of section 1781a of such title is amended by striking “Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs” and inserting “Office of Military Family Readiness Policy”.

(4) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 131(b)(7)(F) of such title is amended by striking “Director of Family Policy” and inserting “Director of Military Family Readiness Policy”.

(5) **HEADING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) **SECTION HEADING.**—The heading of section 1781 of such title is amended to read as follows: “**§1781. Office of Military Family Readiness Policy**”.

(B) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 88 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 1781 and inserting the following new item: “1781. Office of Military Family Readiness Policy.”.

(b) **OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR MILITARY FAMILIES WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.**—

(1) **REDESIGNATION AS OFFICE OF SPECIAL NEEDS.**—Subsection (a) of section 1781c of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs” and inserting “Office of Special Needs”.

(2) **REORGANIZATION UNDER OFFICE OF MILITARY FAMILY READINESS POLICY.**—Such subsection is further amended by striking “Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness” and inserting “Office of Military Family Readiness Policy”.

(3) **REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR HEAD OF OFFICE TO BE MEMBER OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE OR GENERAL OR FLAG OFFICER.**—Such section is further amended by striking subsection (c).

(4) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Such section is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (d) through (i) as subsections (c) through (h), respectively;

(B) by striking “subsection (e)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (d)”;

(C) in subsection (c), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (f)” in paragraph (2) and inserting “subsection (e)”;

(D) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (d)(4)” in paragraph (2)(B) and inserting “subsection (c)(4)”.

(5) **HEADING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) **SECTION HEADING.**—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“**§1781c. Office of Special Needs**”.

(B) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 88 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 1781c and inserting the following new item: “1781c. Office of Special Needs.”.

SEC. 903. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDING FOR OCEAN RESEARCH ADVISORY PANEL.

Section 7903 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c).

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

SEC. 1001. GENERAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this division for fiscal year 2016 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof). Amounts of authorizations so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this section may not exceed \$4,500,000,000.

(3) **EXCEPTION FOR TRANSFERS BETWEEN MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS.**—A transfer of funds between military personnel authorizations under title IV shall not be counted toward the dollar limitation in paragraph (2).

(b) **LIMITATIONS.**—The authority provided by subsection (a) to transfer authorizations—

(1) may only be used to provide authority for items that have a higher priority than the items from which authority is transferred; and

(2) may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied authorization by Congress.

(c) **EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.**—A transfer made from one account to another under the authority of this section shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for the account to which the amount is transferred by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(d) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary shall promptly notify Congress of each transfer made under subsection (a).

SEC. 1002. ANNUAL AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMPONENTS BY INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL AUDITORS.

(a) **AUDITS REQUIRED.**—For purposes of satisfying the requirement under section 3521(e) of title 31, United States Code, for audits of financial statements of Department of Defense components identified by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 3515(c) of such title, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall obtain each year audits of the financial statements of each such component by an independent external auditor.

(b) **INSPECTOR GENERAL SELECTION AND OVERSIGHT.**—The Inspector General shall—

(1) select independent external auditors for purposes of subsection (a) based, among other appropriate criteria, on their qualifications, independence, and capacity to conduct audits described in subsection (a) in accordance with applicable generally accepted government auditing standards; and

(2) shall monitor the conduct of such audits.
(c) **REPORTS ON AUDITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Inspector General shall require the independent external auditors conducting audits under subsection (a) to submit a report on their audits each year to the Secretary of Defense, the Controller of the Office of Federal Financial Management in the Office of Management and Budget, and the appropriate committees of Congress.

(2) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(d) **RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAW.**—The requirements of this section—

(1) shall be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of section 1008 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (10 U.S.C. 2222 note);

(2) shall not be construed to alter the requirement under section 3521(e) of title 31, United States Code, that the financial statements of the Department of Defense as a whole be audited by the Inspector General or by an independent external auditor, as determined by the Inspector General; and

(3) shall not be construed to limit or alter the authorities of the Comptroller General of the United States under section 3521(g) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 1003. TREATMENT AS PART OF THE BASE BUDGET OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS UPON ENACTMENT OF AN ACT REVISING THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the event of the enactment of an Act revising in proportionally equal amounts the defense and non-defense discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2016, the amount authorized to be appropriated by title XV that is in excess of the \$50,900,000,000 that is authorized to be appropriated by that title for revised security category activities, and is also not greater than the amount of the increase in the discretionary spending limit for revised security category activities revised by that Act, shall be deemed to have been authorized to be appropriated by title III.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “Act revising the defense and non-defense discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2016” means an Act—

(A) enacted after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) that—

(i) increases in proportionally equal amounts the discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2016 for the revised security category and the revised nonsecurity category; and

(ii) may include increases to the discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2017 through 2021.

(2) The terms “discretionary spending limit”, “revised nonsecurity category”, and “revised security category” have the meanings given such terms in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900).

SEC. 1004. SENSE OF SENATE ON SEQUESTRATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the nation’s fiscal challenges are a top priority for Congress, and sequestration—non-strategic, across-the-board budget cuts—remains an

unreasonable and inadequate budgeting tool to address the nation’s deficits and debt;

(2) sequestration relief must be accomplished for fiscal years 2016 and 2017;

(3) sequestration relief should include equal defense and non-defense relief; and

(4) sequestration relief should be offset through targeted changes in mandatory and discretionary categories and revenues.

SEC. 1005. SENSE OF SENATE ON FINDING EFFICIENCIES WITHIN THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should, through the military departments, continue to find efficiencies within the working capital fund activities of the Department of Defense with specific emphasis on optimizing the existing workload plans of such activities to ensure a strong organic industrial base workforce.

Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

SEC. 1011. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO SUPPORT UNIFIED COUNTERDRUG AND COUNTERTERRORISM CAMPAIGN IN COLOMBIA.

(a) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.**—Section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375; 118 Stat. 2042), as most recently amended by section 1011(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291), is further amended—

(1) In subsection (a), by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”; and

(2) In subsection (c), by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”.

(b) **EXTENSION OF ANNUAL NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON ASSISTANCE.**—Section 1011(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 is amended by striking “(as amended by subsection (a)) using funds available for fiscal year 2015” and inserting “using funds available for any fiscal year”.

SEC. 1012. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Subsection (a)(2) of section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85; 111 Stat. 1881), as most recently amended by section 1013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 844), is further amended by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”.

(b) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF SUPPORT.**—Subsection (e)(2) of such section 1033, as so amended, is further amended by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”.

(c) **ADDITIONAL GOVERNMENTS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE SUPPORT.**—Subsection (b) of such section 1033, as so amended, is further amended by adding at the end of the following new paragraphs:

“(40) Government of Kenya.

“(41) Government of Tanzania.

“(42) Government of Somalia.”.

Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

SEC. 1021. STUDIES OF FLEET PLATFORM ARCHITECTURES FOR THE NAVY.

(a) **INDEPENDENT STUDIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the performance of three independent studies of alternative future fleet platform architectures for the Navy in the 2030 timeframe.

(2) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than May 1, 2016, the Secretary shall forward the results of each study to the congressional defense committees.

(3) **FORM.**—Each such study shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex as necessary.

(b) **ENTITIES TO PERFORM STUDIES.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the studies under subsection (a) to be performed as follows:

(1) One study shall be performed by the Department of the Navy and shall include participants from—

(A) the Office of Net Assessment within the Office of the Secretary of Defense; and

(B) the Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren Division.

(2) The second study shall be performed by a federally funded research and development center.

(3) The final study shall be conducted by an independent, non-governmental institute which is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code, and has recognized credentials and expertise in national security and military affairs.

(c) **PERFORMANCE OF STUDIES.**—

(1) **INDEPENDENT PERFORMANCE.**—The Secretary of Defense shall require the three studies under this section to be conducted independently of each other.

(2) **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED.**—In performing a study under this section, the organization performing the study, while being aware of the current and projected fleet platform architectures, shall not be limited by the current or projected fleet platform architecture and shall consider the following matters:

(A) The National Security Strategy of the United States.

(B) Potential future threats to the United States and to United States naval forces in the 2030 timeframe.

(C) Traditional roles and missions of United States naval forces.

(D) Alternative roles and missions for United States naval forces.

(E) Other government and non-government analyses that would contribute to the study through variations in study assumptions or potential scenarios.

(F) The role of evolving technology on future naval forces, including unmanned systems.

(G) Opportunities for reduced personnel and sustainment costs.

(H) Current and projected capabilities of other United States military services that could affect force structure capability and capacity requirements of United States naval forces.

(d) **STUDY RESULTS.**—The results of each study under this section shall—

(1) present the alternative fleet platform architectures considered, with assumptions and possible scenarios identified for each;

(2) provide for presentation of minority views of study participants; and

(3) for the recommended architecture, provide—

(A) the numbers, kinds, and sizes of vessels, the numbers and types of associated manned and unmanned vehicles, and the basic capabilities of each of those platforms;

(B) other information needed to understand that architecture in basic form and the supporting analysis;

(C) deviations from the current Annual Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels required under section 231 of title 10, United States Code;

(D) options to address ship classes that begin decommissioning prior to 2035; and

(E) implications for naval aviation, including the future carrier air wing and land-based aviation platforms.

SEC. 1022. AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND.

Section 1022(b)(1) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law

113–291) is amended by striking “for the Navy for the Ohio Replacement Program”.

SEC. 1023. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES FOR CERTAIN NAVY MESS OPERATIONS AFLOAT.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Subsection (b) of section 1014 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4585), as amended by section 1021 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4348), is further amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2020”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.**—Subsection (a) of such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “not more than” and inserting “not more than”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “Naval vessels” and inserting “such vessels”.

SEC. 1024. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPORTING LONG-RANGE PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS.

Section 231(b)(2)(C) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “by ship class in both graphical and tabular form” after “The estimated levels of annual funding”.

SEC. 1025. REPORT AND ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PRIVATIZING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMMISSARIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report assessing the viability of privatizing, in whole or in part, the Department of Defense commissary system. The report shall be so submitted to Congress before the development of any plans or pilot program to privatize defense commissaries or the defense commissary system.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A methodology for defining the total number and locations of commissaries.

(2) An evaluation of commissary use by location in the following beneficiary categories:

(A) Pay grades E–1 through E–4.

(B) Pay grades E–5 through E–7.

(C) Pay grades E–8 and E–9.

(D) Pay grades O–1 through O–3.

(E) Pay grades O–4 through O–6.

(F) Pay grades O–7 through O–10.

(G) Military retirees.

(3) An evaluation of commissary use in locations outside the continental United States and in remote and isolated locations in the continental United States when compared with other locations.

(4) An evaluation of the cost of commissary operations during fiscal years 2009 through 2014.

(5) An assessment of potential savings and efficiencies to be achieved through implementation of some or all of recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

(6) A description and evaluation of the strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for pricing products sold at commissaries.

(7) A description and evaluation of the transportation strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for products sold at commissaries.

(8) A description and evaluation of the formula of the Defense Commissary Agency for calculating savings for its customers as a result of its pricing strategy.

(9) An evaluation of the average savings per household garnered by commissary use.

(10) A description and evaluation of the use of private contractors and vendors as part of the defense commissary system.

(11) An assessment of costs or savings, and potential impacts to patrons and the Government, of privatizing the defense commissary system, including potential increased use of Government assistance programs.

(12) A description and assessment of potential barriers to privatization of the defense commissary system.

(13) An assessment of the extent to which patron savings would remain after the privatization of the defense commissary system.

(14) An assessment of the impact of any recommended changes to the operation of the defense commissary system on commissary patrons, including morale and retention.

(15) An assessment of the actual interest of major grocery retailers in the management and operations of all, or part, of the existing defense commissary system.

(16) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on off-installation prices of similar products available in the system.

(17) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system, and conversion of the Defense Commissary Agency workforce to non-appropriated fund status, on employment of military family members, particularly with respect to pay, benefits, and job security.

(18) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on Exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation (MWR) quality-of-life programs.

(c) **USE OF PREVIOUS STUDIES.**—The Secretary shall consult previous studies and surveys on matters appropriate to the report required by subsection (a), including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) The January 2015 Final Report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

(2) The 2014 Military Family Lifestyle Survey Comprehensive Report.

(3) The 2013 Living Patterns Survey.

(4) The report required by section 634 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) on the management, food, and pricing options for the defense commissary system.

(d) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF REPORT.**—Not later than May 1, 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth an assessment by the Comptroller General of the report required by subsection (a). Section 652 of this Act shall be null and void.

SEC. 1026. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEFINITION OF AND POLICY REGARDING SOFTWARE SUSTAINMENT.

(a) **REPORT ON ASSESSMENT OF DEFINITION AND POLICY.**—Not later than March 15, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the President pro tempore of the Senate a report setting forth an assessment, obtained by the Secretary for purposes of the report, on the definition used by the Department of Defense for and the policy of the Department regarding software maintenance, particularly with respect to the totality of the term “software sustainment” in the definition of “depot-level maintenance and repair” under section 2460 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.**—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall be conducted by a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), or another appropriate independent entity with expertise in matters described in subsection (a), selected by the Secretary for purposes of the assessment.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall address, with respect to software and weapon systems of the Department of Defense (including space systems), each of the following:

(A) Fiscal ramifications of current programs with regard to the size, scope, and cost of software to the program’s overall budget, including embedded and support software, percentage of weapon systems’ functionality controlled by software, and reliance on proprietary data, processes, and components.

(B) Legal status of the Department in regards to adhering to section 2464(a)(1) of such title with respect to ensuring a ready and controlled source of maintenance and sustainment on software for its weapon systems.

(C) Operational risks and reduction to materiel readiness of current Department weapon systems related to software costs, delays, rework, integration and functional testing, defects, and documentation errors.

(D) Other matters as identified by the Secretary.

(2) **ADDITIONAL MATTERS.**—For each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall include review and analysis regarding sole-source contracts, range of competition, rights in technical data, public and private capabilities, integration lab initial costs and sustaining operations, and total obligation authority costs of software, disaggregated by armed service, for the Department.

(d) **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide the independent entity described in subsection (b) with timely access to appropriate information, data, resources, and analysis so that the entity may conduct a thorough and independent assessment as required under such subsection.

Subtitle D—Counterterrorism

SEC. 1031. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT OR MODIFY FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES TO HOUSE DETAINEES TRANSFERRED FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available for the Department of Defense may be used, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the effective date specified in section 1032(f), to construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house an individual detained at Guantanamo for the purpose of detention or imprisonment in the custody or control of the United States Government unless authorized by Congress.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) **INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “individual detained at Guantanamo” means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(d) **REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROHIBITION.**—Section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 850), as amended by section 1032 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), is repealed.

SEC. 1032. LIMITATION ON THE TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available for the Department of Defense may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after January 20, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

(b) TRANSFER FOR DETENTION AND TRIAL.—The Secretary of Defense may transfer a detainee described in subsection (a) to the United States for detention pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40), trial, and incarceration if the Secretary—

(1) determines that the transfer is in the national security interest of the United States;

(2) determines that appropriate actions have been taken, or will be taken, to address any risk to public safety that could arise in connection with detention and trial in the United States; and

(3) notifies the appropriate committees of Congress not later than 30 days before the date of the proposed transfer.

(c) NOTIFICATION ELEMENTS.—A notification on a transfer under subsection (b)(3) shall include the following:

(1) A statement of the basis for the determination that the transfer is in the national security interest of the United States.

(2) A description of the action the Secretary determines have been taken, or will be taken, to address any risk to the public safety that could arise in connection with the detention and trial in the United States.

(d) STATUS WHILE IN THE UNITED STATES.—A detainee who is transferred to the United States under this section—

(1) shall not be permitted to apply for asylum under section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) or be eligible to apply for admission into the United States;

(2) shall be considered to be paroled into the United States temporarily pursuant to section 212(d)(5)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)(A));

(3) shall not at any time be subject to, and may not apply for or obtain, or be deemed to enjoy, any right, privilege, status, benefit, or eligibility for any benefit under any provision of the immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17)), or any other law or regulation; and

(4) shall not, as a result of such transfer, have a change in designation as an unprivileged enemy belligerent eligible for detention pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force, as determined in accordance with applicable law and regulations.

(e) LIMITATIONS ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) LIMITATIONS.—Except as provided for in paragraph (2), no court, justice, or judge shall have jurisdiction to hear or consider any action against the United States or its agents relating to any aspect of the detention, transfer, treatment, or conditions of confinement of a detainee described in subsection (a) who is held by the Armed Forces of the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION.—A detainee who is transferred to the United States under this section shall not be deprived of the right to challenge his designation as an unprivileged enemy belligerent by filing a writ of habeas corpus as provided by the Supreme Court in *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld* (548 U.S. 557 (2006)) and *Boumediene v. Bush* (553 U.S. 723 (2008)).

(3) NO CAUSE OF ACTION IN DECISION NOT TO TRANSFER.—A decision not to transfer a detainee to the United States under this section shall not give rise to a judicial cause of action.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) shall take effect on the effective date of a joint resolution approved pursuant to subsection (h) on the plan on the disposition of detainees held at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, submitted pursuant to subsection (g).

(g) PLAN FOR DISPOSITION OF DETAINEES.—

(1) REPORT ON PLAN REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth a comprehensive plan on the disposition of detainees held at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall contain the following:

(A) A case-by-case determination made for each individual detained at Guantanamo of whether such individual is intended to be transferred to a foreign country, transferred to the United States for the purpose of civilian or military trial, or transferred to the United States or another country for continued detention under the law of armed conflict.

(B) The specific facility or facilities that are intended to be used, or modified to be used, to hold individuals inside the United States for the purpose of trial, for detention in the aftermath of conviction, or for continued detention under the law of armed conflict.

(C) The estimated costs associated with the detention inside the United States of individuals detained at Guantanamo.

(D) A description of the legal implications associated with the detention inside the United States of an individual detained at Guantanamo, including but not limited to the right to challenge such detention as unlawful.

(E) A detailed description and assessment, made in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, of the actions that would be taken prior to the transfer to a foreign country of an individual detained at Guantanamo that would substantially mitigate the risk of such individual engaging or re-engaging in any terrorist or other hostile activity that threatens the United States or United States person or interests.

(F) What additional authorities, if any, may be necessary to detain an individual detained at Guantanamo inside the United States as an unprivileged enemy belligerent pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force, pending the end of hostilities or a future determination by the Secretary of Defense that such individual no longer poses a threat to the United States or United States persons or interests.

(G) A plan for the disposition of any individuals who are detained by the United States under the law of armed conflict after the date of the report, including a plan to detain and interrogate such individuals for the purposes of—

(i) protecting the security of the United States, its persons, allies, and interests; and

(ii) collecting intelligence necessary to ensure the security of the United States, its person, allies, and interests.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(h) CONSIDERATION BY CONGRESS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE PLAN.—

(1) TERMS OF THE RESOLUTION.—For purposes of this section the term “joint resolution” means only a joint resolution which is introduced within the 10-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress a report under subsection (g) and—

(A) which does not have a preamble;

(B) the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That Congress approves

the plan of the Secretary of Defense on the disposition of detainees held at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, under section 1032(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 as submitted by the Secretary of Defense to Congress on _____”, the blank space being filled in with the appropriate date; and

(C) the title of which is as follows: “Joint resolution approving the plan of the Secretary of Defense on the disposition of detainees held at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.”.

(2) REFERRAL.—A resolution described in paragraph (1) that is introduced in the House of Representatives shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. A resolution described in paragraph (1) introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(3) DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a resolution described in paragraph (1) is referred has not reported such resolution (or an identical resolution) by the end of the 20-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits to Congress a report under subsection (g), such committee shall be, at the end of such period, discharged from further consideration of such resolution, and such resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House involved.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—(A) On or after the third day after the date on which the committee to which such a resolution is referred has reported, or has been discharged (under paragraph (3)) from further consideration of, such a resolution, it is in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for any Member of the respective House to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. A Member may make the motion only on the day after the calendar day on which the Member announces to the House concerned the Member's intention to make the motion, except that, in the case of the House of Representatives, the motion may be made without such prior announcement if the motion is made by direction of the committee to which the resolution was referred. All points of order against the resolution (and against consideration of the resolution) are waived. The motion is highly privileged in the House of Representatives and is privileged in the Senate and is not debatable. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the respective House shall immediately proceed to consideration of the joint resolution without intervening motion, order, or other business, and the resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the respective House until disposed of.

(B) Debate on the resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the resolution is not in order. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. A motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the resolution is not in order. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to is not in order.

(C) Immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a resolution described in paragraph (1) and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the appropriate House, the

vote on final passage of the resolution shall occur.

(D) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution described in paragraph (1) shall be decided without debate.

(5) CONSIDERATION BY OTHER HOUSE.—(A) If, before the passage by one House of a resolution of that House described in paragraph (1), that House receives from the other House a resolution described in paragraph (1), then the following procedures shall apply:

(i) The resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee and may not be considered in the House receiving it except in the case of final passage as provided in clause (ii)(II).

(ii) With respect to a resolution described in paragraph (1) of the House receiving the resolution—

(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no resolution had been received from the other House; but

(II) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(B) Upon disposition of the resolution received from the other House, it shall no longer be in order to consider the resolution that originated in the receiving House.

(6) RULES OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a resolution described in paragraph (1), and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(i) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF DETAINEES TRANSFERRED TO THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) LIMITATION PENDING ENACTMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVING PLAN.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to paragraph (2), any individual detained at Guantanamo who is transferred to the United States after the date of the enactment of this Act shall not be released within the United States or its territories, and may only be transferred or released in accordance with the procedures under section 1033.

(2) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OVERSEAS AFTER ENACTMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVING PLAN.—Effective on the effective date specified in subsection (f)—

(A) the provisions of section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 851; 10 U.S.C. 801 note), as previously repealed by section 1033, shall be revived;

(B) the procedures under such section 1035, as so revived, shall apply to the transfer of individuals detained at Guantanamo to foreign countries rather than the procedures under section 1033; and

(C) in the application of procedures under such section 1035 as described in subparagraph (B), any reference to an individual detained at Guantanamo shall be deemed to refer also to any such individual transferred to the United States after such effective date.

(j) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROHIBITION.—Section 1034 of the National Defense Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 851), as amended by section 1033 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), is repealed.

(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term “individual detained at Guantanamo” means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(A) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is—

(i) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 1033. REENACTMENT AND MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN PRIOR REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATIONS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF DETAINEES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND OTHER FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED PRIOR TO TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may not use any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity unless the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress the certification described in subsection (b) not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress of promptly after issuance).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this subsection is a written certification made by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, that—

(1) the government of the foreign country or the recognized leadership of the foreign entity to which the individual detained at Guantanamo is to be transferred—

(A) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(B) maintains control over each detention facility in which the individual is to be detained if the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(C) is not, as of the date of the certification, facing a threat that is likely to substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(D) has taken or agreed to take effective actions to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(E) has taken or agreed to take such actions as the Secretary of Defense determines are nec-

essary to ensure that the individual cannot engage or reengage in any terrorist activity; and

(F) has agreed to share with the United States any information that—

(i) is related to the individual or any associates of the individual; and

(ii) could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies;

(2) the United States Government and the government of the foreign country have entered into a written memorandum of understanding (MOU) regarding the transfer of the individual and such memorandum of understanding has previously been transmitted to the appropriate committees of Congress; and

(3) includes an assessment, in classified or unclassified form, of the capacity, willingness, and past practices (if applicable) of the foreign country or entity in relation to the Secretary's certifications.

(c) PROHIBITION IN CASES OF PRIOR CONFIRMED RECIDIVISM.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may not use any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual who was detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, at any time after September 11, 2001, who was transferred to such foreign country or entity and subsequently engaged in any terrorist activity.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Subject to subsection (e), paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress of promptly after issuance).

(d) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (e), the Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability to a detainee transfer of a certification requirement specified in subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), or the prohibition in subsection (c), if the Secretary certifies the rest of the criteria required by subsection (b) for transfers prohibited by subsection (c) and, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, determines that—

(A) alternative actions will be taken to address the underlying purpose of the requirement or requirements to be waived;

(B) in the case of a waiver of subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), it is not possible to certify that the risks addressed in the paragraph to be waived have been completely eliminated, but the actions to be taken under subparagraph (A) will substantially mitigate such risks with regard to the individual to be transferred;

(C) in the case of a waiver of subsection (c), the Secretary has considered any confirmed case in which an individual who was transferred to the country subsequently engaged in terrorist activity, and the actions to be taken under subparagraph (A) will substantially mitigate the risk of recidivism with regard to the individual to be transferred; and

(D) the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) REPORTS.—Whenever the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual concerned, the following:

(A) A copy of the determination and the waiver concerned.

(B) A statement of the basis for the determination, including—

(i) an explanation why the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States;

(ii) in the case of a waiver of paragraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), an explanation why it is not possible to certify that the risks addressed in the paragraph to be waived have been completely eliminated; and

(iii) a classified summary of—

(I) the individual's record of cooperation while in the custody of or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; and

(II) the agreements and mechanisms in place to provide for continuing cooperation.

(C) A summary of the alternative actions to be taken to address the underlying purpose of, and to mitigate the risks addressed in, the paragraph or subsection to be waived.

(D) The assessment required by subsection (b)(2).

(e) RECORD OF COOPERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In assessing the risk that an individual detained at Guantanamo will engage in terrorist activity or other actions that could affect the security of the United States if released for the purpose of making a certification under subsection (b) or a waiver under subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may give favorable consideration to any such individual—

(A) who has substantially cooperated with United States intelligence and law enforcement authorities, pursuant to a pre-trial agreement, while in the custody of or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; and

(B) for whom agreements and effective mechanisms are in place, to the extent relevant and necessary, to provide for continued cooperation with United States intelligence and law enforcement authorities.

(2) REPORTS.—Each certification under subsection (b) or report under subsection (d)(2) that includes an assessment in which favorable consideration was given an individual as described in paragraph (1) shall also include the following:

(A) A description of the cooperation for which favorable consideration was so given.

(B) A description of operational outcomes, if any, affected by such cooperation.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1)(A) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(i) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(B) In connection with a certification made under subsection (b), the term also includes the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, but only with respect to the submittal to such committees of a copy of the written memorandum of understanding concerned described in subsection (b)(2).

(2) The term “individual detained at Guantanamo” means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(A) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is—

(i) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(3) The term “foreign terrorist organization” means any organization so designated by the

Secretary of State under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(4) The term “state sponsor of terrorism” has the meaning given that term in section 301(13) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8541(13)).

(g) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—Section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 851; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is repealed.

SEC. 1034. AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY TRANSFER INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE UNITED STATES FOR EMERGENCY OR CRITICAL MEDICAL TREATMENT.

(a) TRANSFER FOR EMERGENCY OR CRITICAL MEDICAL TREATMENT AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, or any other provision of law enacted after September 30, 2013, but subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may temporarily transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to a Department of Defense medical facility in the United States for the sole purpose of providing the individual medical treatment if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the Senior Medical Officer, Joint Task Force–Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, has determined that the medical treatment is necessary to prevent death or imminent significant injury or harm to the health of the individual;

(2) based on the recommendation of the Senior Medical Officer, Joint Task Force–Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, the medical treatment is not available to be provided at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, without incurring excessive and unreasonable costs;

(3) the Department of Defense has provided for appropriate security measures for the custody and control of the individual during any period in which the individual is temporarily in the United States under this subsection; and

(4) except in cases involving the especially immediate need for the provision of medical treatment to prevent death or imminent significant injury or harm to the health of the individual, the estimated aggregate cost of providing the individual medical treatment in a Department of Defense medical facility in the United States (including the cost of transferring and securing the individual in such facility during any period in which the individual is temporarily in the United States for treatment and the cost of treatment) would be less than the estimated cost of providing the individual such medical treatment at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay.

(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS REQUIRED BEFORE TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the requirements in subsection (a), an individual may not be temporarily transferred under the authority in that subsection unless the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate committees of Congress the notice described in paragraph (2)—

(A) not later than 30 days before the date of the proposed transfer; or

(B) if notice cannot be provided in accordance with subparagraph (A) because of an especially immediate need for the provision of medical treatment to prevent death or imminent significant injury or harm to the health of the individual, as soon as is practicable, but not later than 5 days after the date of transfer.

(2) NOTICE ELEMENTS.—The notice on the transfer of an individual under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) A statement of the basis for the determination that the transfer is necessary to prevent death or imminent significant injury or harm to the health of the individual.

(B) The specific Department of Defense medical facility that will provide medical treatment to the individual.

(C) A description of the actions the Secretary determines have been taken, or will be taken, to address any risk to the public safety that could arise in connection with the provision of medical treatment to the individual in the United States.

(c) LIMITATION ON EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a) may be exercised only by the Secretary of Defense or by another official of the Department of Defense at the level of Under Secretary of Defense or higher.

(d) CONDITIONS OF TRANSFER.—An individual who is temporarily transferred under the authority in subsection (a) shall—

(1) while in the United States, remain in the custody and control of the Secretary of Defense at all times; and

(2) be returned to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as soon as feasible after a Department of Defense physician determines that—

(A) the individual is medically cleared to travel; and

(B) in consultation with the Commander, Joint Task Force–Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, any necessary follow-up medical care may reasonably be provided the individual at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(e) STATUS WHILE IN UNITED STATES.—An individual who is temporarily transferred under the authority in subsection (a), while in the United States—

(1) shall be deemed at all times and in all respects to be in the uninterrupted custody of the Secretary of Defense, as though the individual remained physically at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba;

(2) shall not at any time be subject to, and may not apply for or obtain, or be deemed to enjoy, any right, privilege, status, benefit, or eligibility for any benefit under any provision of the immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17)), or any other law or regulation;

(3) shall not be permitted to avail himself of any right, privilege, or benefit of any law of the United States beyond those available to individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; and

(4) shall not, as a result of such transfer, have a change in any designation that may have attached to that detainee while detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40), as determined in accordance with applicable law and regulations.

(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW PRECLUDED.—

(1) NO CREATION OF ENFORCEABLE RIGHTS.—Nothing in this section is intended to create any enforceable right or benefit, or any claim or cause of action, by any party against the United States, or any other person or entity.

(2) LIMITATION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), no court, justice, or judge shall have jurisdiction to hear or consider any claim or action against the United States or its agents relating to any aspect of the detention, transfer, treatment, or conditions of confinement of an individual transferred under this section.

(3) HABEAS CORPUS.—

(A) JURISDICTION.—The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction to consider an application for writ of habeas corpus challenging the fact or duration of detention and seeking release from custody filed by or on behalf of an individual who is in the United States pursuant to a temporary transfer under subsection (a). Such jurisdiction shall be limited to that required by the

Constitution with respect to the fact or duration of detention.

(B) **SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.**—A court order in a proceeding covered by paragraph (3) may not—

(i) review, halt, or stay the return of the individual who is the object of the application to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, including pursuant to subsection (d); or

(ii) order the release of the individual within the United States.

(g) **NOTIFICATION.**—The Secretary of Defense shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives of any temporary transfer of an individual under the authority in subsection (a) not later than 5 days after the transfer of the individual under that authority.

(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term “individual detained at Guantanamo” means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(A) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is—

(i) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 1035. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE TO YEMEN OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available for the Department of Defense may be used, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of any individual detained in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of the Republic of Yemen or any entity within Yemen.

SEC. 1036. REPORT ON CURRENT DETAINEES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, DETERMINED OR ASSESSED TO BE HIGH RISK OR MEDIUM RISK.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees and members of Congress a report, in unclassified form, setting forth a list of the individuals detained at Guantanamo as of the date of the enactment of this Act who have been determined or assessed by Joint Task Force Guantanamo, at any time before the date of the report, to be a high-risk or medium-risk threat to the United States, its interests, or its allies.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall set forth, for each individual covered by the report, the following:

(1) The name and country of origin.

(2) The date on which first designated or assessed as a high-risk or medium-risk threat to the United States, its interests, or its allies.

(3) Whether, as of the date of the report, currently designated or assessed as a high-risk or medium-risk threat to the United States, its interests, or its allies.

(4) If the designation or assessment changed between the date specified pursuant to para-

graph (2) and the date of the report, the year and month in which the designation or assessment changed and the designation or assessment to which changed.

(5) To the extent practicable, without jeopardizing intelligence sources and methods—

(A) prior actions in support of terrorism, hostile actions against the United States or its allies, gross violations of human rights, and other violations of international law; and

(B) any affiliations with al Qaeda, al Qaeda affiliates, or other terrorist groups.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate committees and members of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(B) the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term “individual detained at Guantanamo” means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(A) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is—

(i) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 1037. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES REGARDING TRANSFER OF DETAINEES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth the written memorandum of understanding between the United States Government and the government of the foreign country concerned regarding each individual detained at Guantanamo who was transferred to a foreign country during the 18-month period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **STATEMENT ON LACK OF MOU.**—If an individual detained at Guantanamo was transferred to a foreign country during the period described in paragraph (1) and no memorandum of understanding exists between the United States Government and the government of the foreign country regarding such individual, the report under paragraph (1) shall include an unclassified statement of that fact.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term “individual detained at Guantanamo” means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(A) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is—

(i) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 1038. SEMIANNUAL REPORTS ON USE OF UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, AND ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OR BUREAU OF PRISONS PRISON OR OTHER DETENTION OR DISCIPLINARY FACILITY IN RECRUITMENT AND OTHER PROPAGANDA OF TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every six months thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, submit to Congress a report on the use by terrorist organizations and their leaders of images and symbols relating to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and any other Department of Defense or Bureau of Prisons prison or other detention or disciplinary facility for recruitment and other propaganda purposes during the six-month period ending on the date of such report. Each report shall include the following:

(1) A description and assessment of the effectiveness of the use of such images and symbols for recruitment and other propaganda purposes.

(2) A description and assessment of the efforts of the United States Government to counter the use of such images and symbols for such purposes and to disseminate accurate information about such facilities.

(b) **ADDITIONAL MATERIAL IN FIRST REPORT.**—The first report under subsection (a) shall include a description of the use by terrorist organizations and their leaders of images and symbols relating to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and any other Department of Defense or Bureau of Prisons prison or other detention or disciplinary facility for recruitment and other propaganda purposes before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1039. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE REWARDS FOR COMBATING TERRORISM.

(a) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE REWARDS THROUGH GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL OF ALLIED FORCES.**—Subsection (c)(3)(C) of section 127b of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”.

(b) **MODIFICATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Subsection (f)(2) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (D);

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G), as subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F), respectively; and

(3) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including in which countries the program is being operated”.

(c) **REPORT ON DESIGNATION OF COUNTRIES FOR WHICH REWARDS MAY BE PAID.**—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) **REPORT ON DESIGNATION OF COUNTRIES FOR WHICH REWARDS MAY BE PAID.**—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the Secretary designates a country as a country in which an operation or activity of the armed forces is occurring in connection with which rewards may be paid under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the designation. Each report shall include the following:

“(1) The country so designated.

“(2) The reason for the designation of the country.

“(3) A justification for the designation of the country for purposes of this section.”.

(d) CHANGE OF SECTION HEADING TO REFLECT NAME OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§ 127b. Department of Defense Rewards Program”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 127b and inserting the following new item: “127b. Department of Defense Rewards Program.”.

SEC. 1040. REAFFIRMATION OF THE PROHIBITION ON TORTURE.

(a) LIMITATION ON INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES TO THOSE IN THE ARMY FIELD MANUAL.—

(1) ARMY FIELD MANUAL 2–22.3 DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “Army Field Manual 2–22.3” means the Army Field Manual 2–22.3 entitled “Human Intelligence Collector Operations” in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act or any similar successor Army Field Manual.

(2) RESTRICTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual described in subparagraph (B) shall not be subjected to any interrogation technique or approach, or any treatment related to interrogation, that is not authorized by and listed in the Army Field Manual 2–22.3.

(B) INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this subparagraph is an individual who is—

(i) in the custody or under the effective control of an officer, employee, or other agent of the United States Government; or

(ii) detained within a facility owned, operated, or controlled by a department or agency of the United States, in any armed conflict.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—Interrogation techniques, approaches, and treatments described in Army Field Manual 2–22.3 shall be implemented strictly in accord with the principles, processes, conditions, and limitations prescribed by Army Field Manual 2–22.3.

(4) AGENCIES OTHER THAN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—If a process required by Army Field Manual 2–22.3, such as a requirement of approval by a specified Department of Defense official, is inapposite to a department or an agency other than the Department of Defense, the head of such department or agency shall ensure that a process that is substantially equivalent to the process prescribed by Army Field Manual 2–22.3 for the Department of Defense is utilized by all officers, employees, or other agents of such department or agency.

(5) INTERROGATION BY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this subsection shall preclude an officer, employee, or other agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other Federal law enforcement agency from continuing to use authorized, non-coercive techniques of interrogation that are designed to elicit voluntary statements and do not involve the use of force, threats, or promises.

(6) UPDATE OF THE ARMY FIELD MANUAL.—

(A) REQUIREMENT TO UPDATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and once every three years thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall complete a thorough review of Army Field Manual 2–22.3, and revise Army Field Manual 2–22.3, as necessary to ensure that Army Field Manual 2–22.3 complies with the legal obligations of the United States and reflects current, evidence-based, best practices for interrogation that are designed to elicit reliable and voluntary statements and do not involve the use or threat of force.

(ii) AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.—Army Field Manual 2–22.3 shall remain available to the public and any revisions to the Army Field Manual 2–22.3 adopted by the Secretary of Defense shall be made available to the public 30 days prior to the date the revisions take effect.

(B) REPORT ON BEST PRACTICES OF INTERROGATIONS.—

(i) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the interagency body established pursuant to Executive Order 13491 (commonly known as the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group) shall submit to the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, the Attorney General, and other appropriate officials a report on current, evidence-based, best practices for interrogation that are designed to elicit reliable and voluntary statements and do not involve the use of force.

(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report required by clause (i) may include recommendations for revisions to Army Field Manual 2–22.3 based on the body of research commissioned by the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group.

(iii) AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.—Not later than 30 days after the report required by clause (i) is submitted such report shall be made available to the public.

(b) INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS ACCESS TO DETAINEES.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The head of any department or agency of the United States Government shall provide the International Committee of the Red Cross with notification of, and prompt access to, any individual detained in any armed conflict in the custody or under the effective control of an officer, employee, contractor, subcontractor, or other agent of the United States Government or detained within a facility owned, operated, or effectively controlled by a department, agency, contractor, or subcontractor of the United States Government, consistent with Department of Defense regulations and policies.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to create or otherwise imply the authority to detain; or

(B) to limit or otherwise affect any other individual rights or state obligations which may arise under United States law or international agreements to which the United States is a party, including the Geneva Conventions, or to state all of the situations under which notification to and access for the International Committee of the Red Cross is required or allowed.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

SEC. 1041. ASSISTANCE TO SECURE THE SOUTHERN LAND BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide assistance to United States Customs and Border Protection for purposes of increasing ongoing efforts to secure the southern land border of the United States.

(b) CONCURRENCE IN ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under subsection (a) shall be provided with the concurrence of the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(c) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—The assistance provided under subsection (a) may include the following:

(1) Deployment of members and units of the regular and reserve components of the Armed Forces to the southern land border of the United States.

(2) Deployment of manned aircraft, unmanned aerial surveillance systems, and ground-based surveillance systems to support continuous surveillance of the southern land border of the United States.

(3) Intelligence analysis support.

(d) MATERIEL AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to deploy such materiel and equipment and logistics support as is necessary to ensure the effectiveness of assistance provided under subsection (a).

(e) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense by this Act, the Secretary of Defense may use up to \$75,000,000 to provide assistance under this section.

(f) REPORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on any provision of assistance under subsection (a) during the 90-day period ending on the date of such report. Each report shall include, for the period covered by such report, the following:

(1) A description of the assistance provided.

(2) A description of the sources and amounts of funds used to provide such assistance.

(3) A description of the amounts obligated to provide such assistance.

SEC. 1042. PROTECTION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS.

(a) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AUTHORITY.—Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2671 the following new section:

“§ 2672. Protection of buildings, grounds, property, and persons

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall protect the buildings, grounds, and property that are under the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the Department of Defense and the persons on that property.

“(b) OFFICERS AND AGENTS.—(1)(A) The Secretary of Defense may designate military or civilian personnel of the Department of Defense as officers and agents to perform the functions of the Secretary under subsection (a), including, with regard to civilian officers and agents, duty in areas outside the property specified in that subsection to the extent necessary to protect that property and persons on that property.

“(B) A designation under subparagraph (A) may be made by individual, by position, by installation, or by such other category of personnel as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(C) In making a designation under subparagraph (A) with respect to any category of personnel, the Secretary shall specify each of the following:

“(i) The personnel or positions to be included in the category.

“(ii) Which authorities provided for in paragraph (2) may be exercised by personnel in that category.

“(iii) In the case of civilian personnel in that category—

“(I) which authorities provided for in paragraph (2), if any, are authorized to be exercised outside the property specified in subsection (a); and

“(II) with respect to the exercise of any such authorities outside the property specified in subsection (a), the circumstances under which coordination with law enforcement officials outside of the Department of Defense should be sought in advance.

“(D) The Secretary may make a designation under subparagraph (A) only if the Secretary determines, with respect to the category of personnel to be covered by that designation, that—

“(i) the exercise of each specific authority provided for in paragraph (2) to be delegated to that category of personnel is necessary for the performance of the duties of the personnel in that category and such duties cannot be performed as effectively without such authorities; and

“(ii) the necessary and proper training for the authorities to be exercised is available to the personnel in that category.

“(2) Subject to subsection (h) and to the extent specifically authorized by the Secretary, while engaged in the performance of official duties pursuant to this section, an officer or agent designated under this subsection may—

“(A) enforce Federal laws and regulations for the protection of persons and property;

“(B) carry firearms;

“(C) make arrests—

“(i) without a warrant for any offense against the United States committed in the presence of the officer or agent; or

“(ii) for any felony cognizable under the laws of the United States if the officer or agent has reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing a felony;

“(D) serve warrants and subpoenas issued under the authority of the United States; and

“(E) conduct investigations, on and off the property in question, of offenses that may have been committed against property under the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the Department of Defense or persons on such property.

“(c) REGULATIONS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may prescribe regulations, including traffic regulations, necessary for the protection and administration of property under the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the Department of Defense and persons on that property. The regulations may include reasonable penalties, within the limits prescribed in paragraph (2), for violations of the regulations. The regulations shall be posted and remain posted in a conspicuous place on the property to which they apply.

“(2) A person violating a regulation prescribed under this subsection shall be fined under title 18, imprisoned for not more than 30 days, or both.

“(d) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary of Defense under subsections (b) and (c) may be exercised only by the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

“(e) DISPOSITION OF PERSONS ARRESTED.—A person who is arrested pursuant to authority exercised under subsection (b) may not be held in a military confinement facility, other than in the case of a person who is subject to chapter 47 of this title (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

“(f) FACILITIES AND SERVICES OF OTHER AGENCIES.—In implementing this section, when the Secretary of Defense determines it to be economical and in the public interest, the Secretary may utilize the facilities and services of Federal, State, Indian tribal, and local law enforcement agencies, with the consent of those agencies, and may reimburse those agencies for the use of their facilities and services. Such services of State, Indian tribal, and local law enforcement, including application of their powers of law enforcement, may be provided notwithstanding that the property is subject to the legislative jurisdiction of the United States.

“(g) AUTHORITY OUTSIDE FEDERAL PROPERTY.—For the protection of property under the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the Department of Defense and persons on that property, the Secretary of Defense may enter into agreements with Federal agencies and with State, Indian tribal, and local governments to obtain authority for civilian officers and agents designated under this section to enforce Federal laws and State, Indian tribal, and local laws concurrently with other Federal law enforcement officers and with State, Indian tribal, and local law enforcement officers.

“(h) ATTORNEY GENERAL APPROVAL.—The powers granted pursuant to subsection (b)(2) to officers and agents designated under subsection (b)(1) shall be exercised in accordance with guidelines approved by the Attorney General. Such guidelines may include specification of the

geographical extent of property outside of the property specified in subsection (a) within which those powers may be exercised.

“(i) LIMITATION WITH REGARD TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for the protection of facilities (including the buildings, grounds, and properties of the General Services Administration) that are under the jurisdiction, custody, or control, in whole or in part, of a Federal agency other than the Department of Defense and that are located off of a military installation.

“(j) COOPERATION WITH LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—Before authorizing civilian officers and agents to perform duty in areas outside the property specified in subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall consult with, and is encouraged to enter into agreements with, local law enforcement agencies exercising jurisdiction over such areas for the purposes of avoiding conflicts of jurisdiction, promoting notification of planned law enforcement actions, and otherwise facilitating productive working relationships.

“(k) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to preclude or limit the authority of any Federal law enforcement agency;

“(2) to restrict the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security under the Homeland Security Act of 2002 or of the Administrator of General Services, including the authority to promulgate regulations affecting property under the custody and control of that Secretary or the Administrator, respectively;

“(3) to expand or limit section 21 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 797);

“(4) to affect chapter 47 of this title;

“(5) to restrict any other authority of the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department; or

“(6) to restrict the authority of the Director of the National Security Agency under section 11 of the National Security Agency Act of 1959 (50 U.S.C. 3609).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 159 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2671 the following new item:

“2672. Protection of buildings, grounds, property, and persons.”.

SEC. 1043. STRATEGY TO PROTECT UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS IN THE ARCTIC REGION.

(a) REPORT ON STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that sets forth an updated military strategy for the protection of United States national security interests in the Arctic region.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of United States military interests in the Arctic region.

(2) A description of operational plans and associated military requirements for the protection of United States national security interests in the Arctic region, including United States citizens, territory, freedom of navigation, and economic and trade interests.

(3) An identification of any operational seams and a plan to enhance unity of effort among the combatant commands with responsibility for the Arctic region, as well as among the Armed Forces.

(4) A description of the security environment in the Arctic region, including the activities of foreign nations operating within the Arctic region.

(5) A description of United States military capabilities required to implement the strategy required by subsection (a).

(6) An identification of any capability gaps and resource gaps, including in installations, infrastructure, communications and domain awareness, and personnel in the Arctic region, that would impact the implementation of the strategy required by subsection (a) or the execution of any associated operational plan, and a mitigation plan to address such gaps.

(7) A plan to enhance military-to-military cooperation with partner nations that have mutual security interests in the Arctic region, including by exploring opportunities for sharing installations and maintenance facilities.

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1044. EXTENSION OF LIMITATIONS ON THE TRANSFER TO THE REGULAR ARMY OF AH-64 APACHE HELICOPTERS ASSIGNED TO THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1712 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended by striking “March 31, 2016” each place it appears and inserting “September 30, 2016”.

(b) READINESS OF AIRCRAFT AND PERSONNEL.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking “fiscal year 2015” and inserting “fiscal years 2015 and 2016”.

SEC. 1045. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PREVIOUSLY TRANSFERRED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD HELICOPTERS AS COUNTING AGAINST NUMBER TRANSFERABLE UNDER EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD HELICOPTERS.

(a) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the number of AH-64D Apache helicopters that have been transferred from the Army National Guard to the original equipment manufacturer for the purpose of remanufacture to the AH-64E Apache helicopter variant.

(b) TREATMENT AS COUNTING AGAINST NUMBER TRANSFERABLE.—The Secretary of the Army shall treat the number of helicopters specified in the report under subsection (a) as counting against the total number of AH-64 Apache helicopters that may be transferred from the Army National Guard to the regular Army pursuant to subsection (e) of section 1712 of the Carl Levin and Howard B. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3668).

(c) CONSTRUCTION WITH REQUIRED CERTIFICATION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to alter or terminate the requirement for a certification by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (f) of section 1712 of the Carl Levin and Howard B. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 as a precondition for any action under subsection (e) of such section.

SEC. 1046. MANAGEMENT OF MILITARY TECHNICIANS.

(a) CONVERSION OF CERTAIN MILITARY TECHNICIAN (DUAL STATUS) POSITIONS TO CIVILIAN POSITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall convert not fewer than 20 percent of the positions described in paragraph (2) as of January 1, 2017, from military technician (dual status) positions to positions filled by individuals who are employed under section 3101 of title 5, United States Code, and are not military technicians.

(2) COVERED POSITIONS.—The positions described in this paragraph are military technician (dual status) positions as follows:

(A) Military technician (dual status) positions identified as general administration, clerical,

and office service occupations in the report of the Secretary of Defense under section 519 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1397).

(B) Such other military technician (dual status) positions as the Secretary shall specify for purposes of this subsection.

(b) PHASED-IN TERMINATION OF ARMY RESERVE, AIR FORCE RESERVE, AND NATIONAL GUARD NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 10217 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) PHASED-IN TERMINATION OF POSITIONS.—(1) No individual may be newly hired or employed, or rehired or reemployed, as a non-dual status technician for the purposes of this section after December 31, 2016.

“(2) Commencing January 1, 2017, the maximum number of non-dual status technicians employable by the Army Reserve and by the Air Force Reserve shall be reduced from the number otherwise provided by subsection (c)(1) by one for each individual who retires, is separated from, or otherwise ceases service as a non-dual status technician of the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve, as the case may be, after such date until the maximum number of non-dual status technicians employable by the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve, as the case may be, is zero.

“(3) Commencing January 1, 2017, the maximum number of non-dual status technicians employable by the National Guard shall be reduced from the number otherwise provided by subsection (c)(2) by one for each individual who retires, is separated from, or otherwise ceases service as a non-dual status technician of the National Guard after such date until the maximum number of non-dual status technicians employable by the National Guard is zero.

“(4) Any individual newly hired or employed, or rehired or employed, to a position required to be filled by reason of the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall be an individual employed in such position under section 3101 of title 5, and may not be a military technician.

“(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to terminate the status as a non-dual status technician under this section after December 31, 2016, of any individual who is a non-dual status technician for the purposes of this section on that date.”

(2) REPORT ON PHASED-IN TERMINATIONS.—Not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a plan for implementing the amendment made by paragraph (1).

SEC. 1047. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CONSIDERATION OF THE FULL RANGE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANPOWER WORLDWIDE IN DECISIONS ON THE PROPER MIX OF MILITARY, CIVILIAN, AND CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL TO ACCOMPLISH THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY.

It is the sense of Congress that, as the Department of Defense makes decisions on military end strength requests, proper sizing of the civilian workforce, and the proper mix of these sources of manpower with contractor personnel to accomplish the National Defense Strategy, the Secretary of Defense should consider the full range of manpower available to the Secretary in all locations worldwide in order to arrive at the proper mix and size of manpower to accomplish that Strategy without arbitrarily protecting or exempting any particular group or location of manpower.

SEC. 1048. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) As senior United States statesmen Dr. Henry Kissinger wrote in testimony submitted to

the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate on January 29, 2015, “[t]he United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War.”

(2) The rise of committed, non-state forces and near peer competitors has introduced destabilizing pressures around the globe.

(3) Advances in information and weapons technology have reduced the time available for the United States to prepare for a respond to crises against either known or unknown threats.

(4) The importance of the maritime domain cannot be overstated. As acknowledged in the March 2015 Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard maritime strategy entitled “A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower: Forward, Engaged, Ready”, “[o]ceans are the lifeblood of the interconnected global community. . . 90 percent of trade by volume across the oceans. Approximately 70 percent of the world’s population lives within 100 miles of the coastline”.

(5) In this global security environment, it is critical that the United States possess a maritime forces whose mission and ethos is readiness, a fight tonight force, forward deployed, that can respond immediately to emergent crises across the full range of military operations around the globe either from the sea or home station.

(6) The need for such forces was recognized by the 82nd Congress during the Korean War, when it mandated a core mission for the Nation’s leanest force, the Marine Corps, to be most ready when the nation is least ready.

(7) In recognition of this continued need and the wisdom of the 82nd Congress, the Senate reaffirms section 5063 of title 10, United States Code, uniquely charging the United States Marine Corps with this responsibility.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, should remain the Nation’s expeditionary, crisis response force; and

(2) as provided in section 5063 of title 10, United States Code, the Marine Corps should—

(A) be organized to include no less than three combat divisions and three air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic to it;

(B) be organized, trained, and equipped to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign; and

(C) provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and perform such other duties as the President may direct;

(D) develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations that pertain to the tactics, techniques, and equipment used by landing forces; and

(E) be responsible, in accordance with the integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war.

Subtitle F—Studies and Reports

SEC. 1061. REPEAL OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORTS UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORT ON GIFTS MADE FOR THE BENEFIT OF MILITARY MUSICAL UNITS.—Section 974(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(2) BIENNIAL REPORT ON SPACE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY STRATEGY.—Section 2272(a) of title

10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(3) ANNUAL REPORT ON PRIZES FOR ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY ACHIEVEMENTS.—Section 2374a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(b) REPORTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 113–66.—

(1) REPORTS ON USE OF TEMPORARY AUTHORITIES FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS AT DOD RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING FACILITIES.—Section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (g); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

(2) ANNUAL REPORT ON ADVANCING SMALL BUSINESS GROWTH.—Section 1611 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (127 Stat. 946) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(c) REPORTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 112–239.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORTS ON QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAMS FOR MEDICAL EVALUATION BOARDS AND PHYSICIAN EVALUATION BOARDS AND RELATED PERSONNEL.—Section 524 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1723; 10 U.S.C. 1222 note) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(2) ANNUAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON NUMBER OF MEMBERS IN INTEGRATED DISABILITY EVALUATION SYSTEM ON READINESS REQUIREMENTS.—Section 528 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (126 Stat. 1725) is repealed.

(3) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NOTICE ON UNFUNDED PRIORITIES.—Section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (126 Stat. 1903) is repealed.

(d) ANNUAL UPDATES ON IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR WHOLE-OF-GOVERNMENT VISION PRESCRIBED IN THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY.—Section 1072 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1592; 50 U.S.C. 3043 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(e) REPORTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 111–383.—

(1) REPORTS ON DEFENSE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM.—Section 1073 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4366; 10 U.S.C. 2359 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (f); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

(2) REPORT ON TASK FORCE FOR BUSINESS AND STABILITY OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN.—Section 1535(a) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (124 Stat. 4426) is amended by striking paragraph (6).

(f) ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ELECTRONIC WARFARE STRATEGY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Section 1053 of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2458) is repealed.

(g) REPORTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 110–417.—

(1) MITIGATION OF POWER OUTAGE RISKS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES AND ACTIVITIES.—Section 335 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4422; 10 U.S.C. 2911 note) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(2) UPDATES OF INCREASES IN NUMBER OF UNITS OF JROTC.—Section 548 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (122 Stat. 4466) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(3) ANNUAL REPORTS ON CENTER OF EXCELLENCE ON TRAUMATIC EXTREMITY INJURIES AND AMPUTATIONS.—Section 723 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (122 Stat. 4508) is amended by striking (d).

(4) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT ON STATUS OF NAVY NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORKS PROGRAM.—Section 1034 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (122 Stat. 4593) is hereby repealed.

(h) REPORTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 110-181.—

(1) BIENNIAL UPDATE OF STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Section 904(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 275) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(2) REPORTS ON ACCESS OF RECOVERING SERVICEMEMBERS TO ADEQUATE OUTPATIENT RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES.—Section 1662 of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 479; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended—

(A) by striking “(a) REQUIRED INSPECTIONS OF FACILITIES.—”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(i) REPORTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 109-364.—

(1) ROADMAPS AND REPORTS ON HYPERSONICS DEVELOPMENT.—Section 218 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d), by striking paragraph (4); and

(B) by striking subsection (f).

(2) UPDATES OF ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES EXPERIENCING GROWTH IN ENROLLMENT DUE TO FORCE STRUCTURE CHANGE AND OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES.—Section 574 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (20 U.S.C. 7703b note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(3) ANNUAL REPORT ON OVERHAUL, REPAIR, AND MAINTENANCE OF VESSELS UNDER ACQUISITION POLICY ON OBTAINING CARRIAGE BY VESSEL.—Section 1017 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (120 Stat. 2379) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(j) REPORTS ON ANNUAL REVIEW OF ROLES AND MISSIONS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS.—Section 513(h) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375; 118 Stat. 1882; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(k) ANNUAL SUBMITTAL OF INFORMATION REGARDING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CAPITAL ASSETS.—Section 351 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314; 10 U.S.C. 221 note) is hereby repealed.

(l) REPORTS ON EXPERIMENTAL PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PERSONNEL.—Section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (5 U.S.C. 3104 note) is amended by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 1062. TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENT FOR SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS OF REPORTS REQUIRED OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BY STATUTE.

(a) TERMINATION.—Effective on the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, each report described in subsection (b) that is still required to be submitted to Congress as of such effective date shall no longer be required to be submitted to Congress.

(b) COVERED REPORTS.—A report described in this subsection is a report that is required to be submitted to Congress by the Department of Defense, or by any officer, official, component, or element of the Department, by a provision of statute (including title 10, United States Code, and any annual national defense authorization Act) as of April 1, 2015.

SEC. 1063. ANNUAL SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS OF MUNITIONS ASSESSMENTS.

Not later than March 1, 2016, and each year thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees each of the following:

(1) The most current Munitions Assessments, as defined by Department of Defense Instruction Number 3000.04, relating to the Department of Defense munitions process.

(2) The most current Sufficiency Assessments, as defined by that Department of Defense Instruction.

(3) The most current approved memorandum of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council resulting from the Munitions Requirements Process (MRP).

SEC. 1064. POTENTIAL ROLE FOR UNITED STATES GROUND FORCES IN THE PACIFIC THEATER.

(a) GENERAL ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall jointly conduct a comprehensive operational assessment of a potential future role for United States ground forces in the island chains of the western Pacific in creating anti-access and area denial capabilities in cooperation with host nations in order to deter and defeat aggression in the western Pacific region.

(2) CAPABILITIES TO BE EXAMINED.—In conducting the assessment, the Secretary and the Chairman shall assess the feasibility and potential effectiveness of the deployment by United States ground forces, jointly with host nations, of the following:

(A) Anti-ship mines and mobile missiles as a means of neutralizing adversary naval forces, including amphibious forces, and inhibiting their movement, and protecting the shores of host nations and friendly naval forces and supply operations.

(B) Mobile air defense surveillance and missile systems to protect host-nation territory and ground, naval, and air forces, and to deny access to defended airspace by adversaries.

(C) Electronic warfare capabilities to support air and naval operations.

(D) Hardened ground-based communications capabilities for host-nation defense and for augmentation and extension of naval, air, and satellite communications.

(E) Maneuver forces to assist in host-nation defense, deny access to adversaries, and provide security for air and naval deployments.

(b) GEOPOLITICAL IMPACT OF ENHANCED GROUND FORCE ROLE.—The Secretary and the Chairman shall also jointly assess the potential geopolitical impact on the United States posture in the Pacific theater of a strategy of long-term engagement by United States ground forces with the island nations of the western Pacific to enhance United States strategic relationships with potential partners in the region.

(c) TYPES OF ANALYSES TO BE CONDUCTED.—The Secretary and the Chairman shall conduct the assessment required by subsection (a) using operations research methods and war gaming, in addition to historical analysis of the use of ground forces by the United States and Japan in the Pacific theater during World War II.

(d) RESOURCES.—In conducting the assessment required by subsection (a), the Secretary and the Chairman shall use the following, as appropriate:

(1) The United States Pacific Command.

(2) The Joint Requirements and Analysis Division and the war gaming resources of the Warfighting Analysis Division of the Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment Directorate of the Joint Staff, augmented as necessary and appropriate from the war colleges of the military departments.

(3) The Office of Net Assessment.

(4) Appropriate Federally funded research and development centers (FFRDCs).

(e) COMPLETION DATE.—The assessments required by this section shall be completed not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) BRIEFING OF CONGRESS.—Upon the completion of the assessments required by this section, the Secretary and the Chairman shall provide a briefing on the assessments to—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON PLANS FOR THE USE OF DOMESTIC AIRFIELDS FOR HOMELAND DEFENSE AND DISASTER RESPONSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Transportation, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the plans for airfields in the United States that are required to support homeland defense and local disaster response missions.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The report shall include the following items:

(1) The criteria used to determine the capabilities and locations of airfields in the United States needed to support safe operations of military aircraft in the execution of homeland defense and local disaster response missions.

(2) A description of the processes and procedures in place to ensure that contingency plans for the use of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations are coordinated among the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies with jurisdiction over those airfields.

(3) An assessment of the impact, if any, to logistics and resource planning as a result of the reduction of certain capabilities of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations.

(4) A review of the existing agreements and authorities between the Commander of the United States Northern Command and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration that allow for consultation on decisions that impact the capabilities of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations.

(c) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(2) CAPABILITIES OF AIRFIELDS.—The term “capabilities of airfields” means the length and width of runways, taxiways, and aprons, the operation of navigation aids and lighting, the operation of fuel storage, distribution, and refueling systems, and the availability of air traffic control services.

(3) AIRFIELDS IN THE UNITED STATES THAT SUPPORT BOTH MILITARY AND CIVILIAN AIR OPERATIONS.—The term “airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations” means the following:

(A) Airports that are designated as joint use facilities pursuant to section 47175 of title 49, United States Code, in which both the military

and civil aviation have shared use of the airfield.

(B) Airports used by the military that have a permanent military aviation presence at the airport pursuant to a memorandum of agreement or tenant lease with the airport owner that is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1066. ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU ON THE ABILITY OF THE NATIONAL GUARD TO MEET ITS MISSIONS.

Section 10504(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “The Chief of the National Guard Bureau”;

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by striking “, through the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force,”;

(3) by striking the second sentence; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) Each report shall include the following:

“(A) An assessment, prepared in conjunction with the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force, of the ability of the National Guard to carry out its Federal missions.

“(B) An assessment, prepared in conjunction with the chief executive officers of the States and territories, of the ability of the National Guard to carry out emergency support functions of the National Response Framework.

“(3) Each report may be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.”.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

SEC. 1081. TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A, and at the beginning of part I of such subtitle, are each amended by striking the item relating to chapter 19 and inserting the following new item:

“19. Cyber Matters 391”.

The heading of section 130e is amended to read as follows:

“§ 130e. Treatment under Freedom of Information Act of certain critical infrastructure security information”.

(3) The heading of section 153(a)(5) is amended to read as follows: “JOINT FORCE DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—”.

(4) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 19 is amended by striking the item relating to section 391 and inserting the following new item:

“391. Reporting on cyber incidents with respect to networks and information systems of operationally critical contractors and certain other contractors.”.

(5) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 21 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 429 the following new item:

“430. Tactical exploitation of national capabilities executive agent.”.

(6) Section 2006a is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “August, 1” and inserting “August 1”; and

(B) by striking “the such program or authorities” and inserting “the program”.

(7) Sections 2222(j)(5), 2223(c)(3), and 2315 are each amended by striking “section 3552(b)(5)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(6)”.

(8) Section 2229(d)(1) is amended by striking “certification” and inserting “a certification”.

(9) Section 2679, as transferred, redesignated, and amended by section 351 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3346), is amended

in subsection (a)(1) by striking “with” before “, on a sole source”.

(10) Section 2684(d)(1) is amended by striking “section 101(a) of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a(a))” and inserting “section 302101 of title 54”.

(11) Section 2687a(d)(2) is amended by inserting “fair market” before “value”.

(12) Section 2926, as added and amended by section 901(g) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (128 Stat. 3464), is amended in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) by striking “for Installations, Energy,” each place it appears and inserting “for Energy, Installations.”.

(13) Section 9314a(b) is amended by striking “only so long at” and inserting “only so long as”.

(b) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015.—Effective as of December 19, 2014, and as if included therein as enacted, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 351(b)(1) (128 Stat. 3346) is amended by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting “; and”.

(2) Section 901(g)(1)(F) (128 Stat. 3465) is amended by inserting “paragraph (4) of” before “subsection (b) of section 2926”.

(3) Section 1072(a)(2) (128 Stat. 3516) is amended by inserting “in the table of sections” before “at the beginning of”.

(4) Section 1079(a)(1) (128 Stat. 3561) is amended by striking “section 12102 of title 42, United States Code” and inserting “section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102)”.

(5) Section 1104(b)(2) (128 Stat. 3526) is amended by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A)”.

(6) Section 1208 (128 Stat. 3551) is amended by striking “of Fiscal Year” each place it appears and inserting “for Fiscal Year”.

(7) Section 2803(a) (128 Stat. 3696) is amended in paragraph (2) of the subsection (f) being added by the amendment to be made by that section by inserting “section” before “1105 of title 31”.

(8) Section 2832(c)(3) (128 Stat. 3704) is amended by striking “United State Code” and inserting “United States Code”.

(9) Section 3006(i) (128 Stat. 3744) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Section 8” and inserting “Section 18”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “S1/2 N1/2 SE” and inserting “S1/2 N1/2 SE1/4”.

(10) Section 3023 (128 Stat. 3762) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, in the matter being added by subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting “has been waived,” after “expired,”; and

(ii) by striking “the permit or lease required” and inserting “the allotment management plan, permit, or lease required”;

(C) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, in the matter being added as subsection (h)(1)—

(i) by striking “a grazing permit or lease” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of such subsection and inserting “an allotment management plan or grazing permit or lease”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A) of such subsection, by striking “permit or lease” and inserting “allotment management plan, permit, or lease”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)(i) of such subsection, by striking “lease or permit” and inserting “allotment management plan, permit, or lease”; and

(D) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(1) in subsection (a), by striking “by the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to lands within National Forests in the sixteen contiguous Western States” and inserting “on National Forest System land by the Secretary of Agriculture (notwithstanding, for purposes of this section, the definition in section 103(p))”;

(11) Section 3024 (16 U.S.C. 6214; 128 Stat. 3764) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “report using National Median Price values”; and

(B) in subsection (f)(3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “by regulation establish criteria pursuant to which the annual fee determined in accordance with this section may be suspended or reduced temporarily” and inserting “provide for suspension or reduction temporarily of the annual fee determined in accordance with this section”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “by regulation”.

(c) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.—Section 1709(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 962; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “RETALIATION AND PERSONNEL ACTION DESCRIBED.—” and all that follows through “For purposes of the” and inserting “RETALIATION DESCRIBED.—For purposes of the”;

(2) by striking “at a minimum—” and that follows through “ostracism” and inserting “at a minimum ostracism”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2).

(d) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.—Section 943(d)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4578) by striking the second period at the end of the first sentence.

(e) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005.—Section 1208(f)(2) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375; 118 Stat. 2086), as amended by section 1202(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 363) and section 1202(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2512), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating the paragraphs (1) through (8) added by section 1202(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2512) as subparagraphs (A) through (H), respectively; and

(2) by moving the margins of such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, two ems to the right.

(f) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AMENDMENTS MADE BY THIS ACT.—For purposes of applying amendments made by provisions of this Act other than this section, the amendments made by this section shall be treated as having been enacted immediately before any such amendments by other provisions of this Act.

SEC. 1082. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE TRAINING AND SUPPORT TO PERSONNEL OF FOREIGN MINISTRIES OF DEFENSE.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 168 note), as amended by section 1047 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b) TRAINING OF PERSONNEL OF FOREIGN MINISTRIES WITH SECURITY MISSIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, carry out a program to provide training and associated training support services to personnel of foreign ministries of defense (or ministries with security force oversight) or regional organizations with security missions—

“(A) for the purpose of—

“(i) enhancing civilian oversight of foreign security forces;

“(ii) establishing responsible defense governance and internal controls in order to help build effective, transparent, and accountable defense institutions;

“(iii) assessing organizational weaknesses and establishing a roadmap for addressing shortfalls; and

“(iv) enhancing ministerial, general or joint staff, or service level core management competencies; and

“(B) for such other purposes as the Secretary considers appropriate, consistent with the authority in subsection (a).

“(2) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Each fiscal year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on activities under the program under paragraph (1) during the preceding fiscal year quarter. Each report shall include, for the fiscal year quarter covered by such report, the following:

“(A) A list of activities under the program.

“(B) A list of any organization described in paragraph (1) to which the Secretary assigned employees under the program, including the number of such employees so assigned, the duration of each assignment, a brief description of each assigned employee’s activities, and a statement of the cost of each assignment.

“(C) A comprehensive justification of any activities conducted pursuant to paragraph (1)(B).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “MINISTRY OF DEFENSE ADVISOR” before “AUTHORITY”;

(2) in subsections (d) and (e), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, by striking “the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Armed Services and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives” and inserting “the appropriate committees of Congress”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(1) the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

“(2) the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO SECTION HEADING TO REFLECT NAME OF PROGRAM.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1081. DEFENSE INSTITUTION CAPACITY BUILDING PROGRAM.”.

SEC. 1083. EXPANSION OF OUTREACH FOR VETERANS TRANSITIONING FROM SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) EXPANSION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—Subsection (c)(2) of section 5 of the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act (Public Law 114–2; 38 U.S.C. 1712A note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) conducts outreach to individuals transitioning from serving on active duty in the Armed Forces who are participating in the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense or other similar transition programs to inform such individuals of the community oriented veteran peer support network under paragraph (1) and other support programs and opportunities that are available to such individuals.”.

(b) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN INTERIM REPORT.—Subsection (d)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) the number of veterans who—

“(i) received outreach from the Department of Veterans Affairs while serving on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces; and

“(ii) participated in a peer support program under the pilot program for veterans transitioning from serving on active duty.”.

SEC. 1084. MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASE FOR A DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OUTPATIENT CLINIC IN TULSA, OKLAHOMA.

Section 601(b) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146; 128 Stat. 1793) is amended—

(1) by striking out “IN TULSA.—” and all that follows through “In carrying out” and inserting “IN TULSA.—In carrying out”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively, and adjusting the indentation of the margin of such paragraphs, as so redesignated, two ems to the left;

(4) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated, by striking “140,000 gross square feet” and inserting “140,000 net usable square feet”;

(5) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking “not more than the average” and all that follows and inserting “not more than the average of equivalent medical facility leases executed by the Department of Veterans Affairs over the last five years, plus 20 percent”; and

(6) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated, by striking “30-year life cycle” and inserting “20-year life cycle”.

SEC. 1085. COMPTROLLER GENERAL BRIEFING AND REPORT ON MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) BRIEFING.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall provide to the appropriate committees of Congress a briefing on the administration and oversight by the Department of Veterans Affairs of contracts for the design and construction of major medical facility projects, as defined in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the administration and oversight described in subsection (a).

(c) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required by subsection (a) and the report required by subsection (b) shall each include an examination of the following:

(1) The processes used by the Department for overseeing and assuring the performance of construction design and construction contracts for major medical facility projects, as so defined.

(2) Any actions taken by the Department to improve the administration of such contracts.

(3) Such opportunities for further improvement of the administration of such contracts as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1086. SENSE OF SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the accidental transfer of live *Bacillus anthracis*, also known as anthrax, from an Army laboratory to more than 28 laboratories located in at least 12 states and three countries discovered in May 2015 represents a serious safety lapse;

(2) the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, should continue to investigate the cause of this lapse and determine if protective protocols should be strengthened;

(3) the Department of Defense should reassess standards on a regular basis to ensure they are current and effective to prevent a reoccurrence; and

(4) the Department of Defense should keep Congress apprised of the investigation, any potential public health or safety risk, remedial actions taken and plans to regularly reassess standards.

SEC. 1087. MELVILLE HALL OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.

(a) GIFT TO THE MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.—The Maritime Administrator may accept a gift of money from the Foundation under section 51315 of title 46, United States Code, for the purpose of renovating Melville Hall on the campus of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

(b) COVERED GIFTS.—A gift described in this subsection is a gift under subsection (a) that the Maritime Administrator determines exceeds the sum of—

(1) the minimum amount that is sufficient to ensure the renovation of Melville Hall in accordance with the capital improvement plan of the United States Merchant Marine Academy that was in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) 25 percent of the amount described in paragraph (1).

(c) OPERATION CONTRACTS.—Subject to subsection (d), in the case that the Maritime Administrator accepts a gift of money described in subsection (b), the Maritime Administrator may enter into a contract with the Foundation for the operation of Melville Hall to make available facilities for, among other possible uses, official academy functions, third-party catering functions, and industry events and conferences.

(d) CONTRACT TERMS.—The contract described in subsection (c) shall be for such period and on such terms as the Maritime Administrator considers appropriate, including a provision, mutually agreeable to the Maritime Administrator and the Foundation, that—

(1) requires the Foundation—

(A) at the expense solely of the Foundation through the term of the contract to maintain Melville Hall in a condition that is as good as or better than the condition Melville Hall was in on the later of—

(i) the date that the renovation of Melville Hall was completed; or

(ii) the date that the Foundation accepted Melville Hall after it was tendered to the Foundation by the Maritime Administrator; and

(B) to deposit all proceeds from the operation of Melville Hall, after expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of Melville Hall, into the account of the Regimental Affairs Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentality or successor entity, to be used solely for the morale and welfare of the cadets of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

(2) prohibits the use of Melville Hall as lodging or an office by any person for more than 4 days in any calendar year other than—

(A) by the United States; or

(B) for the administration and operation of Melville Hall.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term “contract” includes any modification, extension, or renewal of the contract.

(2) FOUNDATION.—In this section, the term “Foundation” means the United States Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association and Foundation, Inc.

(f) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed under section 3105 of title 41, United States Code, as requiring the Maritime Administrator to award a contract for the operation of Melville Hall to the Foundation.

SEC. 1088. CONFLICT OF INTEREST CERTIFICATION FOR INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO WHISTLEBLOWER RETALIATION.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the term “covered employee” means a whistleblower who is an employee of the Department of Defense or a military department, or an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, or subgrantee thereof;

(2) the term “covered investigation” means an investigation carried out by an Inspector General of a military department or the Inspector General of the Department of Defense relating to—

(A) a retaliatory personnel action taken against a member of the Armed Forces under section 1034 of title 10, United States Code; or

(B) any retaliatory action taken against a covered employee; and

(3) the term “military department” means each of the departments described in section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each investigator involved in a covered investigation shall submit to the Inspector General of the Department of Defense or the Inspector General of the military department, as applicable, a certification that there was no conflict of interest between the investigator, any witness involved in the covered investigation, and the covered employee or member of the Armed Forces, as applicable, during the conduct of the covered investigation.

(2) STANDARDIZED FORM.—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall develop a standardized form to be used by each investigator to submit the certification required under paragraph (1).

(3) INVESTIGATIVE FILE.—Each certification submitted under paragraph (1) shall be included in the file of the applicable covered investigation.

SEC. 1089. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR WHICH AMOUNTS HAVE BEEN APPROPRIATED.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235) appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(A) \$35,000,000 to make seismic corrections to Building 205 in the West Los Angeles Medical Center of the Department in Los Angeles, California, which, according to the Department, is a

building that is designated as having an exceptionally high risk of sustaining substantial damage or collapsing during an earthquake;

(B) \$101,900,000 to replace the community living center and mental health facilities of the Department in Long Beach, California, which, according to the Department, are designated as having an exceptionally high risk of sustaining substantial damage or collapsing during an earthquake;

(C) \$187,500,000 to replace the existing spinal cord injury clinic of the Department in San Diego, California, which, according to the Department, is designated as having an extremely high risk of sustaining major damage during an earthquake; and

(D) \$122,400,000 to make renovations to address substantial safety and compliance issues at the medical center of the Department in Canandaigua, New York, and for the construction of a new clinic and community living center at such medical center.

(2) The Department is unable to obligate or expend the amounts described in paragraph (1) because it lacks an explicit authorization by an Act of Congress pursuant to section 8104(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, to carry out the major medical facility projects described in such paragraph.

(3) Among the major medical facility projects described in paragraph (1), three are critical seismic safety projects in California.

(4) Every day that the critical seismic safety projects described in paragraph (3) are delayed puts the lives of veterans and employees of the Department at risk.

(5) According to the United States Geological Survey—

(A) California has a 99 percent chance or greater of experiencing an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater in the next 30 years;

(B) even earthquakes of less severity than magnitude 6.7 can cause life threatening damage to seismically unsafe buildings; and

(C) in California, earthquakes of magnitude 6.0 or greater occur on average once every 1.2 years.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the major medical facility projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs specified in the explanatory statement accompanying the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235) at the locations and in the amounts specified in such explanatory statement, including by obligating and expending such amounts.

SEC. 1090. REFORM AND IMPROVEMENT OF PERSONNEL SECURITY, INSIDER THREAT DETECTION AND PREVENTION, AND PHYSICAL SECURITY.

(a) PERSONNEL SECURITY AND INSIDER THREAT PROTECTION IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) PLANS AND SCHEDULES.—Consistent with the Memorandum of the Secretary of Defense dated March 18, 2014, regarding the recommendations of the reviews of the Washington Navy Yard shooting, the Secretary of Defense shall develop plans and schedules—

(A) to implement a continuous evaluation capability for the national security population for which clearance adjudications are conducted by the Department of Defense Central Adjudication Facility, in coordination with the Suitability Executive Agent, the Security Executive Agent, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(B) to produce a Department-wide insider threat strategy and implementation plan, which includes—

(i) resourcing for the Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center (DITMAC) and component insider threat programs, and

(ii) alignment of insider threat protection programs with continuous evaluation capabilities and processes for personnel security;

(C) to centralize the authority, accountability, and programmatic integration responsibilities, including fiscal control, for personnel security and insider threat protection under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(D) to align the Department's consolidated Central Adjudication Facility under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(E) to develop a defense security enterprise reform investment strategy to ensure a consistent, long-term focus on funding to strengthen all of the Department's security and insider threat programs, policies, functions, and information technology capabilities, including detecting threat behaviors conveyed in the cyber domain, in a manner that keeps pace with evolving threats and risks;

(F) to resource and expedite deployment of the Identity Management Enterprise Services Architecture (IMESA); and

(G) to implement the recommendations contained in the study conducted by the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation required by section 907 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 1564 note), including, specifically, the recommendations to centrally manage and regulate Department of Defense requests for personnel security background investigations.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the plans and schedules required under paragraph (1).

(b) PHYSICAL AND LOGICAL ACCESS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Secretary of Defense shall define physical and logical access standards, capabilities, and processes applicable to all personnel with access to Department of Defense installations and information technology systems, including—

(A) periodic or regularized background or records checks appropriate to the type of physical or logical access involved, the security level, the category of individuals authorized, and the level of access to be granted;

(B) standards and methods for verifying the identity of individuals seeking access; and

(C) electronic attribute-based access controls that are appropriate for the type of access and facility or information technology system involved;

(2) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services, and in consultation with representatives from stakeholder organizations, shall design a capability to share and apply electronic identity information across the Government to enable real-time, risk-managed physical and logical access decisions; and

(3) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in conjunction with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and in consultation with representatives from stakeholder organizations, shall establish investigative and adjudicative standards for the periodic or regularized reevaluation of the eligibility of an individual to retain credentials issued pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004), as appropriate, but not less frequently than the authorization period of the issued credentials.

(c) SECURITY ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) formalize the Security, Suitability, and Credentialing Line of Business;

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committee that describes plans—

(A) for oversight by the Office of Management and Budget of activities of the executive branch of the Government for personnel security, suitability, and credentialing;

(B) to designate enterprise shared services to optimize investments;

(C) to define and implement data standards to support common electronic access to critical Government records; and

(D) to reduce the burden placed on Government data providers by centralizing requests for records access and ensuring proper sharing of the data with appropriate investigative and adjudicative elements.

(d) RECIPROCITY MANAGEMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council shall ensure that—

(1) a centralized system is available to serve as the reciprocity management system for the Federal Government; and

(2) the centralized system described in paragraph (1) is aligned with, and incorporates results from, continuous evaluation and other enterprise reform initiatives.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Security Executive Agent, the Suitability Executive Agent, and the Secretary of Defense, shall jointly develop a plan to—

(1) implement the Security Executive Agent Directive on common, standardized employee and contractor security reporting requirements;

(2) establish and implement uniform reporting requirements for employees and Federal contractors, according to risk, relative to the safety of the workforce and protection of the most sensitive information of the Government; and

(3) ensure that reported information is shared appropriately.

(f) ACCESS TO CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER PURPOSES.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 9101(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) The terms ‘Security Executive Agent’ and ‘Suitability Executive Agent’ mean the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent, respectively, established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.”

(2) COVERED AGENCIES.—Section 9101(a)(6) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) The Department of Homeland Security.

“(H) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

“(I) An Executive agency that—

“(i) is authorized to conduct background investigations under a Federal statute; or

“(ii) is delegated authority to conduct background investigations in accordance with procedures established by the Security Executive Agent or the Suitability Executive Agent under subsection (b) or (c)(iv) of section 2.3 of Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

“(J) A contractor that conducts a background investigation on behalf of an agency described in subparagraphs (A) through (I).”

(3) APPLICABLE PURPOSES OF INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “the head of”; and

(ii) by inserting “all” before “criminal history record information”; and

(iii) by striking “for the purpose of determining eligibility for any of the following:” and inserting “, in accordance with Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Suitability Executive Agent and Security Executive Agent, for the purpose of—

“(A) determining eligibility for—”; and

(C) in clause (i), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Access” and inserting “access”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(D) in clause (ii), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Assignment” and inserting “assignment”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting “or positions”; and

(E) in clause (iii), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Acceptance” and inserting “acceptance”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(F) in clause (iv), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Appointment” and inserting “appointment”; and

(ii) by striking “or a critical or sensitive position”; and

(iii) by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) conducting a basic suitability or fitness assessment for Federal or contractor employees, using Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent in accordance with—

“(i) Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto; and

“(ii) the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum ‘Assignment of Functions Relating to Coverage of Contractor Employee Fitness in the Federal Investigative Standards’, dated December 6, 2012;

“(C) credentialing under the Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004); and

“(D) Federal Aviation Administration checks required under—

“(i) the Federal Aviation Administration Drug Enforcement Assistance Act of 1988 (subtitle E of title VII of Public Law 100-690; 102 Stat. 4424) and the amendments made by that Act; or

“(ii) section 44710 of title 49.”

(4) BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC SEARCHES.—Section 9101(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2)(A) A State central criminal history record depository shall allow a covered agency to conduct both biometric and biographic searches of criminal history record information.

“(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Bureau of Investigation from requiring a request for criminal history record information to be accompanied by the fingerprints of the individual who is the subject of the request.”

(5) USE OF MOST COST-EFFECTIVE SYSTEM.—Section 9101(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) If a criminal justice agency is able to provide the same information through more than 1 system described in paragraph (1), a covered agency may request information under subsection (b) from the criminal justice agency, and require the criminal justice agency to provide the information, using the system that is most cost-effective for the Federal Government.”

(6) SEALED OR EXPUNGED RECORDS; JUVENILE RECORDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 9101(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: “, and includes any analogous juvenile records”; and

(ii) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “The term includes those

records of a State or locality sealed pursuant to law if such records are accessible by State and local criminal justice agencies for the purpose of conducting background checks.”

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not uniformly reject applicants for employment with the Federal Government or Federal contractors based on—

(i) sealed or expunged criminal records; or

(ii) juvenile records.

(7) INTERACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES ABROAD.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Upon request by a covered agency and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this section, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Overseas Citizens Services shall make available criminal history record information collected by the Deputy Assistant Secretary with respect to an individual who is under investigation by the covered agency regarding any interaction of the individual with a law enforcement agency or intelligence agency of a foreign country.”

(8) CLARIFICATION OF SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTRACTORS CONDUCTING BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this subsection, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) If a contractor described in subsection (a)(6)(J) uses an automated information delivery system to request criminal history record information, the contractor shall comply with any necessary security requirements for access to that system.”

(9) CLARIFICATION REGARDING ADVERSE ACTIONS.—Section 7512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or”; and

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period and inserting “, or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) a suitability action taken by the Office under regulations prescribed by the Office, subject to the rules prescribed by the President under this title for the administration of the competitive service.”

(10) ANNUAL REPORT BY SUITABILITY AND SECURITY CLEARANCE PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY COUNCIL.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this subsection, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) The Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, an annual report that—

“(1) describes efforts of the Council to integrate Federal, State, and local systems for sharing criminal history record information;

“(2) analyzes the extent and effectiveness of Federal education programs regarding criminal history record information;

“(3) provides an update on the implementation of best practices for sharing criminal history record information, including ongoing limitations experienced by investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency with respect to access to State and local criminal history record information; and

“(4) provides a description of limitations on the sharing of information relevant to a background investigation, other than criminal history record information, between—

“(A) investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency; and

“(B) State and local law enforcement agencies.”.

(11) GAO REPORT ON ENHANCING INTEROPERABILITY AND REDUCING REDUNDANCY IN FEDERAL CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION ACCESS CONTROL, BACKGROUND CHECK, AND CREDENTIALING STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the background check, access control, and credentialing requirements of Federal programs for the protection of critical infrastructure and key resources.

(B) CONTENTS.—The Comptroller General shall include in the report required under subparagraph (A)—

(i) a summary of the major characteristics of each such Federal program, including the types of infrastructure and resources covered;

(ii) a comparison of the requirements, whether mandatory or voluntary in nature, for regulated entities under each such program to—

(I) conduct background checks on employees, contractors, and other individuals;

(II) adjudicate the results of a background check, including the utilization of a standardized set of disqualifying offenses or the consideration of minor, non-violent, or juvenile offenses; and

(III) establish access control systems to deter unauthorized access, or provide a security credential for any level of access to a covered facility or resource;

(iii) a review of any efforts that the Screening Coordination Office of the Department of Homeland Security has undertaken or plans to undertake to harmonize or standardize background check, access control, or credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs overseen by the Department; and

(iv) recommendations, developed in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, regarding—

(I) enhancing the interoperability of security credentials across critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(II) eliminating the need for redundant background checks or credentials across existing critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(III) harmonizing, where appropriate, the standards for identifying potentially disqualifying criminal offenses and the weight assigned to minor, nonviolent, or juvenile offenses in adjudicating the results of a completed background check; and

(IV) the development of common, risk-based standards with respect to the background check, access control, and security credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(C) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the term “Performance Accountability Council” means the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

SEC. 1091. DESIGNATION OF CONSTRUCTION AGENT FOR CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall seek to enter into an agreement subject to subsections (b), (c), and (e) of section 1535 of title 31, United States Code, with the Army Corps of Engineers or another entity of the Federal Government to serve, on a reimbursable basis, as the construction agent on all construction projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs specifically authorized by Congress after the date of the enactment of this Act that involve a total expenditure of more than \$100,000,000, excluding any acquisition by exchange.

(b) AGREEMENT.—Under the agreement entered into under subsection (a), the construction agent shall provide design, procurement, and construction management services for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of facilities of the Department.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

SEC. 1101. REQUIRED PROBATIONARY PERIOD FOR NEW EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REQUIRED PROBATIONARY PERIOD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§1599e. Probationary period for employees

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding sections 3321 and 3393(d) of title 5, the appointment of a covered employee shall become final only after such employee has served a probationary period of two years. The Secretary of the military department concerned may extend a probationary period under this subsection at the discretion of such Secretary.

“(b) COVERED EMPLOYEE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered employee’ means any individual—

“(1) appointed to a permanent position within the competitive service at the Department of Defense; or

“(2) appointed as a career appointee (as that term is defined in section 3132(a)(4) of title 5) within the Senior Executive Service at the Department.

“(c) EMPLOYMENT BECOMES FINAL.—Upon the expiration of a covered employee’s probationary period under subsection (a), the supervisor of the employee shall determine whether the appointment becomes final based on regulations prescribed for such purpose by the Secretary.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 81 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1599e. Probationary period for employees.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to any covered employee (as that term is defined in section 1599e of title 10, United States Code, as added by such subsection) appointed after the date of the enactment of this section.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 3321(c)—

(A) by striking “Service or” and inserting “Service.”; and

(B) by inserting at the end before the period the following: “, or any individual covered by section 1599e of title 10”; and

(2) in section 3393(d), by adding at the end the following: “The preceding sentence shall not apply to any individual covered by section 1599e of title 10.”.

SEC. 1102. DELAY OF PERIODIC STEP INCREASE FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASED UPON UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.

(a) DELAY.—Under procedures established by the Secretary of Defense, upon a determination

by the Secretary that the work of an employee is not at an acceptable level of competence, the period of time during which the work of the employee is not at an acceptable level of competence shall not count toward completion of the period of service required for purposes of subsection (a) of section 5335 of title 5, United States Code, or subsection (e)(1) or (e)(2) of section 5343 of such title.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO PERIODS OF SERVICE.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any period of service performed before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1103. PROCEDURES FOR REDUCTION IN FORCE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.

Section 1597 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) REDUCTIONS BASED PRIMARILY ON PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures to provide that, in implementing any reduction in force for civilian positions in the Department of Defense in the competitive service or the excepted service, the determination of which employees shall be separated from employment in the Department shall be made primarily on the basis of performance, as determined under any applicable performance management system.”.

SEC. 1104. UNITED STATES CYBER COMMAND WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§1599e. United States Cyber Command recruitment and retention

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may—

“(A) establish, as positions in the excepted service, such qualified positions in the Department as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the United States Cyber Command including—

“(i) staff of the headquarters of the United States Cyber Command provided to the Command by the Air Force;

“(ii) elements of the United States Cyber Command enterprise relating to cyberspace operations;

“(iii) elements of the United States Cyber Command provided by the armed forces; and

“(iv) positions formerly identified as—

“(I) senior level positions designated under section 5376 of title 5; and

“(II) positions in the Senior Executive Service;

“(B) appoint an individual to a qualified position (after taking into consideration the availability of preference eligibles for appointment to the position); and

“(C) subject to the requirements of subsections (b) and (c), fix the compensation of an individual for service in a qualified position.

“(2) The authority of the Secretary under this subsection applies without regard to the provisions of any other law relating to the appointment, number, classification, or compensation of employees.

“(b) BASIC PAY.—(1) In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall fix the rates of basic pay for any qualified position established under subsection (a)—

“(A) in relation to the rates of pay provided for employees in comparable positions in the Department, in which the incumbent performs, manages, or supervises functions that execute the cyber mission of the Department; and

“(B) subject to the same limitations on maximum rates of pay established for such employees by law or regulation.

“(2) The Secretary may—

“(A) consistent with section 5341 of title 5, adopt such provisions of that title as provide for prevailing rate systems of basic pay; and

“(B) apply those provisions to qualified positions for employees in or under which the Department may employ individuals described by section 5342(a)(2)(A) of such title.

“(c) **ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION, INCENTIVES, AND ALLOWANCES.**—(1) The Secretary may provide employees in qualified positions compensation (in addition to basic pay), including benefits, incentives, and allowances, consistent with, and not in excess of the level authorized for, comparable positions authorized by title 5.

“(2) An employee in a qualified position whose rate of basic pay is fixed under subsection (b)(1) shall be eligible for an allowance under section 5941 of title 5 on the same basis and to the same extent as if the employee was an employee covered by such section, including eligibility conditions, allowance rates, and all other terms and conditions in law or regulation.

“(d) **PLAN FOR EXECUTION OF AUTHORITIES.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress with a plan for the use of the authorities provided under this section.

“(e) **COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.**—Nothing in subsection (a) may be construed to impair the continued effectiveness of a collective bargaining agreement with respect to an office, component, subcomponent, or equivalent of the Department that is a successor to an office, component, subcomponent, or equivalent of the Department covered by the agreement before the succession.

“(f) **REQUIRED REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section.

“(g) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—(1) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section and not less frequently than once each year thereafter until the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in coordination with the Secretary, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed report on the administration of this section during the most recent one-year period.

“(2) Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, for the period covered by the report, the following:

“(A) A discussion of the process used in accepting applications, assessing candidates, ensuring adherence to veterans’ preference, and selecting applicants for vacancies to be filled by an individual for a qualified position.

“(B) A description of the following:

“(i) How the Secretary plans to fulfill the critical need of the Department to recruit and retain employees in qualified positions.

“(ii) The measures that will be used to measure progress.

“(iii) Any actions taken during the reporting period to fulfill such critical need.

“(C) A discussion of how the planning and actions taken under subparagraph (B) are integrated into the strategic workforce planning of the Department.

“(D) The metrics on actions occurring during the reporting period, including the following:

“(i) The number of employees in qualified positions hired, disaggregated by occupation, grade, and level or pay band.

“(ii) The placement of employees in qualified positions, disaggregated by directorate and office within the Department.

“(iii) The total number of veterans hired.

“(iv) The number of separations of employees in qualified positions, disaggregated by occupation and grade and level or pay band.

“(v) The number of retirements of employees in qualified positions, disaggregated by occupation, grade, and level or pay band.

“(vi) The number and amounts of recruitment, relocation, and retention incentives paid to em-

ployees in qualified positions, disaggregated by occupation, grade, and level or pay band.

“(E) A description of the training provided to supervisors of employees in qualified positions at the Department on the use of the new authorities.

“(h) **THREE-YEAR PROBATIONARY PERIOD.**—The probationary period for all employees hired under the authority established in this section shall be three years.

“(i) **INCUMBENTS OF EXISTING COMPETITIVE SERVICE POSITIONS.**—(1) An individual serving in a position on the date of enactment of this section that is selected to be converted to a position in the excepted service under this section shall have the right to refuse such conversion.

“(2) After the date on which an individual who refuses a conversion under paragraph (1) stops serving in the position selected to be converted, the position may be converted to a position in the excepted service.

“(j) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(2) The term ‘collective bargaining agreement’ has the meaning given that term in section 7103(a)(8) of title 5.

“(3) The term ‘excepted service’ has the meaning given that term in section 2103 of title 5.

“(4) The term ‘preference eligible’ has the meaning given that term in section 2108 of title 5.

“(5) The term ‘qualified position’ means a position, designated by the Secretary for the purpose of this section, in which the incumbent performs, manages, or supervises functions that execute the responsibilities of the United States Cyber Command relating to cyber operations.

“(6) The term ‘Senior Executive Service’ has the meaning given that term in section 2101a of title 5.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 3132(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the matter following subparagraph (E)—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (iii), by inserting “or” after the semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

“(iv) any position established as a qualified position in the excepted service by the Secretary of Defense under section 1599e of title 10;”

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1599d the following new item:

“1599e. United States Cyber Command recruitment and retention.”

SEC. 1105. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE ANNUAL LIMITATION ON PREMIUM PAY AND AGGREGATE LIMITATION ON PAY FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES WORKING OVERSEAS.

Effective January 1, 2016, section 1101(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4615), as most recently amended by section 1101 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291), is further amended by striking “through 2015” and inserting “through 2016”.

SEC. 1106. FIVE-YEAR EXTENSION OF EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY FOR DESIGNATED DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE POSITIONS.

Section 1705(g)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “September 30, 2022”.

SEC. 1107. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY TO GRANT ALLOWANCES, BENEFITS, AND GRATUITIES TO CIVILIAN PERSONNEL ON OFFICIAL DUTY IN A COMBAT ZONE.

Paragraph (2) of section 1603(a) of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109-234; 120 Stat. 443), as added by section 1102 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4616) and most recently amended by section 1102 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291), is further amended by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”.

SEC. 1108. EXTENSION OF RATE OF OVERTIME PAY FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY EMPLOYEES PERFORMING WORK ABOARD OR DOCKSIDE IN SUPPORT OF THE NUCLEAR-POWERED AIRCRAFT CARRIER FORWARD DEPLOYED IN JAPAN.

Section 5542(a)(6)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2017”.

SEC. 1109. EXPANSION OF TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO MAKE DIRECT APPOINTMENTS OF CANDIDATES POSSESSING BACHELOR’S DEGREES TO SCIENTIFIC AND ENGINEERING POSITIONS AT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY REINVENTION LABORATORIES.

(a) **EXPANSION.**—Section 1107(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended by striking “3 percent” and inserting “5 percent”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2016, and shall apply with respect to appointments of candidates under section 1107(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 on or after that date.

SEC. 1110. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE CIVILIAN ACQUISITION WORKFORCE PERSONNEL DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 1762(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Such section is further amended by striking “demonstration program” and inserting “demonstration project”.

SEC. 1111. PILOT PROGRAM ON DYNAMIC SHAPING OF THE WORKFORCE TO IMPROVE THE TECHNICAL SKILLS AND EXPERTISE AT CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORIES.

(a) **PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of the use of the authorities specified in subsection (b) at the Department of Defense laboratories specified in subsection (c) to permit the directors of such laboratories to dynamically shape the mix of technical skills and expertise in the workforces of such laboratories in order to achieve one or more of the following:

(1) To meet organizational and Department-designated missions in the most cost-effective and efficient manner.

(2) To upgrade and enhance the scientific quality of the workforces of such laboratories.

(3) To shape such workforces to better respond to such missions.

(4) To reduce the average unit cost of such workforces.

(b) **WORKFORCE SHAPING AUTHORITIES.**—The authorities that may be used by the director of a Department of Defense laboratory under the pilot program are the following:

(1) **FLEXIBLE LENGTH AND RENEWABLE TERM TECHNICAL APPOINTMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the provisions of this paragraph, authority otherwise available to the director by law (and within the available budgetary resources of the laboratory) to appoint qualified scientific and technical personnel who are not currently Department of Defense civilian employees into any scientific or technical position in the laboratory for a period of more than one year but not more than six years.

(B) **BENEFITS.**—Personnel appointed under this paragraph shall be provided with benefits comparable to those provided to similar employees at the laboratory concerned, including professional development opportunities, eligibility for all laboratory awards programs, and designation as “status applicants” for the purposes of eligibility for positions in the Federal service.

(C) **EXTENSION OF APPOINTMENTS.**—The appointment of any individual under this paragraph may be extended at any time during any term of service of the individual under this paragraph for an additional period of up to six years under such conditions as the director concerned shall establish for purposes of this paragraph.

(D) **CONSTRUCTION WITH CERTAIN LIMITATION.**—For purposes of determining the workforce size of a laboratory in connection with compliance with section 955 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1896; 10 U.S.C. 129a note), any individual serving in an appointment under this paragraph shall be treated as a fractional employee of the laboratory, which fraction is—

(i) the current term of appointment of the individual under this paragraph; divided by

(ii) the average length of tenure of a career employee at the laboratory, as calculated at the end of the last fiscal year ending before the date of the most recent appointment or extension of the individual under this paragraph.

(2) **REEMPLOYMENT OF ANNUITANTS.**—Authority to reemploy annuitants in accordance with section 9902(g) of title 5, United States Code, except that as a condition for reemployment the director may authorize the deduction from the pay of any annuitant so reemployed of an amount up to the amount of the annuity otherwise payable to such annuitant allocable to the period of actual employment of such annuitant, which amount shall be determined in a manner specified by the director for purposes of this paragraph to ensure the most cost effective execution of designated missions by the laboratory while retaining critical technical skills.

(3) **EARLY RETIREMENT INCENTIVES.**—Authority to authorize voluntary early retirement of employees in accordance with section 8336 of title 5, United States Code, without regard to section 8336(d)(2)(D) or 3522 of such title, and with employees so separated voluntarily from service under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for purposes of the pilot program.

(4) **SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAY.**—Authority to pay voluntary separation pay to employees in accordance with section 8414(b)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, without regard to clause (iv) or (v) of such section or section 3522, of such title, and with—

(A) employees so separated voluntarily from service under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for purposes of the pilot program; and

(B) payments to employees so separated authorized under section 3523 of such title without regard to—

(i) the plan otherwise required by section 3522 of such title; and

(ii) paragraph (1) or (3) of section 3523(b) of such title.

(c) **LABORATORIES.**—The Department of Defense laboratories specified in this subsection are the laboratories specified in section 1105(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2486; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note).

(d) **EXPIRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The authority in this section shall expire on December 31, 2023.

(2) **CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITIES EXERCISED BEFORE TERMINATION.**—The expiration in paragraph (1) shall not be construed to effect the continuation after the date specified in paragraph (1) of any term of employment or other benefit authorized under this section before that date in accordance with the terms of such authorization.

SEC. 1112. PILOT PROGRAM ON TEMPORARY EXCHANGE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND ACQUISITION PERSONNEL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of the temporary assignment of covered employees of the Department of Defense to nontraditional defense contractors and of covered employees of such contractors to the Department.

(b) **COVERED EMPLOYEES; NONTRADITIONAL DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.**—

(1) **COVERED EMPLOYEES.**—An employee of the Department of Defense or a nontraditional Defense contractor is a covered employee for purposes of this section if the employee—

(A) works in the field of financial management or in the acquisition field;

(B) is considered by the Secretary of Defense to be an exceptional employee; and

(C) is compensated at not less than the GS-11 level (or the equivalent).

(2) **NONTRADITIONAL DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.**—For purposes of this section, the term “nontraditional defense contractor” has the meaning given that term in section 2302(9) of title 10, United States Code.

(c) **AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for a written agreement among the Department of Defense, the nontraditional defense contractor concerned, and the employee concerned regarding the terms and conditions of the employee’s assignment under this section.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—An agreement under this subsection—

(A) shall require, in the case of an employee of the Department, that upon completion of the assignment, the employee will serve in the civil service for a period at least equal to three times the length of the assignment, unless the employee is sooner involuntarily separated from the service of the employee’s agency; and

(B) shall provide that if the employee of the Department or of the contractor (as the case may be) fails to carry out the agreement, or if the employee is voluntarily separated from the service of the employee’s agency before the end of the period stated in the agreement, the employee shall be liable to the United States for payment of all expenses of the assignment unless that failure or voluntary separation was for good and sufficient reason, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) **DEBT TO THE UNITED STATES.**—An amount for which an employee is liable under paragraph (2)(B) shall be treated as a debt due the United States. The Secretary may waive, in whole or in part, collection of such a debt based on a determination that the collection would be against

equity and good conscience and not in the best interests of the United States.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—An assignment under this section may, at any time and for any reason, be terminated by the Department of Defense or the nontraditional defense contractor concerned.

(e) **DURATION.**—An assignment under this section shall be for a period of not less than three months and not more than one year.

(f) **STATUS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ASSIGNED TO CONTRACTORS.**—An employee of the Department of Defense who is assigned to a nontraditional defense contractor under this section shall be considered, during the period of assignment, to be on detail to a regular work assignment in the Department for all purposes. The written agreement established under subsection (c) shall address the specific terms and conditions related to the employee’s continued status as a Federal employee.

(g) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR PRIVATE SECTOR EMPLOYEES.**—An employee of a nontraditional defense contractor who is assigned to a Department of Defense organization under this section—

(1) shall continue to receive pay and benefits from the contractor from which such employee is assigned;

(2) shall be deemed to be an employee of the Department of Defense for the purposes of—

(A) chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code;

(B) sections 201, 203, 205, 207, 208, 209, 603, 606, 607, 643, 654, 1905, and 1913 of title 18, United States Code, and any other conflict of interest statute;

(C) sections 1343, 1344, and 1349(b) of title 31, United States Code;

(D) the Federal Tort Claims Act and any other Federal tort liability statute;

(E) the Ethics in Government Act of 1978;

(F) section 1043 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(G) chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code; and

(H) subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for work-related injuries; and

(3) may not have access, while the employee is assigned to a Department organization, to any trade secrets or to any other nonpublic information which is of commercial value to the contractor from which such employee is assigned.

(h) **PROHIBITION AGAINST CHARGING CERTAIN COSTS TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**—A nontraditional defense contractor may not charge the Department of Defense or any other agency of the Federal Government, as direct or indirect costs under a Federal contract, the costs of pay or benefits paid by the contractor to an employee assigned to a Department organization under this section for the period of the assignment.

(i) **CONSIDERATION.**—In providing for assignments of employees under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall take into consideration the question of how assignments might best be used to help meet the needs of the Department of Defense with respect to the training of employees in financial management or in acquisition.

(j) **NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES.**—The number of employees of the Department of Defense who may be assigned to nontraditional defense contractors under this section at any given time may not exceed the following:

(A) Five employees in the field of financial management.

(B) Five employees in the acquisition field.

(2) **NONTRADITIONAL DEFENSE CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.**—The total number of nontraditional defense contractor employees who may be assigned to the Department under this section at any given time may not exceed 10 such employees.

(k) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY FOR ASSIGNMENTS.**—No assignment of an employee may commence under this section after September 30, 2019.

SEC. 1113. PILOT PROGRAM ON ENHANCED PAY AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN ACQUISITION AND TECHNOLOGY POSITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of using the pay authority specified in subsection (d) to fix the rate of basic pay for positions described in subsection (c) in order to assist the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military departments in attracting and retaining high quality acquisition and technology experts in positions responsible for managing and developing complex, high cost, technological acquisition efforts of the Department of Defense.

(b) **APPROVAL REQUIRED.**—The pilot program may be carried out only with approval as follows:

(1) Approval of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in the case of positions in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(2) Approval of the Service Acquisition Executive of the military department concerned, in the case of positions in a military department.

(c) **POSITIONS.**—The positions described in this subsection are positions that—

(1) require expertise of an extremely high level in a scientific, technical, professional, or acquisition management field; and

(2) are critical to the successful accomplishment of an important acquisition or technology development mission.

(d) **RATE OF BASIC PAY.**—The pay authority specified in this subsection is authority as follows:

(1) Authority to fix the rate of basic pay for a position at a rate not to exceed 150 percent of the rate of basic pay payable for level I of the Executive Schedule, upon the approval of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics or the Service Acquisition Executive concerned, as applicable.

(2) Authority to fix the rate of basic pay for a position at a rate in excess of 150 percent of the rate of basic pay payable for level I of the Executive Schedule, upon the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

(e) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The authority in subsection (a) may be used only to the extent necessary to competitively recruit or retain individuals exceptionally well qualified for positions described in subsection (c).

(2) **NUMBER OF POSITIONS.**—The authority in subsection (a) may not be used with respect to more than five positions in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and more than five positions in each military department at any one time.

(3) **TERM OF POSITIONS.**—The authority in subsection (a) may be used only for positions having terms less than five years.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The authority to fix rates of basic pay for a position under this section shall terminate on October 1, 2020.

(2) **CONTINUATION OF PAY.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to prohibit the payment after October 1, 2020, of basic pay at rates fixed under this section before that date for positions whose terms continue after that date.

SEC. 1114. PILOT PROGRAM ON DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY FOR VETERAN TECHNICAL EXPERTS INTO THE DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.

(a) **PILOT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of appointing qualified veteran candidates to positions described in subsection (b) in the defense acquisition

workforce of the military departments without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code. The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program in each military department through the Service Acquisition Executive of such military department.

(b) **POSITIONS.**—The positions described in this subsection are scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics positions, including technicians, within the defense acquisition workforce.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—Authority under subsection (a) may not, in any calendar year and with respect to any military department, be exercised with respect to a number of candidates greater than the number equal to 1 percent of the total number positions the acquisition workforce of that military department that are filled as of the close of the fiscal year last ending before the start of such calendar year.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “employee” has the meaning given that term in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) The term “veteran” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) **TERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The authority to appoint candidates to positions under the pilot program shall expire on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **EFFECT ON EXISTING APPOINTMENTS.**—The termination by paragraph (1) of the authority in subsection (a) shall not affect any appointment made under that authority before the termination date specified in paragraph (1) in accordance with the terms of such appointment.

SEC. 1115. DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY FOR TECHNICAL EXPERTS INTO THE DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—Each Secretary of a military department may appoint qualified candidates possessing a scientific or engineering degree to positions described in subsection (b) for that military department without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—Positions described in this subsection are scientific and engineering positions within the defense acquisition workforce.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—Authority under this section may not, in any calendar year and with respect to any military department, be exercised with respect to a number of candidates greater than the number equal to 5 percent of the total number of scientific and engineering positions within the acquisition workforce of that military department that are filled as of the close of the fiscal year last ending before the start of such calendar year.

(d) **NATURE OF APPOINTMENT.**—Any appointment under this section shall be treated as an appointment on a full-time equivalent basis, unless such appointment is made on a term or temporary basis.

(e) **EMPLOYEE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “employee” has the meaning given that term in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The authority to make appointments under this section shall not be available after December 31, 2020.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Training and Assistance

SEC. 1201. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF FUNDING LIMITATIONS FOR AUTHORITY TO BUILD THE CAPACITY OF FOREIGN SECURITY FORCES.

Section 1205(d) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “for fiscal year 2015” and all that follows through “section 4301” and inserting “for fiscal year 2015 or 2016 for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance”; and

(B) by inserting “, in such fiscal year” before the period; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “for fiscal year 2015” and inserting “for a fiscal year specified in that paragraph”.

SEC. 1202. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY FOR REIMBURSEMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF JORDAN FOR BORDER SECURITY OPERATIONS.

(a) **EXPANSION TO GOVERNMENT OF LEBANON.**—Subsection (a) of section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 902; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting “and the Government of Lebanon” after “the Government of Jordan” each place it appears; and

(2) by striking “armed forces of Jordan” each place it appears and inserting “armed forces of the country concerned”.

(b) **SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.**—Subsection (a) of such section is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “maintaining” and inserting “enhancing”; and

(B) by striking “increase security and sustain increased security along the border between Jordan and Syria” and inserting “sustain security along the border of Jordan with Syria and Iraq and increase or sustain security along the border of Lebanon with Syria, as applicable”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “maintain” and inserting “enhance”; and

(B) by striking “increase security or sustain increased security along the border between Jordan and Syria” and inserting “sustain security along the border of Jordan with Syria and Iraq or increase or sustain security along the border of Lebanon with Syria, as applicable”.

(c) **FUNDS.**—Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ASSISTANCE.**—While the authority in this section is in effect, amounts may be used to provide assistance under the authority in subsection (a) as follows:

“(1) Amounts authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for the Department of Defense and available for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations pursuant to section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–81).

“(2) Amounts authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for the Department of Defense for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund.”.

(d) **LIMITATIONS.**—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “may not exceed \$150,000,000” and inserting “in any fiscal year may not exceed \$125,000,000”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) **ASSISTANCE TO GOVERNMENT OF LEBANON.**—Assistance provided under the authority in subsection (a) to the Government of Lebanon may be used only for the armed forces of Lebanon, and may not be used for or to reimburse Hezbollah or any forces other than the armed forces of Lebanon.”.

(e) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

(f) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1207. ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF JORDAN AND THE GOVERNMENT OF LEBANON FOR BORDER SECURITY OPERATIONS.”

SEC. 1203. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT ACTIVITIES TO ENHANCE THE CAPABILITY OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO RESPOND TO INCIDENTS INVOLVING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

Section 1204(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 897; 10 U.S.C. 401 note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “September 30, 2018”.

SEC. 1204. REDESIGNATION, MODIFICATION, AND EXTENSION OF NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) **REDESIGNATION.**—The heading of section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 897; 32 U.S.C. 107 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1205. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.”

(b) **SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.**—Subsection (a) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “a program of exchanges” and all that follows and inserting “a program of activities described in paragraph (2) between members of the National Guard of a State or territory and any of the following:

“(A) The military forces of a foreign country.

“(B) The security forces of a foreign country.

“(C) Governmental organizations of a foreign country whose primary functions include disaster response or emergency response.”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) **STATE PARTNERSHIP.**—Each program established under this subsection shall be known as a ‘State Partnership’.”.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking “activity under a program” and all that follows through “State or territory,” and inserting “activity with forces referred to in subsection (a)(1)(B) or organizations described in subsection (a)(1)(C) under a program established under subsection (a)”.

(d) **STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUND.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a joint assessment of the feasibility and advisability of establishing a central fund to manage funds for programs and activities under the Department of Defense State Partnership Program under section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as amended by this section.

(e) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Subsection (e)(2) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “a program” and inserting “each program”; and

(2) by striking “the program” and inserting “such program”.

(f) **PERMANENT AUTHORITY.**—Such section is further amended by striking subsection (i).

(g) **ENHANCED SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.**—Subsection (a)(1) of such section, as amended by subsection (b)(1) of this section, is further amended by inserting after “activities described in paragraph (2)” the following: “, to support the security cooperation objectives of the United States.”.

(h) **PROCEDURES.**—Such section, as amended by subsections (b) through (f) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) **COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.**—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall designate a director for each State and territory to be responsible for the coordination of activities under a program established under subsection (a) for such State or territory and reporting on activities under the program.”.

(i) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (h)(1) of this section, is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by inserting “or other government organizations” after “and security forces”;

(2) in clause (iv), by adding at the end before the period the following: “and country”;

(3) in clause (v), by striking “training” and inserting “activities”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) An assessment of the extent to which the activities conducted during the previous year met the objectives described in clause (v).”.

SEC. 1205. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE SUPPORT TO NATIONAL MILITARY FORCES OF ALLIED COUNTRIES FOR COUNTERTERRORISM OPERATIONS IN AFRICA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide, on a nonreimbursable basis, logistic support, supplies, and services to the national military forces of an allied country conducting counterterrorism operations in Africa if the Secretary of Defense determines that the provision of such logistic support, supplies, and services, on a nonreimbursable basis, is—

(1) in the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) critical to the timely and effective participation of such national military forces in such operations.

(b) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON SUPPORT PROVIDED.**—Not later than 15 days after providing logistic support, supplies, or services under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a notice setting forth the following:

(1) The determination of the Secretary specified in subsection (a).

(2) The type of logistic support, supplies, or services provided.

(3) The national military forces supported.

(4) The purpose of the operations for which such support was provided, and the objectives of such support.

(5) The estimated cost of such support.

(6) The intended duration of such support.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense may not use the authority in subsection (a) to provide any type of support that is otherwise prohibited by any other provision of law.

(2) **AMOUNT.**—The aggregate amount of logistic support, supplies, and services provided under subsection (a) in any fiscal year may not exceed \$100,000,000.

(d) **REPORTS.**—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every six months thereafter through the expiration date in subsection (f) of the authority provided by this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a description of the use of the authority provided by this section during the six-month period ending on the date of such report. Each report shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the extent to which the support provided under this section during the period covered by such report facilitated the national military forces of allied countries so supported in conducting counterterrorism operations in Africa.

(2) A description of any efforts by countries that received such support to address, as practicable, the requirements of their forces for logistics support, supplies, or services for conducting counterterrorism operations in Africa, including

under acquisition and cross-servicing agreements.

(e) **LOGISTIC SUPPORT, SUPPLIES, AND SERVICES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “logistic support, supplies, and services” has the meaning given that term in section 2350(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(f) **EXPIRATION.**—The authority provided by this section may not be exercised after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 1206. AUTHORITY TO BUILD THE CAPACITY OF FOREIGN MILITARY INTELLIGENCE FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, is authorized to conduct or support a program or programs to train the military intelligence forces of a foreign country in order for that country to—

(1) improve interoperability with United States and allied forces;

(2) enhance the capacity of such forces to receive and act upon time-sensitive intelligence;

(3) increase the capacity and capability of such forces to fuse and analyze intelligence; and

(4) ensure the ability of such forces to support the military forces of that country in conducting lawful military operations in which intelligence plays a critical role.

(b) **TYPES OF SUPPORT.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZED ELEMENTS.**—A program under subsection (a) may include the provision of training, and associated supplies and support.

(2) **REQUIRED ELEMENTS.**—A program under subsection (a) shall include elements that promote the following:

(A) Observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

(B) Respect for civilian control of the military.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **ANNUAL FUNDING LIMITATION.**—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for a fiscal year and available for the military intelligence program (MIP), the Secretary of Defense may use up to \$25,000,000 in such fiscal year to carry out programs authorized by subsection (a).

(2) **ASSISTANCE OTHERWISE PROHIBITED BY LAW.**—The Secretary of Defense may not use the authority in subsection (a) to provide any type of assistance described in subsection (b) that is otherwise prohibited by any provision of law.

(3) **LIMITATION ON ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.**—The Secretary of Defense may not use the authority in subsection (a) to provide assistance described in subsection (b) to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such assistance under any other provision of law.

(d) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—Not less than 15 days before initiating activities under a program under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a notice on the following:

(1) The country whose capacity to engage in activities in subsection (a) will be built under the program.

(2) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, military department responsible for management and associated program executive office, and completion date for the program.

(3) Assurances, if any, provided with respect to an enduring arrangement between the United States and the forces provided training pursuant to subsection (a).

(4) The objectives and assessment framework to be used to develop capability and performance metrics associated with operational outcomes for the recipient forces.

(5) An assessment of the capacity of the recipient country to absorb assistance under the program.

(6) An assessment of the manner in which the program fits into the theater security cooperation strategy of the applicable geographic combatant command.

(e) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1207. PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO ENTITIES IN YEMEN CONTROLLED BY THE HOUTHI MOVEMENT.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—No amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense by this Act may be used to provide assistance to an entity in Yemen that is controlled by members of the Houthi movement.

(b) **NATIONAL SECURITY EXCEPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, determines that the provision of assistance as described in that subsection is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) **NOTICE REQUIRED.**—Not later than 30 days after providing assistance under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees notice on such assistance, including the following:

(A) The assistance provided.

(B) The rationale for the provision of such assistance.

(C) The national security interests of the United States in providing such assistance.

(3) **FORM.**—Each notice under paragraph (2) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1208. REPORT ON POTENTIAL SUPPORT FOR THE VETTED SYRIAN OPPOSITION.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a detailed description of the military support the Secretary considers it necessary to provide to recipients of assistance under section 1209 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3541) upon their return to Syria to make use of such assistance.

(b) **COVERED POTENTIAL SUPPORT.**—The support the Secretary may consider it necessary to provide for purposes of the report is the following:

(1) Logistical support.

(2) Defensive supportive fire.

(3) Intelligence.

(4) Medical support.

(5) Any other support the Secretary considers appropriate for purposes of the report.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The report shall include the following:

(1) For each type of support the Secretary considers it necessary to provide as described in subsection (a), a description of the actions to be taken by the Secretary to ensure that such support would not benefit any of the following:

(A) The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), the Al-Nusra Front, al-Qaeda, the Khorasan Group, or any other extremist Islamic organization

(B) The Syrian Arab Army or any group or organization supporting President Bashar Assad.

(2) An estimate of the cost of providing such support.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute an authorization for the use of force in Syria.

SEC. 1209. SUPPORT FOR SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN AND GIRLS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Through the sacrifice and dedication of members of the Armed Forces, civilian personnel, and our Afghan partners as well as the American people's generous investment, oppressive Taliban rule has given way to a nascent democracy in Afghanistan. It is in our national security interest to help prevent Afghanistan from ever again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism and to solidify and preserve the gains our men and women in uniform fought so hard to establish.

(2) The United States through its National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security has made firm commitments to support the human rights of the women and girls of Afghanistan. The National Action Plan states that “the engagement and protection of women as agents of peace and stability will be central to United States efforts to promote security, prevent, respond to, and resolve conflict, and rebuild societies”.

(3) As stated in the Department of Defense's October 2014 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, the Department of Defense and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) “maintain a robust program dedicated to improving the recruitment, retention, and treatment of women in the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF), and to improving the status of Afghan women in general”.

(4) According to the Department of Defense's October 2014 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, the “Afghan MoI showed significant support for women in the MoI and is taking steps to protect and empower female police and female MoI staff”. Although some positive steps have been made, progress remains slow to reach the MoI's goal of recruiting 10,000 women in the Afghan National Police (ANP) in the next 10 years.

(5) According to Inclusive Security, women only make up approximately 1 percent of the Afghan National Police. There are about 2,200 women serving in the police force, fewer than the goal of 5,000 women set by the Government of Afghanistan.

(6) According to the International Crisis Group, there are not enough female police officers to staff all provincial Family Response Units (FRUs). United Nations Assistance Mission Afghanistan and the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees found that “in the absence of Family Response Units or visible women police officers, women victims almost never approach police stations willingly, fearing they will be arrested, their reputations stained or worse”.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROMOTION OF SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to prevent Afghanistan from again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism;

(2) as an important part of a strategy to achieve this objective and to help Afghanistan achieve its full potential, the United States Government should continue to regularly press the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to commit to the meaningful inclusion of women in the political, economic, and security transition process and to ensure that women's concerns are fully reflected in relevant negotiations;

(3) the United States Government and the Government of Afghanistan should reaffirm their commitment to supporting Afghan civil society, including women's organizations, as agreed to during the meeting between the International Community and the Government of Afghanistan on the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework (TMAF) in July 2013;

(4) the United States Government should continue to support and encourage efforts to recruit

and retain women in the Afghan National Security Forces, who are critical to the success of NATO's Resolute Support Mission and future Enduring Partnership mission; and

(5) the United States should bid on no less than one gender advisor billet within the Resolute Support Mission Gender Advisory Unit and continue to work with other countries to ensure that the Resolute Support Mission Gender Advisory Unit billets are fully staffed.

(c) **PLAN TO PROMOTE SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.**—

(1) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall include in the report required under section 1225 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3550)—

(A) an assessment of the security of Afghan women and girls, including information regarding efforts to increase the recruitment and retention of women in the ANSF; and

(B) an assessment of the implementation of the plans for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, treatment, and provision of appropriate facilities and transportation for women in the ANSF, including the challenges associated with such implementation and the steps being taken to address those challenges.

(2) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to the extent practicable, support the efforts of the Government of Afghanistan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls during and after the security transition process through the development and implementation by the Government of Afghanistan of an Afghan-led plan that should include the elements described in this paragraph.

(B) **TRAINING.**—The Secretary of Defense, working with the NATO-led Resolute Support mission should encourage the Government of Afghanistan to develop—

(i) measures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of existing training for Afghan National Security Forces on this issue;

(ii) a plan to increase the number of female security officers specifically trained to address cases of gender-based violence, including ensuring the Afghan National Police's Family Response Units (FRUs) have the necessary resources and are available to women across Afghanistan;

(iii) mechanisms to enhance the capacity for units of National Police's Family Response Units to fulfill their mandate as well as indicators measuring the operational effectiveness of these units;

(iv) a plan to address the development of accountability mechanisms for ANA and ANP personnel who violate codes of conduct related to the human rights of women and girls, including female members of the ANSF; and

(v) a plan to develop training for the ANA and the ANP to increase awareness and responsiveness among ANA and ANP personnel regarding the unique security challenges women confront when serving in those forces.

(C) **ENROLLMENT AND TREATMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Afghan Ministries of Defense and Interior, shall seek to assist the Government of Afghanistan in including as part of the plan developed under subparagraph (A) the development and implementation of a plan to increase the number of female members of the ANA and ANP and to promote their equal treatment, including through such steps as providing appropriate equipment, modifying facilities, and ensuring literacy and gender awareness training for recruits.

(D) **ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.**—

(i) *IN GENERAL*.—Of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the Afghan Security Forces Fund for Fiscal Year 2016, no less than \$10,000,000 should be used for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women in the ANSF as well as the recruitment, training, and contracting of female security personnel for future elections.

(ii) *TYPES OF PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES*.—Such programs and activities may include—

(I) efforts to recruit women into the ANSF, including the special operations forces;

(II) programs and activities of the Afghan Ministry of Defense Directorate of Human Rights and Gender Integration and the Afghan Ministry of Interior Office of Human Rights, Gender and Child Rights;

(III) development and dissemination of gender and human rights educational and training materials and programs within the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Afghan Ministry of Interior;

(IV) efforts to address harassment and violence against women within the ANSF;

(V) improvements to infrastructure that address the requirements of women serving in the ANSF, including appropriate equipment for female security and police forces, and transportation for policewomen to their station

(VI) support for ANP Family Response Units; and

(VII) security provisions for high-profile female police and army officers.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq

SEC. 1221. DRAWDOWN OF UNITED STATES FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) *SENSE OF SENATE*.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the drawdown of United States forces in Afghanistan should be based on security conditions in Afghanistan and United States security interests in the region; and

(2) as the Afghan National Defense Security Forces develop security capabilities and capacity, an appropriate United States and international presence should continue, upon invitation by the Government of Afghanistan, to provide adequate capability and capacity to preserve gains made to date and continue counterterrorism operations in Afghanistan against terrorist organizations that can threaten United States interests or the United States homeland.

(b) *CERTIFICATION ON REDEPLOYMENTS OF US FORCES FROM AFGHANISTAN*.—

(1) *IN GENERAL*.—Not later than 10 days after the approval by the Secretary of Defense of orders to redeploy United States forces from Afghanistan in order to effect a reduction of the United States force presence in Afghanistan by a significant amount in accordance with plans approved by the President to drawdown United States forces in Afghanistan, the President shall certify to the congressional defense committees that the reduction of such force presence will result in an acceptable level of risk to United States national security objectives taking into consideration the security conditions on the ground.

(2) *SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT*.—For the purposes of this subsection, a significant amount in the reduction of the force presence of United States forces shall be a reduction by the lesser of—

(A) 1,000 or more troops; or

(B) the number of troops equal to 20 percent of the troops in Afghanistan at the time of the reduction.

(3) *WAIVER*.—The President may waive the requirement for a certification under paragraph (1) if the making of the certification would impede national security objectives of the United States. The President shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on each such waiver, including the national security ob-

jectives that would otherwise be impeded if not for the waiver.

SEC. 1222. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF COMMANDERS' EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM.

(a) *ONE-YEAR EXTENSION*.—Section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1619), as most recently amended by section 1221 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3546), is further amended by striking “fiscal year 2015” in subsections (a), (b), and (f) and inserting “fiscal year 2016”.

(b) *RESTRICTION ON AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS*.—Subsection (e) of such section 1201, as so amended, is further amended by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(c) *SUBMITTAL OF REVISED GUIDANCE*.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a copy of the guidance issued by the Secretary to the Armed Forces concerning the Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan as revised to take into account the amendments made by this section.

(d) *AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO REDRESS INJURY AND LOSS IN IRAQ*.—

(1) *IN GENERAL*.—During fiscal year 2016, amounts available pursuant to section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as amended by this section, shall also be available for *ex gratia* payments for damage, personal injury, or death that is incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) *AUTHORITIES APPLICABLE TO PAYMENT*.—Any payment made pursuant to this subsection shall be made in accordance with the authorities and limitations in section 8121 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2015 (division C of Public Law 113–235), other than subsection (h) of such section.

(3) *CONSTRUCTION WITH RESTRICTION ON AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS*.—For purposes of the application of subsection (e) of such section 1201, as so amended, to any payment under this subsection, such payment shall be deemed to be a project described by such subsection (e).

SEC. 1223. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER DEFENSE ARTICLES AND PROVIDE DEFENSE SERVICES TO THE MILITARY AND SECURITY FORCES OF AFGHANISTAN.

(a) *EXTENSION*.—Subsection (h) of section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1992), as amended by section 1231 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2105 (Public Law 113–291), is further amended by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”.

(b) *QUARTERLY REPORTS*.—Subsection (f)(1) of such section, as so amended, is further amended by striking “March 31, 2016” and inserting “March 31, 2017”.

(c) *EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES*.—Subsection (i)(2) of such section, as so amended, is further amended by striking “, 2014, and 2015” each place it appears and inserting “through 2016”.

SEC. 1224. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN COALITION NATIONS FOR SUPPORT PROVIDED TO UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS.

(a) *EXTENSION*.—Subsection (a) of section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–81; 122 Stat. 393), as most recently amended by section 1222 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), is further amended—

(1) by striking “fiscal year 2015” and inserting “fiscal year 2016”; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “Operation Enduring Freedom” and inserting “Operation Freedom's Sentinel”.

(b) *OTHER SUPPORT*.—Subsection (b) of such section 1233, as so amended, is further amended by striking “Operation Enduring Freedom” and inserting “Operation Freedom's Sentinel”.

(c) *LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS AVAILABLE*.—Subsection (d)(1) of such section 1233, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking “during fiscal year 2015 may not exceed \$1,200,000,000” and inserting “during fiscal year 2016 may not exceed \$1,160,000,000”; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking “during fiscal year 2015 may not exceed \$1,000,000,000” and inserting “during fiscal year 2016 may not exceed \$900,000,000”.

(d) *QUARTERLY REPORTS*.—Subsection (f) of such section 1233, as added by section 1223(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2520), is amended by striking “on any” and all that follows and inserting “on any reimbursements made during such quarter under the authorities as follows:

“(1) Subsection (a).

“(2) Subsection (b).

“(3) Section 1224(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.”.

(e) *EXTENSION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENT RELATING TO REIMBURSEMENT OF PAKISTAN FOR SUPPORT PROVIDED BY PAKISTAN*.—Section 1232(b)(6) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (122 Stat. 393), as most recently amended by section 1222 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2015, is further amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2016”.

(f) *EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON REIMBURSEMENT OF PAKISTAN PENDING CERTIFICATION ON PAKISTAN*.—Section 1227(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2001), as so amended, is further amended by striking “fiscal year 2015” and inserting “fiscal year 2016”.

(g) *ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON REIMBURSEMENT OF PAKISTAN PENDING CERTIFICATION ON PAKISTAN*.—Of the total amount of reimbursements and support authorized for Pakistan during fiscal year 2016 pursuant to the third sentence of section 1233(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (as amended by subsection (c)(2)), \$300,000,000 shall not be eligible for the waiver under section 1227(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (126 Stat. 2001) unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(1) Pakistan has undertaken military operations in North Waziristan that have contributed to significantly disrupting the safe haven and freedom of movement of the Haqqani network in Pakistan;

(2) Pakistan has taken actions that have demonstrated a commitment to ensuring that North Waziristan does not return to being a safe haven for the Haqqani network; and

(3) the Government of Pakistan has taken actions to promote stability in Afghanistan, including encouraging the participation of the Taliban in reconciliation talks with the Government of Afghanistan.

(h) *AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR STABILITY ACTIVITIES IN FATA*.—

(1) *IN GENERAL*.—Of the total amount of reimbursements and support authorized for Pakistan during fiscal year 2016 pursuant to the third sentence of section 1233(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (as so amended), \$100,000,000 may be available

for stability activities undertaken by Pakistan in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), including the provision of funds to the Pakistan military and the Pakistan Frontier Corps Khyber Pakhtunkhwa for activities undertaken in support of the following:

(A) Building and maintaining border outposts.
(B) Strengthening cooperative efforts between the Pakistan military and the Afghan National Defense Security Forces in activities that include—

(i) bilateral meetings to enhance border security coordination;

(ii) sustaining critical infrastructure within the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, such as maintaining key ground lines of communication;

(iii) increasing training for the Pakistan Frontier Corps Khyber Pakhtunkhwa; and

(iv) training to improve interoperability between the Pakistan military and the Pakistan Frontier Corps Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the expenditure of funds available under paragraph (1), including a description of the following:

(A) The purpose for which such funds were expended.

(B) Each organization on whose behalf such funds were expended, including the amount expended on such organization and the number of members of such organization trained with such amount.

(C) Any limitation imposed on the expenditure of funds under that paragraph, including on any recipient of funds or any use of funds expended.

(3) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” has the meaning given that term in section 1233(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008.

SEC. 1225. PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER TO VIOLENT EXTREMIST ORGANIZATIONS OF EQUIPMENT OR SUPPLIES PROVIDED BY THE UNITED STATES TO THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—No assistance authorized by section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) may be provided to the Government of Iraq after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress, after the date of the enactment of this Act, that appropriate steps have been taken by the Government of Iraq to safeguard against transferring or otherwise providing such assistance to violent extremist organizations.

(b) **VIOLENT EXTREMIST ORGANIZATION.**—For purposes of this section, an organization is a violent extremist organization if the organization—

(1) is a terrorist group or is associated with a terrorist group; or

(2) is known to be under the command and control of, or is associated with, the Government of Iran.

(c) **REPORTS ON TRANSFERS OF EQUIPMENT OR SUPPLIES TO VIOLENT EXTREMIST ORGANIZATIONS.**—

(1) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—Not later than 30 days after the Secretary of Defense makes any determination that equipment or supplies provided pursuant to section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 have been transferred to a violent extremist organization, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the determination and the transfer.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include, for the transfer covered by such report, the following:

(A) An assessment of the type and quantity of equipment or supplies so transferred.

(B) A description of the criteria used to determine that the organization to which transferred was a violent extremist organization.

(C) A description, if known, of how such equipment or supplies were transferred or acquired by the violent extremist organization concerned.

(D) If such equipment or supplies are determined to remain under the current control of any violent extremist organization, a description of each such organization, including its relationship, if any, with the security forces of the Government of Iraq.

(E) A description of end use monitoring or other policies and procedures in place for the equipment or supplies so transferred in order prevent the transfer or acquisition of such equipment or supplies by violent extremist organizations.

(d) **SUBMITTAL TIME FOR QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORTS ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTER ISIL.**—Section 1236(d) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 is amended by striking “30 days thereafter” and inserting “90 days thereafter”.

SEC. 1226. REPORT ON LINES OF COMMUNICATION OF ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT AND OTHER FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth the following:

(1) An assessment of the lines of communication that enable the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Jabhal al-Nusra, and other foreign terrorist organizations by facilitating the delivery of foreign fighters, funding, equipment, or other assistance through countries bordering on Syria.

(2) An assessment of the impacts of the lines of communication described in paragraph (1) on the security of the United States homeland and the protection of personnel and installations of the Department of Defense and diplomatic facilities in Europe and the Middle East.

(b) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1227. MODIFICATION OF PROTECTION FOR AFGHAN ALLIES.

(a) **COVERED AFGHANS.**—

(1) **TERM OF EMPLOYMENT.**—Clause (ii) of section 602(b)(2)(A) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by striking “year—” and inserting “year, or, if submitting a petition after September 30, 2015, for a period of not less than 2 years—”.

(2) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) **SUCCESSOR NAME FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE FORCE.**—Subclause (II) of section 602(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding item (aa), by striking “Force” and inserting “Force (or any successor name for such Force)”; and

(ii) in item (aa), by striking “Force,” and inserting “Force (or any successor name for such Force),”; and

(iii) in item (bb), by striking “Force;” and inserting “Force (or any successor name for such Force);”.

(B) **SHORT TITLE.**—Section 601 of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 is amended by striking “This Act” and inserting “This title”.

(C) **EXECUTIVE AGENCY REFERENCE.**—Section 602(c)(4) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 is amended by striking “section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)” and inserting “section 133 of title 41, United States Code”.

(b) **NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.**—Subparagraph (F) of section 602(b)(3) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “2015 AND 2016” and inserting “2015, 2016, AND 2017”; and

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(A) by striking “and ending on September 30, 2016,” and inserting “until such time that available special immigrant visas under subparagraphs (D) and (E) and this subparagraph are exhausted,” and

(B) by striking “4,000.” and inserting “7,000.”;

(3) in clause (i), by striking “September 30, 2015;” and inserting “December 31, 2016;”;

(4) in clause (ii), by striking “December 31, 2015;” and inserting “December 31, 2016;”;

(5) in clause (iii), by striking “March 31, 2017,” and inserting “the date such visas are exhausted.”.

(c) **REPORTS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—Section 602(b) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(15) **REPORTS INFORMING THE CONCLUSION OF THE AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM.**—Not later than June 1, 2016, and every six months thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

“(A) a description of the United States force presence in Afghanistan during the previous 6 months;

“(B) a description of the projected United States force presence in Afghanistan;

“(C) the number of citizens or nationals of Afghanistan who were employed by or on behalf of the entities described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) during the previous 6 months; and

“(D) the projected number of such citizens or nationals who will be employed by or on behalf of such entities.

“(16) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the necessity of providing special immigrant status under this subsection should be assessed at regular intervals by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, taking into account the scope of the current and planned presence of United States troops in Afghanistan, the current and prospective numbers of citizens and nationals of Afghanistan employed by or on behalf of the entities described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii), and the security climate in Afghanistan.”.

SEC. 1228. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO SUPPORT OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF SECURITY COOPERATION IN IRAQ.

(a) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.**—Subsection (f)(1) of section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended by striking “fiscal year 2015” and inserting “fiscal year 2016”.

(b) **AMOUNT AVAILABLE.**—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “fiscal year 2015” and all that follows and inserting “fiscal year 2016 may not exceed \$80,000,000.”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “fiscal year 2015” and inserting “fiscal year 2016”.

(c) **SUPERSEDING REPORT REQUIREMENTS.**—Subsection (g) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(g) **REPORTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than September 30, 2015, and every 180 days thereafter until the authority in this section expires, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq.

“(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report under this subsection shall include the following:

“(A) A current description of capability gaps in the security forces of Iraq, including capability gaps relating to intelligence matters, protection of Iraq airspace, and logistics and maintenance, and a current description of the extent, if any, to which the Government of Iraq has requested assistance in addressing such capability gaps.

“(B) A current description of the activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and the extent, if any, to which the programs conducted by the Office in conjunction with other United States programs (such as the Foreign Military Financing program, the Foreign Military Sales program, and the assistance provided pursuant to section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291)) will address the capability gaps described pursuant to subparagraph (A).

“(C) A current description of how the activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq are coordinated with, and complement and enhance, the assistance provided pursuant to section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

“(D) A current description of end use monitoring programs, and any other programs or procedures, used to improve accountability for equipment provided to the Government of Iraq.

“(E) A current description of the measures of effectiveness used to evaluate the activities of the Office of the Security Cooperation in Iraq, and an analysis of any determinations to expand, alter, or terminate specific activities of the Office based on such evaluations.

“(F) A current evaluation of the effectiveness of the training described in subsection (f)(2) in promoting respect for human rights, military professionalism, and respect for legitimate civilian authority in Iraq.

“(3) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”

SEC. 1229. SENSE OF SENATE ON SUPPORT FOR THE KURDISTAN REGIONAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) **SENSE OF SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) poses an acute threat to the people and territorial integrity of Iraq, including the Iraqi Kurdistan Region, and the security and stability of the Middle East and the world;

(2) the United States should, in coordination with coalition partners, provide, in an expeditious and responsive manner and without undue delay, the security forces of the Kurdistan Regional Government associated with the Government of Iraq with defense articles and assistance described in subsection (b), defense services, and related training to more effectively partner with the United States and other inter-

national coalition members to defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant;

(3) defeating the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant is critical to maintaining a unified Iraq in which all faiths, sects, and ethnicities are afforded equal protection and full integration into the Government and society of Iraq;

(4) due to the threat to United States national security and a free and inclusive Iraq brought by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance, including training, equipment, logistics support, supplies, and services, stipends, facility and infrastructure repair and renovation, and sustainment, to military and other security forces of or associated with the Government of Iraq, including Kurdish forces;

(5) leaders of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant have stated that they intend to conduct terrorist attacks internationally, including against the United States, its citizens, and its interests; and

(6) the Kurdistan Regional Government is the democratically elected government of the Iraqi Kurdistan Region, and Iraqi Kurds have been a reliable, stable, and capable partner of the United States, particularly in support of United States military and civilian personnel during Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New Dawn.

(b) **DEFENSE ARTICLES AND ASSISTANCE.**—The defense articles and assistance described in this subsection include anti-tank and anti-armor weapons, armored vehicles, long-range artillery, crew-served weapons and ammunition, secure command and communications equipment, body armor, helmets, logistics equipment, night optical devices, and other excess defense articles and military assistance considered appropriate by the President.

SEC. 1230. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE SECURITY AND PROTECTION OF IRANIAN DISSIDENTS LIVING IN CAMP LIBERTY, IRAQ.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The residents of Camp Liberty, Iraq, renounced violence and unilaterally disarmed more than a decade ago.

(2) The United States recognized the residents of the former Camp Ashraf who now reside in Camp Liberty as “protected persons” under the Fourth Geneva Convention and committed itself to protect the residents.

(3) The deterioration in the overall security situation in Iraq has increased the vulnerability of Camp Liberty residents to attacks from proxies of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps and Sunni extremists associated with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(4) The increased vulnerability underscores the need for an expedited relocation process and that these Iranian dissidents will neither be safe nor secure in Camp Liberty.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) take prompt and appropriate steps in accordance with international agreements to promote the physical security and protection of Camp Liberty residents;

(2) urge the Government of Iraq to uphold its commitments to the United States to ensure the safety and well-being of those living in Camp Liberty;

(3) urge the Government of Iraq to ensure continued and reliable access to food, clean water, medical assistance, electricity and other energy needs, and any other equipment and supplies necessary to sustain the residents during periods of attack or siege by external forces;

(4) oppose the extradition of Camp Liberty residents to Iran;

(5) implement a strategy to provide for the safe, secure, and permanent relocation of Camp Liberty residents that includes a relocation plan, including a detailed outline of the steps that would need to be taken by recipient countries, the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and Camp residents to relocate the residents to other countries;

(6) encourage continued close cooperation between the residents of Camp Liberty and the authorities in the relocation process; and

(7) assist the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in expediting the ongoing resettlement of all residents of Camp Liberty to safe locations outside Iraq.

Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Iran

SEC. 1241. MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF ANNUAL REPORT ON THE MILITARY POWER OF IRAN.

(a) **ELEMENT ON CYBER CAPABILITIES IN DESCRIPTION OF STRATEGY.**—Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2542) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) Iranian strategy regarding offensive cyber capabilities and defensive cyber capabilities.”

(b) **ELEMENTS ON CYBER CAPABILITIES IN ASSESSMENTS OF UNCONVENTIONAL FORCES.**—Paragraph (3) of such subsection, as amended by section 1232(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 920), is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(F) offensive cyber capabilities and defensive cyber capabilities; and

“(G) Iranian ability to manipulate the information environment both domestically and against the interests of the United States and its allies.”

(c) **EXTENSION OF REPORTS.**—Subsection (d) of such section 1245, as amended by section 1277 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3592), is further amended by striking “December 31, 2016” and inserting “December 31, 2021”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to reports required to be submitted under section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, as so amended, after that date.

Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation

SEC. 1251. UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by title XV and available for overseas contingency operations as specified in the funding tables in division D, \$300,000,000 may be available to the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide appropriate security assistance and intelligence support, including training, equipment, and logistics support, supplies and services, to military and other security forces of the Government of Ukraine for the purposes as follows:

(1) To enhance the capabilities of the military and other security forces of the Government of Ukraine to defend against further aggression.

(2) To assist Ukraine in developing the combat capability to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

(3) To support the Government of Ukraine in defending itself against actions by Russia and Russian-backed separatists that violate the ceasefire agreements of September 4, 2014, and February 11, 2015.

(b) **APPROPRIATE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT.**—For purposes of subsection (a), appropriate security assistance and intelligence support includes the following:

(1) Real time or near real time actionable intelligence.

(2) Lethal assistance such as anti-armor weapon systems, mortars, crew-served weapons and ammunition, grenade launchers and ammunition, and small arms and ammunition.

(3) Counter-artillery radars.

(4) Unmanned aerial tactical surveillance systems.

(5) Cyber capabilities.

(6) Counter-electronic warfare capabilities such as secure communications equipment and other electronic protection systems.

(7) Other electronic warfare capabilities.

(8) Training required to maintain and employ systems and capabilities described in paragraphs (1) through (7).

(9) Training for critical combat operations such as planning, command and control, small unit tactics, counter-artillery tactics, logistics, countering improvised explosive devices, battlefield first aid, and medical evacuation.

(10) Training and best practices to identify and treat post-traumatic stress disorder among Ukrainian Armed Forces and National Guard personnel.

(c) **FUNDING AVAILABILITY AND LIMITATION.**—

(1) **TRAINING.**—Up to 20 percent of the amount described in subsection (a) may be used to support training pursuant to section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note), relating to the Global Security Contingency Fund.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—Not more than 50 percent of the amount described in subsection (a) may be obligated or expended until an amount equal to 20 percent of such amount has been obligated or expended for appropriate security assistance described in subparagraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b) for the Government of Ukraine.

(3) **ALTERNATIVE OF FUNDS.**—In the event funds otherwise available pursuant to subsection (a) are not used by reason of the limitation in paragraph (2), such funds may be used at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, with concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide security assistance and intelligence support, including training, equipment, logistics support, supplies and services to military and other national-level security forces of Partnership for Peace nations other than Ukraine that the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate to assist such governments in preserving their sovereignty and territorial integrity against Russian aggression.

(d) **UNITED STATES INVENTORY AND OTHER SOURCES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to any assistance provided pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense is authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to make available to the Government of Ukraine weapons and other defense articles, from the United States inventory and other sources, and defense services, in such quantity as the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate to achieve the purposes specified in subsection (a).

(2) **REPLACEMENT.**—Amounts for the replacement of any items provided to the Government of Ukraine pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be derived from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for over-

seas contingency operations for weapons procurement.

(e) **CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

(f) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—Assistance may not be provided under the authority in this section after December 31, 2017.

SEC. 1252. EASTERN EUROPEAN TRAINING INITIATIVE.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Defense may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, carry out a program (to be known as the “Eastern European Training Initiative”) to provide training, and pay the incremental expenses incurred by a country as the direct result of participation in such training, for the national military forces of the following:

(1) A country that is a signatory to the Partnership for Peace Framework Documents, but is not a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

(2) A country that became a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization after January 1, 1999.

(b) **TYPES OF TRAINING.**—The training provided to the national military forces of a country under subsection (a) shall be limited to multilateral or regional training—

(1) to maintain and increase interoperability and readiness;

(2) to increase capacity to respond to external threats;

(3) to increase capacity to respond to hybrid warfare; or

(4) to increase capacity to respond to calls for collective action within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(c) **REQUIRED ELEMENTS.**—Training provided to the national military forces of a country under subsection (a) shall include elements that promote—

(1) observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; and

(2) respect for legitimate civilian authority within that country.

(d) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **ANNUAL FUNDING LIMITATION.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, up to \$28,000,000 may be used to provide training and pay incremental expenses under subsection (a) in that fiscal year.

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR ACTIVITIES ACROSS FISCAL YEARS.**—Amounts available in a fiscal year to carry out the authority in subsection (a) may be used for training under that authority that begins in that fiscal year and ends in the next fiscal year.

(e) **BRIEFING TO CONGRESS ON USE OF AUTHORITY.**—Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year in which the authority in subsection (a) is used, the Secretary shall brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the use of the authority during such fiscal year, including each country with which training under the authority was conducted and the types of training provided.

(f) **CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority provided in subsection (a) is in addition to any other authority provided by law authorizing the provision of training for the national military forces of a foreign country, including section 2282 of title 10, United States Code.

(g) **INCREMENTAL EXPENSES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “incremental expenses” means the reasonable and proper cost of the goods and services that are consumed by a country as a direct result of that country’s participation in

training under the authority of this section, including rations, fuel, training ammunition, and transportation. Such term does not include pay, allowances, and other normal costs of a country’s personnel.

(h) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2018. Any activity under this section initiated before that date may be completed, but only using funds available for fiscal years 2016 through 2018.

SEC. 1253. INCREASED PRESENCE OF UNITED STATES GROUND FORCES IN EASTERN EUROPE TO DETER AGGRESSION ON THE BORDER OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the increased presence of United States and allied ground forces in Eastern Europe since April 2014 has provided a level of reassurance to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members in the region and strengthened the capability of the Organization to respond to any potential Russian aggression against Organization members;

(2) at the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Wales summit in September 2014 member countries agreed on a Readiness Action Plan which is intended to improve the ability of the Organization to respond quickly and effectively to security threats on the borders of the Organization, including in Eastern Europe, and the challenges posed by hybrid warfare;

(3) the capability of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to respond to threats on the eastern border of the Organization would be enhanced by a more sustained presence on the ground of Organization forces on the territories of Organization members in Eastern Europe; and

(4) an increased presence of United States ground forces in Eastern Europe should be matched by an increased force presence of European allies.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment of options for expanding the presence of United States ground forces of the size of a Brigade Combat Team in Eastern Europe to respond, along with European allies and partners, to the security challenges posed by Russia and increase the combat capability of forces able to respond to unconventional or hybrid warfare tactics such as those used by the Russian Federation in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) An evaluation of the optimal location or locations of the enhanced ground force presence described in paragraph (1) that considers such factors as—

(i) proximity, suitability, and availability of maneuver and gunnery training areas;

(ii) transportation capabilities;

(iii) availability of facilities, including for potential equipment storage and prepositioning;

(iv) ability to conduct multinational training and exercises;

(v) a site or sites for prepositioning of equipment, a rotational presence or permanent presence of troops, or a combination of options; and

(vi) costs.

(B) A description of any initiatives by other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or other European allies and partners, for enhancing force presence on a permanent or rotational basis in Eastern Europe to match or exceed the potential increased presence of United States ground forces in the region.

SEC. 1254. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EUROPEAN DEFENSE AND NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries, at the 2014 North Atlantic Treaty Organization Summit in Wales, pledged to “reverse the trend of declining defense budgets, to make the most effective use of our funds and to further a more balanced sharing of costs and responsibilities”.

(2) Former Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel stated on May 2, 2014, that “[t]oday, America’s GDP is smaller than the combined GDPs of our 27 NATO allies. But America’s defense spending is three times our Allies’ combined defense spending. Over time, this lopsided burden threatens NATO’s integrity, cohesion, and capability, and ultimately both European and transatlantic security”.

(3) Former North Atlantic Treaty Organization Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen stated on July 3, 2014, that “[d]uring the last five years, Russia has increased defense spending by 50 percent, while NATO allies on average have decrease their defense spending by 20 percent. That is not sustainable, we need more investment in defense and security”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security and fiscal interests of the United States that prompt efforts should be undertaken by North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies to meet defense budget commitments made in Declaration 14 of the Wales Summit Declaration of September 2014;

(2) the United States Government should continue efforts through the Department of Defense and other agencies to encourage North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies towards meeting the defense spending goals set out at the Wales Summit;

(3) some North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies have already taken positive steps to reverse declines in defense spending and should continue to be supported in those efforts; and

(4) thoughtful and coordinated defense investments by European allies in military capabilities would add deterrence value to the posture of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization against Russian aggression and terrorist organizations and more appropriately balance the share of Atlantic defense spending.

SEC. 1255. ADDITIONAL MATTERS IN ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY AND SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS INVOLVING THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) ADDITIONAL MATTERS.—Subsection (b) of section 1245 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (15) as paragraphs (6) through (17), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraphs (4) and (5):

“(4) An assessment of the force structure and capabilities of Russian military forces stationed in each of the Arctic, Kaliningrad, and Crimea, including a description of any changes to such force structure or capabilities during the one-year period ending on the date of such report and with a particular emphasis on the anti-access and area denial capabilities of such forces.

“(5) An assessment of Russian military strategy and objectives for the Arctic region.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to reports submitted under section 1245 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 after that date.

SEC. 1256. REPORT ON ALTERNATIVE CAPABILITIES TO PROCURE AND SUSTAIN NONSTANDARD ROTARY WING AIRCRAFT HISTORICALLY PROCURED THROUGH ROSOBORONEXPORT.

(a) REPORT ON ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVE CAPABILITIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment, obtained by the Under Secretary for purposes of the report, of the feasibility and advisability of using alternative industrial base capabilities to procure and sustain, with parts and service, nonstandard rotary wing aircraft historically acquired through Rosoboronexport, or nonstandard rotary wing aircraft that are in whole or in part reliant upon Rosoboronexport for continued sustainment, in order to benefit United States national security interests.

(b) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall be conducted by a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), or another appropriate independent entity with expertise in the procurement and sustainment of complex weapon systems, selected by the Under Secretary for purposes of the assessment.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An identification and assessment of international industrial base capabilities, other than Rosoboronexport, to provide one or more of the following:

(A) Means of procuring nonstandard rotary wing aircraft historically procured through Rosoboronexport.

(B) Reliable and timely supply of required and appropriate parts, spares, and consumables of such aircraft.

(C) Certifiable maintenance of such aircraft, including major periodic overhauls, damage repair, and modifications.

(D) Access to required reference data on such aircraft, including technical manuals and service bulletins.

(E) Credible certification of airworthiness of such aircraft through physical inspection, notwithstanding any current administrative requirements to the contrary.

(2) An assessment (including an assessment of associated costs and risks) of alterations to administrative processes of the United States Government that may be required to procure any of the capabilities specified in paragraph (1), including waivers to Department of Defense or Department of State requirements applicable to foreign military sales or alterations to procedures for approval of airworthiness certificates.

(3) An assessment of the potential economic impact to Rosoboronexport of procuring nonstandard rotary wing aircraft described in paragraph (1)(A) through entities other than Rosoboronexport.

(4) An assessment of the risks and benefits of using the entities identified pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) to procure aircraft described in that paragraph.

(5) Such other matters as the Under Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) USE OF PREVIOUS STUDIES.—The entity conducting the assessment for purposes of subsection (a) may use and incorporate information from previous studies on matters appropriate to the assessment.

(e) FORM OF REPORT.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

Subtitle E—Matters Relating to the Asia-Pacific Region

SEC. 1261. SOUTH CHINA SEA INITIATIVE.

(a) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized, for the purpose of increasing maritime security and maritime domain awareness of foreign countries along the South China Sea—

(A) to provide assistance to national military or other security forces of such countries that have among their functional responsibilities maritime security missions; and

(B) to provide training to ministry, agency, and headquarters level organizations for such forces.

(2) DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—The provision of assistance and training under this section may be referred to as the “South China Sea Initiative”.

(b) RECIPIENT COUNTRIES.—The foreign countries that may be provided assistance and training under subsection (a) are the following:

- (1) Indonesia.
- (2) Malaysia.
- (3) The Philippines.
- (4) Thailand.
- (5) Vietnam.

(c) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—

(1) AUTHORIZED ELEMENTS OF ASSISTANCE.— Assistance provided under subsection (a)(1)(A) may include the provision of equipment, supplies, training, and small-scale military construction.

(2) REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Assistance and training provided under subsection (a) shall include elements that promote the following:

(A) Observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

(B) Respect for legitimate civilian authority within the country to which the assistance is provided.

(d) PRIORITIES FOR ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—In developing programs for assistance or training to be provided under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall accord a priority to assistance, training, or both that will enhance the maritime capabilities of the recipient foreign country, or a regional organization of which the recipient country is a member, to respond to emerging threats to maritime security.

(e) INCREMENTAL EXPENSES OF PERSONNEL OF CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES FOR TRAINING.—

(1) AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENT.—If the Secretary of Defense determines that the payment of incremental expenses in connection with training described in subsection (a)(1)(B) will facilitate the participation in such training of organization personnel of foreign countries specified in paragraph (2), the Secretary may use amounts available under subsection (f) for assistance and training under subsection (a) for the payment of such incremental expenses.

(2) COVERED COUNTRIES.—The foreign countries specified in this paragraph are the following:

- (A) Brunei.
- (B) Singapore.
- (C) Taiwan.

(f) FUNDING.—Funds may be used to provide assistance and training under subsection (a) as follows:

(1) In fiscal year 2016, \$50,000,000 from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for that fiscal year for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide.

(2) In fiscal year 2017, \$75,000,000 from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for that fiscal year for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide.

(3) In each of fiscal years 2018 through 2020, \$100,000,000 from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for such fiscal year for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide.

(g) NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Not later than 15 days before exercising the authority under subsection (a) or (e)

with respect to a recipient foreign country, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a notification containing the following:

(1) The recipient foreign country.
 (2) A detailed justification of the program for the provision of the assistance or training concerned, and its relationship to United States security interests.

(3) The budget for the program, including a timetable of planned expenditures of funds to implement the program, an implementation timeline for the program with milestones (including anticipated delivery schedules for any assistance under the program), the military department or component responsible for management of the program, and the anticipated completion date for the program.

(4) A description of the arrangements, if any, to support host nation sustainment of any capability developed pursuant to the program, and the source of funds to support sustainment efforts and performance outcomes to be achieved under the program beyond its completion date, if applicable.

(5) A description of the program objectives and an assessment framework to be used to develop capability and performance metrics associated with operational outcomes for the recipient force.

(6) Such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(h) **EXPIRATION.**—The authority provided under this section may not be exercised after September 30, 2020.

SEC. 1262. SENSE OF CONGRESS REAFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF IMPLEMENTING THE REBALANCE TO THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States has a longstanding national interest in maintaining security in the Asia-Pacific region.

(2) The Asia-Pacific region is home to the world's three largest economies, four most populous countries, and five largest militaries. The Asia-Pacific's rapid economic growth and mounting security tensions require a renewed focus from the United States on the region to maintain security, expand prosperity, and support common values.

(3) In 2011, President Barack Obama announced that the United States would rebalance to the Asia-Pacific. Since then, there have been a number of actions taken to strengthen the United States posture and relationships in the region, including the negotiation of the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement with the Philippines, the distributed laydown of the United States Marines Corps in the Pacific, the rotational stationing of the Littoral Combat Ship in Singapore, and a new comprehensive partnership with Vietnam on defense and security.

(4) Leaders in regional states remain concerned about a variety of regional military challenges. These include China's military modernization and its increasingly assertive actions in the East and South China Sea and North Korea's continued belligerence and its pursuit of nuclear and ballistic missile technology. United States allies and partners are looking to the United States to demonstrate its willingness and ability to maintain regional peace and security by fully implementing the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific.

(5) In April 2015, the Commander of the United States Pacific Command Admiral Samuel Locklear warned, "Our relative superiority I think has declined and continues to decline. . . we rely very heavily on power projection, which means we have to be able to get the forces forward. . .". Admiral Locklear also noted, "Any significant force structure moves

out of my AOR in the middle of a rebalance would have to be understood and have to be explained because it would counterintuitive to a rebalance to move significant forces in another direction."

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) in order to maintain the credibility of the United States rebalance, it is vital that the United States continue to shift forces to the Asia-Pacific region to strengthen the ability of the United States Armed Forces to project power to shape the choices of regional states and to deter, and if necessary defend, against hostile military actions;

(2) United States allies and partners in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as potential adversaries, would take note of any withdrawal of forces from the Asia-Pacific theater;

(3) any withdrawal of United States forces from Outside the Continental United States ("OCONUS") Asia-Pacific region or from United States Pacific Command would therefore seriously undermine the rebalance; and

(4) in order to properly implement United States rebalance policy, United States forces under the operational control of the United States Pacific Command should be increased consistent with commitments already made by the Department of Defense and aligned with the requirement to maintain a balance of military power that favors the United States and United States allies in the Asia-Pacific region.

SEC. 1263. SENSE OF SENATE ON TAIWAN ASYMMETRIC MILITARY CAPABILITIES AND BILATERAL TRAINING ACTIVITIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States, in accordance with the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96-8), should continue to make available to Taiwan such defense articles and services as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense;

(2) the United States should continue to support the efforts of Taiwan to integrate innovative and asymmetric measures to balance the growing military capabilities of the People's Republic of China, including fast-attack craft, coastal-defense cruise missiles, rapid-runway repair systems, offensive mines, and submarines optimized for defense of the Taiwan straits;

(3) the military forces of Taiwan should be permitted to participate in bilateral training activities hosted by the United States that increase credible deterrent capabilities of Taiwan, particularly those that emphasize the defense of Taiwan Island from missile attack, maritime blockade, and amphibious invasion by the People's Republic of China;

(4) toward that goal, Taiwan should be encouraged to participate in exercises that include realistic air-to-air combat training, including the exercise conducted at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, and Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, commonly referred to as "Red Flag"; and

(5) Taiwan should also be encouraged to participate in advanced bilateral training for its ground forces, Apache attack helicopters, and P-3C surveillance aircraft in island-defense scenarios.

SEC. 1264. MILITARY EXCHANGES BETWEEN SENIOR OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense should carry out a program of exchanges of senior military officers and senior officials between the United States and Taiwan designed to improve military to military relations between the United States and Taiwan.

(b) **EXCHANGES DESCRIBED.**—For the purposes of this section, an exchange is an activity, exercise, event, or observation opportunity between members of the Armed Forces and officials of the Department of Defense, on the one hand, and

armed forces personnel and officials of Taiwan, on the other hand.

(c) **FOCUS OF EXCHANGES.**—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focused on the following:

- (1) Threat analysis.
- (2) Military doctrine.
- (3) Force planning.
- (4) Logistical support.
- (5) Intelligence collection and analysis.
- (6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.
- (7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

(d) **CIVIL-MILITARY AFFAIRS.**—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include activities and exercises focused on civil-military relations, including parliamentary relations.

(e) **LOCATION OF EXCHANGES.**—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall be conducted in both the United States and Taiwan.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term "senior military officer", with respect to the Armed Forces, means a general or flag officer of the Armed Forces on active duty.

(2) The term "senior official", with respect to the Department of Defense, means a civilian official of the Department of Defense at the level of Assistant Secretary of Defense or above.

SEC. 1265. STRATEGY TO PROMOTE UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) **STRATEGY.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall develop an overall strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. Such strategy shall be informed by the following:

(1) The national security strategy of the United States for 2015 set forth in the national security strategy report required under section 108(a)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 5043(a)(3)), as such strategy relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(2) The 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(3) The 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(4) The strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region as contained in the report required by section 1251(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3570).

(5) The integrated, multi-year planning and budget strategy for a rebalancing of United States policy in Asia submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7043(a) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76)).

(b) **PRESIDENTIAL POLICY DIRECTIVE.**—The President shall issue a Presidential Policy Directive to appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government that contains the strategy developed under subsection (a) and includes implementing guidance to such departments and agencies.

(c) **RELATION TO AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS AND ANNUAL BUDGET.**—

(1) **AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS.**—In identifying agency priority goals under section 1120(b) of title 31, United States Code, for each appropriate department and agency of the United States Government, the head of such department

or agency, or as otherwise determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall take into consideration the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

(2) ANNUAL BUDGET.—The President shall, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, ensure that the annual budget submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, includes a separate section that clearly highlights programs and projects that are being funded in the annual budget that relate to the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

Subtitle F—Reports and Related Matters

SEC. 1271. ITEM IN QUARTERLY REPORTS ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTER THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT ON FORCES INELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE DUE TO A GROSS VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) ITEM IN REPORTS.—Section 1236(d) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(1) A list of the forces or elements of forces restricted from receiving assistance under subsection (a), unless waived pursuant to subsection (j), as a result of vetting required by subsection (e) or section 2249e of title 10, United States Code, and a detailed description of the reasons for such restriction, including for each force or element—

“(A) information relating to gross violation of human rights by such force or element (including the timeframe of the alleged violation);

“(B) the source of the information described in subparagraph (A), and an assessment of the veracity of the information;

“(C) the association of such force or element with terrorist groups or groups associated with the Government of Iran; and

“(D) the amount and type of any assistance provided such force or element by the Government of Iran.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to reports submitted pursuant to section 1236(d) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 after that date.

SEC. 1272. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ANTI-TUNNEL COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Tunnels can be used for criminal purposes, such as smuggling drugs, weapons, or humans, or for terrorist or military purposes, such as launching surprise attacks or detonating explosives underneath civilian or military infrastructure.

(2) Tunnels have been a growing threat on the southern border of the United States for years.

(3) In the conflict in Gaza in 2014, terrorists used tunnels to conduct attacks against Israel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to develop technology to detect and counter tunnels, and the best way to do this is to partner with other affected countries;

(2) the Administration should, on a joint basis with Israel, carry out research, development, test, and evaluation of anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel; and

(3) the Administration should use developed anti-tunnel capabilities to better protect the United States and deployed United States military personnel.

(c) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH ANTI-TUNNEL CAPABILITIES PROGRAM WITH ISRAEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, is authorized to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel. Such authority includes authority to construct facilities and install equipment necessary to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation so authorized. Any activities carried out pursuant to such authority shall be conducted in a manner that appropriately protects sensitive information and United States and Israel national security interests.

(2) REPORT.—The activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (d) may be carried out after the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth the following:

(A) A memorandum of agreement between the United States and Israel regarding sharing of research and development costs for the capabilities described in paragraph (1), and any supporting documents.

(B) A certification that the memorandum of agreement—

(i) requires sharing of costs of projects, including in-kind support, between the United States and Israel;

(ii) establishes a framework to negotiate the rights to any intellectual property developed under the memorandum of agreement; and

(iii) requires the United States Government to receive quarterly reports on expenditure of funds, if any, by the Government of Israel, including a description of what the funds have been used for, when funds were expended, and an identification of entities that expended the funds.

(d) ASSISTANCE IN CONNECTION WITH PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide procurement, maintenance, and sustainment assistance to Israel in support of the anti-tunnel capabilities research, development, test, and evaluation activities authorized in subsection (c)(1).

(2) REPORT.—Assistance may not be provided under paragraph (1) until 15 days after the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth a detailed description of the assistance to be provided.

(3) MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.—Assistance may not be provided under this subsection unless the Government of Israel contributes an amount not less than the amount of assistance to be so provided to the program, project, or activity for which the assistance is to be so provided.

(e) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress on a quarterly basis a report that contains a copy of the most recent quarterly report provided by the Government of Israel to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(iii).

(f) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(g) SUNSET.—The authority in this section to carry out activities described in subsection (c), and to provide assistance described in sub-

section (d), shall expire on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1273. SENSE OF SENATE AND REPORT ON QATAR FIGHTER AIRCRAFT CAPABILITY CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL SECURITY.

(a) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should consider, in a timely manner, opportunities to enhance the strike capability of fighter aircraft of the Qatar air force that would contribute to Qatar's self-defense and deter Iran's regional ambitions and simultaneously preserve the qualitative military edge of Israel; and

(2) Qatar should be afforded the opportunity through acquisition of appropriate technologies and exercises with the United States Armed Forces and the armed forces of partner nations to develop improved self-defense and counter force aviation capabilities that advanced fighter aircraft would provide.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31, 2016, the Secretary of Defense, shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the risks and benefits under consideration as they relate to capabilities described in subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of the key assumptions regarding the increase to Qatar air force capabilities as a result of potential pending transfer of technologies and weapons systems.

(B) A description of the key assumptions regarding items described in subparagraph (A) as they impact considerations regarding preservation of Israel's qualitative military edge.

(C) Estimated timelines for final adjudication of decisions to approve such transfers.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

SEC. 1274. REPORT ON THE SECURITY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of ongoing military and security cooperation between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

(2) A discussion of potential steps for enhancing the bilateral security relationship between the United States and Cyprus, including steps to enhance the military and security capabilities of the Republic of Cyprus.

(3) An analysis of the effect on the bilateral security relationship of the United States policy to deny applications for licenses and other approvals for the export of defense articles and defense services to the armed forces of Cyprus.

(4) An analysis of the extent to which such United States policy is consistent with overall United States security and policy objectives in the region.

(5) An assessment of the potential impact of lifting such United States policy.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle G—Other Matters**SEC. 1281. NATO SPECIAL OPERATIONS HEAD-QUARTERS.**

Section 1244(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2541), as most recently amended by section 1272(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2023), is further amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2016, 2017, and 2018”.

SEC. 1282. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR NON-CONVENTIONAL ASSISTED RECOVERY CAPABILITIES.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Subsection (h) of section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4579), as most recently amended by section 1261(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), is further amended by striking “2016” and inserting “2018”.

(b) **SOURCE OF FUNDS.**—Subsection (a) of such section 943, as amended by section 1205(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1623), is further amended by striking “for ‘Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide’” and inserting “for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance”.

(c) **OVERSIGHT.**—Subsection (b) of such section 943 is amended—

(1) by striking “(b) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(b) PROCEDURES AND OVERSIGHT.—

“(1) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) PROGRAMMATIC AND POLICY OVERSIGHT.—The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict shall have primary programmatic and policy oversight of non-conventional assisted recovery activities authorized by this section.”.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION**SEC. 1301. SPECIFICATION OF COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION FUNDS.**

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2016 COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION FUNDS DEFINED.**—As used in this title, the term “fiscal year 2016 Cooperative Threat Reduction funds” means the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 and made available by the funding table in section 4301 for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program established under section 1321 of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (50 U.S.C. 3711).

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 and made available by the funding table in section 4301 for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program shall be available for obligation for fiscal years 2016, 2017, and 2018.

SEC. 1302. FUNDING ALLOCATIONS.

Of the \$358,496,000 authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 in section 301 and made available by the funding table in section 4301 for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program established under section 1321 of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (50 U.S.C. 3711), the following amounts may be obligated for the purposes specified:

(1) For strategic offensive arms elimination, \$1,289,000.

(2) For chemical weapons destruction, \$942,000.

(3) For global nuclear security, \$20,555,000.

(4) For cooperative biological engagement, \$264,608,000.

(5) For proliferation prevention, \$38,945,000.

(6) For threat reduction engagement, \$2,827,000.

(7) For activities designated as Other Assessments/Administrative Costs, \$29,320,000.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**Subtitle A—Military Programs****SEC. 1401. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.**

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital and revolving funds, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1402. NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the National Defense Sealift Fund, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1403. CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

(b) **USE.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) are authorized for—

(1) the destruction of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521); and

(2) the destruction of chemical warfare materiel of the United States that is not covered by section 1412 of such Act.

SEC. 1404. DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE-WIDE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1405. DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1406. DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the funding table in section 4501, for use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense in providing for the health of eligible beneficiaries.

Subtitle B—Other Matters**SEC. 1411. AUTHORITY FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO JOINT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL FACILITY DEMONSTRATION FUND FOR CAPTAIN JAMES A. LOVELL HEALTH CARE CENTER, ILLINOIS.**

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 1406 and available for the Defense Health Program for operation and maintenance, \$120,400,000 may be transferred by the Secretary of Defense to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund established by subsection (a)(1) of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2571). For purposes of subsection (a)(2) of such section 1704, any funds so

transferred shall be treated as amounts authorized and appropriated specifically for the purpose of such a transfer.

(b) **USE OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.**—For the purposes of subsection (b) of such section 1704, facility operations for which funds transferred under subsection (a) may be used are operations of the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility under an operational agreement covered by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4500).

SEC. 1412. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund the sum of \$64,300,000 for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

SEC. 1413. INSPECTIONS OF THE ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME BY THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **INSPECTIONS.**—Subsection (b)(1) of section 1518 of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 418) is amended by striking “a comprehensive inspection of all aspects of each facility of the Retirement Home” and all that follows and inserting “an inspection of the Retirement Home. The Inspector General shall determine the scope of each such inspection using a risk-based analysis of the operations of the Retirement Home.”.

(b) **REPORTS.**—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended in the second sentence by striking “Not later than 90 days after completing the inspection of the facility, the Inspector General” and inserting “The Inspector General”.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations****SEC. 1501. PURPOSE.**

The purpose of this subtitle is to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 to provide additional funds for overseas contingency operations being carried out by the Armed Forces.

SEC. 1502. OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense for overseas contingency operations in such amounts as may be designated as provided in section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 1503. PROCUREMENT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for procurement accounts for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and Defense-wide activities, as specified in the funding table in section 4102.

SEC. 1504. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the funding table in section 4202.

SEC. 1505. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4302.

SEC. 1506. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for military personnel, as specified in the funding table in section 4402.

SEC. 1507. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital and revolving funds, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1508. DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE-WIDE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1509. DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1510. DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1511. COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

(b) **DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.**—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) shall remain available for obligation through September 30, 2017.

Subtitle B—Financial Matters**SEC. 1521. TREATMENT AS ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.**

The amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 1522. SPECIAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this title for fiscal year 2016 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof). Amounts of authorizations so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this subsection may not exceed \$4,000,000,000.

(b) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—Transfers under this section shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as transfers under section 1001.

(c) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.**—The transfer authority provided by this section is in addition to the transfer authority provided under section 1001.

Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters**SEC. 1531. AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND.**

(a) **CONTINUATION OF PRIOR AUTHORITIES AND NOTICE AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Funds available to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund for fiscal year 2016 shall be subject to the conditions contained in subsections (b) through (g) of section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 428), as amended by section 1531(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4424).

(b) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CERTAIN EQUIPMENT.**—Section 1532(b)(1) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended by striking “this Act” and inserting “Acts enacted before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.”

SEC. 1532. JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND.

(a) **USE AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 1514 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2439), as in effect before the amendments made by section 1503 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4649), shall apply to the funds made available to the Department of Defense for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund for fiscal year 2016.

(b) **EXTENSION OF INTERDICTION OF IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE PRECURSOR CHEMICALS AUTHORITY.**—Section 1532(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2057) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and for fiscal year 2016,” after “fiscal year 2013,”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), as most recently amended by section 1533(c) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”.

(c) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN ASSIGNMENTS OF PERSONNEL.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization may be used for the purposes of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization assigning personnel or contractors on a permanent or temporary basis, or as a detail, to the combatant commands or associated military components, or the combat support agencies, unless such personnel or contractors are supporting—

(1) Operation Freedom’s Sentinel or any successor operation to that operation;

(2) Operation Inherent Resolve or any successor operation to that operation; or

(3) another operation that, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, requires the direct support of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization.

(d) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS.**—If after the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary of Defense makes a determination described in subsection (c)(3) that an operation requires the direct support of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a notice of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(e) **LIMITATION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF JIEDDO AS COMBAT SUPPORT AGENCY.**—Relating to the determination by the Deputy Sec-

retary of Defense on March 11, 2015, to make the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization a combat support agency, the Secretary of Defense is prohibited from implementing such determination until 90 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) A detailed plan for the disposition of the Organization as a combat support agency, including the enduring requirements and key functions of the Organization, the chain of command for the Organization, and funding for the Organization as such an agency.

(2) A statement of potential alternative means to achieving the objective of designating the Organization as a combat support agency, including the assumption of one or more functions of the Organization by one or more other components or elements of the Department of Defense, and an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of each such alternative.

SEC. 1533. AVAILABILITY OF JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND FUNDS FOR TRAINING OF FOREIGN SECURITY FORCES TO DEFEAT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICES.

(a) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund, up to \$30,000,000 may be available to provide training to foreign security forces in defeating improvised explosive devices under authority provided the Department of Defense under any other provision of law.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION OF AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—The availability of funds under subsection (a) shall not be construed as authority in and of itself for the provision of training as described in that subsection.

(c) **GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATION.**—Training may be provided using funds available under subsection (a) only—

(1) in locations in which the Department of Defense is conducting a named operation; or

(2) in geographic areas in which the Secretary of Defense has determined that a foreign security force is facing a significant threat from improvised explosive devices.

(d) **COORDINATION WITH GEOGRAPHIC COMBATANT COMMANDS.**—The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, coordinate the provision of training using funds available under subsection (a) with requests received from the commanders of the geographic combatant commands.

(e) **EXPIRATION.**—The authority to use funds described in subsection (a) in accordance with this section shall expire on December 31, 2018.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS**Subtitle A—Space Activities****SEC. 1601. INTEGRATED POLICY TO DETER ADVERSARIES IN SPACE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall establish an interagency process to provide for the development of a policy to deter adversaries in space—

(1) with the objectives of—

(A) reducing risks to the United States and allies of the United States in space; and

(B) protecting and preserving the rights, access, capabilities, use, and freedom of action of the United States in space and the right of the United States to respond to an attack in space and, if necessary, deny adversaries the use of space capabilities hostile to the national interests of the United States; and

(2) that integrates the interests and responsibilities of the agencies participating in the process.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Committees on Armed

Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the policy developed pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) **FUNDING RESTRICTION.**—If the President has not submitted the policy developed under subsection (a) and the answers to Enclosure 1, regarding offensive space control policy, of the classified annex to this Act, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by the date required by paragraph (1), an amount equal to \$10,000,000 of the amount authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 to provide support services to the Executive Office of the President shall be withheld from obligation or expenditure until the policy and such answers are submitted to such Committees.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1602. PRINCIPAL ADVISOR ON SPACE CONTROL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 135 of title 10, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§279a. Principal Advisor on Space Control

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall designate an individual to serve as the Principal Space Control Advisor, who shall act as the principal advisor to the Secretary on space control activities.

“(b) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The Principal Space Control Advisor shall be responsible for the following:

“(1) Supervision of space control activities related to the development, procurement, and employment of, and strategy relating to, space control capabilities.

“(2) Oversight of policy, resources, personnel, and acquisition and technology relating to space control activities.

“(c) **CROSS-FUNCTIONAL TEAM.**—The Principal Space Control Advisor shall integrate the space control expertise and perspectives of appropriate organizational entities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the military departments, the Defense Agencies, and the combatant commands, by establishing and maintaining a full-time, cross-functional team of subject-matter experts from those entities.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2799 the following new item:

“279a. Principal Advisor on Space Control.”.

SEC. 1603. EXCEPTION TO THE PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH RUSSIAN SUPPLIERS OF ROCKET ENGINES FOR THE EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM.

Section 1608 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3626; 10 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “subsections (b) and (c)” and inserting “subsections (b), (c), and (d)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **SPECIAL RULE FOR PHASE 1A COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITIES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For not more than 9 competitive opportunities described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may award a contract—

“(A) requiring the use of a rocket engine designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation that is eligible for a waiver under subsection (b) or an exception under subsection (c); or

“(B) if a rocket engine described in subparagraph (A) is not available, requiring the use of

a rocket engine designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation that is not eligible for such a waiver or exception.

“(2) **COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITIES DESCRIBED.**—A competitive opportunity described in this paragraph is—

“(A) an opportunity to compete for a contract for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities under the evolved expendable launch vehicle program; and

“(B) one of the 9 Phase 1A competitive opportunities for fiscal years 2015 through 2017, as specified in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the budget of the President for fiscal year 2016 (as submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code).”.

SEC. 1604. ELIMINATION OF LAUNCH CAPABILITIES CONTRACTS UNDER EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided by subsections (b) and (c), on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense may not award or renew a contract, or maintain a separate contract line item, for the procurement of property or services for space launch capabilities under the evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

(b) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) and award or renew a contract or maintain a separate contract line item for the procurement of property or services for space launch capabilities if the Secretary of Defense determines, and reports to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days before the waiver takes effect, that—

(1) awarding or renewing such a contract or maintaining such a contract line item is necessary for the national security interests of the United States and the contract or contract line item does not support space launch activities using rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation; and

(2) failing to award or renew such a contract or maintain such a contract line item will have significant consequences to national security and will result in the significant loss of life or property or economic harm.

(c) **EXCEPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to the placement of orders or the exercise of options under the contract numbered FA8811–13–C–0003 and awarded on December 18, 2013.

(2) **TERMINATION.**—The exception under paragraph (1) shall terminate on September 30, 2019.

(d) **SPACE LAUNCH CAPABILITIES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “space launch capabilities” includes all work associated with space launch infrastructure maintenance and sustainment, program management, systems engineering, launch site operations, launch site depreciation, and maintenance commodities.

SEC. 1605. ALLOCATION OF FUNDING FOR EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount requested in the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2017, 2018, or 2019 for the Air Force for the launch of Air Force satellites under the evolved expendable launch vehicle launch capability program shall bear the same ratio to the total amount requested in that budget for that fiscal year for the launch of national security satellites under the evolved expendable launch vehicle launch capability program as the amount requested in that budget for that fiscal year for the procurement of cores for the Air Force for the launch of Air Force satellites under the evolved expendable launch vehicle launch services program bears to the total amount requested in that budget for that fiscal

year for the procurement of cores for the launch of national security satellites under the evolved expendable launch vehicle launch services program.

(b) **NATIONAL SECURITY SATELLITE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “national security satellite” is a satellite launched for national security purposes, including such a satellite launched by the Air Force, the Navy, or the National Reconnaissance Office, or any other element of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 1606. INCLUSION OF PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT AND FIELDING OF A FULL-UP ENGINE IN ROCKET PROPULSION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 1604(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3623; 10 U.S.C. 2273 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) a plan for the development and fielding of a full-up engine.”.

SEC. 1607. LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR THE DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Defense Meteorological Satellite program (PE# 0305160F and line number MS0554) or for the launch of Defense Meteorological Satellite program satellite #20 (in this section referred to as “DMSP20”), and none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for that program or the launch of DMSP20 that remain available for obligation as of the date of the enactment of this Act, may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff jointly certify to the congressional defense committees that—

(1) relying on civil and international contributions to meet space-based environmental monitoring requirements is insufficient or is a risk to national security and launching DMSP20 will meet those requirements;

(2) launching DMSP20 is the most affordable solution to meeting requirements validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council; and

(3) nonmaterial solutions within the Department of Defense, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are incapable of meeting the cloud characterization and theater weather requirements validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council.

(b) **COMPARATIVE COST AND CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT.**—If the Secretary and the Chairman determine that a material solution is required to meet the cloud characterization and theater weather requirements validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, the Secretary and the Chairman shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a cost and capability assessment that compares the cost of meeting those requirements with DMSP20 and with an alternate material solution that includes electro-optical infrared weather imaging or other comparable solutions.

SEC. 1608. QUARTERLY REPORTS ON GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III SPACE SEGMENT, GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT, AND MILITARY GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM USER EQUIPMENT ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the Comptroller

General of the United States a report on the Global Positioning System III space segment, the Global Positioning System operational control segment, and the Military Global Positioning System user equipment acquisition programs.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report required by subsection (a) shall include, with respect to an acquisition program specified in that subsection, the following:

(1) A statement of the status of the program with respect to cost, schedule, and performance.

(2) A description of any changes to the requirements of the program.

(3) A description of any technical risks impacting the cost, schedule, and performance of the program.

(4) An assessment of how such risks are to be addressed and the costs associated with such risks.

(5) An assessment of the extent to which the segments of the program are synchronized.

(c) **BRIEFINGS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on a report submitted under subsection (a)—

(1) in the case of the first such report, not later than 30 days after receiving that report; and

(2) as the Comptroller General considers appropriate thereafter.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—The requirement under subsection (a) shall terminate with respect to an acquisition program specified in that subsection on the date on which that program reaches full operational capability.

SEC. 1609. PLAN FOR CONSOLIDATION OF ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than January 31, 2016, the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the consolidation, during the three-year period beginning on the date on which the plan is submitted, of the acquisition of commercial satellite communications services from across the Department of Defense into a program office in the Space and Missile Systems Center of the Air Force.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the management and overhead costs relating to the acquisition of commercial satellite communications services across the Department of Defense; and

(B) an estimate of—

(i) the costs of implementing the consolidation of the acquisition of such services described in subsection (a); and

(ii) the projected savings of the consolidation.

(2) **VALIDATION BY DIRECTOR OF COST ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION.**—The assessment required by paragraph (1)(A) and the estimates required by paragraph (1)(B) shall be validated by the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation.

SEC. 1610. COUNCIL ON OVERSIGHT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POSITIONING, NAVIGATION, AND TIMING ENTERPRISE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 135 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 1602, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2279b. Council on Oversight of the Department of Defense Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Enterprise

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is within the Department of Defense a council to be known as the ‘Council on Oversight of the Department of Defense Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Enterprise’ (in this section referred to as the ‘Council’).

“(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The members of the Council shall be as follows:

“(1) The Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

“(2) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

“(3) The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

“(4) The Commander of the United States Strategic Command.

“(5) The Commander of the United States Northern Command.

“(6) The Commander of United States Cyber Command.

“(7) The Director of the National Security Agency.

“(8) The Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense.

“(9) Such other officers of the Department of Defense as the Secretary may designate.

“(c) **CO-CHAIR.**—The Council shall be co-chaired by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

“(d) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—(1) The Council shall be responsible for oversight of the Department of Defense positioning, navigation, and timing enterprise, including positioning, navigation, and timing services provided to civil, commercial, scientific, and international users.

“(2) In carrying out the responsibility for oversight of the Department of Defense positioning, navigation, and timing enterprise as specified in paragraph (1), the Council shall be responsible for the following:

“(A) Oversight of performance assessments (including interoperability).

“(B) Vulnerability identification and mitigation.

“(C) Architecture development.

“(D) Resource prioritization.

“(E) Such other responsibilities as the Secretary of Defense shall specify for purposes of this section.

“(e) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—At the same time each year that the budget of the President is submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, the Council shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the activities of the Council. Each report shall include the following:

“(1) A description and assessment of the activities of the Council during the previous fiscal year.

“(2) A description of the activities proposed to be undertaken by the Council during the period covered by the current future-years defense program under section 221 of this title.

“(3) Any changes to the requirements of the Department of Defense positioning, navigation, and timing enterprise made during the previous year, along with an explanation for why the changes were made and a description of the effects of the changes to the capability of such enterprise.

“(4) A breakdown of each program element in such budget that relates to the Department of Defense positioning, navigation, and timing enterprise, including how such program element relates to the operation and sustainment, research and development, procurement, or other activity of such enterprise.

“(f) **BUDGET AND FUNDING MATTERS.**—(1) Not later than 30 days after the President submits to Congress the budget for a fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command shall submit to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff an assessment of—

“(A) whether such budget allows the Federal Government to meet the required capabilities of the Department of Defense positioning, navigation, and timing enterprise during the fiscal year covered by the budget and the four subsequent fiscal years; and

“(B) if the Commander determines that such budget does not allow the Federal Government

to meet such required capabilities, a description of the steps being taken to meet such required capabilities.

“(2) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff receives the assessment of the Commander of the United States Strategic Command under paragraph (1), the Chairman shall submit to the congressional defense committees—

“(A) such assessment as it was submitted to the Chairman; and

“(B) any comments of the Chairman.

“(3) If a House of Congress adopts a bill authorizing or appropriating funds for the activities of the Department of Defense positioning, navigation, and timing enterprise that, as determined by the Council, provides insufficient funds for such activities for the period covered by such bill, the Council shall notify the congressional defense committees of the determination.

“(g) **NOTIFICATION OF ANOMALIES.**—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees written notification of an anomaly in the Department of Defense positioning, navigation, and timing enterprise that is reported to the Secretary or the Council by not later than 14 days after the date on which the Secretary or the Council learns of such anomaly, as the case may be.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘anomaly’ means any unplanned, irregular, or abnormal event, whether unexplained or caused intentionally or unintentionally by a person or a system.

“(h) **TERMINATION.**—The Council shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter, as amended by section 1602, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2799a the following new item:

“2279b. Council on Oversight of the Department of Defense Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Enterprise.”.

SEC. 1611. ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES FOR WIDE-BAND COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an analysis of alternatives for a follow-on wide-band communications system to the Wideband Global SATCOM System that includes space, air, and ground layer communications capabilities of the Department of Defense.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than March 31, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the analysis conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 1612. EXPANSION OF GOALS FOR PILOT PROGRAM FOR ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.

Section 1605(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3623; 10 U.S.C. 2208 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) demonstrates the potential to achieve order-of-magnitude improvements in satellite communications capability.”.

SEC. 1613. STREAMLINE COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH ACTIVITIES.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that eliminating duplicative requirements and approvals for commercial launch and reentry operations will promote and encourage the development of the commercial space sector.

(b) **REAFFIRMATION OF POLICY.**—Congress reaffirms that the Secretary of Transportation, in overseeing and coordinating commercial launch and reentry operations, should—

(1) promote commercial space launches and reentries by the private sector;

(2) facilitate Government, State, and private sector involvement in enhancing United States launch sites and facilities;

(3) protect public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States; and

(4) consult with the head of another executive agency, including the Secretary of Defense or the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as necessary to provide consistent application of licensing requirements under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Transportation under section 50918 of title 51, United States Code, and subject to section 50905(b)(2)(C) of that title, shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate—

(A) to identify all requirements that are imposed to protect the public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle; and

(B) to evaluate the requirements identified in subparagraph (A) and, in coordination with the licensee or transferee and the heads of the relevant executive agencies—

(i) determine whether the satisfaction of a requirement of one agency could result in the satisfaction of a requirement of another agency; and

(ii) resolve any inconsistencies and remove any outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle.

(2) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the Secretary of Transportation determines no outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government exist, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the commercial space sector, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(A) A description of the process for the application for and approval of a permit or license under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code, for the commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle, including the identification of—

(i) any unique requirements for operating on a United States Government launch site, reentry site, or launch property; and

(ii) any inconsistent, outmoded, or duplicative requirements or approvals.

(B) A description of current efforts, if any, to coordinate and work across executive agencies to define interagency processes and procedures for sharing information, avoiding duplication of effort, and resolving common agency requirements.

(C) Recommendations for legislation that may further—

(i) streamline requirements in order to improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary costs, resolve in-

consistencies, remove duplication, and minimize unwarranted constraints; and

(ii) consolidate or modify requirements across affected agencies into a single application set that satisfies the requirements identified in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) any applicable definitions set forth in section 50902 of title 51, United States Code, shall apply;

(B) the terms “launch”, “reenter”, and “reentry” include landing of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle; and

(C) the terms “United States Government launch site” and “United States Government reentry site” include any necessary facility, at that location, that is commercially operated on United States Government property.

Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-related Activities

SEC. 1621. REPORT ON AIR NATIONAL GUARD CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RQ-4 GLOBAL HAWK MISSION.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, shall submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of using the Air National Guard in association with the active duty Air Force to operate and maintain the RQ-4 Global Hawk.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the costs, training requirements, and personnel required to create an association for the Global Hawk mission consisting of members of the Air Force serving on active duty and members of the Air National Guard.

(2) The capacity of the Air National Guard to support an association described in paragraph (1).

Subtitle C—Cyber Warfare, Cyber Security, and Related Matters

SEC. 1631. AUTHORIZATION OF MILITARY CYBER OPERATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 3 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 130g. Authorities concerning military cyber operations

“The Secretary of Defense shall develop, prepare, coordinate, and, when authorized by the President to do so, conduct a military cyber operation in response to malicious cyber activity carried out against the United States or a United States person by a foreign power (as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801)).”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“130g. Authorities concerning military cyber operations.”.

SEC. 1632. DESIGNATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ENTITY RESPONSIBLE FOR ACQUISITION OF CRITICAL CYBER CAPABILITIES.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, for each critical cyber capability described in paragraph (2), designate an entity of the Department of Defense to be responsible for the acquisition of the critical cyber capability.

(2) **CRITICAL CYBER CAPABILITIES DESCRIBED.**—The critical cyber capabilities described in this paragraph are all of the cyber capabilities that the Secretary considers critical to the mission of

the Department of Defense, including the following:

(A) The Unified Platform.

(B) A persistent cyber training environment.

(C) A cyber situational awareness and battle management system.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the designations made under subsection (a).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Identification of each designation made under subsection (a).

(B) Estimates of the funding requirements and acquisition timelines for each critical cyber capability for which a designation was made under subsection (a).

(C) An explanation of whether critical cyber capabilities could be acquired more quickly with changes to acquisition authorities.

(D) Such recommendations as the Secretary may have for legislation or administrative action to improve the acquisition of, or acquire more quickly, the critical cyber capabilities for which designations are made under subsection (a).

SEC. 1633. INCENTIVE FOR SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS BY PRESIDENT OF INTEGRATED POLICY TO DETER ADVERSARIES IN CYBERSPACE.

Until the President submits to the congressional defense committees the report required by section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (127 Stat. 837; Public Law 113–66), \$10,000,000 of the unobligated balance of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to provide support services to the Executive Office of the President may not be obligated or expended.

SEC. 1634. AUTHORIZATION FOR PROCUREMENT OF RELOCATABLE SENSITIVE COMPARTMENTED INFORMATION FACILITY.

Of the unobligated amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for procurement for the Army, \$10,600,000 may be used for the procurement of a relocatable Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility for the Cyber Center of Excellence at Fort Gordon, Georgia, as described in the reprogramming action prior approval request submitted by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to Congress on February 6, 2015.

SEC. 1635. EVALUATION OF CYBER VULNERABILITIES OF MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **EVALUATION REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall complete an evaluation of the cyber vulnerabilities of each major weapon system of the Department of Defense by not later than December 31, 2019.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The Secretary may waive the requirement of paragraph (1) with respect to a weapon system or complete the evaluation of a weapon system required by such paragraph after the date specified in such paragraph if the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees before that date that all known cyber vulnerabilities in the weapon system have minimal consequences for the capability of the weapon system to meet operational requirements or otherwise satisfy mission requirements.

(b) **PLAN FOR EVALUATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the plan of the Secretary for the evaluations of major weapon systems required by subsection (a), including an identification of

each of the weapon systems to be evaluated and an estimate of the funding required to conduct the evaluations.

(2) **PRIORITY IN EVALUATIONS.**—The plan under paragraph (1) shall accord a priority among evaluations based on the criticality of major weapon systems, as determined by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff based on an assessment of employment of forces and threats.

(3) **INTEGRATION WITH OTHER EFFORTS.**—The plan under paragraph (1) shall build upon existing efforts regarding the identification and mitigation of cyber vulnerabilities of major weapon systems, and shall not duplicate similar ongoing efforts such as “Task Force Cyber Awakening” of the Navy or “Task Force Cyber Secure” of the Air Force.

(c) **STATUS ON PROGRESS.**—On a regular basis, the Secretary shall inform the congressional defense committees of the activities undertaken in the evaluation of major weapon systems under this section.

(d) **RISK MITIGATION STRATEGIES.**—As part of the evaluation of cyber vulnerabilities of major weapon systems of the Department under this section, the Secretary shall develop strategies for mitigating the risks of cyber vulnerabilities identified in the course of such evaluations.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under section 201, \$200,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to conduct the evaluations required by subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 1636. ASSESSMENT OF CAPABILITIES OF UNITED STATES CYBER COMMAND TO DEFEND THE UNITED STATES FROM CYBER ATTACKS.

(a) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Principal Cyber Advisor, with the assistance of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, shall sponsor an independent panel to assess the ability of the National Mission Forces of the United States Cyber Command to reliably prevent or block large-scale attacks on the United States by foreign powers with capabilities comparable to the capabilities of China, Iran, North Korea, and Russia expected in the years 2020 and 2025.

(2) **INDEPENDENT EXPERTS.**—The panel sponsored under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) independent experts in cyber warfare technology, intelligence, and operations; and

(B) independent experts in non-cyber military operations.

(b) **WAR GAMES.**—The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the Principal Cyber Advisor, shall conduct a series of war games through the Warfighting Analysis Division of the Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment Directorate to assess the strategy, assumptions, and capabilities of the United States Cyber Command to prevent large-scale cyber attacks by foreign powers with capabilities described in subsection (a)(1) from reaching United States targets.

(c) **FINDINGS.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Principal Cyber Advisor shall convey to the congressional defense committees the findings of the Principal Cyber Advisor with respect to the assessment conducted by the panel sponsored under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall convey to the congressional defense committees the findings of the Chairman with respect to the war games conducted under subsection (b)(1).

(d) **FOREIGN POWER DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “foreign power” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

SEC. 1637. BIENNIAL EXERCISES ON RESPONDING TO CYBER ATTACKS AGAINST CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) **BIENNIAL EXERCISES REQUIRED.**—Not less frequently than once every two years until the date that is six years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the heads of the critical infrastructure sector-specific agencies designated under Presidential Policy Directive-21 (entitled “Critical Infrastructure Security Resilience” and dated February 12, 2013) and in consultation with governors of the States and the owners and operators of critical infrastructure, organize and execute one or more exercises based on scenarios in which—

(1) critical infrastructure of the United States is attacked through cyberspace; and

(2) the President directs the Secretary to—

(A) defend the United States; and

(B) provide support to civil authorities in responding to and recovering from cyber attacks.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the exercises required by subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) To improve cooperation and coordination between various parts of the Government and industry so that the Government and industry can more effectively and efficiently respond to cyber attacks.

(2) To exercise command and control, coordination, communications, and information sharing capabilities under the stressing conditions of an ongoing cyber attack.

(3) To identify gaps and problems that require new enhanced training, capabilities, procedures, or authorities.

(4) To identify—

(A) interdependencies;

(B) strengths that should be leveraged; and

(C) weaknesses that need to be mitigated.

(c) **REQUIREMENT FOR VARIATION OF ASSUMPTIONS AND CONDITIONS.**—In conducting the exercises required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that there is an appropriate degree of variation from exercise to exercise of the following:

(1) The size, scope, duration, and sophistication of the cyber attacks.

(2) The degree of warning and knowledge that is available to the Department of Defense about the attack and the means used in the attack and the degree of delegation of authority from the President to react, including with pre-planned responses.

(3) The effectiveness of the National Mission Force of the United States Cyber Command in preempting and defeating the attack.

(4) The effectiveness of the attacks on critical infrastructure in general and particularly in specific industry sectors.

(5) The effectiveness of resilience and recovery mechanisms.

(d) **COST SHARING AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary shall coordinate with those with whom the Secretary is required to coordinate under subsection (a) to develop equitable cost sharing agreements to defray the expenses of the exercises required by subsection (a).

SEC. 1638. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO SUPPORT CIVIL AUTHORITIES IN RESPONSE TO CYBER ATTACKS BY FOREIGN POWERS.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a comprehensive plan for the United States Cyber Command to support civil authorities in responding to cyber attacks by foreign powers (as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801)) against the United States or a United States person.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A plan for internal Department of Defense collective training activities that are integrated with exercises conducted with other agencies and State and local governments.

(B) Plans for coordination with the heads of other Federal agencies and State and local governments pursuant to the exercises required under subparagraph (A).

(C) Note of any historical frameworks that are used, if any, in the formulation of the plan required by paragraph (1), such as Operation Noble Eagle.

(D) Descriptions of the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of Federal, State, and local authorities as the Secretary understands them.

(E) Descriptions of the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of the active components and reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(F) A description of such legislative and administrative action as may be necessary to carry out the plan required by paragraph (1).

(b) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REVIEW OF PLAN.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan developed under subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 1639. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REVIEWING AND CONSIDERING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCIL OF GOVERNORS ON CYBER CAPABILITIES OF THE ARMED FORCES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should review and consider any findings and recommendations of the Council of Governors pertaining to cyber mission force requirements and any proposed reductions in and synchronization of the cyber capabilities of active or reserve components of the Armed Forces.

Subtitle D—Nuclear Forces

SEC. 1641. DESIGNATION OF AIR FORCE OFFICIALS TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR POLICY ON AND PROCUREMENT OF NUCLEAR COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS.

(a) **DESIGNATION OF OFFICIALS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 24 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 499. Designation of Air Force officials to be responsible for policy on and procurement of nuclear command, control, and communications systems

“(a) **PROCUREMENT.**—The Secretary of the Air Force shall designate a senior acquisition official of the Air Force to be responsible for ensuring the procurement and integration of the nuclear command, control, and communication systems of the Air Force.

“(b) **POLICY.**—The Secretary shall designate an official of the Air Force to be responsible for—

“(1) formulating an integrated policy for the nuclear command, control, and communications systems of the Air Force that includes long-term requirements to satisfy the requirements of the Department of Defense for nuclear command, control, and communications; and

“(2) ensuring that such policy is integrated across all Air Force systems using nuclear command, control, and communications systems.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 24 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 498 the following new item:

“499. Designation of Air Force officials to be responsible for policy on and procurement of nuclear command, control, and communications systems.”.

(b) **DEADLINE.**—The Secretary of the Air Force shall—

(1) designate the officials required by section 499 of title 10, United States Code, as added by

subsection (a)(1), not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) promptly notify the congressional defense committees of such designation.

SEC. 1642. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO THE NUCLEAR SECURITY ENTERPRISE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Comptroller General of the United States shall, in each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, conduct a review of the process of the Department of Defense for addressing the recommendations of the Department of Defense Internal Nuclear Enterprise Review, the Independent Review of the Department of Defense Nuclear Enterprise, and the Nuclear Deterrence Enterprise Review Group, that are evaluated by the Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation of the Department of Defense.

(b) *BRIEFING AND REPORT.*—After conducting each review under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall—

(1) provide to the congressional defense committees an initial briefing on the review; and

(2) after providing the briefing under paragraph (1), submit to those committees a written report on the review and such other topics as the committees request during the briefing.

SEC. 1643. ASSESSMENT OF GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENVIRONMENT.

(a) *FINDINGS.*—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Nuclear competition among countries has become both different and in some ways more complex than was the case during the Cold War.

(2) During the 25 years preceding the date of the enactment of this Act, additional countries have obtained nuclear weapons. North Korea is a nuclear-armed country and Iran aspires to acquire a nuclear weapons capability.

(3) A regional nuclear competition has emerged in South Asia between India and Pakistan. Another such competition may emerge in the Middle East between Iran and Israel, triggering a nuclear proliferation cascade across the Middle East, involving Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and perhaps other countries as well.

(4) The proliferation of nuclear weapons to countries the cultures of which are quite different from that of the United States raises concerns regarding how leaders in those countries calculate cost, benefit, and risk with respect to decisions regarding the use of nuclear weapons.

(b) *ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.*—The Director of Net Assessment of the Department of Defense shall, in coordination with the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, conduct an assessment of the global environment with respect to nuclear weapons and the role of United States nuclear forces, policy, and strategy in that environment.

(c) *OBJECTIVES.*—The objectives of the assessment required by subsection (b) are to inform the long-term planning of the Department of Defense and policies relating to regional nuclear crises and operations that may involve the escalation of nuclear competition among countries.

(d) *REQUIREMENTS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—In conducting the assessment required by subsection (b), the Director shall develop and analyze a range of contingencies and scenarios, including crises that may emerge from nuclear competition during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act that involve the following:

(A) The United States and one other country that possesses a nuclear weapon.

(B) The United States and multiple such countries.

(C) Two other such countries.

(D) Three or more other such countries.

(E) Regional and cross-regional geography, including contingencies and scenarios in Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, and East

Asia, and contingencies and scenarios that transcend regions.

(F) The long-term geopolitical and military-technical competition as it relates to nuclear weapons and strategic warfare.

(2) *ANALYSIS OF COMPETITIVE DISCONTINUITIES.*—In analyzing the long-term geopolitical and military-technical competition as it relates to nuclear weapons and strategic warfare under paragraph (1)(F), the Director shall identify—

(A) prospective discontinuities in that competition; and

(B) strategies and capabilities the United States could adopt to improve its competitive position following such discontinuities.

(e) *STAFFING.*—In conducting the assessment required by subsection (b), the Director shall engage the best talent available, with particular emphasis on engaging individuals and independent entities with demonstrated expertise in strategy and net assessment methodology.

(f) *REPORT REQUIRED.*—Not later than November 15, 2016, the Director shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the assessment required by subsection (b).

SEC. 1644. DEADLINE FOR MILESTONE A DECISION ON LONG-RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON.

Not later than May 31, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall make a Milestone A decision on the long-range standoff weapon.

SEC. 1645. AVAILABILITY OF AIR FORCE PROCUREMENT FUNDS FOR CERTAIN COMMERCIAL OFF-THE-SHELF PARTS FOR INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE FUZES.

(a) *AVAILABILITY OF PROCUREMENT FUNDS.*—Notwithstanding section 1502(a) of title 31, United States Code, of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 101 and available for Missile Procurement, Air Force, as specified in the funding table in section 4101, \$13,700,000 shall be available for the procurement of covered parts pursuant to contracts entered into under section 1645 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3651).

(b) *COVERED PARTS DEFINED.*—In this section, the term “covered parts” has the meaning given that term in section 1645(c) of such Act.

SEC. 1646. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON POLICY ON THE NUCLEAR TRIAD.

(a) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems plays a critical role in ensuring the national security of the United States; and

(2) retaining all three legs of the nuclear triad is among the highest priorities of the Department of Defense and will best maintain strategic stability at a reasonable cost, while hedging against potential technical problems and vulnerabilities.

(b) *STATEMENT OF POLICY.*—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to operate, sustain, and modernize or replace the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems consisting of—

(A) heavy bombers equipped with nuclear gravity bombs and air-launched nuclear cruise missiles;

(B) land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles equipped with nuclear warheads that are capable of carrying multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles; and

(C) ballistic missile submarines equipped with submarine launched ballistic missiles and multiple nuclear warheads;

(2) to operate, sustain, and modernize or replace a capability to forward-deploy nuclear weapons and dual-capable fighter-bomber aircraft;

(3) to deter potential adversaries and assure allies and partners of the United States through

strong and long-term commitment to the nuclear deterrent of the United States and the personnel, systems, and infrastructure that comprise such deterrent;

(4) to ensure that the members of the Armed Forces who operate the nuclear deterrent of the United States have the training, resources, and national support required to execute the critical national security mission of the members; and

(5) to achieve a modern and responsive nuclear infrastructure to support the full spectrum of deterrence requirements.

SEC. 1647. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE NUCLEAR FORCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM OF THE AIR FORCE.

(a) *FINDINGS.*—The Senates makes the following findings:

(1) On February 6, 2014, Air Force Global Strike Command (AFGSC) initiated a force improvement program for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) force designed to improve mission effectiveness, strengthen culture and morale, and identify areas in need of investment by soliciting input from airmen performing ICBM operations.

(2) The ICBM force improvement program generated more than 300 recommendations to strengthen ICBM operations and served as a model for subsequent force improvement programs in other mission areas, such as bomber operations and sustainment.

(3) On May 28, 2014, as part of the nuclear force improvement program, the Air Force announced it would make immediate improvements in the nuclear mission of the Air Force, including enhancing career opportunities for airmen in the nuclear career field, ensuring training activities focused on performing the mission in the field, reforming the personnel reliability program, establishing special pay rates for positions in the nuclear career field, and creating a new service medal for nuclear deterrence operations.

(4) Chief of Staff of the Air Force Mark Welsh has said that, as part of the nuclear force improvement program, the Air Force will increase nuclear-manning levels and strengthen professional development for the members of the Air Force supporting the nuclear mission of the Air Force in order “to address shortfalls and offer our airmen more stable work schedule and better quality of life”.

(5) Secretary of the Air Force Deborah Lee James, in recognition of the importance of the nuclear mission of the Air Force, proposed elevating the grade of the commander of the Air Force Global Strike Command from lieutenant general to general, and on March 30, 2015, the Senate confirmed a general as commander of that command.

(6) The Air Force redirected more than \$160,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 to alleviate urgent, near-term shortfalls within the nuclear mission of the Air Force as part of the nuclear force improvement program.

(7) The Air Force plans to spend more than \$200,000,000 on the nuclear force improvement program in fiscal year 2015, and requested more than \$130,000,000 for the program for fiscal year 2016.

(8) Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel said on November 14, 2014, that “[t]he nuclear mission plays a critical role in ensuring the Nation’s safety. No other enterprise we have is more important”.

(9) Secretary Hagel also said that the budget for the nuclear mission of the Air Force should increase by 10 percent over a five-year period.

(10) Section 1652 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–201; 128 Stat. 3654; 10 U.S.C. 491 note) declares it the policy of the United States “to ensure that the members of the Armed Forces who operate the nuclear deterrent of the United

States have the training, resources, and national support required to execute the critical national security mission of the members”.

(b) **SENSE OF SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the nuclear mission of the Air Force should be a top priority for the Department of the Air Force and for Congress;

(2) the members of the Air Force who operate and maintain the Nation's nuclear deterrent perform work that is vital to the security of the United States;

(3) the nuclear force improvement program of the Air Force has made significant near-term improvements for the members of the Air Force in the nuclear career field of the Air Force;

(4) Congress should support long-term investments in the Air Force nuclear enterprise that sustain the progress made under the nuclear force improvement program;

(5) the Air Force should—

(A) regularly inform Congress on the progress being made under the nuclear force improvement program and its efforts to strengthen the nuclear enterprise; and

(B) make Congress aware of any additional actions that should be taken to optimize performance of the nuclear mission of the Air Force and maximize the strength of the United States strategic deterrent; and

(6) future budgets for the Air Force should reflect the importance of the nuclear mission of the Air Force and the need to provide members of the Air Force assigned to the nuclear mission the best possible support and quality of life.

Subtitle E—Missile Defense Programs

SEC. 1651. PLAN FOR EXPEDITING DEPLOYMENT TIME OF CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES INTERCEPTOR SITE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense completes preparation of an environmental impact statement pursuant to section 227(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) develop a plan for expediting the deployment time for a potential future continental United States interceptor site by at least two years, in the case that the President decides to proceed with such deployment; and

(2) submit to the congressional defense committees a report on such plan.

(b) **REPORT ELEMENTS.**—The report submitted under subsection (a)(2) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the plan, including estimates of the cost of carrying out the plan and a schedule for carrying out the plan.

(2) A description of such legislative or administrative action as may be necessary to carry out the plan.

(3) An assessment of the risks associated with decreasing the deployment time, including with respect to cost and the operational effectiveness and reliability of interceptors.

(4) Identification of any deviation in the plan from robust acquisition processes, including with respect to testing prior to full operational capability designation.

(c) **ASSESSMENT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary submits a report under subsection (a)(2), the Comptroller General shall—

(A) complete a review of the report submitted under subsection (a)(2); and

(B) submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the review conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(2) **REPORT ELEMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1)(B) shall include the following:

(A) The findings of the Comptroller General with respect to the review conducted pursuant to paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) such recommendations as the Comptroller General may have for legislative or administrative action.

SEC. 1652. ADDITIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR COVERAGE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE UNITED STATES HOMELAND.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, there are two fundamental means for improving homeland missile defense capability and capacity, “one, is the reliability of the interceptor, and two, is the discrimination capability of the system”.

(2) The Department of Defense will deploy a new midcourse tracking radar to provide persistent coverage and improve discrimination capabilities against threats to the United States homeland from the Pacific region.

(3) According to the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, a long-range discrimination radar will provide larger hit assessment coverage thereby enabling improved warfighting capabilities to manage ground-based interceptor (GBI) inventory and improve the capacity of the ballistic missile defense system.

(4) According to the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, “while Iran has not yet deployed an intercontinental ballistic missile, its progress on space launch vehicles—along with its desire to deter the United States and its allies—provides Tehran with the means and motivation to develop longer-range missiles, including an ICBM. Iran publically stated that it intends to launch a space-launch vehicle as early as this year capable of intercontinental ranges, if configured as such”.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the currently deployed ground-based midcourse defense system protects the entire United States homeland, including the East Coast, against the threat of limited ballistic missile attack from North Korea and Iran; and

(2) additional missile defense sensor discrimination capabilities are needed to enhance the protection of the United States homeland against potential long-range ballistic missiles from Iran that, according to the Department of Defense, could soon be obtained by Iran as a result of its active space launch program.

(c) **DEPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL COVERAGE.**—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall, in cooperation with the relevant combatant command, deploy by not later than December 31, 2020, a long-range discrimination radar or other appropriate tracking and discrimination sensor capabilities in a location optimized to support the defense of the homeland of the United States from emerging long-range ballistic missile threats from Iran.

SEC. 1653. AIR DEFENSE CAPABILITY AT NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION MISSILE DEFENSE SITES.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the relevant combatant command, should ensure that arrangements are in place, including support from other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), to provide anti-air defense capability at all missile defense sites of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in support of phases 2 and 3 of the European Phased Adaptive Approach.

(b) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing—

(1) the plan to provide anti-air defense capability as described in subsection (a); and

(2) the contributions being made by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and members of such organization to support the provision of the capability described in such subsection.

SEC. 1654. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR IRON DOME SHORT-RANGE ROCKET DEFENSE SYSTEM.

(a) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for Procurement, Defense-wide, and available for the Missile Defense Agency, not more than \$41,400,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel to procure the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system, including for co-production of Iron Dome parts and components in the United States by industry of the United States.

(b) **CONDITIONS.**—

(1) **AGREEMENT.**—Funds described in subsection (a) to produce the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense program shall be available subject to the terms and conditions in the “Agreement Between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement”, signed on March 5, 2014, including any terms and conditions applicable to coproduction of Iron Dome radar components under a negotiated amendment to that agreement.

(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than 30 days prior to the initial obligation of funds described in subsection (a), the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees—

(A) a certification that the agreement specified in paragraph (1) is being implemented as provided in such agreement; and

(B) an assessment detailing any risks relating to the implementation of such agreement.

SEC. 1655. ISRAELI COOPERATIVE MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM CODEVELOPMENT AND POTENTIAL COPRODUCTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for Procurement, Defense-wide, and available for the Missile Defense Agency, \$150,000,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel to procure the David's Sling Weapon System and \$15,000,000 for the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program, including for co-production of parts and components in the United States by United States industry.

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—Following successful completion of milestones and production readiness reviews in the research, development, and technology agreements for the David's Sling Weapon System and the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Development Program, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency may disburse amounts available pursuant to subsection (a) on the basis of a one-for-one cash match with such funds provided by the Government of Israel, or in amounts that otherwise meet best efforts (as mutually agreed by the United States and Israel), on or after the date that is 90 days after the date the Director and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a certification that the United States has entered into a bilateral agreement with the Government of Israel that accomplishes the following:

(1) Establishes the terms of co-production of parts and components of the respective systems—

(A) on the basis of what will minimize non-recurring engineering and facilitization expenses; and

(B) that ensures that, in the case of co-production for the David's Sling Weapon System, not less than half of such co-production is carried out by United States persons.

(2) Establishes complete transparency on the Israeli requirement for the number of interceptors and batteries of the respective systems that will be procured.

(3) Allows the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to establish technical milestones for co-production and procurement of the respective systems.

(4) Establishes joint approval processes for third party sales of such systems.

SEC. 1656. DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF MULTIPLE-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE FOR MISSILE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES HOMELAND.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the defense of the United States homeland against the threat of limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate) is a national priority; and

(2) as the threat described in paragraph (1) continues to evolve, the multiple-object kill vehicle could contribute critical capabilities to the future of the ballistic missile defense of the United States homeland.

(b) MULTIPLE-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall develop a highly reliable, cost-effective multiple-object kill vehicle for the ground-based midcourse defense system.

(2) DEPLOYMENT.—The Director shall—

(A) conduct flight testing of the multiple-object kill vehicle developed under paragraph (1) by not later than 2020; and

(B) field such vehicle as soon as technically practicable.

(c) CAPABILITIES AND CRITERIA.—The Director shall ensure that the multiple-object kill vehicle developed under subsection (b)(1) meets, at a minimum, the following capabilities and criteria:

(1) Vehicle-to-vehicle communications.

(2) Vehicle-to-ground communications.

(3) Kill assessment capability.

(4) The ability to counter advanced counter measures, decoys, and penetration aids.

(5) Producibility and manufacturability.

(6) Use of technology involving high technology readiness levels.

(7) Options to be integrated onto other missile defense interceptor vehicles other than the ground-based interceptors of the ground-based midcourse defense system.

(8) Sound acquisition processes, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Missile Defense Executive Board.

(d) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—The management of the multiple-object kill vehicle program under subsection (b) shall report directly to the Deputy Director of the Missile Defense Agency.

SEC. 1657. REQUIREMENT TO REPLACE CAPABILITY ENHANCEMENT I EXOATMOSPHERIC KILL VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that all remaining ground-based interceptors of the ground-based midcourse defense system that are armed with the capability enhancement I exoatmospheric kill vehicle are replaced with the redesigned exoatmospheric kill vehicle before September 30, 2022.

(b) CONDITION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the Director determines that flight and intercept testing of the redesigned exoatmospheric kill vehicle is not successful.

SEC. 1658. AIRBORNE BOOST PHASE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) To address the growing threat posed by increasingly accurate and longer-ranged ballistic and cruise missiles, the Missile Defense Agency, in collaboration with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the military services, is pursuing a suite of laser technologies

that could serve as a cost-effective solution for destroying cruise missiles and ballistic missiles in the boost phase.

(2) A successful airborne boost phase defense system could transform United States missile defense capabilities against a broad range of missile threats, and place defense on the winning side of the offense-defense cost-curve.

(b) POLICY.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) prioritize technology investments in the Department of Defense to support efforts by the Missile Defense Agency to develop and field an airborne boost phase defense system by fiscal year 2025;

(2) ensure that development and fielding of the airborne boost phase defense system supports multiple warfighter missile defense requirements, including, specifically, protection of the homeland and allies against cruise missiles and ballistic missiles, particularly in the boost phase;

(3) continue development and fielding of high-energy lasers and high-power microwave systems as part of a layered architecture to defend ships and theater bases against air and cruise missile strikes;

(4) encourage collaboration amongst the military services and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency with respect to their high energy laser and directed energy efforts carried out in support of the Missile Defense Agency; and

(5) ensure cooperation and coordination between the Missile Defense Agency in its plans to develop an airborne laser and the Air Force in its requirements for unmanned aerial vehicles.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the efforts of the Department of Defense to develop and deploy an airborne boost phase defense system for missile defense by fiscal year 2025.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Such schedules, costs, warfighter requirements, operational concept, constraints, potential alternative boost phase approaches, and other information regarding the efforts described in paragraph (1) as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(B) Analysis of the efforts described in paragraph (1) with respect to the following cases:

(i) A case in which the Department is under no funding constraints with respect to such efforts and progress is based on the state of the technology.

(ii) A case in which the Department is under funding constraints and the efforts are carried out in accordance with a moderately aggressive schedule and are subject to moderate technical risk.

(iii) A case in which the Department is under funding constraints and the efforts are carried out in accordance with a less aggressive schedule and are subject to less technical risk.

(C) An update on related efforts of the Department to develop high energy lasers and high power microwave systems to defend ships and theater bases against air and cruise missile strikes.

(D) Such recommendations as the Secretary may have for legislative or administrative action to enable more rapid fielding of a directed-energy based missile defense system.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1659. EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON PROVIDING CERTAIN SENSITIVE MISSILE DEFENSE INFORMATION TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

Section 1246(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law

113–66; 127 Stat. 923), as amended by section 1243(2)(A) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3564), is further amended by striking “for fiscal year 2014 or 2015” and inserting “for fiscal years 2014 through 2017”.

SEC. 1660. EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

Section 232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “through 2015” and inserting “through 2020”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), in the first sentence, by striking “through 2016” and inserting “through 2021”; and

(2) in subsection (b), in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking “first three”.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

SEC. 1671. MEASURES IN RESPONSE TO VIOLATIONS OF THE INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES TREATY BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On July 31, 2014, the Department of State released its annual report entitled “Adherence to and Compliance With Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments”, which included the finding that “[t]he United States has determined that the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty not to possess, produce, or flight-test a ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) with a range capability of 500 km to 5,500 km, or to possess or produce launchers of such missiles”.

(2) The United States has undertaken diplomatic efforts to address with the Russian Federation its violations of the INF Treaty since 2013, and the Russian Federation has failed to respond to those efforts in any way.

(3) The Commander of the United States European Command, and Supreme Allied Commander of Europe, General Philip Breedlove stated that “[a] weapon capability that violates the I.N.F., that is introduced into the greater European land mass, is absolutely a tool that will have to be dealt with” and “[i]t can’t go unanswered”.

(4) The Secretary of Defense has informed Congress that the range of options in response to the violation by the Russian Federation of the INF Treaty could include “active defenses to counter intermediate-range ground-launched cruise missiles; counterforce capabilities to prevent intermediate-range ground-launched cruise missile attacks; and countervailing strike capabilities to enhance U.S. or allied forces”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the development and deployment of a nuclear ground-launched cruise missile by the Russian Federation in violation of the INF Treaty would pose a dangerous threat to the United States and its allies;

(2) the Russian Federation has established an increasing role for nuclear weapons in its military strategy;

(3) efforts taken by the President to compel the Russian Federation to return to compliance with the INF Treaty must be persistent and are in the best interests of the United States, but cannot be open-ended; and

(4) efforts by the United States to develop military and nonmilitary options for responding to violations of the INF Treaty could encourage the Russian Federation to return to compliance with the INF Treaty.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

every 180 days thereafter, the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees with respect to whether the Russian Federation—

(1) has flight-tested, has deployed, or possesses a military system that has achieved an initial operating capability that is either a ground-launched ballistic missile or ground-launched cruise missile with a flight-tested range of between 500 and 5,500 kilometers; or

(2) has begun taking measures to return to full compliance with the INF Treaty, including verification measures necessary to achieve high confidence that any missile described in paragraph (1) will be eliminated.

(d) **UPDATES TO ALLIES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes—

(1) the status of updates provided to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other allies of the United States on the Russian Federation's flight testing, operating capability, and deployment of ground-launched ballistic missiles or ground-launched cruise missiles with a flight-tested range of between 500 and 5,500 kilometers; and

(2) efforts to develop, with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and such allies, collective responses, including economic and military responses, to arms control violations by the Russian Federation, including violations of the INF Treaty.

(e) **PLAN ON RESPONSE OPTIONS.**—

(1) **MILITARY RESPONSE OPTIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Russian Federation has not begun taking measures to return to full compliance with the INF Treaty, including by agreeing to verification measures necessary to achieve high confidence that any ground-launched ballistic missile or ground-launched cruise missile with a flight-tested range of between 500 and 5,500 kilometers will be eliminated, the Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 120 days after such date of enactment, submit to Congress a plan with respect to developing the following military capabilities:

(i) Counterforce capabilities to prevent intermediate-range ground-launched ballistic missile and cruise missile attacks, whether or not such capabilities are in compliance with the INF Treaty and including capabilities that may be acquired from allies of the United States.

(ii) Countervailing strike capabilities to enhance the forces of the United States or allies of the United States, whether or not such capabilities are in compliance with the INF Treaty and including capabilities that may be acquired from allies of the United States.

(iii) Active defenses to defend against intermediate-range ground-launched cruise missile attacks.

(B) **COST AND SCHEDULE ESTIMATES.**—The Secretary shall include, in the plan required by subparagraph (A), with respect to each military capability described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of that subparagraph, an estimate of cost and the approximate time for achieving a Milestone A decision, if such a decision is required.

(C) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RECOMMENDED CAPABILITIES.**—The Secretary may use funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4201, to carry out the development of capabilities pursuant to subparagraph (A) that are recommended by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to meet military re-

quirements and current capability gaps. In making such a recommendation, the Chairman shall give priority to such capabilities that the Chairman determines could be tested and fielded most expeditiously, with the most priority given to capabilities that the Chairman determines could be fielded in two years.

(2) **OTHER RESPONSE OPTIONS.**—The President shall include in the plan required by paragraph (1)(A) such other options as the President considers useful to encourage the Russian Federation to return to full compliance with the INF Treaty or necessary to respond to the failure of the Russian Federation to return to full compliance with the INF Treaty.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) **INF TREATY.**—The term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly referred to as the “Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty” or “INF Treaty”).

SEC. 1672. MODIFICATION OF NOTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL TO MODIFY OR INTRODUCE NEW AIRCRAFT OR SENSORS FOR FLIGHT BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION UNDER THE OPEN SKIES TREATY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1242(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “30 days” and inserting “90 days”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The assessment shall also include an assessment of the proposal by the commander of each combatant command potentially affected by the proposal, including an assessment of the potential effects of the proposal on operations and any potential vulnerabilities raised by the proposal.”.

(b) **REPORTS ON MEETINGS OF OPEN SKIES CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of any meeting of the Open Skies Consultative Commission that occurs after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth a description of such meeting, including a description of any agreements entered into during such meeting and whether any such agreement will result in a modification to the aircraft or sensors of any State Party to the Open Skies Treaty that will be subject to the Open Skies Treaty.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” and “Open Skies Treaty” have the meaning given such terms in section 1242 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

SEC. 1673. MILESTONE A DECISION FOR THE CONVENTIONAL PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE WEAPONS SYSTEM.

The Secretary of Defense shall make a Milestone A decision for the Conventional Prompt Global Strike Weapons System not later than the earlier of—

(1) September 30, 2020; or

(2) the date that is 8 months after the successful completion of Intermediate Range Flight 2 of that System.

SEC. 1674. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING MILITARY INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO FORCE PROTECTION FOR INSTALLATIONS, FACILITIES, AND PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Maintaining appropriate force protection for deployed personnel of the Department of Defense and their families is a priority for Congress.

(2) Installations, facilities, and personnel of the Department in Europe face a rising threat from international terrorist groups operating in Europe, from individuals inspired by such groups, and from those traversing through Europe to join or return from fighting the terrorist organization known as the “Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant” (ISIL) in Iraq and Syria.

(3) Robust military intelligence support to force protection is necessary to detect and thwart potential terrorist plots that, if successful, would have strategic consequences for the United States and the allies of the United States in Europe.

(4) Military intelligence support is also important for detecting and addressing early indicators and warnings of aggression and assertive military action by Russia, particularly action by Russia to destabilize Europe with hybrid or asymmetric warfare.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should maintain and enhance robust military intelligence support to force protection for installations, facilities, and personnel of the Department of Defense and the family members of such personnel, in Europe and worldwide.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016”.

SEC. 2002. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW.

(a) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER THREE YEARS.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), all authorizations contained in titles XXI through XXVII for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor) shall expire on the later of—

(1) October 1, 2018; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before the later of—

(1) October 1, 2018; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for fiscal year 2019 for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 2101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) **INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the

Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tions or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Alaska	Fort Greely	\$7,800,000
California	Concord	\$98,000,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	\$5,800,000
Georgia	Fort Gordon	\$90,000,000
Maryland	Fort Meade	\$34,500,000
New York	Fort Drum	\$19,000,000
	U. S. Military Academy	\$70,000,000
Oklahoma	Fort Sill	\$69,400,000
Texas	Corpus Christi	\$85,000,000
Virginia	Fort Lee	\$33,000,000

(b) **OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military construction projects out-

side the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out the military construction projects for the instal-

lations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Cuba	Guantanamo Bay	\$76,000,000
Germany	Grafenwoehr	\$51,000,000

SEC. 2102. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) **CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.**—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and

available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family housing units (including land ac-

quisition and supporting facilities) at the installations or locations, in the number of units, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Army: Family Housing

State/Country	Installation or Location	Units	Amount
Florida	Camp Rudder	Family Housing New Construction	\$8,000,000
Illinois	Rock Island	Family Housing New Construction	\$20,000,000
Korea	Camp Walker	Family Housing New Construction	\$61,000,000

(b) **PLANNING AND DESIGN.**—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$7,195,000.

SEC. 2103. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$3,500,000.

SEC. 2104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) **LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.**—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2101 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(2) \$226,400,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291) for a Command and Control Facility at Fort Shafter, Hawaii).

(3) \$6,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2119) for cadet barracks at the United States Military Academy, New York).

(4) \$78,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2119), as amended by section 2105(d) of this Act, for a Secure Administration/Operations Facility at Fort Belvoir, Virginia).

SEC. 2105. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2119) for the United States Military Academy, New York, for construction of a Cadet barracks building at the installation, the Secretary of the Army may install mechanical equipment and distribution lines sufficient to provide chilled water for air conditioning the nine existing historical Cadet barracks which are being renovated through the Cadet Barracks Upgrade Program.

SEC. 2106. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2101 of that Act (125 Stat. 1661), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) **TABLE.**—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Army: Extension of 2012 Project Authorizations

<i>State</i>	<i>Installation or Location</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Georgia	Fort Benning	Land Acquisition	\$25,000,000
Virginia	Fort Benning	Land Acquisition	\$5,100,000
	Fort Belvoir	Road and Infrastructure Improvements	\$25,000,000

SEC. 2107. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECTS.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2101 of that Act (126 Stat. 2119) shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the

date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) **TABLE.**—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Army: Extension of 2013 Project Authorizations

<i>State or Country</i>	<i>Installation or Location</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount</i>
District of Columbia	Fort McNair	Vehicle Storage Building, Installation	\$7,191,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Complex	\$12,184,000
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	Aerial Gunnery Range	\$41,945,000
Texas	Joint Base San Antonio	Barracks	\$20,971,000
Virginia	Fort Belvoir	Secure Admin/Operations Facility	\$93,876,000
Italy	Camp Ederle	Barracks	\$35,952,000
Japan	Sagami	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	\$17,976,000

SEC. 2108. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2016 PROJECT.

(a) **PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary of the Army may carry out a military construction project to construct a vehicle bridge and traffic circle to facilitate traffic flow to and from the Medical Center at Rhine Ordnance Barracks, Germany, in the amount of \$12,400,000.

(b) **USE OF HOST-NATION PAYMENT-IN-KIND FUNDS.**—The Secretary may use available host-nation payment-in-kind funding for the project described in subsection (a).

SEC. 2109. LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES AT GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be used to construct new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that any new construction of facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, has enduring military value independent of a high value detention mission.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed as limiting the ability of the Department of Defense to obligate or expend available funds to correct a deficiency

that is life-threatening, health-threatening, or safety-threatening.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**SEC. 2201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.**

(a) **INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Inside the United States

<i>State</i>	<i>Installation or Location</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Arizona	Yuma	\$50,635,000
California	Coronado	\$4,856,000
	Lemoore	\$71,830,000
	Miramar	\$11,200,000
	Pendleton	\$83,800,000
	Point Mugu	\$22,427,000
	San Diego	\$37,366,000
	Twentynine Palms	\$9,160,000
Florida	Jacksonville	\$16,751,000
	Mayport	\$16,159,000
	Pensacola	\$18,347,000
	Whiting Field	\$10,421,000
Georgia	Albany	\$7,851,000
	Kings Bay	\$8,099,000
	Townsend	\$43,279,000
Hawaii	Barking Sands	\$30,623,000
	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	\$14,881,000
	Kaneohe Bay	\$106,618,000
	Marine Corps Base Hawaii	\$12,800,000
	Patuxent River	\$40,935,000
Maryland	Camp Lejeune	\$74,249,000
North Carolina	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	\$57,726,000
	New River	\$8,230,000
South Carolina	Parris Island	\$27,075,000
Virginia	Dam Neck	\$23,066,000
	Norfolk	\$126,677,000
	Portsmouth	\$45,513,000
	Quantico	\$75,399,000
Washington	Bangor	\$34,177,000
	Bremerton	\$22,680,000
	Indian Island	\$4,472,000

(b) *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military construction projects out-

side the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tion or location outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Bahrain Island	Southwest Asia	\$89,791,000
Guam	Joint Region Marianas	\$181,768,000
Italy	Sigonella	\$102,943,000
Japan	Camp Butler	\$11,697,000
	Iwakuni	\$17,923,000
	Kadena Air Base	\$23,310,000
	Yokosuka	\$13,846,000
Poland	RedziKowo Base	\$51,270,000

SEC. 2202. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) *CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and

available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including land ac-

quisition and supporting facilities) at the installations or locations, in the number of units, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Navy: Family Housing

State	Installation or Location	Units	Amount
Virginia	Wallops Island	Family Housing New Construction	\$438,000

(b) *PLANNING AND DESIGN.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$4,588,000.

SEC. 2203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$11,515,000.

SEC. 2204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy, as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) *LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.*—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2201 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(2) \$274,099,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1666) for an explosive handling wharf at Kitsap, Washington).

(3) \$68,196,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2201(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2633) for ramp parking at Joint Region Marianas, Guam).

SEC. 2205. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) *EXTENSION.*—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2201 of that Act (125 Stat. 1666) and extended by section 2208 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3678), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) *TABLE.*—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Navy: Extension of 2012 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
California	Camp Pendleton	Infantry Squad Defense Range	\$29,187,000
Florida	Jacksonville	P–8A Hangar Upgrades	\$6,085,000
Georgia	Kings Bay	Crab Island Security Enclave	\$52,913,000

SEC. 2206. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECTS.

(a) *EXTENSION.*—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2201 of that Act (126 Stat. 2122), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the

date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) *TABLE.*—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Navy: Extension of 2013 Project Authorizations

State/Country	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
California	Camp Pendleton	Comm. Information Systems Ops Complex	\$78,897,000
	Coronado	Bachelor Quarters	\$76,063,000
	Twentynine Palms	Land Expansion Phase 2	\$47,270,000
Greece	Souda Bay	Intermodal Access Road	\$4,630,000
South Carolina	Beaufort	Recycling/Hazardous Waste Facility	\$3,743,000
Virginia	Quantico	Infrastructure—Widen Russell Road	\$14,826,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Various Worldwide Locations	BAMS Operational Facilities	\$34,048,000

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**SEC. 2301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.**

(a) *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the author-

ization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tions or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Alaska	Eielson Air Force Base	\$71,400,000
Arizona	Davis-Monthan Air Force Base	\$16,900,000
	Luke Air Force Base	\$77,700,000
Colorado	U. S. Air Force Academy	\$10,000,000
CONUS Classified	Classified Location	\$77,130,000
Florida	Cape Canaveral Air Force Station	\$21,000,000
	Eglin Air Force Base	\$8,700,000
	Hurlburt Field	\$14,200,000
Hawaii	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	\$46,000,000
Kansas	McConnell Air Force Base	\$15,500,000
Louisiana	Barksdale	\$20,000,000
Missouri	Whiteman Air Force Base	\$29,500,000
Montana	Malmstrom Air Force Base	\$19,700,000
Nebraska	Offutt Air Force Base	\$21,000,000
Nevada	Nellis Air Force Base	\$68,950,000
New Mexico	Cannon Air Force Base	\$7,800,000
	Holloman Air Force Base	\$6,200,000
	Kirtland Air Force Base	\$12,800,000
New York	Fort Drum	\$6,000,000
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	\$17,100,000
Oklahoma	Altus Air Force Base	\$28,400,000
	Tinker Air Force Base	\$49,900,000
South Dakota	Ellsworth Air Force Base	\$23,000,000
Texas	Joint Base San Antonio	\$106,000,000
Utah	Hill Air Force Base	\$38,400,000
Wyoming	F. E. Warren Air Force Base	\$95,000,000

(b) *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military construction projects out-

side the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tion or location outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Greenland	Thule Air Base	\$41,965,000
Guam	Joint Region Marianas	\$50,800,000
Japan	Kadena Air Base	\$3,000,000
	Yokota Air Base	\$8,461,000
Niger	Agadez	\$50,000,000
Oman	Al Musannah Air Base	\$25,000,000
United Kingdom	Royal Air Force Croughton	\$130,615,000

SEC. 2302. FAMILY HOUSING.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$9,849,000.

SEC. 2303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$150,649,000.

SEC. 2304. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

(a) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated

for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force, as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) *LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.*—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2301 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(2) \$21,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 992) for the CYBERCOM Joint Operations Center at Fort Meade, Maryland).

SEC. 2305. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2010 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(a) of the Military Con-

struction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2636), for Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, for construction of a ground control tower at the installation, the Secretary of the Air Force may install communications cabling.

SEC. 2306. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 993) for RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, for construction of a Guardian Angel Operations Facility at the installation, the Secretary of the Air Force may construct the facility at an unspecified worldwide location.

SEC. 2307. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3679)

for McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, for construction of a KC-46A Alter Composite Maintenance Shop at the installation, the Secretary of the Air Force may construct a 696 square meter (7,500 square foot) facility consistent with Air Force guidelines for composite maintenance shops.

SEC. 2308. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECT.

(a) *EXTENSION.*—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided

in section 2301 of that Act (125 Stat. 1670), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) *TABLE.*—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Air Force: Extension of 2012 Project Authorization

Country	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Italy	Signonella Naval Air Station	UAS SATCOM Relay Pads and Facility	\$15,000,000

SEC. 2309. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECT.

(a) *EXTENSION.*—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2301 of that Act (126 Stat. 2126), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the

date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) *TABLE.*—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Air Force: Extension of 2013 Project Authorization

Country	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Portugal	Lajes Field	Sanitary Sewer Lift/Pump Station	\$2,000,000

**TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**

SEC. 2401. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the author-

ization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tions or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Alabama	Fort Rucker	\$46,787,000
Arizona	Marwell Air Force Base	\$32,968,000
California	Fort Huachuca	\$3,884,000
Colorado	Camp Pendleton	\$20,552,000
CONUS Classified	Coronado	\$47,218,000
Delaware	Fresno Yosemite IAP ANG	\$10,700,000
Florida	Fort Carson	\$8,243,000
Georgia	Classified Location	\$20,065,000
Hawaii	Dover Air Force Base	\$21,600,000
Kentucky	Hurlburt Field	\$17,989,000
Maryland	MacDill Air Force Base	\$39,142,000
Nevada	Moody Air Force Base	\$10,900,000
New Mexico	Kaneohe Bay	\$122,071,000
New York	Schofield Barracks	\$123,838,000
North Carolina	Fort Campbell	\$12,553,000
Ohio	Fort Knox	\$23,279,000
Oregon	Fort Meade	\$816,077,000
South Carolina	Nellis Air Force Base	\$39,900,000
Texas	Cannon Air Force Base	\$45,111,000
Virginia	West Point	\$55,778,000
	Camp Lejeune	\$69,006,000
	Fort Bragg	\$168,811,000
	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	\$6,623,000
	Klamath Falls IAP	\$2,500,000
	Fort Jackson	\$26,157,000
	Joint Base San Antonio	\$61,776,000
	Fort Belvoir	\$9,500,000
	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	\$28,000,000
	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek-Story	\$23,916,000

(b) *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for military construction projects out-

side the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tions or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following:

Defense Agencies: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Djibouti	Camp Lemonier	\$43,700,000

Defense Agencies: Outside the United States—Continued

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Germany	Garmisch	\$14,676,000
	Grafenwoehr	\$38,138,000
	Spangdahlem Air Base	\$39,571,000
	Stuttgart-Patch Barracks	\$49,413,000
Japan	Kadena Air Base	\$37,485,000
Poland	RedziKowo Base	\$169,153,000
Spain	Rota	\$13,737,000

SEC. 2402. AUTHORIZED ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECTS.

(a) *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and

available for energy conservation projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy conservation projects

under chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Energy Conservation Projects: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
American Samoa	Wake Island	\$5,331,000
	Edwards Air Force Base	\$4,550,000
	Fort Hunter Liggett	\$22,000,000
Colorado	Schriever Air Force Base	\$4,400,000
District of Columbia	NSA Washington/NRL	\$10,990,000
Guam	Naval Base Guam	\$5,330,000
Hawaii	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	\$13,780,000
	Marine Corps Recruiting Command Kaneohe Bay	\$5,740,000
Idaho	Mountain Home Air Force Base	\$6,471,000
Montana	Malmstrom Air Force Base	\$4,260,000
Virginia	Pentagon	\$4,528,000
Washington	Joint Base Lewis-McChord	\$14,770,000
Various locations	Various locations	\$25,809,000

(b) *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for energy conservation projects out-

side the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy conservation projects under chapter 173 of title 10, United

States Code, for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Energy Conservation Projects: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Bahamas	Ascension Aux Airfield St. Helena	\$5,500,000
Japan	Yokoska	\$12,940,000
Various locations	Various locations	\$3,600,000

SEC. 2403. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) *LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.*—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2401 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(2) \$747,435,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of this Act for an operations facility at Fort Meade, Maryland).

(3) \$20,800,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2129) for the Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System Complex at Deveselu, Romania).

(4) \$141,039,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat.

1672), as amended by section 2404(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2131), for a data center at Fort Meade, Maryland).

(5) \$50,500,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1672) for an Ambulatory Care Center at Joint Base Andrews, Maryland).

(6) \$54,300,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1672) for an Ambulatory Care Center at Joint Base San Antonio, Texas).

(7) \$441,134,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1673) for a hospital at the Rhine Ordnance Barracks, Germany).

(8) \$41,441,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2640) for a hospital at Fort Bliss, Texas).

(9) \$123,827,000 (the balance of the amount authorized as a Military Construction, Defense-Wide project by title X of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32; 123

Stat. 1888) for a data center at Camp Williams, Utah).

SEC. 2404. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization in the table in section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1672), as amended by section 2404(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2131), for Fort Meade, Maryland, for construction of the High Performance Computing Center at the installation, the Secretary of Defense may construct a generator plant capable of producing up to 60 megawatts of back-up electrical power in support of the 60 megawatt technical load.

SEC. 2405. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) *EXTENSION.*—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2401 of that Act (125 Stat. 1672) and as amended by section 2405 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3685), shall remain in effect until October 1,

2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Defense Agencies: Extension of 2012 Project Authorizations

<i>State</i>	<i>Installation or Location</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount</i>
California	Naval Base Coronado	SOF Support Activity Operations Facility ...	\$38,800,000
Virginia	Pentagon Reservation	Heliport Control Tower and Fire Station	\$6,457,000
		Pedestrian Plaza	\$2,285,000

SEC. 2406. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2401 of that Act (126 Stat. 2127), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the

date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Defense Agencies: Extension of 2013 Project Authorizations

<i>State/Country</i>	<i>Installation or Location</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount</i>
California	Naval Base Coronado	SOF Mobile Communications Detachment Support Facility	\$9,327,000
Colorado	Pikes Peak	High Altitude Medical Research Center	\$3,600,000
Germany	Ramstein AB	Replace Vogelweh Elementary School	\$61,415,000
Hawaii	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	SOF SDVT-1 Waterfront Operations Facility	\$22,384,000
Japan	CFAS Sasebo	Replace Sasebo Elementary School	\$35,733,000
	Camp Zama	Renovate Zama High School	\$13,273,000
Pennsylvania	DEF Distribution Depot New Cumberland	Replace reservoir	\$4,300,000
United Kingdom	RAF Feltwell	Feltwell Elementary School Addition	\$30,811,000

SEC. 2407. MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 995) for Fort Knox, Kentucky, for construction of an Ambulatory Care Center at that location, subsequently cancelled by the Department of Defense, substitute authorization is provided for a 102,000-square foot Medical Clinic Replacement at that location in the amount of \$80,000,000, using appropriations available for the original project pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403 of such Act (127 Stat. 997). This substitute authorization shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 2501. AUTHORIZED NATO CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the sum of the amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in section 2502 and the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

SEC. 2502. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10,

United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program authorized by section 2501 as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 2601. AUTHORIZED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606 and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Army National Guard locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army National Guard

<i>State</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Alabama	Camp Foley	\$4,500,000
Connecticut	Camp Hartell	\$11,000,000
Florida	Palm Coast	\$18,000,000
Georgia	Fort Stewart	\$6,800,000
Illinois	Sparta	\$1,900,000
Kansas	Salina	\$6,700,000
Maryland	Easton	\$13,800,000
Mississippi	Gulfport	\$40,000,000
Nevada	Reno	\$8,000,000
Ohio	Camp Ravenna	\$3,300,000
Oregon	Salem	\$16,500,000
Pennsylvania	Fort Indiantown Gap	\$16,000,000
Vermont	North Hyde Park	\$7,900,000
Virginia	Richmond	\$29,000,000

SEC. 2602. AUTHORIZED ARMY RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the author-

ization of appropriations in section 2606 and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real

property and carry out military construction projects for the Army Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army Reserve: Inside the United States

State	Location	Amount
California	Miramar	\$24,000,000
Florida	MacDill Air Force Base	\$55,000,000
New York	Orangeburg	\$4,200,000
Pennsylvania	Conneaut Lake	\$5,000,000
Virginia	A.P. Hill	\$24,000,000

(b) *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606 and available for the National Guard and Reserve as

specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out a military construction project for the Army Reserve location outside

the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Army Reserve: Outside the United States

Country	Location	Amount
Puerto Rico	Fort Buchanan	\$10,200,000

SEC. 2603. AUTHORIZED NAVY RESERVE AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606

and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps

Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve

State	Location	Amount
Nevada	Fallon	\$11,408,000
New York	Brooklyn	\$2,479,000
Virginia	Dam Neck	\$18,443,000

SEC. 2604. AUTHORIZED AIR NATIONAL GUARD CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606

and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construc-

tion projects for the Air National Guard locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air National Guard

State	Location	Amount
Alabama	Dannelly Field	\$7,600,000
California	Moffett Field	\$6,500,000
Colorado	Buckley Air Force Base	\$5,100,000
Connecticut	Bradley	\$6,300,000
Florida	Cape Canaveral	\$6,100,000
Georgia	Savannah/Hilton Head IAP	\$9,000,000
Hawaii	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	\$9,700,000
Iowa	Des Moines Map	\$6,700,000
Kansas	Smokey Hill ANG Range	\$2,900,000
Louisiana	New Orleans	\$10,000,000
Maine	Bangor IAP	\$7,200,000
New Hampshire	Pease International Tradeport	\$4,300,000
New Jersey	Atlantic City IAP	\$10,200,000
New York	Niagara Falls IAP	\$7,700,000
North Carolina	Charlotte/Douglas IAP	\$9,000,000
North Dakota	Hector IAP	\$7,300,000
Oklahoma	Will Rogers World Airport	\$7,600,000
Oregon	Klamath Falls IAP	\$7,200,000
West Virginia	Yeager Airport	\$3,900,000

SEC. 2605. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606

and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construc-

tion projects for the Air Force Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force Reserve

State	Location	Amount
California	March Air Force Base	\$4,600,000
Florida	Patrick Air Force Base	\$3,400,000
Georgia	Dobbins Air Reserve Base	\$10,400,000
Ohio	Youngstown	\$9,400,000

Air Force Reserve—Continued

State	Location	Amount
Texas	Joint Base San Antonio	\$9,900,000

SEC. 2606. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

Subtitle B—Others Matters**SEC. 2611. MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECT.**

(a) **MODIFICATION.**—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2135) for Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, for construction of an Army Reserve Center at that location, the Secretary of the Army may construct a new facility in the vicinity of Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland.

(b) **DURATION OF AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorization set forth in subsection (a) shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

SEC. 2612. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECTS.

(a) **DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB.**—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2605 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3689) for Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, for construction of a Guardian Angel Operations facility at that location, the Secretary of the Air Force may construct a new 5,913 square meter (63,647 square foot) facility in the amount of \$18,200,000.

(b) **FORT SMITH.**—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2604 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3689) for Fort Smith Municipal Airport, Arkansas, for construction of a consolidated Secure Compartmented Information Facility at that location, the Secretary of the Air Force may construct a new facility in the amount of \$15,200,000.

SEC. 2613. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2602 of that Act (125 Stat. 1678), and extended by section 2611 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3690, 3691), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) **TABLE.**—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Extension of 2012 National Guard and Reserve Project Authorization

State	Location	Project	Amount
Kansas	Kansas City	Army Reserve Center	\$13,000,000
Massachusetts	Attleboro	Army Reserve Center	\$22,000,000

SEC. 2614. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECTS.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in sections 2601, 2602, and 2603 of that Act (126 Stat. 2134, 2135) shall remain in effect until Oc-

tober 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) **TABLE.**—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Extension of 2013 National Guard and Reserve Project Authorization

State	Location	Project	Amount
Arizona	Yuma	Reserve Training Facility—Yuma	\$5,379,000
California	Tustin	Army Reserve Center	\$27,000,000
Iowa	Fort Des Moines	Joint Reserve Center—Des Moines	\$19,162,000
Louisiana	New Orleans	Transient Quarters	\$7,187,000
New York	Camp Smith (Stormville)	Combined Support Maintenance Shop Phase 1	\$24,000,000

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES**SEC. 2701. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES FUNDED THROUGH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT.**

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for base realignment and closure activities, including real property acquisition and military construction projects, as authorized by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and funded through the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 2906 of such Act (as amended by section 2711 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2140)), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2702. PROHIBITION ON CONDUCTING ADDITIONAL BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE (BRAC) ROUND.

Nothing in the Act shall be construed to authorize an additional round of defense base closure and realignment.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS**Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes****SEC. 2801. AUTHORITY FOR ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS FOR CERTAIN MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL PROJECTS.**

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—Subchapter II of chapter 138 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2350n. Construction, maintenance, and repair projects mutually beneficial to the Department of Defense and armed forces of a partner nation

“(a) **AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS.**—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may accept cash

contributions from any partner nation for the purposes specified in subsection (c).

“(b) **ACCOUNTING.**—Contributions accepted under subsection (a) shall be placed in an account established by the Secretary of Defense and shall remain available until expended for the purposes specified in subsection (c).

“(c) **AVAILABILITY OF CONTRIBUTIONS.**—Contributions accepted under subsection (a) shall be available only for payment of costs in connection with mutually beneficial construction (including military construction not otherwise authorized by law), maintenance, and repair projects.

“(d) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO OFFSET BURDEN SHARING CONTRIBUTIONS REQUIRED OF PARTNER NATIONS.**—Contributions accepted under subsection (a) may not be used to offset burden sharing contributions that are otherwise required to be provided by partner nations.

“(e) **MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL DEFINED.**—A project shall be considered to be ‘mutually beneficial’ for purposes of this section if—

“(1) the project is in support of a bilateral defense cooperation agreement between the United States and a partner nation; or

“(2) the Secretary of Defense determines that the United States may derive a benefit from the project, including—

“(A) access to and use of facilities of the armed forces of a partner nation;

“(B) ability or capacity for future force posture; and

“(C) increased interoperability between the Department of Defense and the armed forces of a partner nation.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2350n. Construction, maintenance, and repair projects mutually beneficial to the Department of Defense and armed forces of a partner nation.”.

SEC. 2802. CHANGE IN AUTHORITIES RELATING TO SCOPE OF WORK VARIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) LIMITED AUTHORITY FOR SCOPE OF WORK INCREASE.—Section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “The scope of work” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (d), the scope of work”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) The limitation in subsection (b)(2) on an increase in the scope of work does not apply if—

“(1) the increase in the scope of work is not more than 10 percent of the amount specified for that project, construction, improvement, or acquisition in the justification data provided to Congress as part of the request for authorization of the project, construction, improvement, or acquisition;

“(2) the increase is approved by the Secretary concerned;

“(3) the Secretary concerned notifies the congressional defense committees in writing of the increase in scope and the reasons therefor; and

“(4) a period of 21 days has elapsed after the date on which the notification is received by the committees or, if over sooner, a period of 14 days has elapsed after the date on which a copy of the notification is provided in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.”.

(b) CROSS-REFERENCE AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking “subsection (c) or (d)” and inserting “subsection (c), (d), or (e)”.

(2) Subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(2), is amended by striking “through (d)” and inserting “through (e)”.

(c) ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of such section is further amended by inserting “of this title” after “section 2805(a)”.

SEC. 2803. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY, LIMITED AUTHORITY TO USE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (h) of section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108-136; 117 Stat. 1723), as most recently amended by section 2806 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3699), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “fiscal year 2016” and inserting “fiscal year 2017”.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “October 1, 2014” and inserting “October 1, 2015”;

(2) by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2016”; and

(3) by striking “fiscal year 2016” and inserting “fiscal year 2017”.

(c) ELIMINATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Such section is further amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 2804. MODIFICATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT ON IN-KIND CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION PAYMENTS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2016, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall provide the congressional defense committees a report on in-kind construction and renovation payments received during the preceding fiscal year.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A listing of each facility constructed or renovated for the Department of Defense as payment in-kind.

(B) An estimate of the value in United States dollars of that construction or renovation.

(C) A description of the source of the in-kind payment.

(D) A description of the agreement pursuant to which the in-kind payment was made.

(E) A description of the purpose and need for the construction or renovation.

(b) REPEAL OF EXISTING REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 2805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2149) is repealed.

SEC. 2805. LAB MODERNIZATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FUNDS.—The Secretary of Defense may fund military construction projects at the Department of Defense science and technology reinvention laboratories (as designated by section 1105(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note)), using amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation.

(b) CONDITIONS.—Amounts made available pursuant to subsection (a) may be used for the purpose of funding major military construction projects that meet the following conditions:

(1) Projects are subject to the requirements of section 2802 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Projects are included in the budget submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) Funds are specifically appropriated for the projects.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall certify, as part of the budget submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, that military construction projects proposed pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) will support the research and development activities at Department of Defense science and technology reinvention laboratories (as designated by section 1105(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note)) of more than one military department or Defense Agency or a technology development program that is consistent with the fielding of offset technologies as described in section 212;

(2) have been endorsed for funding by more than one military department or Defense Agency;

(3) will establish facilities that will have significant potential for use by entities outside the Department of Defense, including universities, industrial partners, and other Federal agencies; and

(4) cannot be fully funded under the thresholds specified by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code.

(d) FUNDS.—Amounts used for the pilot program established under this section may not exceed \$100,000,000 for any fiscal year.

(e) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided under this section terminates on October 1, 2020.

SEC. 2806. CONVEYANCE TO INDIAN TRIBES OF CERTAIN HOUSING UNITS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The term “Executive Director” means the Executive Director of Walking Shield, Inc.

(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” means any Indian tribe included on the list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

(b) REQUESTS FOR CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Executive Director may submit to the Secretary of the military department concerned, on behalf of any Indian tribe, a request for conveyance of any relocatable military housing unit located at a military installation in the United States.

(2) CONFLICTS.—The Executive Director shall resolve any conflict among requests of Indian tribes for housing units described in paragraph (1) before submitting a request to the Secretary of the military department concerned under this subsection.

(c) CONVEYANCE BY A SECRETARY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on receipt of a request under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary of the military department concerned may convey to the Indian tribe that is the subject of the request, at no cost to such military department and without consideration, any relocatable military housing unit described in subsection (b)(1) that, as determined by such Secretary, is in excess of the needs of the military.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

SEC. 2811. UTILITY SYSTEM CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.

Section 2688(j) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “CONSTRUCTION OF” and inserting “CONVEYANCE OF ADDITIONAL”; and

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (C);

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (D) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(C) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, by striking “utility system;” and inserting “, or operating the additional utility infrastructure would be in the best interest of the government using a business case analysis similar to the analysis required under subsection (d)(2); and”;

(D) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, by striking “amount equal to the fair market value of” and inserting “amount for”.

SEC. 2812. LEASING OF NON-EXCESS PROPERTY OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS AND DEFENSE AGENCIES; TREATMENT OF VALUE PROVIDED BY LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

Section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) LEASES FOR EDUCATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(4), the Secretary concerned may accept consideration in an amount that is less than the fair market value of the lease, if the lease is to a local education agency or an elementary or secondary school (as those terms are defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)).”.

SEC. 2813. MODIFICATION OF FACILITY REPAIR NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.

Section 2811 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by inserting “or 75 percent of the estimated cost of a military construction project to replace the facility, or the facility is located at an overseas location that has not been designated a main operating base or forward operating site” after “in excess of \$7,500,000”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) **NOTIFICATION THRESHOLD.**—The congressional notification requirement under subsection (d) does not apply to a repair project costing less than \$1,000,000.”.

SEC. 2814. INCREASE OF THRESHOLD OF NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN FACILITIES FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS AND PARITY WITH AUTHORITY FOR UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR PROJECTS.

(a) **NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENT.**—Subsection (a) of section 18233a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$750,000” and inserting “the amount specified in section 2805(b)(1) of this title”.

(b) **REPAIR PROJECTS.**—Subsection (b)(3) of such section is amended by striking “\$7,500,000” and inserting “the amount specified in section 2811(b) of this title”.

SEC. 2815. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COORDINATION OF HUNTING, FISHING, AND OTHER RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES ON MILITARY LAND.

It is the sense of Congress that, in situations where military lands are open to public access for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities, the Department of Defense should seek to ensure that coordination with State fish and wildlife managers, tribes, and local governments occurs sufficiently in advance of traditional hunting, fishing, and recreational use seasons to facilitate communication with hunting, fishing, and recreational user groups.

SEC. 2816. EXEMPTION OF ARMY OFF-SITE USE AND OFF-SITE REMOVAL ONLY NON-MOBILE PROPERTIES FROM CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Excess or unutilized or underutilized non-mobile property of the Army that is situated on non-excess land shall be exempt from the requirements of title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411 et seq.) upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that—

(1) the property is not feasible to relocate;

(2) the property is located in an area to which the general public is denied access in the interest of national security; and

(3) the exemption would facilitate the efficient disposal of excess property or result in more efficient real property management.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—Before making an initial determination under the authority provided under subsection (a), and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of the Army shall consult with the Executive Director of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness on types of non-mobile properties that may be feasible for relocation and suitable to assist the homeless.

(c) **SUNSET.**—The authority under subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2017.

Subtitle C—Land Conveyances**SEC. 2821. RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST RETAINED AS PART OF CONVEYANCE TO THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ALLIANCE OF JEFFERSON COUNTY, ARKANSAS.**

(a) **RELEASE OF CONDITIONS AND RETAINED INTERESTS.**—With respect to a parcel of real prop-

erty in Jefferson County, Arkansas, consisting of approximately 1,447 acres and conveyed by deed to the Economic Development Alliance of Jefferson County, Arkansas (in this section referred to as the “Economic Development Alliance”) by the United States for use as the facility known as the “Bioplex” and related activities pursuant to section 2827 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201), the Secretary of the Army may release subject to the conditions of subsections (b) and (d) below, the conditions of conveyance of subsection (c) of such section 2827 and the reversionary interest retained by the United States under subsection (e) of such section.

(b) **CONSIDERATION.**—

(1) **EFFECT OF RECONVEYANCE.**—Notwithstanding subsection (d) of such section 2827, the release authorized by subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to the condition that, if the Economic Development Alliance reconveys all or any part of the conveyed property during the 25-year period referred to in subsection (c)(2) of such section, the Economic Development Alliance shall pay to the United States, upon reconveyance, an amount equal to the fair market value of the reconveyed property as of the time of the reconveyance, excluding the value of any improvements made to the property by the Economic Development Alliance.

(2) **DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—The Secretary of the Army shall determine fair market value in accordance with Federal appraisal standards and procedures.

(3) **TREATMENT OF LEASES.**—The Secretary of the Army may treat a lease of the property within such 25-year period as a reconveyance if the Secretary determines that the lease is being used to avoid application of paragraph (1).

(4) **DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.**—The Secretary of the Army shall deposit any proceeds received under this subsection in the special account established pursuant to section 572(b) of title 40, United States Code.

(c) **INSTRUMENT OF RELEASE.**—The Secretary of the Army may execute and file in the appropriate office a deed of release, amended deed, or other appropriate instrument reflecting the release of conditions and retained interests under subsection (a).

(d) **PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—

(1) **PAYMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Army shall require the Economic Development Alliance to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the release of conditions and retained interests under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs related to environmental documentation, and other administrative costs related to the release. If amounts paid to the Secretary in advance exceed the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the release, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the Economic Development Alliance.

(2) **TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.**—Amounts received under paragraph (1) as reimbursement for costs incurred by the Secretary to carry out the release under subsection (a) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the release. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(e) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary of the Army may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the release of conditions and retained interests under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United

States, including provisions that the Secretary determines are necessary to preclude any use of the property that would interfere with activities at Pine Bluff Arsenal.

SEC. 2822. LAND EXCHANGE, NAVY OUTLYING LANDING FIELD, NAVAL AIR STATION, WHITING FIELD, FLORIDA.

(a) **LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of the Navy may convey to Escambia County, Florida (in this section referred to as the “County”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, containing Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 in Escambia County associated with Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Milton, Florida.

(b) **LAND TO BE ACQUIRED.**—In exchange for the property described in subsection (a), the County shall convey to the Secretary of the Navy land and improvements thereon in Santa Rosa County, Florida, that is acceptable to the Secretary and suitable for use as a Navy outlying landing field to replace Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8.

(c) **PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—

(1) **PAYMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Navy shall require the County to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the land exchange under this section, including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, other administrative costs related to the land exchange, and all costs associated with relocation of activities and facilities from Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 to the replacement location. If amounts are collected from the County in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the land exchange, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the County.

(2) **TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.**—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the land exchange. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(d) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy.

(e) **CONVEYANCE AGREEMENT.**—The exchange of real property under this section shall be accomplished using a quit claim deed or other legal instrument and upon terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy and the County, including such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS****Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations****SEC. 3101. NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.**

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2016 for the activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF NEW PLANT PROJECTS.**—From funds referred to in subsection

(a) that are available for carrying out plant projects, the Secretary of Energy may carry out the following new plant project for the National Nuclear Security Administration:

Project 16-D-621, Substation Replacement at Technical Area 3, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, \$25,000,000.

SEC. 3102. DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2016 for defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

SEC. 3103. OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2016 for other defense activities in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 3111. RESPONSIVE CAPABILITIES PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XLII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 4220. RESPONSIVE CAPABILITIES PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish and carry out a program to exercise the technical capabilities of the Administration with respect to design and production of nuclear weapons to ensure that the Administration is ready to respond to future uncertainties not addressed by existing life extension programs.

“(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—The Administrator shall ensure that the program required by subsection (a)—

“(1) is integrated across the science, engineering, design, and manufacturing cycle of the Administration;

“(2) results in—

“(A) physics models of components and systems the understanding of which will ensure existing models and experimental capabilities are robust, capable of being certified as safe and reliable in the absence of testing, and contribute to the predictive design framework;

“(B) shortened engineering design cycles that minimize the amount of time leading to an engineering prototype; and

“(C) rapid manufacturing capabilities to reduce the time and cost of production; and

“(3) integrates physics, engineering, and production capabilities into joint test assemblies and designs.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Atomic Energy Defense Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4219 the following new item:

“Sec. 4220. Responsive capabilities program.”.

SEC. 3112. LONG-TERM PLAN FOR MEETING NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR UNENCUMBERED URANIUM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XLII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521 et seq.), as amended by section 3111, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 4221. LONG-TERM PLAN FOR MEETING NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR UNENCUMBERED URANIUM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Concurrent with the submission to Congress of the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, in each even-numbered year beginning in 2016, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for meeting national security requirements for unencumbered uranium through 2065.

“(b) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) An inventory of unencumbered uranium (other than depleted uranium), by program

source and enrichment level, that, as of the date of the plan, is allocated to national security requirements.

“(2) An inventory of unencumbered uranium (other than depleted uranium), by program source and enrichment level, that, as of the date of the plan, is not allocated to national security requirements but could be allocated to such requirements.

“(3) An identification of national security requirements for unencumbered uranium, by program source and enrichment level.

“(4) A description of any shortfall in obtaining unencumbered uranium to meet national security requirements and an assessment of whether that shortfall could be mitigated through the blending down of uranium that is of a higher enrichment level.

“(5) An inventory of unencumbered depleted uranium, an assessment of the portion of that uranium that could be allocated to national security requirements through re-enrichment, and an estimate of the costs of re-enriching that uranium.

“(6) A description of the swap and barter agreements involving unencumbered uranium needed to meet national security requirements that are in effect on the date of the plan.

“(7) An assessment of whether additional enrichment of uranium will be required to meet national security requirements and an estimate of the time for production operations and the cost for each type of enrichment being considered.

“(8) A description of changes in policy that would mitigate any shortfall in obtaining unencumbered uranium to meet national security requirements and the implications of those changes.

“(c) FORM OF PLAN.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘depleted’, with respect to uranium, means that the uranium is depleted in uranium-235 compared with natural uranium.

“(2) The term ‘unencumbered’, with respect to uranium, means that the United States has no obligation to foreign governments to use the uranium for only peaceful purposes.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Atomic Energy Defense Act, as amended by section 3111, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4220 the following new item:

“Sec. 4221. Long-term plan for meeting national security requirements for unencumbered uranium.”.

SEC. 3113. DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XLIII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2563 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 4309. DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION MANAGEMENT PLAN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Concurrent with the submission to Congress of the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, in each odd-numbered year beginning in 2017, the Administrator shall submit to the congressional defense committees a five-year management plan for activities associated with the defense nuclear nonproliferation programs of the Administration.

“(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include, with respect to each defense nuclear nonproliferation program of the Administration, the following:

“(1) A description of the following:

“(A) The policy context in which the program operates, including—

“(i) a list of relevant laws, policy directives issued by the President, and international agreements; and

“(ii) nuclear nonproliferation activities carried out by other Federal agencies.

“(B) The objectives and priorities of the program during the year preceding the submission of the plan required by subsection (a).

“(C) The activities carried out under the program during that year.

“(D) The accomplishments and challenges of the program during that year.

“(2) Plans for activities of the program during the five-year period beginning on the date on which the plan required by subsection (a) is submitted, including activities with respect to the following:

“(A) Preventing nuclear and radiological proliferation and terrorism, including through—

“(i) material management and minimization;

“(ii) global nuclear material security;

“(iii) nonproliferation and arms control;

“(iv) defense nuclear research and development; and

“(v) nonproliferation construction programs, including activities associated Department of Energy Order 413.1 (relating to program management controls).

“(B) Countering nuclear and radiological proliferation and terrorism.

“(C) Responding to nuclear and radiological proliferation and terrorism, including through—

“(i) crisis operations;

“(ii) consequences management; and

“(iii) emergency management, including international capacity building.

“(3) A threat analysis in support of the plans described in paragraph (2).

“(4) A plan for funding the program during the five-year period beginning on the date on which the plan required by subsection (a) is submitted.

“(5) A description of funds for the program received through contributions from or cost-sharing agreements with foreign governments consistent section 3132(f) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (50 U.S.C. 2569(f)).

“(6) Such other matters as the Administrator considers appropriate.

“(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The plan required by subsection (a) may be submitted to the congressional defense committees in classified form if necessary.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Atomic Energy Defense Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4308 the following new item:

“Sec. 4309. Defense nuclear nonproliferation management plan.”.

(c) CONFORMING REPEALS.—

(1) Section 3122 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1710) is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (a) and (b);

(B) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (a), (b), and (c), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (2) of subsection (b), as redesignated by subparagraph (B), by striking “subsection (c)(2)” and inserting “subsection (a)(2)”.

(2) Section 3145 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2197) is repealed.

SEC. 3114. PLAN FOR DEACTIVATION AND DECOMMISSIONING OF NONOPERATIONAL DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title XLIV of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2602 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 4423. PLAN FOR DEACTIVATION AND DECOMMISSIONING OF NONOPERATIONAL DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—During each even-numbered year beginning in 2016, the Secretary of

Energy shall develop a plan to provide guidance for the activities of the Department of Energy relating to the deactivation and decommissioning of nonoperational defense nuclear facilities.

“(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) A list of nonoperational defense nuclear facilities, prioritized for deactivation and decommissioning based on the potential to reduce risks to human health, property, or the environment and to maximize cost savings.

“(2) An assessment of the life cycle costs of each nonoperational defense nuclear facility during the period beginning on the date on which the plan is submitted under subsection (c) and ending on the earlier of—

“(A) the date that is 25 years after the date on which the plan is submitted; or

“(B) the estimated date for deactivation and decommissioning of the facility.

“(3) An estimate of the cost and time needed to deactivate and decommission each nonoperational defense nuclear facility, if available.

“(4) An estimate of the time at which the Office of Environmental Management anticipates accepting nonoperational defense nuclear facilities for deactivation and decommissioning.

“(5) An estimate of costs that could be avoided by—

“(A) accelerating the cleanup of nonoperational defense nuclear facilities; or

“(B) other means, such as reusing such facilities for another purpose.

“(c) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than March 31 of each even-numbered year beginning in 2016, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

“(1) the plan required by subsection (a);

“(2) a description of the deactivation and decommissioning actions expected to be taken during the following fiscal year pursuant to the plan; and

“(3) in the case of a report submitted during 2018 or any year thereafter, a description of the deactivation and decommissioning actions taken at each nonoperational defense nuclear facility during the preceding fiscal year.

“(d) **TERMINATION.**—The requirements of this section shall terminate after the submission to the congressional defense committees of the report required by subsection (c) to be submitted not later than March 31, 2026.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘life cycle costs’, with respect to a facility, means—

“(A) the present and future costs of all resources and associated cost elements required to develop, produce, deploy, or sustain the facility; and

“(B) the present and future costs to deactivate, decommission, and deconstruct the facility.

“(2) The term ‘nonoperational defense nuclear facility’ means a production facility or utilization facility (as those terms are defined in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014)) under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary of Energy and operated for national security purposes that is no longer needed for the mission of the Department of Energy, including the National Nuclear Security Administration.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Atomic Energy Defense Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4422 the following new item:

“Sec. 4423. Plan for deactivation and decommissioning of nonoperational defense nuclear facilities.”

SEC. 3115. HANFORD WASTE TREATMENT AND IMMOBILIZATION PLANT CONTRACT OVERSIGHT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle C of title XLIV of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 4446. HANFORD WASTE TREATMENT AND IMMOBILIZATION PLANT CONTRACT OVERSIGHT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the Secretary of Energy shall arrange to have an owner’s agent assist the Secretary in carrying out the oversight responsibilities of the Secretary with respect to the contract described in subsection (b).

“(b) **CONTRACT DESCRIBED.**—The contract described in this subsection is the contract between the Office of River Protection of the Department of Energy and Bechtel National, Inc. or its successor relating to the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (contract number DE-AC27-01RV14136).

“(c) **DUTIES.**—The duties of the owner’s agent under subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) Performing design, construction, nuclear safety, and operability oversight of each facility covered by the contract described in subsection (b).

“(2) Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, ensuring that the preliminary documented safety analyses for all facilities covered by the contract meet the requirements of all applicable Department of Energy regulations and guidance, including section 830.206 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, and the Department of Energy Standard on the Integration of Safety into the Design Process (DOE-STD-1189-2008).

“(3) Assisting the Secretary in ensuring that, until the Secretary approves the documented safety analysis for each facility covered by the contract, the contractor ensures that each preliminary documented safety analysis is current.

“(4) Ensuring that the contractor acts to promptly resolve any unreviewed safety questions.

“(d) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, and every 180 days thereafter, the owner’s agent specified in subsection (a) shall submit to the Secretary and the congressional defense committees a report on the assistance provided by the owner’s agent to the Secretary under that subsection with respect to oversight of the contract described in subsection (b).

“(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) Information on the status of, and the plan for resolving, each unreviewed safety question at each facility covered by the contract described in subsection (b).

“(B) An identification of each instance of disagreement between the owner’s agent and the contractor with respect to whether an unreviewed safety question exists and the plan for resolution of the disagreement.

“(C) An identification of each aspect of each preliminary documented safety analysis that is not current, the plan for making that aspect current, and the status of the corrective efforts.

“(D) Information on the status of, and the plan for resolving, each unresolved technical issue at each facility covered by the contract, and the status of corrective efforts.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘contractor’ means Bechtel National, Inc.

“(2) The term ‘current’, with respect to a documented safety analysis, means that the docu-

mented safety analysis includes any design changes approved by the contractor and any safety evaluation reports issued by the Secretary with respect to the facility covered by the analysis before the date that is 60 days before the date of the analysis.

“(3) The terms ‘documented safety analysis’, ‘safety evaluation report’, and ‘unreviewed safety question’ have the meanings given those terms in section 830.3 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar ruling or regulation).

“(4) The term ‘owner’s agent’ means a private third-party entity with nuclear safety management expertise and without any contractual relationship with the contractor or conflict of interest.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Atomic Energy Defense Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4445 the following new item:

“Sec. 4446. Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant contract oversight.”

SEC. 3116. ASSESSMENT OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle A of title XLVIII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2781 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 4802 the following new section:

“SEC. 4802A. ASSESSMENTS OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Energy shall include, in each award-fee evaluation conducted under section 16.401 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, of a management and operating contract for a Department of Energy defense nuclear facility in 2016 or any even-numbered year thereafter, an assessment of the adequacy of the emergency preparedness of that facility, including an assessment of the seniority level of employees and contractors of the Department of Energy that participate in emergency preparedness exercises at that facility.

“(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after conducting an assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the assessment.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Atomic Energy Defense Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4802 the following new item:

“Sec. 4802A. Assessments of emergency preparedness of defense nuclear facilities.”

SEC. 3117. LABORATORY- AND FACILITY-DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) **FUNDING FOR LABORATORY-DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—Section 4811(c) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2791(c)) is amended by striking “not to exceed 6 percent” and inserting “of not less than 5 percent and not more than 8 percent”.

(b) **FACILITY-DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle B of title XLVIII of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2791 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 4811 the following new section:

“SEC. 4811A. FACILITY-DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

“(a) **AUTHORITY.**—A covered facility that is funded out of funds available to the Department of Energy for national security programs may carry out facility-directed research and development.

“(b) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary of Energy shall prescribe regulations for the conduct of facility-directed research and development under subsection (a).

“(c) **FUNDING.**—Of the funds provided by the Department of Energy to covered facilities, the Secretary shall provide a specific amount, not to exceed 4 percent of such funds, to be used by such facilities for facility-directed research and development.

“(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **COVERED FACILITY.**—The term ‘covered facility’ means a nuclear weapons production facility or the Nevada Site Office of the Department of Energy.

“(2) **FACILITY-DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—The term ‘facility-directed research and development’ means research and development work of a creative and innovative nature that, under the regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (b), is selected by the director or manager of a covered facility for the purpose of maintaining the vitality of the facility in defense-related scientific disciplines.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Atomic Energy Defense Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4811 the following new item:

“Sec. 4811A. Facility-directed research and development.”

SEC. 3118. LIMITATION ON BONUSES FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION WHO ENGAGE IN IMPROPER PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle C of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 3245. LIMITATION ON BONUSES FOR EMPLOYEES WHO ENGAGE IN IMPROPER PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.

“(a) **LIMITATION.**—If the Secretary of Energy or the Administrator determines that a senior employee of the Administration committed improper program management, the Secretary and the Administrator may not pay a bonus to that employee during the one-year period beginning on the date of the determination.

“(b) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary or the Administrator may waive the limitation on the payment of bonuses under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis if—

“(1) the Secretary or the Administrator, as the case may be, notifies the congressional defense committees of the waiver; and

“(2) a period of 60 days elapses following the notification before the bonus is paid.

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘bonus’ means any bonus or cash award, including—

“(A) an award under chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code;

“(B) an additional step-increase under section 5336 of title 5, United States Code;

“(C) an award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code;

“(D) a recruitment or relocation bonus under section 5753 of title 5, United States Code; and

“(E) a retention bonus under section 5754 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) The term ‘covered project’ means—

“(A) a construction project of the Administration that is not a minor construction project (as defined in section 4703(d) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2743(d))); or

“(B) a life extension program.

“(3) The term ‘improper program management’ means actions relating to the management of a covered project that significantly—

“(A) delay the project;

“(B) reduce the scope of the project; or

“(C) increase the cost of the project.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3244 the following new item:

“Sec. 3245. Limitation on bonuses for employees who engage in improper program management.”

SEC. 3119. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS OF THE OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY.

Section 3241A(b)(3) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441a(b)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) 100 employees in positions established under section 3241.”

SEC. 3120. MODIFICATION OF SUBMISSION OF ASSESSMENTS OF CERTAIN BUDGET REQUESTS RELATING TO THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS STOCKPILE.

Section 3255(a)(2) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2455(a)(2)) is amended by inserting “in each even-numbered year and 150 days in each odd-numbered year” after “90 days”.

SEC. 3121. REPEAL OF PHASE THREE REVIEW OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP PROJECTS.

Section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2713), as amended by section 3134(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2193), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “a series of three reviews, as described in subsections (b), (c), and (d)” and inserting “two reviews, as described in subsections (b) and (c)”; and

(2) by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 3122. MODIFICATIONS TO COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES FOR COMPETITION OF MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTS.

Section 3121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2175), as amended by section 3124 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1062), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(1) a clear and complete description of the cost savings the Administrator expects to result from the competition for the contract over the life of the contract, including associated analyses, assumptions, and information sources used to determine such cost savings;

“(2) a description of any key limitations or uncertainties that could affect such costs savings, including costs savings that are anticipated but not fully known;

“(3) the costs of the competition for the contract, including the immediate costs of conducting the competition;

“(4) a description of any expected disruptions or delays in mission activities or deliverables resulting from the competition for the contract;

“(5) a clear and complete description of the benefits expected by the Administrator with respect to mission performance or operations resulting from the competition.”

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) **INFORMATION QUALITY.**—A report required by subsection (a) shall be prepared in accordance with—

“(1) the information quality guidelines of the Department of Energy that are relevant to the clear and complete presentation of information on each matter required to be included in the report under subsection (b); and

“(2) best practices of the Government Accountability Office and relevant industries for cost estimating, if appropriate.”

(4) in subsection (d), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph (1):

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a review of each report required by subsection (a) with respect to a contract not later than 3 years after the report is submitted to such committees that includes an assessment, based on the most current information available, of the following:

“(A) The actual cost savings achieved compared to cost savings estimated under subsection (b)(1), and any increased costs incurred under the contract that were unexpected or uncertain at the time the contract was awarded.

“(B) Any disruptions or delays in mission activities or deliverables resulting from the competition for the contract compared to the disruptions and delays estimated under subsection (b)(4).

“(C) Whether expected benefits of the competition with respect to mission performance or operations have been achieved.”

(5) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2013 through 2017” and inserting “2015 through 2020”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(D) in paragraph (2), as redesignated by subparagraph (C), by striking “subsections (a) and (d)(2)” and inserting “subsection (a)”.

SEC. 3123. REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY PANEL ON THE GOVERNANCE OF THE NUCLEAR SECURITY ENTERPRISE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Public Administration (in this section referred to as the “joint panel”) to review the implementation of the recommendations specified in subsection (b) of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise established by section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2208).

(b) **RECOMMENDATIONS SPECIFIED.**—The recommendations specified in this subsection are recommendations 4 through 10, 12, 13, and 15 through 19 in the table of recommendations in the report of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise entitled “A New Foundation for the Nuclear Security Enterprise” and submitted to Congress pursuant to section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2208), as amended by section 3142 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1069).

(c) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than March 31, 2016, and annually thereafter through 2020, the joint panel shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the review required by subsection (a) that includes an assessment of—

(1) the status of the implementation of the recommendations specified in subsection (b); and

(2) the extent to which the implementation of the recommendations is resulting in the desired effect as envisioned by the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SEC. 3201. AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016, \$29,150,000 for the operation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board under chapter 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286 et seq.).

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION
SEC. 3501. CADET COMMITMENT AGREEMENTS.

Section 51306(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “must” and inserting “shall”;

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) obtain a merchant mariner license, unlimited as to horsepower or tonnage, issued by the United States Coast Guard as an officer in the merchant marine of the United States, accompanied by the appropriate national and international endorsements and certifications required by the Coast Guard for service aboard vessels on domestic and international voyages, without limitation, before graduation from the Academy;”;

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) for at least 6 years after graduation from the Academy, maintain—

“(A) a valid merchant mariner license, unlimited as to horsepower or tonnage, issued by the United States Coast Guard as an officer in the merchant marine of the United States, accompanied by the appropriate national and international endorsements and certifications required by the Coast Guard for service aboard vessels on domestic and international voyages, without limitation;

“(B) a valid transportation worker identification credential; and

“(C) a United States Coast Guard medical certificate;”;

(4) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) apply for, and accept if tendered, an appointment as a commissioned officer in the Navy Reserve (including the Strategic Sealift Officer Program, Navy Reserve), the Coast Guard Reserve, or any other reserve component of an armed force of the United States, and, if tendered the appointment, to serve, meet the participation requirements, and maintain active status in good standing, as determined by the program manager of the appropriate military service, for at least 8 years after the date of commissioning;”.

SEC. 3502. STUDENT INCENTIVE PAYMENT AGREEMENTS.

Section 51509 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(3) AUTHORIZED USES.—” before the last sentence and indenting accordingly;

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (3), by striking “Payments” and inserting “(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), payments” and indenting accordingly; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1), the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may modify the payments made to an individual under paragraph (1), but the total amount of payments to that individual may not exceed \$32,000.”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “Merchant Marine Reserve” and inserting “Strategic Sealift Officer Program”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) obtain a merchant mariner license, without limitation as to tonnage or horsepower, from the United States Coast Guard as an officer in the merchant marine of the United States, accompanied by the appropriate national and international endorsements and certification required by the Coast Guard for service aboard vessels on domestic and international voyages, without limitation, within three months of completion of the course of instruction at the academy the individual is attending;”;

(B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) for at least 6 years after graduation from the academy, maintain—

“(A) a valid merchant mariner license, unlimited as to horsepower or tonnage, issued by the United States Coast Guard as an officer in the merchant marine of the United States, accompanied by the appropriate national and international endorsements and certifications required by the Coast Guard for service aboard vessels on domestic and international voyages, without limitation;

“(B) a valid transportation worker identification credential; and

“(C) a United States Coast Guard medical certificate;” and

(C) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) apply for, and accept, if tendered, an appointment as a commissioned officer in the Navy Reserve (including the Strategic Sealift Officer Program, Navy Reserve), the Coast Guard Reserve, or any other reserve component of an armed force of the United States, and, if tendered the appointment, to serve and meet the participation requirements and to maintain active status in good standing, as determined by the program manager of the appropriate military service, for at least 8 years after the date of commissioning;”;

(4) by amending subsection (e)(1) to read as follows:

“(1) ACTIVE DUTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may order an individual to serve on active duty in the armed forces of the United States for a period of not more than 2 years if—

“(i) the individual has attended an academy under this section for more than 2 academic years, but less than 3 academic years;

“(ii) the individual has accepted the payments described in subsection (b) in an amount totaling at least \$8,000; and

“(iii) the Secretary of Transportation has determined that the individual has failed to fulfill the part of the agreement described in subsection (d)(1).

“(B) 3 OR MORE YEARS.—The Secretary of Defense may order an individual to serve on active duty in the armed forces of the United States for a period of not more than 3 years if—

“(i) the individual has attended an academy under this section for 3 or more academic years;

“(ii) the individual has accepted the payments described in subsection (b) in an amount totaling at least \$16,000; and

“(iii) the Secretary of Transportation has determined that the individual has failed to fulfill the part of the agreement described in subsection (d)(1).

“(C) HARDSHIP WAIVER.—In cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Transportation may waive this paragraph in whole or in part.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) ALTERNATIVE SERVICE.—

“(1) SERVICE AS COMMISSIONED OFFICER.—An individual who, for the 5-year period following graduation from an academy, serves as a commissioned officer on active duty in an armed force of the United States or as a commissioned officer of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or the Public Health Service shall be excused from the requirements of paragraphs (3) through (5) of subsection (d).

“(2) MODIFICATION OR WAIVER.—The Secretary may modify or waive any of the terms and conditions set forth in subsection (d) through the imposition of alternative service requirements.”.

SEC. 3503. FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ACT.

Section 3305 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 3305) is amended by striking

“Secretary of Commerce” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary of Transportation”.

SEC. 3504. SHORT SEA TRANSPORTATION DEFINED.

Paragraph (1) of section 55605 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) shipped in discrete units or packages that are handled individually, palletized, or unitized for purposes of transportation; or

“(D) freight vehicles carried aboard commuter ferry boats; and”.

SEC. 3505. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY ASPECTS OF THE MERCHANT MARINE FOR FISCAL YEARS 2016 AND 2017.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2016.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016, to be available without fiscal year limitation if so provided in appropriations Acts, for the use of the Department of Transportation for Maritime Administration programs associated with maintaining national security aspects of the merchant marine, as follows:

(1) For expenses necessary for operations of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, \$96,028,000, of which—

(A) \$71,306,000 shall remain available until expended for Academy operations;

(B) \$24,722,000 shall remain available until expended for capital asset management at the Academy.

(2) For expenses necessary to support the State maritime academies, \$34,550,000, of which—

(A) \$2,400,000 shall remain available until expended for student incentive payments;

(B) \$3,000,000 shall remain available until expended for direct payments to such academies;

(C) \$1,800,000 shall remain available until expended for training ship fuel assistance payments;

(D) \$22,000,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of State maritime academy training vessels;

(E) \$5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for a National Security Multi-Mission Vessel Design Program; and

(F) \$350,000 shall remain available until expended for improving the monitoring of graduates' service obligation.

(3) For expenses necessary to support Maritime Administration operations and programs, \$54,059,000.

(4) For expenses necessary to dispose of vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, \$8,000,000 to remain available until expended.

(5) For expenses to maintain and preserve a United States-flag merchant marine to serve the national security needs of the United States under chapter 531 of title 46, United States Code, \$186,000,000.

(6) For the cost (as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a(5)) of loan guarantees under the program authorized by chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, \$3,135,000, of which \$3,135,000 shall remain available until expended for administrative expenses of the program.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2017.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2017, to be available without fiscal year limitation if so provided in appropriations Acts, for the use of the Department of Transportation for Maritime Administration programs associated with maintaining national security aspects of the merchant marine, as follows:

(1) For expenses necessary for operations of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, \$96,028,000, of which—

(A) \$71,306,000 shall remain available until expended for Academy operations;

(B) \$24,722,000 shall remain available until expended for capital asset management at the Academy.

(2) For expenses necessary to support the State maritime academies, \$34,550,000, of which—

(A) \$2,400,000 shall remain available until expended for student incentive payments;

(B) \$3,000,000 shall remain available until expended for direct payments to such academies;

(C) \$1,800,000 shall remain available until expended for training ship fuel assistance payments;

(D) \$22,000,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of State maritime academy training vessels;

(E) \$5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for a National Security Multi-Mission Vessel Design Program; and

(F) \$350,000 shall remain available until expended for improving the monitoring of graduates' service obligation.

(3) For expenses necessary to support Maritime Administration operations and programs, \$54,059,000.

(4) For expenses necessary to dispose of vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, \$8,000,000 to remain available until expended.

(5) For expenses to maintain and preserve a United States-flag merchant marine to serve the national security needs of the United States under chapter 531 of title 46, United States Code, \$186,000,000.

(6) For the cost (as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C.

661a(5)) of loan guarantees under the program authorized by chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, \$3,135,000, of which \$3,135,000 shall remain available until expended for administrative expenses of the program.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

SEC. 4001. AUTHORIZATION OF AMOUNTS IN FUNDING TABLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever a funding table in this division specifies a dollar amount authorized for a project, program, or activity, the obligation and expenditure of the specified dollar amount for the project, program, or activity is hereby authorized, subject to the availability of appropriations.

(b) MERIT-BASED DECISIONS.—A decision to commit, obligate, or expend funds with or to a specific entity on the basis of a dollar amount authorized pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of sections 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, or on competitive procedures; and

(2) comply with other applicable provisions of law.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO TRANSFER AND PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY.—An amount specified in the funding tables in this division may be transferred or reprogrammed under a transfer or reprogramming authority provided by another provision of this Act or by other law. The transfer or reprogramming of an amount specified in such funding tables shall not count against a ceiling on such transfers or reprogrammings

under section 1001 or section 1522 of this Act or any other provision of law, unless such transfer or reprogramming would move funds between appropriation accounts.

(d) APPLICABILITY TO CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—This section applies to any classified annex that accompanies this Act.

(e) ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.—No oral or written communication concerning any amount specified in the funding tables in this division shall supersede the requirements of this section.

SEC. 4002. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTIONS OF CERTAIN OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDING AMONG ALL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDING.

Any undistributed reduction in funding available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4301, that is attributable to savings in connection with foreign currency fluctuations or bulk fuel purchases, may be applied against any funds available for that fiscal year for the Department for operation and maintenance, regardless of whether available as specified in the funding table in section 4301 or available as specified in the funding table in section 4302.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT (In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY			
FIXED WING			
2	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	879	879
4	MQ-1 UAV	260,436	260,436
ROTARY			
6	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	187,177	187,177
7	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	1,168,461	1,168,461
8	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN (AP)	209,930	209,930
11	UH-60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	1,435,945	1,435,945
12	UH-60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP) (AP)	127,079	127,079
13	UH-60 BLACK HAWK A AND L MODELS	46,641	46,641
14	CH-47 HELICOPTER	1,024,587	1,024,587
15	CH-47 HELICOPTER (AP)	99,344	99,344
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT			
16	MQ-1 PAYLOAD (MIP)	97,543	97,543
19	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)	95,725	95,725
20	AH-64 MODS	116,153	116,153
21	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	86,330	86,330
22	GRCS SEMA MODS (MIP)	4,019	4,019
23	ARL SEMA MODS (MIP)	16,302	16,302
24	EMARSS SEMA MODS (MIP)	13,669	13,669
25	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	16,166	16,166
26	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS	13,793	13,793
28	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN	112,807	112,807
29	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE	82,904	82,904
30	GATM ROLLUP	33,890	33,890
31	RQ-7 UAV MODS	81,444	81,444
GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS			
32	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	56,215	56,215
33	SURVIVABILITY CM	8,917	8,917
34	CMWS	78,348	104,348
	Army UPL for AH-64 ASE: urgent survivability requirement		[26,000]
OTHER SUPPORT			
35	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,937	6,937
36	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	64,867	64,867
37	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	44,085	44,085
38	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	94,545	94,545
39	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	1,207	1,207
40	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET	3,012	3,012
TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		5,689,357	5,715,357
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY			
SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM			

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
1	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD)	115,075	115,075
2	MSE MISSILE	414,946	614,946
	Army UPL for Patriot PAC 3 for improved ballistic missile defense		[200,000]
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM		
3	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	27,975	27,975
4	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MSLs (JAGM)	27,738	27,738
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS		
5	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	77,163	77,163
6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	87,525	87,525
8	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	251,060	251,060
9	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	17,428	17,428
	MODIFICATIONS		
11	PATRIOT MODS	241,883	241,883
12	ATACMS MODS	30,119	20,119
	Early to need		[-10,000]
13	GMLRS MOD	18,221	18,221
14	STINGER MODS	2,216	2,216
15	AVENGER MODS	6,171	6,171
16	ITAS/TOW MODS	19,576	19,576
17	MLRS MODS	35,970	35,970
18	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS	3,148	3,148
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
19	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	33,778	33,778
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
20	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	3,717	3,717
21	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MISSILES)	1,544	1,544
22	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	4,704	4,704
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,419,957	1,609,957
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		
1	STRYKER VEHICLE	181,245	181,245
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		
2	STRYKER (MOD)	74,085	74,085
3	STRYKER UPGRADE	305,743	305,743
5	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)	225,042	225,042
6	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	60,079	60,079
7	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	273,850	273,850
8	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	123,629	195,629
	16 M88A2s to supports modernization of ABCTs and industrial base		[72,000]
9	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD)	2,461	2,461
10	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	2,975	2,975
11	M88 FOV MODS	14,878	14,878
12	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	33,455	33,455
13	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	367,939	367,939
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
15	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	6,479	6,479
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		
16	MORTAR SYSTEMS	4,991	4,991
17	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	26,294	26,294
18	PRECISION SNIPER RIFLE	1,984	0
	Early to need		[-1,984]
19	COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM	1,488	0
	Early to need		[-1,488]
20	CARBINE	34,460	34,460
21	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	8,367	14,767
	Transferred funds		[6,400]
22	HANDGUN	5,417	0
	RFP release delayed, early to need		[-5,417]
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH		
23	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS	2,777	2,777
24	M777 MODS	10,070	10,070
25	M4 CARBINE MODS	27,566	27,566
26	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS	44,004	44,004
27	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS	1,190	1,190
28	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS	1,424	1,424
29	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS	2,431	1,031
	Early to need		[-1,400]
30	M119 MODIFICATIONS	20,599	20,599
32	MORTAR MODIFICATION	6,300	6,300
33	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	3,737	3,737
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
34	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	391	2,891
	Transfer funds		[2,500]
35	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	9,027	9,027
36	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	304	304
37	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	2,392	2,392

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	1,887,073	1,957,684
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION		
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	43,489	43,489
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	40,715	40,715
3	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES	7,753	6,801
	Program funding ahead of need		[-952]
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	24,728	24,728
5	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	8,305	8,305
6	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	34,330	34,330
7	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	79,972	69,972
	Early to need		[-10,000]
	MORTAR AMMUNITION		
8	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	42,898	42,898
9	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	43,500	43,500
10	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	64,372	64,372
	TANK AMMUNITION		
11	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES	105,541	105,541
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION		
12	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES	57,756	57,756
13	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	77,995	77,995
14	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	45,518	45,518
15	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	78,024	78,024
	ROCKETS		
16	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	7,500	7,500
17	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	33,653	33,653
	OTHER AMMUNITION		
18	CAD/PAD, ALL TYPES	5,639	5,639
19	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	9,751	9,751
20	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	19,993	19,993
21	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	9,761	9,761
22	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	9,749	9,749
	MISCELLANEOUS		
23	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	3,521	3,521
24	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	1,700	1,700
25	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION (AMMO)	6,181	6,181
26	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	17,811	17,811
27	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	14,695	14,695
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		
29	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	221,703	221,703
30	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION	113,250	113,250
31	ARMS INITIATIVE	3,575	3,575
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	1,233,378	1,222,426
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	12,855	12,855
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	53	53
4	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	308,336	308,336
5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	90,040	90,040
6	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP	8,444	8,444
7	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	27,549	27,549
8	PLS ESP	127,102	127,102
10	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	48,292	48,292
11	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	130,993	130,993
12	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS	19,146	19,146
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES		
14	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	1,248	1,248
15	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER	9,614	9,614
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS		
16	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	783,116	583,116
	Delayed obligation of prior year funds		[-200,000]
17	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	49,898	49,898
18	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY	4,062	4,062
19	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	5,008	5,008
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
20	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	196,306	196,306
21	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS	44,998	29,998
	Early to need in FY16 due to one year delay		[-15,000]
22	SHF TERM	7,629	7,629
23	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	14,027	14,027
24	SMART-T (SPACE)	13,453	13,453
25	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS	6,265	6,265
26	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	1,042	1,042
27	ENROUTE MISSION COMMAND (EMC)	7,116	7,116
	COMM—C3 SYSTEM		
28	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	10,137	10,137

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS			
29	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	64,640	64,640
30	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVN)	27,762	27,762
31	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)	9,422	9,422
32	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	26,020	26,020
33	TRACTOR DESK	4,073	4,073
34	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT	1,403	1,403
35	SPIDER FAMILY OF NETWORKED MUNITIONS INCR	9,199	9,199
36	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS	349	349
37	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM	25,597	25,597
38	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE	21,854	21,854
40	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE	24,388	24,388
COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM			
42	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	1,349	1,349
43	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	3,695	3,695
INFORMATION SECURITY			
45	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	19,920	19,920
46	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	72,257	72,257
COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS			
47	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	16,082	16,082
COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS			
48	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	86,037	86,037
50	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	8,550	8,550
51	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM	73,496	73,496
ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)			
54	JTT/CIBS-M	881	881
55	PROPHET GROUND	63,650	48,650
	Unjustified program growth		[–15,000]
57	DCGS-A (MIP)	260,268	260,268
58	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTGS)	3,906	3,906
59	TROJAN (MIP)	13,929	13,929
60	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)	3,978	3,978
61	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)	7,542	7,542
62	CLOSE ACCESS TARGET RECONNAISSANCE (CATR)	8,010	8,010
63	MACHINE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM-M	8,125	8,125
ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)			
64	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	63,472	63,472
65	EW PLANNING & MANAGEMENT TOOLS (EWPMT)	2,556	2,556
66	AIR VIGILANCE (AV)	8,224	8,224
67	CREW	2,960	2,960
68	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE	1,722	1,722
69	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	447	447
70	CI MODERNIZATION	228	228
ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)			
71	SENTINEL MODS	43,285	43,285
72	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	124,216	124,216
74	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	23,216	23,216
76	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS	60,679	60,679
77	FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS)	53,453	53,453
78	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	3,338	3,338
79	PROFILER	4,057	4,057
81	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	133,339	133,339
82	JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS)	47,212	47,212
83	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)	22,314	22,314
84	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32	12,131	12,131
85	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	10,075	10,075
86	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	217,379	142,379
	Under execution of prior year funds		[–75,000]
ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS			
87	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	1,190	1,190
90	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	28,176	28,176
91	IAMD BATTLE COMMAND SYSTEM	20,917	20,917
92	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	5,850	5,850
93	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE	12,738	12,738
94	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	145,405	145,405
95	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A)	162,654	146,654
	Program growth		[–16,000]
96	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPP)	4,446	4,446
98	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET	16,218	16,218
99	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (ENFIRE)	1,138	1,138
ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION			
100	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	12,089	12,089
101	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	105,775	93,775
	Reduce IT procurement		[–12,000]
102	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM	18,995	18,995
103	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP)	62,319	62,319
104	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	17,894	17,894
ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)			
106	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	4,242	4,242

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT		
107	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	425	425
108	BCT EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES	7,438	7,438
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
108A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,467	6,467
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT		
109	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	248	248
110	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	1,487	1,487
112	CBRN DEFENSE	26,302	26,302
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT		
113	TACTICAL BRIDGING	9,822	9,822
114	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	21,516	21,516
115	BRIDGE SUPPLEMENTAL SET	4,959	4,959
116	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP	52,546	52,546
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT		
117	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)	58,682	58,682
118	HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS)	13,565	13,565
119	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)	2,136	2,136
120	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION	6,960	6,960
121	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	17,424	17,424
122	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS	8,284	8,284
123	< \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	5,459	5,459
124	FAMILY OF BOATS AND MOTORS	8,429	8,429
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
125	HEATERS AND ECU'S	18,876	18,876
127	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	2,287	2,287
128	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)	7,733	7,733
129	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	49,798	49,798
130	MOBILE SOLDIER POWER	43,639	43,639
132	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	13,118	13,118
133	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	28,278	28,278
135	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS	34,544	34,544
136	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (ENG SPT)	595	595
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT		
137	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	5,368	5,368
138	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	35,381	35,381
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		
139	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	73,828	73,828
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT		
140	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	25,270	25,270
141	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ)	2,760	2,760
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		
142	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)	5,903	5,903
143	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	26,125	26,125
146	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	27,156	27,156
147	ALL TERRAIN CRANES	16,750	16,750
148	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	984	984
149	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)	2,656	2,656
150	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP	2,531	2,531
151	FAMILY OF DIVER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	446	446
152	CONST EQUIP ESP	19,640	19,640
153	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	5,087	5,087
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT		
154	ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP	39,772	39,772
155	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	5,835	5,835
	GENERATORS		
156	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	166,356	166,356
157	TACTICAL ELECTRIC POWER RECAPITALIZATION	11,505	11,505
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
159	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	17,496	17,496
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
160	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	74,916	74,916
161	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	303,236	278,236
	Unjustified program growth		[-25,000]
162	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	45,210	45,210
163	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	30,068	30,068
164	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING	9,793	9,793
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)		
165	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	4,650	4,650
166	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	34,487	34,487
167	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	11,083	11,083
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
169	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	17,937	17,937
170	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	52,040	52,040
171	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT	1,568	1,568
172	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	64,219	64,219
173	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	1,525	1,525
174	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	3,268	3,268
176	TRACTOR YARD	7,191	7,191

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
	OPA2		
177	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	48,511	48,511
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	5,899,028	5,541,028
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT		
2	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	0	1,150,000
	Additional 12 aircraft, unfunded requirement		[1,150,000]
3	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	897,542	873,042
	Efficiencies and excess cost growth		[-24,500]
4	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV (AP)	48,630	48,630
5	JSF STOVL	1,483,414	2,508,314
	Efficiencies and excess cost growth		[-25,100]
	Additional 6 aircraft, unfunded requirement		[1,050,000]
6	JSF STOVL (AP)	203,060	203,060
7	CH-53K (HEAVY LIFT)	41,300	41,300
8	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	1,436,355	1,436,355
9	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) (AP)	43,853	43,853
10	H-1 UPGRADES (UH-1Y/AH-1Z)	800,057	800,057
11	H-1 UPGRADES (UH-1Y/AH-1Z) (AP)	56,168	56,168
12	MH-60S (MYP)	28,232	28,232
14	MH-60R (MYP)	969,991	969,991
16	P-8A POSEIDON	3,008,928	3,008,928
17	P-8A POSEIDON (AP)	269,568	269,568
18	E-2D ADV HAWKEYE	857,654	857,654
19	E-2D ADV HAWKEYE (AP)	195,336	195,336
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT		
20	JPATS	8,914	8,914
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
21	KC-130J	192,214	192,214
22	KC-130J (AP)	24,451	24,451
23	MQ-4 TRITON	494,259	494,259
24	MQ-4 TRITON (AP)	54,577	54,577
25	MQ-8 UAV	120,020	120,020
26	STUASLO UAV	3,450	3,450
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		
28	EA-6 SERIES	9,799	9,799
29	AEA SYSTEMS	23,151	23,151
30	AV-8 SERIES	41,890	45,190
	AV-8B Link 16 upgrades, unfunded requirement		[3,300]
31	ADVERSARY	5,816	5,816
32	F-18 SERIES	978,756	1,148,756
	Jamming protection upgrades, unfunded requirement		[170,000]
34	H-53 SERIES	46,887	46,887
35	SH-60 SERIES	107,728	107,728
36	H-1 SERIES	42,315	42,315
37	EP-3 SERIES	41,784	41,784
38	P-3 SERIES	3,067	3,067
39	E-2 SERIES	20,741	20,741
40	TRAINER A/C SERIES	27,980	27,980
41	C-2A	8,157	8,157
42	C-130 SERIES	70,335	70,335
43	FEWSG	633	633
44	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	8,916	8,916
45	E-6 SERIES	185,253	185,253
46	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	76,138	76,138
47	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	23,702	23,702
48	T-45 SERIES	105,439	105,439
49	POWER PLANT CHANGES	9,917	9,917
50	JPATS SERIES	13,537	13,537
51	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	131,732	131,732
52	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	202,745	202,745
53	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM	3,062	3,062
54	ID SYSTEMS	48,206	48,206
55	P-8 SERIES	28,492	28,492
56	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION	7,680	7,680
57	MQ-8 SERIES	22,464	22,464
58	RQ-7 SERIES	3,773	3,773
59	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	121,208	144,208
	MV-22 Integrated Aircraft Survivability		[15,000]
	MV-22 Ballistic Protection		[8,000]
60	F-35 STOVL SERIES	256,106	256,106
61	F-35 CV SERIES	68,527	68,527
62	QRC	6,885	6,885
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
63	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	1,563,515	1,563,515
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES		
64	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	450,959	450,959

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
65	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	24,010	24,010
66	WAR CONSUMABLES	42,012	42,012
67	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	2,455	2,455
68	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	50,859	50,859
69	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	1,801	1,801
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	16,126,405	18,473,105
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		
1	TRIDENT II MODS	1,099,064	1,099,064
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
2	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	7,748	7,748
	STRATEGIC MISSILES		
3	TOMAHAWK	184,814	214,814
	Combined with 47 FY15 OCO missiles, returns production to MSR		[30,000]
	TACTICAL MISSILES		
4	AMRAAM	192,873	207,873
	Additional captive air training missiles		[15,000]
5	SIDEWINDER	96,427	96,427
6	JSOW	21,419	21,419
7	STANDARD MISSILE	435,352	435,352
8	RAM	80,826	80,826
11	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	4,265	4,265
12	AERIAL TARGETS	40,792	40,792
13	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	3,335	3,335
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		
14	ESSM	44,440	44,440
15	ESSM (AP)	54,462	54,462
16	HARM MODS	122,298	122,298
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
17	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	2,397	2,397
18	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	39,932	39,932
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
19	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	57,641	61,309
	Classified Program		[3,668]
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP		
20	SSTD	7,380	7,380
21	MK-48 TORPEDO	65,611	65,611
22	ASW TARGETS	6,912	6,912
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP		
23	MK-54 TORPEDO MODS	113,219	113,219
24	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	63,317	63,317
25	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	13,254	13,254
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
26	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	67,701	67,701
27	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	3,699	3,699
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		
28	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	3,342	3,342
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS		
29	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	11,937	11,937
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS		
30	CIWS MODS	53,147	53,147
31	COAST GUARD WEAPONS	19,022	19,022
32	GUN MOUNT MODS	67,980	67,980
33	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS	19,823	19,823
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
35	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	149,725	149,725
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	3,154,154	3,202,822
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		
	NAVY AMMUNITION		
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	101,238	101,238
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	67,289	67,289
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	20,340	20,340
4	PRACTICE BOMBS	40,365	40,365
5	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	49,377	49,377
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	59,651	59,651
7	JATOS	2,806	2,806
8	LRLAP 6" LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE	11,596	11,596
9	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	35,994	35,994
10	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION	36,715	36,715
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	45,483	45,483
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	52,080	52,080
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	10,809	10,809
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	4,469	4,469
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION		
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	46,848	46,848

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	350	350
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES	500	500
18	60MM, ALL TYPES	1,849	1,849
19	81MM, ALL TYPES	1,000	1,000
20	120MM, ALL TYPES	13,867	13,867
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	1,390	1,390
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	14,967	14,967
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	45,219	45,219
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES	29,335	29,335
27	NON LETHALS	3,868	3,868
28	AMMO MODERNIZATION	15,117	15,117
29	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	11,219	11,219
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	723,741	723,741
	SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY		
	OTHER WARSHIPS		
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1,634,701	1,634,701
2	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM (AP)	874,658	874,658
3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	3,346,370	3,346,370
4	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE (AP)	1,993,740	2,793,740
	Accelerate shipbuilding funding		[800,000]
5	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	678,274	678,274
6	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP)	14,951	14,951
7	DDG 1000	433,404	433,404
8	DDG-51	3,149,703	3,549,703
	Incremental funding for one DDG-51		[400,000]
10	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	1,356,991	1,356,991
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS		
12	LPD-17	550,000	550,000
13	AFLOAT FORWARD STAGING BASE	0	97,000
	Accelerate shipbuilding funding		[97,000]
15	LHA REPLACEMENT	277,543	476,543
	Accelerate LHA-8 advanced procurement		[199,000]
XX	LX (R) AP	0	51,000
	Accelerate LX (R)		[51,000]
XXX	LCU Replacement	0	34,000
	Accelerate LCU replacement		[34,000]
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST		
17	TAO FLEET OILER	674,190	674,190
19	MOORED TRAINING SHIP (AP)	138,200	138,200
20	OUTFITTING	697,207	697,207
21	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR	255,630	255,630
22	SERVICE CRAFT	30,014	30,014
23	LCAC SLEP	80,738	80,738
24	YP CRAFT MAINTENANCE/ROH/SLEP	21,838	21,838
25	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	389,305	389,305
XX	T-ATS(X) Fleet Tug	0	75,000
	Accelerate T-ATS(X)		[75,000]
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY	16,597,457	18,253,457
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT		
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	4,881	4,881
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	5,814	5,814
3	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED)	32,906	32,906
	GENERATORS		
4	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E	36,860	36,860
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		
5	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	87,481	87,481
	PERISCOPES		
6	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	63,109	63,109
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		
7	DDG MOD	364,157	424,157
	Restore additional DDG BMD modernization (CNO UPL)		[60,000]
8	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	16,089	16,089
9	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	2,255	2,255
10	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE	28,571	28,571
11	LCC 19/20 EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE PROGRAM	12,313	12,313
12	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	16,609	16,609
13	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,498	10,498
14	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	35,747	35,747
15	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	48,399	48,399
16	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	23,072	23,072
17	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	55,283	55,283
18	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	18,563	18,563
19	DSSP EQUIPMENT	7,376	7,376
21	LCAC	20,965	20,965

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
22	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	51,652	51,652
23	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	102,498	102,498
24	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	3,027	3,027
25	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	7,399	7,399
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT		
27	REACTOR COMPONENTS	296,095	296,095
	OCEAN ENGINEERING		
28	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	15,982	15,982
	SMALL BOATS		
29	STANDARD BOATS	29,982	29,982
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
30	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	66,538	66,538
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		
31	OPERATING FORCES IPE	71,138	71,138
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT		
32	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	132,625	132,625
33	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT	23,500	23,500
34	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES	85,151	29,351
	Procurement in excess of need ahead of satisfactory testing		[-55,800]
35	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES	35,228	35,228
36	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	87,627	22,027
	Procurement in excess of need ahead of satisfactory testing		[-65,600]
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT		
37	LSD MIDLIFE	2,774	2,774
	SHIP SONARS		
38	SPQ-9B RADAR	20,551	20,551
39	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	103,241	103,241
40	SSN ACOUSTICS	214,835	234,835
	Towed Array-unfunded requirement		[20,000]
41	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,331	7,331
42	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	11,781	11,781
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
44	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	21,119	21,119
45	SSTD	8,396	8,396
46	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	146,968	146,968
47	SURTASS	12,953	12,953
48	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNAISSANCE FORCE	13,725	13,725
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT		
49	AN/SLQ-32	324,726	352,726
	SEWIP Block II unfunded requirement		[28,000]
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT		
50	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	148,221	148,221
51	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)	152	152
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		
52	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	79,954	79,954
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
53	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	25,695	25,695
54	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	284	284
55	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	14,416	14,416
56	ATDLS	23,069	23,069
57	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	4,054	4,054
58	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	21,014	21,014
59	SHALLOW WATER MCM	18,077	18,077
60	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	12,359	12,359
61	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE	4,240	4,240
62	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	17,440	17,440
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
63	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	41,314	41,314
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
64	MATCALs	10,011	10,011
65	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	9,346	9,346
66	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	21,281	21,281
67	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	25,621	25,621
68	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS	8,249	8,249
69	LANDING SYSTEMS	14,715	14,715
70	ID SYSTEMS	29,676	29,676
71	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	13,737	13,737
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
72	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND & CONTROL	1,314	1,314
74	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS	13,600	13,600
75	DCGS-N	31,809	31,809
76	CANES	278,991	278,991
77	RADIAC	8,294	8,294
78	CANES-INTELL	28,695	28,695
79	GPETE	6,962	6,962
80	MASF	290	290
81	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	14,419	14,419
82	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	4,175	4,175
83	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	44,176	44,176

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS		
84	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	8,722	8,722
85	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	108,477	108,477
86	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M	16,613	16,613
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS		
87	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT	20,691	20,691
88	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	60,945	60,945
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
89	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	30,892	30,892
90	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)	118,113	118,113
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		
91	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	4,591	4,591
92	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	1,403	1,403
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		
93	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	135,687	135,687
94	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM	970	970
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT		
95	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	11,433	11,433
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT		
96	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	2,529	2,529
	SONOBUOYS		
97	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES	168,763	168,763
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
98	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	46,979	46,979
100	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	123,884	123,884
103	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	15,090	15,090
104	DCRS/DPL	638	638
106	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	14,098	14,098
111	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	49,773	49,773
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT		
112	SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT	5,300	5,300
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		
115	SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	298,738	298,738
120	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	71,245	71,245
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
123	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	240,694	240,694
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
124	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	96,040	96,040
125	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	30,189	30,189
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
129	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	22,623	22,623
130	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	9,906	9,906
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE		
134	TRAINING DEVICE MODS	99,707	99,707
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
135	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	2,252	2,252
136	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	2,191	2,191
137	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	2,164	2,164
138	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	14,705	14,705
139	TACTICAL VEHICLES	2,497	2,497
140	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	12,517	12,517
141	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	3,018	3,018
142	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION	14,403	14,403
143	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	1,186	1,186
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
144	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	18,805	18,805
145	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,469	10,469
146	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	5,720	5,720
147	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	211,714	211,714
	TRAINING DEVICES		
148	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,468	7,468
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
149	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	36,433	36,433
150	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,180	3,180
151	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,790	4,790
153	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,608	4,608
154	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	5,655	5,655
155	C4ISR EQUIPMENT	9,929	9,929
156	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	26,795	26,795
157	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	88,453	88,453
159	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	99,094	99,094
	OTHER		
160	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE SERVICE	99,014	99,014
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
160A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	21,439	21,439
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
161	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	328,043	328,043
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	6,614,715	6,601,315

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		
1	AAV7A1 PIP	26,744	26,744
2	LAV PIP	54,879	54,879
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS		
3	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,652	2,652
4	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	7,482	7,482
5	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	17,181	17,181
6	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION	8,224	8,224
	OTHER SUPPORT		
7	MODIFICATION KITS	14,467	14,467
8	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	488	488
	GUIDED MISSILES		
9	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE	7,565	7,565
10	JAVELIN	1,091	1,091
11	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW	4,872	4,872
12	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)	668	668
	OTHER SUPPORT		
13	MODIFICATION KITS	12,495	152,495
	Additional missiles		[140,000]
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS		
14	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER	13,109	13,109
15	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (C	35,147	35,147
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		
16	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT	21,210	21,210
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)		
17	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	792	792
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)		
19	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	3,642	3,642
20	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	3,520	3,520
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
21	RADAR SYSTEMS	35,118	35,118
22	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	130,661	98,546
	Not meeting performance reqs reduce until technology is refined		[-32,115]
23	RQ-21 UAS	84,916	84,916
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
24	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	9,136	9,136
25	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	29,936	29,936
28	DCGS-MC	1,947	1,947
	OTHER COMMELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
31	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	2,018	2,018
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)		
32	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN)	67,295	67,295
33	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	43,101	43,101
34	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	29,255	29,255
35	RADIO SYSTEMS	80,584	80,584
36	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	66,123	66,123
37	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	79,486	79,486
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
37A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,803	2,803
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES		
38	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	3,538	3,538
39	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	22,806	22,806
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
41	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS	7,743	7,743
43	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	79,429	79,429
44	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS	3,157	3,157
	OTHER SUPPORT		
45	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	6,938	6,938
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		
46	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	94	94
47	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	896	896
48	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	136	136
49	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	10,792	10,792
50	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,235	3,235
51	EOD SYSTEMS	7,666	7,666
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
52	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	33,145	33,145
53	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)	1,419	1,419
	GENERAL PROPERTY		
57	TRAINING DEVICES	24,163	24,163
58	CONTAINER FAMILY	962	962
59	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	6,545	6,545
60	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)	7,533	7,533
	OTHER SUPPORT		
62	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	4,322	4,322
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
63	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	8,292	8,292

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	1,131,418	1,239,303
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	TACTICAL FORCES		
1	F-35	5,260,212	5,161,112
	Efficiencies and excess cost growth		[-99,100]
2	F-35 (AP)	460,260	460,260
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT		
3	KC-46A TANKER	2,350,601	2,326,601
	FY15 excess to need by \$24 million due to program delays		[-24,000]
	OTHER AIRLIFT		
4	C-130J	889,154	889,154
5	C-130J (AP)	50,000	50,000
6	HC-130J	463,934	463,934
7	HC-130J (AP)	30,000	30,000
8	MC-130J	828,472	828,472
9	MC-130J (AP)	60,000	60,000
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT		
11	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	2,617	2,617
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
12	TARGET DRONES	132,028	132,028
14	RQ-4	37,800	37,800
15	MQ-9	552,528	1,032,528
	Accelerating procurement schedule to meet CCDR demand		[480,000]
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT		
17	B-2A	32,458	32,458
18	B-1B	114,119	114,119
19	B-52	148,987	148,987
20	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES	84,335	84,335
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT		
22	F-15	464,367	713,671
	EPAWSS upgrade		[11,600]
	F-15C AESA radars		[48,000]
	F-15D AESA radars		[192,500]
	ADCP II upgrades		[10,000]
	F-15C MIDS JTRS transfer to RDT&E		[-6,387]
	F-15E MIDS JTRS transfer to RDT&E		[-6,409]
23	F-16	17,134	17,134
24	F-22A	126,152	126,152
25	F-35 MODIFICATIONS	70,167	70,167
26	INCREMENT 3.2B	69,325	69,325
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		
28	C-5	5,604	5,604
30	C-17A	46,997	46,997
31	C-21	10,162	10,162
32	C-32A	44,464	44,464
33	C-37A	10,861	10,861
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT		
34	GLIDER MODS	134	134
35	T-6	17,968	17,968
36	T-1	23,706	23,706
37	T-38	30,604	30,604
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
38	U-2 MODS	22,095	22,095
39	KC-10A (ATCA)	5,611	5,611
40	C-12	1,980	1,980
42	VC-25A MOD	98,231	98,231
43	C-40	13,171	13,171
44	C-130	7,048	130,248
	C-130H Electronic Prop Control System – UPL		[13,500]
	C-130H In-flight Prop Balancing System – UPL		[1,500]
	C-130H T-56 3.5 Engine Mods		[33,200]
	Funds added to comply with Sec 134, FY15 NDAA		[75,000]
45	C-130J MODS	29,713	29,713
46	C-135	49,043	49,043
47	COMPASS CALL MODS	68,415	97,115
	Modification for restored EC-130H		[28,700]
48	RC-135	156,165	156,165
49	E-3	13,178	13,178
50	E-4	23,937	23,937
51	E-8	18,001	18,001
52	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	183,308	183,308
53	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	44,163	44,163
54	H-1	6,291	6,291
55	UH-1N REPLACEMENT	2,456	2,456
56	H-60	45,731	45,731
57	RQ-4 MODS	50,022	50,022
58	HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS	21,660	21,660

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
59	OTHER AIRCRAFT	117,767	115,521
	C2ISR TDL transfer to COMSEC equipment		[-2,246]
60	MQ-1 MODS	3,173	3,173
61	MQ-9 MODS	115,226	115,226
63	CV-22 MODS	58,828	58,828
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
64	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	656,242	656,242
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
65	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP	33,716	33,716
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		
67	B-2A	38,837	38,837
68	B-52	5,911	5,911
69	C-17A	30,108	30,108
70	CV-22 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	3,353	3,353
71	C-135	4,490	4,490
72	F-15	3,225	3,225
73	F-16	14,969	14,969
74	F-22A	971	971
76	MQ-9	5,000	5,000
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		
77	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS	18,802	18,802
	WAR CONSUMABLES		
78	WAR CONSUMABLES	156,465	156,465
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		
79	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	1,052,814	1,111,900
	Transfer from RDT&E for NATO AWACS		[59,086]
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
79A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	42,503	42,503
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	15,657,769	16,472,713
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC		
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	94,040	94,040
	TACTICAL		
3	JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE	440,578	440,578
4	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	200,777	200,777
5	AMRAAM	390,112	390,112
6	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	423,016	423,016
7	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	133,697	133,697
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		
8	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS/POL PREVENTION	397	397
	CLASS IV		
9	MM III MODIFICATIONS	50,517	50,517
10	AGM-65D MAVERICK	9,639	9,639
11	AGM-88A HARM	197	197
12	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	25,019	25,019
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
14	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	48,523	48,523
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		
28	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	276,562	276,562
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
28A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	893,971	893,971
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	2,987,045	2,987,045
	SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	SPACE PROGRAMS		
1	ADVANCED EHF	333,366	333,366
2	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)	53,476	53,476
3	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	199,218	0
	GPS III SV10 early to need		[-199,218]
4	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	18,362	18,362
5	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	66,135	66,135
6	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	89,351	0
	Cut DMSP #20		[-89,351]
7	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH CAPABILITY	571,276	571,276
8	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	800,201	800,201
9	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	452,676	452,676
	TOTAL SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	2,584,061	2,295,492
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		
	ROCKETS		
1	ROCKETS	23,788	23,788
	CARTRIDGES		
2	CARTRIDGES	131,102	169,602
	Increase to match size of A-10 fleet		[38,500]
	BOMBS		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
3	PRACTICE BOMBS	89,759	89,759
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	637,181	637,181
5	MASSIVE ORDNANCE PENETRATOR (MOP)	39,690	39,690
6	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	374,688	374,688
	OTHER ITEMS		
7	CAD/PAD	58,266	58,266
8	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)	5,612	5,612
9	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	103	103
10	MODIFICATIONS	1,102	1,102
11	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	3,044	3,044
	FLARES		
12	FLARES	120,935	120,935
	FUZES		
13	FUZES	213,476	213,476
	SMALL ARMS		
14	SMALL ARMS	60,097	60,097
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	1,758,843	1,797,343
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		
1	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	8,834	8,834
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES		
2	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE	58,160	58,160
3	CAP VEHICLES	977	977
4	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	12,483	12,483
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES		
5	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES	4,728	4,728
6	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	4,662	4,662
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		
7	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES	10,419	10,419
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
8	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	23,320	23,320
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT		
9	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP	6,215	6,215
10	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	87,781	87,781
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)		
11	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	136,998	139,244
	Transfer for Link 16 upgrades		[2,246]
12	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	677	677
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS		
13	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	4,041	4,041
14	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT	22,573	22,573
15	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	14,456	14,456
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS		
16	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS	31,823	31,823
17	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	5,833	5,833
18	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED	1,687	1,687
19	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS	22,710	22,710
20	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	21,561	21,561
21	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	286,980	286,980
22	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	36,186	36,186
24	INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN & ANALY NETWORK (ISPAN)	9,597	9,597
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS		
25	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	27,403	27,403
26	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	7,212	7,212
27	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	11,062	30,962
	Additional battlefield air operations kits to meet need		[19,900]
28	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	131,269	131,269
29	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	33,606	33,606
30	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N	5,232	5,232
31	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	7,453	7,453
32	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM	3,976	3,976
33	GCSS-AF FOS	25,515	25,515
34	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE ACCOUNTING AND MGMT SYSTEM	9,255	9,255
35	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM	7,523	7,523
36	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS	12,043	12,043
37	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) 10.2	24,246	24,246
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS		
38	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS	74,621	74,621
39	AFNET	103,748	86,748
	Restructure program		[-17,000]
41	JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT ELEMENT (JCSE)	5,199	5,199
42	USCENTCOM	15,780	15,780
	SPACE PROGRAMS		
43	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	79,592	79,592
44	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	90,190	90,190
45	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	2,029	2,029
46	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	5,095	5,095

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
47	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	76,673	76,673
48	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	113,275	113,275
49	MILSATCOM SPACE	35,495	35,495
50	SPACE MODS SPACE	23,435	23,435
51	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	43,065	43,065
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		
52	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	77,538	113,538
	Increase JTAC training and rehearsal simulators per AF unfunded priority list		[36,000]
54	RADIO EQUIPMENT	8,400	8,400
55	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	6,144	6,144
56	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	77,010	77,010
	MODIFICATIONS		
57	COMM ELECT MODS	71,800	71,800
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP		
58	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	2,370	2,370
59	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	79,623	79,623
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ		
60	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	7,249	7,249
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
61	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	9,095	9,095
62	ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT	17,866	17,866
64	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	61,850	61,850
65	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	30,477	30,477
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		
67	DARP RC135	25,072	25,072
68	DCGS-AF	183,021	183,021
70	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	629,371	629,371
71	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	100,663	100,663
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
71A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	15,038,333	15,038,333
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
73	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	59,863	59,863
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	18,272,438	18,313,584
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA		
1	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	1,488	1,488
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA		
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	2,494	2,494
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA		
3	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	9,341	9,341
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA		
7	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	8,080	18,080
	Sharkseer increase		[10,000]
8	TELEPORT PROGRAM	62,789	62,789
9	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	9,399	9,399
10	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	1,819	1,819
11	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK	141,298	141,298
12	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	12,732	12,732
13	WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY	64,098	64,098
14	SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE	617,910	617,910
15	JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT	84,400	84,400
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA		
16	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	5,644	5,644
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT		
17	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	11,208	11,208
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA		
18	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS	1,298	1,298
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS		
20	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	1,048	1,048
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY		
21	VEHICLES	100	100
22	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	5,474	5,474
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY		
23	THAAD	464,067	464,067
24	AEGIS BMD	558,916	706,681
	Increase SM-3 Block IB purchase		[117,880]
	Increase SM-3 Block IB canisters		[2,565]
	Undifferentiated Block IB test and evaluation costs		[27,320]
25	AEGIS BMD (AP)	147,765	0
	Early to need		[-147,765]
26	BMDS AN/TPY-2 RADARS	78,634	78,634
27	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III	30,587	30,587
28	IRON DOME	55,000	41,100
	Request excess of requirement		[-13,900]
XX	DAVIDS SLING	0	150,000
	Increase for David's Sling co-production		[150,000]
XXX	ARROW 3	0	15,000

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
	Increase for Arrow 3 co-production		[15,000]
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA		
35	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	37,177	37,177
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		
36	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	46,939	46,939
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		
38	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	13,027	13,027
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		
40	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	27,859	27,859
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
40A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	617,757	617,757
	AVIATION PROGRAMS		
41	MC-12	63,170	0
	SOCOM requested realignment		[-63,170]
42	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT	135,985	135,985
44	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	61,275	61,275
45	U-28	0	63,170
	SOCOM requested realignment		[63,170]
47	RQ-11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	20,087	20,087
48	CV-22 MODIFICATION	18,832	18,832
49	MQ-1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	1,934	1,934
50	MQ-9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	11,726	21,726
	MQ-9 capability enhancements		[10,000]
51	STUASLO	1,514	1,514
52	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE	204,105	204,105
53	AC/MC-130J	61,368	61,368
54	C-130 MODIFICATIONS	66,861	31,412
	C-130 TF/TA adjustments		[-35,449]
	SHIPBUILDING		
55	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	32,521	32,521
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS		
56	ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M	174,734	174,734
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS		
57	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	93,009	93,009
58	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	14,964	14,964
59	OTHER ITEMS <\$5M	79,149	79,149
60	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	33,362	33,362
61	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	143,533	143,533
62	TACTICAL VEHICLES	73,520	73,520
63	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M	186,009	186,009
64	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	19,693	19,693
65	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,967	3,967
66	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	19,225	19,225
68	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	213,252	213,252
	CBDP		
74	CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS	141,223	141,223
75	CB PROTECTION & HAZARD MITIGATION	137,487	137,487
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
XX	USCC CYBER CAPABILITIES	0	75,000
	Cyber capabilities		[75,000]
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	5,130,853	5,341,504
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		
1	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND	99,701	99,701
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND	99,701	99,701
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	106,967,393	111,847,577

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CON-
TINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	FIXED WING		
3	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	99,500	99,500
4	MQ-1 UAV	16,537	16,537
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		
16	MQ-1 PAYLOAD (MIP)	8,700	8,700
23	ARL SEMA MODS (MIP)	32,000	32,000
31	RQ-7 UAV MODS	8,250	8,250

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	164,987	164,987
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM		
3	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	37,260	37,260
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	37,260	37,260
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		
16	MORTAR SYSTEMS	7,030	7,030
21	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	19,000	19,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	26,030	26,030
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION		
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	4,000	4,000
	MORTAR AMMUNITION		
8	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	11,700	11,700
9	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	4,000	4,000
10	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	7,000	7,000
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION		
12	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES	5,000	5,000
13	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	10,000	10,000
15	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	2,000	2,000
	ROCKETS		
17	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	136,340	136,340
	OTHER AMMUNITION		
19	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	4,000	4,000
21	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	8,000	8,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	192,040	192,040
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	243,998	243,998
9	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	223,276	223,276
11	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	130,000	130,000
12	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS	393,100	393,100
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
21	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS	5,724	5,724
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS		
51	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM	29,500	29,500
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)		
57	DCGS-A (MIP)	54,140	54,140
59	TROJAN (MIP)	6,542	6,542
61	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTNG AND COLL(CHARCS)	3,860	3,860
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)		
68	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE	14,847	14,847
69	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	19,535	19,535
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)		
84	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32	2,601	2,601
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS		
87	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	48	48
94	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	252	252
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION		
101	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	652	652
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT		
111	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	4,035	4,035
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
131	FORCE PROVIDER	53,800	53,800
133	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	700	700
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
159	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	10,486	10,486
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
169	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	8,500	8,500
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,205,596	1,205,596
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		
	FORCE TRAINING		
3	TRAIN THE FORCE	7,850	7,850
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT		
2	DEFEAT THE DEVICE	77,600	77,600
	NETWORK ATTACK		
1	ATTACK THE NETWORK	219,550	215,086
	Adjustment due to low execution in prior years		[-4,464]

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE		
4	OPERATIONS	188,271	144,464
	Maintain prior year funding level		[-43,807]
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND	493,271	445,000
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
26	STUASLO UAV	55,000	55,000
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		
30	AV-8 SERIES	41,365	41,365
32	F-18 SERIES	8,000	8,000
37	EP-3 SERIES	6,300	6,300
47	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	14,198	14,198
51	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	72,700	72,700
52	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	13,988	13,988
59	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	4,900	4,900
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES		
65	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	943	943
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	217,394	217,394
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	TACTICAL MISSILES		
10	LASER MAVERICK	3,344	3,344
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	3,344	3,344
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		
	NAVY AMMUNITION		
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	9,715	9,715
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	11,108	11,108
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	3,603	3,603
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	11,982	11,982
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	4,674	4,674
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	3,456	3,456
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	1,989	1,989
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	4,674	4,674
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION		
20	120MM, ALL TYPES	10,719	10,719
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	3,993	3,993
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	67,200	67,200
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES	3,299	3,299
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	518	518
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	136,930	136,930
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
135	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	186	186
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
160A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	12,000	12,000
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	12,186	12,186
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
	GUIDED MISSILES		
10	JAVELIN	7,679	7,679
	OTHER SUPPORT		
13	MODIFICATION KITS	10,311	10,311
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS		
14	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER	8,221	8,221
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)		
18	MODIFICATION KITS	3,600	3,600
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)		
19	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	8,693	8,693
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
27	RQ-11 UAV	3,430	3,430
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
52	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	7,000	7,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	48,934	48,934
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
15	MQ-9	13,500	13,500
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
44	C-130	1,410	1,410
56	H-60	39,300	39,300

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
58	HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS	5,690	5,690
61	MQ-9 MODS	69,000	69,000
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	128,900	128,900
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	TACTICAL		
6	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	280,902	280,902
7	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	2,520	2,520
	CLASS IV		
10	AGM-65D MAVERICK	5,720	5,720
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	289,142	289,142
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		
	CARTRIDGES		
2	CARTRIDGES	8,371	8,371
	BOMBS		
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	17,031	17,031
6	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	184,412	184,412
	FLARES		
12	FLARES	11,064	11,064
	FUZES		
13	FUZES	7,996	7,996
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	228,874	228,874
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS		
25	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	3,953	3,953
27	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	2,000	2,000
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS		
42	USCENTCOM	10,000	10,000
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		
52	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	4,065	4,065
56	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	15,400	15,400
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP		
58	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	3,580	3,580
59	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	3,407	3,407
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
62	ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT	46,790	46,790
64	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	400	400
65	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	9,800	9,800
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		
71	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	28,070	28,070
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
71A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,732,499	3,732,499
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	3,859,964	3,859,964
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA		
8	TELEPORT PROGRAM	1,940	1,940
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
40A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	35,482	35,482
	AVIATION PROGRAMS		
41	MC-12	5,000	5,000
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS		
56	ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M	35,299	35,299
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS		
61	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	15,160	15,160
63	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M	15,000	15,000
68	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	104,537	104,537
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	212,418	212,418
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	7,257,270	7,208,999

**TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT,
TEST, AND EVALUATION**

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION.**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY				
BASIC RESEARCH				
1	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	13,018	13,018
2	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	239,118	279,118
		Basic research program increase		[40,000]
3	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	72,603	72,603
4	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	100,340	100,340
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	425,079	465,079
APPLIED RESEARCH				
5	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	28,314	28,314
6	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	38,374	38,374
7	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	6,879	6,879
8	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	56,884	56,884
9	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	19,243	19,243
10	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	45,053	45,053
11	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	29,428	29,428
12	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	27,862	27,862
13	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	68,839	68,839
14	0602618A	BALLISTIAG TECHNOLOGY	92,801	92,801
15	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,866	3,866
16	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,487	5,487
17	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	48,340	48,340
18	0602705A	ELECTRONIAG AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	55,301	55,301
19	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	33,807	33,807
20	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	25,068	25,068
21	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	23,681	23,681
22	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	20,850	20,850
23	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	36,160	36,160
24	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	12,656	12,656
25	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	63,409	63,409
26	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	24,735	24,735
27	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	35,795	35,795
28	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	76,853	76,853
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	879,685	879,685
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
29	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	46,973	46,973
30	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	69,584	69,584
31	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	89,736	89,736
32	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,663	57,663
33	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	113,071	113,071
34	0603006A	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	5,554	5,554
35	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	12,636	12,636
37	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	7,502	7,502
38	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	17,425	17,425
39	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	11,912	11,912
40	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	27,520	27,520
41	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	2,381	2,381
42	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,431	2,431
43	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	26,874	26,874
44	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	49,449	49,449
45	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	10,999	10,999
46	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	177,159	167,159
		Encourage use of commercial technology		[-10,000]
47	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,993	13,993
48	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,105	5,105
49	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	40,929	40,929
50	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	10,727	10,727
51	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,145	20,145
52	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	38,163	38,163
53	0603794A	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,816	37,816
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	895,747	885,747
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES				
54	0603305A	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	10,347	10,347
55	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	25,061	25,061
56	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV	49,636	49,636
57	0603627A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	13,426	13,426
58	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	46,749	46,749
60	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	6,258	6,258
61	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	13,472	13,472
62	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	7,292	7,292
63	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	8,813	8,813
65	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	6,075	6,075
67	0603804A	LOGISTIAG AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	21,233	21,233
68	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	31,962	31,962
69	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	22,194	22,194
71	0604100A	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	9,805	9,805

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
72	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	40,917	40,917
73	0604120A	ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT)	30,058	30,058
74	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2—INTERCEPT (IFPC2)	155,361	155,361
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	498,659	498,659
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
76	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONIAG	12,939	12,939
78	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	18,843	18,843
79	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	9,861	9,861
80	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVr)	8,763	8,763
81	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	4,309	4,309
82	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	15,138	15,138
83	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	74,128	76,628
		Transfer from WTCV		[2,500]
85	0604611A	JAVELIN	3,945	3,945
87	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	10,076	10,076
88	0604641A	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	40,374	40,374
89	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	67,582	67,582
90	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	1,763	1,763
91	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	27,155	27,155
92	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	24,569	24,569
93	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	23,364	23,364
94	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	8,960	8,960
95	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	9,138	9,138
96	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	21,622	21,622
97	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	99,242	99,242
98	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	21,379	21,379
99	0604804A	LOGISTIAG AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	48,339	48,339
100	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	2,726	2,726
101	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	45,412	45,412
102	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	55,215	55,215
104	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	163,643	163,643
105	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	12,309	12,309
106	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBs)	15,700	15,700
107	0604823A	FIREFINDER	6,243	6,243
108	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	18,776	18,776
109	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	1,953	1,953
110	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	67,358	67,358
111	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	136,011	86,011
		Restructure program		[-50,000]
112	0605028A	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV)	230,210	230,210
113	0605030A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	13,357	13,357
114	0605031A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN)	18,055	18,055
115	0605032A	TRACTOR TIRE	5,677	5,677
116	0605035A	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM)	77,570	101,570
		Army UPL for AH-64 ASE development		[24,000]
117	0605051A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT	18,112	78,112
		Army UPL for AH-64 ASE development		[60,000]
118	0605350A	WIN-T INCREMENT 3—FULL NETWORKING	39,700	39,700
119	0605380A	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)	12,987	6,155
		Only for SALT program		[-6,832]
120	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	88,866	88,866
121	0605456A	PAC-3/MSE MISSILE	2,272	2,272
122	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	214,099	214,099
123	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	49,247	49,247
124	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	2	2
125	0605766A	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP)	10,599	10,599
126	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	32,486	32,486
127	0605830A	AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	8,880	8,880
128	0210609A	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	152,288	152,288
129	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	5,022	5,022
130	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	12,686	12,686
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	2,068,950	2,098,618
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
131	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	20,035	20,035
132	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,684	16,684
133	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	62,580	62,580
134	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,853	20,853
135	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	205,145	205,145
136	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	19,430	19,430
138	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	277,646	277,646
139	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	51,550	51,550
140	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	33,246	33,246
141	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	4,760	4,760
142	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	8,303	8,303
143	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	20,403	20,403
144	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	10,396	10,396

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
145	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	49,337	49,337
146	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	52,694	52,694
147	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	938	938
148	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	60,319	60,319
149	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	28,478	28,478
150	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	32,604	24,604
		Under execution of prior year funds		[-8,000]
151	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	3,186	3,186
152	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	48,955	48,955
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	1,027,542	1,019,542
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
154	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	18,397	18,397
155	0603813A	TRACTOR PULL	9,461	9,461
156	0607131A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	4,945	4,945
157	0607133A	TRACTOR SMOKE	7,569	7,569
158	0607135A	APACHE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	69,862	69,862
159	0607136A	BLACKHAWK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	66,653	66,653
160	0607137A	CHINOOK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	37,407	37,407
161	0607138A	FIXED WING PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,151	1,151
162	0607139A	IMPROVED TURBINE ENGINE PROGRAM	51,164	51,164
163	0607140A	EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES FROM NIE	2,481	2,481
164	0607141A	LOGISTIAG AUTOMATION	1,673	1,673
166	0607665A	FAMILY OF BIOMETRIAG	13,237	13,237
167	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	105,816	105,816
169	0202429A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT—COCOM EXERCISE	40,565	40,565
171	0203728A	JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM (JADOAG)	35,719	35,719
172	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	257,167	297,167
		Stryker modification and improvement		[40,000]
173	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	15,445	15,445
175	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	364	364
176	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	4,361	4,361
177	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	3,154	3,154
178	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	35,951	35,951
179	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	34,686	34,686
180	0205402A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV	10,750	10,750
181	0205410A	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	402	402
183	0205456A	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM	64,159	64,159
184	0205778A	GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS)	17,527	17,527
185	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	20,515	20,515
187	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	12,368	12,368
188	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	31,154	31,154
189	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	12,274	12,274
190	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	9,355	9,355
191	0303150A	WWMCA/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	7,053	7,053
193	0305179A	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	750	750
194	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	13,225	13,225
195	0305206A	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	22,870	22,870
196	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	25,592	25,592
199	0305233A	RQ-7 UAV	7,297	7,297
201	0310349A	WIN-T INCREMENT 2—INITIAL NETWORKING	3,800	3,800
202	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	48,442	48,442
	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,536	4,536
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,129,297	1,169,297
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	6,924,959	7,016,627
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
1	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	116,196	116,196
2	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	19,126	19,126
3	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	451,606	506,606
		Basic research program increase		[55,000]
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	586,928	641,928
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
4	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	68,723	68,723
5	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	154,963	154,963
6	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	49,001	49,001
7	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	42,551	42,551
8	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	45,056	45,056
9	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	115,051	115,051
10	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	42,252	42,252
11	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,119	6,119
12	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	123,750	142,350
		Accelerate undersea warfare research		[18,600]
13	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	179,686	179,686
14	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	37,418	37,418
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	864,570	883,170

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
15	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,093	37,093
16	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	38,044	38,044
17	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	34,899	34,899
18	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	137,562	137,562
19	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,745	12,745
20	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	258,860	248,860
		Capable manpower, enablers, and sea basing		[-10,000]
21	0603680N	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	57,074	57,074
22	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,807	4,807
23	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,748	13,748
24	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	66,041	66,041
25	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	1,991	1,991
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	662,864	652,864
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES				
26	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	41,832	41,832
27	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	5,404	5,404
28	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	3,086	3,086
29	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	11,643	11,643
30	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	5,555	5,555
31	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	3,087	3,087
32	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,636	1,636
33	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	118,588	118,588
34	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	77,385	77,385
35	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,348	8,348
36	0603525N	PILOT FISH	123,246	123,246
37	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	28,819	28,819
38	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	112,678	112,678
39	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	710	710
40	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	1,096	1,096
41	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	87,160	98,160
		Accelerate unmanned underwater vehicle development		[11,000]
42	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	10,371	10,371
43	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	11,888	11,888
44	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	4,332	4,332
45	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	482,040	482,040
46	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	25,904	25,904
47	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	511,802	511,802
48	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LAG)	118,416	118,416
49	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	35,901	35,901
50	0603595N	OHIO REPLACEMENT	971,393	971,393
51	0603596N	LAG MISSION MODULES	206,149	206,149
52	0603597N	AUTOMATED TEST AND RE-TEST (ATRT)	8,000	8,000
53	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	7,678	7,678
54	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	219,082	219,082
55	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	623	623
56	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	18,260	18,260
57	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	76,247	76,247
58	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,520	4,520
59	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	20,711	20,711
60	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	47,761	47,761
61	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	5,226	5,226
62	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	182,771	182,771
63	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	3,866	3,866
64	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	360,065	360,065
65	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	237,416	237,416
66	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	37,944	37,944
67	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	47,312	47,312
68	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	17,408	17,408
69	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,359	9,359
70	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	887	887
71	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	29,448	29,448
72	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	91,479	91,479
73	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS	67,360	67,360
74	0604112N	GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN 78—80)	48,105	127,205
		Full ship shock trials for CVN-78		[79,100]
75	0604122N	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	20,089	20,089
76	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	18,969	18,969
77	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	7,874	7,874
78	0604292N	MH-XX	5,298	5,298
79	0604454N	LX (R)	46,486	75,486
		Accelerate LX (R)		[29,000]
80	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	3,817	3,817
81	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	9,595	9,595
82	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	29,581	29,581
83	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	285,849	285,849
84	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	36,656	36,656

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
85	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	9,835	9,835
86	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	580	580
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	5,024,626	5,143,726
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
87	0603208N	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	21,708	21,708
88	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	11,101	11,101
89	0604214N	AV-8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	39,878	39,878
90	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	53,059	53,059
91	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	21,358	21,358
92	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	4,515	4,515
93	0604221N	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,514	1,514
94	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	5,875	5,875
95	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	81,553	81,553
96	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	272,149	272,149
97	0604245N	H-1 UPGRADES	27,235	27,235
98	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	35,763	35,763
99	0604262N	V-22A	87,918	87,918
100	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	12,679	12,679
101	0604269N	EA-18	56,921	56,921
102	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	23,685	23,685
103	0604273N	EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	507,093	507,093
104	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	411,767	411,767
105	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	25,071	25,071
106	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	443,433	443,433
107	0604311N	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	747	747
108	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	97,002	97,002
109	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	129,649	129,649
110	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	11,647	11,647
111	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION	2,778	2,778
112	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	23,695	23,695
113	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM	134,708	0
		Excess FY15 funds buy down FY16 requirements		[-134,708]
114	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	43,914	43,914
115	0604503N	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	109,908	109,908
116	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	57,928	57,928
117	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	120,217	120,217
118	0604522N	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM	241,754	241,754
119	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	122,556	122,556
120	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	48,213	60,213
		Accelerate submarine combat and weapon system modernization		[12,000]
121	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	49,712	49,712
122	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	4,096	4,096
123	0604580N	VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM)	167,719	167,719
124	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	15,122	15,122
125	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	33,738	33,738
126	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,123	8,123
127	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	7,686	7,686
128	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	405	405
129	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	153,836	153,836
130	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	99,619	99,619
131	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	116,798	116,798
132	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	4,353	4,353
133	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	9,443	9,443
134	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	32,469	32,469
135	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	537,901	525,401
		F-35B Block 4 development early to need		[-12,500]
136	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	504,736	492,236
		F-35C Block 4 development early to need		[-12,500]
137	0604810M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT—MARINE CORPS	59,265	59,265
138	0604810N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT—NAVY	47,579	47,579
139	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	5,914	5,914
140	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	89,711	89,711
141	0605212N	CH-53K RDTE	632,092	632,092
142	0605220N	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC)	7,778	7,778
143	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	25,898	25,898
144	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	247,929	247,929
145	0204202N	DDG-1000	103,199	103,199
146	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	998	998
147	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	17,785	17,785
148	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	35,905	35,905
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	6,308,800	6,161,092
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
149	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	30,769	30,769
150	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	112,606	112,606
151	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	61,234	61,234
152	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	6,995	6,995

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
153	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	4,011	4,011
154	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	48,563	48,563
155	0605285N	NEXT GENERATION FIGHTER	5,000	5,000
157	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	925	925
158	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	78,143	78,143
159	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,258	3,258
160	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	76,948	76,948
161	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	132,122	132,122
162	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	351,912	351,912
163	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	17,985	17,985
164	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	5,316	5,316
165	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	6,519	6,519
166	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	13,649	13,649
		SUBTOTAL, MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	955,955	955,955
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
174	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	107,039	107,039
175	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	46,506	46,506
176	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	3,900	4,700
		Accelerate combat rapid attack weapon		[800]
177	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	16,569	16,569
178	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	18,632	18,632
179	0204136N	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	133,265	133,265
181	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	62,867	62,867
182	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	36,045	36,045
183	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	25,228	25,228
184	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	54,218	54,218
185	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	11,335	11,335
186	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	80,129	80,129
187	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	39,087	39,087
188	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,915	1,915
189	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	46,609	46,609
190	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	52,708	52,708
191	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	149,997	149,997
192	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	24,460	24,460
193	0205632N	MK-48 ADCAP	42,206	47,706
		Accelerate torpedo upgrades		[5,500]
194	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	117,759	117,759
195	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	101,323	101,323
196	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	67,763	67,763
197	0206335M	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (CAC2S)	13,431	13,431
198	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	56,769	56,769
199	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	20,729	20,729
200	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	13,152	13,152
201	0206629M	AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT VEHICLE	48,535	48,535
202	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	76,016	76,016
203	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	32,172	32,172
208	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	53,239	53,239
209	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	21,677	21,677
210	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	28,102	28,102
211	0303150M	WWMCA/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	294	294
213	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	599	599
214	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	6,207	6,207
215	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	8,550	8,550
216	0305205N	UAS INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	41,831	41,831
217	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	1,105	1,105
218	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	33,149	33,149
219	0305220N	RQ-4 UAV	227,188	227,188
220	0305231N	MQ-8 UAV	52,770	52,770
221	0305232M	RQ-11 UAV	635	635
222	0305233N	RQ-7 UAV	688	688
223	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASLO)	4,647	4,647
224	0305239M	RQ-21A	6,435	6,435
225	0305241N	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	49,145	49,145
226	0305242M	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP)	9,246	9,246
227	0305421N	RQ-4 MODERNIZATION	150,854	150,854
228	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	4,757	4,757
229	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	24,185	24,185
231	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	4,321	4,321
231A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,252,185	1,252,185
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,482,173	3,488,473
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	17,885,916	17,927,208
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
1	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	329,721	374,721
		Basic research program increase		[45,000]
2	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	141,754	141,754

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
3	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,778	13,778
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	485,253	530,253
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
4	0602102F	MATERIALS	125,234	115,234
		Nanostructured and biological materials		[-10,000]
5	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	123,438	123,438
6	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	100,530	100,530
7	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	182,326	182,326
8	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	147,291	147,291
9	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	116,122	116,122
10	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	99,851	99,851
11	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	115,604	115,604
12	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	164,909	164,909
13	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	42,037	42,037
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	1,217,342	1,207,342
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
14	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	37,665	37,665
15	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	18,378	18,378
16	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	42,183	42,183
17	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	100,733	100,733
18	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	168,821	168,821
19	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	47,032	47,032
20	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	54,897	54,897
21	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	12,853	12,853
22	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	25,448	25,448
23	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	48,536	48,536
24	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	30,195	30,195
25	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	42,630	42,630
26	0603788F	BATTLESACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	46,414	46,414
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	675,785	675,785
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		
27	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,032	5,032
29	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	4,070	4,070
30	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	21,790	21,790
31	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,736	4,736
33	0603830F	SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM	30,771	30,771
34	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	39,765	39,765
36	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE	1,246,228	786,228
		Delayed EMD contract award		[-460,000]
37	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	3,512	3,512
38	0604327F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	54,637	54,637
40	0604422F	WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON	76,108	76,108
44	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	6,457	19,957
		Increase to match previous year funding level		[13,500]
45	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	246,514	246,514
46	0605230F	GROUND BASED STRATEGIC DETERRENT	75,166	75,166
49	0207110F	NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE	8,830	8,830
50	0207455F	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR)	14,939	14,939
51	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	142,288	142,288
52	0306250F	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	81,732	96,732
		Increase USCC Cyber Operations Technology Development		[15,000]
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	2,062,575	1,631,075
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
55	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	929	929
56	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	60,256	60,256
57	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	5,973	5,973
58	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	32,624	32,624
59	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	24,208	24,208
60	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	32,374	32,374
61	0604426F	SPACE FENCE	243,909	243,909
62	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	8,358	8,358
63	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	292,235	292,235
64	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	40,154	40,154
65	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,506	2,506
66	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	57,678	57,678
67	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	8,187	8,187
68	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	15,795	15,795
69	0604800F	F-35—EMD	589,441	564,441
		F-35A Block 4 development early to need		[-25,000]
71	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD	84,438	84,438
72	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	36,643	36,643
73	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	142,551	142,551
74	0605213F	F-22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	140,640	140,640
75	0605214F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	3,598	3,598
76	0605221F	KC-46	602,364	402,364

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
		<i>Schedule delay and availability of unobligated prior year funds</i>		[−200,000]
77	0605223F	ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING	11,395	11,395
78	0605229F	AGAR HH-60 RECAPITALIZATION	156,085	156,085
80	0605431F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	228,230	228,230
81	0605432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	72,084	72,084
82	0605433F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE)	56,343	56,343
83	0605458F	AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2 RDT&E	47,629	47,629
84	0605931F	B-2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	271,961	271,961
85	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	212,121	212,121
86	0207171F	F-15 EPAWSS	186,481	215,981
		NRE for ADCPII upgrade		[28,000]
		Flight test support		[1,500]
87	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	18,082	18,082
88	0305176F	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	993	993
89	0307581F	NEXTGEN JSTARS	44,343	44,343
91	0401319F	PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT (PAR)	102,620	102,620
92	0701212F	AUTOMATED TEST SYSTEMS	14,563	14,563
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	3,847,791	3,652,291
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
93	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	23,844	23,844
94	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	68,302	68,302
95	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	34,918	34,918
97	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	10,476	10,476
98	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	673,908	673,908
99	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	21,858	21,858
100	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	28,228	28,228
101	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	40,518	40,518
102	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,895	27,895
103	0606017F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	16,507	16,507
104	0606116F	SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT	18,997	18,997
106	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	185,305	185,305
107	0308602F	ENTEPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS)	4,841	4,841
108	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	15,357	15,357
109	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,315	1,315
111	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	2,315	2,315
		SUBTOTAL, MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	1,174,584	1,174,584
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
112	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	350,232	350,232
113	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	10,465	10,465
114	0604445F	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	24,577	24,577
117	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	69,694	24,294
		Restructure program		[−45,400]
118	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	26,718	26,718
119	0605278F	HC/MC-130 RECAP RDT&E	10,807	10,807
121	0101113F	B-52 SQUADRONS	74,520	74,520
122	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	451	451
123	0101126F	B-1B SQUADRONS	2,245	2,245
124	0101127F	B-2 SQUADRONS	108,183	108,183
125	0101213F	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS	178,929	178,929
126	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	28,481	28,481
127	0101314F	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM	87	87
128	0101316F	WORLDWIDE JOINT STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	5,315	5,315
131	0105921F	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES	8,090	8,090
132	0205219F	MQ-9 UAV	123,439	123,439
134	0207131F	A-10 SQUADRONS	0	16,200
		Sustain avionics software development		[16,200]
135	0207133F	F-16 SQUADRONS	148,297	148,297
136	0207134F	F-15E SQUADRONS	179,283	192,079
		Transfer from procurement		[12,796]
137	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,860	14,860
138	0207138F	F-22A SQUADRONS	262,552	262,552
139	0207142F	F-35 SQUADRONS	115,395	115,395
140	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	43,360	43,360
141	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	46,160	46,160
143	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	412	412
144	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	657	657
145	0207247F	AF TENCAP	31,428	31,428
146	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	1,105	1,105
147	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	14,249	14,249
148	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	103,942	103,942
149	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	12,793	12,793
150	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	21,193	21,193
151	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	559	559
152	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWAAG)	161,812	161,812
153	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	6,001	6,001
155	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	7,793	7,793
156	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	12,465	12,465

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
157	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,681	1,681
159	0207452F	DCAPES	16,796	16,796
161	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	21,564	21,564
162	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	24,994	24,994
163	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	6,035	6,035
164	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	4,358	4,358
165	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	55,835	55,835
167	0208087F	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	12,874	12,874
168	0208088F	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	7,681	7,681
171	0301017F	GLOBAL SENSOR INTEGRATED ON NETWORK (GSIN)	5,974	5,974
177	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	13,815	13,815
178	0302015F	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	80,360	80,360
179	0303001F	FAMILY OF ADVANCED BLOS TERMINALS (FAB-T)	3,907	3,907
180	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	75,062	75,062
181	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	46,599	46,599
183	0303142F	GLOBAL FORCE MANAGEMENT—DATA INITIATIVE	2,470	2,470
186	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	112,775	112,775
189	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,235	4,235
192	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	7,879	7,879
193	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	29,955	29,955
194	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	21,485	21,485
195	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	2,515	2,515
198	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	472	472
199	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	12,137	12,137
200	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	361	361
203	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,162	3,162
204	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,543	1,543
205	0305179F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	7,860	7,860
206	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	6,902	6,902
207	0305202F	DRAGON U-2	34,471	34,471
209	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	50,154	50,154
210	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,245	13,245
211	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	22,784	22,784
212	0305219F	MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV	716	716
213	0305220F	RQ-4 UAV	208,053	208,053
214	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	21,587	21,587
215	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK EXECUTIVE AGENT (CDL EA)	43,986	43,986
216	0305238F	NATO AGS	197,486	138,400
		Transfer from procurement for NATO AWACS		[?59,086]
217	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	28,434	28,434
218	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	180,902	180,902
220	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	81,911	81,911
221	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	3,149	3,149
222	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	14,447	14,447
223	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	20,077	20,077
225	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	853	853
226	0401115F	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	33,962	33,962
227	0401119F	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	42,864	42,864
228	0401130F	C-17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	54,807	54,807
229	0401132F	C-130J PROGRAM	31,010	31,010
230	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	6,802	6,802
231	0401219F	KC-10S	1,799	1,799
232	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	48,453	48,453
233	0401318F	CV-22	36,576	36,576
235	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTIAG / COMBAT CONTROL	7,963	7,963
236	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,525	1,525
237	0708610F	LOGISTIAG INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	112,676	81,676
		Program growth		[-31,000]
238	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	12,657	12,657
239	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	1,836	1,836
240	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	121	121
241	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	5,911	5,911
242	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	3,604	3,604
243	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	4,598	4,598
244	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	1,103	1,103
246	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	101,840	101,840
246A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	12,780,142	12,945,142
		Three program increases		[165,000]
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,010,339	17,068,849
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	26,473,669	25,940,179
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
1	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	38,436	38,436
2	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	333,119	333,119
3	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	42,022	42,022
4	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	56,544	56,544
5	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	49,453	49,453

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
6	0601228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS	25,834	25,834
7	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	46,261	46,261
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	591,669	591,669
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
8	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	19,352	19,352
9	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	114,262	114,262
10	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,026	51,026
11	0602251D8Z	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES	48,226	33,226
		General program decrease		[−15,000]
12	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	356,358	356,358
14	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	29,265	29,265
15	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	208,111	208,111
16	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	13,727	13,727
18	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	314,582	309,582
		Multi-azimuth defense fast intercept round engagement system		[−5,000]
19	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	220,115	210,115
		Decrease in program growth		[−10,000]
20	0602716E	ELECTRONIAG TECHNOLOGY	174,798	174,798
21	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	155,415	155,415
22	0602751D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH	8,824	8,824
23	1160401BB	SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	37,517	37,517
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	1,751,578	1,721,578
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
24	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,915	25,915
26	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	71,171	71,171
27	0603133D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	21,782	21,782
28	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	290,654	290,654
30	0603176C	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	12,139	12,139
31	0603177C	DISCRIMINATION SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	28,200	28,200
32	0603178C	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	45,389	75,389
		Fiber laser prototype development		[20,000]
		Divert attitude control tech to support MOKV		[10,000]
33	0603179C	ADVANCED CAISR	9,876	9,876
34	0603180C	ADVANCED RESEARCH	17,364	17,364
35	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	18,802	18,802
36	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY	2,679	2,679
37	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	64,708	64,708
38	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	185,043	185,043
39	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	126,692	126,692
40	0603288D8Z	ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS	14,645	9,645
		General program decrease		[−5,000]
41	0603289D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS	59,830	59,830
42	0603294C	COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	46,753	66,753
		Increase for Multiple Object Kill Vehicle		[20,000]
43	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	140,094	140,094
44	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH	118,666	118,666
45	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	43,966	43,966
46	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	141,540	131,540
		General program decrease		[−10,000]
47	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	6,980	6,980
50	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	157,056	157,056
51	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	33,515	33,515
52	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTIAG R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	16,543	16,543
53	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	29,888	29,888
54	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	65,836	65,836
55	0603720S	MICROELECTRONIAG TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	79,037	79,037
56	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	9,626	9,626
57	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONIAG TECHNOLOGIES	79,021	79,021
58	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	201,335	201,335
59	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	452,861	432,861
		Decrease to reduce inefficiency		[−20,000]
60	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	257,127	257,127
61	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	10,771	10,771
62	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	15,202	15,202
63	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	90,500	70,500
		Program decrease		[−20,000]
66	0603833D8Z	ENGINEERING SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	18,377	18,377
67	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	82,589	82,589
68	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	37,420	37,420
69	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	42,488	42,488
70	1160402BB	SOF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	57,741	57,741
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	3,229,821	3,224,821
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES		
71	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	31,710	31,710
73	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	90,567	90,567
74	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSORS APPLICATION PROGRAM	15,900	19,900

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
		<i>Increase to match previous year funding level</i>		[4,000]
75	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	52,758	52,758
76	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	228,021	228,021
77	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,284,891	1,284,891
78	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	172,754	172,754
79	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	233,588	233,588
80	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	409,088	409,088
81	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	400,387	400,387
82	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	843,355	843,355
83	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	31,632	31,632
84	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	23,289	23,289
85	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI	450,085	450,085
86	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	49,570	49,570
87	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	49,211	49,211
88	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	9,583	9,583
89	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	72,866	72,866
90	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	102,795	268,795
		<i>Increase for Arrow/David's Sling</i>		[166,000]
91	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	274,323	274,323
92	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	513,256	513,256
93	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	10,129	10,129
94	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	10,350	10,350
95	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	1,518	11,518
		<i>Program Increase</i>		[10,000]
96	0604115C	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	96,300	96,300
97	0604250D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	469,798	469,798
98	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	3,129	3,129
103	0604826J	JOINT C5 CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT, INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY ASSESSMENTS	25,200	25,200
105	0604873C	LONG RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR (LRDR)	137,564	137,564
106	0604874C	IMPROVED HOMELAND DEFENSE INTERCEPTORS	278,944	298,944
		<i>Redesigned kill vehicle development</i>		[20,000]
107	0604876C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT TEST	26,225	26,225
108	0604878C	AEGIS BMD TEST	55,148	55,148
109	0604879C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR TEST	86,764	86,764
110	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM-3 (LBSM3)	34,970	34,970
111	0604881C	AEGIS SM-3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	172,645	172,645
112	0604887C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE SEGMENT TEST	64,618	64,618
114	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	2,660	2,660
115	0305103C	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	963	963
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	6,816,554	7,016,554
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION		
116	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	8,800	8,800
117	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	78,817	88,817
		<i>CPGS development and flight test</i>		[10,000]
118	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	303,647	303,647
119	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	23,424	23,424
120	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	14,285	14,285
121	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	7,156	7,156
122	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,542	12,542
123	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	191	191
124	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	3,273	3,273
125	0605027D8Z	OUS(D) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	5,962	5,962
126	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	13,412	13,412
127	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	2,223	2,223
128	0605080S	DEFENSE AGENCY INITIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM	31,660	31,660
129	0605090S	DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS)	13,085	13,085
130	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	7,209	7,209
131	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	15,158	5,158
		<i>Early to need</i>		[-10,000]
132	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)	4,414	4,414
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	545,258	545,258
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
133	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	5,581	5,581
134	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	3,081	3,081
135	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	229,125	229,125
136	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	28,674	28,674
138	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	45,235	45,235
139	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	24,936	24,936
141	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	35,471	35,471
144	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	37,655	32,655
		<i>Reducing reporting and inefficiencies</i>		[-5,000]
145	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	3,015	3,015
146	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	5,287	5,287
147	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	5,289	5,289

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
148	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	2,120	2,120
149	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	102,264	102,264
158	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,169	2,169
159	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	13,960	13,960
160	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	51,775	51,775
161	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	9,533	9,533
162	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	17,371	17,371
163	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	71,571	71,571
164	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,123	4,123
165	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	1,946	1,946
166	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	7,673	7,673
169	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	10,413	10,413
170	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	971	971
171	0305193D8Z	CYBER INTELLIGENCE	6,579	6,579
173	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)—MHA	43,811	43,811
174	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	35,871	35,871
176	0903230D8W	WHS—MISSION OPERATIONS SUPPORT - IT	1,072	1,072
176A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	49,500	49,500
		SUBTOTAL, MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	856,071	851,071
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT		
178	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	7,929	7,929
179	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA	1,750	1,750
180	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	294	294
181	0607210D8Z	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT	22,576	22,576
182	0607310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS: OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,901	1,901
183	0607327T	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS)	8,474	8,474
184	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	33,561	33,561
186	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	3,061	3,061
187	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	64,921	64,921
189	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	3,645	3,645
193	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	963	963
194	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	10,186	10,186
195	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DAG	36,883	36,883
196	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	13,735	13,735
197	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	6,101	6,101
198	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	43,867	43,867
199	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	8,957	8,957
200	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	146,890	146,890
201	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	21,503	21,503
202	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	20,342	20,342
203	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	444	444
205	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	1,736	1,736
206	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	65,060	65,060
210	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,976	2,976
215	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	4,182	4,182
216	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	18,130	18,130
218	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,302	5,302
221	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,239	3,239
225	0305327V	INSIDER THREAT	11,733	11,733
226	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,119	2,119
234	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	24,605	24,605
235	0708012S	LOGISTIAG SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	1,770	1,770
236	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJAG	2,978	2,978
237	1105219BB	MQ-9 UAV	18,151	23,151
		MQ-9 capability enhancements		[5,000]
238	1105232BB	RQ-11 UAV	758	758
240	1160403BB	AVIATION SYSTEMS	173,934	191,141
		ISR payload technology improvements		[2,000]
		C-130 T/TA Program Adjustment		[15,207]
241	1160405BB	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	6,866	6,866
242	1160408BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	63,008	63,008
243	1160431BB	WARRIOR SYSTEMS	25,342	25,342
244	1160432BB	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	3,401	3,401
245	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,212	3,212
246	1160483BB	MARITIME SYSTEMS	63,597	63,597
247	1160489BB	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,933	3,933
248	1160490BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	10,623	10,623
248A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,564,272	3,564,272
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	4,538,910	4,561,117
		UNDISTRIBUTED		
xx	xxxxx	DEFENSE WIDE CYBER VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT	0	200,000
		Assess all major weapon systems for cyber vulnerability		[200,000]
xxx	xxxxxx	UCAS-D DEVELOPMENT AND FOLLOW ON PROTOTYPING	0	725,000
		Supports continued efforts on UCAS-D and follow on prototyping		[725,000]

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Program Element</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
x	xxxx	TECHNOLOGY OFFSET INITIATIVE	0	400,000
		Supports innovative technology development		[400,000]
		SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	1,325,000
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	18,329,861	19,837,068
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
1	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	76,838	76,838
2	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	46,882	46,882
3	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	46,838	46,838
		SUBTOTAL, MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	170,558	170,558
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	170,558	170,558
		TOTAL RDT&E	69,784,963	70,891,640

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Program Element</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
60	0603747A	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		
		SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	1,500	1,500
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	1,500	1,500
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	1,500	1,500
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
231A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	35,747	35,747
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	35,747	35,747
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	35,747	35,747
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
133	0205671F	JOINT COUNTER RCIED ELECTRONIC WARFARE	300	300
246A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	16,800	16,800
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,100	17,100
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	17,100	17,100
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT		
248A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	137,087	137,087
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	137,087	137,087
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	137,087	137,087
		TOTAL RDT&E	191,434	191,434

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY OPERATING FORCES		
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,094,429	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-1,094,429]
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	68,873	68,873
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	508,008	508,008
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	763,300	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-763,300]
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,054,322	0

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-1,054,322]
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,546,129	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-1,546,129]
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,158,606	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-3,158,606]
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	438,909	438,909
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,214,116	1,291,316
	Readiness funding increase		[77,200]
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,616,008	7,626,508
	Readiness funding increase		[10,500]
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,617,169	2,651,169
	Kwajalein facilities restoration		[34,000]
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	421,269	421,269
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	164,743	164,743
170	COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	448,633	436,276
	Streamlining of Army Combatant Commands Direct Mission Support		[-12,357]
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	21,114,514	13,607,071
	MOBILIZATION		
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	401,638	401,638
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	261,683	261,683
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,532	6,532
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	669,853	669,853
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	131,536	131,536
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	47,843	47,843
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	42,565	42,565
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	490,378	490,378
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	981,000	1,014,200
	Readiness funding increase		[33,200]
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	940,872	940,872
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	230,324	230,324
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	603,519	603,519
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	491,922	491,922
300	EXAMINING	194,079	194,079
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	227,951	227,951
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	161,048	161,048
330	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS	170,118	170,118
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	4,713,155	4,746,355
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES		
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	485,778	485,778
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	813,881	813,881
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	714,781	714,781
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	322,127	322,127
390	ADMINISTRATION	384,813	384,813
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,781,350	1,781,350
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	292,532	292,532
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	375,122	375,122
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,119,848	1,115,348
	Army outreach reduction		[-4,500]
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	225,358	225,358
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	239,755	239,755
460	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS	223,319	223,319
470	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	469,865	469,865
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	40,521	40,521
480A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,120,974	1,146,474
	Additional SOUTHCOM ISR and intel support		[20,000]
	Readiness increase		[5,500]
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-238,451
	Streamlining of Army Management Headquarters		[-238,451]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	8,610,024	8,392,573
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT	0	-281,500
	Foreign currency adjustment		[-281,500]
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-260,100
	Bulk fuel savings		[-260,100]
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-541,600
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	35,107,546	26,874,252
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	16,612	16,612
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	486,531	486,531
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	105,446	105,446
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	516,791	516,791

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
060	AVIATION ASSETS	87,587	87,587
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	348,601	348,601
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	81,350	81,350
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	59,574	91,974
	Readiness funding increase		[32,400]
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	570,852	570,852
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	245,686	245,686
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	40,962	40,962
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	2,559,992	2,592,392
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,665	10,665
140	ADMINISTRATION	18,390	18,390
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	14,976	14,976
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,841	8,841
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	52,928	52,928
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-6,011
	Streamlining of Army Reserve Management Headquarters		[-6,011]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	105,800	99,790
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-7,600
	Bulk fuel savings		[-7,600]
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-7,600
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	2,665,792	2,684,581
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MANEUVER UNITS	709,433	709,433
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	167,324	167,324
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	741,327	741,327
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	88,775	96,475
	ARNG border security enhancement		[7,700]
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	32,130	32,130
060	AVIATION ASSETS	943,609	996,209
	Readiness funding increase		[39,600]
	ARNG border security enhancement		[13,000]
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	703,137	703,137
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	84,066	84,066
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	166,848	189,348
	Readiness funding increase		[22,500]
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,022,970	1,022,970
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	673,680	673,680
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	954,574	954,574
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	6,287,873	6,370,673
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	6,570	6,570
140	ADMINISTRATION	59,629	59,379
	Reduction to National Guard Heritage Paintings		[-250]
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	68,452	68,452
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,841	8,841
170	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	283,670	272,170
	Reduction to Army Marketing Program		[-11,500]
180	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	2,942	2,942
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-26,631
	Streamlining of Army National Guard Management Headquarters		[-26,631]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	430,104	391,723
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-25,300
	Bulk fuel savings		[-25,300]
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-25,300
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	6,717,977	6,737,096
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,940,365	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-4,940,365]
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,830,611	1,830,611
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	37,225	37,225
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	103,456	103,456
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	376,844	390,744
	Readiness funding increase		[13,900]
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	897,536	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-897,536]
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	33,201	33,201

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	544,056	549,356
	Readiness funding increase		[5,300]
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	4,287,658	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-4,287,658]
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	787,446	787,446
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,960,951	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-5,960,951]
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,554,863	1,554,863
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	704,415	704,415
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	96,916	96,916
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	192,198	192,198
160	WARFARE TACTICS	453,942	453,942
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	351,871	351,871
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,186,847	1,186,847
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	123,948	123,948
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,443	2,443
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	98,914	98,914
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	73,110	67,628
	Streamlining of Navy Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support		[-5,483]
230	CRUISE MISSILE	110,734	110,734
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,206,736	1,206,736
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	141,664	141,664
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	523,122	523,122
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	371,872	371,872
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	896,061	896,061
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	2,220,423	2,220,423
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,472,468	4,486,468
	Funding increase for Behavioral Counseling		[14,000]
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	34,581,896	18,523,103
	MOBILIZATION		
310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	422,846	422,846
320	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,464	6,964
	Readiness funding increase		[500]
330	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	361,764	361,764
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	69,530	69,530
350	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,237	2,237
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	21,823	21,823
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	884,664	885,164
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
370	OFFICER ACQUISITION	149,375	149,375
380	RECRUIT TRAINING	9,035	9,035
390	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	156,290	156,290
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	653,728	653,728
410	FLIGHT TRAINING	8,171	8,171
420	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	168,471	168,471
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	196,048	196,048
440	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	234,233	234,233
450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	137,855	137,855
460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	77,257	77,257
470	JUNIOR ROTC	47,653	47,653
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	1,838,116	1,838,116
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
480	ADMINISTRATION	923,771	923,771
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	13,967	13,967
500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	120,812	120,812
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	350,983	350,983
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	265,948	265,948
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	335,482	335,482
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	197,724	197,724
570	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	274,936	274,936
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,122,178	1,122,178
590	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	48,587	48,587
600	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	25,599	25,599
610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	72,768	72,768
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	577,803	577,803
680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,768	4,768
680A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	560,754	560,754
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-209,823
	Streamlining of Navy Management Headquarters		[-209,823]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	4,896,080	4,686,257
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT	0	-59,900
	Foreign currency adjustment		[-59,900]
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-482,300
	Bulk fuel savings		[-482,300]

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-542,200
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	42,200,756	25,390,440
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	931,079	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-931,079]
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	931,757	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-931,757]
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	227,583	227,583
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	86,259	86,259
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	746,237	746,237
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,057,362	2,058,562
	Readiness funding increase for Criminal Investigative Equipment		[1,200]
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	4,980,277	3,118,641
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
070	RECRUIT TRAINING	16,460	16,460
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION	977	977
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	97,325	97,325
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	40,786	40,786
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	347,476	347,476
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	164,806	164,806
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	39,963	39,963
140	JUNIOR ROTC	23,397	23,397
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	731,190	731,190
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	37,386	37,386
160	ADMINISTRATION	358,395	358,395
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	76,105	76,105
180A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	45,429	45,429
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-32,588
	Streamlining of Marine Corps Management Headquarters		[-32,588]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	517,315	484,727
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT	0	-19,800
	Foreign currency adjustment		[-19,800]
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-17,000
	Bulk fuel savings		[-17,000]
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-36,800
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	6,228,782	4,297,758
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	563,722	563,722
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	6,218	6,218
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	82,712	82,712
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	326	326
050	AVIATION LOGISTICS	13,436	13,436
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	557	557
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	14,499	14,499
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	117,601	117,601
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	29,382	29,382
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	48,513	48,513
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	102,858	102,858
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	979,824	979,824
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	ADMINISTRATION	1,505	1,505
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	13,782	13,782
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,437	3,437
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,210	3,210
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-1,386
	Streamlining of Navy Reserve Management Headquarters		[-1,386]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	21,934	20,548
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-39,700
	Bulk fuel savings		[-39,700]
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-39,700
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	1,001,758	960,672
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
010	OPERATING FORCES	97,631	97,631
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	18,254	18,254
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	28,653	28,653
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	111,923	111,923
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	256,461	256,461
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	924	924
060	ADMINISTRATION	10,866	10,866
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,785	8,785
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-1,473
	Streamlining of Marine Corps Reserve Management Headquarters		[-1,473]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	20,575	19,102
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-1,000
	Bulk fuel savings		[-1,000]
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-1,000
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	277,036	274,563
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,336,868	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-3,336,868]
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,897,315	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-1,897,315]
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,797,549	1,757,249
	Cancel transition of A-10 to F-15E training		[-78,000]
	Readiness increase		[37,700]
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,537,127	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-6,537,127]
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,997,712	1,997,712
060	BASE SUPPORT	2,841,948	2,841,948
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	930,341	930,341
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	924,845	924,845
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	271,177	271,177
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	382,824	382,824
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	900,965	885,586
	Streamlining of Air Force Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support		[-15,380]
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	205,078	164,078
	Cutting Joint Enabling Capabilities Command		[-41,000]
xxx	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	907,496	924,296
	Increase One Program		[20,000]
	Unjustified increase		[-3,200]
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	22,931,245	11,080,055
	MOBILIZATION		
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,229,196	2,229,196
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	148,318	148,318
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,617,571	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[-1,617,571]
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	259,956	259,956
180	BASE SUPPORT	708,799	708,799
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	4,963,840	3,346,269
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	92,191	92,191
200	RECRUIT TRAINING	21,871	21,871
210	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	77,527	77,527
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	228,500	228,500
230	BASE SUPPORT	772,870	772,870
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	359,304	402,404
	Readiness increase for RPA training		[43,100]
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	710,553	710,553
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	228,252	228,252
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	76,464	76,464
280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	375,513	375,513
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	79,690	79,690
300	EXAMINING	3,803	3,803
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	180,807	180,807
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	167,478	167,478
330	JUNIOR ROTC	59,263	59,263
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	3,434,086	3,477,186
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,141,491	1,141,491
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	862,022	852,022
	Acquisition Management Adjustment		[-10,000]

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
360	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	61,745	61,745
370	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	298,759	298,759
380	BASE SUPPORT	1,108,220	1,096,220
	Reduce IT procurement		[-12,000]
390	ADMINISTRATION	689,797	669,097
	DEAMS reduction-Funding ahead of need		[-20,700]
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	498,053	498,053
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	900,253	900,253
420	CIVIL AIR PATROL	25,411	25,411
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	89,148	89,148
450A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,187,859	1,182,959
	Unjustified increase		[-4,900]
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-276,203
	Streamlining of Air Force Management Headquarters		[-276,203]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	6,862,758	6,538,955
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xx	Restore EC-130 Compass Call	0	27,300
	Costs associated with preventing divestiture of EC-130		[27,300]
x	Restore A-10	0	235,300
	Costs associated with preventing divestiture of A-10 fleet		[235,300]
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-618,300
	Bulk fuel savings		[-618,300]
	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT	0	-137,800
	Foreign currency adjustment		[-137,800]
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-493,500
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	38,191,929	23,948,965
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,779,378	1,779,378
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	226,243	226,243
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	487,036	487,036
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	109,342	109,342
050	BASE SUPPORT	373,707	373,707
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	2,975,706	2,975,706
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
060	ADMINISTRATION	53,921	53,921
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	14,359	14,359
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	13,665	13,665
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,606	6,606
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-2,116
	Costs associated with preventing divestiture of A-10 fleet		[2,500]
	Streamlining of Air Force Reserve Management Headquarters		[-4,616]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES	88,551	86,435
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xxxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-101,100
	Bulk fuel savings		[-101,100]
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-101,100
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	3,064,257	2,961,041
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,526,471	3,526,471
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	740,779	743,379
	ARNG border security enhancement		[2,600]
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,763,859	1,763,859
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	288,786	288,786
050	BASE SUPPORT	582,037	582,037
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	6,901,932	6,904,532
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES		
060	ADMINISTRATION	23,626	23,626
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	30,652	30,652
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-3,015
	Streamlining of Air National Guard Management Headquarters		[-3,015]
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	42,200
	Costs associated with preventing divestiture of A-10 fleet		[42,200]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES	54,278	93,463
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xxxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-162,600
	Bulk fuel savings		[-162,600]
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-162,600

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	6,956,210	6,835,395
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	485,888	505,888
	Middle East Assurance Initiative		[20,000]
020	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	534,795	530,795
	DOD Rewards reduction-funding ahead of need		[-4,000]
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	4,862,368	4,862,368
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	5,883,051	5,899,051
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
040	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	142,659	142,659
050	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	78,416	78,416
060	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/TRAINING AND RECRUITING	354,372	354,372
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	575,447	575,447
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
070	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	160,320	160,320
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	570,177	570,177
100	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,374,536	1,374,536
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	642,551	642,551
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,282,755	1,292,755
	Sharkseer increase		[10,000]
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	26,073	26,073
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	366,429	366,429
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	192,625	192,625
180	DEFENSE PERSONNEL ACCOUNTING AGENCY	115,372	115,372
190	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	524,723	517,723
	Reduction to Combating Terrorism Fellowship		[-7,000]
200	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	508,396	508,396
230	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	33,577	33,577
240	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	415,696	415,696
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,753,771	2,784,021
	Impact Aid		[30,000]
	School lunches for territories		[250]
270	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	432,068	432,068
290	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	110,612	57,512
	Guam outside the fence infrastructure		[-20,000]
	Defense industry adjustment		[-33,100]
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,388,285	1,378,785
	BRAC 2017 Planning and Support		[-10,500]
	OSD fleet architecture study		[1,000]
310	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/ADMIN & SVC-WIDE ACTIVITIES	83,263	83,263
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	621,688	621,688
320A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,379,428	14,379,428
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-897,552
	Streamlining of Department of Defense Management Headquarters		[-897,552]
	SUBTOTAL, ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES	25,982,345	25,055,443
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT	0	-51,900
	Foreign currency adjustment		[-51,900]
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-36,000
	Bulk fuel savings		[-36,000]
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-87,900
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	32,440,843	31,442,041
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS		
	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR ARMED FORCES, DEF		
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	14,078	14,078
	SUBTOTAL, US COURT OF APPEALS FOR ARMED FORCES, DEF	14,078	14,078
	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID		
010	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	100,266	100,266
	SUBTOTAL, OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID	100,266	100,266
	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT		
010	FORMER SOVIET UNION (FSU) THREAT REDUCTION	358,496	358,496
	SUBTOTAL, COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT	358,496	358,496
	DOD ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND		
010	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	84,140	84,140
	SUBTOTAL, DOD ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND	84,140	84,140
	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY		
040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	234,829	234,829
	SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	234,829	234,829

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY		
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	292,453	292,453
	SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	292,453	292,453
	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE		
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	368,131	368,131
	SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	368,131	368,131
	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE		
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	8,232	8,232
	SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	8,232	8,232
	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES		
080	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	203,717	203,717
	SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	203,717	203,717
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	1,664,342	1,664,342
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	176,517,228	134,071,146

**SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPER-
ATIONS.**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY OPERATING FORCES		
010	MANEUVER UNITS	257,900	1,352,329
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[1,094,429]
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	1,110,836	1,874,136
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[763,300]
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	261,943	1,316,265
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[1,054,322]
060	AVIATION ASSETS	22,160	1,568,289
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[1,546,129]
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,119,201	4,277,807
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[3,158,606]
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	117,881	117,881
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	50,000	50,000
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	4,500,666	4,500,666
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	10,000	10,000
160	RESET	1,834,777	1,834,777
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	9,285,364	16,902,150
	MOBILIZATION		
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	40,000	40,000
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	40,000	40,000
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES		
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	529,891	529,891
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	5,033	5,033
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	100,480	100,480
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	154,350	154,350
480A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,267,632	1,267,632
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	2,057,386	2,057,386
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	11,382,750	18,999,536
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES OPERATING FORCES		
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	2,442	2,442
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	813	813
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	779	779
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,525	20,525
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	24,559	24,559
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	24,559	24,559
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG OPERATING FORCES		
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,984	1,984
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	4,671	4,671
060	AVIATION ASSETS	15,980	15,980

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	12,867	12,867
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	23,134	23,134
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	1,426	1,426
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	60,062	60,062
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	783	783
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	783	783
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	60,845	60,845
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND		
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE		
010	SUSTAINMENT	2,214,899	2,214,899
030	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	182,751	182,751
040	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	281,555	281,555
	SUBTOTAL, MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	2,679,205	2,679,205
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR		
060	SUSTAINMENT	901,137	901,137
080	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	116,573	116,573
090	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	65,342	65,342
	SUBTOTAL, MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	1,083,052	1,083,052
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	3,762,257	3,762,257
	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
010	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	715,000	715,000
	SUBTOTAL, IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	715,000	715,000
	TOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	715,000	715,000
	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
010	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	600,000	600,000
	SUBTOTAL, SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	600,000	600,000
	TOTAL SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	600,000	600,000
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	358,417	5,302,082
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[4,940,365]
	Readiness funding increase		[3,300]
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	110	110
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	4,513	4,513
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	126,501	126,501
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	75,897	990,433
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[897,536]
	Readiness funding increase		[17,000]
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,770	2,770
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	34,101	34,101
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,184,878	5,472,536
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[4,287,658]
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	16,663	16,663
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,922,829	7,883,780
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[5,960,951]
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	33,577	33,577
160	WARFARE TACTICS	26,454	26,454
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	22,305	22,305
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	513,969	513,969
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	10,007	10,007
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	60,865	60,865
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	275,231	275,231
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	7,819	7,819
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	61,422	61,422
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	4,738,328	20,845,138
	MOBILIZATION		
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	5,307	5,307
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	160,002	160,002
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	165,309	165,309
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	44,845	44,845
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	44,845	44,845
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Authorized
480	ADMINISTRATION	2,513	2,513
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	500	500
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	5,309	5,309
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	1,469	1,469
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	156,671	156,671
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	8,834	8,834
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,490	1,490
680A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,320	6,320
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	183,106	183,106
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	5,131,588	21,238,398
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	353,133	1,284,212
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[931,079]
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	259,676	1,191,433
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[931,757]
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	240,000	240,000
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	16,026	16,026
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	868,835	2,731,671
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	37,862	37,862
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	37,862	37,862
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	43,767	43,767
180A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,070	2,070
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	45,837	45,837
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	952,534	2,815,370
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,033	4,033
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	60	60
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	20,300	20,300
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	7,250	7,250
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	31,643	31,643
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	31,643	31,643
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	OPERATING FORCES	2,500	2,500
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	955	955
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	3,455	3,455
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	3,455	3,455
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,505,738	4,839,106
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[3,336,868]
	Retain Current A-10 Fleet		[-1,400]
	Unjustified Increase		[-2,100]
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	914,973	2,802,588
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[1,897,315]
	Unjustified Increase		[-14,000]
	Readiness funding increase		[4,300]
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	31,978	31,978
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,192,765	7,729,892
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[6,537,127]
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	85,625	85,625
060	BASE SUPPORT	917,269	917,269
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	30,219	30,219
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	174,734	174,734
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	869	869
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	5,008	5,008
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	100,190	100,190
xxx	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	22,893	22,893
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	4,982,261	16,740,371
	MOBILIZATION		
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,995,703	2,995,703
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	108,163	108,163
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	511,059	2,128,630
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[1,617,571]

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
180	BASE SUPPORT	4,642	4,642
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	3,619,567	5,237,138
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	92	92
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	11,986	11,986
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	12,078	12,078
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	86,716	86,716
380	BASE SUPPORT	3,836	3,836
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	165,348	165,348
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	204,683	141,683
	Reduction to the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq		[-63,000]
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	61	61
450A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	15,463	15,463
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	476,107	413,107
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	9,090,013	22,402,694
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	51,086	51,086
050	BASE SUPPORT	7,020	7,020
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	58,106	58,106
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	58,106	58,106
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	19,900	19,900
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	19,900	19,900
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	19,900	19,900
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	9,900	9,900
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	2,345,835	2,345,835
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	2,355,735	2,355,735
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	18,474	18,474
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	29,579	29,579
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	110,000	110,000
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	5,960	5,960
190	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	1,677,000	1,577,000
	Reduction from Coalition Support Funds		[-100,000]
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	73,000	73,000
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	106,709	106,709
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	2,102	2,102
320A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,427,074	1,427,074
	SUBTOTAL, ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	3,449,898	3,349,898
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	5,805,633	5,705,633
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	37,638,283	76,437,396

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
MILITARY PERSONNEL		
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS		
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS	130,491,227	129,236,727
Military Personnel Underexecution		[-987,200]
Additional support for the National Guard's Operation Phalanx		[21,700]
Reduction for anticipated cost of TRICARE consolidation		[-85,000]
TRICARE program improvement initiatives		[15,000]
Financial literacy improvement		[85,000]
Reduction from Foreign Currency Gains, Army		[-65,200]
Reduction from Foreign Currency Gains, Navy		[-81,400]

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
Reduction from Foreign Currency Gains, Marine Corps		[–27,000]
Reduction from Foreign Currency Gains, Air Force		[–130,400]
SUBTOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS	130,491,227	129,236,727
MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS		
MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS	6,243,449	6,243,449
SUBTOTAL, MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS	6,243,449	6,243,449
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	136,734,676	135,480,176

**SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS
CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
MILITARY PERSONNEL		
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS		
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS	3,204,758	3,204,758
SUBTOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS	3,204,758	3,204,758
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	3,204,758	3,204,758

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND		
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY		
020	SUPPLY MANAGEMENT—ARMY	50,432	50,432
	SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	50,432	50,432
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE		
010	SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS	62,898	62,898
	SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	62,898	62,898
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE		
030	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	45,084	45,084
	SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	45,084	45,084
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA		
020	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,154,154	1,154,154
	SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,154,154	1,154,154
	TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND	1,312,568	1,312,568
	NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND		
040	POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING	15,456	15,456
060	LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE	124,493	124,493
070	DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS	8,243	8,243
080	TAH MAINTENANCE	27,784	27,784
090	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	25,197	25,197
100	READY RESERVE FORCE	272,991	272,991
	SUBTOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	474,164	474,164
	TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	474,164	474,164
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		
01	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—O&M	139,098	139,098
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	139,098	139,098
	RDT&E		
02	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—RDT&E	579,342	579,342
	SUBTOTAL, RDT&E	579,342	579,342
	PROCUREMENT		
03	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—PROC	2,281	2,281
	SUBTOTAL, PROCUREMENT	2,281	2,281

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
	TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	720,721	720,721
	DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF		
	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES		
010	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	739,009	761,009
	SOUTHCOM Operational support		[30,000]
	Transfer to Demand Reduction Program		[-8,000]
	SUBTOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES	739,009	761,009
	DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM		
020	DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	111,589	119,589
	Expanded drug testing		[8,000]
	SUBTOTAL, DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	111,589	119,589
	TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	850,598	880,598
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
010	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	310,459	310,459
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	310,459	310,459
	RDT&E		
020	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	4,700	2,100
	Funding ahead of need		[-2,600]
	SUBTOTAL, RDT&E	4,700	2,100
	PROCUREMENT		
030	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	1,000	0
	Funding ahead of need		[-1,000]
	SUBTOTAL, PROCUREMENT	1,000	0
	TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	316,159	312,559
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		
010	IN-HOUSE CARE	9,082,298	9,082,298
020	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	14,892,683	14,892,683
030	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,415,658	2,405,368
	Reduction of funds related to Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria (CARB) project		[-10,290]
040	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,677,827	1,677,827
050	MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	327,967	327,967
060	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	750,614	750,614
070	BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,742,893	1,742,893
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT	0	-36,400
	Foreign currency adjustment		[-36,400]
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	30,889,940	30,843,250
	RDT&E		
090	R&D RESEARCH	10,996	10,996
100	R&D EXPLORATRY DEVELOPMENT	59,473	56,323
	Reduction of funds related to Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria (CARB) project		[-3,150]
110	R&D ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	231,356	228,256
	Reduction of funds related to Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria (CARB) project		[-3,100]
120	R&D DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION	103,443	103,443
130	R&D ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	515,910	515,910
140	R&D MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	41,567	41,567
150	R&D CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT	17,356	17,356
	SUBTOTAL, RDT&E	980,101	973,851
	PROCUREMENT		
160	PROC INITIAL OUTFITTING	33,392	33,392
170	PROC REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION	330,504	330,504
180	PROC THEATER MEDICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM	1,494	1,494
190	PROC IEHR	7,897	7,897
	SUBTOTAL, PROCUREMENT	373,287	373,287
	TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	32,243,328	32,190,388
	TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	35,917,538	35,890,998

**SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVER-
SEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Line</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND		
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE		
020	TRANSPORTATION OF FALLEN HEROES	2,500	2,500
	SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	2,500	2,500
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE		
030	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	86,350	86,350
	SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	86,350	86,350
	TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND	88,850	88,850
	DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF		
	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES		
010	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	186,000	186,000
	SUBTOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES	186,000	186,000
	TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	186,000	186,000
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
010	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	10,262	10,262
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	10,262	10,262
	TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	10,262	10,262
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		
010	IN-HOUSE CARE	65,149	65,149
020	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	192,210	192,210
030	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	9,460	9,460
060	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	5,885	5,885
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	272,704	272,704
	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	272,704	272,704
	COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND		
	COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND		
090	COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	2,100,000	1,000,000
	Request excess to need		[-1,100,000]
	SUBTOTAL, COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	2,100,000	1,000,000
	TOTAL, COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	2,100,000	1,000,000
	UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE		
	UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE		
xxx	UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE	0	300,000
	Provides assistance to Ukraine		[300,000]
	SUBTOTAL, UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE	0	300,000
	TOTAL, UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE	0	300,000
	TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATION	2,657,816	1,857,816

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.**

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Account</i>	<i>State or Country and Installa- tion</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Budget Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				
MILCON, ARMY				
MILCON, ARMY	Alaska			
	Fort Greely	Physical Readiness Training Facility	7,800	7,800
MILCON, ARMY	California			
	Concord	Pier	98,000	98,000
MILCON, ARMY	Colorado			
	Fort Carson, Colorado	Rotary Wing Taxiway	5,800	5,800
MILCON, ARMY	Georgia			
	Fort Gordon	Command and Control Facility	90,000	90,000
	Germany			

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State or Country and Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Authorized
MILCON, ARMY	Grafenwoehr	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	51,000	51,000
MILCON, ARMY	Guantanamo Bay, Cuba Guantanamo Bay	Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	0	76,000
MILCON, ARMY	Maryland Fort Meade	Access Control Point-Reece Road	0	19,500
MILCON, ARMY	Fort Meade	Access Control Point-Mapes Road	0	15,000
MILCON, ARMY	New York Fort Drum, New York	NCO Academy Complex	19,000	19,000
MILCON, ARMY	U.S. Military Academy	Waste Water Treatment Plant	70,000	70,000
MILCON, ARMY	Oklahoma Fort Sill	Reception Barracks Complex Ph2	56,000	56,000
MILCON, ARMY	Fort Sill	Training Support Facility	13,400	13,400
MILCON, ARMY	Texas Corpus Christi	Powertrain Facility (Infrastructure/Metal)	85,000	85,000
MILCON, ARMY	Joint Base San Antonio	Homeland Defense Operations Center	43,000	0
MILCON, ARMY	Virginia Fort Lee	Training Support Facility	33,000	33,000
MILCON, ARMY	Joint Base Myer-Henderson	Instruction Building	37,000	0
MILCON, ARMY	Worldwide Unspecified			
MILCON, ARMY	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Host Nation Support	36,000	36,000
MILCON, ARMY	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Minor Construction	25,000	25,000
MILCON, ARMY	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Planning and Design	73,245	73,245
MILCON, ARMY	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Prior Year Unobligated Amounts	0	-52,000
SUBTOTAL, MILCON, ARMY			743,245	721,745
MIL CON, NAVY				
MIL CON, NAVY	Arizona Yuma	Aircraft Maint. Facilities & Apron (So. CALA)	50,635	50,635
MIL CON, NAVY	Bahrain Island SW Asia	Mina Salman Pier Replacement	37,700	37,700
MIL CON, NAVY	SW Asia	Ship Maintenance Support Facility	52,091	52,091
MIL CON, NAVY	California Camp Pendleton, California	Raw Water Pipeline Pendleton to Fallbrook	44,540	0
MIL CON, NAVY	Camp Pendleton, California	Pendleton Ops Center	0	25,000
MIL CON, NAVY	Coronado	Coastal Campus Utilities	4,856	4,856
MIL CON, NAVY	Lemoore	F-35C Hangar Modernization and Addition	56,497	56,497
MIL CON, NAVY	Lemoore	F-35C Training Facilities	8,187	8,187
MIL CON, NAVY	Lemoore	RTO and Mission Debrief Facility	7,146	7,146
MIL CON, NAVY	Miramar	KC-130J Enlisted Air Crew Trainer	0	11,200
MIL CON, NAVY	Point Mugu	E-2C/D Hangar Additions and Renovations	19,453	19,453
MIL CON, NAVY	Point Mugu	Triton Avionics and Fuel Systems Trainer	2,974	2,974
MIL CON, NAVY	San Diego	LCS Support Facility	37,366	37,366
MIL CON, NAVY	Twentynine Palms, California	Microgrid Expansion	9,160	9,160
MIL CON, NAVY	Florida Jacksonville	Fleet Support Facility Addition	8,455	8,455
MIL CON, NAVY	Jacksonville	Triton Mission Control Facility	8,296	8,296

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Account</i>	<i>State or Country and Installation</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Budget Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
MIL CON, NAVY	Mayport	LCS Mission Module Readiness Center	16,159	16,159
MIL CON, NAVY	Pensacola	A-School Unaccompanied Housing (Corry Station)	18,347	18,347
MIL CON, NAVY	Whiting Field	T-6B JPATS Training Operations Facility	10,421	10,421
	Georgia			
MIL CON, NAVY	Albany	Ground Source Heat Pumps	7,851	7,851
MIL CON, NAVY	Kings Bay	Industrial Control System Infrastructure	8,099	8,099
MIL CON, NAVY	Townsend	Townsend Bombing Range Expansion Phase 2	48,279	43,279
	Guam			
MIL CON, NAVY	Joint Region Marianas	Live-Fire Training Range Complex (NW Field)	125,677	125,677
MIL CON, NAVY	Joint Region Marianas	Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Closure	10,777	10,777
MIL CON, NAVY	Joint Region Marianas	Sanitary Sewer System Recapitalization	45,314	45,314
	Hawaii			
MIL CON, NAVY	Barking Sands	PMRF Power Grid Consolidation	30,623	30,623
MIL CON, NAVY	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	UEM Interconnect Sta C to Hickam	6,335	6,335
MIL CON, NAVY	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	Welding School Shop Consolidation	8,546	8,546
MIL CON, NAVY	Kaneohe Bay	Airfield Lighting Modernization	26,097	26,097
MIL CON, NAVY	Kaneohe Bay	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	68,092	68,092
MIL CON, NAVY	Kaneohe Bay	P-8A Detachment Support Facilities	12,429	12,429
MIL CON, NAVY	Mcb Hawaii	LHD Pad Conversions MV22 Landing Pads	0	12,800
	Italy			
MIL CON, NAVY	Sigonella	P-8A Hangar and Fleet Support Facility	62,302	62,302
MIL CON, NAVY	Sigonella	Triton Hangar and Operation Facility	40,641	40,641
	Japan			
MIL CON, NAVY	Camp Butler	Military Working Dog Facilities (Camp Hansen)	11,697	11,697
MIL CON, NAVY	Iwakuni	E-2D Operational Trainer Complex	8,716	8,716
MIL CON, NAVY	Iwakuni	Security Modifications—CVW5/MAG12 HQ	9,207	9,207
MIL CON, NAVY	Kadena AB	Aircraft Maint. Shelters & Apron	23,310	23,310
MIL CON, NAVY	Yokosuka	Child Development Center	13,846	13,846
	Maryland			
MIL CON, NAVY	Patuxent River	Unaccompanied Housing	40,935	40,935
	North Carolina			
MIL CON, NAVY	Camp Lejeune	Range Safety Improvements	0	19,400
MIL CON, NAVY	Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	Simulator Integration/Range Control Facility	54,849	54,849
MIL CON, NAVY	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	Air Field Security Improvements	0	23,300
MIL CON, NAVY	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	KC130J Enlsited Air Crew Trainer Facility	4,769	4,769
MIL CON, NAVY	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	Unmanned Aircraft System Facilities	29,657	29,657
MIL CON, NAVY	New River	Operational Trainer Facility	3,312	3,312
MIL CON, NAVY	New River	Radar Air Traffic Control Facility Addition	4,918	4,918
	Poland			
MIL CON, NAVY	RedziKowo Base	AEGIS Ashore Missile Defense Complex	51,270	51,270
	South Carolina			
MIL CON, NAVY	Parris Island	Range Safety Improvements & Modernization	27,075	27,075
	Virginia			
MIL CON, NAVY	Dam Neck	Maritime Surveillance System Facility	23,066	23,066

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State or Country and Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Authorized
MIL CON, NAVY	Norfolk	Communications Center	75,289	75,289
MIL CON, NAVY	Norfolk	Electrical Repairs to Piers 2,6,7, and 11	44,254	44,254
MIL CON, NAVY	Norfolk	MH60 Helicopter Training Facility	7,134	7,134
MIL CON, NAVY	Portsmouth	Waterfront Utilities	45,513	45,513
MIL CON, NAVY	Quantico	ATFP Gate	5,840	5,840
MIL CON, NAVY	Quantico	Electrical Distribution Upgrade	8,418	8,418
MIL CON, NAVY	Quantico	Embassy Security Guard BEQ & Ops Facility	43,941	43,941
MIL CON, NAVY	Quantico	TBS Fire Station Replacement	0	17,200
MIL CON, NAVY	Washington Bangor	WRA Land/Water Interface	34,177	34,177
MIL CON, NAVY	Bremerton	Dry Dock 6 Modernization & Utility Improve.	22,680	22,680
MIL CON, NAVY	Indian Island	Shore Power to Ammunition Pier	4,472	4,472
MIL CON, NAVY	Worldwide Unspecified			
MIL CON, NAVY	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCON Design Funds	91,649	91,649
MIL CON, NAVY	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	22,590	22,590
SUBTOTAL, MIL CON, NAVY			1,605,929	1,665,289
MILCON, AIR FORCE				
	Alaska			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Eielson AFB	F-35A Flight Sim/Alter Squad Ops/AMU Facility	37,000	37,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Eielson AFB	Rpr Central Heat & Power Plant Boiler Ph3	34,400	34,400
	Arizona			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC-130J Age Covered Storage	4,700	4,700
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC-130J Wash Rack	12,200	12,200
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Luke AFB	Communications Facility	0	21,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Luke AFB	F-35A ADAL Fuel Offload Facility	5,000	5,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Luke AFB	F-35A Aircraft Maintenance Hangar/Sq 3	13,200	13,200
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Luke AFB	F-35A Bomb Build-Up Facility	5,500	5,500
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Luke AFB	F-35A Sq Ops/AMU/Hangar/Sq 4	33,000	33,000
	Colorado			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	U.S. Air Force Academy	Front Gates Force Protection Enhancements	10,000	10,000
	Florida			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Cape Canaveral AFS	Range Communications Facility	21,000	21,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Eglin AFB	F-35A Consolidated HQ Facility	8,700	8,700
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Hurlburt Field	ADAL 39 Information Operations Squad Facility	14,200	14,200
	Greenland			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Thule AB	Thule Consolidation Ph 1	41,965	41,965

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State or Country and Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Authorized
	<i>Guam</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Joint Region Marianas	APR—Dispersed Maint Spares & SE Storage Fac	19,000	19,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Joint Region Marianas	APR—Installation Control Center	22,200	22,200
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Joint Region Marianas	APR—South Ramp Utilities Phase 2	7,100	7,100
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC Roads	2,500	2,500
	<i>Hawaii</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	F-22 Fighter Alert Facility	46,000	46,000
	<i>Japan</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Yokota AB	C-130J Flight Simulator Facility	8,461	8,461
	<i>Kansas</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	McConnell AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower	0	11,200
MILCON, AIR FORCE	McConnell AFB	KC-46A ADAL Deicing Pads	4,300	4,300
	<i>Louisiana</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Barksdale AFB	Consolidated Communications Facility	0	20,000
	<i>Maryland</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Fort Meade	CYBERCOM Joint Operations Center, Increment 3	86,000	86,000
	<i>Missouri</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Whiteman AFB	Consolidated Stealth Ops & Nuclear Alert Fac	29,500	29,500
	<i>Montana</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Malmstrom AFB	Tactical Response Force Alert Facility	19,700	19,700
	<i>Nebraska</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Offutt AFB	Dormitory (144 RM)	21,000	21,000
	<i>Nevada</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Nellis AFB	F-35A Airfield Pavements	31,000	31,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Nellis AFB	F-35A Live Ordnance Loading Area	34,500	34,500
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Nellis AFB	F-35A Munitions Maintenance Facilities	3,450	3,450
	<i>New Mexico</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Cannon AFB	Construct AT/FP Gate—Portales	7,800	7,800
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Holloman AFB	Marshalling Area ARM/DE-ARM Pad D	3,000	3,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Holloman AFB	Fixed Ground Control	0	3,200
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Kirtland AFB	Space Vehicles Component Development Lab	12,800	12,800
	<i>New York</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Fort Drum, New York	ASOS Expansion	0	6,000
	<i>Niger</i>			
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Agadez	Construct Airfield and Base Camp	50,000	50,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (In Thousands of Dollars)				
Account	State or Country and Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Authorized
MILCON, AIR FORCE	North Carolina Seymour Johnson AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower/Base Ops Facility	17,100	17,100
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Oklahoma Altus AFB	Dormitory (120 RM)	18,000	18,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Altus AFB	KC-46A FTU ADAL Fuel Cell Maint Hangar	10,400	10,400
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Tinker AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower	12,900	12,900
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Tinker AFB	KC-46A Depot Maintenance Dock	37,000	37,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Oman AL Musannah AB	Airlift Apron	25,000	25,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	South Dakota Ellsworth AFB	Dormitory (168 RM)	23,000	23,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Texas Joint Base San Antonio	BMT Classrooms/Dining Facility 3	35,000	35,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Joint Base San Antonio	BMT Recruit Dormitory 5	71,000	71,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	United Kingdom Croughton Raf	Consolidated SATCOM/Tech Control Facility	36,424	36,424
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Croughton Raf	JIAC Consolidation—Ph 2	94,191	94,191
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Utah Hill AFB	F-35A Flight Simulator Addition Phase 2	5,900	5,900
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Hill AFB	F-35A Hangar 40/42 Additions and AMU	21,000	21,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Hill AFB	Hayman Igloos	11,500	11,500
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Worldwide Classified Classified Location	Long Range Strike Bomber	77,130	77,130
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Classified Location	Munitions Storage	3,000	3,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Prior Year Unobligated Amounts	0	-50,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	89,164	89,164
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Military Construction	22,900	22,900
MILCON, AIR FORCE	Wyoming F. E. Warren AFB	Weapon Storage Facility	95,000	95,000
SUBTOTAL, MILCON, AIR FORCE			1,354,785	1,366,185
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE				
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Alabama Fort Rucker	Fort Rucker ES/PS Consolidation/Replacement	46,787	46,787
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Maxwell AFB	Maxwell ES/MS Replacement/Renovation	32,968	32,968

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State or Country and Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Authorized
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Arizona Fort Huachuca	JITC Buildings 52101/52111 Renovations	3,884	3,884
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	California Camp Pendleton, California	SOF Combat Service Support Facility	10,181	10,181
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Camp Pendleton, California	SOF Performance Resiliency Center-West	10,371	10,371
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Coronado	SOF Logistics Support Unit One Ops Fac. #2	47,218	47,218
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Fresno Yosemite IAP ANG	Replace Fuel Storage and Distrib. Facilities	10,700	10,700
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Colorado Fort Carson, Colorado	SOF Language Training Facility	8,243	8,243
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Conus Classified Classified Location	Operations Support Facility	20,065	20,065
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Delaware Dover AFB	Construct Hydrant Fuel System	21,600	21,600
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Djibouti Camp Lemonier, Djibouti	Construct Fuel Storage & Distrib. Facilities	43,700	43,700
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Florida Hurlburt Field	SOF Fuel Cell Maintenance Hangar	17,989	17,989
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	MacDill AFB	SOF Operational Support Facility	39,142	39,142
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Georgia Moody AFB	Replace Pumphouse and Truck Fillstands	10,900	10,900
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Germany Garmisch	Garmisch E/MS-Addition/Modernization	14,676	14,676
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Grafenwoehr	Grafenwoehr Elementary School Replacement	38,138	38,138
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	Medical Center Replacement Incr 5	85,034	85,034
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Spangdahlem AB	Construct Fuel Pipeline	5,500	5,500
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Spangdahlem AB	Medical/Dental Clinic Addition	34,071	34,071
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Stuttgart-Patch Barracks	Patch Elementary School Replacement	49,413	49,413
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Hawaii Kaneohe Bay	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	122,071	122,071
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Schofield Barracks	Behavioral Health/Dental Clinic Addition	123,838	123,838
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Japan Kadena AB	Airfield Pavements	37,485	37,485
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Kentucky Fort Campbell, Kentucky	SOF Company HQ/Classrooms	12,553	12,553
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Fort Knox	Fort Knox HS Renovation/MS Addition	23,279	23,279
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Maryland Fort Meade	NSAW Campus Feeders Phase 2	33,745	33,745
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Fort Meade	NSAW Recapitalize Building #2 Incr 1	34,897	34,897
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Nevada Nellis AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	39,900	39,900
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	New Mexico Cannon AFB	Construct Pumphouse and Fuel Storage	20,400	20,400
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Cannon AFB	SOF Squadron Operations Facility	11,565	11,565
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Cannon AFB	SOF ST Operational Training Facilities	13,146	13,146
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	New York West Point	West Point Elementary School Replacement	55,778	55,778
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	North Carolina Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	SOF Combat Service Support Facility	14,036	14,036

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State or Country and Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Authorized
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	SOF Marine Battalion Company/Team Facilities	54,970	54,970
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Fort Bragg	Butner Elementary School Replacement	32,944	32,944
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Fort Bragg	SOF 21 STS Operations Facility	16,863	16,863
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Fort Bragg	SOF Battalion Operations Facility	38,549	38,549
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Fort Bragg	SOF Indoor Range	8,303	8,303
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Fort Bragg	SOF Intelligence Training Center	28,265	28,265
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Fort Bragg	SOF Special Tactics Facility (PH 2)	43,887	43,887
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Ohio Wright-Patterson AFB	Satellite Pharmacy Replacement	6,623	6,623
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Oregon Klamath Falls IAP	Replace Fuel Facilities	2,500	2,500
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Pennsylvania Philadelphia	Replace Headquarters	49,700	0
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Poland RedziKowo Base	Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System Complex	169,153	169,153
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	South Carolina Fort Jackson	Pierce Terrace Elementary School Replacement	26,157	26,157
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Spain Rota	Rota ES and HS Additions	13,737	13,737
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Texas Fort Bliss	Hospital Replacement Incr 7	239,884	239,884
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Joint Base San Antonio	Ambulatory Care Center Phase 4	61,776	61,776
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Virginia Fort Belvoir	Construct Visitor Control Center	5,000	5,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Fort Belvoir	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility	4,500	4,500
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Replace Fuel Pier and Distribution Facility	28,000	28,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story	SOF Applied Instruction Facility	23,916	23,916
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Contingency Construction	10,000	10,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	ECIP Design	10,000	10,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Energy Conservation Investment Program	150,000	150,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Exercise Related Minor Construction	8,687	8,687
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Planning and Design	118,632	118,632
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Unspecified Minor Construction	23,676	23,676
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Prior year savings, including rescoped medical facility at Fort Knox ..	0	-120,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	31,772	31,772
SUBTOTAL, MIL CON, DEF-WIDE			2,300,767	2,131,067
MILCON, ARNG				
MILCON, ARNG	Alabama Camp Foley	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	0	4,500
MILCON, ARNG	Connecticut Camp Hartell	Ready Building (CST-WMD)	11,000	11,000
MILCON, ARNG	Delaware Dagsboro	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop	10,800	10,800
MILCON, ARNG	Florida Palm Coast	National Guard Readiness Center	18,000	18,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State or Country and Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Authorized
MILCON, ARNG	Georgia Fort Stewart	Tactical Aerial Unmanned Systems	0	6,800
MILCON, ARNG	Illinois Sparta	Basic 10M–25M Firing Range (Zero)	1,900	1,900
MILCON, ARNG	Kansas Salina	Automated Combat Pistol/MP Firearms Qual Cour	2,400	2,400
MILCON, ARNG	Salina	Modified Record Fire Range	4,300	4,300
MILCON, ARNG	Maryland Easton	National Guard Readiness Center	13,800	13,800
MILCON, ARNG	Mississippi Gulfport	Aviation Classification and Repair	0	40,000
MILCON, ARNG	Nevada Reno	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop Add/A	8,000	8,000
MILCON, ARNG	Ohio Camp Ravenna	Modified Record Fire Range	3,300	3,300
MILCON, ARNG	Oregon Salem	National Guard/Reserve Center Bldg Add/Alt (J	16,500	16,500
MILCON, ARNG	Pennsylvania Fort Indiantown Gap	Training Aids Center	16,000	16,000
MILCON, ARNG	Vermont North Hyde Park	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop Addit	7,900	7,900
MILCON, ARNG	Virginia Richmond	National Guard/Reserve Center Building (JFHQ)	29,000	29,000
MILCON, ARNG	Washington Yakima	Enlisted Barracks, Transient Training	19,000	19,000
MILCON, ARNG	Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Planning and Design	20,337	20,337
MILCON, ARNG	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Unspecified Minor Construction	15,000	15,000
SUBTOTAL, MILCON, ARNG			197,237	248,537
MILCON, ANG				
MILCON, ANG	Alabama Dannelly Field	TFI—Replace Squadron Operations Facility	7,600	7,600
MILCON, ANG	California Moffett Field	Replace Vehicle Maintenance Facility	6,500	6,500
MILCON, ANG	Colorado Buckley Air Force Base	ASE Maintenance and Storage Facility	5,100	5,100
MILCON, ANG	Connecticut Bradley	Ops and Deployment Facility	0	6,300
MILCON, ANG	Florida Cape Canaveral AFS	Space Control Facility	0	6,100
MILCON, ANG	Georgia Savannah/Hilton Head IAP	C–130 Squadron Operations Facility	9,000	9,000
MILCON, ANG	Hawaii Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	F–22 Composite Repair Facility	0	9,700
MILCON, ANG	Iowa Des Moines Map	Air Operations Grp/CYBER Beddown-Reno Blg 430	6,700	6,700
MILCON, ANG	Kansas Smokey Hill ANG Range	Range Training Support Facilities	2,900	2,900
MILCON, ANG	Louisiana New Orleans	Replace Squadron Operations Facility	10,000	10,000
MILCON, ANG	Maine			

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State or Country and Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Authorized
MILCON, ANG	Bangor IAP	Add to and Alter Fire Crash/Rescue Station	7,200	7,200
MILCON, ANG	New Hampshire Pease International Trade Port	Bidg Mo KC-46 Fuselage Trainer	0	1,500
MILCON, ANG	Pease International Trade Port	KC-46A ADAL Flight Simulator Bldg 156	2,800	2,800
MILCON, ANG	New Jersey Atlantic City IAP	Fuel Cell and Corrosion Control Hangar	10,200	10,200
MILCON, ANG	New York Niagara Falls IAP	Remotely Piloted Aircraft Beddown Bldg 912	7,700	7,700
MILCON, ANG	North Carolina Charlotte/Douglas IAP	Replace C-130 Squadron Operations Facility	9,000	9,000
MILCON, ANG	North Dakota Hector IAP	Intel Targeting Facilities	7,300	7,300
MILCON, ANG	Oklahoma Will Rogers World Airport	Medium Altitude Manned ISR Beddown	7,600	7,600
MILCON, ANG	Oregon Klamath Falls IAP	Replace Fire Crash/Rescue Station	7,200	7,200
MILCON, ANG	West Virginia Yeager Airport	Force Protection—Relocate Coonskin Road	3,900	3,900
MILCON, ANG	Worldwide Unspecified Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	5,104	5,104
MILCON, ANG	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,734	7,734
SUBTOTAL, MILCON, ANG			123,538	147,138
MILCON, ARMY R				
MILCON, ARMY R	California Miramar	Army Reserve Center	24,000	24,000
MILCON, ARMY R	Florida MacDill AFB	AR Center/AS Facility	55,000	55,000
MILCON, ARMY R	Mississippi Starkville	Army Reserve Center	9,300	9,300
MILCON, ARMY R	New York Orangeburg	Organizational Maintenance Shop	4,200	4,200
MILCON, ARMY R	Pennsylvania Conneaut Lake	DAR Highway Improvement	5,000	5,000
MILCON, ARMY R	Puerto Rico Fort Buchanan	Access Control Point	0	10,200
MILCON, ARMY R	Virginia Fort AP Hill	Equipment Concentration	0	24,000
MILCON, ARMY R	Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Planning and Design	9,318	9,318
MILCON, ARMY R	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,777	6,777
SUBTOTAL, MILCON, ARMY R			113,595	147,795
MIL CON, NAVY RES				
MIL CON, NAVY RES	Nevada Fallon	NAVOPSPTCEN Fallon	11,480	11,480
MIL CON, NAVY RES	New York Brooklyn	Reserve Center Storage Facility	2,479	2,479
MIL CON, NAVY RES	Virginia Dam Neck	Reserve Training Center Complex	18,443	18,443
MIL CON, NAVY RES	Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	MCNR Planning & Design	2,208	2,208

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Account</i>	<i>State or Country and Installation</i>			<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Budget Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
MIL CON, NAVY RES	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	MCNR Unspecified Minor Construction	1,468	1,468
SUBTOTAL, MIL CON, NAVY RES					36,078	36,078
MILCON, AF RES						
MILCON, AF RES	California March AFB			Satellite Fire Station	4,600	4,600
MILCON, AF RES	Florida Patrick AFB			Aircrew Life Support Facility	3,400	3,400
MILCON, AF RES	Georgia Dobbins			Fire Station/Security Complex	0	10,400
MILCON, AF RES	Ohio Youngstown			Indoor Firing Range	9,400	9,400
MILCON, AF RES	Texas Joint Base San Antonio			Consolidate 433 Medical Facility	9,900	9,900
MILCON, AF RES	Worldwide Unspecified Various Worldwide Locations			Planning and Design	13,400	13,400
MILCON, AF RES	Various Worldwide Locations			Unspecified Minor Military Construction	6,121	6,121
SUBTOTAL, MILCON, AF RES					46,821	57,221
NATO SEC INV PRGM						
NATO SEC INV PRGM	Worldwide Unspecified NATO Security Investment Pro- gram			NATO Security Investment Program	120,000	120,000
SUBTOTAL, NATO SEC INV PRGM					120,000	120,000
TOTAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					6,641,995	6,641,055
FAMILY HOUSING						
FAM HSG CON, ARMY						
FAM HSG CON, ARMY	Florida Camp Rudder			Family Housing Replacement Construction	8,000	8,000
FAM HSG CON, ARMY	Germany Wiesbaden Army Airfield			Family Housing Improvements	3,500	3,500
FAM HSG CON, ARMY	Illinois Rock Island			Family Housing Replacement Construction	20,000	20,000
FAM HSG CON, ARMY	Korea Camp Walker			Family Housing New Construction	61,000	61,000
FAM HSG CON, ARMY	Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Family Housing P & D	7,195	7,195
SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG CON, ARMY					99,695	99,695
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY						
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Furnishings	25,552	25,552
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Leased Housing	144,879	144,879
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Maintenance of Real Property Facilities	75,197	75,197
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Management Account	48,515	48,515

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State or Country and Installation			Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Authorized
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Military Housing Privatization Initiative	22,000	22,000
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Miscellaneous	840	840
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Services	10,928	10,928
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Utilities	65,600	65,600
SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG O&M, ARMY					393,511	393,511
FAM HSG CON, N/MC						
FAM HSG CON, N/MC	Virginia Wallops Island			Construct Housing Welcome Center	438	438
FAM HSG CON, N/MC	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Design	4,588	4,588
FAM HSG CON, N/MC	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Improvements	11,515	11,515
SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG CON, N/MC					16,541	16,541
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC						
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Furnishings Account	17,534	17,534
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Leasing	64,108	64,108
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Maintenance of Real Property	99,323	99,323
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Management Account	56,189	56,189
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Miscellaneous Account	373	373
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Privatization Support Costs	28,668	28,668
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Services Account	19,149	19,149
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Utilities Account	67,692	67,692
SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG O&M, N/MC					353,036	353,036
FAM HSG CON, AF						
FAM HSG CON, AF	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Improvements	150,649	150,649
FAM HSG CON, AF	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Planning and Design	9,849	9,849
SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG CON, AF					160,498	160,498
FAM HSG O&M, AF						
FAM HSG O&M, AF	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Furnishings Account	38,746	38,746
FAM HSG O&M, AF	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Housing Privatization	41,554	41,554
FAM HSG O&M, AF	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Leasing	28,867	28,867
FAM HSG O&M, AF	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Maintenance	114,129	114,129
FAM HSG O&M, AF	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Management Account	52,153	52,153
FAM HSG O&M, AF	Unspecified tions	Worldwide	Loca-	Miscellaneous Account	2,032	2,032

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Account</i>	<i>State or Country and Installation</i>			<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Budget Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
FAM HSG O&M, AF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Services Account	12,940	12,940
FAM HSG O&M, AF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Utilities Account	40,811	40,811
SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG O&M, AF					331,232	331,232
FAM HSG O&M, DW						
FAM HSG O&M, DW	Worldwide Unspecified					
FAM HSG O&M, DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Furnishings Account	4,203	4,203
FAM HSG O&M, DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Leasing	51,952	51,952
FAM HSG O&M, DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Maintenance of Real Property	1,448	1,448
FAM HSG O&M, DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Management Account	388	388
FAM HSG O&M, DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Services Account	31	31
FAM HSG O&M, DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Utilities Account	646	646
SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG O&M, DW					58,668	58,668
TOTAL FAMILY HOUSING					1,413,181	1,413,181
DEFENSE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE						
DOD BRAC—ARMY						
DOD BRAC—ARMY	Worldwide Unspecified					
DOD BRAC—ARMY	Base Realignment & Closure, Army			Base Realignment and Closure	29,691	29,691
SUBTOTAL, DOD BRAC—ARMY					29,691	29,691
DOD BRAC—NAVY						
DOD BRAC—NAVY	Worldwide Unspecified					
DOD BRAC—NAVY	Base Realignment & Closure, Navy			Base Realignment & Closure	118,906	118,906
DOD BRAC—NAVY	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-100: Planing, Design and Management	7,787	7,787
DOD BRAC—NAVY	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-101: Various Locations	20,871	20,871
DOD BRAC—NAVY	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-138: NAS Brunswick, ME	803	803
DOD BRAC—NAVY	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-157: MCSA Kansas City, MO	41	41
DOD BRAC—NAVY	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-172: NWS Seal Beach, Concord, CA	4,872	4,872
DOD BRAC—NAVY	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-84: JRB Willow Grove & Cambria Reg AP	3,808	3,808
SUBTOTAL, DOD BRAC—NAVY					157,088	157,088
DOD BRAC—AIR FORCE						
DOD BRAC—AIR FORCE	Worldwide Unspecified					
DOD BRAC—AIR FORCE	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DoD BRAC Activities—Air Force	64,555	64,555
SUBTOTAL, DOD BRAC—AIR FORCE					64,555	64,555
TOTAL DEFENSE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE					251,334	251,334
TOTAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FAMILY HOUSING, AND BRAC					8,306,510	8,305,570

**TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL
SECURITY PROGRAMS.**

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)**

<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation		
Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies		
Appropriation Summary:		
Energy Programs		
Nuclear Energy	135,161	135,161
Atomic Energy Defense Activities		
National nuclear security administration:		
Weapons activities	8,846,948	9,026,948
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,940,302	1,945,302
Naval reactors	1,375,496	1,375,496
Federal salaries and expenses	402,654	402,654
Total, National nuclear security administration	12,565,400	12,750,400
Environmental and other defense activities:		
Defense environmental cleanup	5,527,347	5,075,550
Other defense activities	774,425	774,425
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	6,301,772	5,849,975
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	18,867,172	18,600,375
Total, Discretionary Funding	19,002,333	18,735,536
Nuclear Energy		
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	126,161	126,161
Used nuclear fuel disposition	9,000	9,000
Total, Nuclear Energy	135,161	135,161
Weapons Activities		
Directed stockpile work		
Life extension programs		
B61 Life extension program	643,300	643,300
W76 Life extension program	244,019	244,019
W88 Alt 370	220,176	220,176
W80-4 Life extension program	195,037	195,037
Total, Life extension programs	1,302,532	1,302,532
Stockpile systems		
B61 Stockpile systems	52,247	52,247
W76 Stockpile systems	50,921	50,921
W78 Stockpile systems	64,092	64,092
W80 Stockpile systems	68,005	68,005
B83 Stockpile systems	42,177	42,177
W87 Stockpile systems	89,299	89,299
W88 Stockpile systems	115,685	115,685
Total, Stockpile systems	482,426	482,426
Weapons dismantlement and disposition		
Operations and maintenance	48,049	48,049
Stockpile services		
Production support	447,527	447,527
Research and development support	34,159	34,159
R&D certification and safety	192,613	192,613
Management, technology, and production	264,994	264,994
Total, Stockpile services	939,293	939,293
Nuclear material commodities		
Uranium sustainment	32,916	32,916
Plutonium sustainment	174,698	174,698
Tritium sustainment	107,345	107,345
Domestic uranium enrichment	100,000	100,000
Total, Nuclear material commodities	414,959	414,959
Total, Directed stockpile work	3,187,259	3,187,259
Research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E)		
Science		
Advanced certification	50,714	50,714
Primary assessment technologies	98,500	98,500
Dynamic materials properties	109,000	109,000
Advanced radiography	47,000	47,000
Secondary assessment technologies	84,400	84,400
Total, Science	389,614	389,614
Engineering		
Enhanced surety	50,821	50,821

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	17,371	17,371
Nuclear survivability	24,461	24,461
Enhanced surveillance	38,724	48,724
Program increase		[10,000]
Total, Engineering	131,377	141,377
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield		
Ignition	73,334	73,334
Support of other stockpile programs	22,843	22,843
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	58,587	58,587
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	4,963	4,963
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	8,900	8,900
Facility operations and target production	333,823	333,823
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield	502,450	502,450
Advanced simulation and computing	623,006	623,006
Response Capabilities Program	0	20,000
Supports flexible design capability for national labs		[20,000]
Advanced manufacturing		
Component manufacturing development	112,256	112,256
Processing technology development	17,800	17,800
Total, Advanced manufacturing	130,056	130,056
Total, RDT&E	1,776,503	1,806,503
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)		
Operating		
Program readiness	75,185	75,185
Material recycle and recovery	173,859	173,859
Storage	40,920	40,920
Recapitalization	104,327	104,327
Total, Operating	394,291	394,291
Construction:		
15-D-302, TA-55 Reinvestment project, Phase 3, LANL	18,195	18,195
11-D-801 TA-55 Reinvestment project Phase 2, LANL	3,903	3,903
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	11,533	11,533
07-D-220-04 Transuranic liquid waste facility, LANL	40,949	40,949
06-D-141 PED/Construction, Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project Y-12	430,000	430,000
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy replacement project, LANL	155,610	155,610
Total, Construction	660,190	660,190
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,054,481	1,054,481
Secure transportation asset		
Operations and equipment	146,272	146,272
Program direction	105,338	105,338
Total, Secure transportation asset	251,610	251,610
Infrastructure and safety		
Operations of facilities		
Kansas City Plant	100,250	100,250
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	70,671	70,671
Los Alamos National Laboratory	196,460	196,460
Nevada National Security Site	89,000	89,000
Panther	58,021	58,021
Sandia National Laboratory	115,300	115,300
Savannah River Site	80,463	80,463
Y-12 National security complex	120,625	120,625
Total, Operations of facilities	830,790	830,790
Safety operations	107,701	107,701
Maintenance	227,000	227,000
Recapitalization	257,724	407,724
Increase to support deferred maintenance		[150,000]
Construction:		
16-D-621 Substation replacement at TA-3, LANL	25,000	25,000
15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12	17,919	17,919
Total, Construction	42,919	42,919
Total, Infrastructure and safety	1,466,134	1,616,134
Site stewardship		
Nuclear materials integration	17,510	17,510
Minority serving institution partnerships program	19,085	19,085
Total, Site stewardship	36,595	36,595
Defense nuclear security		
Operations and maintenance	619,891	619,891
Construction:		

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
14-D-710 Device assembly facility argus installation project, NV	13,000	13,000
Total, Defense nuclear security	632,891	632,891
Information technology and cybersecurity	157,588	157,588
Legacy contractor pensions	283,887	283,887
Total, Weapons Activities	8,846,948	9,026,948
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D		
Global material security	426,751	426,751
Material management and minimization	311,584	311,584
Nonproliferation and arms control	126,703	126,703
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D	419,333	419,333
Nonproliferation Construction:		
99-D-143 Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, SRS	345,000	345,000
Analysis of Alternatives	0	5,000
Assess alternatives to MOX		[5,000]
Total, Nonproliferation construction	345,000	350,000
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs	1,629,371	1,634,371
Legacy contractor pensions	94,617	94,617
Nuclear counterterrorism and incident response program	234,390	234,390
Use of prior-year balances	-18,076	-18,076
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,940,302	1,945,302
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,940,302	1,945,302
Naval Reactors		
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	445,196	445,196
Naval reactors development	444,400	444,400
Ohio replacement reactor systems development	186,800	186,800
S8G Prototype refueling	133,000	133,000
Program direction	45,000	45,000
Construction:		
15-D-904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3	900	900
15-D-903 KL Fire System Upgrade	600	600
15-D-902 KS Engineroom team trainer facility	3,100	3,100
14-D-902 KL Materials characterization laboratory expansion, KAPL	30,000	30,000
14-D-901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF	86,000	86,000
10-D-903, Security upgrades, KAPL	500	500
Total, Construction	121,100	121,100
Total, Naval Reactors	1,375,496	1,375,496
Federal Salaries And Expenses		
Program direction	402,654	402,654
Total, Office Of The Administrator	402,654	402,654
Defense Environmental Cleanup		
Closure sites:		
Closure sites administration	4,889	4,889
Hanford site:		
River corridor and other cleanup operations:		
River corridor and other cleanup operations	196,957	196,957
Central plateau remediation:		
Central plateau remediation	555,163	555,163
Richland community and regulatory support	14,701	14,701
Construction:		
15-D-401 Containerized sludge removal annex, RL	77,016	77,016
Total, Hanford site	843,837	843,837
Idaho National Laboratory:		
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	357,783	357,783
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,000	3,000
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	360,783	360,783
NNSA sites		
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	1,366	1,366
Nevada	62,385	62,385
Sandia National Laboratories	2,500	2,500
Los Alamos National Laboratory	188,625	208,625
Accelerate cleanup of transuranic waste		[20,000]
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	254,876	274,876
Oak Ridge Reservation:		

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
OR Nuclear facility D & D		
OR Nuclear facility D & D	75,958	75,958
Construction:		
14-D-403 Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility	6,800	6,800
Total, OR Nuclear facility D & D	82,758	82,758
U233 Disposition Program	26,895	26,895
OR cleanup and disposition:		
OR cleanup and disposition	60,500	60,500
Total, OR cleanup and disposition	60,500	60,500
OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,400	4,400
Solid waste stabilization and disposition		
Oak Ridge technology development	2,800	2,800
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	177,353	177,353
Office of River Protection:		
Waste treatment and immobilization plant		
01-D-416 A-D/ORP-0060 / Major construction	595,000	595,000
01-D-16E Pretreatment facility	95,000	95,000
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	690,000	690,000
Tank farm activities		
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	649,000	649,000
Construction:		
15-D-409 Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System, Hanford	75,000	75,000
Total, Tank farm activities	724,000	724,000
Total, Office of River protection	1,414,000	1,414,000
Savannah River sites:		
Savannah River risk management operations	386,652	386,652
SR community and regulatory support	11,249	11,249
Radioactive liquid tank waste:		
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	581,878	581,878
Construction:		
15-D-402—Saltstone Disposal Unit #6	34,642	34,642
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	194,000	194,000
Total, Construction	228,642	228,642
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	810,520	810,520
Total, Savannah River site	1,208,421	1,208,421
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant		
Waste isolation pilot plant	212,600	212,600
Construction:		
15-D-411 Safety significant confinement ventilation system, WIPP	23,218	23,218
15-D-412 Exhaust shaft, WIPP	7,500	7,500
Total, Construction	30,718	30,718
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	243,318	243,318
Program direction	281,951	281,951
Program support	14,979	14,979
Safeguards and Security:		
Oak Ridge Reservation	17,228	17,228
Paducah	8,216	8,216
Portsmouth	8,492	8,492
Richland/Hanford Site	67,601	67,601
Savannah River Site	128,345	128,345
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,860	4,860
West Valley	1,891	1,891
Technology development	14,510	14,510
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	5,055,550	5,075,550
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	471,797	0
Requires industry match authorization that will not be forthcoming		[-471,797]
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,527,347	5,075,550
Other Defense Activities		
Specialized security activities	221,855	221,855
Environment, health, safety and security		
Environment, health, safety and security	120,693	120,693
Program direction	63,105	63,105
Total, Environment, Health, safety and security	183,798	183,798
Enterprise assessments		

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2016 Request</i>	<i>Senate Authorized</i>
<i>Enterprise assessments</i>	<i>24,068</i>	<i>24,068</i>
<i>Program direction</i>	<i>49,466</i>	<i>49,466</i>
Total, Enterprise assessments	73,534	73,534
Office of Legacy Management		
<i>Legacy management</i>	<i>154,080</i>	<i>154,080</i>
<i>Program direction</i>	<i>13,100</i>	<i>13,100</i>
Total, Office of Legacy Management	167,180	167,180
Defense-related activities		
Defense related administrative support		
<i>Chief financial officer</i>	<i>35,758</i>	<i>35,758</i>
<i>Chief information officer</i>	<i>83,800</i>	<i>83,800</i>
<i>Management</i>	<i>3,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>
Total, Defense related administrative support	122,558	122,558
<i>Office of hearings and appeals</i>	<i>5,500</i>	<i>5,500</i>
Subtotal, Other defense activities	774,425	774,425
Total, Other Defense Activities	774,425	774,425

VETERAN'S I.D. CARD ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 91 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 91) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the Blumenthal substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2076) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Identification Card Act 2015".

SEC. 2. VETERANS IDENTIFICATION CARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Effective on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, veteran identification cards were issued to veterans who have either completed the statutory time-in-service requirement for retirement from the Armed Forces or who have received a medical-related discharge from the Armed Forces.

(2) Effective on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, a veteran who

served a minimum obligated time in service, but who did not meet the criteria described in paragraph (1), did not receive a means of identifying the veteran's status as a veteran other than using the Department of Defense form DD-214 discharge papers of the veteran.

(3) Goods, services, and promotional activities are often offered by public and private institutions to veterans who demonstrate proof of service in the military, but it is impractical for a veteran to always carry Department of Defense form DD-214 discharge papers to demonstrate such proof.

(4) A general purpose veteran identification card made available to veterans would be useful to demonstrate the status of the veterans without having to carry and use official Department of Defense form DD-214 discharge papers.

(5) On the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department of Veterans Affairs had the infrastructure in place across the United States to produce photographic identification cards and accept a small payment to cover the cost of these cards.

(b) PROVISION OF VETERAN IDENTIFICATION CARDS.—Chapter 57 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 5705 the following new section:

"§ 5706. Veterans identification card

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall issue an identification card described in subsection (b) to each veteran who—

"(1) requests such card;

"(2) presents a copy of Department of Defense form DD-214 or other official document from the official military personnel file of the veteran that describes the service of the veteran; and

"(3) pays the fee under subsection (c)(1).

"(b) IDENTIFICATION CARD.—An identification card described in this subsection is a card issued to a veteran that—

"(1) displays a photograph of the veteran;

"(2) displays the name of the veteran;

"(3) explains that such card is not proof of any benefits to which the veteran is entitled to;

"(4) contains an identification number that is not a social security number; and

"(5) serves as proof that such veteran—

"(A) served in the Armed Forces; and

"(B) has a Department of Defense form DD-214 or other official document in the official military personnel file of the veteran that describes the service of the veteran.

"(c) COSTS OF CARD.—(1) The Secretary shall charge a fee to each veteran who receives an identification card issued under this section, including a replacement identification card.

"(2)(A) The fee charged under paragraph (1) shall equal such amount as the Secretary determines is necessary to issue an identification card under this section.

"(B) In determining the amount of the fee under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall ensure that the total amount of fees collected under paragraph (1) equals an amount necessary to carry out this section, including costs related to any additional equipment or personnel required to carry out this section.

"(C) The Secretary shall review and reassess the determination under subparagraph (A) during each five-year period in which the Secretary issues an identification card under this section.

"(3) Amounts collected under this subsection shall be deposited in an account of the Department available to carry out this section. Amounts so deposited shall be—

"(A) merged with amounts in such account;

"(B) available in such amounts as may be provided in appropriation Acts; and

"(C) subject to the same conditions and limitations as amounts otherwise in such account.

"(d) EFFECT OF CARD ON BENEFITS.—(1) An identification card issued under this section shall not serve as proof of any benefits that the veteran may be entitled to under this title.

"(2) A veteran who is issued an identification card under this section shall not be entitled to any benefits under this title by reason of possessing such card.

"(e) ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES.—(1) The Secretary shall ensure that any information collected or used with respect to an identification card issued under this section is appropriately secured.

"(2) The Secretary may determine any appropriate procedures with respect to issuing a replacement identification card.

“(3) In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with the National Personnel Records Center.

“(4) The Secretary may conduct such outreach to advertise the identification card under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(f) CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to affect identification cards otherwise provided by the Secretary to veterans enrolled in the health care system established under section 1705(a) of this title.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5705 the following new item:

“5706. Veterans identification card.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 91), as amended, was passed.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 160

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, June 23; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved

to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:38 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 23, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JULIE FURUTA-TOY, OF WYOMING, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF EQUATORIAL GUINEA.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID J. BUCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. TOD D. WOLTERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. RUSSELL J. HANDY

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. FRANK H. STOKES

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. THOMAS K. WARK

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. HOWARD P. PURCELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN W. RAYMOND

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES E. PORTER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT P. ASHLEY, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DANIEL R. HOKANSON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. KEVIN D. SCOTT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. KEVIN M. DONEGAN

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

ROBERT B. A. MACGREGOR

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ROBERT H. MCCARTHY III

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 22, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DANIEL R. ELLIOTT III, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

PETER V. NEFFENGER, OF OHIO, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 24

Time to be announced

Committee on the Budget

Business meeting to markup S. 1495, to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy Act".

SD-406

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control

To hold hearings to examine cannabidiol, focusing on barriers to research and potential medical benefits.

SD-226

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine assessing and improving flood insurance management and accountability in the wake of Superstorm Sandy.

SD-538

Committee on Finance

Business meeting to consider S. 607, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, S. 1349, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals, S. 1461, to provide for the extension of the

enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015, S. 313, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare, S. 1253, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of certain disposable medical technologies under the Medicare program, S. 1347, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, S. 704, to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries, S. 1362, to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs), S. 861, to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs, S. 349, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts, S. 466, to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives, and S. 599, to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

SD-215

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 742, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to employees, S. 1411, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, S. 1550, to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in certain Federal agencies, S. 1073, to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, S. 1580, to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates, S. 1090, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, S. 1115, to close out expired, empty grant accounts, S. 779, to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access poli-

cies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency, S. 310, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, S. 991, to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, H.R. 1626, to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, H.R. 1640, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, H.R. 728, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office", H.R. 891, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building", H.R. 1326, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office", H.R. 1350, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building", an original bill entitled, "District of Columbia Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act of 2015", an original bill entitled, "EINSTEIN Act of 2015", an original bill entitled, "Representative Payee Fraud Prevention Act of 2015", an original bill entitled, "Saving Federal Dollars Through Better Use of Government Purchase and Travel Cards Act of 2015", and an original to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers, and the nominations of Carol Fortine Ochoa, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, General Services Administration, and Steven M. Wellner, and William Ward Nooter, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

SD-342

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine lessons learned from past WMD negotiations.

SD-419

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine demanding results to end Native youth suicides.

SD-628

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine work in retirement, focusing on career reinventions and the new retirement workscape.

SD-562

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine pending health care and benefits legislation.

SR-418

JUNE 25

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine federal cybersecurity and the Office of Personnel Management data breach.

SD-342

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine economic opportunity for our veterans and their families through entrepreneurship.

SR-428A

9:45 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 1482, to improve and reauthorize provisions relating to the application of the anti-trust laws to the award of need-based educational aid, and the nominations of Luis Felipe Restrepo, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Travis Randall McDonough, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, and Waverly D. Crenshaw, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee.

SD-226

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine country of origin labeling and trade retaliation, focusing on what's at stake for America's farmers, ranchers, businesses, and consumers.

SD-G50

Committee on Appropriations

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016", and an original bill entitled, "Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016".

SD-106

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the private sector, focusing on state innovations in financing transportation infrastructure.

SD-215

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. Res. 204, recognizing June 20, 2015 as "World Refugee Day", S. Res. 152, recognizing threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority in efforts of the United States Government to promote democracy and good governance, and the nomination of Janet L. Yellen, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund; to be immediately followed by hearings to examine evaluating key components of a joint comprehensive plan of action with Iran.

SD-419

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider S. 1626, to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, improve safety, streamline rail project delivery, S. 1611, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, S. 1573, to establish regional weather forecast offices, S. 1298, to provide nationally consistent measures of performance of the Nation's ports, S. 1403, to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to promote sustainable conservation and management for the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic fisheries and the communities that rely on them, S. 1551, to provide for certain requirements relating to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition, S. 1182, to exempt application of JSA attribution rule in case of existing agreements, S. 1250, to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and the nominations of Andrew J. Read, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission, and routine lists in the Coast Guard.

SR-253

1:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance

To hold hearings to examine economic crisis, focusing on the global impact of a Greek default.

SD-538

JULY 7

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine highly pathogenic avian influenza, focusing on the impact on the United States poultry sector and protecting United States poultry flocks.

SR-328A

JULY 8

2:15 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism

To hold hearings to examine cyber crime, focusing on modernizing our legal framework for the information age.

SD-226

JULY 9

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an oversight hearing to examine mitigation requirements, interagency coordination, and pilot projects related to economic development on Federal lands.

SD-366

AUGUST 4

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the back-end of the nuclear fuel cycle and related legislation, including S. 854, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste.

SD-366

SENATE—Tuesday, June 23, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, You are from everlasting to everlasting. Keep us under Your watchful eyes, that we may dwell in Your eternal presence.

Lord, into Your care we entrust our lawmakers. Help them to feel the companionship of Your presence, as they labor for liberty. Give them safety from all danger and the wisdom to remember that You will never leave or forsake them.

Be with the members of their staffs. Control their thoughts as You fill them with peace. Surround them with the shield of Your Divine favor, sustaining them in all they do and say. Be present in their hearts as a Spirit of power, joy, and contentment.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 160

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying H.R. 644.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill (H.R. 644) entitled "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory," and further

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 644.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks, the time until 11 a.m. this morning be equally divided between the leaders or their designees, and that the second-degree filing deadline for H.R. 2146 and H.R. 1295 be 10:30 a.m. this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate's top Democrat on trade announced his support for the bipartisan trade legislation we will vote on today.

It adds to the renewed momentum we are seeing for America's workers. It is showing that Democrats can join Republicans to knock down unfair international barriers that discriminate against America's middle class—barriers that for too long have prevented American workers from selling more of what they make and American farmers from selling more of what they grow. It is demonstrating that both parties can work together to strengthen America's national security at home and America's leadership abroad, instead of simply ceding the future and one of the world's fastest growing regions to Chinese aggression.

It is proving that our friends can rally with us and support 1.4 million additional jobs in our country—including over 18,000 in Kentucky alone—as one study estimates new trade agreements with Europe and the Pacific could well support. These are the reasons a bill is gaining steam that would help advance all of these objectives—a bill that would enhance Congress's role in the trade process while ensuring Presidents of either party have the tools to secure strong and enforceable trade agreements.

That is the bipartisan trade bill before us today. It passed the Finance Committee with strong bipartisan support in April. It passed the full Senate with strong bipartisan support in May. It just passed the House with backing from across the political spectrum as well, gaining the support of everyone from Chairman RYAN and Representative HENSARLING on one side to Representative KIND on the other.

Now it is time for the next step.

I urge all of our colleagues to vote for cloture on this bipartisan trade bill today. That will open the way for final passage of TPA tomorrow. It will open the way for final passage of TAA and the AGOA and preferences measure the following day, too.

Earlier this morning, Speaker BOEHNER reaffirmed his commitment to taking up TAA once it passes the Senate. He stated his desire to see both TAA and TPA on the President's desk by the end of this week, and he underlined the House's readiness to go to conference on the Customs bill. Speaker BOEHNER is clearly committed to building trust across the aisle on this issue, and I am as well. That is why I just moved to go to conference on the Customs bill.

So this is where we are. Let's vote today. Let's vote today to move ahead on TPA, an important accomplishment for the country. Then we can vote to move ahead on TAA, AGOA, and preferences, and then we can vote to move ahead on Customs.

If we all keep working together and trusting each other, then by the end of the week the President will have TPA, TAA, and AGOA and preferences on his desk, with Customs in the process of heading his way as well.

Today is a very big vote. It is an important moment for the country. It sets in motion the completion of a project we set out on literally months ago, completing work on all four of the bills reported by the Finance Committee. That is what my friends on the other side have said they wanted, and that is what can be achieved by continuing to work together.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

RACISM IN AMERICA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, our Nation's heart remains broken over the senseless tragedy last week in Charleston, SC. A young man full of hate took the lives of nine worshippers after they welcomed him into their Bible study.

Once again, someone motivated by ignorance and hatred got his hands on a gun and inflicted pain on innocent Americans. Once again, we must witness the people of a community as they struggle to reconnect and put the pieces of their lives back together. Once again, we are looking at our newspapers, watching our TV screens, and talking at our dinner tables about why—why did this happen?

As the painful details emerge, we cannot turn away from the hard truth this tragedy lays bare: Racism still exists in our society.

We have to accept that reality. If we ever hope to change it, we have to accept that reality. I watched this weekend as pundits and the Nation's thought leaders attempted to address this issue by sidestepping the truth. This violent attack was racially motivated, plain and simple. It was intended to terrorize the African-American community both in Charleston and around this Nation.

Fifty years after Dr. Martin Luther King led a March in Washington, 50 years after Congress passed the Civil Rights Act, 50 years after the march for voting rights in Selma, 50 years after Congress passed the Voting Rights Act, we must still face the hard truth about race in America. The truth is that we still have much to do. We must overcome. We have no choice. One cannot ignore this underlying issue.

It deeply troubles our Nation that hatred and bigotry exist. The harsh reality of hatred and bigotry in this country, in addition to the consistent lack of opportunities in communities of color, have left far too many men and women of color feel that their lives really don't matter. It is easy to feel that your life doesn't matter when the odds are stacked against you every place you look, on every hand.

Here are some of the facts African Americans face on a daily basis. Nearly half of all African-American families have lived in poor neighborhoods for at least two generations—50 percent compared to 7 percent of White families. An African-American man is far more likely to be stopped and searched by police, charged with crimes, and sentenced to longer prison terms than a White male—10 percent longer for the same crimes in the Federal system. In the State system, the numbers are even more skewed than that.

These facts alone illustrate that countless men and women face unprecedented challenges and are still judged by the color of their skin, not the content of their character.

We have a moral obligation to change these realities. We must do everything within our power to ensure that all Americans know that their lives matter. This means standing for what is right, calling out bigotry and hatred when it is seen and felt, and then taking action to address the bigotry.

It is hard to fathom that even as the community of Charleston grapples with the devastation of this hateful act, African-American men and women have to walk under a Confederate flag when they step on the grounds of the South Carolina statehouse in Columbia, SC.

The Confederate flag is a symbol of the dark past from which our country has come. It does not and should not represent our values or the way we treat our fellow Americans. It is a symbol of slavery. It is a symbol of White supremacy. There is no other way to explain it. It often flew high as vile organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan torched African-American churches.

This symbol of the past has no place atop buildings that govern Americans. It is just not who we are, and certainly it shouldn't be who we want to be. The flag should be removed and now.

Yesterday, Governor Nikki Haley of South Carolina said that in the Capitol of South Carolina the flag should not be flown. She said: We will do this in spite of what the State legislature feels.

We have tried this in the past, and the State legislatures have said: No, we are keeping the flag flying.

So I applaud her. I appreciate her courageous act so that the Confederate flag has no future in the future of South Carolina. It belongs in the past in every place in America, not just South Carolina. Anyone who desires to fly that flag on private property can do so, of course, but no State in our great Nation should allow this flag to soar above its capitol. It shouldn't soar in public places.

We must always stand for what is right. We must stand for equality and justice and act to defend them. We must preserve and protect the rights of every American, not because it is the safe thing to do, not because it is pop-

ular or because it has political benefit. We must stand and defend equality and justice because that is the right thing to do.

We must take meaningful action to ensure the safety of our citizens.

Once again, our hearts are broken as another community struggles to recover from a mass shooting. I am going to mention now just a few of them: Fort Hood, 13 Americans killed, and this was on a military base; Tucson, AZ, 6 Americans killed; Carson City, NV, 4 Americans killed; Newtown, CT, 27 Americans dead, and 22 of them were innocent little children; Aurora, CO, in a movie theater, 12 killed; the Navy Yard, maybe a mile from here at the most, in the District of Columbia, 12 killed; Charleston, SC—of course we know 9 were killed while in a Bible study class. And these are not all of the violent acts; these are but a handful. All of these violent events occurred within the past few years.

Our country, the United States, is the only advanced country where this type of mass violence occurs—the only country. Per capita, in America we kill each other with guns at a rate 297 times higher than Japan, 49 times higher than France, 33 times higher than Israel, and we outdistance every other country by far too much.

We can do something about this sad, violent reality. Let's do something. We can expand, for example, background checks for people who want to buy guns to prevent the mentally ill and criminals from buying guns. Is that asking too much—the mentally ill and criminals? More than 80 percent of the American people support this. Why can't we in Congress support it? The American people support it. It has bipartisan support. I say it over and over again. The American community is overwhelmingly in support of not giving guns to people who are mentally ill or felons. They shouldn't be able to buy guns. We should act to save lives by expanding these background checks. Isn't that the least we can do?

I know people will come and say: Well, he wasn't a felon. Maybe so. But couldn't we do something? Couldn't we at least do this minimal thing to stop people who are sick in the head and people who are criminals from purchasing guns? Couldn't we at least do that?

Einstein's definition of insanity is continuing the same thing over and over while expecting a different result, and that is what we are doing. For the future of our country, we have to change. In the face of racism and bigotry, we must act. We can't do nothing. We must prevent felons and the mentally ill from gunning down even more Americans in broad daylight. If we do not, we will be here again. Our hearts will be broken again. Again we will have to ask ourselves how we allowed another senseless tragedy to take place

while we stood by doing nothing to prevent other deaths.

Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate today?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, later today the Senate will once again have an opportunity to vote on whether to renew trade promotion authority. The Senate has already considered this issue once and the House has voted on it twice, each time demonstrating strong bipartisan support for TPA. My hope is that we can get to a similar result with today's vote in the Senate.

We need to be clear about what is at stake. The United States is currently negotiating a number of trade agreements with some of our most important trading partners in the world. If the Senate fails to approve this bill, neither Congress nor the American people will have a strong voice during these negotiations. As a result, our Nation will not be able to get the best trade agreements possible, if we are able to advance any trade agreements at all. Some people, including some of our colleagues, may be fine with that result. They do not think we need trade agreements to promote a healthy economy. But nothing could be further from the truth.

As we all know, most of the world's consumers live outside our borders—95 percent of them. In addition, the vast majority of economic growth in the world is likely to occur outside of the United States over the next decade. If our workers, farmers, ranchers, and service providers are going to be able to compete in these growing markets, we must have open access to these markets and fair trade rules to boot. Without strong trade agreements, neither of these is possible.

When it comes to international trade, we cannot stand still. If we don't lead and set the rules of the game, other nations will and our economy will be left behind.

The United States continues to be a leader in agricultural exports throughout the world. In fact, we still export more agricultural goods than any other country. In addition, the United States continues to boast an enormous manufacturing base that supplies consumers in every corner of the globe.

We also lead the world in technology, digital services, and innovation. Indeed, not only do we lead the world in creation of intellectual property, America essentially created the modern digital landscape.

The United States also continues to lead in trade in services, exporting more than \$700 billion in services in 2014 alone. That is more than twice as much as the United Kingdom, the world's second highest services exporter.

I ask that the Parliamentarian let me know when my 10 minutes has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. HATCH. In other words, we know we can compete on the world stage when the rules are fair and the playing field is level. That is why I am such a strong proponent of this TPA legislation. This bill, which is the product of a great deal of work and a lot of bipartisan cooperation, will have a powerful and positive impact on industries throughout our economy, on consumers, and, of course, on American workers as well.

In an America that embraces international trade, I believe even those individuals who encounter a temporary setback can find new opportunities, can out-work, out-produce, out-think, and out-innovate our global competition so long as the groundwork has been laid to give them those opportunities. That is why we need strong trade agreements, and that is why we need TPA.

As you can surely tell, I feel very passionately about free trade, and I know many of my colleagues are just as passionate in their opposition. But as Congress has considered this legislation, I think we have had a full and fair debate on these issues. We have been transparent on the substance of the bill and in the way things have moved forward. Both sides have been able to make their case to the American people.

It is at times such as these when working in Congress is the most rewarding. We have the opportunity to hear so many different accounts, sift through mountains of data and research, meet with hundreds of interested parties representing thousands of our constituents, and work through hotly contested differences. Then, after all of that work, when circumstances are right, we are able to come up with bipartisan legislation that addresses the needs of our country, our constituents, and our economy. That is what we have been able to do with this TPA debate, which is a debate that has been going on for many years now.

I still want to work with those who may not share all my views on all these issues. One way we have agreed to do that is to help ensure that trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, will be extended. As you know, TAA has been included in the trade preferences bill the Senate will hopefully vote on later this week after we pass TPA.

I have said many times that I am not a fan of TAA. Personally, I think the

program is redundant and ineffective. However, after 38 years here in the Senate, believe me, I am well aware that everything is not about me. I understand TAA is a priority for a number of my colleagues and that it continues to be the price of admission for many who want to support TPA. The Senate majority leader recognizes this as well, which is why he has committed to ensuring that TAA gets a fair vote here in the Senate and a fair opportunity to pass.

Throughout this process, we have done all we can, within reason, to accommodate the concerns of Senators. I am very appreciative of all the support we have received from Members on both sides of the aisle. We couldn't have gotten this far without that support.

Now it is time to finish the work—to pass this bill and get it to the President's desk. We need this bill to ensure that our constituents' voices are heard in the trade negotiating process. We need this bill to give our trade negotiators the tools they need to get a good deal. And we need this bill to expand access to foreign markets so that we can grow our economy and create new and high-paying jobs here at home. That is what this bill is all about and why we have been working on this process for so long. We are very close to the finish line, and we need just one more burst of energy and a few more steps to get us there.

I urge all my colleagues who support free trade, open markets, and the advancement of American values and interests abroad to join me once again in supporting TPA and working with me and with my colleague Senator WYDEN to get all the pending trade bills passed in the Senate and signed into law.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, over the last several weeks on the floor of both this body and the House, we have heard Members, colleagues, say they are tired of the old 1990s North American Free Trade Agreement playbook on trade. They are concerned that the package which is once again before the Senate is more of the same.

Here is my message on why this legislation needs to move forward. If you believe those policies of the 1990s failed to protect American workers and strengthen our economy, this is our chance to set a new course. This is our chance to put in place higher standards in global trade on matters such as labor rights and environmental protection, to shine some real sunlight on trade agreements and ensure that our country writes the rules of the road.

The fact is, in 2015, globalization is a reality. The choice is whether to sit back and allow globalization to push and pull on our economy until in ways dictated by countries in China. So our

choice is either to move now and get into the center of the ring and fight for a stronger economic future, protect our workers and promote our values, or remain tethered to many of those old policies of the 1990s.

I say to the Senate today: If you believe, like me, that it is time once and for all to close the books on the North American free-trade era in trade, this legislation deserves your support.

In my hometown paper recently, there was an opinion article, and it stated that this trade bill lays out “a hard-and-fast checklist for the TPP, holding the Obama administration accountable for meeting its goals and conditions.” The article goes on to say that this legislation “will reorient priorities and improve the process for the TPP and other trade agreements in the future.” I completely agree with that view, but the Senate doesn’t have to take my word for it. Those are the words of Tim Nesbitt, the past president of the Oregon AFL-CIO, who has disagreed with me on trade often over the years. Yet now he states that this legislation we will vote on today provides a fresh opportunity for trade done right.

When it comes to core American values—labor rights, environmental protection, and human rights—this legislation raises the bar and demands more from our trade negotiators than ever before.

We have talked a lot about a race to the bottom. My view is that if our country doesn’t fight to protect worker rights and the environment with tough, enforceable trade agreements, those priorities are going to wither away. China is certainly not going to take up the banner for American values in trade. So if you believe America should stop a race to the bottom on labor rights, environmental safeguards, and human rights, this legislation is our chance to lift up global standards.

I want to talk for a moment about the economic potential of this legislation. What we all understand we need to do is make things here, grow things here, add value to them here, and then ship them somewhere. My State knows how to make this happen, and so do many others. About one out of five jobs in Oregon depends on international trade. Almost 90 percent of them are small and medium sized. And what we know is that in many instances those jobs pay better.

The fact is, if our farmers want to sell their products in Japan—and this is true of agriculture all over America. A lot of our farmers face average tariffs of 40 percent. That is right. If you want to export some jam to Vietnam, it will be marked up by 90 percent. If you want to sell a bottle of wine—and we have wine growers with prosperous businesses all over the country—they have to fork over 50 percent of the value to the government. So if we be-

lieve other countries should open their markets to American exports, like the U.S. is open to theirs, this is our chance to break down the tariffs and other barriers.

I want to touch for a moment again on how different this is than the 1990s. In the 1990s, nobody could have imagined the right tools to protect the modern Internet. Twenty-five years ago, it was impossible to make a living by setting up a business online. A cell phone was as big as a brick. In fact, the NAFTA negotiations began a year before the first Web site was set up. Today, Internet commerce is at the heart of our economy. If we want to cement America’s leadership in the digital economy, this is our chance to vote for trade policies that will protect a free and open Internet.

Now, I wish to mention again, apropos of how different this is, that I have felt for some time that critics of past trade policy have been spot on with respect to a lot of this secrecy which is just gratuitous. If we believe deeply in trade, as Chairman HATCH and I do, and want more of it, why should we have all this unnecessary secrecy which just makes people cynical about trade?

So we have brought sunshine to this trade debate in a way that is unprecedented. For the first time, before the President can sign a deal, the full text has to be released to the public for 60 days. Before we can have votes in the other body and in the Senate, there will be no fewer than 4 months where people can open a proposed trade deal and read it for themselves.

So picture that: For 4 months, the American people will have in their hands—starting with the TPP—what the trade agreement is all about. That is simply unprecedented.

I wish to close the question of how we are going to proceed from here. This has obviously been a complicated piece of legislation. I appreciate the Senate and House leaders have committed to moving trade adjustment assistance alongside trade promotion authority as well as a proposal that originated with Senator BROWN to strengthen our critically important trade enforcement laws. While the goal of enacting trade policies is a tool to give all Americans a chance to get ahead, trade adjustment assistance is an absolute must-pass bill, and I am confident it is going to get through Congress to the President’s desk. That bill includes the vitally important program also that creates new opportunities for impoverished nations in Africa.

The Customs enforcement bill is also moving forward on a bipartisan basis, and there is important work there to be done. The Senate must resolve differences in the enforcement bill with the other body. I wish to make it clear this morning that I expect that conference to respect Democratic priorities. My Democratic colleagues and I

will be laying down markers on several of our top priorities. I discussed those priorities with Chairman RYAN last night. Those priorities include provisions in the Senate bill championed by Senator SHAHEEN to help our small businesses, provisions authored by Senator BENNET to address enforcement environmental laws, and Senator CANTWELL’s important trade enforcement trust fund.

In my view, the Congress has an opportunity in this legislation to show it can work in a bipartisan way to take on one of the premier economic challenges of our time. Our job is to get past the policies of the 1990s and move toward getting trade done right.

Colleagues, let’s pry open foreign markets and send more of our exports abroad. Let’s fight for the American brand and the Oregon brand against the trade chiefs and the bad actors who are blocking our way, and let’s raise the bar for American values and open our trade policies to sunlight.

I urge all in the Senate to vote yes on cloture today and to support this package as it advances this week. In effect, we get three important bills done this week and set in motion.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the motion to invoke cloture on TPA, the so-called fast-track legislation. I am still incredulous, as I have watched this trade nondebate, if you will, at the speed at which, time after time, the majority leader has tried to shut down debate. It has happened again and again, and that is compounded by the secrecy of this whole process.

I can’t count the number of times in my State of Ohio and in meetings in Washington, with people from all over the country, that people have said we have little or no access to the Trans-Pacific Partnership. TPA, in the past—fast-track—has actually been sort of a rule book for how we should negotiate trade agreements and, at the same time, has been a direction on how to negotiate these trade agreements and a rule book on how it is presented on the Senate floor. Yet none of the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations by Ambassador Froman have been informed at all by a TPA because we haven’t had a TPA yet. We haven’t even had an instruction booklet in the past. At the same time, we have gotten the worst of both worlds because we are voting on TPA, and we really haven’t been able

to see what is in TPP. I know supporters of TPP will say we are going to have 60 days now, but Members are casting their votes now—where 60 votes are required and they have maximum leverage—to put no final point on it, just giving up the leverage they have as we are still kept in the dark on what is happening.

Let me give one example before I get to where I think we are making a mistake by moving so quickly today, in essence, fast-tracking fast-track.

One example, my office and I personally have repeatedly spoken to the President of the United States and the U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Froman, repeatedly asking them to fix some of the language on tobacco. Because one of the things that apparently—we really don't know for sure—the Trans-Pacific Partnership does is it gives even more power to American tobacco companies—more power to American tobacco companies to have influence over laws in particularly small countries which don't have the wherewithal and can't afford the huge legal bills a large tobacco company can afford to write public health law.

If a small country wants to write a law to protect their children from marketing of tobacco products—which is what we have done in this country—the U.S. tobacco company or British tobacco company can—let's keep it here. The U.S. tobacco company can threaten a lawsuit against those countries, and those countries are probably going to back off because they probably can't afford to go to court with the big American tobacco company. Even something as clearly violative of the public interest and of public health as what damage Big Tobacco inflicts on children has not, to our knowledge, been addressed. Again, so much of this is secretive that we don't even know that.

That is why there is anger in this country and why there is—so many people in this country tell me, so many in my State: Why are you moving so fast? Why is this coming up right now? Why don't we know more about this whole process?

Yet again, the majority leader is shutting down debate. He will be joined, I assume, by a small number, a distinct, small number of minority Democrats, getting up over the 60-vote margin so they can shut down debate, so they can move the TPA—the fast-track—forward, so they can get the Trans-Pacific Partnership down the road.

No matter which side of the TPP debate, no matter which side of the trade promotion authority, TPA, fast-track—no matter which side you are on, it is clear that our trade policy creates winners and losers. It is clear. Even the most vigorous cheerleaders for free trade—the Wall Street Journal editorial board, for instance—even the

strongest free-traders, even though people who reflectively support these free-trade agreements acknowledge there are winners and losers.

They will argue that these trade agreements create more jobs than they lose. I don't agree with that. They argue that. Put that aside. But they also acknowledge that people lose jobs because of decisions we make.

We are about to pass fast-track here. We are about to pass trade promotion authority, leading probably to the Trans-Pacific Partnership having a reasonable chance of passage. We are about to do that. We are making that decision here. Members of Congress, people who are well paid, with government-financed retirements and health care—we are about to make those decisions, and we know—we are knowingly making that decision, acknowledging that some people will lose their jobs because of a decision we make, but we are not going to take care of those workers. We are going to pass today the TPA, the trade promotion authority, fast-track. We are going to pass that and ignore those workers. How shameful is that that we know the decisions we are making in this body—we are making the decisions, the President of the United States makes this decision, the House of Representatives has made this decision, the Senate is about to make this decision, we are making this decision, knowing people will lose their jobs because of our actions. Yet we are unwilling to provide for those workers who lose their jobs.

Let me give a little history, a special message to Congress. In January of 1962, President Kennedy said:

When considerations of national policy make it desirable to avoid higher tariffs, those injured by that competition should not be required to bear the full brunt of the impact. Rather, the burden of economic adjustment should be borne in part by the Federal Government.

That is President Kennedy at the advent, at the beginning, at the creation of the trade adjustment assistance, the support for workers who lose their jobs because of—again, I repeat—decisions we make in this body, in the House of Representatives, in the White House. We make decisions on trade. We know people will lose their jobs. We should help them. It should be our moral responsibility to help them.

Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana said: “No small group of firms and workers should be made to bear the full burden of the costs of a program whose great benefits enrich the Nation as a whole.”

This is as true today as it was 53 years ago. It is not a Democratic idea. It is not a Republican idea. Everyone from the Cato Institute—a libertarian-oriented think tank in Washington, a bunch of well-paid scholars who make pronouncements from on high about various kinds of public policy issues—

to the Wall Street Journal—a similar body but one with greater ability to disseminate information—even those two venerable institutions admit the trade agreements do not create winners everywhere.

A Cato Institute trade briefing says, “All of those job losses are a painful but necessary part of the larger process of innovation and productivity increases.”

I am always a bit amused when people who—again, well-educated, good pay, dress like this, good benefits, good retirement, good health care—make pronouncements saying: Well, job losses are painful—not to us, of course. The same as editorial writers who make these decisions, these pronouncements on trade, they are not losing their jobs. People in my State are losing jobs on these fair trade agreements. We are going to inflict this pain. As the Cato Institute and the Wall Street Journal say, by the decisions we make, we are going to inflict pain on these workers. People are going to lose jobs in my town of Mansfield, OH. People are going to lose jobs where I grew up. People are going to lose jobs in Cleveland where I live now. People are going to lose jobs in Zanesville and Newark because of decisions we make today on fast-track, because of decisions we will make next year on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. People are going to lose their jobs, but we are going to vote today to cut off debate, and we are going to forget, at least temporarily, about helping those workers who lose jobs because of decisions we make. How immoral is that? How shameful is that? What a betrayal we are inflicting on those workers if we make this decision today.

Former Wall Street Journal economics editor David Wessel writes, “Even [free trade's] most fervent admirers concede trade creates winners and losers.”

I will debate until the cows come home the net benefits of these trade agreements. I think they are net job loss. But even if you believe these trade agreements are net job-gainers—I don't think there is a lot of evidence of that—but even if you believe that, we know people lose their jobs because of decisions we make. That is why Republicans in the past have supported trade adjustment assistance in principle and in policy going back decades.

Fifteen years ago, President George W. Bush said, “I recognize that some American workers may face adjustment challenges”—that means they get thrown out of work. It is a nice way a President might talk about people he has left behind. Put that aside. “I recognize that some American workers may face adjustment challenges as a result of trade.”

At least to President Bush's credit—I wish his words would be followed today on this floor by the majority

leader, by Republican Leader McCONNELL as he cuts off debate and leaves behind trade adjustment assistance. President Bush said, "I support helping these workers by reauthorizing and improving trade adjustment assistance programs that will give workers impacted by trade new skills, help them find new jobs quickly, and provide them with financial assistance."

I can give lots of stories about people I know in Youngstown, Lima, Dayton, Hamilton, and people in Portsmouth who lost their jobs because of trade, but at least they have gotten a helping hand from a government that used to have their backs and believe in them—at least until today—from a government that actually will extend that hand and help them retrain. Maybe they can become a nurse, maybe they can work in information technology, maybe they can become a radiology technologist at the local hospital.

Earlier this year, my colleague JOHN CORNYN—Republican from Texas, the senior Senator and assistant Republican leader—told reporters that "there is no doubt that the benefits of more trade do not fall uniformly. There are some segments of the economy that don't prosper as well."

We know that. We have seen that acknowledgement across the board. Yet today Leader McCONNELL is going to cut off debate, even though decisions we have made have cost people their jobs. That is why we have a moral obligation. It is not a new idea. It is not a partisan idea. It is universally accepted. Trade deals don't benefit everybody. That is why this moral obligation to include trade adjustment assistance in any package with TPA is so important.

We can't send a framework for a new trade deal to the President's desk without assistance for the workers who will be left behind, but that is not what we are doing today. Today, it is full-speed ahead, cut off debate, move ahead on fast-track, move ahead on trade promotion authority.

I assume a number of my Democratic colleagues are going along with it. I hope the wrath of people in this country—if the House and Senate refuse to do what some of their leaders say they will, that they will pass trade adjustment assistance, that they will take care of those workers—if they don't live up to that promise—and many times in the past they haven't lived up to similar promises—a lot of my colleagues are going to go home and face people who say: Wait. You made a decision. I got thrown out of a job because of a decision you made, because of a decision you made as a House Member, because of a decision you made as a Senator, because of a decision you made, Mr. President. I was thrown out of work, and you passed on June 23—or whatever today is—fast-track without taking care of me, even though it was your decision that I lose my job.

What kind of government—what kind of principles do we live under here?

In March, conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer wrote in *National Review Online*:

To be sure, any trade deal, while a net plus overall, produces winners and losers. But the TPP will be accompanied by so-called Trade Adjustment Assistance, training and subsidies to help those negatively affected.

Again, Krauthammer, as he is about 95 percent of the time, is wrong. He is wrong that it is going to be accompanied by the trade adjustment assistance. The assumption all along, even among TPP proponents, has been that TPA would be passed in tandem with aid for workers. But you know, even though that is what we did first here, Republicans in the House of Representatives are unwilling to vote for them together. They are just not going to vote. Speaker BOEHNER, for some reason, acquiesced to the President of the United States, pulled them apart, and had separate votes. Think about the message we will send. If we put another huge trade deal—parenthetically, once-majority leader, Republican leader Trent Lott said: You can't pass a trade agreement in an even-numbered year. Do you know why he said that? He said that because people don't like trade deals in this country. People know NAFTA sold them out. They know CAFTA sold them out. They know PNTR with China sold them out. They know Korea sold them out. We heard these promises over and over.

With NAFTA, we were promised 200,000 jobs in 2 years. Thank you, President Bush 1, and thank you, President Clinton, for that. We lost 680,000 net jobs. Central America Free Trade Agreement—thank you, President Bush 2, for that. Promises were made, big promises about job increases, big promises about wages going up. It didn't happen. Wages stayed flat. Jobs were lost. Thank you, President Bush 2, for that.

Korea, South Korea Free Trade Agreement, negotiated in part by President Bush, pushed through the Senate by President Obama—thank you, Mr. Presidents of both parties, for that. They told us 70,000 jobs would be created out of the South Korea Free Trade Agreement. No, we have lost 75,000 jobs.

Using the same formula that we have—we have seen this over and over. We know what happens. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that between 2009 and 2012, two-thirds of displaced manufacturing workers who did find new jobs ended up taking lower paying jobs. Most of those workers saw wage losses of more than 20 percent.

You can debate whether the gains others experienced make these losses worth it. I don't think they do. I think if you have traveled darned near anywhere—if Members of Congress spent a little more time with people who can't

contribute to them, with people who don't belong to a local rotary club, with people who might just work hard, play by the rules, not make a lot of money, barely make it, sometimes have their house foreclosed on, sometimes lose their job—if we would spend a little more time with people like that, I think we would see how these trade agreements are working.

There is a debate to be had. I will cede it is debatable, whether these trade agreements—whether the evidence is that they create jobs or lose jobs. I think it is pretty clear they lose jobs. But there is no debate. There is no debate on what actually happens here. Because of decisions—I will repeat—before this vote coming up in about 60 seconds, because of decisions we make in this body—the President makes, Senators make, Congress men and women make—because of decisions we make in this body, people in our States, whether it is Arkansas or Arizona, Oregon, Utah or my State of Ohio, people lose jobs because of decisions we make. There is no question people lose jobs because of decisions we make. Anything short of providing for those workers who lose their jobs today, not doing this on a promise—we are basically trusting the majority leader who doesn't really like, I understand, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. We are relying on the word of Speaker BOEHNER, who doesn't particularly like trade adjustment assistance. We know most of the Members of his party in the House of Representatives do not particularly like trade adjustment assistance. We are going to rely on their promise.

We are voting today on the fly. We are saying to workers in this country: Yes, we have made decisions that may have cost you your job. We are going to try to help you when you lose that job, but we are still going to go ahead today and do that. That is why I asked my colleagues to vote no on this motion today to invoke cloture on trade promotion authority.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to

the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 218 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alexander	Feinstein	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Murray
Barrasso	Flake	Nelson
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Carper	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Shaheen
Cochran	Johnson	Sullivan
Coons	Kaine	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Tillis
Cotton	Lankford	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Daines	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown	Leahy	Sessions
Cardin	Manchin	Shelby
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	Merkley	Tester
Cruz	Mikulski	Udall
Donnelly	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Paul	Whitehouse
Franken	Peters	
Gillibrand	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Corker	Lee	Menendez
--------	-----	----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 37.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 218, the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146, trade promotion authority. Had I been present, I would have voted nay. •

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 2146, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with amendment No. 2060 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2061 (to amendment No. 2060), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2062, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2063 (to the instructions) amendment No. 2062), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2064 (to amendment No. 2063), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer falls.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would just like to announce that Senator CORKER was inadvertently detained in getting to the floor of the Senate. Had he been here, he would have voted yea on the cloture motion.

Mr. President, I also just want to say to our colleagues that this is a very important day for our country. We have demonstrated we can work together on a bipartisan basis to achieve something that is extremely important for America. Not only when we confirm this trade promotion authority will we have the mechanism in place for the President to finalize an extraordinarily important deal with a number of different Asian countries, but it will indicate that America is back in the trade business. It will also send a message to our allies that we understand that they are somewhat wary about Chinese commercial and potentially military domination and that we intend to still be deeply involved in the Pacific.

So I want to congratulate Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN. This has

been a long and rather twisted path to where we are today, but it is a very important accomplishment for the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like to mention that as to the other two absences, Senator MENENDEZ had voted no on cloture before, and Senator LEE had voted no on cloture before. So the vote would have been 61 to 39.

More importantly, this is a day of celebration in the corporate suites of this country, to be sure, because they have another corporate-sponsored trade agreement that will mean more money in some investors' pockets. It will mean more plant closings in Ohio, Arizona, Delaware, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Maine, and all over this country.

Most importantly, what I didn't understand about the vote today is that even though the Wall Street Journal, the CATO Institute, and others acknowledge that, as to the decisions we make here on trade agreements—while they say it is a net increase in jobs—people lose their jobs because of the decisions we make. So we make decisions here today that throw people out of work. We know that. Across the political spectrum that is acknowledged. But we today don't do anything to help those workers that lose their jobs. We make a decision to throw people in Mansfield, OH, and Cleveland, OH, out of work, but then we don't take care of those workers that lost their jobs because of our decisions. It is shameful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me just concur with the Senator from Ohio. This trade agreement was supported by virtually every major corporation in this country, the vast majority of whom have outsourced millions of jobs to low-wage countries all over the world. This trade agreement is supported by Wall Street. This trade agreement is supported by the pharmaceutical industry, which wants to charge people in poor countries higher prices for the medicine they desperately need.

This agreement was opposed by every union in this country, working for the best interests of working families, and by almost every environmental group and many religious groups.

In my view, this trade agreement will continue the policies of NAFTA, CAFTA, and Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China—agreements that have cost us millions of decent-paying jobs.

We need a new trade policy in America—a policy that represents working families and not just the big money interests.

I strongly disagree with the majority leader, who called this a great day for America. It is not a great day. It is a

great day for the Big Money interests, not a great day for working families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. today for the weekly conference meetings, as well as from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. today for an all-Senators briefing, and that all time in recess count postclosure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it is no secret that Republicans on this side of the aisle don't agree with President Obama about everything. In fact, I would say that on balance most Republicans disagree with the policy choices made by this President. But occasionally—occasionally—even the leader of the Democratic Party, the President of the United States, gets things right.

Occasionally, the President of the United States gets his policy choices right, and he did so with regard to trade promotion authority.

I would point out to our friends and to anybody listening that this actually is a 6-year trade promotion authority. This extends well beyond the tenure of the current occupant of the White House, and it will be available for the next President of the United States to negotiate trade deals that are in the best interests of the United States.

So I agree with the majority leader. This latest vote is just another example of the Senate getting back to work and restored to regular working order. This is a dramatic departure from the old Senate, because there has actually been a lot of time for consideration of important pieces of legislation—from the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act to the Justice for Victims of Human Trafficking Act to the budget.

By moving this trade promotion authority bill forward, we can ensure that American workers and businesses can get the best deal in trade agreements with countries from Asia to South America to Europe.

I believe we have actually kept the campaign promises we made last year that, if the American people entrusted the Republicans with the new majority, we would work together with our allies where we could on the other side of the aisle where we have common cause to deliver results for the American people, to legislate in their best interest—not just to obstruct for obstruction's sake or gain some temporary tactical or political advantage but to promote a functioning, deliberative Senate. I see one of the leaders of this effort, the Senator from Delaware, who has done great work trying to find that common cause and producing a result, as exemplified by the TPA. I am going to yield for him in just a moment.

But let me just talk briefly about my response to the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio, who said there is nothing good to be had out of this trade promotion authority or any potential trade deals that we might negotiate.

My home State of Texas relies heavily on international trade. We are the number one trading State in the Nation, which is just one reason why our economy grew at the rate of 5.2 percent in 2014. Our economy in Texas grew at the rate of 5.2 percent in 2014. Do you know the rate at which the U.S. economy grew? The U.S. economy grew at just 2.2 percent. So why wouldn't we want to do anything and everything we can to stimulate the growth of the economy to benefit people looking for work and people looking for higher wages? This important trade promotion authority is the first step to doing that.

I will conclude because the distinguished Senator from Delaware is here and others who want to speak.

Trade is an engine of growth. It keeps our economy growing. These upcoming trade agreements, whether it is the Trans-Pacific Partnership or the transatlantic investment treaty, serve as a great opportunity to turbo-charge that growth.

Our economy actually contracted last quarter by 0.7 percent. As long as our economy is shrinking and not growing, we are not going to be able to create the jobs to put America back to work. We are not going to be able to create the sorts of wages that we want for all working Americans. This legislation represents an important step in that direction. I am glad that in the exercise of a little mutual trust and comity, we have reached this important point.

We are not through yet because there are other parts of this trade package that we are going to need to process this week. But the promise and commitment we made on this side of the aisle was that if our colleagues across the aisle trust us to move through the trade promotion authority bill, we will continue to work with them and keep our commitments to them, and, hopefully, more than just the trust that produces these pieces of legislation will result from this increased confidence and trust in one another.

We know we are going to find measures we will disagree on, and we will fight like cats and dogs when we need to. But when we actually agree on the policy and can find it within ourselves to work together, the American people are the beneficiaries.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, while the Senator from Texas is still on the floor, let me say, if I could—he mentioned the word “trust” a number of

times. It is an important word in Congress. One of my favorite sayings is “Integrity—if you have it, nothing else matters. Integrity—if you don't have it, nothing else matters.” The same is true for trust.

In order to get things done here—there is a lot we need to get done. Everybody realizes that.

My takeaway from the election last November was threefold: No. 1, people want us to work together; No. 2, they want us to get stuff done; and No. 3, they want us to get things done that will actually strengthen the economic recovery.

One of the ways to strengthen the economic recovery, frankly, is to make sure that those markets overseas will actually allow us to sell into them, whether it is products or goods or services, that we have access to those markets.

The other thing is that my colleague from Texas is as big believer, as am I, in the Golden Rule, and that is to treat people the way we want to be treated. And I think most of the people in this country support what we are doing. Most of the Democrats in our country support what their President has proposed, and the Republicans as well.

But what we need to do while we move forward with trade promotion authority is we need to keep in mind that not everybody will be helped by this and that there are some people who will to be disadvantaged, and we have an obligation to them to treat them how we would want to be treated if we were in their shoes.

There is a sister piece of legislature to go along with trade promotion authority, and I would ask the Republican whip from Texas to give us some assurance or reassurance so we build trust around this issue. When we are contacted by folks from around the country today, tomorrow, or the next day, what are we going to do to provide assistance to those people who may be disadvantaged because of trade promotion authority and the trade deal that is going to be negotiated? Can you give us some assurance there? Is this like the end of the road or are there some more pieces to follow this week?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would respond to the question by our colleague from Delaware that assurances have been given that we understand that the trade promotion authority and the trade adjustment assistance travel together.

I think we have seen examples where the benefits of trade are not uniformly felt across the country. There are some people who will be displaced. But the importance of trade adjustment assistance—I wish we could negotiate something a little more frugal that would actually get the job done. But a negotiation took place between Chairman

RYAN in the House and the ranking member, Senator WYDEN, in the Senate on this important piece of the package.

We all recognize that these travel in pairs and that trade adjustment assistance is part of the price you pay for getting trade promotion authority done. But most importantly to my colleague's point from Delaware, for those people who are displaced, this guarantees that they will have access to the sort of job training and skills enhancement that they will need in order to get even better jobs in this economy that, on net, will benefit the entire country. That is the intent on this side of the aisle and I think the intent of trade adjustment authority and making sure that we finish our work—not here today but through the rest of the week—on this important package of pieces of legislation.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I thank the Republican whip for those words and for his work on this. I would just close with this thought: Whenever I talk to people who have been married a long time—like 50, 60, 70 years—I always ask them, what is the secret to being married a long time? I get some very funny answers, and I get some very poignant ones as well. The best answer I have ever heard to that question, what is the secret to being married 50, 60, or 70 years, is the two c's—not "Cornyn" and "Carper" but "communicate" and "compromise." I would add maybe a third to that, and that is "collaborate."

We need to demonstrate the ability to communicate and to compromise and to collaborate. And those aren't always the secret to a vibrant marriage, but they are the secret to a vibrant democracy.

This is a confidence-building measure. I think we have taken an important step here, working with Democrats and Republicans and working with a Democratic President, and the next step is one we have just talked about, trade adjustment assistance. We need to do that. If we can actually work through these issues this week and produce a bipartisan product that the President is going to sign, we will actually build some trust. And when we turn to the issue of transportation and having a robust, vibrant transportation system and how to fund that, how to pay for that, what to do, this will be helpful.

So my applause to Senator RON WYDEN, Senator MURRAY on our side, Senator HATCH, the leader on the Republican side, and to Senator CORNYN for good work—not done but a very good start today.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for my colleagues, and I think they make compelling ar-

guments. I just have a hard time. I really have a hard time, with this. I have not had one West Virginian—average, working West Virginian—who had a good job at one time and lost a job who thinks this type of approach to trade is good. Not one. And I am hearing them talking about how much trade we do from our States. I would like to know what type of trade. Manufactured products? I don't see many manufactured products leaving this country. I see an awful lot of resources, such as oil that has been refined into diesel fuel or gasoline. It probably comes from Texas, I would say. I think that is probably a big part of their trading, and those types of things. But how many people actually benefit from that who really have a good manufacturing job? That is all I have asked.

We talked about TAA. We are all hung up on TAA. Do you know why we are hung up? Because we all understand we are going to lose more jobs. We have already lost 6 million jobs since NAFTA. We have all lost 6 million jobs across this country. I lost 31,000 manufacturing jobs.

I understand NAFTA hasn't been enforced, and they had some rules in there. And then you take this piece of legislation, TPA—there was more security around this piece of legislation than there was around the Iran nuclear deal we were talking about. My staff could go there, they could take notes, we were briefed, and we were able to ask questions. We couldn't even take a note or take a note out.

They are telling me: Well, you know, we all depend on trade and the market shrinking. We are at \$18 trillion GDP. Think about this. We in the United States of America have the greatest economy the world has ever seen—\$18 trillion. Do you know that of all these 11 countries we are talking about, the closest one to us is Japan—\$4.5 trillion. It falls off the Richter scale. But yet we have to be very secretive because somebody might leave us.

Well, let me tell you, I have been a businessperson all of my life. If I wanted to get into a market, I will assure you, I would be able to evaluate my competition, the people with whom I want to do business. If that was the big person on the block, I had to make more adjustments than they had to make. But yet we are so concerned about the secrecy of this deal that none of us are able to see it, work it, define it, dissect it, and improve upon it. Now we are just voting basically carte blanche and saying: OK, sure, you are going to get a 60-day review. You can't do a thing about it if you don't like it.

I didn't think we were elected to do that. I really didn't.

When you start looking at everything this stands for and you look at basically—and my father—my grandfather had a grocery store and my dad

had a little furniture store, so I was raised in retail. One thing my dad always encouraged was competition. He enjoyed having it. He said: JOE, listen, good competition brings out more buyers. More buyers gives us more of a chance to sell our goods.

What he never did like and what he thought was unfair was when you had unfair competition—didn't pay their taxes, didn't live by the rules or play by the rules. And if we didn't enforce those, it gave them an unfair competitive advantage.

If you believe our past performance in our trade deals makes us an expert at enforcing and making sure people play by the rules so that America is treated right, then you probably would have voted for this. I don't. I can only judge off of our past performance, where we are today.

When you go shopping for whatever types of goods—household goods, clothing goods, furniture—the greatest furniture markets in the world were in the United States. We make very little furniture in this country today. They still want our wood products, so you know what, yes, we ship logs out of West Virginia around the world so people can make the furniture that they want to send back to America. So I guess they say: Oh, yes, that is good trade. The only reason they are buying our logs is because they don't have the quality logs we have. They don't have the quality hardwood forests.

The best coal in the world, the best metallurgical coal—coking—that makes the steel, the best in the world comes out of West Virginia. Sure they are going to buy it because they don't have it. They are going to make their products and send them back to us and come into these markets subsidized.

I would just say sooner or later we ought to do something for America. You have to rebuild this country, and you don't build the wealth of a country based on basically moving paper back and forth. Moving paper back and forth—there are some people, with the wealth they accrue from this, I am sure they are very satisfied and happy with that. And we see the income inequality over the last 20 years. We have never seen this big of a spread. Never.

You see the flatline of workers all over America, just as flatline as can be. I don't know how we can look them in the eye and say we have done the best because now we have opened up 11 new countries.

Vietnam—58 cents an hour is what they are going to pay their workers. And we said: Whoa, whoa, NAFTA is going to be basically bringing the whole North American trade up to par. Twenty-two years later, I understand that Mexico's minimum wage is still under \$1 an hour, around 80 cents.

You think a person who makes 58 cents an hour or 80 cents an hour or \$1.50 an hour—7 out of 11 countries

make less than \$2—that those people will have disposable income to buy the products we would like to sell so that we can expand our economy and our jobs? I am sorry, I don't think that is going to happen. I really don't. It doesn't make any sense to me at all how we expect a person who can barely survive to have disposable income to buy products that we in the United States of America wish to sell to really lift our manufacturing base. But I guess that is why we have TAA that we are arguing about because we know we have given that up. We just about wrote that off 22 years ago, so I guess we are going to write the rest of it off now.

Technology is great. I am all for innovation, creation, technology. I am for every bit of that. But sooner or later, you have to make something, you have to build something, you have to reinvest, and there have to be people making these products, being able to support their families and to have a benefit package that gives them a decent life.

When I was growing up in little Farmington, WV, we had manufacturing, mining. We had people who could go to work, work hard, make a living, take their family on vacation, pay the bills. And we let all of that slip away from us. I am not saying they will be the jobs of the past, but we could have the jobs of the future—steel, manufacturing.

So I am not willing to give up on this. You don't find me chastising my colleagues on the Republican side or my colleagues on the Democratic side. I think we are all here for the right reason. Sometimes we get a little bit off track, and I think this is one time we have gotten off track. Something that would really help the United States of America, working families all over this country, we have kind of forgotten about, and I am concerned about that.

I am concerned about going home to my beautiful State of West Virginia and telling the people: I am sorry, we are going to have a harder time competing with some of these countries because there is just no way.

We have opened up our borders. We have let international trade, an international manufacturing base go wherever they get the best deal. And I guarantee you that in every developing country, they are not going to be as tough as we are on human rights and on the environmental quality they should be aspiring to. They are not going to be tough on these things. They are trying to build an economy. They are trying to build, basically, a nation, bring it up. And they are going to be a little bit lax on these things. That is unfair competition, which my dad always warned me against.

When we talk about European trade, I am not worried about European trade

because they are basically on the same level playing field that we are. But when you are trying to build up a country, should you sacrifice and tear down your country? Should you give away everything you have worked hard for and built?

I want to help these countries. I have not a bit of problem helping these countries. I am not an isolationist. But I basically would have put something in there that would have protected our manufacturing base. I would have put something in that said that when we fell below certain jobs in manufacturing, it stops. You don't give it all away. It is hard to regain that and recapture it.

I am sure Wall Street is very happy today. I have a lot of friends who work on Wall Street. There are a lot of good people who work on Wall Street, but there are a lot of people who basically are just driven by the almighty dollar. They are not driven by Main Street. They are not worried about West Virginia. They are not worried about my little town of Farmington or any part of my State. And they are going to be very happy. They are not worried about 99 percent of the people who are still on Main Street trying to survive.

We talked about the Export-Import Bank. They said: Trust us; we are going to get a vote on Export-Import Bank. Maybe we will sometime. I would hope that comes to fruition. That helped a lot of small businesses. We haven't gotten that vote yet. So you would have thought there would have been a priority to get a vote on that. It has done an awful lot to get us in the market so we can compete on a more level playing field. That hasn't happened.

But here we go again. We are going to have some votes tomorrow, and the votes tomorrow are going to be based on the TAA because the House couldn't pass TPA fast-track with TAA in it. It is basically what we are dealing with. So they think we can do a backdoor. What makes you think TAA would be acceptable in any way, shape, or form in the House? What makes you think now, since we have carved this out—but we were promised a vote here on the TAA, which we know we are going to need—it is going to make it more acceptable on the House side when they made them take TAA out and couldn't pass TAA in the TPA bill? Doesn't make any sense to me.

So I think it is a sad day today. I really do. And I am concerned. I am concerned about our country. I am concerned about my hard-working people in West Virginia—and I know you are—and all the other States we have. These are good people. They deserve an opportunity. They deserve fair trade. They really deserve a fair trading country, people who will trade honestly with us and who have a quality or standard that they have to live up to in order to get into our markets. I don't

think we should sacrifice our markets basically just to build them up. I think we should assist them, but they are going to have to find their own markets to the point where we don't sacrifice.

So I think this could be a troubling thing. I am hoping it is not, but it could be. I have concerns. And I have said that if I can't explain it back home, I can't vote for it. And this is one I could not explain back home. I could not make the people feel comfortable that this is really going to improve quality of life and opportunities for them and their families. I couldn't do it because I don't see it. I don't believe in it. And I said I wouldn't vote for it, and I didn't.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I just want to say a few things about the vote we just took on cloture to proceed with TPA.

The Senator who just spoke talked about some of the problems with the deal and the dislocations that happen when we have trade. We all recognize there are dislocations. There are dislocations whenever an economy adjusts and moves ahead with or without trade. But trade overall is necessary. It is good. Free trade is good.

Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers live outside our boundaries. Seventy percent of the world's economic output happens outside of our boundaries. We need to trade. We can't just say: Well, we are just going to live within ourselves here, have an economy that doesn't reach out or pull in. We benefit. We benefit from better services and cheaper goods when we trade. Our manufacturers benefit when we are able to export our products.

It was said before that we haven't seen any good outcomes after NAFTA. We have. It is rewriting history to say that we haven't seen good outcomes as a result of NAFTA. I think the last speaker said Mexico has not improved since NAFTA. It has. I can tell you, as a representative of a State that borders with Mexico, the economy is considerably bigger and better. Arizona is one of our biggest trading partners. It has improved since NAFTA.

These trade agreements work. We haven't had a trade agreement negotiated without the TPA process—with the exception of one—I think in over 30 years. That one was a deal I believe with Jordan, and it had far more to do with defense than commerce.

So we need to have TPA—this process—in order to negotiate these trade agreements. The vast majority of our trade—I believe it is close to 90 percent of our trade—is with countries with which we have free-trade agreements.

So I applaud those who have worked so hard to bring this to pass here—Senators HATCH and WYDEN and others—and the compromises that took place. I am not a particular fan of trade adjustment assistance. When economies move forward, there are dislocations. We can't account for all of them. In fact, we have seen some of the problems with previous TAA assistance. I believe some of it went to those who were laid off at Solyndra and to some of these things that had very little to do with trade. Because of the way you seek such assistance, we don't do the best that we could to keep track of where those jobs were lost to. But having said that, we all recognize, as the Senator from Texas said earlier, that TAA is the price we pay to get TPA. We all recognize in this body that there are compromises that need to be made. That is how we move legislation, and that is how we get important legislation such as TPA passed so that we can have more free trade, and our economy will benefit because of it.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

PERMANENT INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor today to talk about Internet tax freedom and to talk about ensuring that our online businesses remain competitive.

First of all, I commend the House of Representatives for recently passing the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, which would permanently extend the current ban on Internet access taxes. The current tax moratorium will

expire on October 1, and if we fail to renew it, it could cost taxpayers nearly \$15 billion in new fees and taxes next year. In addition, as importantly, it would make Internet access less affordable to hard-working families and hamper small businesses' ability to grow and create jobs using the Internet because essentially it would allow all of these jurisdictions to tax the Internet. So when you get on the Internet, you can expect many more taxes if we do not do what the House of Representatives did and extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act. In fact, I think we should make it permanent.

I am a cosponsor of a Senate companion bill of which I hope this Senate will follow the House's lead to pass and send a permanent extension to the President's desk.

Unfortunately, one of the things we have heard is that some see this extension of the moratorium on Internet taxation as an opportunity to attach another piece of legislation that, in fact, would burden our online businesses and would tremendously disadvantage a State like my home State of New Hampshire that has made the legislative decision not to have a sales tax.

We have seen this playbook before. It was called before the Marketplace Fairness Act. Of course, there is nothing fair about this act when it comes to our online businesses having to collect taxes for nearly 9,000 taxing jurisdictions. You can imagine the bureaucratic nightmare that would occur. So this so-called Marketplace Fairness Act—I always used to like to call it the "Online Sales Tax Act" or the "Online Sales Tax Collection Act." That would be a more accurate description of that particular act.

So here we are. We have a rerun of this particular bill that would have required businesses in the State of New Hampshire—even though we do not have a sales tax—our online businesses to collect for all these other tax jurisdictions. Again, it is not even just States that have sales taxes. In some States, it goes down to the municipal level when it comes to municipalities and local jurisdictions actually collecting a separate tax, so it would have ended up being over 9,000 taxing jurisdictions. So here you have a nice online business out there having to be the tax collector for all these different jurisdictions. You can imagine that this would really be a huge burden on these online businesses.

The individuals who have been supporting this new sales tax collection scheme in this new burden on the Internet—by the way, one of the reasons I am such a strong proponent of permanently extending the tax freedom and the lack of taxes on the Internet, on Internet access, is because we have seen not only consumers' access to the Internet but the ability of busi-

nesses and the ability of us to create jobs and to see real growth on the Internet. This has allowed people to start businesses from their home. It has allowed so much creativity. It has been very positive for our economy.

So lo and behold in all of that there are some talking about attaching to this Internet Tax Freedom Act this incredibly burdensome collection scheme to require businesses to be out there collecting all these sales taxes throughout the Nation. The latest proposal the proponents of this type of tax collection scheme have come up with is one that again creates even more issues—certainly as many if not more issues—than the prior proposal that was called the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act. Of course, we know there is nothing fair about it if you are a business having to collect all these taxes.

What this rerun would do is actually create this reporting system and require businesses to purchase this software and then require States to actually have what are called certified software providers. Here is what would happen: Under this latest scheme, the certified software providers for these States would actually collect all the sales information for every sale—every online sale in a State—and then they would manage the collection of these taxes. Well, can you imagine? So now we are going to say to businesses: Yes, you have to purchase this certain software. And guess what. Every sale you make is going to be held by the central government in each State.

Can you imagine, with all the things we have seen happen in terms of breach of privacy of individuals? We have seen cyber attacks, all these issues we are facing. We have seen it in our government with OPM. We have seen it with the IRS. We have seen it with private companies in data breach.

Now this latest scheme is, let's send all the sales information to one place, and we will have some company—I guess some private companies will stand to benefit from this—they will now collect all these taxes, and they will hold all this information. Imagine how much information they would hold in each State.

So that is how we are going to create this new taxing scheme. You can imagine how a State such as New Hampshire would feel about that as a State that has decided not to have a sales tax—that suddenly our State has to keep all this information, has to hire some private company to do this, to collect all these taxes, and then that each of our online businesses has to purchase this software which is supposed to interface with its State government. What a massive bureaucracy, and how unfair it is in terms of State sovereignty that the Federal Government would impose this on a State such as New Hampshire that has made a decision not to have a sales tax.

This, to me, would be the opposite of what we are trying to accomplish under the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, which I fully support, and to attach this proposal to that Internet Tax Freedom Act, which some people, I think, are scheming around here to do, which with the right hand we are going to give you Internet freedom and with the left hand we are going to take that freedom away from States like mine that have chosen not to have a sales tax. And our online businesses would now have to be part of this huge bureaucratic scheme to collect taxes for other States and other localities.

So I would hope my colleagues would not go down this road because I think the Internet should be free. I think online businesses should be able to continue to thrive and grow. I think online businesses should not be required to collect for over 9,000 taxing jurisdictions. And certainly I think all of us should have concerns about all of the sales data being collected by some kind of third party and being held in one place just so we can collect more taxes on online businesses.

In fact, what I have heard from our businesses in New Hampshire previously when the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act was on the floor of the Senate—many of the businesses in New Hampshire that have online sales told me then how unfair they thought this taxing scheme was, and those concerns remain, great businesses such as Garnet Hill in Franconia, NH. Russ Gaitskill, who is the president and CEO of Garnet Hill, told me previously: "It's going to be a nightmare."

I heard in the past from E&R Laundry and Dry Cleaners, a small business founded in Manchester in 1921. About 70 percent of E&R's sales are now Internet based. The company's president said he would not have the resources to calculate, collect, and deliver sales taxes for thousands of jurisdictions across the country.

There is a great bakery, certainly, in the Nashua and Amherst area, Frederick's Pastries. Anybody who has been there—I can tell you, Frederick's is a great bakery. Susan Lozier Roberts of Frederick's expressed concern that this taxing scheme would create mass confusion, keeping up with all the individual tax codes.

There is the fact that we are going to have to have software and have some third party hold all of the sales information for all these online businesses. That creates so many other additional burdensome issues, as well as privacy issues.

Travis Adams with whaddy.com, based in Nashua, said previously: One tax audit from another State or jurisdiction would completely crush us. Because what happens under this so-called taxing scheme is now all of our

online businesses can be audited in all of these taxing jurisdictions. So you can be an online business in New Hampshire, and what the proponents of this new tax scheme would like to have is this opportunity that businesses in New Hampshire can now be audited in all these other jurisdictions. You can imagine what kind of burdens that would create on businesses that are trying to focus every day on the bottom line and creating jobs.

So I would say that as we look at this new proposal that some people behind the scenes are talking about trying to attach to the Internet Tax Freedom Act—I hope we will not go down this road. It would be bad for business, it would be bad for people's privacy, it would be a big power grab, I think, from Washington to require States such as New Hampshire to collect these taxes from throughout the country, and it certainly would not be positive to create more jobs through online businesses.

In fact, the Competitive Enterprise Institute said of this latest proposal, which is a cousin to the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act:

[This] new tax grab erodes healthy tax competition among states, puts consumers' information at higher risk, and ushers in a regime of taxation without representation. It's like the Blackwater of tax collection, state-paid mercenaries with sales tax charts. Under the Marketplace Fairness Act businesses are threatened by the prospect of being audited and prosecuted in every state into which they sell.

This issue is one I think we all should care about. I know in my home State of New Hampshire, where we have chosen not to have a sales tax, it would be completely unfair for us to consider passing this proposal which is a brandnew tax grab that erodes New Hampshire's competitive status of choosing not to have a sales tax. Also, there is the concern we all should have about a central taxing authority holding all of this private sales information in each of the States and what could be done with that information and how will consumers' information be protected. New Hampshire's residents and Internet retailers cannot afford this radical Federal invasion of our State.

I hope my colleagues will see the importance of extending the Internet Tax Freedom Act to encourage innovation and job creation, but under no circumstances should the Internet access tax moratorium be held hostage by a new and invasive sales tax that would not only undo the benefits of the tax moratorium but also burden our small businesses with becoming tax collectors for other States. That is wrong, and I hope this body will not go down that road. I certainly will be doing everything I can within my power in the Senate to make sure this new sales tax collection regime does not get attached to a very positive proposal, which is the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, it is an honor to follow my colleague from New Hampshire, who has done such an eloquent job.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

I want to talk about the Export-Import Bank. I said this during the unnecessary 2013 Government shutdown, and I will say it again: Most Americans think Congress can do something to help create jobs and strengthen our economy—even if it is simply not doing any harm. Yet here we are again, willfully allowing an important tool for economic growth to expire by not taking commonsense action.

On June 30, the charter for the Export-Import Bank will expire. During its 80-plus years of existence, the Bank has garnered support from every President during that span and repeatedly been renewed by Congress, often without any objection. The Export-Import Bank is not a Democratic program or a Republican program. It is a program to help American businesses. President Reagan's words from 30 years ago still ring true:

Exports create and sustain jobs for millions of American workers and contribute to the growth and strength of the United States economy. The Export-Import Bank contributes in a significant way to our nation's export sales.

The Gipper was right then, and he is right today.

Those who oppose the Ex-Im Bank for ideological reasons may make their case in the abstract, but I have to operate in the reality, where I have heard over and over from Indiana small business owners and workers about the importance of the Ex-Im Bank.

Jon, the vice president of Specialty Hardwoods of Indiana, in Nappanee, told me about their small company, which has around 40 employees. They got through the financial downturn of 2008 and 2009 but suffered during that time, as all small manufacturers did, not only here in this country but worldwide. As they returned to profitability, they made a decision to try to diversify markets.

Up until 2008, they mostly sold their products to the recreational vehicle industry. Since then, they have started to sell to cabinet companies that market to the kitchen and bath industry nationally and made a direct attempt to go after export sales. Lumber product exports now account at Specialty Hardwoods for more than 45 percent of their current sales. Jon told me:

We could not have done this without the support of EXIM bank. I personally have helped other small companies in our industry contact EXIM and establish relationships with EXIM to market their products. It levels the playing field for smaller companies to enter this market segment of our industry.

We have grown our business and survived because of EXIM bank and the efforts of the 40-45 people that we employ.

The stories continue.

Mark, the vice president and co-owner of Agrarian Marketing Corporation, told us about his company that makes feed additives and nutritional supplements for the livestock industry. They have a very large distributor in Cairo, Egypt, that represents nearly 30 percent of their business. For this Hoosier business, nearly 30 percent of their business comes from Cairo, Egypt.

The credit insurance they purchase through Ex-Im Bank allows them to source this business by extending beneficial credit terms to their Egyptian customer. It would not be possible if they required their customer to prepay for those orders.

Mark said:

Although we are a small business, this segment of our business is very important to us and provides excellent profitability and jobs here in Indiana as well as jobs for our contract manufacturers in Iowa, Illinois, and Ohio. All would suffer if we lost this business.

Bruce, the CEO and chairman of Sullivan-Palatek in Michigan City, noted that not only are the 140 jobs at his company impacted but several hundred more at local suppliers.

Bruce said:

In the event that the Ex-Im Bank were to be shut down, the impact to us would be immediate. I believe we would have very much difficulty in getting any new orders.

In fact, the orders that we have in house, many of them we would not be able to ship. We would have to shut them down right in the middle . . . of the order process.

Jon, Mark, and Bruce are three of many in Indiana, many around the country. In my home State, the Hoosier State, since 2010 the Export-Import Bank has directly helped more than 100 companies that have exported more than \$3 billion in goods and services.

The Ex-Im Bank costs zero in taxpayer dollars. In fact, it turns a profit. Since 1992, the Bank has returned more than \$7 billion in profits to the Treasury. Last year, \$675 million was returned to the Treasury. And the default rate is 0.175 percent. That is less than one-fifth of 1 percent. That is an effort to manage it in a fiscally prudent, fiscally responsible manner.

In fiscal year 2014, the Ex-Im Bank authorized around \$20.5 billion for 3,746 transactions, which contributed to \$27.5 billion of U.S. exports and more than 164,000 jobs right here in the United States.

These are not, for the most part, huge corporations. They are small companies that wouldn't be able to afford financing elsewhere. In 2014, 90 percent of the transactions approved by the Bank were in support of small businesses.

So what happens if Ex-Im's charter is to expire? It will be forced to shut down, unwind current obligations, and the loss of future financing could result in a significant amount of business being lost overseas. That directly af-

fects the bottom line for many businesses, leaving them with less revenue to reinvest and less revenue to pay wages or create new jobs. It becomes difficult—if not nearly impossible—for the private sector to replace the loans, the guarantees, and the insurance provided by the Ex-Im Bank.

At a time when American companies are competing in a game that is often rigged by foreign currency manipulation, intellectual property theft, and insurmountable regulatory barriers, unilaterally eliminating our export credit agency further handcuffs U.S. job creators and allows competitors in foreign countries to pick up the business.

If Ex-Im no longer provides financing, foreign companies and countries are still going to buy their goods and products. They need the products. But instead of buying that product from Muncie, IN, they will purchase it in Russia or China.

This is, to me, the direct opposite of what Congress should be doing. It seems as if up is down and down is up in this discussion. Nearly every other major country has a credit export agency. Many are larger and much more aggressive than the Export-Import Bank. Unilaterally eliminating our export credit agency hurts not only the United States and handcuffs our job creators, but it also helps competitors in foreign countries to capitalize and seize that business.

Our global competitors, including China, Brazil, and India, are investing more in export financing every single day. They are investing in their companies and in their economy. If we take this measure, we are stepping back. They are rooting for America's Export-Import Bank to close because it means more business for them.

Even our neighbor Canada is providing far more export financing than the United States. Canada's economy is one-tenth the size of the U.S. economy, and their export-import agency already provides far more export financing than we do at the present time. The Ex-Im Bank is a tool that helps American companies compete in the global economy.

In Indiana, we pride ourselves on what we call Hoosier common sense. It does not get more common sense than creating more American jobs in a fiscally responsible way. That is what the Export-Import Bank does.

Congress needs a dose of that Hoosier common sense, which is the same as the common sense in the Presiding Officer's home State of Ohio. We should act quickly to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank to help our companies, to help our employees, to help workers around our country, and to help our Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, our country stands on the brink of a great opportunity in the Asia-Pacific. Since 2008, the United States and 11 other Pacific nations, including Japan and New Zealand, have worked to conclude negotiations on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. This agreement represents nearly 40 percent of the global gross domestic product, or GDP, and is the most ambitious free-trade agreement in history. By upending antiquated international tariff systems and tearing down barriers to trade, we can unleash American ingenuity and send our Nation's products from Main Street to Malaysia.

Much has been said about the national benefits of concluding TPP, but I want to focus on some of the particular benefits for my home State of Colorado. Colorado, like most States, benefits immensely from international trade, particularly with Asia. According to the Business Roundtable, more than 265,000 Colorado jobs are supported by the countries that would be affected by TPP. These trade-related jobs include the farmworker harvesting world-famous melons down in Rocky Ford and the meatpacker shipping American beef from Greeley. They are the electrical engineer designing computer systems in Boulder and the natural gas worker maintaining a rig in Parachute. Collectively, these everyday working Americans help drive the economic and trade engine of Colorado. Last year, my State exported more than \$8 billion worth of goods all across the world. Approximately half of them, or \$4 billion, went directly to TPP countries.

While nations like Vietnam and Japan have imposed hefty tariffs on our Colorado goods in the past, TPP presents an opportunity to level the playing field. American goods would flow more freely to the region and American workers stand to benefit. That is why I strongly support granting the President trade promotion authority, or TPA, and finalizing a high-standard TPP. A vote for TPA is a vote for the American worker. It is a vote for more active engagement in the world and a higher standard of living, and it is a vote to recognize that through increased trade, we can indeed deliver upon the promise of a better tomorrow.

Unfortunately, however, some in Congress have opted for isolationism and retreat. They have sounded the alarm over supposed failure of past trade agreements and argued in favor of taking cover rather than taking

charge, and they have doubled down on the false notion that trade is always bad for the American economy and the American worker. But a quick review of the facts will dispel these myths very quickly. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, national beef exports to Colombia and Panama have more than tripled since 2011 when we enacted free-trade agreements with these countries. National wheat exports to Chile more than doubled from the enactment of our 2003 free-trade agreement through 2014, while dairy exports increased more than 20 times to that country, and our beef exports have increased more than eight times to the participant countries of the Central America and Dominican Republic free-trade agreement.

Colorado businesses have played a large role in expanding overseas as well. My State witnessed a 37-percent increase in goods exported to countries with free-trade agreements between 2003 and 2013. Exports to Korea have increased 61 percent since the conclusion of our free-trade agreement with that nation in 2011. And NAFTA, which anti-trade forces frequently dismiss as the poster child for trade deals gone awry, has resulted in a 293-percent—that is right, 293 percent—increase in Colorado exports to Canada and Mexico since 1994.

Beyond the numbers, though, it is important to meet with the workers and business owners who understand that freer trade helps their bottom line. Just a few days ago, I traveled to Eastern Colorado on my annual wheat tour. It is a tradition that Senator Wayne Allard started in the 1990s—then a U.S. Representative—and one I was excited to continue in the Senate. I invited my colleague from Colorado Senator BENNET, so we could both hear the needs directly from Coloradans and see the positive impacts that agreements such as TPP could have not only on Eastern Colorado but farmers across this country.

On the tour, we had the chance to marvel at the truly incredible production level of Colorado wheat growers. We are just about 2 weeks away from the height of the winter wheat harvest in Colorado—a time when I have always enjoyed working at our family implement dealership in Yuma—and a reminder that Colorado helps feed the world. The vast majority of Colorado's wheat crop is exported. In fact, in 2013, we shipped more than \$235 million worth of wheat across the globe. Eighty percent of the wheat we produce in Colorado is exported. Most of the wheat growers we met on the Eastern Plains aren't interested in re-treating from the international marketplace. In fact, they want to expand the international marketplace. They understand that freer trade means improved opportunities to place their product. And with a high-standard

TPP, Colorado wheat growers could penetrate notoriously difficult markets in countries such as Japan and begin to ship from Thurman to Tokyo and beyond.

It isn't just wheat either. Colorado farmers and ranchers already export millions of dollars in Western Slope beef, Southern Colorado onions, and San Luis Valley potatoes. In fact, according to the Department of Agriculture, Colorado potatoes represent around 70 percent of all U.S. potato exports to Mexico. That market stands to grow significantly if TPP is successfully concluded, considering that Mexico is a member nation in the negotiations.

There is no question that trade benefits rural America. We should be promoting Palisade peaches in Perth and Olathe sweet corn on the streets of Singapore. Growing up in rural Colorado, I saw the potential that our hard-working farmers and ranchers created for Colorado and for Colorado products abroad. Their determined spirit and hard-working attitude are what keep America at the top of the global economy, and TPP will expand that promise in the Asia-Pacific.

Urban and suburban America succeed with increased trade as well. As do their rural counterparts, urban and suburban Coloradans benefit from a wider selection of cheaper goods. The mechanics of free trade stretch dollars a little bit further for the teenager with a part-time summer job as well as for the family struggling to make ends meet.

Aside from the benefit of cheaper products, increased trade creates jobs here at home. A couple of months ago, I was fortunate enough to visit a company in Boulder, CO, that manufactures zip lines and other adventure equipment. This company has successfully expanded their business to Europe and Asia, helping people across the globe enjoy rain forest canopy tours, free falling, and more.

As this business expanded overseas, they had the ability to hire more employees and boost the local economy in Boulder. They doubled their Colorado office and are still looking to grow. An agreement such as TPP will open further opportunities for this company in the Asia-Pacific and beyond, perhaps facilitating world-class bungee jumping in New Zealand or advanced rock climbing in Peru, and with those new opportunities come more Colorado jobs.

That is the essence of free trade. It encourages innovation and entrepreneurship. It connects the world while growing our workforce at home, and it presents an opportunity for Colorado and our country to spread our goods and ideas across the globe.

That is why I have supported free-trade agreements in the past—agreements that have yielded significant

economic and strategic benefits for our Nation. That is why I supported the latest generation of trade promotion authority and look forward to supporting it again. We will continue to support it this week as it goes to the President's desk to be signed into law. That is why I urge my colleagues to continue their support for free-trade agreements, so the United States can help grasp the great opportunity that awaits us in the Asia-Pacific.

We have held several hearings over the past couple of months in the Foreign Relations Committee and beyond talking about the benefits of free trade. A couple of weeks ago, we were joined by experts from Asia and economic leaders around this country, all of whom believe we have an important role to play in expanding trade and expanding the opportunities that the Trans-Pacific Partnership will lead to when that agreement comes to this floor, thanks to trade promotion authority. It is an important measure that we must enact. It is an important statement of good faith that the United States truly is interested in the Asia region, the Asia-Pacific region, making good on our efforts to truly pivot to Asia to rebalance policy we all support but making good on our word that we are indeed in the region to stay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

REPUBLICAN-LED SENATE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last fall, Republicans promised that if we were elected to the majority, we would get Washington working. That wasn't a campaign slogan, that was a commitment. After 6 months of Republican control, I am proud to report we are delivering on that promise.

The past 6 months in the Senate have been the most productive months in a long time. We passed bipartisan legislation to approve the Keystone Pipeline. We passed a bipartisan bill to help prevent suicides among veterans. We passed the first significant bipartisan reform of Medicare in years, which will ensure that our seniors have access to physicians and that those physicians are judged by the quality rather than the quantity of the care they provide. We passed bipartisan legislation to give law enforcement new tools to fight human trafficking and provide support for trafficking victims. We passed a bipartisan bill to authorize funding for our national defense to provide for the needs of our men and women in uniform.

Those are just some of the highlights.

Every piece of legislation I mentioned passed with bipartisan support. One reason that happened is because the Republican majority has been committed to ensuring that all Senators, whatever the party, have the opportunity to make their voices heard.

Under Democratic leadership, not only were Members of the minority party shut out of the legislative process, but many rank-and-file Democrats were as well. During all of 2014, the Democratic leadership in the Senate allowed just 15 amendment rollcall votes—15 votes in an entire year. That is barely more than a vote a month.

By contrast, the Republican-led Senate has taken more than 130 amendment rollcall votes so far this year or more than 21 votes a month. That is not only more amendment rollcall votes than last year, it is more amendment rollcall votes than the Senate has taken in the past 2 years combined. That is through the first 6 months of 2015. We have another 6 months to go.

This week, the Senate is considering what I hope is going to be our next bipartisan achievement; that is, the legislation to help expand U.S. trade with other countries and increase the opportunities that are available for American businesses and American workers.

Over the past few years, exports have been a bright spot in our economy, supporting an increasing number of American jobs each and every year. In 2014, exports supported 11.7 million U.S. jobs and made up 13 percent of our Nation's economy. We need to continue to open markets around the globe to American goods and services, and the best way to do that is through new trade agreements.

Countries with which we have free and fair trade agreements purchase substantially more from us than other countries. In fact, in 2013, free-trade agreement countries purchased 12 times more goods per capita from the United States than nonfree-trade agreement countries—12 times more goods per capita.

For American workers, increased trade means more opportunity and increased access to high-paying jobs. Manufacturing jobs tied to exports pay, on average, 13 to 18 percent more than other jobs in our economy.

Unfortunately, while trade agreements have proliferated around the globe over the past several years, the United States hasn't signed a new trade agreement in 8 years. A big reason for that is the fact that trade promotion authority expired in 2007. Since 1934, almost all of the U.S. free-trade agreements have been negotiated using trade promotion authority or a similar streamlined, expedited process.

Trade promotion authority is designed to put the United States in the strongest possible position when it comes to negotiating trade agreements. Under TPA, Congress sets guidelines for trade negotiations and outlines the priorities the administration must follow. In return, Congress promises a simple up-or-down vote on the resulting trade agreement instead of the long amendment process that could leave the final deal looking nothing like what was initially negotiated.

That simple up-or-down vote is the key. It lets our negotiating partners know that Congress and trade negotiators are on the same page, which gives other countries the confidence they need to put their best offers on the table. That, in turn, allows for a successful and timely conclusion of negotiations.

Currently, the administration is negotiating two major trade agreements that have the potential to vastly expand the market for American goods and services in the European Union and in the Pacific. The Trans-Pacific Partnership is being negotiated with a number of Asia-Pacific nations, including Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, and Vietnam. If this agreement is done right, it could have huge benefits for American agriculture, among other industries.

Agriculture producers in my State of South Dakota and in the Presiding Officer's State of Iowa understand that trade promotion authority is the most effective way to secure trade agreements that will benefit our farmers and our ranchers. One pork producer in my State of South Dakota contacted me to tell me that a successful TPP deal could increase U.S. pork exports to just one of the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries by literally hundreds of millions of dollars in a year.

Discussions of the benefits of trade tend to focus on the economic benefits, and with good reason—it helps our economy. It creates good-paying jobs and raises the standard of living for people in this country and gives access for consumers to lower cost goods and services. But new trade agreements also have the potential to result not just in economic gains for America's farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers but in national security gains for the country.

When we make trade deals with other countries, we are not just opening new markets for our goods, we are also developing and cementing alliances. Trade agreements build bonds of friendship with other nations that extend not only to cooperation on economic issues but to cooperation on security issues as well.

It is also important to remember that just because the United States isn't negotiating trade agreements doesn't mean other countries will not be. In fact, the United States hasn't signed a single new trade agreement over the past 8 years, but that hasn't prevented other countries from signing numerous trade agreements over the same period. If America fails to lead on trade, other nations such as China will step in to fill the void, and these nations will not have the best interests of American workers and American families in mind.

The bill before us today will help pave the way for the United States to cement alliances with friendly nations

through trade and will help ensure that any trade deals the United States enters into will be favorable to our economic and our national security interests.

The Senate passed a version of this bill last month with a bipartisan majority, and I am hopeful we will have a similarly strong bipartisan vote yet this week. Republicans believe our Nation's problems are best solved when Members of both parties come together to find solutions for the American people.

Republicans' plans for our second 6 months in the majority are the same as those for the first 6 months of our majority; that is, to make sure we continue to move forward in a way that addresses the challenges that are facing our country. Unfortunately, last week we saw an unfortunate return to partisanship on the part of the Democrats when they blocked an appropriations bill to fund our troops. It is not that Democrats have a problem with this bill; in fact, many of them voted to support the funding this bill provides when they voted in favor of the National Defense Authorization Act last week. The authorization act is the first step in a two-step process which has to be followed by the appropriations bill that actually provides the funding. But Democratic leaders and the President, even though many of them supported the Defense authorization bill, are upset that government agencies such as the EPA and the IRS aren't receiving the Democrats' preferred level of funding, so they have decided to hold appropriations bills hostage in an effort to get what they want.

It is unfortunate that Democrats are holding money for our troops hostage in order to get more funding for the EPA and the IRS. If Democrats believe the funding levels in the appropriations bills are not acceptable, they will have the opportunity to offer amendments to increase the funding. But in order to do that, they have to allow us to actually proceed to consideration of these bills on the Senate floor. What they are, in effect, doing now is filibustering any attempt to bring any spending bill to the floor; most recently, as I mentioned, the funding bill for our troops. The bill that funds our national security interests in this country is currently being held hostage. We can't even get it on the floor to debate it. We are not only talking about ultimately passing it, we are talking about even having a discussion on the floor of the Senate about something as important as funding our troops and the important military objectives we have as a nation. Yet, right now, we have a filibuster being conducted by the Democrats—again, because they want to get more funding for their favorite agencies. Well, that is a bad way to go about this.

I am hopeful that this obstruction—which is largely driven by the Democratic leadership—that most rank-and-file Democrats will rethink a strategy that involves opposing every opportunity to fund our Nation's priorities and to get things done for the American people.

After years of stagnation in the Senate under Democratic leadership, I think even most Democrats have enjoyed governing in a functioning Senate again. We have dozens of bipartisan bills to show for the first 6 months of this year, and our record of accomplishment can continue if the Democrats abandon their strategy of obstruction and continue to work with us to solve the challenges facing our Nation. They can start by not objecting to proceeding to even getting a bill that funds our national security interests here on the floor of the Senate so we can debate it. As I said, if they don't like the funding levels in there, we will have an open amendment process in which they will be able to offer amendments to change those funding levels. But what they are doing right now is fundamentally wrong, not even allowing consideration of an appropriations bill that funds our military and pays our troops on the floor of the United States Senate. I hope that will change.

I hope that the Democrats will join us in making the next 6 months of 2015 as productive as the first 6 months have been and that we can point to bipartisan achievements that are good for the American people, that focus on their basic daily needs, and that will promote policies which will grow our economy and create jobs and lead to a higher standard of living and increased take-home pay for middle-income families across this country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I would like to take a few minutes to underscore the importance of trade and trade promotion authority to the American manufacturing industry.

Despite some claims to the contrary, U.S. manufacturers have been among the principal beneficiaries of our existing free-trade agreements. One in four U.S. manufacturing jobs depends on exports. On average, the wages of those in export-supported manufacturing jobs are 18 percent higher than those of other factory workers.

Furthermore, since the last TPA bill passed through the Congress in 2002, U.S. goods exports have more than dou-

bled, reaching \$1.6 trillion in 2013 alone. While we hear a constant drumbeat decrying our trade deficits, the United States enjoys a nearly \$60 billion yearly manufacturing surplus with our 20 existing partners to the free-trade agreements. Consumers and businesses in those 20 countries purchased \$658 billion of U.S. manufactured goods in 2013 alone, which represents nearly 48 percent of all exports produced by the 12 million Americans employed in manufacturing.

Clearly, in places where we have free-trade agreements, where our manufacturers can compete on a level playing field, they are winning. We need to build on that track record of success and enact more high-standard, 21st-century free-trade agreements. That is yet another reason why we need TPA.

It is no wonder, then, that our TPA bill is supported by manufacturers throughout the country. We have received letters or statements of support from groups such as the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, the Grocery Manufacturers Association, the American Forest and Paper Association, the Association of Equipment Manufacturers, the Semiconductor Industry Association, the Society of Chemical Manufacturers & Affiliates, the National Council of Textile Organizations, and many others.

On top of that, a number of iconic individual manufacturing companies have weighed in publicly in support of our bill, including Boeing, Cummins, Dow Chemical, Honeywell, Intel, Texas Instruments, Xerox, and, of course, many others.

Caterpillar, which is based in Peoria, IL, is the world's leading manufacturer of construction and mining equipment, diesel engines, and gas turbines. Caterpillar knows the value of trade to a healthy economy, having exported nearly \$88 billion in goods and services over the past 5 years. They know that if we pass TPA, they can do even better.

Upon introduction of our bill, the company issued a statement saying, "Passage of TPA will provide the United States with the strongest possible hand when negotiating future trade agreements and will help eliminate the current high tariffs and trade barriers that companies like Caterpillar currently face."

It is not just big companies that benefit. Ninety-eight percent of nearly 300,000 American exporters are small and medium-sized businesses. Let me say that again. Ninety-eight percent of all U.S. exporters are small and medium-sized businesses. There are 300,000 of them. That fact escapes many people.

Let me give an example of one of those small businesses from my home State of Utah. Kimber Kable is owned and operated by Ray Kimber. Ray's

story is emblematic of the American dream. In the late 1970s, Ray figured out a way to weave audio cables to reduce unwanted noise and improve fidelity. The company he started in his garage over 35 years ago is now a driver of economic growth and a source of jobs. Today, he employs 30 people in Ogden, UT. He sells his cables to the world. Two-thirds of Ray's cables are shipped to customers overseas.

Ray is not only a friend of mine, he is also an outstanding example of a larger truth: The U.S. manufacturing sector is the most innovative in the world, and American workers are unsurpassed in manufacturing productivity. Because of U.S. innovation and productivity, where U.S. manufacturing competes on an equal footing, it always succeeds.

We can help people like Ray reach more markets and maintain healthy small businesses across America—businesses that will grow our economy and create more jobs—but we can only do that if our trade negotiators have the tools to set fair trade rules for our exporters. That is what our TPA bill provides.

For example, a big part of the ability of small companies like Kimber Kable to sell around the world is digital trade. That is why the TPA bill that is again before us directs our trade negotiators to ensure that electronically delivered goods and services are classified with the most liberal trade treatment possible and that our trading partners allow the free flow of data across borders.

Using the Internet to market, sell, and transmit digital products is only part of the story. Companies like Ray's are also innovators, and their innovations must be protected. Too many small businesses have experienced firsthand the destructive impact of intellectual property theft. Companies like Kimber Kable have to contend with counterfeiters stealing their company name to sell inferior products. This TPA bill, therefore, will also ensure that U.S. trade agreements reflect a standard of intellectual property rights protection similar to that found in our own U.S. law. The bill calls for an end to the theft of U.S. intellectual property by foreign governments, including piracy and the theft of trade secrets, and for the elimination of measures that require U.S. companies to locate their intellectual property abroad in return for market access. These are strong provisions that will help U.S. manufacturing compete and sell their products around the world.

Companies from Caterpillar to Kimber Kable recognize the importance of trade and trade agreements to the future of American manufacturing. They recognize that 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of the United States and that if we want to sell American-made products to these

customers, we need strong agreements to break down barriers and level the playing field. We simply cannot do that without the TPA.

We can do better and we must do better for American manufacturers. If we really want to support the American manufacturing industry, then we should vote today to pass this TPA legislation once and for all.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I wish to take a few minutes to talk about the importance of international trade to my home State of Utah and how Utahns will benefit from the passage of the TPA bill.

Despite having a relatively small population, the State of Utah is a very significant player in international trade. In 2014 alone, Utah exported more than \$12 billion in goods. That number has more than doubled over the past decade, despite the economic downturn that took place during that time.

Goods exports account for more than 11 percent of Utah's GDP. More than 50,000 Utah jobs are directly tied to goods exports, as more than 3,400 Utah-based companies export goods to countries around the world. By the way, nearly 86 percent of those exporting companies are small or medium-sized businesses.

These Utah exports include a number of key manufacturing exports, including primary metal products, computer and electronics products, chemicals, processed foods, and transportation equipment, just to mention a few.

There are a number of Utah companies that I could single out here today. As I said, there are more than 3,400 Utah-based exporters, but let me talk about one in particular—Albion Laboratories, which is based in Clearfield, UT.

Albion is a leading, global manufacturer of chelated minerals for human and plant nutritional applications. The company is incredibly innovative, owning more than 100 patents from manufacturing processes to food applications. Over the years, Albion has enjoyed strong growth in large part because of its expanded exports. Today, Albion exports to more than 100 different countries, which has allowed the company to regularly add new jobs to accommodate its increased output. As of right now, the company employs approximately 150 people. This is just one example of the many unique and innovative Utah companies that have bene-

fited from international trade and will benefit even more from expanded access to foreign markets in the future.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about the potential benefits of our pending trade agreements with countries in the Asia-Pacific region and the European Union. As of right now, more than half of Utah's exports already go to these two markets. Therefore, I think it is safe to say that Utah-based exporters will benefit greatly from the expanded market access they will undoubtedly see if we can get both the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership over the finish line.

Of course, without TPA, these two important trade agreements, which are among the largest and most ambitious agreements in our Nation's history, don't stand a chance. TPA gives our negotiators the tools they need to get the best deals possible. TPA gives Congress and our constituents a strong voice in the negotiating process, and, of course, TPA assures that once an agreement is reached, our country will be able to deliver on the deal.

Utahns depend on international trade. Utah's job creators, like those throughout the country, need greater access to foreign markets in order to compete. Put simply, they are not going to get that access without TPA.

So for the sake of the thousands of Utah companies that export goods around the world and the tens of thousands of Utahns whose jobs depend on those exports—and for the hundreds of thousands of companies all over this country and more—I urge my colleagues to join me one more time in supporting our TPA legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1648 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 5 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4 p.m., recessed until 5 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. AYOTTE).

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

JASON SIMCAKOSKI MEMORIAL OPIOID SAFETY ACT

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I rise not to speak about an issue that divides this Chamber but rather one that unites us; that is, the care of those who have served and sacrificed for our Nation, America's veterans.

Today, I take great pride in the fact I have worked across the aisle to introduce bipartisan VA reform legislation, the Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act. I am pleased to be joined in offering this legislation by my friend and colleague Senator CAPITO of West Virginia.

This legislation is aimed at addressing the problem of overprescribing practices at the VA and providing safer and more effective pain management services to our Nation's veterans. It is named in honor of a Wisconsin veteran, U.S. Marine veteran Jason Simcakoski.

On August 30, 2014, Jason tragically died at Wisconsin's Tomah Veterans Affairs Medical Center as a result of what was medically deemed mixed-drug toxicity. I call this a failure to serve someone who has faithfully served our country.

At the time of his death at the VA, Jason was on 14 different prescription drugs. Yet this Marine's heartbreaking story is just one example of the overprescribing problem at the VA.

After two, decade-long, wars, a large number of our servicemembers are coming home with the damage of combat, and our veterans and their families are facing the difficult challenge of physical injuries, PTSD, and other mental illnesses.

Unfortunately, I believe the VA's overreliance on powerful and highly addicting opioids has resulted in getting our veterans hooked rather than getting them help. Jason's story is a tragic example of the devastation caused by addiction—addiction whose roots are, regrettably, at the VA.

To me, overprescription of opioids at the VA is a root problem, and it is growing into a weed—a weed of addiction whose impact is being felt beyond the walls of VA facilities. The ripples are indeed being felt across America in the communities we work for every day in our Nation's Capital.

The families whom we have a responsibility to represent—families of those who have bravely served our country—are struggling with the loss of a son or a daughter, a father or a mother, a sister or a brother to addiction whose

root is planted within the VA system. It is our job to make sure they do not feel alone, and I believe we have a shared responsibility to do everything we can to pull out this weed by its roots.

Jason's family is in Washington today, and I am so honored to have worked with them and others in putting these reforms together to provide the VA with the tools it needs to help prevent this type of tragedy from occurring to other veterans and their families.

I what to thank the Simcakoski family and let them know I have a tremendous amount of respect for the courage they have shown in telling theirs and Jason's story and working to make a difference in the lives of other veterans and their families.

Their story is one of a sacred trust we must have with our veterans and their families. It is a story of how that trust has been broken, and it is a tragic story of loss.

My message to my colleagues comes from Jason's widow Heather, who has said:

When I look back at the past, I want to know we made a difference. I want to believe we have leaders in our country who care. I want to inspire others to never give up because change is possible.

Her words have inspired me, and it is my hope they will inspire my colleagues to join us in taking action. I hope I speak for all of us when I say there is no room for politics when it comes to ensuring that our Nation's veterans receive the timely, safe, and highest quality care that they have earned.

Our legislation takes steps to give veterans and their families a stronger voice in their care by strengthening opioid prescribing guidelines and other measures. It also works to improve coordination and communication throughout the VA and puts in place stronger oversight and accountability for the quality of care we are providing our veterans.

Our goal is simple: put these bipartisan reforms in place to prevent tragedies like Jason's from occurring to other veterans and their families.

I wish to thank and recognize Senators BLUMENTHAL, BROWN, HIRONO, JOHNSON, KAINE, MANCHIN, MARKEY, MORAN, MURRAY, SANDERS, and TESTER for joining Senator CAPITO and me, signing on as original cosponsors of this bipartisan effort. I also wish to thank the many veterans service organizations and medical professionals for their invaluable support, insight, and input as we crafted this legislation.

Today, I ask the rest of my colleagues to join us in working to confront the problems of overprescribing practices at the VA and to provide more safe and effective pain management services to our Nation's veterans.

Let us work together to fix what has been broken and restore that sacred

trust with our veterans and their families. Let us work together to give our veterans and their families a voice—a voice that is heard, respected, and recognized. Let us be inspired by that voice to take bipartisan action on solutions to prevent these problems and tragedies from ever happening again and to provide our veterans and their families with the care they have earned and the care they deserve.

Madam President, I yield time to my coauthor on this bill Senator CAPITO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I come here before you today, joined by my colleague Senator BALDWIN from Wisconsin—but also by colleagues from both sides of the aisle, as she mentioned—in support of legislation to provide safer and more effective pain management to our Nation's veterans.

Too many of our veterans have returned from overseas duties only to fight another battle here at home. The Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act takes the necessary steps to address challenges faced by our veterans.

Again, I thank the Simcakoskis for their bravery and courage, as painful as it is for the family, in hopes that it will help—and it will help—the next generation of veterans who are being treated at the VA.

This bill reforms the overreliance on painkillers by the VA while still ensuring that veterans receive appropriate medication. This legislation not only updates and strengthens the guidelines for opioid prescriptions, but it requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to expand the scope of research, education, delivery, and integration of alternative pain management. Chronic pain should not be something our veterans are forced to live with, and the VA must be on the cutting edge of developing effective pain management.

This bill will elevate the role of patient advocates—as I am sure Jason's wife was a great patient advocate—require community meetings hosted by the VA, and establish a joint DOD-VA working group to improve coordination and communication at all levels of government.

In an era where medical research and technological advancements have led to at least a 90-percent survival rate for our wounded soldiers, we must continue to focus on the battles our veterans face when they return home, including treatment of those wounds that are not evidently visible.

One marine in my hometown, Andrew White, returned home to West Virginia after serving in Iraq. Andrew displayed signs of PTSD, including insomnia, nightmares, constant restlessness, and pain related to an injury. In addition to antidepressant and anti-anxiety pills, doctors placed Andrew on a strong antipsychotic drug and, over time, in-

creased his dosage from 25 milligrams to 1600 milligrams—more than twice the dosage recommended to treat schizophrenia. Andrew White died in his sleep at the age of 23.

Andrew is a reminder of the physical and mental side effects of the war. We must work together to provide the resources and care necessary to assist our veterans in their transition into civilian life.

Expansion of the Opioid Safety Initiative and further development of the opioid therapy risk support tool will do just that. These measures will enable the VA to use the patient record database to detect those at higher risk of opioid abuse and submit information to the State prescription drug monitoring programs. We really need all hands on deck. This real-time tracking of information will enable medical professionals to better diagnose and treat patients.

This legislation calls for more accountability within the VA through internal audits, reports to Congress, and increased information sharing. We cannot allow bureaucracy to get in the way of delivering quality care to veterans, and we must prioritize the efficient delivery of care.

In my home State of West Virginia, the tragic effects of opioid abuse have left families devastated. I have met with other families who lost their loved ones who suffered from PTSD and traumatic brain injury, and I believe more can be done to find solutions.

It is incumbent upon us in a bipartisan way, as my colleague has said, to do right by our veterans. I wish to thank Senator BALDWIN. I have been at committee meeting after committee meeting with her where she has pounded the drum on the importance of this issue and how devastating it is to families across this country. I thank Senator BALDWIN.

Our best is not just the least we can do. It is our duty to those who have served, of whom we have asked so much, to do more than our best, and this bill does that.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DATA BREACH AT OPM

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, earlier today the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, of which I am a member,

conducted a hearing on the data security breach at the Office of Personnel Management. I am a member of that subcommittee, and we had several witnesses, including OPM Director Archuleta. Our goal was to learn about the latest data breach that was revealed earlier this month.

I think that in many ways the hearing was useful and in other ways it was inadequate. The hearing once again demonstrated that much more needs to be done to address the ongoing IT management issues which plague so many agencies but in particular OPM.

As our witnesses testified, the recent breach—and really, it is breaches—at OPM was not a resource issue but a management issue. Too often—and I certainly understand that how we appropriate money is important—the excuse is we don't have enough resources. Today, in my view, it was made clear that this is much more of a management issue than a resource issue.

As Director Archuleta said in her confirmation hearing as well as in today's hearing, IT security was her top priority when she entered the agency in November of 2013. But what has transpired since then has been troubling. She reminded me today that in her confirmation hearing—IT data security was her top priority when she arrived at the agency in late 2013.

Ms. Archuleta highlighted the fact that in March of 2014, OPM detected a sophisticated attack targeting sensitive information. While the hackers didn't get information in that particular instance, this should have been the first alarm to go off that somebody was trying to get access to very sensitive documents.

I will reiterate what I am talking about in this case. This was March of 2014. We are talking about a hack attempt that occurred last year, not the ones that are making the news today. Unfortunately, it happened again a year ago—in June of 2014—when a company that was involved in background checks for the government, U.S. Investigation Services, USIS, suffered a breach impacting as many as 26,000 Federal employee records. It happened again in August of 2014—a third time. So we have March, June, and August. In August of 2014, another company involved in background checks, KeyPoint, was breached, and this time over 48,000 records were stolen.

In both of these contractor breaches, OPM was required to send out notifications to Federal employees who were affected. Clearly OPM knew about these breaches. Now we have learned that the credentials stolen in those original breaches were used to enter the OPM system and this time steal highly sensitive information. The information stolen was Social Security numbers, military records, veteran status, addresses, birth dates, job and pay history, health insurance, life insur-

ance, pension, age, gender, race, and union status. So these three separate examples should have been the stark warning to secure this highly sensitive data.

When I asked the Director today about this topic, she merely pointed to an IT modernization plan that was drafted when she entered the agency about 20 months ago. My question was: Having seen these three attempts to breach the information at OPM, what then occurred at OPM following that which was different to further and better protect information at the Office of Personnel Management? The answer was really about pointing to a plan that was developed when the Director initially arrived at OPM some 20 months ago.

In addition to those three breaches, if those were not warning enough, there were two other important reports which also could have and should have suggested that better management was needed. In November 2014, the inspector general for OPM released its annual report on Federal information security. That report found that 11 of the 47 major information systems—23 percent—at OPM lacked proper security authorization. In fact, 5 of the 11 systems were in the office of the Chief Information Officer, the person responsible for the agency's data security.

This morning, Ms. Archuleta was proud to claim that the agency had been upgraded to just “significant deficiency” with regard to its IT system, up from “material weakness.” And the inspector general testified this morning that they had offered 29 recommendations in their November report, and to date only 3 of the 29 recommendations had been adopted.

In addition to the inspector general report in November of 2014, in December—the following month—of 2014, the General Accounting Office, or GAO, issued a report highly critical of IT management at OPM. The report identified best practices that OPM should implement to improve IT management. The report found that “OPM's efforts to modernize retirement processing have been plagued by IT management weaknesses”—another indication that OPM desperately needed to address IT management, which our witnesses argue is critical to ensuring agency-wide security.

So my takeaway from this morning's hearing is that all the warning signs were there. OPM was aware of the persistent issues. They knew about breaches to their contractors, and the agency knew they were a target. Yet the only evidence that OPM did anything was a plan that was written in the first 100 days of the new Director's tenure at OPM. Planning is important, but execution matters a lot more.

We still need lots of answers as to what OPM did following those original breaches last year. What security plan

did they put in place? Have they identified which information to secure? How did they secure these documents? Were they effective in preventing other attacks? How often did the OPM Director and the CIO, the Chief Information Officer, meet and what were their discussions?

I am encouraged to know that our Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee intends to have another hearing, and this time we will have the opportunity to present it in a secured setting so that no one can indicate that they are incapable of answering the question because of security issues. I look forward to that hearing. However, I will tell my colleagues that it is discouraging to know what I now know, and it is a discouraging time for IT security and the Federal Government.

I hope we can use this as a lesson for other agencies that they need to be vigilant. We face real and serious threats. Inaction by agencies put Federal workers, the American people, and, most importantly, our national security at risk.

In my view, this is important. These hearings matter. The information we are garnering and attempting to garner is important for those who are employees of the Federal Government. They need to know what has transpired so they can better protect themselves. Why are they at risk because of these hacks? Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, we need to know what has transpired here. Processes need to be in place to prevent additional challenges to our information technology, because it is a matter of our national security.

So for the sake of our Federal employees and their well-being but also for the sake of the American citizens and our national security, this is not an issue that we have the opportunity to avoid. Answers need to be forthcoming and decisions need to be made system-wide—not just at OPM but throughout the entire Federal Government—as we work to protect those who work for the Federal Government and as we work to protect American citizens from a national security perspective.

With that, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to address the Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS PARROTT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I, as chairman of the Committee on Finance along with Ranking Member WYDEN, recognize Thomas Parrott, a distinguished executive at the Social Security Administration—or, SSA. Tom is currently the Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Legislation and Congressional Affairs at SSA. He is a dedicated public servant who has served his country for more than 40 years.

Tom began his career at SSA in January 1975 as a claims representative in the Midtown Manhattan district office, before being assigned to district offices in Rochester, NY, and later in Redding, CA. He returned to his hometown of Baltimore in 1980 as a policy analyst in the predecessor office of what is currently called the Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs. Since that time, he has been in the same component office at SSA serving as the Associate Commissioner for Legislative Development and Operations, as Acting Deputy Commissioner, and in his current position as the Assistant Deputy Commissioner.

Tom is a 1972 graduate of Denison University in Ohio, and he completed the Federal Executive Institute's Leadership for a Democratic Society program in 2005. He was appointed in 2008, by then-SSA Commissioner Michael Astrue, to the Senior Executive Service.

As testimony to Tom's devotion to public service, prior to joining SSA, he was a VISTA volunteer and a field health inspector in western New York working with migrant farm workers in the potato and apple growing regions of the State.

Sequences of staffers in the Finance Committee have had the pleasure of working with Tom on many issues relating to Social Security during his tenure at SSA. He has always been resourceful, insightful, and forthcoming.

Tom will retire from the Social Security Administration on July 3, 2015. He will be sorely missed by his colleagues and his many friends on the Hill. He will leave behind the numerous individuals he has mentored and encouraged over the years and who will now carry on this work.

Both Ranking Member WYDEN and I feel that it is important that we in Congress recognize those who devote their working lives to improving the lives of others. Career civil servants often do their work in quiet anonymity behind the scenes providing vital service to the American people. They are rarely recognized for their many contributions. Tom Parrott is one of those people. His record of leadership at the Social Security Administration and his commitment to providing the American people with effective and compas-

sionate service is a record of which he can be justly proud.

Ranking Member WYDEN and I wish Tom all the best in his retirement from Federal service and thank him for his many years of dedicated service. Tom will continue in many ways to serve people in his community, and we are all grateful for his efforts. We wish him all the very best in his future endeavors.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I commemorate the 3-year anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, commonly referred to as DACA. This program has played a vital role in empowering the Nation's undocumented immigrant youth population.

Many of these young people were brought to the United States at a young age, through no fault of their own, and know no other home or country. They are woven into the fabric of California and this country. At school, they are taught American history, culture, and values. They strive to achieve the American dream.

The DACA Program enables such youth to fulfill their potential and thus to maximize their contribution to their families, communities, and this country. President Obama announced the DACA Program in June 2012 to protect eligible young people from deportation for a 2-year period, while Congress considered comprehensive immigration reform legislation.

The Senate passed the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act with a strong bipartisan majority, 68 to 32. This bill would have provided a pathway to citizenship for DACA grantees and others similarly situated. But the House failed to act, and so here we are today without comprehensive immigration reform. Although we have not yet succeeded in fixing our broken immigration system through congressional action, at least the DACA Program provides some temporary reprieve for these young immigrants so that they do not live in constant fear of deportation.

The program enables them to get work authorization, and thus to seek higher education and contribute to the American economy. To qualify, an individual must have come to the United States when they were under 16 years of age and lived in the country continuously for at least 5 years. The individual must also receive an education, pass a background check, and pay an application fee.

The State of California is home to over a quarter of the estimated 1.8 million young immigrants who potentially meet the criteria of the DACA Program. Of the approximately 660,000

DACA applications that have been approved since the program's inception in 2012, about 30 percent reside in California. This is more than any other State. To help those who are eligible, nonprofits, religious organizations, pro bono legal networks, and other volunteers in California and nationwide have risen to the occasion. They have helped, and continue to help, hundreds of thousands of DACA applicants to navigate the filing process.

The benefits of DACA for these young individuals and for this country are undeniable. A recent report published by the University of California, Berkeley School of Law found that 66 percent of students granted DACA noted a positive change in post-graduate plans and greater hope for their future. All of the study's participants come from low-income households, with 88 percent living below 150 percent of the Federal poverty level. Many students reported that parents could not assist them with educational costs; and, in some instances, students contributed a portion of their own earnings to provide for their families. Several students had suffered the deportation of a close relative, and over a quarter had a parent or sibling with an active case in immigration court.

Imagine the day-to-day stresses of being a college student: trying to excel in the classroom, paying for food and housing, and finding future employment. For these students, they must also consider additional financial, psychological, and emotional challenges because they—despite spending their lives in this country—are undocumented. The DACA Program gives these young people a measure of stability so they can focus on their school work and professional growth and development, not on whether they or a loved one will be deported. The DACA Program allows them to do just that and look forward.

The economic impacts of the 2012 DACA Program show that the United States has much to gain from enabling eligible undocumented individuals to work lawfully within our borders. According to the University of California, Los Angeles' North American Integration and Development Center "The DACA program of 2012-2014 appears to have spurred extraordinary growth in the earnings of DACA beneficiaries. According to the results of two recent surveys, this wage growth surpassed 240 percent, a number that far exceeds the expectations in the literature."

All around the country, this time of year is punctuated by graduation ceremonies. Parents and grandparents beam as their children and grandchildren earn their high school, college, and graduate degrees. This year, I was one of those grandparents. My granddaughter, Eileen, graduated from Stanford, my alma mater, and I was so proud to attend the ceremony. DACA

recipients and their families should have that feeling too—a feeling of hope for the future, accomplishment, and growth, and they should have it without fear of deportation right around the corner. That is what this is about.

So I am pleased to commemorate the 3-year anniversary of the DACA Program, and I very much hope we can renew our commitment to passing comprehensive immigration reform legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize the 70th anniversary of the United Nations.

As World War II came to a close, representatives of 50 nations met in San Francisco to sign the United Nations' founding charter, officially establishing an international forum to prevent war, support human rights, respect international law, and promote social progress. These delegates hoped the creation of this new organization would prevent another devastating global conflict by addressing diplomatic challenges and humanitarian crises around the world.

Over the past seven decades, the United Nations has engaged in peacekeeping operations throughout the world, with more than 120 nations contributing military personnel, police, and civilians to these humanitarian efforts. Although there continue to be areas where armed conflict is all too prevalent, I am proud of the many successes achieved through this global mission.

The United Nations has also played an important role in addressing the needs of the world's most vulnerable populations by promoting health, nutrition, and education. Through the work of the World Health Organization, the World Food Programme, and many other bodies, the United Nations has led efforts worldwide to reduce poverty and save lives.

As United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and leaders from around the world gather in San Francisco on June 26 to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the United Nations Charter, I want to congratulate the United Nations for its incredible achievements and dedicated commitment to fostering consensus, partnership, and unity among the nations of the world.

NEFFENGER CONFIRMATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday I missed Senate rollcall vote No. 217, the nomination of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, because of flight delay issues due to weather. Had I been here, I would have voted in favor of this nomination.

I support the Senate's confirmation last night of Coast Guard VADM Peter V. Neffenger who was confirmed to be the next Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, TSA.

The TSA has been without Senate-confirmed leadership for too long. John Pistole, the previous TSA Administrator, announced on October 16, 2014, that he would be resigning in December. Since the end of 2014, the TSA Administrator position has been vacant. In January, I along with Ranking Member NELSON, and Senators AYOTTE, CANTWELL, and FISCHER, called on President Obama to send us a qualified, experienced, and dedicated individual to serve as TSA Administrator. Unfortunately, President Obama did not nominate Admiral Neffenger until April 28, 2015, over 6 months after John Pistole informed the administration that he would be leaving. I was disappointed at the length of time it took for the President to send us a qualified nominee. Even the New York Times editorial page, normally quite deferential to the President, expressed the opinion that "the Obama Administration has been disturbingly slow to give the TSA strong leadership at the top."

By comparison, the Senate has very rapidly moved the Neffenger nomination, despite two separate committees being involved with his formal vetting. Since the TSA was transferred to the Department of Homeland Security, the Senate has abided by an understanding that TSA Administrator nominees would be vetted by the Commerce Committee, which has primary jurisdiction over TSA, and also by the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, which oversees the Department of Homeland Security where TSA is organizationally housed. Some could say that this protocol could lend itself to unnecessary delay. However, Admiral Neffenger received three votes in less than 3 weeks, first by the Commerce Committee on June 4, 2015, the second one on June 15, 2015, by the Homeland Security Committee, and last night when he was confirmed by a vote of 81 to 1. So the Senate has moved swiftly to confirm this important nomination, in comparison to the time the Obama administration has taken to send the Senate a qualified nominee.

While I am disappointed at the length of time it took for the President to send the Senate a qualified nominee, I applaud the President's selection of Admiral Neffenger to be the next TSA Administrator. Admiral Neffenger has served ably and well for 34 years in the U.S. Coast Guard, rising through the ranks to become the Vice Commandant when the Senate confirmed him last year for that distinguished position.

During an assignment to Mobile, AL, he helped to lead the multi-agency response to the 1993 Amtrak Sunset Lim-

ited train derailment into a remote waterway in the Mobile River Delta, which killed 47 people. Admiral Neffenger also has substantial experience serving right here in the Senate, having been a Coast Guard fellow and detailee for 3 years at the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Admiral Neffenger also served as Deputy National Incident Commander for the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. In that role, Admiral Neffenger coordinated and led over 50,000 people from Federal, State, and local agencies, tribal representatives, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector throughout five Gulf Coast States in the clean-up and response effort. Clearly, Admiral Neffenger has the requisite background and experience to lead reforms at the TSA.

Admiral Neffenger has proven himself as a leader, and the TSA is an agency in dire need of strong, capable leadership. In May, the Department of Homeland Security's Inspector General testified in the House of Representatives that, "[u]nfortunately, although nearly 14 years have passed since TSA's inception, we remain deeply concerned about its ability to execute its important mission." Then, earlier this month, news broke that undercover investigators from the Inspector General's office had penetrated TSA security checkpoints while carrying illegal weapons or simulated bombs on 67 of 70 attempts. In other words, TSA failed 95 percent of the time to prevent illegal weapons or simulated bombs from being smuggled through TSA security checkpoints. This is unacceptable, and it is clear that the Inspector General is right to be concerned about TSA's ability to execute its important mission in a rapidly changing threat environment.

TSA has also experienced a number of other troubling failures about which I have written to the agency. I have been concerned about the TSA's oversight of Secure Identification Display Area, SIDA, badges at the Nation's airports. In December 2014, it was revealed that a Delta ramp agent in Atlanta allegedly used his SIDA badge to bypass TSA security and facilitate an interstate gun smuggling operation via commercial aircraft. TSA's response to my letter of inquiry about its oversight of SIDA badges stated that TSA does not issue or manage SIDA badges and that this responsibility falls to airport operators—which raised even more concerns about TSA's awareness about lost SIDA badges at our Nation's airports.

Another issue I have raised with TSA relates to the potential security gaps in its PreCheck initiative raised in reports by the inspector general. On January 28, 2015, the inspector general released an unclassified summary of a classified report concluding that PreCheck is a positive step towards risk-based security screening as a concept, but that TSA needs to modify its

PreCheck vetting and screening processes and improve its PreCheck communication and coordination. The Department of Homeland Security Office of the Inspector General report also stated that, "TSA did not concur with all recommendations and all recommendations remain open."

In response to the conclusions and recommendations, I wrote to TSA along with Ranking Member NELSON on March 25, 2015, asking a series of questions about potential security gaps in TSA PreCheck. TSA responded to this letter on April 14, 2015, but the issue of potential security gaps in PreCheck and other expedited screening initiatives must still be addressed as TSA seeks to continue these initiatives, let alone expand them.

Admiral Neffenger's proven leadership throughout the course of his service in the U.S. Coast Guard will undoubtedly afford valuable perspective in his role as TSA Administrator. Admiral Neffenger understands the need for TSA to continuously evolve to meet the challenges presented by an ever-changing threat environment. Obviously, the TSA is an agency that needs a strong leader who will bring cultural change to the agency. I am hopeful that Admiral Neffenger can be a leader who can fundamentally reform the TSA. He has a heavy burden, but I believe he is capable of shouldering that burden and I pledge to work with him and my colleagues here in the Senate to see that those changes occur.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING ARKANSAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE VOLUNTEERS

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the work of 12 power linemen from nine electric cooperatives in Arkansas for their work to bring reliable electricity to citizens in Guatemala.

The Arkansas linemen dedicated more than 2 weeks to completely change the lives of more than 1,390 residents in 2 villages in rural Guatemala—Jolom I'Jix and Zapotal. Through construction activities such as installation of poles, distribution transformers, household connections, and meters, these volunteers extended the electric distribution system 4 miles, connecting homes to an electric grid powered by a small hydroelectric plant.

Since 2013, Electric Cooperatives of Arkansas volunteers have worked to improve the lives of Guatemalans by providing electricity. The significance of this project stretches to impact numerous aspects of daily life for these residents. Electricity is a critical element in improving the quality of life and to providing health care, edu-

cation, access to clean water, and economic growth. Equipped with this newfound source of electricity, hope for a brighter future exists for subsistence farmers whose main worry is simply providing food for their family.

This effort, funded by participating co-ops and supporters in Arkansas, continues the State's storied history of making an impact. By being a beacon of good for these villagers, the linemen were able to engrave a lasting impact, which will help future generations of Guatemalans.

I offer my sincere gratitude to all those who contributed to make a difference for those who are truly in need. Doug Evans, Will Glover, Kyle Metcalf, Andy Caywood, Michael Counts, Andy Ward, Brent Hufstедler, Kirk Kempson, Joey Burk, Kris Rankin, Paul Garrison and Ryan Hayes, thank you for your dedication and service to helping connect citizens of Guatemala to electric service.●

RECOGNIZING ALAN LEVIN

• Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise on behalf of the Delaware Delegation to honor the exemplary service of Alan Levin, director of the Delaware Economic Development Office, upon his retirement. Alan became director in January 2009 and continued to serve with distinction in that capacity for 6 years. He assumed that position at a time when tens of thousands of Delawareans were losing their jobs, and the State's top priority was putting them back to work. Throughout this tumultuous time, he has been a tremendous leader and true advocate for the State.

Alan has a lifetime of experience when it comes to knowing what it takes to make a business successful. In 1987, he took over Delaware's home-grown pharmacy chain Happy Harry's, the business his father started, and grew it to become an iconic brand with 76 stores throughout the state. Prior to taking over the family business, he worked for United States Senator Bill Roth as his executive assistant and counsel. He is a graduate of Tulane University and Widener University Law School.

When Delaware Governor Jack Markell tapped him to head the Delaware Economic Development Office, unemployment in Delaware was soaring. The State's automotive plants were shuttering, and the State's major oil refinery announced plans to idle operations. Alan got straight to work, and over the next 6 years, the Delaware Economic Development Office awarded more than \$213 million in job creation grants and loans to corporations through its strategic fund, and courted big firms such as Amazon, Barclays, Capitol One, JP Morgan Chase, Kraft Foods, Purdue and Sallie Mae to expand its current operations or relocate

to Delaware. Alan was also instrumental in reopening the shuttered Delaware City Oil Refinery, putting hundreds of people back to work at one of the State's most significant industrial sites.

Alan has been lauded as a bold risk-taker whose experience and innovative planning has helped Delaware have the fastest job growth in the Mid-Atlantic over the last 2 years. He can also be credited with helping to level the playing field for minority, women, and veteran business owners, as well as those with disabilities. On behalf of Senator CHRIS COONS and Congressman JOHN CARNEY, I wholeheartedly thank Alan Levin for his service to the State of Delaware. His model leadership and dedication has improved the quality of life for countless residents and businesses in our great State. We offer our sincere congratulations on a job well done, and wish him and his wife Ellen, their children Andrew, Daniel and Jason, and their granddaughter Hannah, many happy, healthy and successful years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE CORPORAL MARK W. THALHAMMER

• Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I wish to honor Mark W. Thalhammer, Pueblo, CO, police detective corporal, and recognize his retirement after 34 years of service to his community and to his country. Detective Thalhammer has served with distinction in a variety of roles for the Pueblo Police Department. During his tenure, Detective Thalhammer has served as a police officer, a criminal investigator, a narcotics enforcement officer assigned to a U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration multiagency drug task force, a gang reinforcement detective, a felon enforcement officer, and a tactical officer assigned to high-risk law enforcement endeavors. His dedication to law enforcement for more than three decades has left an indelible mark on the community, the country, and the Pueblo Police Department.

Please join me in honoring Pueblo Police Department Detective Corporal Thalhammer for his devotion to his community and our State's law enforcement profession. His years of courageous service and commitment deserve great recognition and admiration.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, with an amendment, in which it

requests the concurrence of the Senate, and agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 160. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2026. A communication from the Regulatory Liaison, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indian Oil Valuation Amendments" (RIN1012-AA15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2027. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary" ((RIN1545-BM53) (TD 9724)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1645. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-70).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BLUNT:

S. 1643. A bill to require a report on actions to secure the safety and security of dissidents housed at Camp Liberty, Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1644. A bill to permanently extend the private mortgage insurance tax deduction; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1645. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1646. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to make a

technical correction relating to the amendments made by Public Law 113-243; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1647. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1648. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create a sustainable future for rural healthcare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1649. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate the Sonoran Corridor connecting Interstate 19 to Interstate 10 south of the Tucson International Airport, as a future part of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1650. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make changes to the Medicare home health face-to-face encounter requirements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VITTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1651. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1652. A bill to designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1653. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to enhance access for independent agents and brokers to information regarding marketplace enrollment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1654. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. Res. 208. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the requested release of convicted terrorist Juvenal Ovidio Ricardo Palmera Pineda, also known as "Simon Trinidad", from prison in the United States as a part of the Colombian peace process; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN,

Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Res. 209. A resolution designating the Ulysses S. Grant Association as the organization to implement the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant, Civil War General and 2-term President of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARASSO):

S. Res. 210. A resolution celebrating the 125th anniversary of the State of Wyoming; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 71

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 163

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 163, a bill to establish a grant program to help State and local law enforcement agencies reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism and other disabilities.

S. 238

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 238, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capsicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

S. 267

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 267, a bill to authorize the transfer of certain items under the control of the Omar Bradley Foundation to the descendants of General Omar Bradley.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator

from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, *supra*.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 370

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes.

S. 429

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic foster care services in Medicaid.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services

for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 613

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 684, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 704

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 704, a bill to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 786

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 786, a bill to provide paid and family medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 827

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 827, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 891

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as co-

sponsors of S. 891, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to facilitate the administration and enforcement of antidumping and countervailing duty orders, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, *supra*.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1143

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to make the authority of States of Washington, Oregon, and California to manage Dungeness crab fishery permanent and for other purposes.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1252, a bill to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric

utility generating units, and for other purposes.

S. 1362

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1362, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs).

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1461

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1461, a bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending.

S. 1507

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the visa waiver program, and for other purposes.

S. 1513

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1513, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1524

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1524, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 1611

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1611, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes.

S. 1617

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1617, supra.

S. 1618

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1618, a bill to reallocate Federal Government-held spectrum for commercial use, to promote wireless innovation and enhance wireless communications, and for other purposes.

S. 1640

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1640, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve immigration law enforcement within the interior of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 200

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 200, a resolution wishing His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama a happy 80th birthday on July 6, 2015, and recognizing the outstanding contributions His Holiness has made to the promotion of nonviolence, human rights, interfaith dialogue, environmental awareness, and democracy.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1648. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create a sustainable future for rural healthcare; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss a bill I am introducing, the Rural Emergency Acute Care Hospital Act, or REACH Act.

Since January 2010, 55 rural hospitals have closed their doors. It is even more troubling that the pace of rural hospital closures appears to be accelerating.

As you can see from this chart, the number of hospital closures has increased each year over the past 5 years. These closures are creating a health care crisis for hundreds of thousands of Americans across the country.

The REACH Act will create a new rural hospital model under Medicare that will enable struggling rural hospitals to keep their doors open and maintain the most critical hospital service: emergency medicine.

When a rural hospital closes, the community loses the lifesaving capabilities of the emergency room. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, 60 percent of trauma deaths in the United States occur in rural areas. After a traumatic event, access to an emergency room within 1 hour can make a big difference between life and death.

Take, for example, Portia Gibbs from North Carolina. At 48, Portia suffered a heart attack 75 miles from the nearest emergency room. She later died while waiting for a helicopter to arrive that would have taken her over the State line to Virginia, where the closest hospital was located. If Portia's heart attack had occurred just 1 week earlier, Portia would have been transported to a hospital in Belhaven, NC, just 30 miles away. Unfortunately, the facility in Belhaven had closed just 6 days before Portia's heart attack, citing insurmountable financial struggles.

Then there is the tragic story of 18-month-old Edith Gonzalez who choked on a grape in her hometown of Center, TX. Edith's frantic parents rushed her to their local hospital, Shelby Regional Medical Center, only to discover that it had closed just weeks earlier. By the time little Edith arrived at the next closest hospital, she had passed away.

While we can't say with certainty that both Edith and Portia would have survived if their local hospitals had not closed, we know the earlier people access care, the better their chances are.

The term used by emergency medical practitioners is the "golden hour." The golden hour is the hour following a traumatic event when lifesaving intervention—like that which can be provided in an emergency room—has the best chance of impacting survival. In other words, the longer a patient has to wait to receive emergency medical care, the lower their chances will be for survival.

Rural hospital closures mean patients have to travel longer distances to access emergency medical care. Ensuring that rural communities keep their emergency care resources could make the difference between life and death. Rural hospital closures also extend beyond the loss of emergency services to include economic consequences for rural communities. Hospital closures can mean the death of a rural community. Approximately 62 million Americans live in rural areas. Rural communities play an integral role in the economic stability of this country through their invaluable contributions in food production, manufacturing, and other vital industries.

In addition to supporting the medical needs of those who participate in rural industry, rural hospitals also serve as the single largest employer in a rural community. The economic impacts of closing a hospital when no other hospital is close by are devastating. If we

care about the physical and economic health of rural communities, we must make a change that will reverse the trend of accumulating rural hospital closures.

iVantage Analytics compiled a report for the National Rural Health Association which identified 283 additional hospitals at risk of closure based upon performance indicators that matched those of the 53 facilities that already closed.

Allow me to direct the Presiding Officer's attention to this map. This map depicts the approximate locations of 53 of the 55 hospitals that have closed in the last 5 years.

I would like to point out that between the printing of this chart and today, two additional rural hospitals have closed. That alone is a clear indication of the problem I am trying to convey.

Now, imagine this same map depicting five times the number of hospital closures you see here. That is what is what will happen if we do not act to protect America's rural hospitals. Furthermore, the loss of those additional hospitals would not only impact local economies but would also result in a \$10.6 billion loss in GDP. It must change, not only for the health of rural Americans but also for the health and stability of our economy.

Payment cuts to hospitals are one contributing factor to rural hospital closures. More significant, however, is the current Medicare payment structure that supports rural hospitals. Today, the Medicare payment structure for hospitals is focused on inpatient volume. Emergency rooms act as a loss leader, and income is primary generated through inpatient stays.

A RAND study published in 2013 found that the average cost of an inpatient stay is 10 times the cost of an emergency room visit. Researchers at the University of North Carolina found that many of the at-risk rural hospitals around the country have an average of two or fewer patients admitted to a hospital on any given day. These hospitals can have up to 25 inpatient beds, and if only 2 or fewer of those beds are filled every day, that is a utilization rate of 8 percent or less.

Instead of letting these facilities close because they do not have the needed inpatient volume to generate enough revenue, why not let go of the underutilized inpatient services in favor of sustaining life-saving emergency care. That is what the REACH Act does. It provides a voluntary pathway for rural hospitals to eliminate their underutilized inpatient services and ensure residents have access to emergency medical care that saves lives. A key component of the bill that allows the rural emergency hospital model to function is the requirement for these facilities to have protocols in place for the timely transfer of pa-

tients who require a higher level of care or inpatient admission.

The value of the rural emergency hospitals in the case of a life-threatening emergency will be their ability to administer lifesaving measures in order to stabilize a patient before they are transferred to a higher level of care.

In addition to providing lifesaving emergency care, rural emergency hospitals will have the flexibility to provide a wide array of outpatient services, including observation care, skilled nursing facility care, infusion services, hemodialysis, home health, hospice, nursing home care, population health, as well as telemedicine services. This list is not all-inclusive but is just a sample of the outpatient services rural emergency hospitals could provide to their communities. The door is left open for rural emergency hospitals to design their outpatient services to match the needs of their communities.

There are roughly 1,300 critical access hospitals in America, including 82 in Iowa, the second most just behind Kansas. I am not suggesting that 1,300 critical access hospitals will become rural emergency hospitals. Some hospitals may never consider giving up their inpatient beds, others may consider it in the future, but some critical access hospitals need this or something like it right now.

The rural emergency hospital model, with its outpatient and emergency care services, will be good for the health of rural communities and our Nation because of the critical care it will provide when and where rural Americans need it. When there is a farm accident in the afternoon or a heart attack in the middle of the night, that emergency room can be the difference between life and death. Medicare needs a payment policy that recognizes that simple fact.

I look forward to continuing to work with my cosponsor Senator GARDNER, other colleagues, and stakeholders in building a sustainable future for rural health care.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VITTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1651. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to address America's retirement savings crisis. A 2013 survey conducted by the Governors of the Federal Reserve System found that roughly 31 percent of Americans have no retirement savings or access to a defined-benefit pension. In addition, 19 percent of respondents nearing retirement—

those aged 55 to 64—reported having zero savings or pension to rely on in the coming years.

In light of these figures it is more important than ever that Congress ensure America's seniors have access to the Social Security benefits they have earned. Yet provisions such as the Windfall Elimination Provision, WEP, and the Government Pension Offset, GPO, prevent millions of Americans—including teachers, firefighters, and police officers—from receiving their full benefits. It is time Congress repealed them.

This afternoon, I, along with Senator COLLINS and a number of my Senate colleagues from both sides of the aisle, introduced the Social Security Fairness Act. This bipartisan bill will repeal both the WEP and GPO provisions which Congress enacted in 1983 and 1977, respectively. In December 2014, these unfair provisions chipped away at more than 2 million Americans' Social Security benefits. That same month, in my State of Ohio, more than 200,000 Ohioans had their Social Security benefits reduced because of these provisions.

Over the past 35 years, fewer and fewer workers have been given access to defined-benefit plans, and, today, only about half of the total U.S. workforce is covered by an employer-sponsored retirement plan. That is why Social Security is critical for so many. Congress should make sure that every American has access to all the Social Security benefits he or she has earned. Repealing these provisions is an important step in that direction.

I ask my colleagues to join me in repealing the WEP and GPO by cosponsoring this legislation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Social Security Fairness Act of 2015, which I am joining my colleague from Ohio in introducing today. This bill would repeal both the windfall elimination provision, WEP, and the government pension offset, GPO. We believe that these two provisions in the Social Security Act unfairly penalize certain individuals for holding jobs in public service when the time comes for them to retire.

The WEP affects individuals who have worked in both the private sector and in public sector jobs for which Social Security taxes were not withheld. For such individuals, the WEP applies a special formula to calculate benefits, reducing them compared to what would otherwise be paid.

The GPO affects retired public employees whose spouses are entitled to Social Security benefits. When these individuals apply for Social Security spousal or survivor benefits, the GPO applies an offset, reducing the Social Security benefit based on the amount of that individual's public pension. In

some cases, the spouse will not be entitled to any spousal or survivor benefit because of the GPO.

The WEP and the GPO have enormous financial implications for many of our teachers, police officers, firefighters, postal workers and other public employees. Given their important responsibilities, it is simply unfair to penalize them when it comes to their Social Security benefits. These public servants—or their spouses—have all paid taxes into the Social Security system. So have their employers. They have worked long enough to earn their Social Security benefits. Yet, because of the GPO and WEP, they are unable to receive all of the Social Security benefits to which they otherwise would be entitled.

The impact of these two provisions is most acute in 15 States, including Maine, which have state retirement plans that lack a Social Security component. However, it is important to point out that the GPO and WEP affect public employees and retirees in every state, including our emergency responders, other Federal employees, and postal workers. Nationwide, more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of teachers and educating employees, and more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of other public employees, are affected by the GPO and/or the WEP.

As of 2013, one and a half million people were affected by the WEP and 615,000 people had their benefits reduced by the GPO. Many more public employees across the country stand to be harmed in the future. Moreover, at a time when we should be doing all that we can to attract qualified people to public service, this reduction in retirement benefits makes it even more difficult for our federal, state and local governments to recruit and retain the public servants who are so critical to the safety and well-being of our families.

What is most troubling is that this offset is most harsh for those who can least afford the loss: lower-income women. In fact, of those affected by the GPO, more than 80 percent are women. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the GPO reduces benefits for more than 200,000 individuals by more than \$3,600 a year—an amount that can make the difference between a comfortable retirement and poverty.

Many Maine teachers, in particular, have talked with me about the impact of these provisions on their retirement security. They love their jobs and the children they teach, but they worry about the future and about their financial security.

Roxie Brechlin of Bar Harbor, Maine, is one of many examples of the effect that the GPO and the WEP have on our teachers when they retire. Mrs. Brechlin first began paying into Social Security when she took her first summer job at age 16. After graduation, she continued to pay into Social Security

for 18 more years before getting her first teaching job. Mrs. Brechlin worked as a teacher for 23 years, and for 14 of those years she worked full-time at another job during the summer, paying more and more into Social Security each year.

Mr. Brechlin recently contacted my office to explain the effect that the WEP and GPO will have on his wife. Mrs. Brechlin recently retired. When she applied for Social Security benefits, the WEP applied, and her benefit was reduced by two thirds. Mr. Brechlin is more concerned about what would happen to his wife if he were to predecease her. Normally, a widow would be eligible to continue to collect 100 percent of her husband's benefit. Mrs. Brechlin, however, would not be able to collect any survivor benefit, due to the application of the GPO. Not only does this fact worry Mr. Brechlin, he also sees it as unfair.

It is time for us to take action, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring the Social Security Fairness Act to eliminate these two unfair provisions.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1654. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, in an effort to decrease the rate of drug overdose deaths, I am pleased to be joined by Senators DURBIN, WHITEHOUSE, MARKEY, and LEAHY in introducing the Overdose Prevention Act. Representative DONNA EDWARDS is introducing this bill in the other body.

Throughout the country, the death rate from drug overdoses has been rapidly climbing. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, drug overdose death rates have more than tripled since 1990, and more than 110 Americans died each day from drug overdoses in 2011. More than half of these deaths are attributable to opioids, like prescription pain relievers or heroin. Indeed, this tragic epidemic has hit particularly hard in my home state of Rhode Island, where in 2014, 239 individuals died from drug overdoses.

Americans aged 25 to 64 are now more likely to die as a result of drug overdose than from injuries sustained in motor vehicle traffic crashes. While overdoses from illegal drugs persist as a major public health problem, fatal overdoses from prescribed opioid pain medications such as oxycodone account for more than 40 percent of all overdose deaths.

It is clear that we must do more to stop these often preventable deaths. Fortunately, the drug naloxone, which has no side effects and no potential for abuse, is widely recognized as an important tool to help prevent drug over-

dose deaths. Naloxone can rapidly reverse an overdose from heroin and opioid medications if provided in a timely manner. Overdose prevention programs, including those that utilize naloxone, have been credited with saving more than 26,000 lives since 1996, according to the CDC.

Opioid abuse and overdose is not an abstract threat found in far-off corners. It is a national public health crisis and it's taking place right here at home in our communities and our neighborhoods.

Rhode Island is taking steps to combat this scourge and is leading the way in adopting innovative solutions. Through a "collaborative practice agreement," some Rhode Island pharmacies are dispensing naloxone, along with training about its proper use, to anyone who walks in and requests the treatment, no prescription necessary. In addition, the Rhode Island State Police carry naloxone in every cruiser.

The Overdose Prevention Act, which we are introducing today, would complement these efforts and take important steps towards addressing this issue nationally and increasing access to naloxone in our communities. The legislation aims to establish a comprehensive response to this epidemic that emphasizes collaboration between state and federal officials and employs best practices from the medical community, as well as programs and treatments that have been proven effective to combat this startling national trend. This is an emergency and it requires a coordinated and comprehensive response.

Specifically, the bill would authorize the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, to award funding through cooperative agreements to eligible entities—like public health agencies or community-based organizations with expertise in preventing overdose deaths. As a condition of participation, an entity would use the grant to purchase and distribute naloxone, and carry out overdose prevention activities, such as educating and training prescribers, pharmacists, and first responders on how to recognize the signs of an overdose, seek emergency medical help, and administer naloxone and other first aid.

As rates of overdose deaths continue to spike, public health agencies, law enforcement, and others are struggling to keep up without clear and timely information about the epidemic. Therefore, the Overdose Prevention Act would also require HHS to take steps to improve surveillance and research of drug overdose deaths, so that public health agencies, law enforcement, and community organizations have an accurate picture of the problem.

It would also establish a coordinated federal plan of action to address this epidemic. The Overdose Prevention Act

seeks to bring together first responders, medical personnel, addiction treatment specialists, social service providers, and families to help save lives and get at the root of this problem.

I am pleased that the Overdose Prevention Act has the support of the American Association of Poison Control Centers, the Drug Policy Alliance, the Harm Reduction Coalition, and the Trust for America's Health. I look forward to working with these and other stakeholders, as well as our cosponsors to join us in supporting this crucial legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 208—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE REQUESTED RELEASE OF CONVICTED TERRORIST JUVENAL OVIDIO RICARDO PALMERA PINEDA, ALSO KNOWN AS "SIMON TRINIDAD", FROM PRISON IN THE UNITED STATES AS A PART OF THE COLOMBIAN PEACE PROCESS

Mr. RUBIO submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 208

Whereas the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia—People's Army (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia—Ejército del Pueblo (FARC-EP) is a Marxist insurgency group engaged in a bloody civil war with the Government of Colombia;

Whereas FARC-EP has been designated a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Department of State since 1997;

Whereas fighting between FARC-EP and the Government of Colombia has claimed hundreds of thousands of lives, including United States citizens, since 1964;

Whereas multiple FARC-EP terrorist have been indicted, captured, and extradited to the United States to face trial for their crimes against United States citizens;

Whereas Juvenal Ovidio Ricardo Palmiera Pineda, also known as "Simon Trinidad", joined FARC in the 1980s and later became a rebel leader within the FARC-EP;

Whereas, on February 13, 2003, a small Cessna airplane carrying 5 people including a United States pilot named Thomas Janis, a Colombian national, Luis Cruz, and 3 other United States nationals, Marc Gonsalves, Keith Stansell, and Thomas Howes, crashed in Southern Colombia;

Whereas heavily armed FARC-EP guerrillas immediately surrounded the plane and brutally executed Thomas Janis and Luis Cruz, then took the other men hostage;

Whereas, on April 27, 2003, the FARC-EP issued a communiqué taking credit for the abduction of the three United States nationals, made demands in exchange for the release of the hostages, and appointed "Simon Trinidad" the spokesperson and negotiator for the FARC-EP;

Whereas "Simon Trinidad" was captured in Ecuador's capital of Quito 8 months later on January 2, 2004;

Whereas "Simon Trinidad" was convicted by a court in Colombia for aggravated kid-

napping and rebellion and sentenced to 35 years in prison on May 4, 2004;

Whereas "Simon Trinidad" was convicted by a United States jury of plotting to hold 3 United States nationals hostage after they were captured in Colombia, and was sentenced to 60 years in prison on January 28, 2008; and

Whereas FARC-EP has reportedly named "Simon Trinidad" a member of their Colombian peace negotiating team and made a request for President Barack Obama to release him: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) opposes the FARC-EP's requested release of Juvenal Ovidio Ricardo Palmiera Pineda, also known as "Simon Trinidad", who was convicted by a United States jury of plotting to hold 3 United States nationals hostage after they were captured in Colombia, and was sentenced to 60 years in prison;

(2) extends deepest sympathies to all family members of the victims of FARC-EP atrocities; and

(3) recognizes this type of action would send a negative message to terrorists groups and undermines the United States judicial system.

SENATE RESOLUTION 209—DESIGNATING THE ULYSSES S. GRANT ASSOCIATION AS THE ORGANIZATION TO IMPLEMENT THE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE BIRTH OF ULYSSES S. GRANT, CIVIL WAR GENERAL AND 2-TERM PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 209

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant was born in southern Ohio on April 27, 1822, to Jesse Grant and Hannah Simpson Grant;

Whereas the first line of the memoirs of Ulysses S. Grant proudly states: "My Family is American, and has been for generations, in all its branches, direct and collateral.";

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant attended school in Georgetown, Ohio, graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1843, and entered the United States Army;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant served in a variety of military posts from the Atlantic Coast to the Pacific Coast, including posts in New York, Michigan, and California, and a post at the famous Jefferson Barracks in Missouri;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant distinguished himself in combat during the Mexican-American War and worked tirelessly to succeed in civilian life;

Whereas, as a civilian farmer in Missouri, Ulysses S. Grant—

(1) met and married his wife, Julia Dent, for whom Ulysses S. Grant built a home named Harborside;

(2) worked alongside slaves and emancipated the only slave that Ulysses S. Grant owned; and

(3) continued to own land while Ulysses S. Grant was President;

Whereas when the Civil War erupted, Ulysses S. Grant left Galena, Illinois to rejoin the United States Army, gained the colonelcy of the 21st Illinois Volunteer Regiment, and began his meteoric military rise;

Whereas during the Civil War, Ulysses S. Grant led troops in numerous victorious battles including—

(1) in Tennessee, at Forts Henry and Donelson and at Shiloh and Chattanooga; and

(2) in Mississippi, at Vicksburg;

Whereas President Abraham Lincoln chose Ulysses S. Grant to be Commanding General during the Civil War, and in that role Ulysses S. Grant revolutionized warfare in Virginia to preserve the Union;

Whereas in gratitude, the people of the United States twice elected Ulysses S. Grant President of the United States;

Whereas during his Presidency from 1869 to 1877, Ulysses S. Grant worked valiantly to help former slaves become full citizens and some prominent historians consider him to be the first modern President of the United States;

Whereas after leaving the Presidency, Ulysses S. Grant became the first President of the United States to tour the world;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant established a foreign policy that the United States followed into the 20th century and beyond;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant authored his memoirs, a significant piece of 19th-century nonfiction, while courageously battling cancer, which eventually took his voice and his life but did not silence the noble words that he left as a legacy;

Whereas the Ulysses S. Grant Association was founded during the Centennial of the Civil War in 1962 by the leading historians of that era and the Civil War Centennial Commissions of New York, Illinois, and Ohio, 3 States where Ulysses S. Grant lived;

Whereas, in the years since it was founded in 1962, the Ulysses S. Grant Association—

(1) has produced 32 volumes of "The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant", the major source for the study of the life of Ulysses S. Grant and the 19th century in which he lived; and

(2) has worked toward the publication of the first scholarly edition of the memoirs of Ulysses S. Grant, which as of May 2015, is nearing completion;

Whereas the Ulysses S. Grant Association was first headquartered at the Ohio Historical Society located on the campus of Ohio State University, later moved to Southern Illinois University, and relocated in 2008 to Mississippi State University; and

Whereas in 2012, the Ulysses S. Grant Association established the Ulysses S. Grant Presidential Library, the world center for Ulysses S. Grant scholars and tourists: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant, military leader and President;

(2) designates the Ulysses S. Grant Association, housed at the Ulysses S. Grant Presidential Library on the grounds of Mississippi State University, as the designated institution for organizing and leading the celebration of the bicentennial; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to join in that bicentennial celebration to honor Ulysses S. Grant, one of the major historical figures of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 210—CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 210

Whereas Wyoming became a State on July 10, 1890;

Whereas Wyoming, as the Equality State, celebrates firsts for women of Wyoming, including—

(1) Louisa Swain, who in 1870, was the first woman to vote in an election in Wyoming and the United States;

(2) Esther Hobart Morris, who in 1870, was the first woman in the United States to be appointed Justice of the Peace; and

(3) Nellie Tayloe Ross, who in 1924, was the first woman in the United States to serve as governor;

Whereas Wyoming celebrates several firsts in land conservation, including—

(1) the first national park, Yellowstone National Park, established in 1872;

(2) the first national forest, Shoshone National Forest, established in 1891; and

(3) the first national monument, Devil's Tower, established in 1906;

Whereas Fort D.A. Russell, established in 1867 and proclaimed by President Hoover in 1930 as F.E. Warren Air Force Base, is the oldest continuously active military installation in the Air Force, and is located west of Cheyenne, Wyoming;

Whereas the Wyoming Air National Guard was established in 1946 and the Wyoming Army National Guard was established in 1970 to serve under the Wyoming Military Department as a federal military reserve force;

Whereas Wyoming is among the top 5 energy producers in the United States;

Whereas Wyoming is the largest coal producer in the United States, producing nearly 40 percent of all coal mined in the United States and providing nearly 40 percent of all electricity generated in the United States;

Whereas Wyoming is home to the largest reserves of uranium ore in the United States and produces more uranium than any other State;

Whereas Wyoming is a leading producer of oil and natural gas;

Whereas Wyoming, with one of the lowest tax rates in the United States, is one of the States most friendly to business;

Whereas in 1977, Wyoming was the first State to establish a limited liability corporation (LLC) statute;

Whereas in 1902, in Kemmerer, Wyoming, James Cash Penney opened his first store, the Golden Rule, which subsequently grew into the J.C. Penney chain;

Whereas in 1968, in Cheyenne, Wyoming, John "Taco" Turner opened up the Taco House, which one year later became Taco John's, the now popular fast food chain;

Whereas Wyoming has 15,846 miles of fishing streams and 297,633 acres of fishing lakes that support 31 species of game fish;

Whereas Wyoming provides winter habitat for nearly 1,000,000 big game animals;

Whereas the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming is home to the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho tribes;

Whereas since 1897, Wyoming has celebrated cowboy heritage at Cheyenne Frontier Days, the largest outdoor rodeo in the world; and

Whereas in 2010, Wyoming was the first State to adopt an official State code of ethics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends and celebrates Wyoming and the people of Wyoming on the 125th anniversary of the State of Wyoming.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Oversight Review of the National Flood Insurance Program."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Update on the Recalls of Defective Takata Air Bags and NHTSA's Vehicle Safety Efforts."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a joint hearing with the Committee on the Budget entitled "Accounting for the True Cost of Regulation: Exploring the Possibility of a Regulatory Budget."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 1 p.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled,

"The Impacts of EPA's proposed Carbon Regulations on Energy Costs for American Businesses, Rural Communities and Families, and a legislative hearing on S. 1324."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC, ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy and Environmental Policy be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 2:45 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "American Energy Exports: Opportunities for U.S. Allies and U.S. National Security."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Laura Newell on my staff be granted floor privileges for the remainder of today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF LAVERNE HORTON COUNCIL TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY)

NOMINATION OF DAVID J. SHULKIN TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR HEALTH OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 146 and 147; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of LaVerne Horton Council, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Information

and Technology); and David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

VOTE ON COUNCIL NOMINATION

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of LaVerne Horton Council, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Information and Technology)?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SHULKIN NOMINATION

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 157 through 192 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Lawrence B. Jackson
Rear Adm. (1h) Scott B. J. Jerabek
Rear Adm. (1h) Luke M. McCollum

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Christina M. Alvarado

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Katherine A. McCabe

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Grafton D. Chase, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Daniel V. MacInnis

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Captain Alan D. Beal
Captain Darren J. Hanson
Captain Brian S. Hurley
Captain Andrew C. Lennon

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Brian K. Antonio
Rear Adm. (1h) Mark R. Whitney

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Paul A. Sohl

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Nancy A. Norton
Rear Adm. (1h) Robert D. Sharp

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Terry J. Moulton

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Bret J. Muilenburg

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Mark L. Leavitt

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Ann M. Burkhardt

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. James P. Downey
Capt. Stephen F. Williamson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Michael W. Zarkowski

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. David G. Manero

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Paul Pearigen

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Anne M. Swap

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Peter G. Stamatopoulos

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. John W. Korka

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Paul E. Bauman

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Antonio A. Aguto, Jr.
Colonel Maria B. Barrett
Colonel James E. Bonner
Colonel Jeffery D. Broadwater
Colonel Xavier T. Brunson
Colonel Charles H. Cleveland
Colonel Douglas C. Crissman
Colonel Timothy J. Daugherty
Colonel Bradley K. Dreyer
Colonel John R. Evans, Jr.
Colonel Antonio M. Fletcher
Colonel Patrick D. Frank
Colonel Bradley T. Gericke
Colonel Steven W. Gilland
Colonel Karl H. Gingrich
Colonel Williams H. Graham, Jr.
Colonel Charles R. Hamilton
Colonel Diana M. Holland
Colonel Gary W. Johnston
Colonel Kenneth L. Kamper
Colonel John S. Laskodi
Colonel Donna W. Martin
Colonel Joseph P. McGee
Colonel Randall A. McIntire
Colonel John E. Novalis, II
Colonel Mark W. Odom
Colonel Paul H. Pardew
Colonel Thomas A. Pugh
Colonel James H. Raymer
Colonel John B. Richardson, IV
Colonel Andrew M. Rohling
Colonel Michel M. Russell, Sr.
Colonel Thomas H. Todd, III
Colonel Joel K. Tyler
Colonel Kevin Vereen
Colonel Daniel R. Walrath

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. William W. Way

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Michael K. Hanifan
Brig. Gen. Daniel M. Krumrei

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Hugh T. Corbett

Colonel Andrew Lawlor
Colonel Roderick R. Leon Guerrero
Colonel Gervasio Ortiz Lopez

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William C. Mayville, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Michael S. Cederholm
Colonel Dennis A. Crall
Colonel Bradford J. Gering
Colonel James F. Glynn
Colonel Gregory L. Masiello
Colonel David W. Maxwell
Colonel Stephen M. Neary
Colonel Stephen D. Sklenka
Colonel Roger B. Turner, Jr.
Colonel Rick A. Uribe

IN THE ARMY

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Clifford B. Chick

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John W. Hesterman, III

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Leela J. Gray

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Donald B. Tatum

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Timothy E. Gowen

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. William A. Brown

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Ronald F. Lewis

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Robert B. Abrams

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while serving as the Chief Defense Counsel for Military Commissions under the United States Constitution, article II, section 2, clause 2, and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, section 1037:

To be brigadier general

Col. John G. Baker

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S
DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN521 AIR FORCE nomination of Daniel A. Lapostole, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 21, 2015.

IN THE ARMY

PN75 ARMY nominations (12) beginning CYNTHIA AITAHOLMES, and ending RYAN J. WANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN76-1 ARMY nominations (66) beginning DONALD W. ALGEO, and ending AMY L. H. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN485 ARMY nominations (37) beginning ROBERT B. ALLMAN, III, and ending EDWARD J. YURUS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN486 ARMY nominations (54) beginning LYDE C. ANDREWS, and ending D012582, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN487 ARMY nomination of Elizabeth M. Libao, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN488 ARMY nomination of John J. Morris, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN489 ARMY nomination of Christopher A. Wodarz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN532 ARMY nomination of Karen M. Wrancher, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN533 ARMY nomination of Susan R. Cloft, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

PN465-1 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (102) beginning Daniel L. Angermiller, and ending Laura Merritt Stone, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2015.

PN466 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (478) beginning Bruce Matthews, and ending Brian Stephen Zelakiewicz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN557 MARINE CORPS nominations (5) beginning ROBERT A. PETERSEN, and ending GENE C. WYNNE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

PN399 NAVY nominations (2) beginning IAN D. BRANUM, and ending BRYAN P. HYDE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN400 NAVY nominations (10) beginning JOSUE M. BELLINGER, and ending DONALD E. MESERVE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN401 NAVY nominations (2) beginning GEORGE J. EBERLY, III, and ending DAVID GARLINGHOUSE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN402 NAVY nomination of Gregory K. Emery, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN403 NAVY nominations (4) beginning DANIEL B. COPELAND, and ending GEORGE W. LASKEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN405 NAVY nominations (63) beginning SCOTT W. ARNOLD, and ending KURT J. ZAHNEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN406 NAVY nominations (14) beginning CHRISTOPHER P. BROWN, and ending VAN T. WENNEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN407 NAVY nominations (3) beginning SABRINA J. BOBKOWSKI, and ending DIANE C. LEBLANC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN408 NAVY nominations (4) beginning KEVIN R. BOARDMAN, and ending SEAN P. MCDONALD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN409 NAVY nomination of Carl O. Pistole, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN410 NAVY nomination of Jon E. Rugg, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN411 NAVY nominations (3) beginning VICTOR S. CHEN, and ending ELIZABETH A. ZIMMERMANNYOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN412 NAVY nominations (13) beginning DONALD W. BABCOCK, JR., and ending JOHN J. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN413 NAVY nominations (6) beginning GLEN A. DIBLEUTERIO, and ending WILLIAM Y. PIKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN430 NAVY nominations (7) beginning RICHARD A. BRAUNBECK, III, and ending JEFFREY J. PRONESTI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN431 NAVY nominations (3) beginning THURRAYA S. KENT, and ending WENDY L. SNYDER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN432 NAVY nominations (6) beginning MICHAEL E. BIERY, and ending RICKY M. URSERY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN433 NAVY nominations (4) beginning NEIL T. SMITH, and ending DOMINICK A. VINCENT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN434 NAVY nominations (11) beginning JASON B. BABCOCK, and ending CHRISTOPHER P. SLATTERY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN435 NAVY nominations (12) beginning NICHOLAS E. ANDREWS, and ending VINCENT S. TIONQUIAO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN436 NAVY nominations (11) beginning SOWON S. AHN, and ending CRAIG M. WHITTINGHILL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN437 NAVY nominations (8) beginning STEVEN W. CONNELL, and ending MICHAEL A. WHITT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN439 NAVY nominations (9) beginning CHRISTINE J. CASTON, and ending JAMES V. WALSH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN440 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MICHAEL A. HURNI, and ending ELIZABETH R. SANABIA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN441 NAVY nominations (18) beginning ROBERT C. BANDY, and ending DOUGLAS L. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN442 NAVY nominations (12) beginning DOMINIC S. CARONELLO, and ending MICHAEL J. SUPKO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN490 NAVY nominations (5) beginning FATMATTA M. KUYATEH, and ending MICHAEL J. SCARCELLA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN491 NAVY nomination of Maregina L. Wicks, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN492 NAVY nomination of Nikki K. Conlin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN493 NAVY nominations (20) beginning MICHAEL R. CATHEY, and ending ERIC H. TWERDAHL, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN494 NAVY nominations (50) beginning TERESA M. ALLEN, and ending JOON S. YUN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN495 NAVY nominations (14) beginning MARTIN J. ANERINO, and ending MARTHA S. SCOTTY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN496 NAVY nominations (24) beginning DAVID J. BACON, and ending RICHARD G. ZEBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN497 NAVY nominations (11) beginning ARTHUR R. BLUM, and ending FLORENCIO

J. YUZON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN498 NAVY nominations (26) beginning PATRICK K. AMERSBACH, and ending NANCY V. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN499 NAVY nominations (22) beginning CRAIG L. ABRAHAM, and ending SCOTT Y. YAMAMOTO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN500 NAVY nominations (9) beginning CHAD M. BROOKS, and ending ROD W. TRIBBLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN501 NAVY nomination of Heather J. Walton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN502 NAVY nominations (2) beginning WILLIAM A. HLAVIN, and ending BASHON W. MANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN534 NAVY nomination of Jacky P. Cheng, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN535 NAVY nominations (209) beginning CHARLES S. ABBOT, and ending DAVID G. ZOOK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN536 NAVY nominations (23) beginning JOHN J. ANDREW, and ending MARK C. WADSWORTH, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN537 NAVY nominations (33) beginning DAVID A. BACKER, and ending SCOTT E. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN538 NAVY nominations (16) beginning ANTONIO ALEMAR, and ending JOHN L. YOUNG, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN539 NAVY nominations (8) beginning LYLE P. AINSWORTH, and ending JUAN C. VARELA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN540 NAVY nominations (4) beginning KARIN R. BURZYNSKI, and ending FRANCISCO E. MAGALLON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN541 NAVY nominations (12) beginning PAOLO CARCAVALLO, JR., and ending MATTHEW G. ZUBLIC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN542 NAVY nominations (9) beginning SHELLY D. CAPLAN, and ending MIKE E. SVATEK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN543 NAVY nominations (28) beginning AUDREY G. ADAMS, and ending JOEL A. YATES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN544 NAVY nominations (21) beginning EUGENE A. ALBIN, and ending KENYA D. WILLIAMSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN545 NAVY nominations (33) beginning ALLAN M. BAKER, and ending DENNIS M. ZOGG, which nominations were received by

the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN546 NAVY nominations (46) beginning ROBERT E. BEATON, and ending JAMES L. WILLETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN547 NAVY nominations (24) beginning PAUL T. ANTONY, and ending PETER C. WAGNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN548 NAVY nominations (8) beginning JEFFREY M. CLARK, and ending CAROL W. WATT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN549 NAVY nominations (3) beginning LAURA M. MUSSULMAN, and ending KENNETH W. WAGNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN550 NAVY nominations (16) beginning KERRY L. ABRAMSON, and ending IAN K. THORNHILL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN551 NAVY nominations (10) beginning TAMBERLYNN W. BAKER, and ending ANGELIA W. THOMPSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN552 NAVY nominations (15) beginning SARAVOOT P. BAGWELL, and ending KATHY M. WARREN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN553 NAVY nominations (2) beginning GREGORY T. STEHMAN, and ending RODNEY E. TUGADE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN554 NAVY nominations (2) beginning TERRY W. EDDINGER, and ending DAVID R. GLASSMIRE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN555 NAVY nominations (4) beginning DARYLL D. LONG, and ending MILTON W. WASHINGTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN556 NAVY nominations (439) beginning HOLMAN R. AGARD, and ending MARK E. ZEMATIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN565 NAVY nomination of Natalie R. Bakan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2015.

PN566 NAVY nomination of Patrick R. O'Mara, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

DESIGNATING THE ULYSSES S. GRANT ASSOCIATION AS THE ORGANIZATION TO IMPLEMENT THE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE BIRTH OF ULYSSES S. GRANT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 209, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 209) designating the Ulysses S. Grant Association as the organization to implement the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant, Civil War General and 2-term President of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 209) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 210, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 210) celebrating the 125th anniversary of the State of Wyoming.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language of my motion and the corresponding cloture motion with respect to proceeding to conference on H.R. 644 be amended to request a conference with the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President,

pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, designee of the Committee on Armed Services and the Honorable CHRISTOPHER MURPHY of Connecticut, designee of the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 24; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 2146; and finally, that all time during adjournment of the Senate count postcloture on H.R. 2146.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:10 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 24, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 23, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

LAVERNE HORTON COUNCIL, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY).

DAVID J. SHULKIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR HEALTH OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) LAWRENCE B. JACKSON

REAR ADM. (LH) SCOTT B. J. JERABEK

REAR ADM. (LH) LUKE M. MCCOLLUM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) CHRISTINA M. ALVARADO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KATHERINE A. MCCABE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. GRAFTON D. CHASE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DANIEL V. MACINNIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN ALAN D. BEAL

CAPTAIN DARREN J. HANSON

CAPTAIN BRIAN S. HURLEY

CAPTAIN ANDREW C. LENNON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRIAN K. ANTONIO

REAR ADM. (LH) MARK R. WHITNEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL A. SOHL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) NANCY A. NORTON

REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT D. SHARP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) TERRY J. MOULTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRET J. MUILENBURG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MARK L. LEAVITT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ANN M. BURKHARDT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JAMES P. DOWNEY

CAPT. STEPHEN F. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MICHAEL W. ZARKOWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID G. MANERO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PAUL PEARIGEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ANNE M. SWAP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PETER G. STAMATOPOULOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN W. KORKA

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. PAUL E. BAUMAN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL ANTONIO A. AGUTO, JR.
COLONEL MARIA B. BARRETT
COLONEL JAMES E. BONNER
COLONEL JEFFERY D. BROADWATER
COLONEL XAVIER T. BRUNSON
COLONEL CHARLES H. CLEVELAND
COLONEL DOUGLAS C. CRISSMAN
COLONEL TIMOTHY J. DAUGHERTY
COLONEL BRADLEY K. DREYER
COLONEL JOHN R. EVANS, JR.
COLONEL ANTONIO M. FLETCHER
COLONEL PATRICK D. FRANK
COLONEL BRADLEY T. GERICKE
COLONEL STEVEN W. GILLAND
COLONEL KARL H. GINGRICH
COLONEL WILLIAMS H. GRAHAM, JR.
COLONEL CHARLES R. HAMILTON
COLONEL DIANA M. HOLLAND
COLONEL GARY W. JOHNSTON
COLONEL KENNETH L. KAMPER
COLONEL JOHN S. LASKODI
COLONEL DONNA W. MARTIN
COLONEL JOSEPH P. MCGEE
COLONEL RANDALL A. MCINTIRE
COLONEL JOHN E. NOVALIS II
COLONEL MARK W. ODOM
COLONEL PAUL H. PARDEW
COLONEL THOMAS A. PUGH
COLONEL JAMES H. RAYMER
COLONEL JOHN B. RICHARDSON IV
COLONEL ANDREW M. ROHLING
COLONEL MICHEL M. RUSSELL, SR.
COLONEL THOMAS H. TODD III
COLONEL JOEL K. TYLER
COLONEL KEVIN VEREEN
COLONEL DANIEL R. WALRATH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM W. WAY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL K. HANIFAN
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL M. KRUMREI

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL HUGH T. CORBETT
COLONEL ANDREW LAWLOR
COLONEL RODERICK R. LEON GUERRERO
COLONEL GERVASIO ORTIZ LOPEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. WILLIAM C. MAYVILLE, JR.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL MICHAEL S. CEDERHOLM
COLONEL DENNIS A. CRALL
COLONEL BRADFORD J. GERING
COLONEL JAMES F. GLYNN
COLONEL GREGORY L. MASIELLO
COLONEL DAVID W. MAXWELL
COLONEL STEPHEN M. NEARY
COLONEL STEPHEN D. SKLENKA
COLONEL ROGER B. TURNER, JR.
COLONEL RICK A. URIBE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. CLIFFORD B. CHICK

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN W. HESTERMAN III

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. LEELA J. GRAY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DONALD B. TATUM

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY E. GOWEN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. WILLIAM A. BROWN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RONALD F. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ROBERT B. ABRAMS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE CHIEF DEFENSE COUNSEL FOR MILITARY COMMISSIONS UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014, SECTION 1037:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN G. BAKER

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF DANIEL A. LAPOSTOLE, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CYNTHIA AITAHOLMES AND ENDING WITH RYAN J. WANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 13, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DONALD W. ALGEO AND ENDING WITH AMY L. H. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 13, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT B. ALLMAN III AND ENDING WITH EDWARD J. YURUS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LYDE C. ANDREWS AND ENDING WITH D012582, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ELIZABETH M. LIBAO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOHN J. MORRIS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER A. WODARZ, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KAREN M. WRANCHER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SUSAN R. CLOFT, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT A. PETERSEN AND ENDING WITH GENE C. WYNNE,

WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH IAN D. BRANUM AND ENDING WITH BRYAN P. HYDE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSUE M. BELLINGER AND ENDING WITH DONALD E. MESERVE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE J. EBERLY III AND ENDING WITH DAVID GARLINGHOUSE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GREGORY K. EMERY, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL B. COPELAND AND ENDING WITH GEORGE W. LASKEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT W. ARNOLD AND ENDING WITH KURT J. ZAHNEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER P. BROWN AND ENDING WITH VAN T. WENNEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SABBINA J. BOBKOWSKI AND ENDING WITH DIANE C. LEBLANC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN R. BOARDMAN AND ENDING WITH SEAN P. MCDONALD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CARL O. PISTOLE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JON E. RUGG, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VICTOR S. CHEN AND ENDING WITH ELIZABETH A. ZIMMERMANNYOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DONALD W. BABCOCK, JR. AND ENDING WITH JOHN J. WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GLEN A. DIELEUTERIO AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM Y. PIKE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD A. BRAUNBECK III AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY J. PRONESTI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THURRAYA S. KENT AND ENDING WITH WENDY L. SNYDER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL E. BIERY AND ENDING WITH RICKY M. URSERY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NEIL T. SMITH AND ENDING WITH DOMINICK A. VINCENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON B. BABCOCK AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER P. SLATTERY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICHOLAS E. ANDREWS AND ENDING WITH VINCENT S. TIONQUIAO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SOWON S. AHN AND ENDING WITH CRAIG M. WHITTINGHILL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN W. CONNELL AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL A. WHITT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTINE J. CASTON AND ENDING WITH JAMES V. WALSH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL A. HURNI AND ENDING WITH ELIZABETH R. SANABIA, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT C. BANDY AND ENDING WITH DOUGLAS L. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DOMINIC S. CARONELLO AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. SUPKO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FATMATT A. KUYATEH AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. SCARCELLA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MAREGINA L. WICKS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF NIKKI K. CONLIN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL R. CATHEY AND ENDING WITH ERIC H. TWERDAHL, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TERESA M. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH JOON S. YUN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARTIN J. ANERINO AND ENDING WITH MARTHA S. SCOTTY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID J. BACON AND ENDING WITH RICHARD G. ZEBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARTHUR R. BLUM AND ENDING WITH FLORENCIO J. YUZON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK K. AMERSBACH AND ENDING WITH NANCY V. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CRAIG L. ABRAHAM AND ENDING WITH SCOTT Y. YAMAMOTO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHAD M. BROOKS AND ENDING WITH ROD W. TRIBBLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF HEATHER J. WALTON, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM A. HLAVIN AND ENDING WITH BASHON W. MANN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-

PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JACKY P. CHENG, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES S. ABBOT AND ENDING WITH DAVID G. ZOOK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN J. ANDREW AND ENDING WITH MARK C. WADSWORTH, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. BACKER AND ENDING WITH SCOTT E. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTONIO ALEMAR AND ENDING WITH JOHN L. YOUNG III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LYLE P. AINSWORTH AND ENDING WITH JUAN C. VARELA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KARIN R. BURZYNSKI AND ENDING WITH FRANCISCO E. MAGALLON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAOLO CARCAVALLO, JR. AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW G. ZUBLIC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHELLEY D. CAPLAN AND ENDING WITH MIKE E. SVATEK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AUDREY G. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH JOEL A. YATES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EUGENE A. ALBIN AND ENDING WITH KENYA D. WILLIAMSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALLAN M. BAKER AND ENDING WITH DENNIS M. ZOGG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT E. BEATON AND ENDING WITH JAMES L. WILLETT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL T. ANTONY AND ENDING WITH PETER C. WAGNER, WHICH NOMINA-

TIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY M. CLARK AND ENDING WITH CAROL W. WATT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAURA M. MUS-SULMAN AND ENDING WITH KENNETH W. WAGNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KERRY L. ABRAMSON AND ENDING WITH IAN K. THORNHILL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TAMBERLYNN W. BAKER AND ENDING WITH ANGELIA W. THOMPSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARAVOOT P. BAGWELL AND ENDING WITH KATHY M. WARREN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GREGORY T. STEHMAN AND ENDING WITH RODNEY E. TUGADE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TERRY W. EDDINGER AND ENDING WITH DAVID R. GLASSMIRE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DARYLL D. LONG AND ENDING WITH MILTON W. WASHINGTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HOLMAN R. AGARD AND ENDING WITH MARK E. ZEMATIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF NATALIE R. BAKAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF PATRICK R. O'MARA, TO BE COMMANDER.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL L. ANGERMILLER AND ENDING WITH LAURA MERRITT STONE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2015.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRUCE MATTHEWS AND ENDING WITH BRIAN STEPHEN ZELAKIEWICZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 23, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 23, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BLAKE FARENTHOLD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last Congress, we passed a new farm bill. As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I could not support it, either in committee or on the House floor. I couldn't support it because it cut SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, our Nation's premier antihunger program. I couldn't support a bill that I believed made hunger worse in America.

At the time, members of both parties offered many assurances that the changes to SNAP's relationship with LIHEAP, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, wouldn't hurt SNAP recipients, that the changes were merely "closing a loophole" rather than a true benefit cut.

I was skeptical of those assurances at the time—and with good reason. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the change would reduce benefits for about 850,000 low-income households by an average of \$90 a month in the 14 States and the District of Co-

lumbia that took advantage of a State option to link LIHEAP and SNAP. States chose to use this option to alleviate some of the heartbreaking choices that poor families face. Seniors and the disabled are all too often the ones forced to choose between buying food or heating their homes or paying for their prescriptions.

Throughout the farm bill process, antihunger advocates in the "heat and eat" States vigorously opposed the LIHEAP cuts to SNAP, saying their effects would be much greater than the Congressional Budget Office estimates. I'm sorry to say they were right. These cuts are much more than just abstract numbers. We are starting to hear real stories from real people who are seeing their SNAP benefits cut. Hunger is worse in this country because of these cuts.

Take Judy Beals, a disabled senior from Belleville, Wisconsin. Earlier this year, she saw her SNAP benefit cut from \$120 a month to \$16 a month. Let me repeat that, she now gets \$16 a month in food assistance. That is it. That is unconscionable. How could anyone afford to feed themselves for a month on that?

Ms. Beals says she is forced to eat just once a day now that her SNAP benefit has been cut as she tries to figure out how to pay her other bills. To add insult to injury, Ms. Beals found out that her SNAP benefit had been cut at the register at the grocery store with a full cart of groceries.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Beals' story is not unique. The Hunger Task Force in Milwaukee estimates that, in Wisconsin alone, 255,000 families have seen their SNAP benefits reduced since the LIHEAP cuts went into effect.

We are hearing similar stories in New Jersey, another State that did not extend its heat and eat program. The Food Bank of South New Jersey estimates that 160,000 New Jersey residents have lost about \$90 a month in SNAP benefits due to the farm bill cut.

Now, to be fair, there are several States, including my home State of Massachusetts, that did the right thing and found a way, mostly with State funds, to make up the money lost by the LIHEAP cut in the farm bill. Republican and Democratic Governors stepped up and recognized that those already struggling to put food on the table would be worse off if they didn't find a way to fix the cut. In those States that did not make up the money, we will continue to hear stories of people who have seen their SNAP benefit cut.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to serve on the House Agriculture Committee. Since the beginning of this Congress, the committee has been conducting a top-to-bottom review of the SNAP program. Now, I have no idea where these hearings are going and, once again, we have heard assurances that there will be no cuts in SNAP, but I have this sinking feeling in my stomach that these hearings are not leading to a place that is good for millions of struggling Americans.

The fact is SNAP is a good program. It works. It is effective, and it is efficient. It is one of the most efficiently run Federal programs that exists, with an unbelievably low error rate.

Instead of cutting SNAP or making other harmful policy changes, we should be strengthening the program. Democratic and Republican witnesses alike have testified before the Agriculture Committee that the SNAP benefit is already too low.

We have heard that the certification and recertification process is time-consuming and onerous, especially for working families. We have heard about people who are eligible to get renewed benefits who fall off the program because of these onerous, new requirements.

We have heard from charities that they cannot solve the problems of hunger on their own. Charities do incredible work, but they cannot meet the demand for food assistance. They need a strong Federal partner.

We need better coordination among all stakeholders—Federal agencies, nonprofits, faith-based organizations, and businesses—to end hunger. That is why I have been advocating for a White House conference on food, nutrition, and hunger. We need a coordinated, holistic plan to end hunger now.

If we make further cuts to SNAP, we will no doubt hear more stories like Ms. Beals where those who are already struggling to put food on the table see their food assistance benefits cut.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that we should not be making hunger worse in this country. We should end hunger now.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JUAN FELIPE HERRERA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and pay tribute to Juan Felipe Herrera, who was recently appointed to serve as the United States Poet Laureate.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The son of migrant farmworkers, Mr. Herrera is the first Latino American to be appointed to this position and has published more than a dozen short stories, novels, and collections of poetry.

In 2008, he was awarded the National Book Critics Circle Award, and in 2012 he was appointed California's Poet Laureate.

Never one to shy away from experimentation, Mr. Herrera conducted a 2-year poetry project, entitled, "The Most Incredible and Biggest Poem on Unity in the World," where California residents of all ages submit their writings on unity. The project resulted in a 170-page collection of poems on unity and how we as Americans can come together.

A recent retiree from the University of California, Riverside, Mr. Herrera taught creative writing and worked with young people in the Inland Empire by creating an antibullying poetry project that allows kids affected by bullying to channel their feelings through poetry. Poetry, after all, is an incredibly powerful medium.

In his work, "Let Me Tell You What a Poem Brings," Herrera spoke of poetry's impact, saying:

Before you go further,
let me tell you what a poem brings,
first, you must know the secret, there is no
poem
to speak of, it is a way to attain a life with-
out boundaries,
yes, it is that easy, a poem, imagine me tell-
ing you this,
instead of going day by day against the raz-
ors, well,
the judgments, all the tick-tock bronze, a
leather jacket
sizing you up, the fashion mall, for example,
from
the outside you think you are being enter-
tained,
when you enter, things change, you get
caught by surprise,
your mouth goes sour, you get thirsty, your
legs grow cold
standing still in the middle of a storm, a
poem, of course,
is always open for business too, except, as
you can see,
it isn't exactly business that pulls your spir-
it into
the alarming waters, there you can bathe,
you can play,
you can even join in on the gossip—the mist,
that is,
the mist becomes central to your existence.

As a former student of Juan Felipe Herrera's, I offer my congratulations and know that he will continue to inspire and move us with his words as our next Poet Laureate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Barry Black, Chaplain of the United States Senate, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Sovereign Lord, Your kingdom cannot be shaken.

Thank You for inviting us to ask and receive, to seek and find, and to knock for doors to open. Lord, forgive us when we forfeit our blessings because of our failure to ask. Remind us that we have not because we ask not.

Inspire our lawmakers to harness prayer power continuously. May they follow Your admonition to pray without ceasing. Throughout this day, may they repeatedly ask You for wisdom and guidance. May their fervent prayers make a positive impact on the legislative process.

We pray in Your great name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CONGRATULATING JOE RAMSTAD

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Joe Ramstad, a high school senior from Forest Lake, Minnesota.

This impressive 18-year-old from my district was recently named the 2015 Star in Agriscience by the Minnesota Future Farmers of America for his work teaching a local agricultural literacy program.

Agriculture is a vital part of Minnesota's economy, and we are dependent on these young men and women to ensure that agriculture remains a bright and thriving industry in our State.

In the fall, Joe will be heading to the University of Minnesota with plans to work toward an agricultural education degree. Eventually, he hopes to work in an urban setting to educate students on a variety of agricultural opportunities that exist.

I applaud Joe and all Future Farmers of America for their interest and passion in agriculture and Minnesota.

Thank you, and congratulations on your recent honor, Joe.

HUMANE COSMETICS ACT

(Mr. BEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a bill that Representatives MCSALLY, CÁRDENAS, JOE HECK, and I have introduced, the Humane Cosmetics Act.

The Humane Cosmetics Act would phase out the use of animal-based testing for cosmetic products. It will eventually prohibit the sale of cosmetics tested on animals in foreign countries, making sure that only safe products tested with cutting-edge technology enter the American market.

It is time for us to end the painful and completely unnecessary process of testing American cosmetics on animals. Safer, more cost-effective, and completely humane alternatives already exist; and the United States is in no danger of losing its competitive role as a leader in the global cosmetics industry. Now, we need to ensure our place as a moral leader.

Over the last 20 years, cosmetics companies have reduced their use of animals for cosmetics testing in favor of more reliable, cost-effective, and technologically advanced methods that can more accurately predict whether cosmetics are safe for humans.

Let's not stay in the past. Let's keep up with our peers. The Humane Cosmetics Act would match U.S. law to the European Union, Israel, and India and ensure that the American cosmetics industry can remain competitive in a changing global market.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.

REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD

(Mrs. BLACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, President Obama described his signature healthcare law as "a new set of rules that treats everyone fairly and honestly."

But under President Obama's Independent Payment Advisory Board, also known as IPAB, a panel of 15 unelected bureaucrats would be tasked with cutting Medicare costs in a way that could

deny care to seniors who need it the most.

Now, I have been a nurse for over 40 years, but you don't have to be in health care as a professional to understand that there is nothing fair about that. Even Democrat Governor Howard Dean called IPAB "a healthcare rationing board" that should be scrapped.

Mr. Speaker, no senior needs a Washington bureaucrat standing between them and their doctor.

Vote "yes" on H.R. 1190, and let's repeal IPAB today.

IRAN NEGOTIATIONS

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the goal of the ongoing P5+1 negotiations is to guarantee that Iran never develops a nuclear weapon.

As Congress assesses the final deal, I am going to draw upon a recent publication which is entitled, "Negotiations with Iran: Five Requirements for a Good Deal," which details the following five components: one, mechanisms supporting strong verification, including anytime, anywhere inspections of all Iranian nuclear and military facilities; two, Iranian compliance with all U.N. resolutions and full disclosure of its previous work toward nuclear weapons; three, a schedule which lifts sanctions only as Iran meets the agreement's obligations; four, must include measures to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear threshold state; and, lastly, requirements that Iran dismantle its nuclear weapon infrastructure and relinquish its fissionable weapons material stockpile.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 19, 2015 at 2:22 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 808.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 23, 2015 at 11:02 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 91.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 22, 2015 at 5:26 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1735.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

CONSUL GENERAL TOYOEI SHIGEEDA

(Mr. TAKAI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a very good friend of Hawaii and a very good friend of mine, Consul General Toyoei Shigeeda.

Consul General Shigeeda has been a tireless advocate for Japan and has been the glue that has held together a solid bond between Hawaii and Japan.

I have known Consul General Shigeeda and his wife, Michiko, since they arrived in October of 2012. I have enjoyed many occasions with the consul general and Michiko at the numerous bon dances throughout Oahu.

I recall inviting Consul General Shigeeda to the Aiea Hongwanji bon dance 2 years ago. We had a great time. More importantly, Consul General Shigeeda and I enjoyed spending many Friday and Saturday nights last year going to bon dances. He and Michiko are really great bon dancers.

I also wanted to commend the consul general on his efforts to bridge the Pacific Ocean and bring together the leaders of Japan's Diet with the mem-

bers of the Hawaii State Legislature. This Japan-Hawaii Friendship Association will continue for many years and will continue to foster the great relationship between Hawaii and Japan.

I also wanted to thank Michiko. She has developed strong bonds with many Japanese organizations and has always been a great advocate for Japan.

I wish them well, Mr. Speaker, for their service in Hawaii, and I wish them the very best in their future endeavors.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1501

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DOMAIN OPENNESS THROUGH CONTINUED OVERSIGHT MATTERS ACT OF 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 805) to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibility over the Internet domain name system until the Comptroller General of the United States submits to Congress a report on the role of the NTIA with respect to such system, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 805

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters Act of 2015" or the "DOTCOM Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENTS FOR IANA STEWARDSHIP TRANSITION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Until the date that is 30 legislative days after the submission to Congress of

the report described in subsection (b), the Assistant Secretary may not permit the NTIA's role in the performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions to terminate, lapse, be cancelled, or otherwise cease to be in effect.

(b) *REPORT DESCRIBED.*—The report described in this subsection is a report that contains—

(1) the proposal relating to the transition of the NTIA's stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions that was developed in a process convened by ICANN at the request of the NTIA; and

(2) a certification by the Assistant Secretary that—

(A) such proposal—

(i) supports and enhances the multistakeholder model of Internet governance;

(ii) maintains the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet domain name system;

(iii) meets the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority services;

(iv) maintains the openness of the Internet; and

(v) does not replace the role of the NTIA with a government-led or intergovernmental organization solution; and

(B) the required changes to ICANN's bylaws contained in the final report of ICANN's Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability and the changes to ICANN's bylaws required by ICANN's IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group have been adopted.

(c) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) *ASSISTANT SECRETARY.*—The term "Assistant Secretary" means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

(2) *ICANN.*—The term "ICANN" means the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers.

(3) *LEGISLATIVE DAY.*—The term "legislative day" does not include Saturdays, Sundays, legal public holidays, or days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress.

(4) *NTIA.*—The term "NTIA" means the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for certain requirements relating to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we are here to consider H.R. 805, the DOTCOM Act. I first introduced this legislation last Congress, and I am proud to see it brought to the floor today. The DOTCOM Act is a great example of what can get done when we work together and build on the Energy and

Commerce Committee's growing record of legislative success.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, from the time the administration announced their intent to transition the IANA functions, I have had serious concerns about the potential risk associated with the move. I have said time and again that this is far too important to rush and that we must carefully consider all the potential consequences and outcomes before any transition occurs.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would require a period of 30 legislative days for us to review any proposal that NTIA receives from the multistakeholder community and ICANN. This allows us to hear from our constituents and consult with outside experts before we decide if ICANN's proposal is satisfactory. If, in this review period allowed only through passage of the DOTCOM Act, we find that ICANN and/or its proposal does not adequately protect the free and open Internet, Congress can then take action to either completely stop the transfer or require more safeguards to be put in place.

Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, the DOTCOM Act requires NTIA to renew their contract to continue these important stewardship functions with ICANN before it expires in September. Everyone agrees that the contract should remain with NTIA while this process moves forward. DOTCOM is the vehicle to make sure this does in fact happen. Extending the contract takes the pressure off of making a rushed transition and perhaps making mistakes. We get one bite at the apple on this, and we need to make sure it is done correctly.

Mr. Speaker, before I relinquish my time, I want to say that I am very proud of the work that has been done on this bill in the Energy and Commerce Committee, particularly by Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN and Ranking Members PALLONE and ESHOO. We wouldn't be here today without their hard work and also the work of staff, particularly Greta Joynes of my office and committee staff David Redl, Kelsey Guyselman, Margaret McCarthy, David Goldman, and Tiffany Guarascio.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, this is an issue that has brought both sides together for the best interests of all Americans. I ask my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 805, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 805, the Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters, or DOTCOM, Act. I am pleased to support this bill, and I want to commend my colleagues for the bipartisan process in the Energy and Commerce Committee that brought us here.

The Internet is a great American success story that has benefited billions of

users around the globe. Over the last two decades, the United States Government has taken steps to get out of the way and empower a bottom-up approach to Internet governance. Thanks to the success of this multistakeholder model, the Internet has opened up new markets and economic opportunities and become an unprecedented platform for democratic free expression.

Mr. Speaker, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, the U.S. Government has supported the idea that the Internet should be governed through a decentralized process, free from governmental control. Since the late 1990s, the U.S. Government has moved towards private sector management of the domain name system. To put it another way, we think that the future of the Internet should be determined by businesses, civil society, and technical experts.

Congress has also explicitly embraced this vision. As recently as 2013, the House voted unanimously in support of a bill making it official U.S. policy to "preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet."

Mr. Speaker, completing the transition of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority advances that policy goal. The IANA transition reaffirms our two-decade commitment to the global multistakeholder community, but we have a responsibility to make sure that the transition is done right.

The DOTCOM Act continues the longstanding congressional support for the global, open Internet while appropriately conducting oversight of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration. We require NTIA to live up to the commitments the agency has made for the IANA transition and ensure that transparency and accountability mechanisms are in place before the U.S. Government can relinquish its stewardship role. In short, I believe our bill provides the necessary safeguards for the IANA transition to occur without unnecessary delay.

Our vote on the DOTCOM Act today is timely for several reasons. Key meetings are taking place, as we speak, in Buenos Aires, Argentina, to finalize planning for the IANA transition. And quick action on the DOTCOM Act is needed to provide a better alternative to the language in the House Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill that blocks NTIA's ability to implement the transition. Unlike the appropriations rider, the DOTCOM Act provides a real opportunity for congressional oversight, so I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN, Representative SHIMKUS, and their respective staffs, David Redl and Greta Joynes, for working with Congresswoman ESHOO and other Democrats on

this bill. The DOTCOM Act shows what we can accomplish when our work is bipartisan from the start. I would also like to thank David Goldman and Margaret McCarthy of my staff for their hard work on this legislation. I look forward to working with you all and our colleagues in the Senate to see this bill become law.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I urge passage of the DOTCOM Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 805, the DOTCOM Act.

Over the past two decades, U.S. policy through Republican and Democratic administrations has supported the transition of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) to the private sector. The DOTCOM Act which passed the Energy and Commerce Committee by voice vote last week carries on this bipartisan tradition by ensuring that the IANA transition supports and enhances the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance; maintains the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet domain name system; and does not replace the role of the NTIA with a government-led or intergovernmental organization solution.

Importantly, the DOTCOM Act as amended by the Committee, represents a sensible alternative to the funding restriction included in the House-passed Commerce, Justice and Science (CJS) Appropriations bill. I look forward to working with my colleagues to see that the DOTCOM Act becomes the law of the land—rather than enacting a counter-productive limitation of funds which sends the wrong message to the international community.

I thank Chairman WALDEN, Ranking Member PALLONE and Congressman SHIMKUS for their bipartisan cooperation on this bill and I urge my colleagues to support the DOTCOM Act, which is a vote for the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance and a global, open Internet, free from governmental control.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, right now as we speak, the international community is meeting in Argentina to discuss the state of the Internet around the globe. We have an opportunity today to send a loud and clear message to those gathered in Buenos Aires: that the United States will not stand for anything other than strong safeguards to protect our online future.

By advancing the DOTCOM Act, we can ensure that the Internet—the world's greatest platform of ideas, commerce, and social connection—continues to thrive to the benefit of folks in Michigan and every corner of the country.

As we move toward transitioning the United States' oversight role of the Domain Name System to the international community of stakeholders, it is essential we tread carefully and thoughtfully. The bill we are considering today is a bipartisan effort to ensure appropriate congressional oversight of this incredibly important transition, and ensure that the administration and NTIA get it right as there are no do-overs.

Over the course of the past year, the Energy and Commerce Committee has engaged

in efforts to ensure that any transition proposal considered by the administration contains the necessary safeguards to protect the Internet. This bill incorporates the criteria initially put forward by NTIA, and requires the agency to certify to Congress that the proposal meets these important metrics. It would also put important accountability measures in place for the Internet community.

This legislation, which the Energy and Commerce Committee approved by voice vote, is the result of many informative hearings, feedback from a variety of stakeholders—both domestically and internationally—and productive and ongoing conversations between members on both sides of the aisle. Once again, our committee's efforts demonstrate that Congress can work together to achieve meaningful results and build a bipartisan record of success. I want to recognize Mr. SHIMKUS for his leadership on this issue from the beginning, as well as Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Member PALLONE for their hard work on this common-sense solution to protect the Internet on which we have come to depend.

The world is watching. A vote for the DOTCOM Act is a vote for effective Congressional oversight. I urge all members to support this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 805, as amended. The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TSCA MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2576) to modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2576

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “TSCA Modernization Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Testing of chemical substances and mixtures.

Sec. 4. Regulation of hazardous chemical substances and mixtures.

Sec. 5. Relationship to other Federal laws.

Sec. 6. Disclosure of data.

Sec. 7. Effect on State law.

Sec. 8. Administration of the Act.

Sec. 9. Conforming amendments.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2602) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (14) as paragraphs (8) through (10) and (12) through (16), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) The term ‘intended conditions of use’ means the circumstances under which a chemical substance is intended, known, or reasonably foreseeable to be manufactured, processed, distributed in commerce, used, and disposed of.”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (10), as so redesignated, the following:

“(11) The term ‘potentially exposed subpopulation’ means a group of individuals within the general population who, due to either greater susceptibility or greater potential exposure, are likely to be at greater risk than the general population of adverse health effects from exposure to a chemical substance.”.

SEC. 3. TESTING OF CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES AND MIXTURES.

Section 4 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “; and” and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) testing of a chemical substance is necessary to conduct a risk evaluation under section 6(b); and”;

(2) in the matter following subsection (a)(2), by inserting “, order, or consent agreement” after “by rule”; and

(3) in subsection (b)(5), by striking “paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A), (1)(B), or (1)(C)”.

SEC. 4. REGULATION OF HAZARDOUS CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES AND MIXTURES.

(a) SCOPE OF REGULATION.—Section 6(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “finds that there is a reasonable basis to conclude” and inserting “determines under subsection (b)”;

(2) by inserting “or designates a chemical substance under subsection (i)(2),” before “the Administrator shall by rule”; and

(3) by striking “to protect adequately against such risk using the least burdensome requirements” and inserting “so that the chemical substance or mixture no longer presents or will present an unreasonable risk, including an identified unreasonable risk to a potentially exposed subpopulation”.

(b) RISK EVALUATIONS.—Section 6(b) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) RISK EVALUATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall conduct risk evaluations pursuant to this subsection to determine whether or not a chemical substance presents or will present, in the absence of requirements under subsection (a), an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment.

“(2) APPLYING REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall apply requirements with respect to a chemical substance through a rule under subsection (a) only if the Administrator determines through a risk evaluation under this subsection, without consideration of costs or other non-risk factors, that the chemical substance presents or will present, in the absence of such requirements, an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment.

“(3) CONDUCTING RISK EVALUATION.—

“(A) REQUIRED RISK EVALUATIONS.—The Administrator shall conduct and publish the results of a risk evaluation under this subsection for a chemical substance if—

“(i) the Administrator determines that the chemical substance may present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment because of potential hazard and a potential route of exposure under the intended conditions of use; or

“(ii) a manufacturer of the chemical substance requests such a risk evaluation in a form and manner prescribed by the Administrator.

“(B) TSCA WORK PLAN CHEMICALS.—The Administrator may, without making a determination under subparagraph (A)(i), conduct and publish the results of a risk evaluation under this subsection for a chemical substance that, on the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, is listed in the TSCA Work Plan for Chemical Assessments published by the Administrator.

“(4) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting a risk evaluation under this subsection, the Administrator shall—

“(A) integrate and assess information on hazards and exposures for all of the intended conditions of use of the chemical substance, including information that is relevant to specific risks of injury to health or the environment and information on potentially exposed subpopulations;

“(B) not consider information on cost and other factors not directly related to health or the environment;

“(C) take into account, where relevant, the likely duration, intensity, frequency, and number of exposures under the intended conditions of use of the chemical substance;

“(D) describe the weight of the scientific evidence for identified hazard and exposure;

“(E) consider whether the weight of the scientific evidence supports the identification of doses of the chemical substance below which no adverse effects can be expected to occur; and

“(F) in the case of a risk evaluation requested by a manufacturer under paragraph (3)(A)(ii), ensure that the costs to the Environmental Protection Agency, including contractor costs, of conducting the risk evaluation are paid for by the manufacturer.

“(5) DEADLINES.—

“(A) RISK EVALUATIONS.—The Administrator shall conduct and publish a risk evaluation under this subsection for a chemical substance as soon as reasonably possible, subject to the availability of resources, but not later than—

“(i) 3 years after the date on which the Administrator—

“(I) makes a determination under paragraph (3)(A)(i); or

“(II) begins the risk evaluation under paragraph (3)(B); or

“(ii) in the case of a risk evaluation requested by a manufacturer under paragraph (3)(A)(ii), 2 years after the later of the date on which—

“(I) the manufacturer requests the risk evaluation; or

“(II) if applicable, the risk evaluation is initiated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

“(B) DEADLINE ADJUSTMENT.—If the Administrator receives more requests for risk evaluations under paragraph (3)(A)(ii) than the Administrator has resources to conduct by the deadline under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) (taking into account the requirement in paragraph (4)(F)), the Administrator shall—

“(i) initiate risk evaluations that exceed the Administrator's allotted resources as soon as resources for such risk evaluations are available; and

“(ii) not collect a fee under section 26 from the manufacturer for a risk evaluation until the Administrator initiates the risk evaluation.

“(C) SUBSECTION (a) RULES.—If, based on a risk evaluation conducted under this subsection, the Administrator determines, without consideration of costs or other non-risk factors, that a chemical substance presents or will present, in the absence of a rule under subsection (a), an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment, the Administrator shall—

“(i) propose a rule under subsection (a) for the chemical substance not later than 1 year after the date on which the risk evaluation regarding such chemical substance is published under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) publish in the Federal Register a final rule not later than 2 years after the date on which the risk evaluation regarding such chemical substance is published under subparagraph (A).

“(D) EXTENSION.—If the Administrator determines that additional information is necessary to make a risk evaluation determination under this subsection, the Administrator may extend the deadline under subparagraph (A) accordingly, except that the deadline may not be extended to a date that is later than—

“(i) 90 days after receipt of such additional information; or

“(ii) 2 years after the deadline being extended under this subparagraph.

“(6) DETERMINATIONS OF NO UNREASONABLE RISK.—

“(A) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—Not later than 30 days before publishing a final determination under this subsection that a chemical substance does not and will not present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment, the Administrator shall make a preliminary determination to such effect and provide public notice of, and an opportunity for comment regarding, such preliminary determination.

“(B) POTENTIALLY EXPOSED SUBPOPULATIONS.—The Administrator shall not make a determination under this subsection that a chemical substance will not present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment if the Administrator determines that the chemical substance, under the intended conditions of use, presents or will present an unreasonable risk of injury to 1 or more potentially exposed subpopulations.

“(C) FINAL ACTION.—A final determination under this subsection that a chemical substance will not present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment shall be considered a final agency action.

“(7) MINIMUM NUMBER.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Administrator shall initiate 10 or more risk evaluations under paragraphs (3)(A)(i) or (3)(B) in each fiscal year beginning in the fiscal year of the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015.”

(c) PROMULGATION OF SUBSECTION (a) RULES.—Section 6(c) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605(c)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) REQUIREMENTS FOR RULE.—In promulgating any rule under subsection (a) with respect to a chemical substance or mixture, the Administrator shall—

“(A) consider and publish a statement with respect to—

“(i) the effects of the chemical substance or mixture on health and the magnitude of the exposure of human beings to the chemical substance or mixture;

“(ii) the effects of the chemical substance or mixture on the environment and the magnitude of the exposure of the environment to the chemical substance or mixture;

“(iii) the benefits of the chemical substance or mixture for various uses; and

“(iv) the reasonably ascertainable economic consequences of the rule, including consideration of the likely effect of the rule on the national economy, small business, technological innovation, the environment, and public health;

“(B) impose requirements under the rule that the Administrator determines, consistent with the information published under subparagraph (A), are cost-effective, except where the Administrator determines that additional or different requirements described in subsection (a) are necessary to protect against the identified risk;

“(C) based on the information published under subparagraph (A), in deciding whether to prohibit or restrict in a manner that substantially prevents a specific use of a chemical substance or mixture and in setting an appropriate transition period for such action, determine whether technically and economically feasible alternatives that benefit health or the environment, compared to the use so proposed to be prohibited or restricted, will be reasonably available as a substitute when the proposed prohibition or other restriction takes effect;

“(D) exempt replacement parts designed prior to the date of publication in the Federal Register of the rule unless the Administrator finds such replacement parts contribute significantly to the identified risk, including identified risk to identified potentially exposed subpopulations; and

“(E) in selecting among prohibitions and other restrictions to address an identified risk, apply prohibitions or other restrictions to articles on the basis of a chemical substance or mixture contained in the article only to the extent necessary to protect against the identified risk.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “PROCEDURES.—” before “When prescribing a rule”;;

(B) by striking “provide an opportunity for an informal hearing in accordance with paragraph (3); (D)”;

(C) by striking “, and (E)” and inserting “; and (D)”;

(D) by moving such paragraph 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3); and

(4) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4)” and inserting “APPLICATION.—Paragraphs (1) and (2)”;

(B) by moving such paragraph 2 ems to the right.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 6(d)(2)(B) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605(d)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Any rule promulgated under subsection (a) shall provide for a reasonable transition period.”

(e) NON-RISK FACTORS; CRITICAL USE EXEMPTIONS; PBT CHEMICALS.—Section 6 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) NON-RISK FACTORS.—The Administrator shall not consider costs or other non-risk factors when deciding whether to initiate a rulemaking under subsection (a).

“(h) CRITICAL USE EXEMPTIONS.—

“(1) CRITERIA FOR EXEMPTION.—The Administrator may grant an exemption from a requirement of a subsection (a) rule for a specific use of a chemical substance or mixture, if—

“(A) the requirement is not cost-effective with respect to the specific use, as determined by the Administrator pursuant to subsection (c)(1)(B); and

“(B) the Administrator finds that—

“(i) the specific use is a critical or essential use; or

“(ii) the requirement, as applied with respect to the specific use, would significantly disrupt the national economy, national security, or critical infrastructure.

“(2) PROCEDURE.—An exemption granted under paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) supported by clear and convincing evidence;

“(B) preceded by public notice of the proposed exemption and an opportunity for comment; and

“(C) followed by notice of the granted exemption—

“(i) to the public, by the Administrator; and

“(ii) to known commercial purchasers of the chemical substance or mixture with respect to which the exemption applies, by the manufacturers and processors of such chemical substance or mixture.

“(3) PERIOD OF EXEMPTION.—An exemption granted under paragraph (1) shall expire after a period not to exceed 5 years, but may be renewed for one or more additional 5-year periods if the Administrator finds that the requirements of paragraph (1) continue to be met.

“(4) CONDITIONS.—The Administrator shall impose conditions on any use for which an exemption is granted under paragraph (1) to reduce risk from the chemical substance or mixture to the greatest extent feasible.

“(i) CHEMICALS THAT ARE PERSISTENT, BIOACCUMULATIVE, AND TOXIC.—

“(1) IDENTIFICATION.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, the Administrator shall publish a list of those chemical substances that the Administrator has a reasonable basis to conclude are persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic, not including any chemical substance that is a metal, a metal compound, or subject to subsection (e).

“(2) CONFIRMATION OF CONCERN.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, the Administrator shall designate as a PBT chemical of concern each chemical substance on the list published under paragraph (1)—

“(A) that, with respect to persistence and bioaccumulation, scores high for one and either high or moderate for the other, pursuant to the TSCA Work Plan Chemicals Methods Document published by the Administrator in February 2012; and

“(B) exposure to which is likely to the general population or to a potentially exposed subpopulation identified by the Administrator.

“(3) EXPEDITED ACTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(2), subject to the availability of appropriations, not later than 2 years after designating a chemical substance under paragraph (2), the Administrator shall promulgate a rule under subsection (a) with respect to the chemical substance to reduce likely exposure to the extent practicable.

“(4) RELATIONSHIP TO SUBSECTION (b).—If, at any time prior to the date that is 90 days after the date on which the Administrator publishes the list under paragraph (1), the Administrator makes a finding under subsection (b)(3)(A)(i), or a manufacturer requests a risk evaluation under subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii), with respect to a chemical substance, such chemical substance shall not be subject to this subsection.”.

SEC. 5. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.

Section 9(b) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2608(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Administrator shall coordinate” and inserting “(1) The Administrator shall coordinate”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) In making a determination under paragraph (1) that it is in the public interest for the Administrator to take an action under this title with respect to a chemical substance or mixture rather than under another law administered in whole or in part by the Administrator, the Administrator shall consider the relevant risks, and compare the estimated costs and efficiencies, of the action to be taken under this title and an action to be taken under such other law to protect against such risk.”.

SEC. 6. DISCLOSURE OF DATA.

Section 14 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2613) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

“(5) may be disclosed to a State, local, or tribal government official upon request of the official for the purpose of administration or enforcement of a law; and

“(6) shall be disclosed upon request—

“(A) to a health or environmental professional employed by a Federal or State agency in response to an environmental release; or

“(B) to a treating physician or other health care professional to assist in the diagnosis or treatment of 1 or more individuals.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter following subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “data which discloses” and inserting “data that disclose formulas (including molecular structures) of a chemical substance or mixture.”;

(B) by striking “mixture or,” and inserting “mixture, or.”; and

(C) by striking “the release of data disclosing”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking the subsection heading and inserting “DESIGNATING AND SUBSTANTIATING CONFIDENTIALITY.”;

(B) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows: “(1)(A) In submitting information under this Act after date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, a manufacturer, processor, or distributor in commerce shall designate the information which such person believes is entitled to protection under this section, and submit such designated information separately from other information submitted under this Act. A designation under this subparagraph shall be made in writing and in such manner as the Administrator may prescribe, and shall include—

“(i) justification for each designation of confidentiality;

“(ii) a certification that the information is not otherwise publicly available; and

“(iii) separate copies of all submitted information, with 1 copy containing and 1 copy excluding the information to which the request applies.

“(B) Designations made under subparagraph (A) after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015 shall expire after 10 years, at which time the information shall be made public unless the manufac-

turer, processor, or distributor in commerce has reasserted the claim for protection, in writing and in such manner as the Administrator may prescribe, including all of the elements required for the initial submission.

“(C) Not later than 60 days prior to making information public under subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall notify, as appropriate and practicable, the manufacturer, processor, or distributor in commerce who designated the information under subparagraph (A) of the date on which such information will be made public unless a request for renewal is granted under subparagraph (B).”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, for a reason other than the expiration of such designation pursuant to paragraph (1)(B),” before “proposes to release”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “or (4)” and inserting “(4), or (6)”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(f) PROHIBITION.—No person who receives information as permitted under subsection (a) may use such information for any purpose not specified in such subsection, nor disclose such information to any person not authorized to receive such information.

“(g) SAVINGS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the applicability of State or Federal rules of evidence or procedure in any judicial proceeding.”.

SEC. 7. EFFECT ON STATE LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 18(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2617(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by striking paragraph (2)(B) and inserting the following:

“(B) if the Administrator makes a final determination under section 6(b) that a chemical substance will not present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment under the intended condition of use, no State or political subdivision may, after the date of publication of such determination, establish or continue in effect any requirement that applies to such chemical substance under the intended conditions of use considered by the Administrator in the risk evaluation under section 6(b), and is designed to protect against exposure to such chemical substance under the intended conditions of use, unless the requirement of the State or political subdivision—

“(i) is adopted under the authority of a Federal law; or

“(ii) is adopted to protect air or water quality or is related to waste treatment or waste disposal, except that this clause does not apply to such a requirement if a provision of this title, or an action or determination made by the Administrator under this title, actually conflicts with the requirement; and

“(C) if the Administrator imposes a requirement, through a rule or order under section 5 or 6, that applies to a chemical substance or mixture (other than a requirement described in section 6(a)(6)) and is designed to protect against a risk of injury to health or the environment associated with such chemical substance or mixture, no State or political subdivision may, after the effective date of such requirement, establish or continue in effect any requirement that applies to such chemical substance or mixture (including a requirement that applies to an article because the article contains the chemical substance or mixture) and is designed to protect against exposure to the chemical

substance or mixture either under the intended conditions of use considered by the Administrator in the risk evaluation under section 6(b) or from a use identified in a notice received by the Administrator under section 5(a), or, in the case of a requirement imposed pursuant to section 6(i), is designed to protect against a risk of injury considered by the Administrator in imposing such requirement, unless the requirement of the State or political subdivision—

“(i) is identical to the requirement imposed by the Administrator;

“(ii) is adopted under the authority of a Federal law; or

“(iii) is adopted to protect air or water quality or is related to waste treatment or waste disposal, except that this clause does not apply to such a requirement if a provision of this title, or an action or determination made by the Administrator under this title, actually conflicts with the requirement.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In the case of an identical requirement described in paragraph (2)(C)(i)—

“(A) a State may not assess a penalty for a specific violation for which the Administrator has assessed a penalty under section 16; and

“(B) if a State has assessed a penalty for a specific violation, the Administrator may not assess a penalty for that violation in an amount that would cause the total of the penalties assessed for the violation by the State and the Administrator combined to exceed the maximum amount that may be assessed for that violation by the Administrator under section 16.”.

(b) SAVINGS.—Section 18 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2617) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) SAVINGS.—

“(1) PRIOR STATE ACTIONS.—Nothing in this title, nor any risk evaluation, rule, order, standard, or requirement completed or implemented under this title, shall be construed to preempt or otherwise affect the authority of a State or political subdivision of a State to continue to enforce any action taken or requirement that has taken effect—

“(A) before August 1, 2015, under the authority of a State law that prohibits or otherwise restricts the manufacturing, processing, distribution in commerce, use, or disposal of a chemical substance; or

“(B) pursuant to a State law that was in effect on August 31, 2003,

unless an action or determination made by the Administrator under this title actually conflicts with the action taken or requirement that has taken effect pursuant to such a State law.

“(2) TORT AND CONTRACT LAW.—Nothing in this title, nor any risk evaluation, rule, order, standard, or requirement completed or implemented under this title, shall be construed to preempt or otherwise affect either Federal or State tort law or the law governing the interpretation of contracts of any State, including any remedy for civil relief, whether under statutory or common law, including a remedy for civil damages, and any cause of action for personal injury, wrongful death, property damage, or other injury based on negligence, strict liability, products liability, failure to warn, or any other legal theory relating to tort law.

“(3) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is not the intent of Congress that this title, or rules, regulations, or orders issued pursuant to this title, be interpreted as influencing, in either a plaintiff's or defendant's favor, the disposition of any civil action for damages in a

State court, or the authority of any court to make a determination in an adjudicatory proceeding under applicable State law with respect to the admissibility of evidence, unless a provision of this title actually conflicts with the State court action.

“(4) APPLICATION.—For purposes of this title, the term ‘requirements’ does not include civil tort actions for damages under State law.”.

(c) EFFECT OF ACTIONS BY ADMINISTRATOR.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed as changing the preemptive effect of an action taken by the Administrator prior to the date of enactment of this Act or under section 6(e).

SEC. 8. ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT.

Section 26 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2625) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking “of a reasonable fee”;

(B) by inserting “of a fee that is sufficient and not more than reasonably necessary” after “section 4 or 5”;

(C) by inserting “, or who requests a risk evaluation under section 6(b)(3)(A)(ii),” before “to defray the cost”;

(D) by striking “this Act” and inserting “the provision of this title for which such fee is collected”; and

(E) by striking “Such rules shall not provide for any fee in excess of \$2,500 or, in the case of a small business concern, any fee in excess of \$100.” and inserting “Such rules shall provide for lower fees for small business concerns.”;

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following:

“(3) FUND.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund, to be known as the TSCA Service Fee Fund (in this paragraph referred to as the ‘Fund’), consisting of such amounts as are deposited in the Fund under this paragraph.

“(B) COLLECTION AND DEPOSIT OF FEES.—The Administrator shall collect the fees described in paragraph (1) and deposit those fees in the Fund.

“(C) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—On request by the Administrator, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the Fund to the Administrator amounts appropriated to pay or recover the full costs incurred by the Environmental Protection Agency, including contractor costs, in carrying out the provisions of this title for which the fees are collected under paragraph (1).

“(D) USE OF FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR.—Fees authorized under this section shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts, and shall be available without fiscal year limitation for use only in administering the provisions of this title for which the fees are collected.

“(E) ACCOUNTING AND AUDITING.—

“(i) ACCOUNTING.—The Administrator shall biennially prepare and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that includes an accounting of the fees paid to the Administrator under this paragraph and amounts disbursed from the Fund for the period covered by the report, as reflected by financial statements provided in accordance with sections 3515 and 3521 of title 31, United States Code.

“(ii) AUDITING.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of section 3515(c) of title 31, United States Code,

the Fund shall be considered a component of a covered executive agency.

“(II) COMPONENTS OF AUDIT.—The annual audit required in accordance with sections 3515 and 3521 of title 31, United States Code, of the financial statements of activities carried out using amounts from the Fund shall include an analysis of—

“(aa) the fees collected and amounts disbursed under this subsection;

“(bb) the reasonableness of the fees in place as of the date of the audit to meet current and projected costs of administering the provisions of the title for which the fees are collected; and

“(cc) the number of requests for a risk evaluation made by manufacturers under section 6(b)(3)(A)(ii).

“(III) FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY.—The Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency shall conduct the annual audit described in subclause (II) and submit to the Administrator a report that describes the findings and any recommendations of the Inspector General resulting from the audit.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) SCIENTIFIC STANDARDS.—In carrying out sections 4, 5, and 6, to the extent that the Administrator makes a decision based on science, the Administrator shall consider, as applicable—

“(1) the extent to which the scientific and technical procedures, measures, methods, or models employed to generate the information are reasonable for and consistent with the use of the information;

“(2) the extent to which the information is relevant for the Administrator's use in making a decision about a chemical substance or mixture;

“(3) the degree of clarity and completeness with which the data, assumptions, methods, quality assurance, and analyses employed to generate the information are documented;

“(4) the extent to which the variability and uncertainty in the information, or in the procedures, measures, methods, or models, are evaluated and characterized; and

“(5) the extent of independent verification or peer review of the information or of the procedures, measures, methods, or models.

“(i) WEIGHT OF SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE.—The Administrator shall make decisions under sections 4, 5, and 6 based on the weight of the scientific evidence.

“(j) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Subject to section 14, the Administrator shall make available to the public all notices, determinations, findings, rules, and orders of the Administrator under this title.

“(k) POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND GUIDANCE.—

“(1) DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, the Administrator shall develop any policies, procedures, and guidance the Administrator determines are necessary to carry out the amendments to this Act made by the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015.

“(2) REVIEW.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator shall—

“(A) review the adequacy of the policies, procedures, and guidance developed under paragraph (1), including with respect to animal, nonanimal, and epidemiological test methods and procedures for assessing and determining risk under this title; and

“(B) revise such policies, procedures, and guidance as the Administrator determines

necessary to reflect new scientific developments or understandings.

“(1) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, the Administrator shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate a report containing an estimation of—

“(A) the capacity of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct and publish risk evaluations under subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B) of section 6(b)(3), and the resources necessary to initiate the minimum number of risk evaluations required under section 6(b)(7);

“(B) the capacity of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct and publish risk evaluations under section 6(b)(3)(A)(ii), the likely demand for such risk evaluations, and the anticipated schedule for accommodating that demand;

“(C) the capacity of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate rules under section 6(a) as required based on risk evaluations conducted and published under section 6(b); and

“(D) the actual and anticipated efforts of the Environmental Protection Agency to increase the Agency's capacity to conduct and publish risk evaluations under section 6(b).

“(2) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—The Administrator shall update and resubmit the report described in paragraph (1) not less frequently than once every 5 years.”

SEC. 9. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) SECTION 4.—Section 4 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “rule” each place it appears and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “rules” and inserting “rules, orders, and consent agreements”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “rule” each place it appears and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “rule under subsection (a)” each place it appears and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement under subsection (a)”;

(ii) by striking “repeals the rule” each place it appears and inserting “repeals the rule or order or modifies the consent agreement to terminate the requirement”;

(iii) by striking “repeals the application of the rule” and inserting “repeals or modifies the application of the rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “rule” and inserting “rule or order”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “a rule under subsection (a) or for which data is being developed pursuant to such a rule” and inserting “a rule, order, or consent agreement under subsection (a) or for which data are being developed pursuant to such a rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “such rule or which is being developed pursuant to such rule” and inserting “such rule, order, or consent agreement or which is being developed pursuant to such rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(iii) in the matter following subparagraph (B), by striking “the rule” and inserting “the rule or order”;

(C) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by striking “rule promulgated” and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “rule promulgated” each place it appears and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(ii) by striking “such rule” each place it appears and inserting “such rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the rule” and inserting “the rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(3) in subsection (d), by striking “rule” and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(4) in subsection (g), by striking “rule” and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement”.

(b) SECTION 5.—Section 5 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2604) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) by striking “rule promulgated” and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(B) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) by striking “rule promulgated” and inserting “rule or order”;

(ii) by striking “the date of the submission in accordance with such rule” and inserting “the required date of submission”;

(C) in paragraph (2)(A)(ii), by striking “rule promulgated” and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(2) in subsection (d)(2)(C), by striking “rule” and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(3) in subsection (h)(4), by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 6(c)” and inserting “paragraph (2) of section 6(c)”.

(c) SECTION 6.—Section 6 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(2)(B)—

(A) by striking “, provide reasonable opportunity, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c), for a hearing on such rule,” and inserting “in accordance with paragraph (2) of subsection (c).”;

(B) by striking “; and if such a hearing is requested” and all that follows through “or revoke it.” and inserting a period;

(2) in subsection (e)(4), by striking “paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (c)” and inserting “paragraph (2) of subsection (c)”.

(d) SECTION 7.—Section 7(a)(1) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2606(a)(1)) is amended, in the matter following subparagraph (C), by striking “a rule under section 4, 5, 6, or title IV or an order under section 5 or title IV” and inserting “a rule under section 4, 5, or 6 or title IV, an order under section 4 or 5 or title IV, or a consent agreement under section 4”.

(e) SECTION 8.—Section 8(a)(3)(A)(ii)(I) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2607(a)(3)(A)(ii)(I)) is amended by striking “or an order in effect under section 5(e)” and inserting “, an order in effect under section 4 or 5(e), or a consent agreement under section 4”.

(f) SECTION 9.—Section 9(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2608(a)) is amended by striking “section 6” each place it appears and inserting “section 6(a)”.

(g) SECTION 11.—Section 11(b)(2)(E) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2610(b)(2)(E)) is amended by striking “rule promulgated” and inserting “rule promulgated, order issued, or consent agreement entered into”.

(h) SECTION 15.—Section 15(1) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2614(1)) is amended by striking “(A) any rule” and all that follows through “or (D)” and inserting “any requirement of this title or any rule promulgated, order issued, or consent agreement entered into under this title, or”.

(i) SECTION 18.—Section 18(a)(2)(A) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2617(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “rule promulgated” and inserting “rule, order, or consent agreement”;

(2) by striking “such rule” each place it appears and inserting “such rule, order, or consent agreement”.

(j) SECTION 19.—Section 19 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2618) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) by striking “(A) Not later than 60 days after the date of the promulgation of a rule” and inserting “Not later than 60 days after the date on which a rule is promulgated”;

(ii) by inserting “or the date on which an order is issued under section 4,” before “any person”;

(iii) by striking “such rule” and inserting “such rule or order”;

(iv) by striking “such a rule” and inserting “such a rule or order”;

(B) by striking paragraph (1)(B);

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “the rule” and inserting “the rule or order”;

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the rule” and inserting “the rule or order”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “a rule under section 4(a)” and inserting “a rule or order under section 4(a)”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “such rule” and inserting “such rule or order”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking “such rule” and inserting “such rule or order”;

(v) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) by striking “to such rule” and inserting “to such rule or order”;

(II) by striking “the date of the promulgation of such rule” and inserting “the date on which such rule is promulgated or such order is issued”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “review a rule” and inserting “review a rule, or an order under section 4,”;

(B) by striking “such rule” and inserting “such rule or order”;

(C) by striking “the rule” and inserting “the rule or order”;

(D) by striking “new rule” each place it appears and inserting “new rule or order”;

(E) by striking “modified rule” and inserting “modified rule or order”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “a rule” and inserting “a rule, or an order under section 4”;

(II) by striking “such rule” and inserting “such rule or order”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “a rule” and inserting “a rule or order”;

(II) in clause (i)—

(aa) by inserting “or an order under section 4,” before “the standard for review”;

(bb) by striking “such rule” and inserting “such rule or order”;

(cc) by striking “the rule” and inserting “the rule or order”;

(dd) by striking the semicolon and inserting “; and”;

(III) by striking clause (ii) and redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii); and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "any rule" and inserting "any rule or order".

(k) SECTION 20.—Section 20(a)(1) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2619(a)(1)) is amended by striking "order issued under section 5" and inserting "order issued under section 4 or 5".

(l) SECTION 21.—Section 21 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2620) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "order under section 5(e) or (6)(b)(2)" and inserting "order under section 4 or 5(e)"; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "order under section 5(e), 6(b)(1)(A), or 6(b)(1)(B)" and inserting "order under section 4 or 5(e)"; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "order under section 5(e) or 6(b)(2)" and inserting "order under section 4 or 5(e)";

(ii) in clause (i), by striking "order under section 5(e)" and inserting "order under section 4 or 5(e)"; and

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking "or an order under section 6(b)(2)".

(m) SECTION 24.—Section 24(b)(2)(B) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2623(b)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "and" at the end of clause (i);

(2) by striking clause (ii); and

(3) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(n) SECTION 27.—Section 27(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2626(a)) is amended by striking "rules promulgated" and inserting "rules, orders, or consent agreements".

(o) SECTION 30.—Section 30(2) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2629(2)) is amended by striking "rule" and inserting "rule, order, or consent agreement".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the TSCA Modernization Act has been a long time in coming. We actually started work on this bill in the last Congress. We held a total of eight hearings and received testimony from a broad range of stakeholders, including the administration; but most importantly, we worked with each other, Member to Member, across the aisle.

The bill before you, Mr. Speaker, reflects lessons learned over the course of the last 3 years in which we worked on TSCA reform. First, the bill is clear

and understandable. Despite the highly technical nature of chemical regulation, Members can pick up this bill, read it from beginning to end, and understand what it does and how it works.

Second, the bill does not try to be all things for all people. Major sections of TSCA are not amended at all. For example, we leave the process for new chemical review in TSCA section 5 unchanged because it is working pretty well right now, and changes could make it worse.

The heart of the bill is our approach to regulating chemicals already on the market. Thousands of these chemicals have been in commerce for many years, and they pose no known risks and really don't need to be regulated at all. We leave those alone. But we do allow some existing chemicals to be scientifically evaluated for risk and, if necessary, to have that risk managed through a rule by the EPA.

Chemicals may be chosen for risk evaluation in one of two ways: either EPA may select a chemical for risk evaluation based on what EPA knows may pose an unreasonable risk, or the manufacturer may designate a chemical for EPA to evaluate for risk.

Now, why would a manufacturer invite EPA scrutiny of its product? There are several reasons. First, some interest or even a retailer may be raising concerns about a product, and the manufacturer wants to put those concerns to rest. Or one or two States may be thinking about regulating the chemical. The State-by-State approach can spell disaster for someone trying to capture economies of scale in a national market.

What better way to put these concerns to rest than to have EPA, with the scientific standards that we require, perform an objective risk evaluation? Then the EPA decision on that chemical will apply in all the States, and consumers and the public can have the confidence that the chemical is safe for its intended uses.

Another area in the legislation that required careful discussion and negotiation is preemption. Of course, we want to make sure national markets are just that and not a patchwork of restrictions varying State to State. At the same time, we did not want to deny anyone a legitimate cause of action under State tort or contract law. So that is what we said: as long as the State law does not conflict with the Federal ruling, the State action may continue.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has strict but attainable deadlines for action. If EPA initiates a risk evaluation, it must finish in 3 years. If a manufacturer initiates one and includes information EPA needs to make a decision, EPA should finish that in 2 years. Once the risk evaluation is complete, if EPA decides a rule is needed to manage the risk,

EPA must propose the rule within a year.

The risk evaluation itself only asks does the chemical present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. That is a science question based on a combination of hazard and actual exposure. If there is an unreasonable risk, the agency's decision on how to manage it is based on many other factors such as cost effectiveness, whether restricting an article will actually reduce exposure, whether replacements are available, and many other concerns.

H.R. 2576 permits EPA to regulate articles in those areas where regulation of chemical substances and mixtures alone would not be effective to reduce the identified risk, but requires EPA to be careful in addressing replacement parts that serve a commercially intended function or the original product or are needed to maintain the functionality of the original product.

We think this system sets a new standard for quality regulation. Of course, we want to be protected from harm, but we do not want needless, expensive regulations. Consumers want safe choices, not no choice at all.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the brink of setting up a commonsense approach to protecting people from unsafe chemical exposure that will become the standard of the world.

□ 1515

We want our constituents to be safe, and we want markets to work. This bill delivers both.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Nearly four decades ago, Congress enacted the Toxic Substances Control Act to identify and regulate risks from dangerous chemicals. Unfortunately, the statute has never worked. Improvements to the law are long overdue, and I am happy to be here today with my Energy and Commerce colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this landmark reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what brought us together is the failure of the current statute to keep the American public safe and to provide confidence in the safety of American products. Toxic chemicals can be found in the products we use every day and are steadily building up in our bodies and the environment.

Consumers are worried about chemicals like BPA and triclosan, but they don't know how to avoid them. It seems like every day there is a new study about how chemicals are negatively affecting our health, and something needs to change.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has held many hearings over the last 6 years to understand why TSCA isn't working. Some critical

flaws were built into the statute, like the grandfathering of over 60,000 chemicals in 1976 without any safety review. Other flaws came to light only through litigation, like the impossible analytical burden of the statute's "least burdensome" clause.

Even though we have recognized these flaws, forward progress has been elusive. When Chairman SHIMKUS and Chairman UPTON approached Ranking Member TONKO and myself about working on a streamlined approach to address the essential components of reform, I was hopeful.

The result is a bipartisan bill that will remove major obstacles to EPA action and give the Agency new authority and new resources. It will offer more protection and more implementation than current law. It is a strong compromise, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2576 will empower EPA to regulate the universe of chemicals that were grandfathered in 1976 by removing the requirement that EPA impose the "least burdensome" regulatory option and by establishing a risk-based standard for risk management, instead of a cost-benefit standard. For the first time, the decision of whether a chemical needs to be regulated will be based purely on the risk it poses.

H.R. 2576 will improve EPA's access to information about potentially dangerous chemicals by allowing EPA to require testing through orders and consent agreements, not just rulemakings, and by authorizing EPA to seek data when needed for a risk evaluation without first demonstrating risk.

H.R. 2576 will provide expedited action for the worst chemicals, those that are persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic. Under this bill, we can expect quick action to get these chemicals out of our environment and out of our bodies.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2576 will explicitly and directly protect vulnerable populations like children, workers, the elderly, and hotspot communities.

The bill will provide more resources for EPA to carry out this important program by removing outdated caps on user fees. It would also ensure that those fees are deposited in a dedicated trust fund for TSCA implementation.

Under the bill, all future confidential business information claims by industry would have to be substantiated, preventing abuse and ensuring greater transparency.

H.R. 2576 would ensure that States maintain their important role as partners in chemical regulation. Under the bill, preemption of State laws would be more limited than current law and other proposals. No State law would be preempted until Federal requirements are in effect.

Many State laws would be protected from preemption, including existing

State laws, new State laws adopted to address air and water quality or implement other Federal laws, State tort claims, and State laws regulating uses not evaluated by EPA.

In response to concerns raised by stakeholders and Members, a few additional important clarifications have been made following committee markup, and I thank the chairman for working with us to make those changes.

There is now clear authority for EPA to set a schedule if manufacturer-requested risk evaluations exceed EPA's capacity, ensuring that such requests won't overwhelm the program. The grandfathering provision for existing State laws has also been clarified based on feedback from State attorneys general.

Mr. Speaker, strong committee report language further clarifies the limited role of costs in risks management, the preservation of State monitoring and reporting requirements, and the expansion of EPA's testing authority.

I know that tomorrow, we will get back to disagreeing on the importance of environmental protection and the essential role EPA plays in keeping America safe, but for today, we can all agree on the need for a strong and protective Federal regulatory program for chemicals.

I want to thank Chairman SHIMKUS and Chairman UPTON for their leadership and their willingness to work with Democrats and stakeholders to craft this legislation. I would also like to thank Jackie Cohen of my staff for her hard work on this legislation, as well as Dave McCarthy of the majority staff for his efforts. This is a true testament to what we can achieve when we work together.

I look forward to supporting this bill, and I hope all my colleagues will join me in supporting this landmark legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), my colleague.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2576, the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, which updates the Toxic Substances Control Act, TSCA, of 1976. This legislation will benefit the Eighth District of Indiana and our Nation by improving the regulation of chemicals in commerce.

Indiana's Eighth District has a strong and diverse manufacturing sector, including plastics, fertilizer production, automobiles, and medical devices, which play pivotal roles in the local and State economy.

H.R. 2576 will improve the EPA's outdated regulatory process for these industries and manufacturers, fostering conditions for stronger interstate commerce, and ensure robust protections for public health and the environment.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and our ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Representative PALLONE, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago, Congress passed the Toxic Substances Control Act, which created a Federal program to manage the risks associated with our Nation's industrial chemicals.

That law, TSCA, has never met that need. As a result, the public has lost confidence in this Federal program. The many failings of the current law have been pointed out in reports, reports issued by the Government Accountability Office and others.

Well-intentioned attempts over the years to address some of the problems administratively or through voluntary agreements amongst the Environmental Protection Agency, the chemical industry, and the environmental and public health communities have failed. The public has too little information about the safety of chemicals that they are exposed to every day in virtually every product that they use.

Even in the face of overwhelming evidence of harm to people's health, EPA is unable to regulate exposure to toxic chemicals. Congress had to step in and explicitly legislate to gain public health and environmental protections from PCBs, for instance, and asbestos.

Because of the regulatory vacuum at the Federal level, some States have legislated to secure protections for their citizens. In some cases, large retailers have initiated their own chemical policies to respond to what are consumers' concerns.

Forty years of ineffective Federal policy is enough. H.R. 2576, the TSCA Modernization Act, amends TSCA and corrects the fundamental flaws that exist in our law.

When my colleague Chairman SHIMKUS began the effort to reform TSCA in the last Congress, I knew the committee could produce a bill. I believed we could. I was not convinced, however, that we could pass a law; but H.R. 2576 is a decisive step, I believe, in that direction.

I thank Chairman SHIMKUS, Chairman UPTON, and Ranking Member PALLONE for their continued cooperation and dedicated effort on behalf of this legislation. This truly has been a productive partnership, and the result is a good bill, a bill that I am pleased to support.

H.R. 2576 is the result of much discussion, much work, and compromise by all parties involved. While no one group gets all that they might have hoped for in this legislation, every stakeholder group gets something that they need. Frankly, we all need a functional, fair, and reliable Federal program of chemical regulation.

Industry gains a fair, predictable Federal program for chemical regulation, a program that will inspire public confidence in the safety of their products. In the context of our global economy, that is an important asset for doing business both here and in other countries.

The public health and environmental communities gain a Federal program in which EPA evaluates chemicals and, based on those evaluations, will act to regulate chemicals the Agency determines present a risk to health or a risk to the environment.

Under current law, in order to regulate a chemical, EPA must demonstrate that the benefits of regulating outweigh the costs. Under H.R. 2576, EPA's evaluation and decision on whether to act will be based solely on risk factors, risk factors alone.

Considerations of cost will be addressed when the Agency selects among different regulatory options to reduce chemical exposures. That is a major gain—a major gain—for public health and a major gain for the environment.

H.R. 2576 is a good bill. It offers significant improvements over our current law. I know many Members have concerns about states' rights and State preemption provisions in TSCA. I share those concerns.

There is State preemption in current law, and there is State preemption in H.R. 2576, but State preemption only occurs when EPA takes final—final—action on a chemical, either finding it safe or regulating its risks.

H.R. 2576 maintains a strong role for the States. With those changes in TSCA, the States will have a more active and credible partner in this effort at the Federal level.

Again, I want to thank Chairman SHIMKUS, Chairman UPTON, and Ranking Member PALLONE for their excellent work on this bill. I appreciate the constructive partnership that we formed in working together on this legislation. We worked through many difficult issues and found that common ground.

I look forward to continuing to work together as this bill moves on to the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman.

I urge my colleagues to end the ineffective chemical policy that we have had for four decades and to support H.R. 2576.

I, too, would like to thank some individuals who are very pertinent to this discussion and final product. I thank David McCarthy from the subcommittee staff on the majority side and Jerry Couri from the subcommittee staff, Jackie Cohen from our subcommittee staff on the Democratic side, and Chris Sarley of Chair-

man SHIMKUS' personal office staff, and Jean Fruci of my personal staff, the legislative director for my Congressional office.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, could I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2576, the TSCA Modernization Act. I am a proud cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation that will update the Toxic Substances Control Act, our Nation's primary statute regulating the use and safety of commercial chemicals for the first time since it was enacted in 1976.

This legislation will directly address many of current TSCA's biggest flaws, including eliminating the "least burdensome" requirement and explicitly clarifying the law's safety standard excludes any consideration of costs.

This bill would require EPA to consider the risks to vulnerable subpopulations, like children, pregnant women, workers, and set restrictions if necessary to protect them.

The TSCA Modernization Act will go a long way towards ensuring that all American families—especially for families of chemical facility workers and fence line communities in our congressional district in Houston and Harris County, Texas—are protected from potentially harmful chemicals and bring needed regulatory clarity to this important sector of our Nation's economy.

I would like to thank both Chairman SHIMKUS and Ranking Member TONKO of the Subcommittee on the Environment and the Economy and Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and their staffs for the hard work and willingness to work together to make TSCA reform a reality.

I would also like to personally thank my legislative director, Sergio Espinosa, who has worked on this for three terms, I think, Mr. Speaker.

I want to ask my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join us and vote in support of this important legislation.

□ 1530

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, we all know that our chemical regulatory system is badly broken and that it has been broken for a very long time. When it comes to chemicals, weak statutory authority and limited resources have

prevented the EPA from fulfilling its mission of protecting public health and the environment. Current law is so weak that the EPA famously could not even use it to ban the use of asbestos despite overwhelming evidence that asbestos poses serious risks to human health.

Even when the EPA can successfully regulate a chemical under the Toxic Substances Control Act, which we know as TSCA—which has happened only five times—they must do so using a flawed cost-benefit analysis that prioritizes profits over health and safety. These are just a few of the many serious flaws of the current system.

While the TSCA Modernization Act does not address all of these problems, it does take several important steps forward that will help improve the health and safety of consumers and their families. It finally ensures that health, not cost, is the standard by which the safety of chemicals is evaluated; it maintains critical State chemical safety laws, such as California's landmark Proposition 65; and for the first time, it includes explicit protections for vulnerable populations, such as pregnant mothers, children, and seniors.

I want to commend Chairmen UPTON and SHIMKUS, Ranking Members PALLONE and TONKO, and the committee staffs for all of their hard work and commitment for making this a truly bipartisan bill. It is far from perfect, but it has improved at every step of the process, and I hope that continues. Should the Senate pass its TSCA reform package, I hope this cooperation continues in conference so we can produce an even stronger bill.

Mr. Speaker, for far too long, our chemical laws have prioritized profits over human health and safety. This bill would put an end to this inequity and to many other serious failings of the current system. The TSCA Modernization Act is a good compromise and is a major step forward. That is why I will be voting for it today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2576, the TSCA Modernization Act.

Since the 11th Congress, a lot of us have been wrestling very seriously with how to reform the EPA's current regime for reviewing and regulating chemicals. Everyone agrees that the statute has been broken for most of the decades that it has been in effect. Devising a new program, though, that would both enable the EPA to take meaningful action on the chemicals that truly need regulation and that will protect the health of our citizens was an uphill battle in deeply partisan

times; yet what we have come up with is a true compromise. We have focused on the aspects of current law that really need to be addressed, and we have developed language that will move the ball forward.

As all of the other speakers have said, our work is not done after the vote later today. The Senate, in working its own will, has come up with a reform bill that takes a distinctly different approach. We have a lot to reconcile. It is important that legislation makes it to the President's desk that will equip the EPA to protect us from toxic chemicals over the long term. Ultimately, we will be judged by how well the new law works, not only over the next few years, but over the coming decade.

I want to add my thanks, Mr. Speaker, to Congressman FRANK PALLONE, Congressman SHIMKUS, Congressman TONKO, Congressman GENE GREEN, all of our staffs, and, in particular, to my legislative director, Eleanor Bastian, who has been working on this bill ever since we really started seriously negotiating.

One last thing—and I think it is important—is that Congresswoman CAPPS mentioned that this bill will not preempt State law and that it will not preempt Proposition 65. This was an important provision, and I want to thank Congressman SHIMKUS and his staff for working on it with us because it is important that we have these kinds of protections that we need.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I will just say thank you again to Mr. SHIMKUS, in particular, for reaching out to me and to Mr. TONKO on this legislation and for making it bipartisan.

I almost feel anticlimactic today because I know how much hard work has gone into getting this bill to the floor. I know we are going to work hard after it passes in the House to get it passed in the Senate and to have a law that goes to the President, so I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is a good bill, and I am going to give my thanks to my colleagues, too. We want a good vote today because we want to make sure we have a strong House position as we go into negotiations with the Senate, and I think we are going to have that. I also appreciate the leadership for bringing this up on the suspension calendar, which, I think, shows a lot of support right at the outset.

As everyone else has done, I want to take a moment to thank our colleagues. This has been a multiyear, multi-Congress approach. As a former

high school teacher in government history, so far, the system is working on this bill, and we are hoping for good things as we move forward with conference and get something to the President's desk. I harken back to PAUL TONKO's comment and FRANK PALLONE's comment that we could pass a bill but that, if we wanted to pass a law, we really needed to open up the process a little bit. That was very helpful to me, and I appreciate that.

I also want to thank Chairman UPTON, obviously, for his leadership and for his friendship.

DIANA DEGETTE, who just spoke, and GENE GREEN have both been with me, slaving away, over the last couple of years. We have learned a lot about each other, and we have learned a lot about the law, and it is a very difficult law to understand. We also started getting help from BOB LATTA, from Ohio, and from BILL JOHNSON, and I want to thank them for their help.

H.R. 2576 has also gained letters of support from a variety of stakeholders, which include—and sometimes this shocks people to know that we have this group of diverse interests—the American Chemistry Council, the American Alliance for Innovation, the American Cleaning Institute, the Consumer Specialty Products Association, the National Association of Chemical Distributors, the National Wildlife Federation, just to name a few.

I also want to thank two people who never promoted any particular policy but who were responsible for exceptional quality in the legislation before us—Tim Brown and Kakuti Lin, who are our House legislative counsel. They make sure that the words in the bill do what we intend them to do. That is a part of this process that really goes unrecognized, the people who are legislative counsel. They spend long hours, and we ask them to do heavy lifting on short notice, so we want to make sure that we thank them here today. In a highly technical field such as chemical risk management, that is not an easy task. I thank them for their skill, dedication, and hard work.

Finally, I would like to recognize the dedicated staffs on both sides of the aisle who helped us craft this legislation—David McCarthy, who has already been mentioned, along with Jerry Couri on the Energy and Commerce staff. Understanding our chemical regulations has helped Members navigate through the complex nature of TSCA reform from our very first informational hearing in the last Congress.

I know, over there, we have got Jackie Cohen, who in the last Congress was a real pain in the rear end to me, but, this year, we have been able to work together, which has been helpful. Jean Fruci also was a calming influence, and we appreciate her steady guidance. They have both provided quality input

to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle throughout this process. I appreciate their dedication, oftentimes through nights and weekends, to help us get to where we are today.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “yes” on H.R. 2576 to send a strong signal that the time is now to update this outdated law and to keep the momentum and the bipartisan spirit moving forward until the President signs it into law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the purpose of engaging Chairman SHIMKUS in colloquy. First, I would like to thank Mr. SHIMKUS for working with me during and after markup to make sure that the important role of states in chemical regulation is preserved. In the absence of a strong federal chemical regulatory program, many states have taken action to protect their citizens from toxic chemicals. Strong laws are in place in many states to address chemicals including BPA, flame retardants, and more. Through the Committee process, explicit protections have been added for state laws and state common laws, including important changes taken from the amendment that I offered at markup. My amendment was drafted in response to the letter sent by 12 State Attorneys General, which I would like to introduce now into the RECORD. Again, I appreciate you working with me to address the points they raised. It is my understanding that nothing in this bill would preempt or otherwise affect existing state laws or private rights of action, unless there is an actual conflict between a federal requirement and a state requirement. Is that correct?

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, Yes it is. H.R. 2576 contains protection for existing state laws and existing citizen enforcement actions. No existing state requirements will be preempted unless they actually conflict with federal requirements.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, as you know, over twenty-five years ago, the people of California enacted a landmark ballot measure known as Proposition 65. Proposition 65 requires persons who expose individuals to certain chemicals that are known to cause cancer or reproductive harm to display a clear and reasonable warning. Proposition 65 enforcement actions by the state and by private parties have played a crucial role in reducing childhood exposure to harmful chemicals. This state law operates somewhat differently from other state laws related to chemicals, so I want to ask specifically about the protection for Proposition 65 in the bill. It is my understanding that nothing in this bill would preempt or otherwise impact enforcement of Proposition 65 or the ability of the State to continue to authorize citizen enforcement of Proposition 65, unless there is an actual conflict. Is that correct?

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. We do not intend to interfere with operation of Proposition 65 unless a requirement under that law actually conflicts with a federal requirement under TSCA.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, and just to be clear, the waiver provision in Section 18(b) of current law, which could protect additional state laws, is not changed by this bill?

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a long time coming. The breakthrough bipartisan bill before us today is the culmination of a multi-year, multi-Congress effort to modernize our decades-old chemical safety laws. The Toxic Substances Control Act, which was signed into law by Michigan's own President Jerry Ford, needs to be updated for the 21st century. And this thoughtful bill improves chemical safety while encouraging continued innovation and economic growth and gives the public greater confidence in the safety of American-made chemicals and the products that contain them.

There are six core elements that form the basis of the TSCA Modernization Act. First, this bill helps markets work and provides certainty. Chemicals will get reviewed and will be ruled either safe for intended uses, or in need of a risk management rule. Once a decision is made by EPA, that decision will apply in all the states. Manufacturers won't have to produce 50 different product versions for 50 different states.

Second, the bill respects the role of states and individual rights of action. Tort and contract claims are explicitly protected in the preemption section.

Third, any regulation of a chemical will be guided by common sense. Is the regulation cost effective? If use in an article were restricted, will exposure actually go down? Is there a feasible replacement? Is the transition period fair? Without good answers to these questions regulation will not move forward.

Fourth, the bill will build confidence for consumers and the general public that chemicals on the market anywhere in the U.S. are safe, and not just because EPA says so. EPA must evaluate risk against the most stringent science standards we've ever enacted for chemicals. And the science has to be transparent and hold up to objective peer review.

Fifth, the bill lets government and industry actually collaborate. Chemical manufacturers are given the choice to ask for and get a chemical evaluated. And EPA must meet strict action deadlines. If the science indicates the chemical is safe, then EPA must say so, and that determination will be the law in all 50 states.

Finally, the bill encourages innovation, largely by protecting confidential business information. New technology is not likely to appear if the secret formula can be stolen and copied the minute a new product appears. This bill would prevent that from happening.

Each of the elements of the bill are not trade-offs, each provision works to the support the others. It would not accomplish much good for EPA to evaluate all these chemicals if the results were not going to apply in all the states. It does not make sense for the government to be writing safety regulations if the result is no real improvement in safety. And a manufacturer is not likely to cooperate with the government in chemical evaluation if to do so means giving up a trade secret.

The TSCA Modernization Act solves each of these concerns, as all these safeguards work together.

Mr. Speaker, this is a big day. The TSCA Modernization Act is good for consumers, good for trade, and good for the environment.

I especially commend Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PALONE, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LATTI for their dedication and hard work in putting together a bill that can be signed into law. Let's put jobs and the economy first and vote yes.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, our country's federal toxic chemicals regulation has been broken for decades. Since Congress first passed the Toxic Substances Control Act in 1976, the EPA has placed restrictions on only five of the estimated 60,000 chemicals in commerce, and since the EPA's ban on asbestos was overturned in 1991, zero chemicals have been regulated. This law is in dire need of reform.

While toxic chemicals regulations have floundered for decades at the federal level, California and several other states have passed important laws to protect communities and notify consumers. These state laws, including California's landmark Proposition 65, have motivated many companies to reduce or eliminate toxic chemicals from their products.

It was with these state laws in mind that I offered an amendment at the Energy & Commerce Committee markup of this legislation to clarify its impact on state laws. My amendment was based on the recommendations of 12 State Attorneys General who wrote to the Committee: California, New York, Massachusetts, Washington, Iowa, Oregon, Maryland, Vermont, Hawaii, Maine, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire.

I'm pleased that the final version of the bill before us today, as well as the Committee Report on the bill and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, addresses several of the issues I raised along with the 12 Attorneys General who wrote to the Committee with their concerns.

First, the final text of the bill includes my amendment's clarification to ensure states can continue to enforce existing laws unless specifically preempted. Without this change, the bill could have been interpreted to only grandfather ongoing enforcement actions, rather than all existing state laws and regulations.

Second, the sponsor of the bill, my good friend Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois, clarified in a colloquy with me that no existing state laws or requirements will be preempted by this bill unless they actually conflict with federal requirements. Mr. SHIMKUS also confirmed on the Record that the bill is not intended to interfere with the operation of Proposition 65 or the ability of the State of California or private citizens to enforce that landmark law.

Third, the multi-state Attorney General letter called for further clarification that the bill is not intended to preempt state monitoring, information reporting, and disclosure laws. These important laws help keep regulators and communities informed about the presence of toxic chemicals. I'm pleased that the Committee Report states that "the Committee expects that these type of requirements would generally fall outside the scope of preemption."

With these important changes and clarifications, the preemption and savings provisions in the TSCA Modernization Act are substantially improved and I appreciate the willingness of Chairmen UPTON and SHIMKUS to make these improvements to the bill.

The TSCA law is long overdue for reform and with the above changes included in the

TSCA Modernization Act, I support it and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2576, the TSCA Modernization Act. While this bill is not perfect, it is a good step toward better protecting Americans and our environment from dangerous chemicals.

Current law, the Toxic Substance Control Act, passed in the 1970s and has been a failure. While its name implies that it gave the Environmental Protection Agency the authority to ensure the safety of many chemicals, in reality, its scope is severely limited and the standards for action are unreasonably high. It also restricted testing to thousands of chemicals that were already in use when it passed. Since it was enacted, EPA has partially regulated only five chemicals under the law.

Democrats have been calling for TSCA reform for many years, and today we are considering the first meaningful change. While it does not go as far as previous Democratic proposals, it represents significant progress over current law. It makes it easier for EPA to test chemicals using a risk-based approach, explicitly protects vulnerable populations, and provides more resources to get the job done. It also allows EPA to move more quickly to address the most toxic and harmful chemicals.

Our work is not done—the Senate is finalizing its proposal and we will have to reconcile our differences. I will continue to advocate for strong protections for American families and our environment. I am voting yes today to take an important step forward in that effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2576, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

BOYS TOWN CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 893) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 893

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Boys Town is a nonprofit organization dedicated to saving children and healing

families, nationally headquartered in the village of Boys Town, Nebraska;

(2) Father Flanagan's Boys Home, known as "Boys Town", was founded on December 12, 1917, by Servant of God Father Edward Flanagan;

(3) Boys Town was created to serve children of all races and religions;

(4) news of the work of Father Flanagan spread worldwide with the success of the 1938 movie, "Boys Town";

(5) after World War II, President Truman asked Father Flanagan to take his message to the world, and Father Flanagan traveled the globe visiting war orphans and advising government leaders on how to care for displaced children;

(6) Boys Town has grown exponentially, and now provides care to children and families across the country in 11 regions, including California, Nevada, Texas, Nebraska, Iowa, Louisiana, North Florida, Central Florida, South Florida, Washington, DC, New York, and New England;

(7) the Boys Town National Hotline provides counseling to more than 150,000 callers each year;

(8) the Boys Town National Research Hospital is a national leader in the field of hearing care and research of Usher Syndrome;

(9) Boys Town programs impact the lives of more than 2,000,000 children and families across America each year; and

(10) December 12th, 2017, will mark the 100th anniversary of Boys Town, Nebraska.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) **\$5 GOLD COINS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue not more than 50,000 \$5 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

- (1) weigh 8.359 grams;
- (2) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and
- (3) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(b) **\$1 SILVER COINS.**—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 350,000 \$1 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

- (1) weigh 26.73 grams;
- (2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and
- (3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(c) **HALF DOLLAR CLAD COINS.**—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 300,000 half dollar clad coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

- (1) weigh 11.34 grams;
- (2) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and
- (3) be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(d) **LEGAL TENDER.**—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(e) **NUMISMATIC ITEMS.**—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the 100 years of Boys Town, one of the largest nonprofit child care agencies in the United States.

(b) **DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.**—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

- (1) a designation of the value of the coin;

(2) an inscription of the year "2017"; and

(3) inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(c) **SELECTION.**—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the National Executive Director of Boys Town and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens of Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) **QUALITY OF COINS.**—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) **MINT FACILITY.**—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) **PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.**—The Secretary may issue coins under this Act only during the period beginning on January 1, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2017.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) **SALE PRICE.**—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

- (1) the face value of the coins; and
- (2) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) **BULK SALES.**—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) **PREPAID ORDERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) **DISCOUNT.**—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge as follows:

- (1) A surcharge of \$35 per coin for the \$5 coin.
- (2) A surcharge of \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin.
- (3) A surcharge of \$5 per coin for the half dollar coin.

(b) **DISTRIBUTION.**—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be paid to Boys Town to carry out Boys Town's cause of caring for and assisting children and families in underserved communities across America.

(c) **AUDITS.**—Boys Town shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with regard to the amounts received under subsection (b).

(d) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the Federal Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 893, the Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act, introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), and I seek its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, on December 12, 2017, Boys Town will celebrate 100 years of saving children and healing families. Boys Town was founded in 1917 by a young Irish priest, Father Edward Flanagan, who believed that every child could be a productive citizen if given love, a home, an education, and a trade. He accepted boys of every race, color, and creed—an amazing thing back in 1917.

Boys Town first opened on December 12 of 1917 in a rundown Victorian mansion in downtown Omaha, Nebraska. In 1921, the home later moved to Overlook Farm on the outskirts of Omaha, where it remains located today. A number of years ago, I had the privilege of visiting Boys Town. By the 1930s, hundreds of boys lived at Boys Town, which grew to include dormitories and administrative buildings, and the boys even elected their own government, which included a mayor, a council, and commissioners.

News of Father Flanagan's work spread worldwide, and even Hollywood took notice with the very famous 1938 movie "Boys Town," with Spencer Tracy, who won an Academy Award for his portrayal of Father Flanagan. At the request of President Truman, he even traveled the world, visiting orphans and advising government leaders on how to care for displaced children after the war.

Although Father Flanagan died in 1948, his work at Boys Town, which Flanagan called “God’s work”—and I think most of us would agree with that—continued. Today, although Boys Town is still headquartered in Nebraska, it continues to expand its care across America. It is one of the largest nonprofit child care agencies in the country, providing treatment for behavioral, emotional, and physical problems for children and their families, helping as many as 2 million people annually. Additionally, the Boys Town National Research Hospital is a global leader in the research of Usher syndrome.

Mr. Speaker, I can’t think of a better way to commemorate Father Flanagan and Boys Town than by creating this commemorative coin. The spirit of Boys Town truly embodies the best of America. This bill would help recognize and continue to nurture that spirit.

I commend the gentleman from Nebraska for his hard work on this issue, and I ask for the immediate passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: I am writing with respect to H.R. 893, the Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Ways and Means will forgo action on H.R. 893 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the jurisdictional interests of the Committee on Ways and Means over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 893 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 893 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: Thank you for your letter of June 19th regarding H.R. 893, the Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego action on H.R. 893 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that by forgoing such action the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdictional interest in this or similar legislation. In addition, if a con-

ference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this measure.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 893, the Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act.

I was pleased to be an original sponsor in the last Congress and a cosponsor in this one. This bill appropriately recognizes the outstanding work done by Boys Town, a nonprofit organization headquartered in the village of Boys Town, Nebraska, that selflessly promotes the interest of children and their families across this Nation.

□ 1545

Boys Town, which takes its name from Father Flanagan’s Boys’ Home, impacts the lives of more than 2 million families across America each year through its counseling services, outreach, and education. I am also pleased to report that each year, Boys Town directly touches the lives of thousands of New Yorkers through its community support services and homes for troubled youth.

Father Flanagan, the founder of Boys Town, focused on the inherent good in children and built a world class organization that emphasized the rehabilitation of troubled youth, rather than punishment. President Franklin Roosevelt once said that America needs 49 more Father Flanagans.

It is this compassionate approach and commitment to love, training, and guidance, regardless of race or religion, that has made Boys Town such a success story and a lifeline for countless children and their families. In commemoration of their centennial anniversary, the bill before us today will require the U.S. Treasury Department to mint and issue \$5 gold, \$1 silver, and half-dollar clad commemorative coins.

Surcharges from the sale of the coins will allow Boys Town to raise needed funds that will be dedicated to making a positive impact on the lives of children and families from underserved communities across America. It is also important to note that the passage of this bill comes at absolutely no cost to the taxpayer.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in passing this commonsense bipartisan bill without further delay.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank Mr. HUIZENGA and

Mrs. MALONEY for their very thoughtful reflections on the history and importance of Boys Town. I greatly appreciate the sentiments offered.

I am very happy and proud to stand here in support of the centennial commemorative coin. As was mentioned, Boys Town was founded in 1917 by Father Edward Flanagan and has since grown from a small local home for children who found themselves in difficult circumstances in Omaha to one of the largest nonprofit, nonsectarian child and family service organizations in America.

Boys Town offers a remarkable model of academic and spiritual engagement. Students learn more than math and grammar, as important as that is. Their teachers and caregivers provide them with solid formation. Graduates are equipped to succeed not only professionally, but are also given the life skills to stay on the right path.

Boys Town is so impactful that about 90 percent of the children who come there integrate successfully back into their communities; and historically, many, over time, have joined the military.

What is this extraordinary model of intervention? It starts with a family. Each child is placed into a family with a caring, nurturing mother and a protective, giving father, where there are rules and expectations, discipline, and love.

The success of Nebraska’s Boys Town has recently been duplicated across many, many communities in our country. Their network of 11 national sites and national hotlines touches the lives of more than 2 million Americans each year.

On December 2, 2017, Boys Town will celebrate 100 years of saving children and helping to heal families. In honor of this 100-year anniversary, this legislation, again, would authorize the U.S. Mint to produce a series of commemorative coins with a design emblematic of Boys Town’s 100-year history.

These coins, of course, will be available to the general public for sale and will more than offset the cost of minting by the Treasury. As was mentioned earlier, there will be no cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, Boys Town is a quiet institution nestled in the heartland, my home. It does great service to America by helping to heal wounds during this socially fractured time.

A quick story, Mr. Speaker: last year, I had the privilege of participating as a commencement speaker at Boys Town. After I finished my address, the young people were called forward to receive their diplomas in a ceremony marked with great dignity and formality and even lightheartedness.

Even though family and friends and those visiting were told to please hold their applause, the excitement couldn’t

be contained. As each graduate crossed the stage, shouts of joy and encouragement and clapping continued throughout the whole event.

Prior to the graduation, students had gathered for a retreat, giving them the opportunity for reflection and recommitment. During their last time together, the seniors discussed what they had to say. Here are quotes from a few of them.

I ran in the wrong crowd, hated my family, kept running away from home, and inflicted self-harm. At Boys Town, I am a member of the Junior ROTC and learned to like myself and my family. I look forward to returning home and being a good example to my younger brother.

Another said:

I lived on the streets from age 10 to 13 and stole to eat. I ended up in prison, and my cousin got shot in the face. I never played sports, let alone attended school, but at Boys Town, I just finished playing baseball this year and signed on with a college to study business.

Another child said this:

My mom and dad were both in prison, and I had trouble since kindergarten. In junior high, I was locked up myself for 2 years, and when I got out, my mom died. My dad was still in prison. Since I have lived at Boys Town, I chose to get myself on the right track and graduate and made a promise to myself that I would never do anything that would land me in prison. Boys Town saved my life.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately, most children do not experience such trauma in their lives, but some do. These are the kids who bear the scars of fraying social and familial bonds, destructive choices, and legal difficulty.

Through no fault of their own, the great problems of our time fall most heavily on our young people. Economic hardship and broken families destroy the sense of safety and possibility that is a necessary antidote to social alienation.

Every child needs a nurturing environment of compassionate challenge and genuine promise. Education should cultivate that creativity, as well as dignity, allowing all boys and girls to realize their full potential.

Today, we have an opportunity to celebrate the lives of remarkable young men and women and the extraordinary institution that is serving them so well. By authorizing this Boys Town commemorative coin, we are investing in the future of our children in a simple but I think really impactful way.

I want to thank the nearly 300 bipartisan Members of this Congress who have signed on as cosponsors of this bill. I think that is an important statement. I would also like to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS as well for their leadership on the committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD), whose

father and grandfather served on the board of Boys Town.

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I would like to commend my colleague Congressman FORTENBERRY for his work on this issue and his words, which are right on. I would like to thank as well the chairman for his words, which accurately describe the history of Boys Town. Let me also thank the ranking member for her comments that so accurately reflect what Boys Town means to our community and to the entire country.

I grew up around Boys Town. I grew up playing sports at Boys Town. The high school that I went to, Boys Town was in our conference; and we spent many very difficult nights playing basketball against the Boys Town basketball team which, quite frankly, was better than we were on most every occasion.

In my years in the legislature that lasted until last year, I had the opportunity to work with a colleague of mine, Senator Bob Krist from Omaha, who spearheaded significant juvenile justice reform in our State.

The child welfare system in Nebraska was in deep trouble; and Senator Krist, along with Father Boes, who is the acclaimed and incredibly competent leader at Boys Town, we passed significant juvenile justice legislation that helps families throughout the State of Nebraska, that deals with brain development, that deals with wraparound services, family services, as was so aptly described by my colleague Congressman FORTENBERRY.

Mr. Speaker, we are changing lives in Nebraska; and, as has been mentioned, Boys Town is changing lives throughout the country. Their unique approach to juvenile justice issues, the wrap-around family-centered services that deal with not only the parents but the siblings to help bring these young people into a productive life, is what Boys Town has been about for the 100 years that it has been in existence.

It is no longer there, but I remember as a child in the 1950s actually seeing the first Boys Town facility in downtown Omaha. When I was growing up, Boys Town was way out of town. It had a farm around it. The farm is still there, but now, it is in the middle of Omaha, as Omaha grows.

Though it is in a different place in the world today than it was in 1917 with Father Flanagan, by bringing business leaders in Omaha together and others to create Boys Town, it serves that grand purpose that Father Flanagan envisioned in 1917.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I thank the ranking member for giving me this opportunity to speak.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank Mr. THORNBERRY for his beautiful statement, as well as Mr. ASHFORD, from the great State of Nebraska.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I, too, want to express my thanks to both Congressman FORTENBERRY and Congressman ASHFORD for their dedication and desire to highlight Boys Town and what an amazing thing that has happened out there and really the impact that it has had.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 893, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BULLION AND COLLECTIBLE COIN PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY AND COST SAVINGS ACT

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1698) to amend design and content requirements for certain gold and silver coins, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1698

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Bullion and Collectible Coin Production Efficiency and Cost Savings Act”.

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

Title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 5112—

(A) in subsection (q)—

(i) by striking paragraphs (3) and (8); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(B) in subsection (t)(6)(B), by striking “90 percent silver and 10 percent copper” and inserting “not less than 90 percent silver”; and

(C) in subsection (v)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “Subject to” and all that follows through “the Secretary shall” and inserting “The Secretary shall”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “To the greatest extent possible, the Secretary”;

(iii) in paragraph (5), by inserting after “may issue” the following: “collectible versions of”; and

(iv) by striking paragraph (8); and

(2) in section 5132(a)(2)(B)(i), by striking “90 percent silver and 10 percent copper” and inserting “not less than 90 percent silver”.

SEC. 3. AMERICAN EAGLE SILVER BULLION 30TH ANNIVERSARY.

Proof and uncirculated versions of coins issued by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to subsection (e) of section 5112 of title 31, United States Code, during calendar year 2016 shall have a smooth edge incused with a designation that notes the 30th anniversary of the first issue of coins under such subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1698, the Bullion and Collectible Coin Production Efficiency and Cost Savings Act, a bipartisan bill which I introduced in March, along with the gentlewoman from New York, Representative MALONEY.

This simple piece of legislation would make minor changes to four existing coin programs. Each change saves money for the United States Mint, and it makes it easier to produce the coins or make the coins more attractive to investors and collectors.

The changes include: first, making it less expensive to package gold investment coins; second, it allows the Mint to buy standard coinage silver for collectible coins instead of the more expensive custom alloy; third, it removes the requirement for an already completed study on the production of an investor coin made of palladium; and, fourth, it allows collector versions of the widely popular American eagle silver investment coin to bear an inscription noting that next year is the 30th anniversary of the first issuance of those coins.

These small changes will have an impact on saving taxpayer dollars over the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate passage of H.R. 1698.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this cost-saving legislation, which I was proud to cosponsor with my friend from Michigan.

People who see the big things that Congress does, they often forget that we have to pay attention to the little things, too, and these little things are important. This is a very good example of that. This is a small bill which makes the government better, saves some taxpayers' money, and makes our coin programs better for collectors and for investors.

For years, the laws that specify the production of silver coins made by the Mint have required them to be 90 percent silver. Today, the standard silver used in coins is 91 percent silver. So the Mint has had to pay extra for custom coin blanks. This legislation fixes that problem.

It also allows the Mint to make a special collectible version of the American Eagle silver bullion coin, noting the popularity of the program over the past 30 years.

The bill also allows the sale of American Buffalo gold coins in bulk rather than in individual packages, making handling easier for the Mint and for investors and clears the final hurdle for the Mint finally to produce investor coins made of palladium, an idea from a 2010 bill from my former colleague and very good friend, Mr. Watt.

Mr. Speaker, this bill saves money and makes coin programs more attractive to collectors and investors. I ask for its immediate passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1698, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES COTTON FUTURES ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2620) to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2620

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXCLUDING CERTAIN COTTON FUTURES CONTRACTS FROM COVERAGE UNDER UNITED STATES COTTON FUTURES ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c)(1) of the United States Cotton Futures Act (7 U.S.C. 15B(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “except that any cotton futures contract” and inserting the following: “except that—

“(A) any cotton futures contract”;

(2) in subparagraph (A) (as designated by paragraph (1)), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) any cotton futures contract that permits tender of cotton grown outside of the United States is excluded from the coverage of this paragraph and section to the extent that the cotton grown outside of the United States is tendered for delivery under the cotton futures contract.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to cotton futures contracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2620. This bill would amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to allow for the creation of a world cotton contract listed on the United States exchange.

Current law, which requires sampling and classing by the USDA of every bale of cotton tendered under contracts listed on a U.S. exchange reflects an antiquated picture of the global cotton market. Some market participants need to hedge price fluctuations in foreign markets, and the current law limits their ability to do so. We need to update our law to reflect the modern nature of this marketplace.

H.R. 2620 accomplishes this by providing an option for cotton produced and delivered in foreign markets to be classed by rating facilities closer to the point of delivery rather than by the United States Department of Agriculture. It makes no changes to the treatment of domestically produced and delivered cotton.

This legislation will allow any willing exchange to meet industry demand to design a world cotton contract. For example, ICE Futures U.S., which has already worked with market participants, has publicly announced their intention and preference to list a world cotton contract side by side with the domestically focused Cotton No. 2 contract they already list.

H.R. 2620 allows for an important new contract for cotton hedging to be developed, which would be beneficial to commercial hedgers. However, it is important specifically to me and to others to note, it would not disrupt the industry's benchmark hedging contract, the No. 2 contract, which is relied upon by U.S. cotton producers in my district and around the country.

Before I close, I would like to thank Chairman CONAWAY both for his continued leadership on the Agriculture Committee and his efforts on this legislation. Additionally, I want to thank Ranking Member DAVID SCOTT for working with me on this issue over the last few months. And I would like to acknowledge LYNN WESTMORELAND's work in this as well. He was instrumental in advancing this issue.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2620.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, too, have enjoyed working with my colleague from Georgia, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit, Congressman AUSTIN SCOTT.

Mr. Speaker, our bill, H.R. 2620, will modernize the way in which cotton futures contracts are listed and regulated under the 1916 Cotton Futures Act.

More specifically, as many of you know, the main tool used in the marketplace for hedging cotton is the No. 2 contract. Currently, the No. 2 contract only permits cotton grown within the United States. That cotton is delivered to only five United States cities: Galveston, Texas; Houston, Texas; Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas; Greenville, South Carolina; and Memphis, Tennessee.

Now, under the 1916 Cotton Futures Act, every bale of cotton tendered under a contract listed on a U.S. exchange must be sampled and classed or graded by the United States Department of Agriculture. However, seeing that cotton is grown all over the world, my bill targets cotton that is grown and delivered outside of the United States' borders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the problem, the concern that our bill is solving. As I mentioned earlier, because of the fact that there are only five domestic cities that are cotton delivery points listed under the 1916 Cotton Futures Act, there has been much concern that the Cotton No. 2 contract cannot accurately reflect price movement in foreign markets and, therefore, cannot provide an effective risk management tool. That is simply the problem.

Now, to solve this problem, what our bill will do is simply allow U.S.-based future exchanges flexibility in how they handle foreign-grown cotton and foreign delivery points that will never touch the United States at all.

Mr. Speaker, we live now and we operate in a rapidly changing global economy. It is very important that we not put our cotton producers or our commodities exchanges into a disadvantaged position competitively when it comes to being able to get the price fluctuations that occur in foreign markets, thereby providing our businesses with the most effective tool by which they can manage their risk.

So because the United States Department of Agriculture does not have the manpower to deploy personnel all over the world at one time, our bill will allow cotton grown outside the United States to be classed by either a United States Department of Agriculture testing lab inside the United States or an international lab deemed to have comparable comprehensive rules and regulations equivalent to the United States. That is it. It is clean and simple.

Our bill solves this problem. It gives our cotton producers and it gives our exchanges that ability to be able to know how prices are sliding in each foreign country that is producing cotton while, at the same time, our producers and our exchanges, without that, cannot apply good risk management. That is why this is so essential.

So let me state again, as my colleague from Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT, made clear, I, too, want to make clear that our bill does not change the fact that 100 percent of all domestically produced and delivered cotton will be classed by the United States Department of Agriculture. There is absolutely no change here.

Furthermore, the bill does not change or alter the Cotton No. 2 contract. What our bill does is simply allow our U.S.-based futures exchanges that much-needed flexibility that is needed in order to list cotton that will never touch the United States through a world cotton contract.

As I said, we live in a global marketplace. It is important that our rules and regulations reflect the modernization that has happened in our global markets since this act was written 100 years ago. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we keep the United States economy the strongest economy in the world, and our bill, H.R. 2620, will do just.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 2620.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, Mr. SCOTT, and I have said, this is simply a necessary, minor change. I would just ask all Members to support passage of H.R. 2620.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2620, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY HEADQUARTERS CONSOLIDATION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1640) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1640

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY HEADQUARTERS CONSOLIDATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project within the National Capital Region. Such report shall include each of the following:

(1) A proposed occupancy plan for the consolidation project that includes specific information about which Department-wide operations, component operations, and support offices will be located at the site, the aggregate number of full time equivalent employees projected to occupy the site, and schedule estimates for migrating operations to the site.

(2) A comprehensive assessment of the current and future real property needed by the Department in the National Capital Region in order to carry out the mission of the Department to secure the homeland and defend the Nation against future acts of terrorism.

(3) An analysis of the difference between the current and needed capital assets and facilities of the Department.

(4) A current plan for construction of the headquarters consolidation at the St. Elizabeths campus that includes—

(A) the estimated costs and schedule for the current plan; and

(B) any estimated costs savings associated with reducing the scope of the consolidation project and increasing the use of existing capacity developed under the project.

(5) A current plan for the leased portfolio of the Department in the National Capital Region that includes—

(A) the total rentable square feet, number of personnel, and proposed utilization rates;

(B) the replacement and consolidation plan, including—

(i) an end-state vision that identifies which Department-wide operations, component operations, and support offices do not migrate

to the St. Elizabeths campus and continue to operate at a property in the leased portfolio;

(ii) the number of full time equivalent employees who are expected to operate at each property, component, or office; and

(iii) timing and anticipated leased terms, for leased space under the plan referred to in paragraph (4); and

(C) the costs and benefits of leasing and construction alternatives for the headquarters consolidation project.

(6) A detailed list of alternatives considered by the Department during the development of the plan referred to in paragraph (4), including the costs and benefits of alternatives to such plan.

(b) UPDATE OF COST AND SCHEDULE ESTIMATES.—Not later than 180 days after date of the submittal of the report required by subsection (a), the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, shall complete the update of the cost and schedule estimates for the portions of the consolidation project that are not yet complete as of such date based on the information contained in the report. Consistent with the recommendation of the Government Accountability Office in GAO-14-648, such estimates shall conform to relevant Federal guidance for cost and schedule estimates.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—

(1) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the update of the cost and schedule estimates under subsection (b) to evaluate the quality and reliability of such estimates.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the completion of the update of the cost and schedule estimates under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall report to the appropriate congressional committees on the results of the review required by paragraph (1).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) The term “National Capital Region” has the meaning given such term under section 2674(f)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

□ 1615

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1640. Mr. Speaker, since 2006, the Department of Homeland Security

and the General Services Administration have been working towards completing a consolidated headquarters on the historic St. Elizabeths campus in Washington, D.C.

However, as with many other Federal projects, the consolidation has run up against cost overruns and construction delays, at times estimated to be more than \$1 billion over budget and 12 years behind schedule.

Earlier this year, I visited the site personally to see firsthand the progress being made and the immense challenges that lie ahead. I remain concerned that taxpayers' dollars will be put at risk without better management.

This bill, H.R. 1640, the DHS Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015, would require the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, to investigate and submit a report on the estimated costs and property needs of the project.

While we were encouraged by the updated DHS St. Elizabeths plans published earlier this year, we still believe that increased oversight of the consolidation project will help ensure accountability and the efficient use of our constituents' taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, accountability is a fundamental aspect of citizen-ruled government and something that our constituents expect their representatives to uphold. H.R. 1640 does just this, and I look forward to the bipartisan support this legislation will receive.

I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, June 15, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Ford House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write concerning H.R. 1640, the Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1640, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the house floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, June 17, 2015

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1640, the “Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015.” I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support a request by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman,
Committee on Homeland Security.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1640, the Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, in 2006, 3 years into the Department of Homeland Security's existence, President Bush proposed consolidating the headquarters functions of the Department and its components from the more than 50 locations to the St. Elizabeths campus in southeast Washington, D.C.

Construction began in 2009, but between sequestration and tightening budgets, appropriations for the project have been \$1.2 billion less than President Bush and President Obama requested.

Naturally, Congress' failure to consistently and adequately fund the project has greatly slowed construction and led to increased costs. It has also forced DHS to revisit its master plan and reduce the scope of the project.

At this juncture, it is important that the Department have a realistic and achievable plan. The legislation under consideration seeks to do just that. If enacted, this legislation would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress an updated plan for St. Elizabeths to inform future funding decisions.

Importantly, H.R. 1640 requires the submission of a proposed occupancy plan for St. Elizabeths that includes a list of components and offices to be housed there. A key consequence of the Department having to scale down the breadth of its consolidation plans is

the reality that its portfolio of leased space will need to remain large.

In fact, with up to 69 percent of DHS' commercial leases in the national capital region expiring between fiscal years 2016 to 2020, we should all be aware that DHS will be forced to embark on the expensive process of re-competing and possibly relocating its operations and personnel.

Before I reserve the balance of my time, I would like to acknowledge that I am pleased that the bill includes an amendment I offered to give the Department adequate time to engage the General Services Administration, the construction manager for the project, in preparing the updated plans, assessments, and estimates.

GSA's participation in the development of these key materials is essential to ensuring that what is transmitted to Congress is realistic and achievable.

As a supporter of the St. Elizabeths project and DHS' Unity of Effort initiative, I urge passage of H.R. 1640. Collocation of DHS' personnel in one headquarters has the potential of not only achieving cost savings, but fostering an environment where integration and collaboration drives more effective and efficient operations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the bipartisan approach taken on this legislation. The St. Elizabeths project is about more than real estate; it is about ensuring the Department of Homeland Security has a home where diverse components can come together.

That is the thinking behind the Secretary's Unity of Effort initiative. Enactment of this legislation will help to ensure that DHS has a realistic plan for St. Elizabeths.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman McCAUL and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for their work on this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this strong bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1640, the "Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015."

I support this bipartisan legislation which directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee for unanimously supporting the inclusion of my amendments to H.R. 1640.

Together, the Jackson Lee amendments offered a comprehensive look at the Department's real estate obligations related to its headquarters consolidation project at St. Elizabeths, as well as its leased portfolio in the National Capital Region.

Further, the Jackson Lee amendments help clarify how DHS will relocate its personnel and operations at the headquarters level and across its components at St. Elizabeths as construction continues on the headquarters consolidation project.

Mr. Speaker, since DHS initiated its headquarters consolidation in 2006, it has progressed despite changes in senior leadership and waning funding support from Congress.

As a result, in April 2015, DHS and GSA announced that the construction sequence and timetable for the headquarters consolidation would be adjusted to reflect reduced funding by Congress.

DHS must now re-compete up to 69 percent of its commercial leases in the National Capital Region as they are scheduled to expire between 2016 and 2020.

My first amendment directs DHS to provide information related to the expected timing and terms of any lease renewals in the National Capital Region.

My second amendment requires the Department to report on the numbers of its full-time equivalents who are expected to occupy each DHS-leased or owned property, which will guide the Department in adjusting its expenditures on the headquarters consolidation project.

Together, they will ensure that DHS and GSA develop a comprehensive picture of which employees and operations will migrate to St. Elizabeths and which will not.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in strong support of the suspension bill, H.R. 1640, the "Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1640, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS PAID ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1633) to provide for certain improvements relating to the tracking and reporting of employees of the Department of Homeland Security placed on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1633

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY IMPROVED INTERNAL TRACKING AND REPORTING OF ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE FOR PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 104. INTERNAL TRACKING AND REPORTING OF ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE FOR PERSONNEL MATTERS.

"(a) INTERNAL REPORTING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015, and quarterly thereafter, the head of each component of the Department shall submit to the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department—

"(1) the number of employees of the component who had been on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters for a period of six consecutive months or longer as of the last day of the period covered by the report;

"(2) the total cost to the component associated with such administrative leave and such paid non-duty status (including salary and benefits) for the period covered by the report; and

"(3) the average duration that employees are placed on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters for a period of six consecutive months or longer, as of the last day of the period covered by the report for the component.

"(b) CHCO TRACKING.—The Chief Human Capital Officer shall—

"(1) maintain records of the number of employees of the Department who are placed on administrative leave or paid non-duty status without charge to leave for personnel matters and the costs (including salary and benefits) associated with such leave or non-duty status; and

"(2) in consultation with the head of each of the components of the Department, determine any appropriate actions to be taken by the Department to resolve any personnel matter objectively, appropriately, and expeditiously or to reduce the use of administrative leave and paid non-duty status without charge to leave in addressing any personnel matter.

"(c) PERSONNEL MATTERS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'personnel matters' means, with respect to an employee, any personnel investigation (including any investigation into misconduct and any national security or suitability investigation), any criminal matter, or any adverse action proposed or taken by the Department, including any action under chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code.

"(d) LEVERAGE OF EXISTING SYSTEMS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary is encouraged to leverage systems and operations in use on the date of enactment of the DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015 to implement the requirements of this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is

amended by inserting after the item relating to section 103 the following new item:

“Sec. 104. Internal tracking and reporting of administrative leave for personnel matters.”.

SEC. 3. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY POLICY RELATING TO EMPLOYEES ON ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE.

By not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall develop and implement a Department-wide policy in accordance with existing Federal guidance specifically related to the use of administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters. Such policy shall include the responsibilities of the components of the Department for reporting information relating to such administrative leave and such paid non-duty status to the Chief Human Capital Officer, as required under section 104(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296), as added by section 2. Such policy shall provide guidance on expediting the resolution of a personnel matter for which an employee has been on administrative leave or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave for a period of six consecutive months or longer in an objective and appropriate manner.

SEC. 4. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY EMPLOYEES ON ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE FOR PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) **QUARTERLY REPORTS.**—Not later than 30 days after the last day of each calendar quarter of 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the number of Department employees on administrative leave, and any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters for a period of six consecutive months or longer as of the last day of the quarter covered by the report. Each such report shall include—

(1) the costs to the Department associated with the placement of such employees on administrative leave or such paid non-duty status (including salary and benefits) for the period covered by the report; and

(2) a description of any actions taken by the Department to resolve any personnel matter for which an employee has been placed on administrative leave or paid non-duty status without charge to leave.

(b) **PERSONNEL MATTERS.**—In this section, the term “personnel matters” has the meaning given such term in section 104(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296), as added by section 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our children and grandchildren deserve a better government than the one that we are passing on to them. Families are struggling due to a lagging economy. Government intrusion and senseless regulations on businesses are pushing jobs overseas. With the recent rash of scandals within our Federal Government, the American people are continually losing their faith in representatives of our government.

I know we can do better, and the American people expect to see change. I came to Congress to make a difference, to cut spending, to eliminate waste, and to hold Big Government bureaucrats accountable and make this Nation a place that is more free, safe, and full of opportunity.

This is what the American people expect from us, and now is the time for us to take bold and decisive action, and that is why I am standing here today.

The Department of Homeland Security has roughly 240,000 employees who work around the clock to protect the lives and liberties of Americans, and I am grateful for their dedicated service.

However, due to a lack of proper management and accountability, there are numbers of DHS employees who are staying at home and drawing a paycheck while being investigated for acts of misconduct.

In May of 2014, the former deputy inspector general at the Department of Homeland Security was accused of altering reports and delaying investigations. One of those investigations was the Secret Service prostitution scandal that occurred in 2012.

The Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight delved into this case, which also led to further investigations. However, even though the former deputy inspector general was being investigated for gross misconduct, he was placed on administrative leave, receiving full pay and benefits for almost an entire year.

We all know that there are occasional incidents like this in any organization. However, if this was an isolated case, I would not be standing here today presenting this bill, but there are numerous cases like it.

The Government Accountability Office reported that from 2011 to 2013, the Department of Homeland Security provided its employees with over 1.5 million days of paid administrative leave, equating to over \$380 million in taxpayer dollars. Most of this paid leave was granted to employees who were on administrative leave for reasons of misconduct.

Unfortunately, the Department has no agencywide standards or reporting

policies regarding paid administrative leave for employees being investigated for misconduct. This lack of management and accountability allows employees with disciplinary issues, like the former deputy inspector general, to fall through the cracks.

This bill, H.R. 1633, the DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015, requires the Chief Human Capital Officer to implement an agencywide policy regarding those who are on paid administrative leave for more than 6 months being investigated for misconduct. In addition, it requires the Department to report to Congress the number of employees on administrative leave during investigation, as well as the associated costs.

Having a commonsense policy, as mandated by this bill, will potentially save the Department millions of dollars and provide for critical oversight and accountability.

The bill will also require the Chief Human Capital Officer to submit quarterly reports to the House and Senate Homeland Security Committees. These reports will allow more oversight by Congress and ensure DHS is no longer squandering hard-working taxpayer dollars.

DHS must do a better job of tracking employees under investigation for misconduct and, in a timely manner, take appropriate action to hold them accountable. Employees who tarnish the Department's reputation do not deserve paid vacations at taxpayer expense.

Americans are tired of government carelessly giving away their future through mismanagement and thoughtless spending habits.

I encourage my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1633, a commonsense bill that will help prevent fraud, alleviate waste, and better safeguard taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in strong support of H.R. 1633, the DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, this measure which was unanimously approved in committee, seeks to enhance how certain paid administrative leave is tracked and managed by the Department of Homeland Security.

H.R. 1633 was introduced in response to a 2014 Government Accountability Office report that looked at paid administrative leave expenditures across government between fiscal years 2011 and 2014.

In that report, GAO found that, overall, agencies spent \$3.1 billion on paid administrative leave. Of that amount, the Department of Homeland Security spent \$380 million on this category of leave. Agencies approve administrative

leave for a variety of reasons, from severe weather events, to jury duty, to voting, to disciplinary matters subject to investigation.

H.R. 1633 focuses on helping to improve DHS' management of just one segment of paid administrative leave expenditures, leave that is paid for 6 or more consecutive months to an employee that is under investigation by the Department for a conduct or criminal matter.

This legislation directs the Department's Chief Human Capital Officer to maintain records from throughout the Department on the number of employees who are paid leave for 6 or more consecutive months during a DHS personnel investigation; the total costs, including salaries and benefits associated with this leave; and the average length of time that an employee in these circumstances is on paid administrative leave.

H.R. 1633 also directs the Department's Chief Human Capital Officer to develop and implement department-wide policy on how components can comply with this recordkeeping requirement and guidance and on how components can expedite the resolution of personnel matters for an employee in these circumstances.

In committee, language I authored was accepted to ensure that when a component expeditiously works to resolve personnel matters, as directed by this bill, that component must do so in a way that is objective and fair.

□ 1630

The addition of this language is important because we do not want to create the impression that Congress values expediency and cost-cutting over fairness.

Even as we look to foster greater accountability, we must not lose sight of the fact that we are talking about people's careers here.

Before I close, I would add that this legislation does nothing to disturb the discretion that the Department has to make leave decisions, and this bill should not impact the availability of paid administrative leave to the DHS workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1633, the DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015, introduced by my colleague from Georgia, BARRY LOUDERMILK.

Over the span of 2 years, Department of Homeland Security employees racked up approximately 1.5 million days of paid administrative leave, which amounts to hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. Some of these em-

ployees were placed on leave due to investigations into alleged misconduct.

Stopping wasteful government spending has been a top priority for me during my time in Congress, which is why I am proud to cosponsor this piece of legislation.

This bill increases government transparency by establishing an accountability system within the Department of Homeland Security. This system is essential in safeguarding against waste, fraud, and abuse.

I am glad that it is a bipartisan measure. I look forward to its passage, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1633 and stand with this commonsense legislation that saves taxpayer dollars.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), my colleague, friend, and fellow member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1633.

From 2011 to 2013, over 200 DHS employees were placed on paid administrative leave. While administrative leave may be necessary on a case-by-case basis, more frequently, we hear of Federal employees who are under investigation for conduct-related actions. These investigations can last for several months, which can result in a substantial cost to taxpayers.

For example, in 2013, a DHS employee was placed on paid administrative leave for running a Web site that predicted and advocated a race war. Such action should not involve paid leave. It clearly should involve termination of employment.

Another example involves former Acting and Deputy DHS Inspector General Charles Edwards. Mr. Edwards was placed on paid leave in May of 2014. As of October 2014, he was still on paid administrative leave.

This bill protects precious taxpayer dollars by requiring DHS to track and report on employees placed on administrative leave for personnel matters. By keeping track of who is on paid administrative leave, we can better ensure we are not using the taxpayers' dime to pay for DHS employee misconduct.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, this legislation would do nothing to disturb the availability of paid administrative leave for DHS workers who need it to vote or to serve on a jury. It is narrowly focused on getting a handle on how much the Department is spending on paid administrative leave for individuals under investigation for 6 or more months.

These circumstances are often tough for all involved. The sooner there is an appropriate resolution, the better it is for everyone involved. If enacted, H.R. 1633 would help to ensure that such matters are resolved in a timely and appropriate manner.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support this strong, commonsense, and bipartisan piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1633, the "DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015."

This bill makes needed improvements relating to the tracking and reporting of employees of the Department of Homeland Security including administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, and personal matters, and for other purposes.

I support this bipartisan legislation, which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the head of each component of the Department of Homeland Security to submit on a quarterly basis two reports to the Chief Human Capital Officer of DHS.

Mr. Speaker, Title I of Homeland Security Act would be amended by adding Section 104 which provides for the improvement of internal tracking and reporting for administrative leave.

First, this bill directs that the number of employees who had been on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters for six consecutive months or longer be reported.

Second, DHS agency heads must report the total cost to the component associated with such leave and paid non-duty status for that quarter.

The Chief Human Capital Officer is responsible for determining appropriate actions to be taken by DHS to resolve any personnel matter expeditiously or to eliminate or reduce the use of such leave and paid non-duty status in addressing any personnel matter.

The Chief HCO is also to develop and implement a department-wide policy in accordance with existing federal guidance specifically related to the use of such leave of paid non-duty status for personnel matters.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1633 enhances transparency and allows for more fiscally conservative policy in regards to the costs associated with paid administrative leave.

However, it may be more difficult to accomplish this level of transparency in regards to how data for leave is extracted and recorded.

These are time sensitive additions which will require that within 90 days of the enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter, the department heads are required to submit their reports to the Chief Officer.

In that same time span the Chief HC Officer is to promulgate a department-wide policy in accordance with existing Federal guidance

specifically related to the use of administrative leave.

I join my colleagues in working to strengthen efficiency in all areas of government and supporting fiscally conservative methods to achieve this goal.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of H.R. 1633.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1633, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMELAND SECURITY DRONE ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS ACT

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1646) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to research how small- and medium-sized unmanned aerial systems could be used in an attack, how to prevent or mitigate the effects of such an attack, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1646

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act".

SEC. 2. DRONE ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Energy, and the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission research how commercially available small and medium sized unmanned aircraft, excluding aircraft over 1,300 pounds could be used to perpetuate an attack and, based on such research, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop policies, guidance, and protocols for the Department of Homeland Security to prevent such an attack or mitigate the risks of such an attack. Not later than 180 days after the completion of the research required under this subsection, the Secretary of Homeland Security may provide, as appropriate, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Energy, and the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission information, based on such research, regarding how to best prevent and mitigate the risk of such an attack.

(b) DISSEMINATION TO STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall disseminate information to State, local, and tribal law enforcement officials and State and major urban area fusion centers, as appropriate, regarding how such officials may bolster preparedness for and responses to attacks perpetrated by commercially available small and medium sized unmanned aircraft, excluding aircraft over 1,300 pounds.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate an assessment of the security risk associated with commercially available small and medium sized unmanned aircraft, excluding aircraft over 1,300 pounds. Such assessment shall be informed by research conducted in accordance with subsection (a), shall contain recommendations, if applicable, to prevent and mitigate the risk of an unmanned aircraft system attack, and may be developed in coordination with the Centers of Excellence of the Department of Homeland Security and other academic institutions.

(d) PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act. This Act shall be carried out using amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1646.

The rapid increase of commercially available small-and medium-sized unmanned aerial systems, or UAS, most often referred to as drones, poses an emerging security threat. This is further evidenced by recent high-profile events at the White House, French nuclear power plants, and numerous airports and sports venues. Drones have been a part of foiled terrorist plots, used to smuggle drugs across our borders, and the negligent use of this technology presents a public safety risk.

During this Congress, bills have been introduced that focus on topics such as the commercial uses of drones and the privacy concerns associated with their use. However, nobody has tackled the security implications of expanding the use of drones. H.R. 1646, the Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act, requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to research how commercially available small- and medium-sized drones could be used in an attack and to develop policies, guidance, and protocols for the Department

of Homeland Security to prevent an attack.

By the end of fiscal year 2015, the Federal Aviation Administration is expected to establish new rules to remove the waiver requirement and allow the operation of drones for nonrecreational purposes in U.S. airspace. Undoubtedly, these regulations would be better informed by a DHS assessment of the potential security risks associated with the expanded use of small- and medium-sized drones. H.R. 1646 is a good first step towards protecting the country and the American people from this emerging threat.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE, WASHINGTON,
DC, JUNE 9, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL

*Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write concerning H.R. 1646, the Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1646, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. In addition, the bill's sponsor and the Committee on Homeland Security have agreed to include two changes to the bill in a Manager's Amendment on the House Floor. Finally, I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to any conference committee named to consider H.R. 1646.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,

*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1646, the "Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act." I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego further action on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing further action on this bill at this time, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to

have the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the house floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,

Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1646, the Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act, and in support of the House's adoption of H.R. 1646. I introduced this legislation in response to testimony that we received in committee this past March on gaps in our understanding of the security implications of unmanned aerial systems, UAS, in domestic airspace.

For example, off-the-shelf systems widely available today, in the wrong hands, can jam transmitted signals, take surveillance imagery, and carry dangerous weapons. Given these systems' capabilities, it is important that there be a comprehensive study of the security risks and plans to address them.

To that end, H.R. 1646 directs the Department of Homeland Security to research how a commercially available small- and medium-sized drone could be used to perpetrate an attack, and to develop policies, guidance, and protocols to prevent such an attack or mitigate the risk of such an attack.

As amended in committee, my legislation directs DHS to work with the U.S. Departments of Transportation and Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to carry out this research, and allows for DHS to share advice and information based on that research with these key Federal partners.

Mr. Speaker, drone technology holds great promise, with significant social and economic benefits not yet fully realized. However, given the rapid growth in the domestic drone market, it is important that we identify and have strategies to mitigate the associated security risk.

If enacted, H.R. 1646 will enhance our Nation's security while, at the same time, clarifying the framework for Americans' legitimate interest in producing and using drones lawfully and safely.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, H.R. 1646, to further the Department of Homeland Security's efforts to work with other agencies on the security risks of small- and medium-sized drones in domestic airspace.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support this strong, bipartisan piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1646, the "Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act."

I support this bipartisan legislation because it addresses the potential terrorist threat posed by small and medium-sized drones throughout our country.

I thank my colleague, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN of New Jersey, for introducing this thoughtful and necessary legislation that will assist the Department of Homeland Security.

The Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act would require the Department of Homeland Security to research how commercially available small and medium-sized drones could be used to perpetrate an attack.

Agencies will be tasked with the responsibility of taking the lead for developing effective policies and guidance along with the proper protocols which will assist in preventing an attack perpetrated with a drone.

Information regarding how to properly respond to the potential threats from these drones will be distributed to state and local law enforcement agencies to allow them to develop approaches to mitigate identified threats.

The protocols that will be developed as a result of this legislation will assist every level of law enforcement in coordinated responses to a drone related emergency.

Recent news reports of small drones crashing in areas such as on the White House lawn and incidents including near misses with commercial aircraft demonstrate the need for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things that can and must continue to be done is to protect our homeland from evolving threats.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I join my colleagues in working to strengthen the laws that allow the Department of Homeland Security to create policies that will address emergency protocol threats such as the proliferation of commercial use of drones.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 1646.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1646, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to research how certain commercially available small and medium sized unmanned aircraft systems could be used in an attack, how to prevent or mitigate the risk of such an attack, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS FOIA EFFICIENCY ACT OF 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1615) to direct the Chief FOIA Officer of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in the implementation of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1615

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DHS FOIA Efficiency Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) DEADLINE FOR UPDATING REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief FOIA Officer of the Department of Homeland Security, as appointed pursuant to section 552(j) of title 5, United States Code, shall finalize and issue an updated regulation implementing section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), which shall include—

(1) public guidance on procedures to be followed when making requests under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code;

(2) updated guidance to the components of the Department responsible for processing such requests, which may include information on how to adopt automated processing of requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code;

(3) detailed information on fees and costs associated with such requests; and

(4) detailed information on the appeals process for such requests.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief FOIA Officer, in coordination with the Chief Financial Officer of the Department and the heads of each of the relevant components of the Department, shall identify the total annual cost to the Department of implementing section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) GUIDANCE.—The Chief FOIA Officer shall develop guidance on reporting standards related to the direct and indirect costs to the Department associated with the processing of requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(c) COST SAVINGS.—The Chief FOIA Officer, in collaboration with the heads of each of the relevant components of the Department, shall—

(1) identify unnecessary and duplicative actions taken by the Department in the course of processing requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, by not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) eliminate unnecessary and duplicative actions taken by the Department in the course of processing requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, by not later than 12 months after the identification of such action under paragraph (1).

(d) **FOIA TRACKING SYSTEMS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief FOIA Officer shall develop a plan to automate the processing of requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code to the Department. Such plan shall take into account the specific needs of each of the components of the Department responsible for processing such requests and address required and recommended technology capabilities and elements. Such plan shall include an assessment of the costs and benefits associated with establishing and using electronic processing systems to process requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) **FOIA BACKLOG.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Privacy Officer of the Department, in consultation with the Chief FOIA Officer, shall update and issue guidance to the heads of each of the relevant components of the Department regarding the goal of reducing the backlog in processing requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, by 50 percent between fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2018.

(f) **REPORT.**—

(1) **SEMIANNUAL PRIVACY REPORT.**—The Chief FOIA Officer shall include in each semiannual privacy report submitted under section 1062(f) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee–1(f)) each of the following:

(A) The total costs to the Department of meeting the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, for the period covered by the report.

(B) An assessment of progress made toward meeting the backlog goals pursuant to subsection (e) during the period covered by the report and the periods covered by the two preceding reports.

(C) An assessment of whether the Department has adequate staffing and other resources to address the backlog goals pursuant to subsection (e) for processing requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(D) An assessment of the progress made towards automating the processing of requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, during the period covered by the report.

(2) **FISCAL YEAR 2016 REQUIREMENTS.**—The Chief FOIA Officer shall include in the second semiannual privacy report for fiscal year 2016 each of the following:

(A) A description of any cost savings identified under subsection (d).

(B) The plan developed under subsection (d).

(g) **DUPLICATIVE ACTION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “duplicative actions” means actions carried out by two or more components or programs that are engaged in the same activities or provide the same services related to the processing of FOIA requests to the same beneficiaries.

SEC. 3. PROGRESS ON AUTOMATION.

Upon completion of the plan to automate the processing of requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, the Chief FOIA Officer shall provide the plan to the heads of the components of the Department and seek written feedback from each head of a component agency regarding the extent to which that component will adopt the plan, the associated costs, and the projected timelines.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Georgia (Mr. CARTER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1615.

In November of 2014, it was reported that DHS had received and processed the most FOIA requests out of any Federal department. It holds the largest backlog of unprocessed FOIA requests of any Federal agency. In fact, since 2010, DHS FOIA requests have increased by over 65 percent, and DHS currently holds almost half of all Federal FOIA requests of any government agency—about 50,000 of 95,000 requests.

In addition, 3 weeks ago, I was informed that the increase in DHS FOIA requests was partly due to requests for immigration records for people requesting information for their future deferred action cases. My bill, H.R. 1615, the DHS FOIA Efficiency Act of 2015, streamlines the process to address the tremendous workload and backlog and bring transparency to the cost of FOIA requests to the Department.

In the recent past, DHS has received poor evaluations regarding its efficiency in handling FOIA requests. For these reasons, my bill directs the chief FOIA officer of DHS to work with other officers within the Department to update their capabilities in handling the large amount of FOIA requests and identify the total annual costs associated with processing these requests.

By updating their capabilities and reporting to Congress on how the Department is addressing their poor performance, my bill will direct the Department to address its backlog and inefficiencies in an appropriate and quick manner.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1615, the DHS FOIA Efficiency Act.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, which was unanimously approved by the committee on May 20, seeks to improve the Department's processing of Freedom of Information Act requests.

In November 2014, the Comptroller General reported that DHS faces the

largest backlog of unprocessed FOIA requests of any Federal agency. While resource challenges and inefficiencies in DHS' internal processes help explain in part the backlog, we must not be complacent and accept these challenges as excuses for the backlog.

A cornerstone of our democracy is that the government is accountable to its citizens. The FOIA process is a key mechanism to ensure accountability. I am pleased that the approach taken under this bill is consistent with the Department's unity of effort initiative.

Specifically, H.R. 1615 requires that the Department's chief FOIA officer collaborate with FOIA officials in component agencies to track the total annual costs associated with processing FOIA requests, identify and adopt cost-savings measures, and strategize on addressing the backlog.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note that in committee, measures authored by Democratic members to promote automation and address staffing resources were adopted with bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1615, a bipartisan bill that seeks to improve the responsiveness of the Department of Homeland Security to the American public, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, timely compliance with FOIA requests is imperative to an open government. The DHS FOIA backlog has existed for too long and needs to be addressed.

I thank Representative CARTER and Chairman MCCAUL for their bipartisan efforts on the DHS FOIA Efficiency Act, which marks an important first step in addressing this FOIA backlog and promoting greater automation in the processing of requests.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support this strong, bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1615, the “DHS FOIA Efficiency Act of 2015.”

I support this bipartisan legislation, which addresses DHS' FOIA backlog by requiring the department's chief FOIA officer to issue updated regulations on obtaining records under the Act.

I am pleased that H.R. 1615 incorporates two key Jackson Lee amendments offered during the committee markup of the bill.

In 2014, DHS had 67,097 FOIA requests that carried over from 2013; added 291,242 requests; and processed 238,031 FOIA requests.

The agency still had 120,308 FOIA requests that were carried over into 2015.

Because FOIA is a critical component of creating our nation's open and transparent government, the process of citizens getting access to information regarding government matters of personal or public interest is important.

DHS's ability to meet public demands for information through FOIA should not be hampered by a lack of technology.

One of the Jackson Lee Amendments included in the bill directs that the agency include information on how to adopt automated processing to meet FOIA obligations triggered by agency: Public Notices published in the Federal Register; Final rules; decisions, outcome of adjudicated matters or other agency actions; and obligations to reply to citizen FOIA request.

Another Jackson Lee Amendment included in H.R. 1615 directs that a report be drafted that provides an assessment of DHS progress made toward automating the FOIA process.

That Jackson Lee amendment also provides that upon completion of the FOIA automation plan that the Chief FOIA officer provides the plan to the heads of the components of the Department.

Mr. Speaker, it is true as Justice Brandeis famously observed that "sunshine is the best disinfectant."

He was speaking of the power of knowledge to illuminate and to enhance the ability of people to understand and evaluate government actions when presented with information.

I agree with Justice Brandeis that "the most important political office is that of the private citizen."

I support H.R. 1615 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1615, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DHS IT DUPLICATION REDUCTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1626) to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1626

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DHS IT Duplication Reduction Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DHS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DUPLICATION REDUCTION.

(a) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DUPLICATION REDUCTION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that includes the following:

(1) The number of information technology systems at the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) An assessment of the number of such systems exhibiting duplication or fragmentation.

(3) A strategy for reducing such duplicative systems, including an assessment of potential cost savings or cost avoidance as a result of such reduction.

(4) A methodology for determining which system should be eliminated when there is duplication or fragmentation.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) The term "duplication or fragmentation" of information technology systems means two or more systems or programs that deliver similar functionality to similar user populations.

(2) The term "information technology" has the meaning given such term in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

(c) NO NEW AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING.—This section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise appropriated or made available to the Department of Homeland Security. No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1626.

Call me crazy, but it just doesn't make sense to me to have Federal agencies using multiple IT systems that do the same thing. As chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Information Technology Subcommittee and a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I see these cost overruns and hear stories of duplicative systems on a daily basis. It is a ridiculous and outrageous waste of taxpayer dollars.

This year, the GAO's annual High Risk report designated information technology as a new area of high risk within the government. Federal agen-

cies spend nearly \$80 billion a year on IT projects, and nearly 80 percent of them are on outdated and legacy systems. In the Department of Homeland Security, there are more than 600 IT systems in FEMA alone.

The DHS IT Duplication Reduction Act is designed to change that. My bill requires the DHS Chief Information Officer to identify all IT systems in the Department, figure out which ones are redundant, and then come up with a strategy to reduce their number.

Mr. Speaker, when I was building a cybersecurity firm in the private sector, things like this didn't happen because there is no way that a small business trying to grow would ever waste their money like this.

Washington should have the same mentality, especially since this money being wasted isn't Washington's in the first place. I believe Washington can and should be much better stewards of the dollars taxpayers have entrusted to them. It is past time to change the "it is not my money, so let's spend it" culture here in Washington that leads to this kind of waste.

Taxpayers should be able to trust that every dollar is being used carefully and thoughtfully on effective and efficient government that works for them. I believe this legislation is a good start in reining in Federal IT spending and getting our government back on track.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1626, the DHS IT Duplication Reduction Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1626 seeks to address duplication or fragmentation within the Department of Homeland Security's information technology systems. Specifically, H.R. 1626 requires the Department's Chief Information Officer to report on the number of IT systems throughout the Department and identify and address those areas where duplication or fragmentation may exist.

This undertaking at the headquarters level should help inform the Department's IT budget planning which, in light of sequestration and the downward trend of the Department's budget, becomes all the more important when considered in the critical missions entrusted to DHS.

This legislation is in the spirit of the Department's Unity of Effort initiative and has the potential of fostering more coordinated IT planning and management among the Department's components. In committee, a number of technical refinements authored by Democrats were accepted to ensure that reducing redundancy frees up resources for DHS' operations.

Mr. Speaker, I do urge support for this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I, once again, want to point out the bipartisan efforts in regards to this measure. This measure has the potential of fostering more coordinated IT planning and management among the Department's components.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage and support of this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN, and my colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee for their support on this bill.

I, once again, urge all my colleagues to support this strong, bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1626, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SUNSHINE ACT OF 2015

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1637) to require annual reports on the activities and accomplishments of federally funded research and development centers within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1637

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ANNUAL REPORTS ON PROJECTS OF FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall annually submit to the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a list of ongoing and completed projects that federally

funded research and development centers within the Department of Homeland Security have been tasked to complete.

(b) PROHIBITION ON NEW AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING.—This section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise appropriated or made available to the Department of Homeland Security. No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1637, the Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent 700,000 north and east Texans. They have sent me here to Washington to pull the curtain back and shine a light into this Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that Federal agencies can be inefficient, ineffective, and resistant to oversight. They don't like to be held accountable, not by the American people or by individuals like me who are elected to represent those folks here in Congress.

As a committed conservative who is fighting to secure the American homeland, I believe that increased transparency is a national security issue, and because of that, every taxpayer dollar that we spend must be scrutinized.

We have to evaluate the government's programs and activities to see if they are worthwhile and to craft reforms that eliminate waste and bolster our national defense. A sluggish national security apparatus simply won't suffice. The American people deserve more.

Congress can't even begin to conduct effective oversight and cut waste, fraud, and abuse if we don't know what is going on behind closed doors. That is why I introduced H.R. 1637. This bill will increase transparency at the Department of Homeland Security by directing the Secretary to give Congress a detailed account each year of the ongoing and completed projects that federally funded research and development centers, or FFRDCs, within the Department of Homeland Security have been assigned.

FFRDCs conduct specialized research and development for the Federal Government. The two FFRDCs within the Department of Homeland Security provide independent analysis of homeland security issues. Currently, the Homeland Security Committee is expected to oversee these FFRDCs; yet the committee doesn't even receive an account of the status of ongoing or completed projects. It is hard to be a vigilant steward of hard-earned taxpayer dollars when you have a blindfold on.

My legislation will enable the committee to have visibility into the scope of FFRDC projects that the DHS has tasked them to meet their mission needs. This detailed accounting will allow committee members to have insight into current research and development projects and be able to further scrutinize them, thereby increasing oversight and transparency of the entire Science and Technology Directorate operation at DHS.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that Congress is aware of the Department of Homeland Security's research and development efforts and funding priorities to ensure that it is meeting the mission needs of its components, and this bill today will shed light on those activities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill. I think that we all agree that we can support increased transparency and a stronger, more secure homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, June 23, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1637, the "Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act of 2015," which your Committee ordered reported on May 20, 2015.

H.R. 1637 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will not seek a sequential referral. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and
Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1637, the "Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act." I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support a request by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1637, the Federally Funded Research and Development Act of 2015, and.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would require the Department of Homeland Security to prepare annual status reports on the research activities of federally funded research and development centers, or FFRDCs, on behalf of the Department.

□ 1700

DHS looks to these institutions that are largely operated by universities and not-for-profit organizations to help meet special long-term research and development needs.

In addition to the two FFRDCs that DHS sponsors, there are 17 national labs managed by the Department of Energy that provide research and technical assistance in support of the Nation's homeland security.

Among the areas of research expertise offered by these labs are critical infrastructure protection; cybersecurity; chemical, biological, and nuclear forensics; biodefense countermeasures; biodetection; and emergency preparedness.

I believe that timely and regular information about how DHS is utilizing these institutions is important to assessing progress on a wide range of homeland security challenges. That is why I support H.R. 1631 and urge passage.

I want to commend members of the Homeland Security Committee on the bipartisan nature in which this legislation has been crafted. It is important for us to know how DHS is using feder-

ally funded research and development centers to address homeland security challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this strong, commonsense bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1637, the "Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act of 2015."

I support this bipartisan legislation which requires annual reports on the activities and accomplishments of federally funded research and development centers within the department of Homeland Security.

The bill requires that the secretary of Homeland Security annually submit to Congressional oversight committees a list of ongoing and completed projects lead by federally funded research and development centers within the Department of Homeland Security have been assigned or completed.

Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) act as a vehicle for special research and development contracting within the federal government.

The FFRDCs provide DHS with independent and objective advice and quick response on critical issues throughout the Homeland Security Enterprise.

Homeland Security Systems Engineering and Development Institute (HSSEDI) and Homeland Security Studies and Analysis Institute (HSSAI) perform high-quality research and provide advice that is authoritative, objective and free from conflicts of interest caused by competition.

I support H.R. 1637, which provides much needed transparency on the research conducted by the Department of Homeland security.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in strong support of the suspension bill, H.R. 1637, the "Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act of 2015."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1637.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMELAND SECURITY UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS REVIEW ACT

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2390) to require a review of university-based centers for homeland security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2390

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act".

SEC. 2. REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS.

(a) GAO STUDY OF UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a study to assess the university-based centers for homeland security program authorized by section 308(b)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 188(b)(2)), and provide recommendations to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate for appropriate improvements.

(b) SUBJECT MATTERS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A review of the Department of Homeland Security's efforts to identify key areas of study needed to support the homeland security mission, and criteria that the Department utilized to determine those key areas for which the Department should maintain, establish, or eliminate university-based centers.

(2) A review of the method by which university-based centers, federally funded research and development centers, and Department of Energy national laboratories receive tasking from the Department of Homeland Security, including a review of how university-based research is identified, prioritized, and funded.

(3) A review of selection criteria for designating university-based centers and a weighting of such criteria.

(4) An examination of best practices from other agencies' efforts to organize and use university-based research to support their missions.

(5) A review of the Department of Homeland Security's criteria and metrics to measure demonstrable progress achieved by university-based centers in fulfilling Department taskings, and mechanisms for delivering and disseminating the research results of designated university-based centers within the Department and to other Federal, State, and local agencies.

(6) An examination of the means by which academic institutions that are not designated or associated with the designated university-based centers can optimally contribute to the research mission of the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security.

(7) An assessment of the interrelationship between the different university-based centers and the degree to which outreach and collaboration among a diverse array of academic institutions is encouraged by the Department of Homeland Security, particularly with historically Black colleges and universities and minority serving institutions.

(8) A review of any other essential elements of the programs determined in the conduct of the study.

(c) INFORMATION RELATING TO UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS.—Subparagraph (D) of section 308(b)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 188(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Each such report shall—

“(i) indicate which center or centers have been designated pursuant to this section;

“(ii) describe how such designation or designations enhance homeland security;

“(iii) provide information on any decisions to revoke or modify such designation or designations;

“(iv) describe research that has been tasked and completed by each center that has been designated during the preceding year;

“(v) describe funding provided by the Secretary for each center under clause (iv) for that year; and

“(vi) describe plans for utilization of each center or centers in the forthcoming year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon in support of H.R. 2390, the Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act of 2015, authored by the ranking member, the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will require the Government Accountability Office to initiate a study to assess the university-based centers for homeland security and provide recommendations to Congress on improvements.

The Department of Homeland Security Centers of Excellence play a vital role in providing long-term research and support of technology development in areas of emerging threats.

Additionally, these centers play key roles in supporting the Department of Homeland Security and its mission in protecting our homeland. I look forward to seeing the results of this study and how we can better improve the effectiveness of these university centers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND
TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 2390, the “Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act,”

which your Committee reported on May 20, 2015.

H.R. 2390 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology’s Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

—
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and
Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2390, the “Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act.” I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego further action on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing further action on this bill at this time, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2390, the Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act.

I introduced H.R. 2390, the Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act, with my colleague Mr. RICHMOND, to provide Congress with the full picture of the Department’s management of the Centers of Excellence program.

This program dates back to the Department’s earliest days. It was authorized in the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to be “a coordinated, university-based system to enhance the Nation’s homeland security.” Since that time, however, we have not had a com-

prehensive review of the Department’s management of this vital research and development program.

H.R. 2390 marks the most significant effort to assess the Centers of Excellence program to date. The measure directs the Government Accountability Office to issue a comprehensive report that, among other things, evaluates how the Department aligns decisions about establishing, maintaining, or eliminating a center with its research needs; how DHS identifies, prioritizes, and funds projects; and how DHS measures progress on its research goals.

The bill also directs GAO to examine how DHS promotes collaboration among the centers, as well as with institutions outside of the network, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other minority-serving institutions.

I have the privilege of representing Jackson State University, which is part of the Department’s Coastal Resilience Center of Excellence program. I am proud that in its capacity, Jackson State has contributed research and modeling that informed realtime operational decisions at the Coast Guard and FEMA in the wake of Hurricane Sandy and other disasters.

I know that throughout this country, there are other institutions that could benefit from and bring unique knowledge and expertise to DHS’ ten standing Centers of Excellence.

Mr. Speaker, the Homeland Security Committee has been involved in vigorous oversight of the Centers of Excellence, particularly encouraging the Department to adopt policies that help diversify university and student participation in the homeland security enterprise.

In my opinion, the DHS Science and Technology Directorate’s robust outreach effort to universities and institutions of recent years is that direct result of our oversight, but we need to understand whether S&T’s outreach, along with its effort to better manage the Centers of Excellence, are really working.

H.R. 2390 is an important first step in effectively assessing the value of the Centers of Excellence and evaluating whether or not the research and development potential of our Nation’s universities are being effectively leveraged.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am grateful for the cooperation of the subcommittee chairman, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and the full committee chairman, Mr. MCCAUL, for their help to improve the Department’s Centers of Excellence; and I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON for their leadership on this bill.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is a strong bipartisan piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2390 "Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act."

I support this bipartisan legislation which requires an annual report be sent to Congress to assess the university-based centers for homeland security program and provide recommendations for appropriate improvements.

Mr. Speaker, the research that our designated institutions conduct is imperative to the current progress and future success of protecting our nation's greatest asset, the American people.

I join my colleagues in working to safeguard our investment by requiring annual reports that give detailed reviews of how our funding is being spent and more effective ways we can use the information yielded from these studies in a real world applicable way.

This bill requires a review of the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) efforts to identify key areas of study needed to support the homeland security mission, and criteria that the Department utilized to determine those key areas for which the Department should maintain, establish, or eliminate university-based centers.

DHS's mission is to ensure a homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards.

H.R. 2390 supports that mission by overseeing the funding of a university-based research program that invests in the homeland security, science and technology of the DHS.

It is imperative that we have oversight of how the funds are being used to meet DHS's university program criteria and this bill requires a review of how university-based research is identified, prioritized, and funded.

The Centers of Excellence (COE) network is an extended consortium of hundreds of universities conducting groundbreaking research to address homeland security challenges.

Sponsored by the Office of University Programs, the COEs work closely with the homeland security community to develop customer-driven, innovative tools and technologies to solve real-world challenges.

The Institute for Infectious Animal Diseases (IIAD) and Texas A&M Engineering Experiment Station, have used this program to develop a mobile Certificate of Veterinary Inspection (CVI) application to support veterinary practitioners submitting animal health certificate records from the field.

This real-time information sharing is an alternative to email or web-based systems, and helps improve communication between veterinarians and state animal health offices by supporting certificate submission from the field.

The Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act requires a review of the Department of Homeland Security's criteria and metrics to measure demonstrable progress achieved by university-based centers in fulfilling Department taskings, and mechanisms for delivering and disseminating the research results of designated university-based centers within the Department and to other Federal, State, and local agencies.

Mr. Speaker, because these funds are used to enrich our future generations of leaders and it is important that the different university-based centers reach out and collaborate among a diverse array of academic institutions, particularly with historically Black colleges and universities (HBCU) and minority serving institutions.

I applaud Ranking Member THOMPSON for including specific language that reaches out to diverse universities, specifically often overshadowed historically Black colleges and universities.

HBCU such as Texas Southern University, in my Congressional district, is preparing technically savvy Homeland Security professionals for Maritime Transportation Security.

All educational institutions who meet criteria should be eligible to participate in the Department of Homeland Security's University Program.

This bill supports the program's mission needs of building a stable community of homeland security researchers and educators at U.S. colleges and universities.

Fostering a homeland security culture within the academic community through research and educational programs is a great partnership between government and our education institutions.

Strengthening U.S. scientific leadership in homeland security research and education giving our students a competitive ranking on a global level.

Generating and disseminating knowledge and technical advances to advance the homeland security mission helps to recruit future partners and participants.

Integrating homeland security activities across agencies engaged in relevant academic research will help partners work in concert to develop critical technologies and analyses to secure the nation's security interest.

The Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Centers of Excellence develop multidisciplinary, customer-driven, homeland security science and technology solutions and help train the next generation of homeland security experts.

The Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act regulates the institutions designated with this distinguished honor of training the next generation of leaders in the scientific and technological fields.

Raising the visibility and status of the government sponsored programs creates an environment where each institution has to take responsibility for the use of their funds and prove those uses furthered the mission needs of DHS.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bipartisan bill and strongly urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2390.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2390, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CBRN INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2200) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2200

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, AND NUCLEAR INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 210G. CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, AND NUCLEAR INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security shall—

"(1) support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of terrorist actors, their claims, and their plans to conduct attacks involving chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials against the Nation;

"(2) support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of global infectious disease, public health, food, agricultural, and veterinary issues;

"(3) support homeland security-focused risk analysis and risk assessments of the homeland security hazards described in paragraphs (1) and (2), including the transportation of chemical, biological, nuclear, and radiological materials, by providing relevant quantitative and nonquantitative threat information;

"(4) leverage existing and emerging homeland security intelligence capabilities and structures to enhance prevention, protection, response, and recovery efforts with respect to a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack;

"(5) share information and provide tailored analytical support on these threats to State, local, and tribal authorities as well as other national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders and other Federal agencies, as appropriate; and

"(6) perform other responsibilities, as assigned by the Secretary.

"(b) COORDINATION.—Where appropriate, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis shall coordinate with other relevant Department components, including the National Biosurveillance Integration Center, others in the Intelligence Community, including the National Counter Proliferation Center, and other Federal, State, local, and tribal authorities, including officials from high-

threat areas, State and major urban area fusion centers, and local public health departments, as appropriate, and enable such entities to provide recommendations on optimal information sharing mechanisms, including expeditious sharing of classified information, and on how they can provide information to the Department.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate having legislative jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or Senate, respectively, over the matter concerned.

“(2) The term ‘Intelligence Community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

“(3) The term ‘national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders’ means officials from the Federal, State, local, and tribal authorities and individuals from the private sector who are involved in efforts to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from a biological attack or other phenomena that may have serious health consequences for the United States, including infectious disease outbreaks.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to such subtitle the following:

“Sec. 210G. Chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing.”.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the appropriate congressional committees on—

(A) the intelligence and information sharing activities under subsection (a) and of all relevant entities within the Department of Homeland Security to counter the threat from attacks using chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials; and

(B) the Department’s activities in accordance with relevant intelligence strategies.

(2) ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The report shall include—

(A) a description of methods established to assess progress of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis in implementing the amendment made by subsection (a); and

(B) such assessment.

(3) TERMINATION.—This subsection shall have no force or effect after the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ANALYZED BY THE DEPARTMENT TO STATE, LOCAL, TRIBAL, AND PRIVATE ENTITIES WITH RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO HOMELAND SECURITY.

Section 201(d)(8) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121(d)(8)) is amended by striking “and to agencies of State” and all that follows and inserting “to State, local, tribal, and private entities with such responsibilities, and, as appropriate, to the public, in order to assist in preventing, deterring, or responding to acts of terrorism against the United States.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security’s Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I rise today in support of H.R. 2200, the CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015.

We know that terrorists have long strived to employ chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear—or CBRN—materials in their attacks. ISIS and other terror organizations have attempted to use chemical weapons, and experts suggest that terrorist interest in utilizing chemical agents has increased. In fact, reports indicate that ISIS may be currently using chemical weapons in Syria and Iraq.

Since the procedures and equipment required to develop biological weapons are the same as those used for legitimate research purposes and are readily available, it is imperative that intelligence information related to bio threats is appropriately analyzed and shared with those who would be on the front lines of response in the event of a biological attack.

Furthermore, events such as the Boston Marathon bombing in 2013 illustrated the need for better information sharing between Federal and local officials.

H.R. 2200 will enhance intelligence analysis and information sharing to fill this need and will work to ensure that State and local officials get the actionable intelligence information necessary to stop or mitigate a CBRN attack.

This legislation considers information garnered from the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications hearings on the threat of chemical and biological terrorism. During two hearings earlier this year, we heard from numerous stakeholders that information sharing with appropriate State and local officials and emergency response providers about these threats is critical.

Specifically, this budget neutral bill requires the Office of Intelligence and Analysis at DHS to support homeland security focused intelligence analysis of CBRN threats, including emerging infectious diseases, working in coordination with the Department’s National Biosurveillance Integration Center and the intelligence community.

As information and intelligence is only useful if it is shared with those

who can take action, such as State, local, tribal, and private entities, H.R. 2200 directs the Office of Intelligence and Analysis to not only share information with these partners, but also engage with them and get their feedback on mechanisms for two-way sharing of information.

Finally, H.R. 2200 directs the Secretary of DHS to report annually for 5 years on the Department’s intelligence and information sharing activities to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction and DHS’s activities in accordance with relevant intelligence strategies.

The House passed nearly identical bills during the 112th and 113th Congresses with bipartisan support.

I urge Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2200, the CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act.

Mr. Speaker, in the years following the September 11 attacks, Congress worked to address many of the preparedness gaps identified by the 9/11 Commission, including the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction. Pursuant to the 9/11 Commission’s recommendations, Congress established the Weapons of Mass Destruction, or WMD Commission.

In 2008, the WMD Commission issued a series of recommendations to counter the proliferation of WMDs and build a more robust national capability to respond to such attacks.

□ 1715

Subsequently, the WMD Commission and its legacy organization, the WMD Center, issued a series of report cards evaluating the Federal Government’s progress in implementing the WMD Commission’s recommendations. Unfortunately, each report card found that the Federal Government was not acting quickly enough.

In the years since the WMD Center issued its final bio-response report card in 2011, WMD threats have continued to evolve. What we know now is that the threats posed by WMDs are more dynamic and that our enemies are growing more agile. H.R. 2200 focuses on an important aspect of our Nation’s ability to prevent, to prepare for, and to respond to a WMD attack—information sharing.

At the full committee and subcommittee levels, the Committee on Homeland Security has devoted significant time and resources to assessing Federal activities to address the threat of WMDs. I have heard one message consistently from the witnesses who have come before us: we need to improve coordination and information

sharing with State and local governments and emergency responders. Situational awareness is essential to ensuring a robust response to a CBRN incident and to saving lives; and I appreciate Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications Subcommittee Chairwoman MCSALLY's efforts to improve CBRN threat-related intelligence and information sharing.

If we learned anything from the 9/11 attacks, it is that information sharing saves lives. From putting desperate pieces of information together, to stopping an attack, to ensuring that first responders are equipped to respond safely and effectively, information sharing plays an essential role in complete situational awareness. H.R. 2200 will improve the way we use information related to evolving threats posed by chemical, biological, nuclear, and radiological agents. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2200.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation that will enhance the sharing of CBRN-related threat information.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2200, the CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015.

I would like to begin by thanking my colleague, MARTHA MCSALLY, for her work on this important bill.

This bipartisan piece of legislation would direct the Department of Homeland Security to analyze terrorist intentions with respect to chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear material, and share this information with state, local and federal entities.

The bill includes my amendment, which was accepted in Committee, to require DHS to assess the specific risks presented by transporting these materials, addressing a key concern in Western New York.

The Department of Energy plans to begin shipping highly-enriched uranium liquid from Canada to South Carolina next year. This material, which is far more radioactive than spent nuclear fuel, would be shipped in casks that have never been certified to carry highly-enriched uranium liquid.

The Department proposes to transport this waste across the Northern Border at the Peace Bridge, the second busiest crossing for cargo and the busiest crossing for passengers on the Northern Border.

The Peace Bridge crosses the Niagara River which connects two Great Lakes, the contamination of which could endanger the world's largest fresh water supply.

The nuclear casks would then proceed from the Peace Bridge through downtown Buffalo, a high-density urban area.

The Department of Energy approved this route nearly twenty years ago, and it reflects the pre-nine-eleven mindset on the threat and consequences of terrorism.

The legislation before us today would allow the Department of Energy to reconsider the wisdom of transporting dangerously radio-

active material through high-risk areas like Buffalo.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, MARTHA MCSALLY, for her work and leadership on this issue and urge passage of this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2200, the "CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015."

I support this bipartisan legislation which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to: (1) support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of terrorist actors, their claims, and their plans to conduct attacks involving chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials against the nation and of global infectious disease, public health, food, agricultural, and veterinary issues; (2) support homeland security-focused risk analysis and risk assessments of such homeland security hazards by providing relevant quantitative and no quantitative threat information; (3) leverage homeland security intelligence capabilities and structures to enhance prevention, protection, response, and recovery efforts with respect to a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack; and (4) share information and provide tailored analytical support on these threats to state, local, and tribal authorities as well as other national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders.

I am pleased that H.R. 2200 incorporates an amendment by Congresswoman MCSALLY that directs the department to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security.

The Nation's chemical facilities represent a terrorist target that must be protected.

It is my hope that this bill will improve upon current legislation authorizing the Department of Homeland Security to regulate security practices at the Nation's chemical facilities.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that we must equip ourselves to be able to detect attacks of a CBRN nature.

H.R. 2200 ensures a standardized communication platform for need to know industries dealing with such sensitive information.

There is no room for error when it comes to our nation's security.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting to pass, H.R. 2200, the "CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2200, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 615) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act" or the "DHS Interoperable Communications Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term "Department" means the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) the term "interoperable communications" has the meaning given that term in section 701(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3; and

(3) the term "Under Secretary for Management" means the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES IN RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT.

Section 701 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", including policies and directives to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(d) INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'interoperable communications' has the meaning given that term in section 7303(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (6 U.S.C. 194(g))."

SEC. 4. STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a strategy, which shall be updated as necessary, for achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department, including for daily operations, planned events, and emergencies, with corresponding milestones, that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of interoperability gaps in radio communications among the components of the Department, as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Information on efforts and activities, including current and planned policies, directives,

and training, of the Department since November 1, 2012 to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department, and planned efforts and activities of the Department to achieve and maintain such interoperable communications.

(3) An assessment of obstacles and challenges to achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department.

(4) Information on, and an assessment of, the adequacy of mechanisms available to the Under Secretary for Management to enforce and compel compliance with interoperable communications policies and directives of the Department.

(5) Guidance provided to the components of the Department to implement interoperable communications policies and directives of the Department.

(6) The total amount of funds expended by the Department since November 1, 2012 and projected future expenditures, to achieve interoperable communications, including on equipment, infrastructure, and maintenance.

(7) Dates upon which Department-wide interoperability is projected to be achieved for voice, data, and video communications, respectively, and interim milestones that correspond to the achievement of each such mode of communication.

(b) **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL.**—Together with the strategy required under subsection (a), the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate information on—

(1) any intra-agency effort or task force that has been delegated certain responsibilities by the Under Secretary for Management relating to achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department by the dates referred to in subsection (a)(7); and

(2) who, within each such component, is responsible for implementing policies and directives issued by the Under Secretary for Management to so achieve and maintain such interoperable communications.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 100 days after the date on which the strategy required under section 4(a) is submitted, and every 2 years thereafter for 6 years, the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the status of efforts to implement the strategy required under section 4(a), including the following:

(1) Progress on each interim milestone referred to in section 4(a)(7) toward achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department.

(2) Information on any policies, directives, guidance, and training established by the Under Secretary for Management.

(3) An assessment of the level of compliance, adoption, and participation among the components of the Department with the policies, directives, guidance, and training established by the Under Secretary for Management to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components.

(4) Information on any additional resources or authorities needed by the Under Secretary for Management.

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY.

Sections 4 and 5 shall only apply with respect to the interoperable communications capabilities within the Department and components of the Department to communicate within the Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I rise today in support of H.R. 615, the Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey, the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. PAYNE.

The bill amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to include, among the responsibilities of the Department of Homeland Security's Under Secretary for Management, achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the Department's components.

H.R. 615 addresses the findings and recommendations of a November 2012 DHS Office of Inspector General report, which stated that the Department does not have the appropriate oversight or governance structure to ensure communications interoperability among its components. It is vital that the Department's components are able to effectively communicate day to day and, most importantly, during emergencies.

In response to the findings of this inspector general's report, I joined Chairman MCCAUL and Oversight and Management Efficiency Subcommittee Chairman PERRY in requesting a review of this issue by the Government Accountability Office. Their report, which was released in March, found that nearly 3 years after the inspector general's report, communications problems persist in the Department and among its components. In particular, Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel reported to the GAO that the lack of interoperability in some cases along the border resulted in missed apprehensions and jeopardized agent safety.

My district is on the southwest border. I know the challenges our Border Patrol agents, CBP officers, and ICE agents face in meeting their vital missions. It is unacceptable that they lack the tools and training necessary to communicate with each other. This bill seeks to make this more of a priority at the headquarters level.

In order to ensure the Department is taking the necessary steps to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities, H.R. 615 requires the Department's Under Secretary for Management to submit an interoperable communications strategy to the Committee on Homeland Security no later than 180 days after enactment and to periodically report to Congress on efforts to implement this strategy.

This bill passed the House in February by a vote of 379-0. I appreciate the swift action of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee under the leadership of my friend, Chairman JOHNSON. Their thoughtful additions have served to further improve this bill. I urge all Members to join me in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 615, the Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act.

In November 2012, the inspector general of the Department of Homeland Security issued an assessment of the interoperable communications capability among DHS components. The inspector general found that, of the 479 field radios that attempted to communicate on a specific common channel, only one user could do so. That is a 99 percent failure rate.

In short, DHS, which is the Federal entity charged with providing guidance to State and local governments to improve interoperable emergency communications, was not practicing what it preached. The inspector general found that DHS' interoperable challenges were not technological in nature. Rather, they were attributed to the fact that there was no one leading the effort to drive changes in the field. Further, there were no policies in place to ensure that the 123,000 radio users at DHS understood how to use the communications equipment issued to them.

Throughout my tenure on the Committee on Homeland Security, I have repeatedly sought opportunities to drive home the message that interoperable communications are critical to the Homeland Security mission at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Addressing this fundamental operational challenge is consistent with the DHS Unity of Effort initiative. So it would seem that the timing is right for real progress. However, late last month, we learned from the inspector general that, nearly 3 years after the issuance of the first report, DHS' components' inability to communicate effectively on the DHS common channel persists and that DHS has not completed the corrective actions necessary to resolve the problem. The inspector general's most recent findings confirm

that it is going to take directing the Department in law to get this done. That is why I was happy to support Ranking Member Donald Payne, Jr., when he introduced this legislation.

H.R. 615 would put DHS components on the path to achieving interoperable communications by directing the Department's Under Secretary for Management to develop a strategy to achieve interoperability. The taxpayers have spent \$430 million on interoperable communications capabilities at the Department so far. In this austere fiscal climate, we cannot afford to waste more money investing in communications capabilities when DHS lacks the policies that are sure to be effective.

With the help of full committee Chairman McCaul and subcommittee Chairwoman MCSALLY, the Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act passed the House unanimously earlier this year. Subsequently, our Senate counterparts approved H.R. 615 by unanimous consent with some enhancements. I urge my colleagues to concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 615 and send this bill to the President's desk.

The inspector general's report identifying the urgent interoperable communications problem at DHS came out 3 years ago. A comprehensive solution is long overdue. Unfortunately, the Department has still not implemented appropriate corrective action. I commend subcommittee Ranking Member PAYNE for introducing this important legislation and for his efforts to get it enacted into law. I urge my colleagues to concur with the Senate amendment of H.R. 615.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 615, which seeks to enhance interoperable communications at the Department of Homeland Security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 615, the Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act for three reasons.

The bill would address interoperability among information technology systems and radio communications systems to exchange voice, data, and video in real time.

First, the bill will save lives of first responders and those they seek to help; Second, the legislation is necessary to create a seamless level of communication among Department of Homeland Security components that are first responders to a terrorist attack, natural or manmade disaster; and finally to meet the technological challenges of bridging the communication divide between different communications systems used by first responders within the Department of Homeland Security.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I am well aware,

as are many of my colleagues, of the essential and lifesaving role of communications during a crisis.

Because the tragedy of September 11, 2001, was compounded by communication failures among the brave first responders who entered the burning towers that comprised the World Trade Center it has been an imperative of the Homeland Security Committee to address first responder communication interoperability challenges.

The number of first responders lost on that single day was the greatest loss of first responders at any single event in U.S. History:

343 New York City Fire Department firefighters; 23 New York City Police Department officers; 37 Port Authority Police Department officers; 15 EMTs and 3 court officers were casualties of the attacks.

The need for this bill authored by Congressman PAYNE is evident.

The City of Houston covers over a 1000 square mile region in Southeast Texas. It has a night-time population of nearly two million people, which peaks with over three million daytime inhabitants.

The City of Houston's 9-1-1 Emergency Center manages nearly 9,000 emergency calls per day. The volume of emergency calls can easily double during times of inclement weather or special City social/sporting events like Hurricanes Ike in September 2008; and Katrina as well as Rita, which occurred in September and October of 2005).

Annually, one out of every ten citizens uses EMS.

There are over 200,000 EMS incidents involving over 225,000 patients or potential patients annually. On the average, EMS responds to a citizen every 3 minutes. Each EMS response is made by one of 88 City of Houston EMS vehicles.

In 2013, the City of Houston's fire Department lost Captain EMT Matthew Renaud, Engineer Operator EMT Robert Bebee, Firefighter EMT Robert Garner and Probationary Firefighter Anne Sullivan when they responded to a hotel fire.

Throughout the history of the Houston Police Department over 110 officers have lost their lives in the line of duty.

Each member of the House of Representatives knows of the loss of a first responder who was going to the aid of those in harm's way. This bill will offer additional resources to the first responders of the Department of Homeland Security.

The bill amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to include among the responsibilities of the Under Secretary for Management responsibilities with respect to policies and directives to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

The Under Secretary of Homeland Security would submit to the House and Senate Homeland Security Committees a strategy, which shall be updated as necessary, for achieving and maintaining interoperable communications, including for daily operations, planned events, and emergencies, with corresponding milestones, that includes:

An assessment of interoperability gaps in radio communications DHS components, as of this Act's enactment date;

Information on DHS efforts and activities, including current and planned policies, directives, and training, since November 1, 2012, to achieve and maintain interoperable communications, and planned efforts and activities to achieve and maintain interoperable communications;

An assessment of obstacles and challenges to achieving and maintaining interoperable communications;

Information on, and an assessment of, the adequacy of mechanisms available to the Under Secretary to enforce and compel compliance with interoperable communications policies and directives of DHS;

Guidance provided to DHS components to implement interoperable communications policies and directives;

The total amount of funds expended by DHS since November 1, 2012, and projected future expenditures, to achieve interoperable communications; and

Dates upon which DHS-wide interoperability is projected to be achieved for voice, data, and video communications, respectively, and interim milestones.

The bill ensures that the Department of Homeland Security would conduct a survey of intra-agency efforts or task forces that have been delegated responsibilities for achieving and maintaining interoperable communications, and report on the status of these efforts, including:

Progress on each interim milestone; information on any policies, directives, guidance, and training established by the Under Secretary of Homeland Security; an assessment of the level of compliance, adoption, and participation among the DHS components with the policies, directives, guidance, and training established by the Under Secretary; and information on any additional resources or authorities needed by the Under Secretary.

This bill will ensure that the Department of Homeland Security's first responders are prepared to meet the challenges of manmade or natural disasters.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of H.R. 615.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 615, the Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act. I want to commend Mr. PAYNE on this momentous day for the hard work he has spent crafting and shaping this bill.

A year ago, when I was Chairman of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, Mr. PAYNE approached me with concern after learning that DHS has not achieved Department-wide interoperability. He told me that although nationwide over \$13 billion has been invested in achieving interoperable communications at the State and local level, the DHS Office of Inspector General, found that "personnel do not have reliable interoperable communications for daily operations, planned events, and emergencies."

As a former U.S. Attorney, who helped set up Indiana's Anti-Terrorism Advisory Council and Fusion Center, I was astounded by this persistent information gap and pledged to work with the gentleman on producing and moving a bill that puts DHS on the path to achieving interoperability.

The bill before us does this by requiring the Department's Under Secretary for Management to develop a strategy for achieving and maintaining interoperable communications between the DHS components. Moreover, it requires DHS to report to Congress on the progress it is making toward achieving these milestones.

Seamless communication between first responders in the aftermath of a disaster is absolutely vital to coordinating an effective response. As we learned on 9/11, inoperability of first responders' communication systems led to confusion, duplication, and discord that cost some brave men and women their lives. The federal government must take the lead in this effort and develop a system that will allow DHS's own components to effectively communicate both day to day and, most importantly, during emergencies.

After nearly a year and three votes on the House floor, I'm proud of the tenacity and dedication of the gentleman in sheparding this bill through both chambers. I'm proud to support this bill that will head directly to the President's desk for signature and thus improve the safety of all our communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 615.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 1190, and motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 805 and H.R. 2576.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 154, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

YEAS—244

Abraham	Gibbs	McSally
Allen	Gibson	Meadows
Amash	Gohmert	Meehan
Amodei	Goodlatte	Messer
Ashford	Gosar	Mica
Babin	Gowdy	Miller (FL)
Barletta	Graham	Miller (MI)
Barr	Granger	Molenaar
Barton	Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Benishek	Graves (LA)	Mullin
Bilirakis	Graves (MO)	Mulvaney
Bishop (MI)	Griffith	Murphy (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Grothman	Neal
Black	Guinta	Neugebauer
Blackburn	Guthrie	Newhouse
Blum	Hanna	Noem
Bost	Hardy	Nugent
Boustany	Harper	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Harris	O'Rourke
Brat	Hartzler	Olson
Bridenstine	Heck (NV)	Palazzo
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Palmer
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Buchanan	Hice, Jody B.	Pearce
Buck	Hill	Perry
Bucshon	Holding	Peterson
Burgess	Hudson	Pittenger
Byrne	Huelskamp	Pitts
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)
Capuano	Hultgren	Poliquin
Carter (GA)	Hunter	Pompeo
Chabot	Hurd (TX)	Posey
Chaffetz	Hurt (VA)	Price, Tom
Clawson (FL)	Issa	Ratcliffe
Coffman	Jenkins (KS)	Reed
Cole	Jenkins (WV)	Reichert
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Comstock	Jolly	Rice (SC)
Conaway	Jones	Rigell
Costello (PA)	Jordan	Roby
Cramer	Joyce	Roe (TN)
Crawford	Katko	Rogers (AL)
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Culberson	King (IA)	Rokita
Curbelo (FL)	King (NY)	Rooney (FL)
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Denham	Kline	Roskam
Dent	Knight	Ross
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rothfus
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Rouzer
Dold	Lamborn	Royce
Donovan	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Duffy	Latta	Salmon
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Sanford
Duncan (TN)	Long	Scalise
Ellmers (NC)	Loudermilk	Schweikert
Emmer (MN)	Love	Scott, Austin
Farenthold	Lucas	Scott, David
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Fleischmann	Lummis	Sessions
Fleming	MacArthur	Shimkus
Flores	Maloney, Sean	Shuster
Forbes	Massie	Simpson
Fortenberry	McCarthy	Sinema
Foster	McCauley	Smith (MO)
Fox	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Gabbard	McMorris	Stefanik
Garrett	Rodgers	Stewart

Stivers	Walden
Stutzman	Walker
Thompson (PA)	Walorski
Thornberry	Walters, Mimi
Tiberi	Weber (TX)
Tipton	Webster (FL)
Trott	Wenstrup
Turner	Westerman
Upton	Whitfield
Valadao	Williams
Walberg	Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—154

Adams	Fattah	Nadler
Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	Nolan
Bass	Fudge	Norcross
Beatty	Gallego	Pallone
Becerra	Garamendi	Pascarell
Bera	Green, Al	Pelosi
Beyer	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Peters
Blumenauer	Hastings	Pingree
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins	Polis
F.	Himes	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Rangel
Bustos	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Israel	Ruiz
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Carney	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Keating	Rush
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Linda
Cicilline	Kildee	T.
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Kuster	Schiff
Cleaver	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Conyers	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lee	Sherman
Costa	Levin	Sires
Crowley	Lewis	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lipinski	Speier
Davis (CA)	Loeback	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Takai
DeFazio	Lowe	Takano
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
DelBene	(NM)	Torres
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Tsongas
Deutch	Maloney	Van Hollen
Dingell	Carolyn	Vargas
Doggett	Matsui	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Velázquez
F.	McDermott	Visclosky
Duckworth	McGovern	Walz
Edwards	McNerney	Wasserman
Ellison	Meeks	Schultz
Eshoo	Moore	Watson Coleman
Esty	Moulton	Welch
Farr	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—35

Aderholt	Grijalva	Payne
Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	Rohrabacher
Carter (TX)	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Russell
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kelly (MS)	Titus
Cook	Kirkpatrick	Vela
Courtney	Lofgren	Wagner
DeSantis	Marchant	Waters, Maxine
Engel	Marino	Westmoreland
Fincher	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Napolitano	

□ 1856

Messrs. CLEAVER, HONDA, and CROWLEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. NEAL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 376 I was delayed due to airline late departure. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 376 on H.R. 1190, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 376 I was delayed by a transportation difficulty. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 376, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF SHOOTING AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH, CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

(Mr. SANFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, in just a moment, I will request a moment of silence, but before I do, I stand here with other Members of the South Carolina delegation to say our colleague JIM CLYBURN, who right now is back home visiting with aggrieved families on the coast of South Carolina, and many of us, like Senator SCOTT and others, will be going back during this week to visit with those same families.

I am joined as well by members of the Congressional Black Caucus and Members of this body who have been deeply shaken by the events of this last week in Charleston, South Carolina.

I rise with this group on behalf of the nine families who have been impacted back home, on behalf of the people of the First District of South Carolina, and on behalf of the people of South Carolina who have shown a whole lot of heart and a whole lot of love here over the last week.

I say this because, less than a week ago, as we all know, a young man with incomprehensible malice came into the Mother Emanuel AME Church on Calhoun Street in Charleston, South Carolina, and did the unthinkable as he joined a Bible study and he gunned down nine of the members, the parishioners, there in the church.

Fortunately, our story doesn't end there because the family members of the victims also did the unthinkable. I say that because there, at the bond hearing, they did the unimaginable, the incomprehensible in, I guess, showing human grace is a reflection of God's grace and what is talked about in Romans in not repaying evil with evil, but repaying evil with good because, at the bond hearing, the first family comes up, and they say: "I am in incomprehensible pain, but I forgive you."

The next family comes up: "I am in incredible pain, but I forgive you."

Those were the words that were repeated by each of the nine families: "I forgive you, I forgive you, and I forgive you."

That set in motion and, if you will, set the stage this last week in Charleston for a level of community that I have never before seen in my life and amazing things done at the church and in the community at large.

It is for that reason that we all stand here to remember the names of the nine victims and to pause for a moment of silence here in just a moment.

If I might, let me read the names of the victims: Reverend Clementa Pinckney; Tywanza Sanders; Cynthia Hurd; Reverend Sharonda Coleman-Singleton; Myra Thompson; Ethel Lance; Reverend Daniel Simmons, Sr.; Reverend Depayne Middleton-Doctor; and Susie Jackson.

Would you all join me and join us in a moment of silence.

DOMAIN OPENNESS THROUGH CONTINUED OVERSIGHT MATTERS ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 805) to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibility over the Internet domain name system until the Comptroller General of the United States submits to Congress a report on the role of the NTIA with respect to such system, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 25, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—378

Abraham	Black	Calvert	Collins (NY)	Honda	Newhouse
Adams	Blackburn	Capps	Comstock	Hoyer	Noem
Aderholt	Blum	Cárdenas	Conaway	Hudson	Nolan
Aguilar	Blumenauer	Carney	Connolly	Huelskamp	Norcross
Allen	Bonamici	Carson (IN)	Conyers	Huffman	Nugent
Amodei	Bost	Carter (GA)	Cooper	Huizenga (MI)	Nunes
Ashford	Boustany	Cartwright	Costa	Hultgren	O'Rourke
Barletta	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)	Costello (PA)	Hunter	Olson
Barr	F.	Chabot	Cramer	Hurd (TX)	Palazzo
Barton	Brady (PA)	Chaffetz	Crawford	Hurt (VA)	Pallone
Bass	Brady (TX)	Cicilline	Crenshaw	Israel	Palmer
Beatty	Brat	Clark (MA)	Crowley	Issa	Pascarella
Becerra	Bridenstine	Clarke (NY)	Cuellar	Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen
Benishek	Brooks (IN)	Clawson (FL)	Culberson	Jenkins (WV)	Pearce
Bera	Brooks (IN)	Clay	Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Beyer	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Perlmutter
Bilirakis	Buchanan	Coffman	Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Perry
Bishop (GA)	Buchson	Cohen	Davis, Danny	Johnson, Sam	Peters
Bishop (MI)	Burgess	Cole	Davis, Rodney	Jolly	Peterson
Bishop (UT)	Bustos	Collins (GA)	DeFazio	Jordan	Pingree
	Butterfield		DeGette	Joyce	Pittenger
			Delaney	Kaptur	Pitts
			DeLauro	Katko	Pocan
			DelBene	Keating	Poliquin
			Denham	Kelly (IL)	Polis
			Dent	Kelly (PA)	Pompeo
			DeSaulnier	Kennedy	Price (NC)
			DesJarlais	Kildee	Price, Tom
			Deutch	Kilmer	Quigley
			Diaz-Balart	Kind	Rangel
			Dingell	King (IA)	Reed
			Doggett	King (NY)	Reichert
			Dold	Kinzing (IL)	Renacci
			Donovan	Kline	Rice (NY)
			Doyle, Michael	Knight	Rice (SC)
			F.	Kuster	Richmond
			Duckworth	LaMalfa	Rigell
			Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Roby
			Duncan (TN)	Lance	Roe (TN)
			Edwards	Langevin	Rogers (AL)
			Ellison	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
			Ellmers (NC)	Larson (CT)	Rokita
			Emmer (MN)	Latta	Rooney (FL)
			Eshoo	Lawrence	Ros-Lehtinen
			Esty	Lee	Roskam
			Farenthold	Levin	Ross
			Farr	Lewis	Rothfus
			Fattah	Lieu, Ted	Rouzer
			Fitzpatrick	Lipinski	Royce
			Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Ruiz
			Flores	Loebach	Ruppersberger
			Forbes	Long	Rush
			Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Ryan (OH)
			Foster	Love	Ryan (WI)
			Fox	Lowenthal	Sánchez, Linda
			Frankel (FL)	Lowey	T.
			Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Sarbanes
			Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
			Fudge	Lujan Grisham	Schakowsky
			Gabbard	(NM)	Schiff
			Gallego	Luján, Ben Ray	Schrader
			Garamendi	(NM)	Schweikert
			Garrett	Lynch	Scott (VA)
			Gibbs	MacArthur	Scott, Austin
			Gibson	Maloney,	Scott, David
			Gohmert	Carolyn	Serrano
			Goodlatte	Maloney, Sean	Sessions
			Gowdy	Matsui	Sewell (AL)
			Graham	McCarthy	Sherman
			Granger	McCaul	Shimkus
			Graves (GA)	McCollum	Shuster
			Graves (LA)	McDermott	Simpson
			Graves (MO)	McGovern	Sinema
			Grayson	McHenry	Sires
			Green, Al	McKinley	Slaughter
			Green, Gene	McMorris	Smith (MO)
			Griffith	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
			Grothman	McNerney	Smith (NJ)
			Guinta	McSally	Smith (TX)
			Guthrie	Meadows	Smith (WA)
			Hahn	Meehan	Speier
			Hanna	Meeks	Stefanik
			Hardy	Messer	Stewart
			Harper	Mica	Stivers
			Harris	Miller (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
			Hartzler	Miller (MI)	Takai
			Hastings	Moore	Takano
			Heck (NV)	Mooney (WV)	Thompson (CA)
			Heck (WA)	Moore	Thompson (MS)
			Hensarling	Moulton	Thompson (PA)
			Hice, Jody B.	Mullin	Thornberry
			Higgins	Murphy (FL)	Tiberi
			Hill	Murphy (PA)	Tipton
			Himes	Nadler	Tonko
			Hinojosa	Neal	Torres
			Holding	Neugebauer	Trott

Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski

Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—25

Amash
Babin
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Byrne
Capuano
Duffy
Fleming
Gosar

Herrera Beutler
Jones
Labrador
Lummis
Massie
McClintock
Mulvaney
Poe (TX)
Posey

Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Salmon
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Stutzman

NOT VOTING—30

Brown (FL)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clyburn
Cook
Courtney
DeSantis
Engel
Fincher

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kelly (MS)
Kirkpatrick
Lofgren
Marchant
Marino
Meng

Napolitano
Payne
Roybal-Allard
Russell
Sanchez, Loretta
Titus
Vela
Wagner
Waters, Maxine
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1909

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to provide for certain requirements relating to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TSCA MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HURD of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2576) to modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 1, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—398

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt

Aguilar
Allen
Amash

Amodei
Ashford
Babin

Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clever
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Portenberry
Foster
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador

LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarella
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe

Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)

Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner

Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

NAYS—1

McClintock

NOT VOTING—34

Brown (FL)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clyburn
Cook
Courtney
DeSantis
Engel
Fincher
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva

Gutiérrez
Harris
Hudson
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kelly (MS)
Kirkpatrick
Lofgren
Marchant
Marino
Meng
Napolitano

Payne
Roybal-Allard
Russell
Sanchez, Loretta
Titus
Vela
Wagner
Waters, Maxine
Westmoreland
Zinke

□ 1916

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for votes on Tuesday, June 23, 2015. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote 376, “yea” on rollcall vote 377, and “yea” on rollcall vote 378.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2822, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2042, RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 26, 2015, THROUGH JULY 6, 2015

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-177) on the resolution (H. Res. 333) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2042) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units before requiring compliance with such rule, and to allow States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability; and providing for proceedings during the period from June 26, 2015, through July 6, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECOGNIZING OUR MILITARY FAMILIES

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, behind every man and woman in uniform serving our country are family members: husbands, wives, mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, sons, daughters, and other family members who make sacrifices as members of military families.

Recently, I attended the dedication of a new Minnesota military family tribute that is now part of the Capitol Mall area in St. Paul at our State Capitol. It was built entirely with private donations. It commemorates the military Gold Star families, Blue Star families, and families of our veterans. This memorial is the first of its kind in the country, and it recognizes the military family members that do so much to support our servicemen and -women and our veterans.

Being a member of a military family comes with many sacrifices. It means many sleepless nights during deployment. It means unexpected moves around the country and serving as the frontline resource when our soldiers transition into a new life. Every military family does this proudly.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Bill and Teri Popp and everyone who has worked so hard to make this tribute recognizing our military families possible.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank before its charter expires on June 30.

In fiscal year 2014 alone, the Ex-Im Bank supported \$27.4 billion worth of U.S. exports, with \$10.7 billion of that total representing exports from small businesses. Additionally, 90 percent of all Ex-Im transactions directly supported small business and more than 163,000 American jobs. That is why 180 Democrats signed a discharge petition to force a vote on this important issue.

Despite this data, some Republicans wrongly think the Ex-Im Bank represents crony capitalism that should be ended. For those Members, I will leave you with this: Men lie, women lie, but numbers don't lie. Reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

NATURAL GAS VEHICLES SHOULDN'T BE PENALIZED IN THE TAX CODE

(Mr. YOUNG of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance of a simple modification to our Tax Code that will greatly support the consumer-driven growth of natural gas in the transportation sector.

Today's abundant and domestically produced natural gas is an increasingly important fuel to our transportation sector, from small passenger vehicles in my home State of Indiana, to container ships that transport goods from America's heartland to overseas markets.

Now, our Tax Code is still taxing cars and trucks that run on natural gas at a higher rate than their diesel equivalent because the tax was instituted years ago when our energy picture looked vastly different. We need to correct this disparity. It is a simple fix and just one example of how Congress can create a more level playing field while diversifying our energy mix.

I urge my colleagues to work with me on this matter.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, last week Pope Francis echoed the chorus of 97 percent of climate scientists whose findings prove that climate change is real and is manmade, and climate

change has the potential to destroy the only planet that we have. Let me say that again. Climate change is real, it is manmade, and it can reverse all the progress we have made as a nation.

Pope Francis frames the reality of climate change in a way that we must consider if we are to protect our environment as directed by our Creator for future generations, future economic development, and future progress. The leader of the Catholic Church accurately points out that it is a moral imperative to act on climate change; it is a moral imperative to act as a good steward of the environment and the gifts we have been given.

I thank Pope Francis, and I hope the words he shared last week will ring true with all of us, including those who continue to deny climate change, both in this body and around the world. I hope the Pope's encyclical will encourage deniers to work with us to find creative ways to clean up our environment, help create jobs, and make our world just a little bit better for our kids and grandkids.

RELIGIOUS CLEANSING

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Roman Empire was notorious in its massacre of Christians 2,000 years ago. Now Christians are once again facing deadly persecution. Barbaric terrorist groups like ISIS are stalking and attacking Christians wherever they find them. Christians are disappearing, and some are fleeing countries like Syria and Iraq, home to Christians since the days of early Christianity.

ISIS boasts of brutally killing and enslaving thousands of Christians. There are more and more reports of ISIS sex-trafficking young girls that are stolen away from their Christian parents. ISIS even posts videos online of their barbaric beheading of Christians.

Why the hate, kidnapping, and murder? Because Christians will not renounce their Christian faith. The world, and the United States in particular, needs to denounce the murder of people based on their religious beliefs, whether Christians, Jews, or Muslims.

We cannot accept nor tolerate ISIS' genocide of Christians. Justice demands ISIS be held accountable for their crimes of religious cleansing.

And that is just the way it is.

JUNE IS NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

(Mr. VALADAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on the House floor

today may not know that June is National Dairy Month. As a dairy farmer myself, I believe this month is a perfect opportunity to recognize how important the dairy industry is to the Central Valley.

Not only are there dairy farms in all 50 States, but dairy is the number one agriculture business in 10 States, including Idaho, New York, and Wisconsin. However, my home State of California is the biggest dairy producer in the country and is responsible for 21.3 percent of the U.S. milk supply. My own district, California 21, produces the most dairy of any congressional district in the Nation.

However, dairy isn't just important to farmers. Not only do Americans consume at least two cups of dairy products each and every day, but America's dairy industry is important to our Nation's agriculture market and our entire economy.

Dairy farms across the country improve our national economy. The U.S. dairy industry creates an estimated \$140 billion in economic output, \$29 billion in household earnings, and is responsible for creating more than 900,000 jobs.

So this summer when you stop for ice cream on a hot night or a bowl of cereal on a rushed morning, remember the hard-working Americans who brought dairy to your grocery store.

□ 1930

CONGRATULATING INGERSOLL RAND

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last month, Ingersoll Rand, a global leader in products that enhance energy efficiency, productivity, and operations for its customers, celebrated the 50th anniversary of its Mocksville, North Carolina, plant.

Opened in 1965, the Mocksville plant began machining rotary components for air compressors. Throughout the years, the workers in Mocksville have manufactured assemblies and components for a number of products within Ingersoll Rand's portfolio.

Within the last 6 years, the plant has experienced tremendous growth as select assembly operations for Trane and Thermo King equipment were moved to the plant. During difficult economic times, these jobs have strengthened the local economy.

The company's major investment in Davie County is a tribute to the area's skilled workforce, men and women who are dedicated to producing the best products in the world.

Congratulations to everyone at Ingersoll Rand in Mocksville as you celebrate this significant milestone.

CONFEDERATE FLAG

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley's call to remove the Confederate battle flag from the South Carolina statehouse grounds, and North Carolina Governor Pat McCrory's call to discontinue State-issued Confederate flag license plates.

As one who grew up in the South, Mr. Speaker, and a proud North Carolinian, I fully understand that to many the Confederate flag represents history and heritage of their forefathers who fought for self-governance of the States. However, I cannot ignore that this same flag has also been used as a symbol of hate, and therefore causes immense pain for many of our citizens—yes, our brothers and sisters.

In Romans, chapter 14, the Apostle Paul writes, "Let us therefore make every effort to do what leads to peace and to mutual edification. Do not destroy the work of God for the sake of food"—or, might I add, a flag.

Let us be proud of our heritage, and let us give our descendants reason to be proud of our proper and thoughtful works today.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MICHAEL JAMES SULLIVAN

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to celebrate the life of Michael James Sullivan and offer my condolences to his friends and family. Michael passed away on June 14, 2015, after an 11-year battle against ALS, also known as Lou Gehrig's disease.

When Michael was diagnosed with ALS in 2004, he was determined not to let the disease control his life. He found hope in his family, friends, and faith. This hope encouraged him to become an advocate for the 30,000 other Americans who live with ALS.

Mike encouraged others and their families to be strong and resilient in the face of illness. His upbeat and optimistic personality was a constant reminder to take advantage of every opportunity that life hands us. He was a frequent visitor to my office. He was a tireless self-advocate who remained upbeat, compassionate, and personable—even in the face of a horribly debilitating disease.

Mr. Speaker, we can all learn from Michael Sullivan's exemplary service, selflessness, and love. He will be greatly missed. His friends and family are blessed to have known such an honorable man. In the words of Michael: "One day together, we can create a world without ALS."

PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House showed leadership tonight in passing H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015.

The IPAB board was going to be very problematic for seniors, and H.R. 1190 is going to be a very important tool in correcting the wrongs of the Affordable Care Act and preserving access to health care. It would indeed have had an unelected board making Medicare spending decisions which, again, would be shifting power to Washington, D.C., and away from that all-important doctor-patient relationship, where it really should be.

We want to talk about savings in the medical field—and we need to—because not nearly enough is done, whether it was in the Affordable Care Act or other conversations around D.C. We need to talk about and work on actually achieving cost cutting, reduction of unnecessary costs delivering health care, litigation, and the time it takes to bring miracle pharmaceuticals to markets.

These are the kinds of things that we need to be doing to make health care more affordable and, indeed, more accessible.

CALIFORNIA DROUGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all sure it is going to be that controversial, but I was just looking outside the Capitol before I came in to make this presentation, and it is raining. It is a downpour. For those of us from California, it has been a long time since we have seen a downpour.

The Golden State, the seventh largest economy in the world and home to over 35 million people, is in the throes of a historic drought. This is the fourth year, and it is a world of hurt in California.

The economy is moving along. We are not complaining about the economy. Many parts of it are moving along. But

for everyone in the State of California, whether you are in the far north up near Mount Shasta or way down here in the San Diego area, we are hurting.

There is a lot of talk. Water restrictions are taking place in every city, whether you are on the coast, up in the north, or in the far south at Laguna Beach. Wherever you happen to be in the State of California, these restrictions are tightening up on the ability of communities to prosper, grow, and keep their lawns green, but more important in some communities, to even live there.

In some parts of the Central Valley, down here in the Fresno area, there are communities that are out of water. Communities of 3,000, 5,000, maybe even 10,000 people, have virtually no water at all.

This is a problem today. As we look to the future, we are going to see the State's economy and population grow and the demand for water will ever increase, unless we do something. What we must do is develop a water plan for all of California.

Unfortunately, what we do most of the time in California is fight over water. There is the famous saying from Mark Twain: "Whiskey is for drinking. Water is for fighting over."

And so it has been ever since my great-great-grandfather came to California in the early days of the Gold Rush up here in the mother lode region. You couldn't mine without water. And fighting over that water was the order of the day, and it is today.

So as this entire State and much of the Southwest region—Nevada, southern Oregon, Utah, New Mexico, and even the western parts of Texas—suffer through this historic drought, we have taken to fighting in California. And I want to spend a few moments this evening talking about what we must do immediately and then a long-term solution for the State of California.

Immediate, we are going to have to seek help. The State of California is using some bond money from past bond acts and some bond money from the historic passage of Proposition 1 last November to immediately try to fix problems that exist in those communities without water. And so that money will begin to flow to those communities, wherever they happen to be.

There are a couple up here in the Sacramento Valley and further down in the San Joaquin Valley. The deserts have always been without water, so this is not new to them, although it is more extreme.

It is good that the bond act can provide immediate relief, but the rest of the short-term solutions will come from Washington. I want to congratulate and thank the administration for providing \$110 million of money for a variety of projects. Some of those projects are to dig deeper wells for those communities without water, to

find ways to improve the conservation immediately, and to set about other programs that are short-term in nature—all to the good. And that should continue.

In the days ahead, we are going to take up the appropriations bill for water. In that appropriations bill, we should direct the administration to do what it is doing—and to continue doing it through this drought—and that is to focus all of those resources on the immediate drought that is occurring.

Whether it is aid for ranchers and farmers or cities, it makes no difference. It is broad and it needs to be done, and it should line up with Proposition 1 of the last November ballot. That is both short-term and long-term. So the Federal Government supports those projects that would be funded under that \$7 billion bond act that the citizens of California voted for in an overwhelming majority.

But I would also like to talk about the long-term here. Because droughts will come and go, and we must be prepared not only in California, but across the West.

For many years, the Department of Water Resources in California has looked at the problem and has made many, many suggestions; but until about 4 years ago, those suggestions were never put together in a comprehensive plan.

I am familiar with this. I am a water warrior in California. I have represented this part of California for nearly 40 years, the great Central Valley of California. I will put up another map so you can get a better look at it.

So the plans that were put together by the California Department of Water Resources deal with the Sacramento River, which flows south, and the San Joaquin River, which flows north from the Fresno area. This is way beyond Sacramento. Mount Shasta and Oregon, it is way up there.

These are the two great rivers of California, together with the Colorado, which is way to the south. It flows into an area here which is called the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. This is the largest estuary of the Western Hemisphere, which is on the West Coast. From Alaska to Chile, there is no other estuary as important to fish and species of all kinds and to the environment and the economy of California.

As this water flows down the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River, it is collected here and pumped south into the San Joaquin Valley and over the Tehachapi Mountains way down here to southern California. That is the Great Southern water project and the Federal water project.

But the result of that pumping is an extreme decline in the environment of the delta, Suisun Bay, and San Francisco Bay. Along with it, the salmon and other species have been largely decimated by those projects.

So what are we to do? We will take the information that has been developed over these many years by the California Department of Water Resources and develop a comprehensive plan.

One plan, which actually dates back some 60 years now, is one that would take the water around the delta and deliver it to the pumps down here at Tracy. That plan, first proposed in the forties and then in the fifties, was taken up by our current Governor, Governor Jerry Brown, in the late 1970s and early 1980s. It was called the Peripheral Canal—peripheral, that is around the delta, delivering water to the pumps.

I represented the delta at that time, and I said: Governor, what you have managed to create here is the great vampire ditch.

The Peripheral Canal was big enough to take the water from the Sacramento, depriving the delta of the freshwater that it needed for its environment, and deliver it to the pumps.

So we had another great water war. It actually went on the ballot, and the people of California decided not to build that canal. And so there it sat until the second iteration of our current Governor, and he decided it was time to address this problem.

And so now his suggestion is, instead of a canal, bury it underground so nobody can see it. He said: Don't worry about the canal. Don't worry. You will never see it.

I said: Because it is not going to get built?

He said: No, no. Because it will be underground.

Two massive tunnels, each 40 feet in diameter—about as tall as this Chamber, actually, if we consider this is probably 50 feet in here—big enough to take all of the water out of the Sacramento River half of the year, creating an existential threat to the delta.

Something needs to be done, no doubt about it. So by cobbling together the plans that were developed by the Department of Water Resources and others, I put together what I called, a Water Plan for All California.

By the way, this tunnel was first priced at \$25 billion and did not create 1 gallon of new water—not 1 gallon of new water.

□ 1945

What it did was to create an existential threat to the delta, in that it was big enough to deprive the delta of the fresh water half of the year. I said: Governor, that doesn't work. Let's look at this in a serious way that can create water for California's future.

This proposal was put together from plans that the State agencies had developed in the past. I commend this to anybody that really wants to look at what California's water future could be. Instead of a battle royal, which we

are now commenced with as we fight over these tunnels, and \$25 billion—oh, by the way, there is a new iteration of it, and they are throwing aside most of the habitat restoration and most of the environmental restoration and just going for the straight tunnels and just a little bit of mitigation.

Let's do something different. Let's create water that California will need in its future. Let's build a system that will actually deliver more water for California, while protecting the environment, and that is what this plan is all about, a water plan for all California.

There are the following elements in it: conservation; recycling; storage; fixing the delta, which actually has to be fixed; letting science run the process rather than politics; and make sure you protect the water rights that have been in existence for more than a decade and a half—excuse me—a century and a half.

These are the principal elements, and we are going to go through them one at a time and explain why, if we were to spend, let's say, the full \$17 billion, the current cost of the tunnels, and that is the first bid; that is not the final cost. Let's say we would spend that \$17 billion.

Let's allocate some of it for conservation, agricultural conservation. Now, every agriculturalist—and I am one—in California will say, Yes, but we are already conserving water. Indeed, we are, and a lot of water conservation has taken place, but that much more can be done again.

There are somewhere, by the estimates of the State, 3 to 4 million acre feet of new water, available simply through conservation, and that does not include the urban conservation.

Now, understand, in today's drought, conservation is on everybody's mind, and in fact, it is mandated by law and executive order, but we can do maybe 3 million acre feet of new water. That is enough for over 120,000 homes a year per million acre feet.

Secondly, recycling—I often say, and I think this is more or less accurate, that the fifth largest river on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere are the sanitation plants in Southern California.

Whoa, what do you mean the fifth biggest river? Well, consider this: the Colorado River, over here, abutting Arizona and Nevada, water is taken from the Colorado River, 200 miles into the Los Angeles Basin.

Water is taken from northern California, the Sacramento River, in a canal, pumps here at the delta, in a canal, 5,000 feet over the Tehachapi Mountains, into the Los Angeles Basin. That water is cleaned once. It is used in the Los Angeles Basin, cleaned again, in most cases, to a higher standard than the day it arrives in southern California; and nearly all of it is dumped into the ocean.

What? You do that in California? Well, we do. Fortunately, Orange County, a bastion of conservatism, is far ahead of the rest of the State and probably the Nation in water recycling. We need to do more of it.

For a few million, a couple of million dollars—excuse me, a couple of billion dollars, we could recycle at least a million acre feet of new water in southern California, water that is already there, water that is not being used.

In northern California, the San Francisco Bay area, for my friends in San Francisco, you are taking what you tell the world is the cleanest water in America, right out of Yosemite National Park, piping it across the Central Valley into the San Francisco area, clean it—well, you really don't have to do much cleaning because it is already clean—use it once, then you pipe it a mile offshore and dump it in the ocean.

Recycling is necessary in every part of California. Another million, perhaps, more acre feet of water could be available through recycling.

So conservation, recycling, 3, 4 million acre feet—we are getting close to what California needs in the future.

So where are you going to put the water? Even in the midst of a drought, we have had heavy rain flows—no place to put the water.

My colleague from northern California, the Sacramento Valley, Mr. LAMALFA and I have introduced a bill to build an off-stream storage reservoir here on the west side of the Sacramento Valley, a reservoir that could hold 2 million acre feet of water—well, slightly less—and that water would be available when needed.

It could flow down the Sacramento River, sweetening, pushing back the saltwater in the delta; or it could be used for agricultural purposes in the Sacramento Valley or down in the San Joaquin Valley.

It also gives flexibilities to the great reservoirs of Shasta, the Oroville Reservoir on the Feather River, and the Folsom Reservoir here on the Sacramento River, giving flexibility to the water managers.

When it is needed for salmon and other species, you could use the water out of Sites Reservoir. When it is needed for agriculture or for water quality in the delta, you could use it out of Sites Reservoir, keeping the cold water in Shasta, Oroville, or Folsom that is necessary for the salmon that spawn in those rivers.

Storage, off-stream storage, off-stream storage here, just east of Contra Costa, in Los Vaqueros Reservoir, off-stream storage further south down here in Los Banos at the San Luis Reservoir, and the biggest off-stream reservoir of all, the great aquifer of the Sacramento, San Joaquin Valley, the great Central Valley of California, arguably, the second or third largest aquifer

anywhere in the world, one that is now seriously overdrafted, as Californians, agriculture, cities, and others thirst for the water in this drought.

These storage reservoirs in northern California are just one part of the storage systems that are needed for the future. The other part actually exists here in southern California, out here along the coast, the West Basin, the San Fernando Valley, the San Gabriel Valley, the Santa Ana in Orange County, and as you move east into Riverside and San Bernardino.

These are all historic aquifers that could be available to take that recycled water, put it back in the ground, pull it out, clean it, and recycle and recycle and eventually, these aquifers, many of which are contaminated, would be clean and available for the future.

We could probably add all of the capacity of these aquifers in southern California and have greater storage capacity than the largest reservoir in the State of California, which is Shasta Reservoir, way up here in northern California.

By using the aquifers as a storage facility in what we call conjunctive water management, when you have a lot of rain, you store it—store it off-stream, store it below ground in the aquifers. Then when you have your dry periods, as California historically does, you can take that water out, but you cannot take out as much as currently being taken from these aquifers in California.

We are seeing the collapse of the aquifers in the San Joaquin Valley. We are seeing the land subsiding in some places, as much as a foot a year as the water is extracted, so we have to stop that, and so water management becomes extremely important in the process.

I want to now turn to the delta, put this delta map back up and remind us, the Sacramento River coming down, the San Joaquin River coming north. From the north, the Sacramento, from the south, the San Joaquin, meeting here in the great delta of California—this delta is seriously at risk, as I said a moment ago.

What to do about this? The Governor's plan, to take water around it, to deliver it to the pumps down here, I think, creates an existential threat. Don't build something that could destroy the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere.

Instead, build something that is the right size, recognizing that while the delta is imperiled, perhaps by earthquakes, perhaps by sea level rise, nonetheless, all the plants call for water to be pumped out of the delta, even if it is taken around the delta.

The first thing to do, right now, is to armor, strengthen those key levees in the delta that are necessary for the transfer of water to the pumps, for the

protection of the cities here on the eastern side, and to make sure that you are able to always be able to take that water through the delta. It is called the armored delta.

Under the Governor's plan or my plan or any other plan, those levees are going to be used for at least the next two decades, if not for a much longer period of time. Improve the delta, levees, and that is a job for the Federal Government.

I talked earlier about what could be done immediately by the Federal Government, and that is to secure some of these key delta channels by improving the levees on those channels. That is step one.

Step two is what I call science. This area, the richest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere, home and nursery to salmon, to other species, such as the delta smelt and many other species, requires very careful attention and very careful scientific study.

We are talking over here, in a place called Rio Vista, about building a science center, bringing together all the State and Federal agencies so they can work in a collaborative science program. That is a great program called the Rivers Program. There are other science studies that are underway.

You have to let science drive this process. You cannot allow politics to drive it; otherwise, you put at risk the communities in this area; you put at risk the environment; you put at risk the fish species, and you put at risk the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere.

Keep in mind that the Congress of the United States, twice in the last 4 years, has passed legislation that removes the environmental protections for this estuarine system and simply grabs 800,000 acre feet of water that was meant for the environment and sends it into the southern valley, into the southern valley here.

It is a rip-off. It is part of what has taken place in California since the gold miners came in the 1850s, and that is, if you want water, you simply take it from somebody. In this case, you are taking it from the delta, from the environment, from the agriculture; and you are pushing aside the environmental protections. Don't do it. It is not necessary.

There is another thing, in addition to fixing the levees, and I call it the "Little Sip, Big Gulp." Here it is. This is a map of the delta of California. Sacramento is up here, the confluence of the American River and the Sacramento River. That is the State capital. This is the delta here.

We were talking about it in the larger map. San Francisco Bay is over here, Suisun Bay and the rest. This is the heart of the delta. Stockton is down here. Tracy and the big massive

pumps at Tracy, capable of taking well over 15,000 cubic feet per second, are down here in this area.

The tunnels that the Governor wants to build would start here, travel through some of the richest agricultural land in the delta, or in the Nation, agricultural land that has been in production since the 1850s and 1860s, along the Sacramento River, displacing, oh, maybe 4 or 5 miles of habitat and agriculture and communities along this area. The tunnel would come down into this—the tunnels would come down into this area.

\$17 billion—why would you do something that, first of all, is large enough to allow for the destruction of the delta? Why would you spend all that money, when a good portion of that project is already built? This is it.

This is the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel, an ocean, a channel that begins at San Francisco Bay, comes up the Sacramento River, and then, in a channel that was built by the Army Corps of Engineers, all the way up to the Port of Sacramento here in West Sacramento, on the other side of the State capital.

This is a deep water shipping channel. Ocean ships come into San Francisco Bay and come all the way up here. It is a pretty good economic activity. Agricultural products are shipped out.

I was over that way this last weekend, and they have log decks. I guess these are logs from the various fires that have occurred in California, and those are going to be shipped off to China. I sometimes wonder why we don't use those logs for the things that we should be making in America, but that is another subject for another day.

So what is an alternative? I call this the little sip solution, "Little Sip, Big Gulp solution." Take the water out of the Sacramento River here, 3,000—not 15,000—3,000 cubic feet per second. We know how to do that. Fish screens are already built to do that.

□ 2000

Let it flow down the Deep Water Channel to about here, just north of Rio Vista. Put in a single ship lock and a pump.

Alternative one: put it in a small pipe through the delta down here to this area; and then, in an open channel along what is called Old River, take it down to the pumps at Tracy, 3,000 cubic feet per second.

You could do that most every day of the year, and it could deliver 2 million acre-feet of water to the pumps at Tracy in most years. In this drought year, it wouldn't be possible.

A second alternative would be to take it down the Deep Water Channel, 3,000 cubic feet, to the shipping lock and the pump, put it into a canal that goes behind Rio Vista here, crosses Sherman Island at the confluence of

the Sacramento and the San Joaquin Rivers, and over to Contra Costa County to the pumps.

This is a very interesting solution because this solution creates a fail-safe solution for about 7 million people that live in the San Francisco Bay area, because this particular route intersects six aqueducts: the Solano aqueduct here, this would intersect it down here in Contra Costa; East Bay Municipal Utility aqueduct; the Contra Costa County aqueduct; the Los Vaqueros aqueduct for the Los Vaqueros river; zone seven, down here in the Livermore area, over here in this area; and also the South Bay aqueduct, going all the way down to Silicon Valley.

What has happened, if this solution were chosen, should the need ever arise for some reason, these critical water districts that supply the water to this entire Bay area could get access to the Sacramento River water. So if, for some reason, the delta was to become saline as a result of a collapse of a levee system or any other reason, we have a fail-safe solution for the entire Bay region, except Marin County, which has its own water system.

Either of these is a system that would be right-sized. That is a Little Sip big enough to provide 2 million acre-feet of water, which is roughly 40, 45 percent of the amount of water needed south of the delta for southern California, for Los Angeles, and for the San Joaquin Valley.

That is the Little Sip solution: a route through the delta, a pipeline from here to Old River, and then an open channel on the east side of Old River to the pumps, or a canal across Contra Costa and Solano County. Either of them would work. And it would be a fraction of the cost of the massive twin tunnels that would come this direction, destroying the agricultural communities here in Portland and Clarksburg and putting at risk the entire delta because of the enormous size.

This is a 15,000-cubic-foot-per-second tunnel system. Now, granted, they are only going to build three of the intakes here on the Sacramento River. Okay. It is good to have only three. That gives you 9,000, which is roughly two-thirds of the water going down the Sacramento River half of the year.

So what does that mean for the delta? It means the delta is going to be salty and deprived of the freshwater that this estuary needs. And all they need to do is to put in one more intake, and then they can take all of the water half of the year.

Don't do it. Never build something that could be so destructive of such a precious natural resource as the delta.

So this is the Little Sip.

Where does the rest of the water come? It is called the Big Gulp. Even in this drought year, there have been two very heavy rains that have sent a surge of water down the San Joaquin and

down the Sacramento. The pumps were turned on—not to their full might, but the pumps were turned on, and the water was shipped to the south.

Okay. It worked. Can it work in the future in normal years?

There is sufficient water in the delta in a normal year to get another 2, 2.5 million acre-feet of water out of the delta, itself, and that is the Big Gulp. So you combine a small facility with a Big Gulp when the water is available in the delta.

Now, keep in mind, this project and the twin tunnel project that the Governor is proposing both require storage south of the delta. Neither project will work. And, in fact, the California water system today will not work without storage south of the delta.

That is why—to back up to a map of all California—we have to have storage offsite, at Sites Reservoir. There is talk of enlarging Shasta Reservoir, way up here in this area. There is talk of building a new reservoir here on the San Joaquin River at Hanford's flat. There is talk of enlarging—in fact, this one is almost certain to happen—enlarging Los Vaqueros Reservoir. The San Luis Reservoir down here needs to be rebuilt because of earthquake safety, and it could be expanded.

There is another reservoir site just south of it, Los Banos Grande. That is another large reservoir. And, of course, the aquifers in the entire Central Valley of California, and we have already talked about the aquifers in southern California.

So you have to have storage south of the delta. If you have storage south of the delta, then the Governor's plan or my plan, the Little Sip, Big Gulp plan will work. Storage is absolutely essential in all of these configurations. Fail to do the storage, and nothing is going to work.

Let me just review what we have been talking about here. We have been talking about a water plant for all California.

Conservation, to be sure, the great agricultural areas—even over here in the Salinas Valley—conservation along this entire area, conservation in southern California, the great metropolitan areas, and in the Bay area. In doing so, the State's own estimate was 5 million. Let's just say you get 3 million acre-feet. Agricultural conservation, urban conservation, 3 million acre-feet of new water, water that is currently unavailable but there.

Recycling, we talked about recycling here in southern California. A \$2 to \$3 billion investment will give you 1 million acre-feet of water, and you already have the storage systems in place, the underground aquifers of southern California. Similarly, recycling in the Bay area.

Sacramento, right here, starting just a month ago, a new recycling program, a \$2 billion recycling program in Sac-

ramento to recycle water—some for that area, the rest to put clean water down the river rather than some of the water, which is a little shady.

So recycling, another million acre-feet at least, maybe more, as you bring on the recycling in the Bay area.

Now we have got 3 to 4 million acre-feet of water.

Storage systems, it is estimated that the Sites Reservoir can add in this drought here, were it available, would have been 900,000 acre-feet of water in this drought year. Of course it is not built; it is not available. But on average, it should provide some 500,000—400,000 to 600,000 acre-feet of water annually out of Sites Reservoir; plus, as I described earlier, the ability to reoperate the great reservoirs and, together, be able to perhaps get even more water as a result of Sites Reservoir. The other reservoirs can provide additional water also.

So we ought to be able, through these processes, to get somewhere near 5 million acre-feet of new water for California. If we have conservation, if we have the storage and we are able to get through the current drought, it is a safe bet that 5 million acre-feet of annual water yield will carry California into the next 30 to 50 years and beyond that, depending on population growth and technologies.

I had not mentioned the use of this water out here. Well, that is the Pacific Ocean. Desalinization and recycling use exactly the same technology. Recycling happens to be cheaper, in that it takes less energy to clean recycled water than to clean the ocean water because the ocean water has a lot of salts and other things in it, and it is just more expensive. But clearly, desalinization is also in our future.

Down here, in the San Diego area, a new recycling plant is going online this year. They have been talking about one in Santa Barbara that actually was built but then mothballed because it rained again. But that one in Santa Barbara is likely to go back online as a result of the current drought and in anticipation of future droughts.

So desalinization is also in California's future.

Those are the basic elements: conservation; recycling; creation of new storage systems; fixing the delta, the levees; Little Sip, Big Gulp strategy; science-driven process.

Keep in mind, you have got to be right on the science; otherwise, you are going to destroy this extraordinarily valuable habitat of the delta and other places.

Finally, you had better be paying attention to the water rights and the laws of California, which, unfortunately, in the first iteration of the bill that passed Congress 4 years ago, just blew aside California water rights. So if you want to start a big, big water war, if you want to heighten and en-

flame a water war in California, push aside the water rights which, incidentally, is now taking place as a result of the drought.

That is a Water Plan for All of California. It is here. It is available. My Web site has it. I recommend it to anybody that is interested in a solution for California's long-term water problems; and also, I recommend to people that we have the Federal Government in the short term align its water policy programs from the EPA—the Environmental Protection Agency—the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Army Corps of Engineers, that those water programs in the short term be aligned with the State of California's bond act so that we can promote, augment, and advance the projects that would be undertaken in the \$7 billion water bond that the California voters passed last November.

My plea to those who think the tunnels are the solution is: stop, take another look. Take another look at the Little Sip, Big Gulp solution. This actually was something that was first proposed by the Natural Resources Defense Council. We were working with this about 5 years ago. They came up with the Little Sip, Big Gulp name, and with some modification, it is now a proposal that would cost a fraction of what the twin, massive, 40-foot-in-diameter tunnels would cost.

So, for California, there is a future. It is the Golden State. It is an economy unmatched by any other in the United States. It is an economy particularly—well, actually, the entire State's economy is stressed as a result of the drought. And if we take the kind of steps that I have been talking about here, we will be able to provide the water that California needs in the next drought and in the years to come as the population grows and as the economy grows.

So that is the water plan for all California. There are many other pieces of the puzzle, one of which I am going to take just a second to talk about. And that is this week, as we take up the appropriations for water programs in the State of California—actually, water plans for the United States, not just the State of California—we ought to be mindful of a project called the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a program that has been in effect for half a century. It takes the royalties from the offshore oil and minerals onshore and allows much of that royalty to be spent on preserving the special places of America—the wildlife refuges, very unique habitat areas—setting aside those areas, using that money to buy up the land and, in some cases, to buy up easements so that the land will forever remain available to future generations in a more natural state. That is the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Unfortunately, the authorization

for it expires this year, and at the moment, there is no perceived movement by the Congress of the United States to reinstitute and reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

When I was deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior in the mid-nineties, we used this fund to set aside redwood forest off along the coast of California, to protect the Everglades of Florida, to set aside some of the land along the sand dunes on the Great Lakes. This is a project for all of America, one that is worthy of being reauthorized and properly funded.

With that, Mr. Speaker, perhaps enough about California's drought. No, I will take that back.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, we have got a problem in California, short term and long term, and it deserves the attention of the Congress of the United States because California is the seventh largest economy in the world and critically important to the future of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we need to think in a comprehensive way about water in California. The controversial California Water Fix, formerly known as the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP), is an outdated and destructive plumbing system. It does not create any new water nor does it provide the water and the ecological protection that the Golden State must have. California and the federal government must set aside this big, expensive, destructive plumbing plan and immediately move forward with a comprehensive approach that includes:

- 1) Conservation,
- 2) Recycling,
- 3) The creation of new storage systems,
- 4) Fix the Delta—right sized conveyance, levee improvements, and habitat restoration,
- 5) Science driven process,
- 6) Protection of existing water rights.

This combination of projects constitutes a comprehensive water plan for the state.

Through a comprehensive plan that brings all stakeholders to the table, California can solve its water needs, and it can avoid the continuous water wars that have long divided our state. Unfortunately, California is once again embroiled in a bitter water war brought about by the California Water Fix (BDCP), the most recent attempt to fix California's water supply. After more than five years of study and over \$200,000,000 spent on consultants, the process has become bogged down and turned into another battle pitting north vs. south, water exporters vs. environmentalists, and senior water right holders vs. new comers. A classic California water brawl is in full bloom.

The governor's water plan for California is to take water out of the Sacramento River just south of Sacramento and put it into two tunnels each 40 miles long, 40 feet in diameter and with a potential capacity of moving 15,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). While the current proposal is set up to move 9000 cfs, the twin tunnels have a much larger capacity therefore setting the system up for future expansion.

Pumping would also continue directly from the southern Delta at the Tracy pumps. The system will be able to deliver up to 5.3 million acre feet of water to the pumps in Tracy and then on to the San Joaquin Valley farmers and Los Angeles.

So what is wrong with the Water Fix (BDCP)? It is not a water plan for California. It does not create one gallon of new water. It does not solve the long term needs of the state. With a minimum estimated construction and operating cost over 50 years of \$24.5 billion, it is an extraordinarily expensive plumbing system dressed up with a coating of habitat restoration. The plan simply takes water from one region and delivers it to another while tearing up acres of prime agricultural farm land in the process. All of this while stoking the fire of divisiveness over water that has plagued our state for years.

A quick look at the water flow in the Sacramento River over the last two decades shows that approximately six months out of the year there is somewhere between 15 and 20 thousand cubic feet per second (cfs) of water flowing in the Sacramento River. This proposal has the potential to suck the river dry and destroy the largest delta estuary on the west coast of the Western Hemisphere. Critical habitat for dozens of fish species like salmon, striped bass, and sturgeon would be threatened. These fish and the water they live in are crucial for jobs, agriculture and fishing businesses, and the region's economy.

We should never build a water system that has such destructive potential. It is never safe to assume that ecological concerns will trump greed and thirst. We should keep in mind that in 2012 the U.S. House of Representatives voted on H.R. 1837, the euphemistically titled Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Reliability Act. The bill passed by a vote of 246 to 175 and swept away all environmental protections for the Delta while stealing 800,000 acre feet of water from the aquatic environment. Luckily, the legislation was derailed in the U.S. Senate, but H.R. 1837 in one form or another is likely to return in future legislative battles.

California must move beyond a patched plumbing system. We need to think about what California really needs, and what it needs is a comprehensive water plan. Big changes are coming that threaten our water supply and our economy. A short list of these challenges include: climate change and related weather events, population growth, world food supplies, and earthquakes.

Climate change is real and its effect on California will be significant. The Colorado River Basin is in a prolonged drought, and likely to be much drier in the future. Based on today's water flows, the water in the Colorado River is oversubscribed by a third and projections indicate less water in the future. This is a big, big problem for the seven states that rely on the river, and especially for Southern California.

The Sierra Nevada Mountains, the Central Valley, and the coastal ranges will also be drastically impacted by climate change. We know that the timing of the precipitation is going to change and the snow is already melting earlier. As a result, the snowpack is moving up the mountains and while it may be deeper at the higher altitudes, the amount of land it covers is greatly reduced. It's the lower

snowpack that has the greatest volumes of water and if that continues to recede, we will have less and less water. The 2009 "California Water Plan," published by the California Department of Water Resources, estimates that the snowpack will decrease 25–40 percent by 2050. We must also anticipate more severe storms and flooding. All of this means the natural and man-made storage systems will hold less water. Putting the denial of scientific facts aside, California has to deal with the reality of climate change and its water policy implications.

We know California's population will continue to grow and therefore, the demand for water will increase. We know the world will be very hungry in the future, and we know that the role of agriculture in California is going to be exceedingly important. California agriculture not only fills our own desire for diverse and nutritious foods, but it will also continue to meet basic food needs for people around the world and will continue to serve as an essential component of our nation's economy.

We know the Delta is in serious trouble. The fish species are threatened with extinction and a total collapse of the estuary ecosystem is possible if the current water pumping program continues. Rising sea levels and deferred maintenance threaten the Delta levees which protect nearly 500,000 people, thousands of acres of valuable farm land, and miles of critical highways, gas and water transmission lines, and water delivery channels. Major upgrades are needed.

For these reasons, California must take off its blinders and expand its scope when thinking about ways to manage its water supply. It must be a holistic approach that is applied to every project that will impact the water needs of all Californians.

To achieve this comprehensive approach, here are six specific actions to provide a foundation for California's water future. If California does all of these, we will create new water supplies and better use the resources we already have:

- 1) Conservation,
- 2) Recycling,
- 3) The creation of new storage systems,
- 4) Fix the Delta—right sized conveyance, levee improvements, and habitat restoration,
- 5) Science driven process,
- 6) Protection of existing water rights

The quickest and cheapest source of new water is to stretch our current supplies by conserving what we have. Californians have been at this for years in our cities, in our industries, on the farm, and in our homes. We have engaged in serious water conservation, yet more can and should be done everywhere.

There are many conservation strategies. One conservation strategy is to use devices that measure the moisture in the soil to provide real time monitoring of the exact amount of water needed for ideal growing conditions. These devices are connected to a computer that automatically turns on just the right amount of water. These systems are in use and conserve at least ten percent with a financial payback in less than one year. If they were deployed widely perhaps at least 1 percent of the 30 million acre feet of water consumed by agriculture could be saved each year (300,000 acre feet).

All of us are going to do a lot more water conservation, not just the agriculture community. The water conservation mandate set by the state is a 20 percent reduction per capita by 2020 which equals 1,600,000 acre feet. In a very real way conservation can create new water that was not previously available for use. To be on the conservative side, let us assume that just one quarter of the State's goal could be obtained in the next decade, thereby adding 400,000 acre feet of new water to our supplies each year.

Can you name the fifth biggest river on the west coast of the Western Hemisphere? It's the water that flows out of the sanitation plants in Southern California and is dumped into the Pacific Ocean.

Why would any sane government take water from the Sacramento River, pump it 500 miles south, lift it 5,000 feet in the air, clean it, use it once, clean it to a higher standard than the day it arrives in Southern California, then dump it in the ocean? California does just this as it discharges over 3.5 million acre feet of water to the ocean each year, much of which could be reused.

We need to think seriously about recycling, not just in Southern California, but everywhere. The State of California currently recycles approximately 650,000 acre feet of water each year and has set a water recycling goal of 1.5 million acre feet of new water in California by 2020, and 2.5 million acre feet by 2030. While achievable, WaterReuse California estimates this goal cannot be achieved without State regulatory changes to expand the types of recycling available that rely on existing technologies.

Another option is desalination of the ocean. This is feasible and used extensively throughout the world, however it is not a viable option for all communities. It costs about 40 percent more to desalinate sea water than to recycle water using current technology. However, technological advances are being pursued for both recycling and desalination that could lower the costs of both.

In the next ten years, conservation and recycling in California can create approximately 2.2 million acre feet of new water to use each year, and that can increase to 3.2 million acre feet in twenty years. This is new water that is not available today because it is wasted or pumped out to sea. It can be developed at a reasonable cost when compared to all other alternatives that might be out there. Conservation and recycling are steps one and two in a comprehensive water program for California.

Water storage south of the Delta is possible and necessary. The capacity of the great Delta pumps near Tracy is 15,000 cubic feet per second. They are designed to meet maximum demand south of the Delta. They do not operate year round, only when there is sufficient water in the Delta, when threatened fish are not near the pumps, and when there is agricultural and urban demand south of the Tracy pumps. There is very limited water storage capacity south of the Delta. We must build more. San Luis and Los Vaqueros reservoirs could be expanded. New dams could be built at Los Banos Grandes, Temperance Flats, and numerous smaller off stream sites throughout the San Joaquin Valley. There are extensive and numerous aquifers throughout

the San Joaquin Valley that may prove suitable to store additional water that would be used in a conjunctive water management system. With these water storage facilities in place and a smaller cross Delta facility operating year round, the need for havoc causing, excessive pumping in the Delta could be avoided.

When coupled with recycling, the underground aquifers in Southern California are another key to our water future. The underground aquifers of the Santa Ana River in Orange County, the San Fernando Basin, Chino Basin, San Bernardino, San Gabriel Basin, and others have a combined capacity larger than Shasta Reservoir, the largest man made reservoir in the state. Today, some recycled water is put into the underground water basins to be stored for those inevitably dry years. When needed, it is pumped out, used, cleaned and returned to storage. On a larger scale this recycling system could create as much as 2.5 million acre feet of new water, and thereby reduce the need for shifting Colorado River supplies and imports from the Sacramento River.

Surface and underground storage should be used in a conjunctive water management program. Use the rivers when there is lots of water and use the reservoirs when there is little. Another way to describe this strategy is "big gulp" and "little sips." When there are low flows in the Delta the system would take a little sip. When there is excessive water in the Delta, the system would take a big gulp, but there must be some place to put that water when the big gulp is taken. Therefore, the surface and sub-surface reservoirs south of the Delta become an essential element in a California water plan.

Water storage north of the Delta is also important, and three proposals are on the books today. An off stream reservoir at Sites, located west of Williams, has great promise for storage and for creating greater flexibility in managing the Sacramento River for salmon runs, water demand, and Delta outflow. This reservoir can deliver 500,000 acre feet of annual yield and the additional flexibility that it offers can under some scenarios save another 500,000 acre feet of water that would otherwise be released into the river systems. Raising Shasta Dam is also possible, as is better conjunctive management of the many aquifers in the Sacramento Valley. State and federal agencies have already commenced studies for these projects. A quick completion of these studies is essential.

The current plan for the California Water Fix (BDCP) is a dual use facility with the main focus on the twin tunnels with a capacity of 15,000 cubic feet per second, and the continued use of the Delta channels for moving water from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers to the Tracy pumps. This dual use system adds another layer of risk to the ecosystem and agricultural economy of the Delta with the potential for the massive tunnels to suck the Delta dry from the north and from the south with the thirsty pumps. In scale, the cost and destructive potential of this project will rival the Three Gorges Dam on the Yangtze River in China. The twin tunnel proposal is a large scale, destructive project that does not create one gallon of new water for a thirsty California.

The location of the intakes for the twin tunnels is in the heart of the rich farm lands of the northern Delta, near the small community of Courtland. Thousands of acres of valuable farmland essential to California agriculture production will be destroyed during construction of the project, and, following completion, a vast industrial zone of pumping stations, fish screens, reservoirs, and electrical stations will impede on one of California's great agricultural regions. Along the forty mile route of the twin tunnels the construction process will produce a total of 22 million cubic yards of tunnel muck. This combination of soil and conditioning agents will have to be stored and managed and the latest draft of the plan calls for storage areas along the tunnel ranging in size from 100 to 570 acres. The amount of muck extracted would be enough to cover 100 football fields to a height of roughly 100 feet, and in the end will destroy close to 1600 acres of farm land while disrupting domestic and agricultural water wells.

Go forward carefully; start small; use science to evaluate each step; then proceed to the next step. Remember the Delta is a unique and precious environmental asset. We must take care of it. A narrowly focused plumbing system like the California Water Fix/BDCP will not achieve progress in creating a water supply sufficient for California's future. We must pursue a holistic, comprehensive approach that will achieve a bigger bang for our buck.

First, reduce demand on the Delta with steps one, two and three: water conservation, recycling, and strategic use of storage facilities. Use the "Big Gulp, Little Sip" pumping strategy. Move forward with the flood plain and fresh and saltwater marsh habitat improvements. Repair and improve the key Delta levees. Evaluate the effect on the Delta as these projects come on line.

Then, and only if necessary, proceed with a conveyance system that is much smaller and with a reduced capacity to destroy.

A much smaller facility with a capacity of no more than 3,000 cubic feet per second could be built to deliver water from the Sacramento River to the Tracy pumps. With the normal minimum flows in the Sacramento River above 15,000 cfs, a small 3,000 cfs facility could operate at least 300 days in most years, delivering approximately two million acre feet of water south to the pumps at Tracy where it would be pumped south to the new and expanded storage facilities.

There are several alternative ways to build this smaller system. One alternative is found with a careful look at the Delta map which reveals that two thirds of this Delta friendly system is already built. Two miles from the State Capital is the Port of Sacramento and the shipping channel that ends 25 miles south near Rio Vista. From there it is thirteen miles to existing channels and the Tracy pumps. The Federal Government already owns the land along the river where an intake and fish screen could be built, allowing 3000 cfs of Sacramento River water to enter the channel and flow south to a shipping lock at the southern end of the channel. Then, pumps could deliver the water into a short 12-mile pipe beneath the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and into the existing Delta channels that

lead to the Tracy Pumps. The threatened Delta fish could be protected by sealing the channel from the Delta. Such a smaller facility is less costly than two 40-foot diameter, 40-mile long tunnels that devastate large swaths of the Delta and put the entire Delta at risk.

It is correct that this smaller facility like the twin tunnels is insufficient to quench the thirst of the Southern water contractors. This is where the southern reservoirs and the "Little Sip, Big Gulp" strategy comes into play. In normal water years there is sufficient water in the Delta to allow the pumps to take a big gulp of two million acre feet of water. This amount together with the two million acre feet delivered through the 3,000 cfs facility and the new water developed from conservation and recycling efforts could add up to six million acre feet. This plan would create far more new water than will ever be available with the current California Water Fix (BDCP) plan, which in its current state creates nothing new, except new destruction.

This small 3,000 cfs proposal and the current twin tunnel proposal envision the continued use of the existing Delta levee system as water conveyance channels for the delivery of water to the big pumps at Tracy. However, the California Water Fix (BDCP) has neither a plan nor funding for the maintenance of the levees that are crucial for their proposed water conveyance system. The Delta levees must be upgraded and maintained if water is to be transported through the Delta and if the Delta agriculture, infrastructure, ecology and people are to be protected.

No sane homeowner would go fifty years without maintaining their plumbing system. For more than fifty years, the Bureau of Reclamation and the California Department of Water Resources have used the Delta levees as a plumbing system to deliver water from the Sacramento River to the Tracy pumps. Yet, they have spent virtually no money maintaining these critical levees, the failure of which could shut down water deliveries for an extended period of time. The Federal and State agencies have relied upon the local reclamation agencies to do the repairs, literally giving the exporters a free ride. When a levee does give way and an island is flooded, it is the local agency and Federal and State governments that foot the bill to repair the levees, often at a much greater cost than would have been necessary with basic maintenance.

Legislation is necessary to require that the Federal and State water contractors, who have for years and will continue for even more years depended upon the Delta levees for the delivery of water to their fields and cities, pay a part of the levee maintenance cost.

The California Water Fix (BDCP) envisions restoring flood plains and the salt and freshwater marsh habitat of the Delta in an effort to restore the fisheries. However, a series of questions are raised: where to do it, how much to do, what type, at what cost and who is to pay for the restoration? Those who have created the ecological problem should pay for the restoration of the problem. All this will require careful attention to science, and a careful balance between competing goals. Current science indicates that no amount of habitat restoration can compensate for the damage done to fish from excessive water exports.

The California Water Fix (BDCP) and any other proposal must be based and driven by quality science that measures and informs decisions. California and federal law require that the Delta aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems be protected. We must do so, not just because the laws demand it, but because our status as human beings on this planet demands that we pay attention and protect precious and rare ecosystems. Also, healthy ecosystems provide a valuable asset to our communities because healthy ecosystems help to ensure we have healthy water. If we let the ecosystems fall by the wayside, our water will get dirtier making it increasingly difficult and costly to clean it up enough to use. For all of these reasons, we must let science govern.

The California Water Fix (BDCP) anticipates 50-year permits from state and federal agencies to allow incidental takes of endangered fish species. Once granted, the water exporters will have assurances that the project can take covered species and pump Delta water despite changes in the environment. To date, the California Water Fix (BDCP) has not built in flexibility to address the inevitable changes that will occur and the damage that could be done if the plan does not account for climate change.

We must also use science to understand our river basins in the age of climate change. Dams on California Rivers serve multiple purposes of water storage, flood protection, electric power generation, recreation, and environmental river flows. Current dam operations on California Rivers place flood protection as the first priority followed by water storage. The decisions to release water to create greater flood storage are based on the average river flows compiled from the last 60 years. Climate change and resulting river flow change is certain and one can only imagine how rare it will be for the historic average to actually occur.

We have the technology today to better understand what is happening, in real time, in every river basin in this state. Satellites and unmanned aircraft using infrared and ground sensing radar, together with terrestrial stations collecting soil conditions, snow temperature and moisture content coupled with telemetry will soon be deployed in the American River basin. Collecting this data and using it in real time to predict river flows allows for better operation of the dams so that additional flood storage capacity could be available by lowering the reservoir ahead of the storm or keeping water in the reservoir if a major storm is heading for a different river basin or if it is a cold snow storm. Using the best science can simultaneously deliver increased flood protection and greater water storage.

Soon after gold was discovered in California, the miners discovered that water could be used to separate gold from gravel and soon after, the right to the water flowing in the rivers became as valuable as the gold. Today, water is California's gold. The classic water war in California is usually about one group attempting to take another group's water. It is reasonable to view the current twin tunnels conflict in this way: southern exporters taking water belonging to northern water right holders and water necessary for the aquatic river environment. Any water plan that ignores the prior and existing water rights is destined to be em-

broiled in a vicious and contracted water war. If a project is to be built, then existing rights must be honored.

California must develop a comprehensive water program. The current California Water Fix (BDCP) is an outdated and destructive plumbing system. It does not create any new water. It does not provide the water and the ecological protection the Golden State must have. California and the federal government must set aside the big, expensive, destructive plumbing plan and immediately move forward with a comprehensive program that includes:

- 1) Conservation,
- 2) Recycling,
- 3) The creation of new storage systems,
- 4) Fix the Delta—right sized conveyance, levee improvements, and habitat restoration,
- 5) Science driven process,
- 6) Protection of existing water rights

California is once again embroiled in a water war. The California Water Fix/BDCP is not a comprehensive plan; it is a plumbing system that seeks to extract water from one part of the state and deliver it to another part. If history is any indication, water wars are expensive and fruitless. Only by embracing a comprehensive plan that creates new water for the entire state can we avoid gridlock and a water war. This paper presents a plan that emphasizes using the best available science and a portfolio of water projects to create a positive solution to the water challenge facing California. It's time to move forward and ensure a reliable water supply for the entire state.

[From sacbee.com]

WATER SOLUTION FOR CALIFORNIA: 'LITTLE SIP, BIG GULP'

(By John Garamendi)

Don't be fooled. The dreaded twin tunnels through the heart of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta did not die. The governor's new "California Water Fix" plan is the same destructive twin tunnel \$17 billion boondoggle, just without the fig leaf cover of habitat restoration. Not one gallon of new water supply is created for our thirsty state.

California water needs can be met with a comprehensive program that over the next 10 years can create more than 5 million acre-feet of new water at a cost no greater than the twin tunnels. Here are the keys to our water future:

1. Conservation
2. Recycling/desalinization
3. Creation of new surface and aquifer storage
4. Science-driven process
5. Fixing the Delta—right-sized conveyance, levee improvements and habitat restoration

Go forward carefully; start small; use science to evaluate each step; then proceed to the next step. The Delta is a unique and precious environmental asset.

First, reduce demand on the Delta with water conservation, recycling and desalinization, and strategic use of surface and aquifer storage. Move forward with habitat improvements for the floodplain and fresh and salt-water marshes. Repair and improve the key Delta levees. Evaluate the effect on the Delta as these projects come online. Then, and only if necessary, proceed with a conveyance system that is much smaller and with a reduced capacity to destroy.

A much smaller facility with a capacity of no more than 3,000 cubic feet per second

could be built to deliver water from the Sacramento River to the Tracy pumps. With the normal minimum flows in the Sacramento River above 15,000 cubic feet per second, a 3,000-cfs facility could operate at least 300 days in most years, delivering about 2 million acre feet of water to the pumps at Tracy and on south to new and expanded storage facilities.

Half of this Delta-friendly system is already built. Two miles from the state Capitol is the Port of Sacramento. A fish screen could be built at the existing opening on the Sacramento River, allowing 3,000 cubic feet per second of Sacramento River water to enter the deep water channel and flow 25 miles south to a shipping lock at the southern end of the channel. Then, pumps could deliver the water into a 12-mile pipe beneath the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and into a new aqueduct alongside the Old River channel that leads to the Tracy pumps.

An alternative route could take the water out at the southern end of the shipping channel, delivering it into an aqueduct around the town of Rio Vista, across the Sacramento River at Sherman Island and through Contra Costa County to the Tracy pumps. This route would intersect six vital San Francisco Bay aqueducts, thus creating a safety system for 8 million Bay residents.

The ‘Little Sip, Big Gulp’ strategy completes the program to meet California’s future water needs.

In normal water years, there is sufficient water in the Delta to allow the pumps to take a “big gulp” of 2 million acre-feet of water. This amount together with the 2 million acre-feet delivered through the 3,000-cfs facility would meet the annual water demand south of the Delta.

The new water developed from surface and underground storage, conservation, and recycling and desalinization efforts could add up to 5 million acre-feet, and together with an eco-friendly Delta solution would be enough to serve the future needs of a thriving California.

INJUSTICE AT HOME AND ABROAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been a tough week, for all Christians in the country have lost three brothers and six sisters in the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina. The whole country mourns—well, probably not everybody. Evil has those who support it and wallow in it, as did the evil perpetrator of the killings.

Our prayers continue to go out to the immediate family members and to the church family members for their peace and for their comfort because those of us who are believers know that those we have lost are at the foot of the Saviour in Paradise.

I learned today that the President will be going to speak at the funeral. I recall a speech in Arizona, and so as I encouraged our prayer caucus tonight, we should be praying for the President to be a uniter as he speaks.

I thought about the way a great President named Abraham Lincoln

concluded his second inaugural address. The war was not over; there was great hatred and bitterness. Of course, he mentioned in his inaugural address—talking about North and South—both read the same Bible, both pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other.

He goes on to give what is one of the great theological treatises on the nature of God; he quotes from the Old Testament a couple of times, but with all the killing that occurred during the Civil War, he ended trying to encourage uniting. I know there are those who advise the President that he should not let a good crisis go to waste, but for many of us, the hope and prayer is that at this week’s funeral, he will be a uniter.

Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln closed his second inaugural with the words: “With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation’s wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.”

Mr. Speaker, that was a man who sought to unite, who knew there was a Heavenly Father to Whom we could pray and Who would answer our prayers. I hope and pray that will be the outcome at the funeral of my brothers and sisters in Charleston, South Carolina.

Of course, then there is the judge side of me. Having sentenced people both to prison and to death, the judge side of me says, from what we know, it sure cries out for the death penalty, but we will let the justice system in South Carolina take care of that.

In the meantime, as we think about injustice, it is also hard not to think of our friends and our allies in Israel who have trouble finding any friends. They are persecuted on every side. We got this report from the U.N., an article talking about it from Marissa Newman of The Times of Israel: “Israel slams ‘politically motivated and morally flawed’ U.N. Gaza report.”

The article says: “Israel on Monday said it would ‘seriously’ evaluate the United Nations Human Rights Council inquiry on the Gaza conflict, while politicians from left and right slammed the international body for bias and declared that the international investigators lacked access to evidence.”

The article goes on down further: “‘The report is biased,’ said Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in response. ‘Israel is not perpetrating war crimes but rather protecting itself from an organization that carries out war crimes. We won’t sit back with our arms crossed as our citizens are attacked by thousands of missiles.’”

The article says: “The Human Rights Council ‘in practice does everything

but worry about human rights,’ the prime minister charged. ‘The commission spends more time condemning Israel than Iran, Syria and North Korea put together.’”

It seems that these are the times that cry out for a moral, pragmatic, and unified response to the anti-Semitism that is growing—it is just unbelievable—in Europe and in the United States colleges and universities. It is incredible.

Mr. Speaker, the Bible talks about times when right will be wrong and wrong will be right; perhaps we are entering such an era. A country like Israel is under attack from virtually every front, every side; and Palestinians, radical Islamists, and Iranians declare that they will see that it is annihilated.

Their leaders make statements such as “we are glad that they are gathered in Israel so that we can annihilate them all at once,” and the U.N. basically sees somehow level parties on the same plane: terrorists and people who promote democratic beliefs and carry them out, allow people to vote, believe in the rights of women, and believe in equal rights.

Israel is a place where Muslims can freely vote and don’t have to worry about a radical Islamist killing them if he or she doesn’t believe and perform exactly like their radical Islamist leader tells them to.

The article says that the Israeli Foreign Ministry also castigated the U.N. Human Rights Council investigation for failing to distinguish between the Israeli military and Hamas:

“It is regrettable that the report fails to recognize the profound difference between Israel’s moral behavior during Operation Protective Edge and the terror organizations it confronted.”

“Likud minister Yuval Steinitz compared the conflict to a Palestinian suicide bomber commandeering a bus full of Palestinian civilians and ramming it into an Israeli tank. ‘Many Palestinian civilians would die,’ he told Army Radio. ‘But that doesn’t mean the tank is to blame.’ The U.N. panel’s approach was ‘absurd,’ he said, in that it would require Israel not to fire back when terrorists fire at its civilians ‘because the terrorists are hiding behind their civilians.’

“Steinitz also said the U.N. Human Rights Commission’s obsessive focus on Israel points to anti-Semitism. Asked whether Israel would have done better to cooperate with the panel, he said, ‘You can’t explain to people who are not prepared to listen.’

“Yesh Atid leader Yair Lapid also rejected the idea that Israel should have cooperated, saying the panel had drawn its conclusions before it even began its probe.”

It goes on to discuss the report from the so-called Human Rights Council.

The United Nations Human Rights Council is an abomination. It should be an affront as it is an outrage to anyone who cares about human rights.

What has happened at the United Nations? We have had so many nations join the United Nations that don't care about human rights, and they don't care about women. Of course, they are so brutal in the treatment of those who would oppose it, that apparently it scares off feminist groups who are afraid to attack those who really are inhumane in their treatment of women, enough so the feminist liberal groups are afraid to take them on.

Hopefully, some day, they will gain the courage to see where women are truly being abused in horrendous ways, and they will join with some of the rest of us in trying to stop that, instead of going after Christian groups or groups who believe that everyone, once conceived, should have a right to live.

Maybe if some of those groups quit attacking those who are pro-life and spent a little time attacking those who are true abusers of women, then we would find common footing, and we would be able to work better together.

There is another article here from Anne Bayefsky. This one is headlined: "U.N. report denies Israel's right of self-defense, advocates arrest of Israelis instead."

It really is outrageous, and the United States, as has been suggested by some writers, should withdraw from participation in the Human Rights Commission. The ICC, International Criminal Court, obviously from its actions and its efforts, is quite anti-Semitic. The United States has no business supporting the efforts of those who support the effort and abuse of Israelis and the effort to eliminate them from off of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, if there had been an Israel during the Holocaust, Jews would have had a place to go, and there would not have been 6 million killed in the Holocaust. This is no time for anyone who cares about world peace and the avoidance of suffering to stand up and decry Israel. This is a time to stand with Israel.

Israel is an actual democratic republic in the middle of the Middle East that respects women like no nation around in the Middle East and supports the value of life and private property. How in the world are we not a better friend to them?

I would like to see, as some writers have suggested, that we withdraw from anything that might lend our support

to the International Criminal Court because of its anti-Semitic views.

Mr. Speaker, I realized, as I was reading these articles about additional anti-Semitic efforts by the United Nations, that the U.N. has been overtaken by so many countries that don't believe in human rights for their people.

□ 2030

Many of them, they are abusive, have no problem with torturing those with whom they disagree, have no problem killing people who convert from, for example, Islamic beliefs to Christian beliefs—get the death penalty in some of these countries.

You know, it is time to begin a new organization of democratic republics that respect the rights of women, men, children, and who have fair elections.

Let's have an international community like that. Let's have an international group that, when it speaks, it is not with blood dripping off of the votes of its members. It would mean something.

A human rights commission, for example, for a while had Libya as the head. Are you kidding me? This is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, I realized, in reviewing these articles, I have not yet filed the bill that I normally file, the U.N. Voting Accountability Act.

What I have learned around this body is, if you keep filing a bill long enough, even if it requires somebody else putting their name on it to get it to the floor, you get that done; you get it passed, and you don't care who gets the credit.

The U.N. Voting Accountability bill is very simple. It basically says any nation that votes against the United States more than half of the time in the preceding year would get no assistance from the United States of any kind whatsoever. As I have said for years, you don't have to pay people to hate you. They will do it for free. It is still true.

It is time to leave that money here. It is time for this administration to stop sending weapons that it knows have continuously fallen in the hands of the Islamic State and made it extremely difficult for the courageous Kurdish fighters to fight and defeat the radical Islamic State.

Let's start sending those weapons directly to the Kurds. Baghdad is not letting them get them. They cannot easily defeat the weapons, the up-armored vehicles, the things that we have sent that we knew ultimately were falling into Islamic State hands.

As some Muslim friends, leaders in Middle Eastern states have continued to ask: Why is it that the United States administration keeps helping the Muslim Brotherhood? Don't they know that is who is at war with the United States?

They ask: Why do you keep helping your enemies?

It is time that we quit helping our enemies. It is time that we help those here at home.

I applaud our conference passing the bills we did tonight. One is going to make it easier for seniors to get access to the health care that ObamaCare has made it very difficult for them to get, so there is some good news.

Our prayers continue so that, by the end of the week, there will be even better news.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSSELL (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of travel in connection with official duties and personal reasons.

Mrs. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending the burial mass for her mother-in-law, Lorretto Wagner.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through June 26 on account of official business in district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. JEFFRIES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a medical appointment.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 24, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, REBECCA TALLENT, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 1 AND MAY 11, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ⁽¹⁾		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Rebecca Tallent	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(3)				1,500.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		654.00		(3)				654.00
	5/6	5/7	Germany		395.00		(3)				395.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		378.00		(3)				378.00
	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(3)				1,960.00
Committee totals					4,887.00						4,887.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

REBECCA TALLENT, June 9, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HUNGARY, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 15 AND MAY 19, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Michael Turner	5/16	5/18	Hungary		659.00		3,365.00				4,024.00
Hon. Tom Marino	5/16	5/18	Hungary		659.00		3,365.00				4,024.00
Hon. Gerry Connolly	5/16	5/18	Hungary		659.00		9,769.00				10,428.00
Hon. Ted Poe	5/16	5/18	Hungary		659.00		3,365.00				4,024.00
Hon. Susan Davis	5/16	5/18	Hungary		659.00		3,365.00				4,024.00
Morley Greene	5/16	5/19	Hungary		912.00		3,365.00				4,277.00
Janice Robinson	5/15	5/19	Hungary		1,012.00		3,365.00				4,377.00
Ed Rice	5/16	5/19	Hungary		912.00		3,365.00				4,277.00
Committee totals					6,131.00		33,324.00				39,455.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER, June 18, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1883. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral James A. Winnefeld, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1884. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Performing the Duties of the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a legislative proposal that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 114th Congress addressing the military retirement recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1885. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Amendments to the 2013 Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Rule Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) and the 2013 Loan Originator Rule Under the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) [Docket No.: CFPB-2014-0028] (RIN: 3170-AA48) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1886. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Commission Guidance Regarding the Definition of the Terms "Spouse" and "Marriage" Following the Supreme Court's Decision in United States v. Windsor [Release Nos.: 33-

9850; 34-75250; IA-4122; IC-31684] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1887. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a list of international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to Congress within sixty days, in accordance with the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1888. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-050; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1889. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter regarding commitments in the Joint Plan of Action, pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 Sec. 1245(d)(5) and 1245(d)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1890. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency, with respect to the Western Balkans, originally declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2015; (H. Doc. No. 114-44); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1891. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency, with respect to North Korea, originally declared on June 26, 2008, by Executive Order 13466, as amended and extended, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2015; (H. Doc. No. 114-45); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1892. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Con-

gress for the 6-month period of October 1, 2014–March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1893. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1894. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, the semiannual reports to Congress from the Treasury Inspector General and the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, during the reporting period of October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1895. A letter from the Executive Director for Operations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a letter providing the Web site address where the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission has posted its commercial activities inventory, pursuant to the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 and the Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-76, "Performance of Commercial Activities"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1896. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Child Welfare Outcomes 2010-2013 Report to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 105-89, Sec. 203(a); (111 Stat. 2127); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1897. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2015-42] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1898. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Additional no-rule area — grantor trusts and Sec. 1014 basis step-up (Rev. Proc. 2015-37) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1899. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Applicable Federal Rates — July 2015 (Rev. Rul. 2015-15) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1900. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Application Procedures for Approval of Benefit Suspensions for Certain Multiemployer Defined Benefit Pension Plans under Sec. 432(e)(9) (Rev. Proc. 2015-34) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 971. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in the limit on the length of an agreement under the Medicare independence at home medical practice demonstration program (Rept. 114-172, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 387. A bill to provide for certain land to be taken into trust for the benefit of Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2620. A bill to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act; with an amendment (Rept. 114-174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 805. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibility over the Internet domain name system until the Comptroller General of the United States submits to Congress a report on the role of the NTIA with respect to such system; with an amendment (Rept. 114-175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2576. A bill to modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 333. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2042) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil

fuel-fired electric utility generating units before requiring compliance with such rule, and to allow States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability; and providing for proceedings during the period from June 26, 2015, through July 6, 2015. Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. S. 971 referred the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2846. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of cancer care planning and coordination under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2847. A bill to encourage African countries provide first-time access to electricity and power services for at least 50,000,000 people in sub-Saharan Africa by 2020; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2848. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to penalize aliens who overstay their visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2849. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to ensure that all dogs and cats used by research facilities are obtained legally; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 2850. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2851. A bill to require each insurer that considers marital status in the rating or underwriting of an insurance policy to consider the proposed insured to be married if the proposed insured is legally married under the laws of any State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 2852. A bill to provide for the eligibility for burial in Arlington National Cemetery of certain members of reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2853. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 2854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the occupational tax on gambling with respect to wagers authorized under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2855. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the time limitation for use of eligibility and entitlement to educational assistance under certain programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2856. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2857. A bill to facilitate the addition of park administration at the Coltsville National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 2858. A bill to phase out cosmetic animal testing and the sale of cosmetics tested on animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 2859. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate the Sonoran Corridor connecting Interstate 19 to Interstate 10 south of the Tucson International Airport as a future part of the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2860. A bill to direct the Mayor of the District of Columbia to establish a District of Columbia National Guard Educational Assistance Program to encourage the enlistment and retention of persons in the District of Columbia National Guard by providing financial assistance to enable members of the

National Guard of the District of Columbia to attend undergraduate, vocational, or technical courses; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HAHN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BASS, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit to certain recently discharged veterans, to improve the coordination of veteran job training services between the Department of Labor, the Department of Veteran Affairs, and the Department of Defense, to require transparency for Executive departments in meeting the Government-wide goals for contracting with small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Small Business, Education and the Workforce, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RIGELL):

H.R. 2862. A bill to authorize the amendment of the Federal sentencing guidelines to provide for an increase in 2 levels if the defendant intentionally selected any victim or any property as the object of the offense of conviction because of the victim's military service or status as a veteran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RIGELL):

H.R. 2863. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit unrecognized individuals from charging fees for legal services provided to veterans related to appeals before the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2864. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from extending the renewable fuel program past 2022 if the Administrator waives applicable volume requirements in prior years; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 2865. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to make a technical correction relating to the amendments made by Public Law 113-243; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr.

FARR, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 2866. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a special enrollment period for pregnant women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARPER:

H. Res. 334. A resolution designating the Ulysses S. Grant Association as the organization to implement the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant, Civil War General and 2-term President of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BOST, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 335. A resolution congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

68. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution 527, urging President Barack Obama and Congress to make federal funds available to the Illinois Community College System; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

69. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware, relative to House Resolution No. 17, reaffirming the commitment to the strong and deepening relationship between Taiwan and Delaware; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce, as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This law is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 to the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 2850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is authorized to enact this legislation under the Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." Additionally, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the Preamble of the Constitution, "to promote the general welfare."

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 2853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause I

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 2854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18,—“To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper

for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." To better ensure the due process rights guaranteed in Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution; and

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses:

1) "The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States"

3) "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

7) "To establish Post Offices and post Roads"

18) "To make all Law which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make Rules for the Government and Regulations of the land and naval Forces

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make Rules for the Government and Regulations of the land and naval Forces

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 2865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

Specifically, Clause 1, Clause 3, Clause 18

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 2866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 12: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 24: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 167: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 169: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 188: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 197: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 232: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 244: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 247: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 263: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 276: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 359: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 402: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 427: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 510: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 540: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 563: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 581: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 602: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 605: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 612: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 616: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 624: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 653: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 662: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 664: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 672: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 699: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 702: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 745: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 756: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 767: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 774: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 800: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 812: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 815: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 822: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 823: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 824: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 829: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 835: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 842: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 855: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 865: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 879: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 885: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 893: Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 910: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 918: Mr. OLSON and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 920: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 921: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 923: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 931: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 932: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 969: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 972: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 985: Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 986: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 990: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1002: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1061: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1087: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1091: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1098: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1101: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1130: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1178: Mr. HARPER and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1185: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1197: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1202: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1221: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. LOBONDO.

H.R. 1250: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1258: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 1288: Ms. HAHN and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1299: Mr. OLSON and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1321: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1338: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1342: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1343: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1369: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1378: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1387: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1388: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1401: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1427: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1439: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1448: Mr. KEATING and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1462: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1475: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1477: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1479: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1487: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1506: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1515: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1516: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1549: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1555: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1559: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 1567: Mr. FARR and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1581: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1595: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1610: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1644: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1665: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1671: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1726: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1737: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1739: Mr. PITTINGER.

H.R. 1752: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1753: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1760: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1769: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. LOBONDO.

H.R. 1786: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1814: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DELAUBO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms.

WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1817: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1818: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1832: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1846: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1853: Mr. TROTT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. Pittenger.

H.R. 1856: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1859: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1920: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1930: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1937: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1941: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1968: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1994: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 2023: Mr. COOPER, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 2061: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 2072: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2140: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2147: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2152: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2156: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2169: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2193: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2197: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. BASS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2216: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2259: Mr. PITTENDER and Mr. POLQUIN.

H.R. 2287: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 2302: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2303: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2315: Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 2342: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 2358: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2360: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2362: Mr. TIPTON and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 2382: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2400: Mr. LANCE and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2404: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 2405: Mr. PAULSEN and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2410: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2412: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2449: Mr. COHEN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2466: Mr. MICA and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 2493: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2501: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2513: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2514: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 2520: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2576: Ms. MOORE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2539: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 2560: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2568: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2576: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2588: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2602: Ms. SPEIER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2606: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 2615: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2639: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2646: Mr. HANNA and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2652: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2654: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2658: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2660: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2669: Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2689: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2698: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2716: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 2726: Mr. KILMER and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 2737: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2738: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2742: Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 2748: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2767: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2768: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2770: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2773: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2790: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2798: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2800: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2802: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 2810: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2813: Mr. KILMER and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2815: Ms. GRAHAM and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2820: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 2826: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 2838: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 2841: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.J. Res. 36: Ms. KUSTER.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 12: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. FUDGE.

H. Res. 28: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 50: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Res. 56: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 102: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 147: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H. Res. 204: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 209: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. PITTENDER.

H. Res. 210: Ms. MOORE and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H. Res. 227: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 291: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 294: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEVIN, and, Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 310: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 316: Mr. HENSARLING.

H. Res. 318: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HENSARLING, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Res. 327: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. FARR, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. NORTON.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative PALLONE or a designee to H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. BABIN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

OFFSHORE DRILLING PERMITS

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Interior to block approval of offshore drilling permits.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE THE THREATENED SPECIES LISTING OF THE LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the threatened species listing of the lesser prairie chicken under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PROPOSED RULE FOR LESSER PRAIRIE CHICKEN

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to write or issue under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) a proposed rule for lesser prairie chickens (*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO ALVIN AND EULA BLANKENSHIP

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Alvin and Eula Blankenship of Council Bluffs, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 80th wedding anniversary.

Alvin and Eula's lifelong commitment to each other, their daughter, two grandchildren, six great-grandchildren and three great-great grandchildren embodies our Iowa values. All five generations were on hand to help Alvin and Eula celebrate this very special day. I salute this devoted couple on their 80th year together and I wish them many more years of happiness. I know my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion. I wish them and their family all the best moving forward.

HONORING LESTER L. STROUP

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Lester L. Stroup, a veteran, a former prisoner of war and a treasured member of the Colorado Springs community. Throughout his life, Lester proudly served and sacrificed for his country, then devoted the remainder of this life to veterans' organizations in the Pikes Peak Region.

Lester joined the Army in 1949, during the Second World War, and was assigned to the artillery outfit of the 2nd Infantry Division. Shortly thereafter, he was deployed in defense of the Busan Perimeter following North Korea's invasion of South Korea in 1950. Lester would be on the front lines only one month when his artillery battery was overrun and suffered a defeat. Wounded and surrounded by Chinese forces, Lester and his unit were captured on December 1, 1950. A brutal 400-mile march to the Puchkin Mining Camp initiated Lester's time as a prisoner of war, which lasted for exactly 1,000 days.

While imprisoned at the Puchkin Mining Camp, Lester and 750 of his fellow American servicemen were compelled to act as their own burial detail. Every day, on the brink of starvation, these gallant soldiers went out in groups of 12 or 14 to dig shallow graves for prisoners who had died. In less than one year's time, five hundred American prisoners of war perished in this camp, also known as the Death Valley Camp. When Lester was finally released, he was denied the Purple

Heart Medal for lack of medical records maintained by the Chinese forces.

Lester first retired in 1969 with 20 years of service in the Army, re-enlisting in 1970 and serving a voluntary combat tour in Vietnam. After retiring for good as a First Sergeant in 1975, he dedicated his time and energy to the Rocky Mountain Chapter of the Ex-Prisoners of War, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Retired Enlisted Association, Disabled American Veterans, and American Legion Post 5. In 2006, Lester vigorously led the effort to erect a beautiful memorial that now stands in Colorado Springs in memory of our POWs.

Until he passed away on August 17, 2014 at the age of 84, Lester unsparingly gave of himself to his fellow ex-prisoners of war and other veterans. His legacy will now be carried on by Doris, his wife of 58 years, his children, his friends, and those with whom he associated as a volunteer. I am greatly honored to celebrate the life and service of Lester Stroup, a patriot whose uncommon and tireless devotion to his country will never be forgotten by his fellow citizens.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES BY VIETNAMESE AUTHORITIES

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnamese-American community is celebrating its 40th year in the U.S. We often think of 1975 as a time of tragedy and loss, as the Vietnam War ended with helicopters flying off the U.S. Embassy. But from tragedy has come hope and prosperity. The Vietnamese-American community has added so much to the American fabric. They are a shining example of an immigrant community, many who came here penniless refugees, who has made important contributions to the United States.

The subcommittee I chair has held numerous hearings on human rights in Vietnam and we have discussed a range of concerns, from restrictions on religious freedom to the jailing and torture of dissidents.

From sex and labor trafficking to the censorship of the press and Internet, the Vietnamese Government and Communist Party continues to be one of the world's worst abusers of human rights. We may want to sweep that reality under the table, paper it over by promises of security cooperation and trade deals. But that reality stares us in the face and requires us to ask whether U.S. policy really serves the people of Vietnam, people who want our liberties and freedoms as much as our trade.

The U.S. Government must continue to press the Vietnamese government on truly fundamental human rights issues, not only in human rights dialogue, but in all meetings with

Vietnamese officials, at the highest levels from the U.S. President on down.

Sixty-six percent of the Vietnamese population is under 35, they don't remember the war, they want their lives to look like those of their Vietnamese cousins in the U.S., in Australia, and Canada. Our policies cannot only be directed at the Vietnamese elite in the Communist Party, but must focus on the people of Vietnam. They are looking for U.S. leadership; they are hungry for a U.S. policy that advances the rights and freedoms of the Vietnamese people. They understand that if the U.S. sides with the Vietnamese Government, they will only receive crumbs from the Communist Party's table.

Our economic, security, and freedom interests must be linked. The Vietnamese Government needs U.S. security cooperation and economic benefits more than the U.S. needs Vietnam. We have leverage to bring about concrete changes in Vietnam. We must not give up or ignore this leverage.

If human rights issues are not explicitly linked to our economic and security interests, we risk having discussions on trade and defense moving forward, while human rights conditions go backward.

Trade between the U.S. and Vietnam has exponentially expanded since Vietnam was granted normal trade relations in 2000. If this expansion is to continue under the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP for short, then the American people should at least be assured that Vietnam, currently our 15th largest source of imports, is protecting basic freedoms.

If the past is any indicator, Vietnam will regress from political liberalization as soon as it gains preferential trade status. In 2007, after the United States lifted its long-standing objection to Vietnam's membership in the World Trade Organization, Hanoi responded by launching the first of three waves of arrests that jailed over one hundred dissidents and introduced sweeping new laws restricting freedom of association, assembly, and the Internet. In short, Vietnam's WTO accession allowed the Communist government free license to jail, torture, and abuse.

Further, when the State Department removed Vietnam from the list of Countries of Particular Concern as a gesture of goodwill in 2006, we once again saw backsliding. Despite the State Department's decision in 2006 to remove Vietnam from the list of Countries of Particular Concern as designated pursuant to the International Religious Freedom Act, Vietnam, in fact, continues to be among the worst violators of religious freedom in the world.

According to the United States Commission for International Religious Freedom's 2015 Annual Report, "The Vietnamese Government continues to control all religious activities through law and administrative oversight, restrict severely independent religious practice, and repress individuals and religious groups it views as challenging its authority . . ." I agree

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

with USCIRF's conclusion that Vietnam should be designated a CPC country.

I met courageous religious leaders during my trips to Vietnam who were struggling for fundamental human rights in their country. Unfortunately, many of them, including Father Ly and the Most Venerable Thich Quang Do, remain wrongly detained today. There are disturbing reports that Father Ly is suffering poor health. There are over 150 prisoners of conscience in Vietnam. We should not forget them.

Some have made the case that Vietnam has made progress in recent years with respect to human rights, especially in regard to joining international agreements like the United Nations Convention Against Torture. In order for there to be real progress, the Vietnamese Government needs to back up its words with actions. The Vietnamese Government can show that it is serious about respecting and protecting human rights by crafting a new religion law that rolls back some of the many constraints on religious activities, but early indications the new law will actually be more restrictive. Vietnam can lift its draconian Internet restrictions and allow for independent labor organizations. Labor protections and Internet freedom are critical economic as well as human rights issues.

Despite the dismal status for human rights in Vietnam, we can exert pressure on the Vietnamese Government to cease these abuses. I have reintroduced the Vietnam Human Rights Act. The Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2015 seeks to promote the development of freedom and democracy in Vietnam by stipulating that the United States can increase its non-humanitarian assistance to Vietnam above FY2012 levels only when the President is able to certify that the Government of Vietnam has made substantial progress in establishing human rights protections. The United States should not be rewarding the Vietnamese regime with taxpayer dollars when it continues to violently repress its own people.

Swift congressional action on this bill will send a strong message that U.S. will not tolerate continuing human rights abuses in Vietnam. Its enactment will send an unmistakable message to the Government of Vietnam that human rights improvements are fundamental to better relations, critically linked to our mutual economic and security interests, and cannot be ignored or bargained away.

Those intent on passing TPP should also be concerned with maximizing leverage over Vietnam, with the Vietnamese Government making true and lasting concessions on human rights, before we agree to provide them with the benefits of trade.

In fact, we heard from a witness at a recent hearing I held, the Reverend Nguyen Manh Hung of the Mennonite Church of Vietnam, how a religious leader has been threatened by security forces who told him that once TPP is passed, his house of worship will be torn down. This is a message that Congress, and the American people need to hear, before we continue to debate TPP in the abstract: There should be no trade deal with Vietnam without milestones being met on human rights on a permanent and sustainable basis.

RECOGNIZING THE WAYNESBORO, PENNSYLVANIA YMCA FOR 100 YEARS OF HISTORY AND SERVICE

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Waynesboro Area YMCA on the occasion of its 100th year of service to the Waynesboro community.

The Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) was first established in 1844, and has grown into a worldwide organization that represents the pursuit of a healthy body, mind, and spirit. The Waynesboro community has been fortunate to have the Waynesboro Area YMCA since 1915, and today I congratulate the organization for 100 years of positive impact on the community.

From the momentous laying of the original building's cornerstone to today, the Waynesboro Area YMCA's Board of Directors, staff, and community members have put an impressive amount of work into continually growing and improving the Y's impact on the community. Countless renovations, fundraising efforts, and hours of work have enabled the Waynesboro Area Y to reach a community presence of which its 1915 founders would be proud.

Today the Waynesboro Y has a membership of nearly 3,600 people and offers more than 100 different programs. With a true communal spirit, it financially assists over 300 youth and 150 adults for membership and programs, providing over \$90,000 in scholarships annually. Though much has changed about the Waynesboro Y, it has remained committed to the principles by which it was founded—the pursuit of a healthy body, mind, and spirit with a Christian basis.

I am privileged to congratulate the Waynesboro Area YMCA for a century of history and service to the Waynesboro community, and to thank all who have helped this YMCA continue its success.

IN HONOR OF KEITH ISRAEL

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable public service career of Keith Israel, who is retiring as the General Manager of the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA), after 27 years. Under Mr. Israel's leadership, the MRWPCA has grown to serve 250,000 people and treat 18.5 million gallons each day.

After obtaining a Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering and a Masters in both Environmental Engineering and Business Administration, Mr. Israel worked for five years as General Manager of the Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation District. In 1988, Mr. Israel came to the Monterey Peninsula and immediately began to revolutionize the work of the MRWPCA. In the 1990's, MRWPCA con-

structed the Regional Treatment Plant (RTP) near Marina under his leadership. The efficiency and new treatment plans spearheaded by Mr. Israel and brought about by the RTP's development led to increased economic opportunity and business and housing development in the Monterey region. Also in the 1990's, Mr. Israel began collaborating with the Monterey County Water Resources Agency to begin a project to reduce groundwater withdrawal and allow for the use of recycled water for 12,000 acres of farmland in the Salinas Valley.

Throughout his tenure at the MRWPCA, Mr. Israel has served as a visionary, coordinating the Salinas River Diversion Project and Pure Water Monterey Project, all while working tirelessly to facilitate collaboration between local leaders to advocate for sustainable water resources. Because of Mr. Israel's dedication to reducing the MRWPCA's carbon footprint, the agency has made great strides in the implementation of environmentally progressive processes, leading to recognition such as the Breathe California Central Coast Clean-Air Award and a partnership with ENERGY STAR. Mr. Israel has also built a personal reputation of excellence in the industry; throughout his career, he has served on the Boards of American Water Works Association and WaterReuse Association and maintained leadership positions in the California Association of Sanitation Agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the whole House in sharing our gratitude to Keith for a job well done and extend our best wishes to him and his family this next chapter of life. I know that even in retirement, he will still find himself involved in the community and continue to better the Monterey Peninsula just as he has done through his work at the MRWPCA these last 27 years.

RECOGNIZING LT. CHRIS MILLER

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Lieutenant Chris J. Miller, Commanding Officer of Coast Guard Station Channel Islands Harbor, on the special occasion of his transfer to the Coast Guard District Eight New Orleans District Response Advisory Team.

During his time as Commanding Officer, Lieutenant Miller expertly managed 51 active duty and reserve personnel while directing the safe and efficient completion of over 3,000 underway hours, conducting more than 1,400 missions and sorties in support of 176 Search and Rescue cases and 300 recreational and commercial boardings. His leadership resulted in the saving of 53 lives, the preservation of over 4.5 million dollars in property, and significantly improved boating safety along the coast of California.

Under his command, Lieutenant Miller regularly held annual National Safe Boating expos, each hosting between 800 to 1,000 visitors annually and provided an average of 420 tours of station boats including hosting 22 marine

supply vendors, fire rescue, police, Red Cross and local maritime organizations. The Expo continues to issue over 90 new lifejackets and promote rescue demonstrations that are highly successful and showcase the efforts made by the United States Coast Guard.

Additionally, Lieutenant Miller's outstanding leadership has resulted in his receipt of numerous awards and accolades to include the Coast Guard Commendation and Coast Guard Achievement Medals, Commandant Letter of Commendation Medals, Coast Guard Good Conduct Medals, as well as a number of other personal and service awards.

Along with his exemplary service in the United States Coast Guard, Lieutenant Miller is an active leader in the community balancing a rigorous work schedule with serving community needs in several local organizations. He volunteered with the Camarillo YMCA and the Naval Base Ventura, Youth Sports Association where he coached basketball and soccer for six youth teams. He volunteered at local homeless shelters and rescue missions distributing food at Thanksgiving and giving out gifts at Christmas. He routinely opened the station for tours to local schools and provided outreach by visiting and speaking at local schools during Career Day functions.

For over two decades, Lieutenant Miller's exceptional career and community involvement is indicative of his commitment to serving his country. As he embarks on a new chapter in his life as Commanding Officer for the Coast Guard District Response Advisory Team in New Orleans, Louisiana, I want to express my sincere appreciation for Lieutenant Miller's honorable and selfless service to our community. I wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING
MIKE RINGLER

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend John Michael "Mike" Ringler on the occasion of his retirement, having served for 17 years on the House Appropriations Committee. In total, he has provided more than 27 years of distinguished, quiet service to our country. His integrity stands as a model for us all.

Mike, a native of Rector, Pennsylvania, graduated from Georgetown University with a Bachelor of Science in Foreign Service, enhancing his experience by studying abroad in the United Kingdom and Ecuador. He also earned a Master of Public and International Affairs from the University of Pittsburgh. Mike counts himself as an avid fan of Steelers football and Hoyas basketball, and he fine tunes his own basketball skills at weekend games with friends and colleagues.

Mike began his career in Washington, D.C. in 1987 as a Presidential Management Intern at the U.S. Information Agency, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. From there, he rose through the ranks as a budget analyst then financial manager by 1996 before spend-

ing a year as the budget officer for the Broadcasting Board of Governors. In 1997, he started his dedicated service to the House Appropriations Committee, serving as Professional Staff from 1997 through 2001; Majority Clerk and Staff Director from 2002 through 2006; Minority Clerk and Staff Director from 2007 through 2010; and finally as Majority Clerk and Staff Director from 2011 through the early spring of 2015. Mike spent his entire Congressional career working on the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, where he was responsible for leading the review, analysis, and production of the annual appropriations bill providing more than \$50 billion for the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and several related agencies. He also oversaw spending for various State Department programs and the U.S. Supreme Court. Mike recently has gone back to his roots and now works for his alma mater, the University of Pittsburgh.

Mike's contributions extend beyond his role on the Appropriations Committee. For years, he participated as a reading mentor with Everybody Wins! in Washington, D.C., a literacy mentor program with one-on-one, read-aloud sessions. Mike's other passions include music—both playing guitar and attending classical Indian music recitals and small music venues.

Mr. Speaker, Mike Ringler has left a tangible, lasting imprint on the Congress where he was known as a calm, diligent force on the Committee and a trusted mentor for professional staff and fellow clerks alike. He will be remembered for his many contributions to the Committee. I wish Mike and his family continued success as he enters this next stage of his life, and I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing my appreciation for his tremendous contributions to our nation.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR.
WILLIAM "BILL" CLEMENS
WALKER

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. William "Bill" Clemens Walker, who passed away peacefully on April 24, 2015. Bill was born to his loving parents Lewis and Ina Walker on May 5, 1925. He was raised in Southern Illinois where he attended a one-room schoolhouse, and while attending school he began working in his father's general merchandise store in Grantsburg, IL as well as his father's furniture store in Vienna, IL.

Bill was very successful in his schooling having graduated from Vienna Township High School in 1942, Northwestern University in 1945, and the Harvard Business School's Mid-Officer Certificate program for Navy Supply Corps Officers in 1945. Bill was very kind and hardworking but above all else, he loved his family and they were his most prized posses-

sion. For all who knew Bill, one of his proudest achievements in life had been serving as an Ensign in the U.S. Navy. He was stationed as Commissary Officer on Guam, until he was honorably discharged in 1946. Bill later dedicated over 32 years working for General Electric (GE) in computer systems until finally retiring in 1988. Bill was passionate about cooking, photography, writing, and working with computers.

On January 16, 1955 Bill married Ms. Joyce (Harkins) Walker in northern Georgia and later the pair welcomed their son Jeffrey and daughter Nancy. After Joyce's passing, Bill married BettyAnn Walker in 1997. The pair lived in Naples, Florida until his passing this year. Bill is preceded in death by his father Lewis; mother Ina; wife Joyce; and his two brothers Newton and James. He leaves behind his wife BettyAnn; son Jeff; daughter Nancy; sister Elizabeth; and seven grandchildren. I would like to extend my deepest condolences to Bill's entire family. He was a great man whose legacy will continue to live on, and he will be missed.

CONGRATULATING MR. AND MRS.
CARL AND HEIDE HAGAR ON
THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. and Mrs. Carl and Heide Hagar on their 50th Wedding Anniversary, which they will be celebrating on July 10, 2015.

Carl was born in Oklahoma and grew up in Arkansas. After Carl joined the United States Army, he was deployed to Germany. During his time in Germany, he met his wife, Heide, who was born in Altenmunster, Germany. Through their married years they lived in Germany, Vietnam, and the United States. Carl and Heide settled in Iberia, Missouri and have lived there since 1979. After 22 years of service in the United States Army, Carl retired. Heide worked in the Mess Hall at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri for 29 years. They have raised three children, Lou Ann Elmore, Walter Stephen Hagar, and Jeffery Andrew Hagar.

Marriage is a sacred institution that represents true love, commitment, and dedication to family. This is a special time to celebrate and showcase the depth of your love and devotion to one another.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Mr. and Mrs. Carl Hagar on this momentous occasion.

CONGRATULATING ADEL
HAGEKHALIL

HON. TONY CÁRDENAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Adel Hagekhalil, Assistant Director for the City of Los Angeles' Bureau of

Sanitation, on his election as President of the National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA). The Bureau of Sanitation is responsible for operating and maintaining one of the world's largest wastewater collection and treatment systems. Over 6,500 miles of sewers serve more than four million residential and business customers in Los Angeles and 29 contracting cities and agencies, treating an average of 550 million gallons of wastewater each day of the year.

Adel is a dynamic leader who has shown an unparalleled ability to collaborate and bring diverse interests together for a common cause—strengths ideally suited for the NACWA Presidency. During this transition year for NACWA, Adel's steady leadership style will help ensure that the Association will build on its 45-year record of being a dynamic and forward-thinking environmental organization.

Beyond his wealth of environmental, engineering, and management expertise, Adel utilized a collaborative approach to watershed-based solutions that garnered broad support among the public, business, elected officials, regulators and policymakers. He moves the needle in the right direction, is results-oriented, and gets the job done.

Adel is also a staunch and effective advocate for investing in our nation's aging and often deteriorating water infrastructure—investments that convey both environmental and economic benefits and help communities across our great nation create jobs, grow, and thrive. Adel believes that great communities must better understand the true value of water and deserve first-class, sustainable water infrastructure.

Under Adel's direction, the City of Los Angeles prepared an award-winning Water Integrated Resources Plan (IRP) for the year 2020 which relies on public input and participation and integrates water supply, water reuse, water conservation and stormwater management with wastewater facilities planning through a regional watershed approach. He has managed the City's collection system maintenance upgrade efforts resulting in over 83 percent reduction in sewer spills and over 70 percent reduction in sewer-related odors.

Adel's work on Fats, Oils and Grease (FOG) reduction has cut FOG-related spills by 90 percent. More recently, he led the development and adoption of a Low Impact Development Ordinance for the City of Los Angeles that focuses on rainwater harvesting and runoff management for new developments and redevelopments. In addition, he was instrumental in the successful development and adoption of a 10-year financial plan including the necessary rates adjustment to support the renewal of the City's clean water systems.

Adel is currently leading the City of Los Angeles' Green Infrastructure program where stormwater is managed through regional and distributed solutions that provide multiple benefits while improving the quality of life in LA's neighborhoods. In addition, he is leading the development of the One Water Plan for Los Angeles for the year 2040 to manage water holistically while reducing consumption, increasing water reuse and reducing dependence on imported water, a critical need in the City's efforts to confront drought conditions.

Adel has more than 26 years of experience in the clean water industry and has published numerous technical papers and participated in various technical conferences and committees. In addition to his service to NACWA, The Bureau of Sanitation is a founding member of the U.S. Water Alliance, and Adel is a proud member of the American Academy of Environmental Engineers, the American Public Works Association, and the Water Environment Federation.

Adel has received many awards at the local, state and national levels. These include the inaugural U.S. Water Prize, Heal the Bay's "Walk the Talk Award," L.A. Water Keeper's "Making Waves Award," and the American Academy of Environmental Engineers Grand Award for Planning. More important to Adel than these professional accomplishments is his family. Adel is a devoted husband and father, married to Lubna Farsakh with whom he is raising three beautiful children, Jana, Jad and Dareen.

Once again, I wish to congratulate Adel Hagekhalil on his election as President of NACWA. As he has done for the residents of the San Fernando Valley and the City of Los Angeles, I am sure he will lead the organization down a road marked by innovation, collaboration, progress and success. Best wishes on future endeavors.

BEN POWELL EARNS EAGLE SCOUT

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dulles High School's Ben Powell on earning the rank of Eagle Scout with Sugar Land Boy Scout Troop 1294.

Ben is among less than ten percent of all Boy Scouts to earn such a prestigious rank by dedicating countless hours towards organizing and working service projects with Troop 1294. For his final Eagle Scout Project, Ben lead 42 volunteers in a restoration effort throughout the historical Farmers' Improvement Society Cemetery. Together, they spent three hours resetting over 25 headstones that marked the graves of African American war veterans. Eagle Scouts exemplify the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership. We are extremely proud of Ben's selfless dedication to our community and for demonstrating such strong leadership.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Ben on becoming an Eagle Scout. You have a bright future ahead.

CONGRATULATING HILLARY CLINTON, 2015 RECIPIENT OF THE BARBARA JORDAN GOLD MEDALLION FOR LEADERSHIP

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 2015, the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs and the Thurgood Marshall School of Law, two of the great institutions of Texas Southern University, which is located in my congressional district and is one of the nation's great historically black colleges and universities, awarded the inaugural Barbara Jordan Gold Medallion for Public-Private Leadership.

The Barbara Jordan Gold Medallion for Public-Private Leadership is presented annually to a woman of demonstrated excellence in the public or private sector whose achievements are an example and inspiration to people everywhere, but especially to women and girls.

The Barbara Jordan Gold Medallion for Public-Private Leadership is presented annually to a woman of demonstrated excellence in the public or private sector whose achievements are an example and inspiration to people everywhere, but especially to women and girls.

It was my honor to present the Barbara Jordan Gold Medallion to the Honorable Hillary Clinton, the former First Lady of Arkansas and the United States, U.S. Senator, and Secretary of State.

As I stated at the award ceremony, it was fitting that the inaugural recipient of this award is a person whose life and achievements embody the passion and principles and values and commitment to service of Barbara Jordan.

When asked to name the woman living anywhere in the world whom they admire most, Americans have named Hillary Clinton in each of the last 13 years and 17 of the last 18.

As a leader on the national and international stage, Hillary Clinton represented our nation with distinction and grace, always reflecting our highest ideals and aspirations.

It was First Lady Hillary Clinton who traveled to Beijing to speak truth to power, declaring on behalf of women and girls everywhere that: "human rights are women's rights. And women's rights are human rights."

It was Hillary Clinton who gave voice to what many of us have always understood, when she said that to raise a happy, healthy and hopeful child, "it takes a family, it takes teachers, it takes clergy, it takes business people, it takes community leaders, it takes those who protect our health and safety, it takes all of us."

That, yes indeed, "it takes a village to raise a child."

But before Hillary Clinton was a household name, many of us in Texas remembered her as a brilliant young activist whose passion for justice and equality brought her to Texas in 1972 to help poor people and African Americans and Latinos register to exercise the right to vote they had been denied so long.

Passed in 1965 with the extraordinary leadership of President Lyndon Johnson, the greatest legislative genius of our lifetime, the

Voting Rights Act of 1965 was bringing dramatic change in many states across the South.

But in 1972, change was not coming fast enough or in many places in Texas.

In fact, Texas, which had never elected a woman to Congress or an African American to the Texas State Senate, was not covered by Section 5 of the 1965 Voting Rights Act and the language minorities living in South Texas that Hillary Clinton came to help were not protected at all.

But the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the voter registration work performed in 1972 by Hillary Clinton in Texas, along with hundreds of others, helped elect Barbara Jordan to Congress.

In 2006, during the floor debate on the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, I said:

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is no ordinary piece of legislation. For millions of Americans, and many of us in Congress, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

But a terrible blow was dealt to the Voting Rights Act on June 25, 2013, when the Supreme Court handed down the decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 537 U.S. 193 (2013), which invalidated Section 4(b), the provision of the law determining which jurisdictions would be subject to Section 5 "preclearance."

The reason the Court gave for its ruling was that "times have changed."

Times have changed, but what the Court did not fully appreciate is that the positive changes it cited were due almost entirely to the existence and vigorous enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

And that is why the Voting Rights Act is still needed today.

In the same way that the vaccine invented by Dr. Jonas Salk in 1953 eradicated the crippling effects but did not eliminate the cause of polio, the Voting Rights Act succeeded in stymying the practices that resulted in the wholesale disenfranchisement of African Americans and language minorities but did not eliminate them entirely.

In Texas, we know this from personal experience.

On the same day that *Shelby County v. Holder* was decided officials in Texas announced they would immediately implement its Photo ID law, and other election laws, policies, and practices that could never pass muster under the Section 5 preclearance regime.

This stands in contrast to President Lyndon Johnson, who understood that the right to vote is:

The most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison men because they are different from other men.

Because Barbara Jordan understood the importance of protecting the right to vote, she authored the 1975 amendment that became Section Sections 4(f)(3) and 4(f)(4) of the Voting Rights Act, which extended to language minorities the protections of Section 4(a) and Section 5, which also had the effect of subjecting Texas to the pre-clearance provisions of Section 5.

I am pleased that the inaugural recipient of the award given in Barbara Jordan's name

also understands, as she made clear in her acceptance remarks in which she called for reforms to make it easier, not harder, for Americans to exercise the franchise, including automatic, universal registration of voters once they turn 18; and a national standard of not fewer than 20 days of early in-person voting in every state, including opportunities for weekend and evenings.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Texas Southern University, and the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs and Thurgood Marshall School of Law for honoring the memory of one of a great American by establishing the Barbara Jordan Gold Medallion and I congratulate the 2015 recipient of this prestigious award, the Honorable Hillary Clinton.

I look forward to congratulating future recipients of the Barbara Jordan Gold Medallion in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 375, due to unforeseen circumstances I was unable to vote on H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

HONORING THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Church of the Living God in Winchester, Kentucky. This church is celebrating their twenty-fifth anniversary in ministry on July 26th. Led by Pastors Thomas and Lela Hall and Mike and Angela Smith, this church is an important part of the Clark County community. Their ministry touches the lives of their members, others in the community, and people all throughout the world by the service and mission work that they carry out. I congratulate the Church of the Living God on their twenty five years serving God and impacting the region through the Lord Jesus Christ and I wish them a long and productive future in ministry.

TRIBUTE TO SHENANDOAH FLORAL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Shenandoah Floral of Shenandoah, Iowa. For over 90 years, Shenandoah Floral has been a staple in the Shen-

andoah community. According to local history, the florist shop was first recorded in the local phonebook in 1925. In 2006, Shenandoah Floral was purchased by current owner Nancy Maher. Nancy purchased the shop when it was in danger of closing and has turned the business into a success story.

Nancy had no prior experience running a floral shop, so the assistance of the existing staff helped in making Shenandoah Floral successful. Nancy contributes the success of the floral shop to her employees. Nancy wanted to keep the floral shop in operation in order to keep existing jobs in Shenandoah. She stated that, "If the doors had closed, they'd have just been out of a job." Nancy has been committed to preserving Shenandoah's downtown area and keeping the downtown business district viable.

Since assuming ownership of the floral shop, Nancy has seen many changes in the operation of the business, such as the streamlining of operations by using advanced technology and computers. She remembers handwriting orders. Nancy takes pride in the services that the floral shop provides. The shop receives orders from around the world, including from our men and women in the military who wish to send flowers to family members. The business cherishes the many friends and customers they have served for the past 90 years.

I commend Shenandoah Floral and their staff for their 90 years of dedicated service to Shenandoah and southwest Iowa. I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Shenandoah Floral for their many achievements in the florist industry. I wish them and all of their employees best wishes moving forward.

IN RECOGNITION OF JACK LUND'S RETIREMENT AFTER 40 YEARS OF LEADERSHIP IN THE YMCA

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Jack Lund and his retirement after forty years of leadership and service in the YMCA.

Jack currently serves as President and Chief Executive Officer of the YMCA of Greater New York, the largest YMCA in the United States. As head of New York City's largest private youth-serving organization, Jack is dedicated to strengthening the foundations of communities in New York City through programs that nurture the potential of children and youth, improve the health and well being of individuals and communities and address some of New York City's most challenging social problems.

Jack has pioneered programs in education, civic engagement and immigrant services. Most recently, the Y has launched signature programs addressing the academic achievement gap for children living in poverty, the epidemic of youth obesity and disconnected young people—who have dropped out of school and are not working.

Jack has spent 40 years working for various YMCAs, starting his service in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Prior to joining the YMCA of Greater New York, he served as president and CEO of the YMCA of Metropolitan Milwaukee from 1995 through 2004.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Mr. Jack Lund on this remarkable occasion. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing him a wonderful retirement and many years of happiness.

TRIBUTE TO JANE HART

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a good friend and a pioneer from my home state of Michigan, Jane Hart. Jane passed away on June 5, 2015.

Some of us in Congress knew Jane through her husband, the late Senator Phil Hart, for whom the Hart Senate Office Building is named and who was known as the "conscience of the Senate." I had the privilege of knowing her personally through common endeavors in Michigan. So while Jane Hart was her husband's partner in so many ways during his service to the people of Michigan, she was a leader and a trailblazer in her own right. She was a person with an unusual combination of a sense of responsibility for the common good, family loyalty and respect for individuality.

Like so many women during World War II, Jane was committed to helping the American war effort. She was involved with the American Red Cross, helping to found their motor corps. She trained other women to drive the trucks built in Michigan factories to military bases around the country and to ports for transport overseas. Her involvement in this effort led to her interest in flying. During a time when there were very few women pilots, Jane earned licenses to fly single and multi-engine airplanes. She later became the first woman in the state of Michigan to earn a license to fly helicopters, and during her husband's first campaign for the Senate, she flew Phil to campaign events throughout the state.

Her passion for flight led to an interest in the space program, and she, along with 12 others, were the first women to pass the physical and psychological tests required by NASA of astronaut candidates. NASA denied their entry into the astronaut program, and the Detroit News reported that she commented at the time, "The men just could not get it and the country lost a great opportunity." While this group of women, who became known as the Mercury 13, never went to space themselves, their efforts and their advocacy helped to pave the way for Sally Ride to become the first American woman astronaut, and for all the women who have contributed so much to our space program since Ms. Ride's historic flight.

As a pioneer for women in flight and in space, it was no surprise that Jane Hart was a powerful advocate for women's rights in general. In 1966, Jane was a founding board member of the National Organization for

Women (NOW), where she chaired the new organization's Task Force on Legal and Political Rights, and she helped to establish NOW chapters in Michigan and in Washington, DC. For many years, she passionately advocated for an Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. In recognition of her leadership, Jane was inducted into the Michigan Women's Hall of Fame in 2007.

Jane was also a well-known peace activist during the tumultuous period of the Vietnam War, which her son Michael told the Washington Post sometimes made things "a little bit . . . complicated" for her husband. But, as her son also noted to the Post, "On occasion someone would demand of him, 'Can't you control that wife of yours?' But the senator would respond, 'Why would I?'"

While leading a life of adventure and advocacy, Jane Hart also raised her family with love and commitment. She and Phil Hart had nine children, eight grandchildren, and seven great-grandchildren. To them, and to all who knew her, Jane Hart was a vital force whose intelligence, energy and passion were inspirational. I encourage my colleagues to join me in remembering Jane Hart's remarkable contributions to our country and in extending condolences to the Hart family on her passing.

IN HONOR OF THE REVEREND ROOSEVELT FRANKLIN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding spiritual leader and man of God, the Reverend Roosevelt Franklin. Sadly, Reverend Franklin passed away on Monday, June 15, 2015. His passing leaves a tremendous void in the hearts of his family, friends, and followers in Georgia and across the world. A funeral service was held in his honor on Saturday, June 20, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. at First Baptist Church in Macon, Georgia.

Reverend Roosevelt Delano Franklin Johnson was born on August 30, 1933 in Chattanooga, Tennessee to James and Cora Ponds Johnson. He attended Oxford School of Divinity in England. Reverend Franklin began his ministry in 1966, and for the past forty-nine years, he has been a willing vessel for the Lord.

Known around the world as the "Original Georgia Prophet," Rev. Franklin traveled the globe teaching people of all walks of life. He served as pastor of Free For All Baptist Church in Greenwood, South Carolina from 1951 until 1952, when he became a spiritual radio minister. He ministered at Spiritual Church in Aiken, South Carolina from 1962–1963. His journey then took him to Macon, Georgia, where he became President of United Council of Spiritual Ministers and Talent Coordinator and Promoter of numerous renowned spiritual singers.

Always seeking to improve the craft of Christian ministry and discipleship, Rev. Franklin created the television program, "The

Prosperity Way of Living" and the radio program, "Echo of Prophecy," in the early 1960s. In 1966, Rev. Franklin founded the Holy Trinity House of God, which he pastored until his departure to his eternal reward.

Rev. Franklin proudly served the craft of Smooth Ashlar Grand Lodge. He was National Grand Orator for the National Grand Council of Nine. Rev. Franklin received numerous awards and recognitions for his accomplishments.

A charismatic leader with an infectious spiritual zeal, Reverend Franklin had a way of ensuring that his listeners found their way to prosperity and happiness as they lived their lives in Christ. But beyond his radio ministry, Rev. Franklin made himself available to those who sought a relationship with Christ, and he would hold personal consultations with anyone who needed guidance and encouragement. He taught people to be positive, to search for knowledge, and overall, to be guided by the voice of God. Rev. Franklin was truly a man of integrity who exuded the genuine principles and values of Christian discipleship.

On a personal note, I have truly been blessed by Rev. Franklin's sage counsel and enduring friendship over the many years I have known him.

Dr. George Washington Carver once said, "No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it." We are so blessed that the Reverend Roosevelt Franklin passed this way and shared with us his legacy of service that will stand the test of time. Surely, the wealth of wisdom that Reverend Franklin has given to his listeners will forever resonate in their hearts and spirits.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 730,000 people in the Second Congressional District of Georgia, would like to extend our deepest sympathies to Rev. Franklin's family, friends, and followers during this difficult time. May we all be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BOROUGH OF BANGOR'S 140TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 140th anniversary of the Borough of Bangor, located in Northampton County, Pennsylvania, and its listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The area now known as Bangor, PA was settled in 1735. It was first named Uttsville after Adam Utt, one of the area's first hotel builders. In 1855, the name was changed to New Village. Slate was discovered in 1856. Robert M. Jones, from Bethesda, Wales, founded the slate industry, and the first quarry opened in 1863. Bangor was incorporated as a borough on May 5, 1875. At that time, the population was 1,500. It was and is the core community in what came to be known as the Slate Belt region of Northampton County. At

its height, Bangor's slate was known as the finest in the world, and Bangor was home to over seven major hotels.

In the mid-1990s, a group of Bangor residents sought to preserve the borough's historical assets to secure its future vitality. In 2007, Bangor's Borough Business Revitalization Program joined a regional Main Street Program to foster the image of Bangor's traditional assets. The program later evolved into the Slate Belt Community Partnership, which continued the work. The National Register of Historic Places listing was approved in late 2014. Its focus is the slate extraction industry and the ethnic groups it attracted to Bangor from 1866–1940.

I offer congratulations to the residents of Bangor for fulfilling their vision of a preserved Historic District. I applaud their dedication to history and to their community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF JACK SANTOS SHIMIZU

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of my dear friend Jack Santos Shimizu. Mr. Shimizu served our island and country faithfully and passed away on June 5, 2015 at the age of 75.

Jack was born on March 23, 1940 to Joaquin Torres Shimizu and Ana Santos Shimizu. He grew up in the village of Dededo and was a member of the first graduating class of Santa Barbara Catholic School. As a child, Jack survived the Japanese occupation of Guam during World War II and was a member of Guam's greatest generation. He joined the United States Navy in 1957 at just 17 years old. Jack served in the U.S. Navy for 28 years before retiring as Master Chief Petty Officer in July 1985.

Upon retiring from the Navy, Jack returned to Guam and settled in Latte Plantation in the village of Mangilao. He continued a life of service to our community and served in several positions in the Government of Guam. He was appointed the Chief of Police of the Guam Police Department and the Director of the Guam Department of Corrections.

Most notably, Jack dedicated much of his time to helping veterans. He was instrumental in founding the Guam chapter of the Military Order of the Purple Heart (MOPH). Jack was the current Commander of the Asia-Pacific Military Order of the Purple Heart. He devoted his time to carry out the mission of the MOPH to foster an environment of goodwill and camaraderie among combat wounded veterans, promote patriotism, support necessary legislative initiatives, and most importantly, provide service to all veterans and their families. Jack was active in promoting the organization to Purple Heart recipients and making them aware of services that were available to them. He, along with other members would visit homebound residents to assess their needs and offer assistance. He would also lead the organization in fundraising to assist other charitable organizations. Additionally, Jack vol-

unteered his time at the Veterans Affairs Office in Asan. He will be remembered as a loving and giving man who was always willing to help others.

I am deeply saddened by the passing of Mr. Jack Santos Shimizu, and I join the people of Guam in celebrating his life and recognizing his dedicated service to Guam and our country. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Teresita Quintanilla Shimizu, his children, family, loved ones and friends. He will be missed, and his memory will live on in the hearts of the people of Guam.

TRIBUTE TO WILL BABOCK

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Will Babock from Panorama High School in Panorama, Iowa for winning the Class 2A Boys State Golf title.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this student demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent him and his family in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating Will on competing in this rigorous competition and wishing him continued success in his education and high school golf career.

HONORING INTERNATIONAL YOGA
DAY

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a global day of physical and mental exercise as the world celebrates International Yoga Day on June 21, 2015.

Yoga is a physical, mental, and spiritual practice that aims to integrate the body and the mind. It encourages participants to assume various postures and to conduct breathing exercise, subsequently allowing them to achieve a deeper sense of consciousness and tranquility.

Developed around the fifth and sixth century BCE by the ancient Indian civilizations of the Indus River Valley, yoga is a hallmark of the Indian culture. The world's religions that originate from India—Buddhism, Hinduism, and Jainism—utilize yoga as a central part of their religious and cultural traditions. In fact, yoga appears prominently in the Bhagavad Gita, one of Hinduism's most important texts, and in some of the earliest Buddhist texts.

In the mid-19th century, the Western public gained an active interest in yoga, valuing the practice for its transcendental experience. By the 1980's, yoga became viewed as a means to promote physical wellbeing, citing improvements to mental health and flexibility.

On December 11, 2014, the United Nations General Assembly declared June 21st as International Yoga Day. The importance of this special day cannot be understated, because as the saying goes, "in the practice of yoga, one can emphasize the body, the mind, or the self and hence the effort can never be fruitless."

This year, there will be a rally on June 21 celebrating International Yoga Day in Times Square. I am honored to recognize the invaluable gift of consciousness and well-being that yoga has brought to the people of the United States and the world, and I wish the participants of International Yoga Day a stimulating experience.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE
MAJOR GENERAL DAVID F.
WHERLEY, JR., DISTRICT OF CO-
LUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD RE-
TENTION AND COLLEGE ACCESS
ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Major General David F. Wherley, Jr., District of Columbia National Guard Retention and College Access Act (NGRCA) on the six-year anniversary of the tragic June 22, 2009 Metro crash, where General Wherley, former Commanding General of the D.C. National Guard, his wife, Ann, and seven others were killed when Metro trains collided on the Red Line. Yesterday, the District of Columbia opened Legacy Memorial Park in Ward 4 to honor those who lost their lives and the 70 area residents who were injured. My bill would permanently authorize funding for a program that provides grants for higher education to members of the D.C. National Guard, which is funded by the federal government. I have renamed this bill after General Wherley because he worked tirelessly with me to get funding for the program for many years, and because of his devotion to the youth of the District of Columbia.

The NGRCA authorizes an education incentive program, recommended by the late General Wherley and his successor, Major General Errol Schwartz, to stem the troublesome loss of members of the D.C. Guard to other units. Surrounding states offer such educational benefits to their Guards. I am grateful that Congress has provided funds for the program in recent years, most recently in fiscal year 2015. Naming a permanently authorized program after General Wherley would memorialize his service to the country and to the Guard in a way that I know his family would appreciate. Authorizing funding is necessary to ensure that D.C. Guard members receive the same treatment and benefits as other National Guard members, particularly those in states that provide the higher education benefits we seek for D.C. Guard members. The Guard for the nation's capital has a limited ability to compete for regional residents, who may find membership in the Maryland and Virginia

Guards more beneficial. A competitive tuition assistance program for the D.C. Guard will provide significant and much needed incentives to help maintain enrollment and level the field of competition. The D.C. Guard is a federal instrument not under the control of the mayor of the District of Columbia. The federal government supports D.C. Guard functions and should support this small benefit as well.

I appreciate that the Congress has not hesitated to fund the education benefits for the D.C. National Guard. These small education incentives have not only encouraged high-quality recruits, but have helped the D.C. Guard to maintain the force necessary to protect the federal presence here, including in the event of a natural disaster or terrorist attack. I am pleased to introduce the bill based on the advice of Guard personnel, who best know what is necessary.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

HOUSTON ASIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Houston Asian Chamber of Commerce.

The Houston Asian Chamber of Commerce has served our community well for 25 successful years. They have been vigilant in their mission to develop future business leaders and to promote the economic development of Houston-area Asian-American communities. The Asian Chamber of Commerce also has a pivotal role in promoting trade for both Houston, Texas and Asia. Chamber Co-chairs Samina Farid, Gordon Quan and Stephen Le, Sr. recently threw an event that truly honored the achievements of the last 25 years.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Houston Asian Chamber of Commerce on a wonderful 25 years. Thank you for all that you have done for our community.

HONORING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LICKING UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 175th anniversary of the Licking United Methodist Church located in Licking, Missouri. The church was organized in 1840 as the first Methodist Society of Licking which met at parishioners' homes and later a schoolhouse.

Since its founding, the church's space and membership have steadily grown. By 1937 the church had built an entire new sanctuary with a seating capacity of roughly 500 people and

added a new cobblestone vestibule and bell tower in 1950. In addition to providing a place for communal prayer for a devoted congregation, they also actively serve the local community. The church has regular food drives, hosts free dinners open to all, organizes blood drives, and even supports a community garden. Through its long and rich history, the church's vital congregation has remained an integral part of the city of Licking.

For their ongoing dedication to serving Christ and their community, it is my pleasure to honor the Licking United Methodist Church on their 175th anniversary before the House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 2015, I missed a Roll Call vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on Roll Call #375, on passage of the Protect Medical Innovation Act.

TRIBUTE TO DR. DAN KINNEY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Dan Kinney, President of Iowa Western Community College in Council Bluffs, Iowa. Dr. Kinney has devoted his career to the community college system. Iowa Western Community College has been a vital part of the development of Southwest Iowa since being founded in 1967, and Dr. Kinney has led the college for the past 21 years. Dr. Kinney has been responsible for the growth and expansion of this outstanding community college. He has helped to build a learning institution that has a reputation for providing a quality education and producing skilled graduates.

Iowa Western currently offers 84 different vocational and technical programs, as well as Arts and Sciences transfer majors. Current enrollment exceeds 5,500 students and there are over 42,795 enrollments in continuing education classes each year. In recognition of Dr. Kinney's successful tenure, the College Board of Trustees recently announced that the new engineering and technology building would be named in his honor. This honor is given to Dr. Kinney for his dedication and determination to move the college forward by meeting the growing demand for students in engineering and technology.

Dr. Kinney's leadership has been critical to the development of this premier, state-of-the-art, and respected learning institution in the state of Iowa. Dr. Kinney is an Iowan who has made a difference in the lives of many and for that we are deeply proud. He has dedicated his life to helping and serving others and so it is with great honor that I recognize him today.

I know my colleagues in the House join me in honoring his accomplishments. I thank him for his service and wish him and his family all the best moving forward.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SACRAMENTO JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Sacramento Japanese American Citizens League's annual high school scholarship recipients. As the members of the Sacramento Japanese American Citizens League and the students gather to celebrate, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing these deserving young women and men.

Each year, the Sacramento Japanese American Citizens League provides scholarships to a select group of high school students who have demonstrated academic excellence, community service and commitment to pursue a higher education. These students will be honored in a public ceremony at the Sacramento Japanese American Citizens League's scholarship dinner this evening. This year the following outstanding students will receive scholarships: Kevin Abdelnour, John F. Kennedy High School; Kenji Bennett, Mira Loma High School; Quinn S. Fujii, C.K. McClatchy High School; Lindsey Kikumoto, Laguna Creek High School; Benjamin Kopania, Oak Ridge High School; Reid Masaki, West Campus High School; Jasper Miura, Mira Loma High School; and Alex Playdon, C.K. McClatchy High School.

I would also like to recognize last year's scholarship recipients: Sydney Kajioka, Laguna Creek High School; Aaron Matsuda, C.K. McClatchy High School; Kari Nakamura, John F. Kennedy High School; Matthew Nakatomi, John F. Kennedy High School; Rebecca Uda, C.K. McClatchy High School; and Kayla Umemoto, Mira Loma High School.

The Sacramento Japanese American Citizens League is dedicated to advancing the civil rights of all Americans, while also leading the Japanese American community to further social and economic equality. I trust that the students being recognized will carry this tradition forward to protect the civil rights of all of our citizens and stay engaged in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, as these students are being recognized by the Japanese American Citizens League members, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing them success in their future endeavors.

HONORING DR. LUCIANO FRANCISCO RAMON BACA

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the

life of Dr. Luciano Francisco Ramon Baca, otherwise known as "Lu" in his beloved community.

Born and raised in Las Vegas, New Mexico, Dr. Lu dedicated his life in the service of others and to his fellow New Mexicans. For more than 10 years, Lu worked as a Social Studies teacher at Leah Harvey Middle School teaching students the heartfelt principles, values, and beliefs that make our country great. Dr. Lu's work transcended the classroom; as Head of the Legislative Educational Committee Lu spearheaded efforts to better finance and improve educational outcomes in New Mexico.

Dr. Lu also had a firm belief that our workforce—the individuals who gave their hard work, persistence and determination to build our country—deserved the support and protections they earned when they retired. After serving in state government, Lu dedicated his life to senior citizens, and carried out every task with the full weight of his energy. He served as the former chief of public school finance for the New Mexico Department of Finance and Administration, helped create the constitution of the State Board of Education as well as the equalized Public School Funding Formula in 1974, and served on the Board of Directors for La Familia Medical Center and with the AARP for 15 years.

More than anything, Lu loved his family and wife of 55 years, Mindy Esquibel Baca. In fact, it was rare to find a time when they were not sharing an experience together, celebrating a family event, or helping out in the community. Dr. Lu cherished his time with his family and could be consistently found going above and beyond to help out an individual in need.

While Dr. Lu is no longer with us, his lasting contributions are still a presence in the community to this day. His character is espoused in the individuals he inspired throughout his life, and his enduring principles live on in the hearts and minds of all those he met. May the memory of Dr. Lu continue to live on in all of us.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DICK ROSSBERG

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Dick Rossberg—father, husband, grandfather, and Torrance patriarch—who passed away on June 10, 2015, at the age of 87.

Dick was a passionate and rare human being whose love of Torrance was evident in all he did. He was a resident of Torrance since 1956 and served on the City Council and as president of the chamber of commerce. He was president of the Palos Verdes Rotary, Hollywood Riviera Sportsman's Club, Los Verdes Men's Golf Club and South Bay Cities Association.

Our community owes Dick a debt of gratitude for his many achievements. Dick was an advocate of Old Torrance redevelopment efforts, ensuring that the history of Torrance

would be passed on to future generations. He founded Torrance's Community Energy Action Committee, which proved to be important during the 1978 energy crisis. Dick helped build a nationally recognized economic education program in the city's schools, as well.

Dick has left a tremendous and indelible mark on the City of Torrance. He touched countless lives and made each of them better for having known him.

Dick is survived by his wife of 62 years, June, his sons, Kirk and Chris, his daughters, Claudia McClain and Jill Carlton, and his three grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the remarkable life of my dear friend, Dick Rossberg.

RECOGNIZING KEN FARFSING

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Ken Farfsing, upon his retirement as the City Manager of the City of Signal Hill, California on June 30, 2015.

I've had the pleasure of working with Ken on local and state-wide issues for almost 20 years while serving on the Long Beach City Council, in the California State Legislature, and now in the U.S. Congress, and I consider him to be a dear friend.

Ken has over 33 years of experience in community development, redevelopment, economic development and city management in five Southern California communities. Ken has spent the last 19 years serving the City of Signal Hill, and I am honored to recognize his outstanding career.

Ken began his career with the City of Santa Fe Springs, California in 1981 as an intern. In 1985 he was promoted to Community Development Director.

In 1988 he continued his career as the Community Development Director for the City of Downey. He later became Downey's Assistant City Manager and Director of Economic Development. He served as the City Manager of the City of South Pasadena for four years before coming to Signal Hill.

Under his guidance, the city established three commercial centers, Town Center North, Town Center West and the Signal Hill Gateway Center. He facilitated the relocation of a Mercedes Benz dealership to Signal Hill and the expansion of Glenn E. Thomas Dodge Auto Dealership, growing sales tax revenues from 6 million dollars to more than 12 million dollars. Additionally, he completed the development of six community parks and a new police station.

Ken has been active in regional issues and a leader with expertise on water issues, working with the 27 area Gateway Cities Council of Government on water, storm water and urban runoff regulation and practices. He served as chair of the City Manager's Steering Committee for the Gateway Cities Manager's Group and was a member of the "Water Quality Task Force" of the League of California.

Ken Farfsing's leadership and service to the community of Signal Hill will be greatly

missed. I want to wish him the very best as he retires. His impact on the city will always be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking Ken Farfsing for his 19 years of public service with the City of Signal Hill.

VICTOR VALLEY COLLEGE FOUNDATION TURNS 40

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Victor Valley College Foundation's establishment. This organization has helped Victor Valley College better serve my constituents of the High Desert by providing students the tools to achieve not only their academic goals, but life goals as well. Students have received more than \$6 million in scholarships, allowing them to focus on their studies rather than how to pay for college.

Through donations, grants, and partnerships, the Victor Valley College Foundation has expanded the budget of the Victor Valley College by nearly \$50 million. In doing so, higher education has been more accessible than public funding alone would have allowed. Over the past 40 years, almost every department and program at Victor Valley College has been supported by the Foundation, of which are the School of Nursing, Southern California Logistics Airport School of Aviation Technology, Solar Photovoltaic Design and Installation, Automotive Technology Hybrid Vehicle Maintenance, Geographic Information Systems, Contract and Community Education, and Paramedic Academy.

The Victor Valley College Foundation has enriched campus life by supporting student experience programs that include the Associated Student Body, Athletics, Model United Nations, Performing Arts, and Tropical Research Institute. Among its major accomplishments, the Foundation helped open and outfit influential campus facilities like the Performing Arts Center, Student Activities Center, Regional Public Safety Training Center, and the new Dr. Prem Reddy Health and Science Building.

Finally, I would like to congratulate the Board Officers, Directors, Emeritus Council, and the Staff members on the Victor Valley College Foundation's 40th Anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO GLORIA WHETSTONE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gloria Whetstone for 50 years of service with the CHI Health Mercy Hospital in Council Bluffs, Iowa. Gloria was hired on March 6, 1965, and she is the first employee to be honored for this milestone anniversary. She has worked on every floor of

the old and new hospital facilities, including the cardiac care unit, psychiatry unit, and in the Intensive Care Unit. Gloria is always willing to lend a helping hand to her co-workers and has been an educator for many years, teaching Basic Life Support and Advanced Cardiac Life Support classes.

Throughout her career, Gloria has volunteered in her community as an agent of change. She makes and donates crib sheets for Birthright, helps with funerals at St. Patrick's Church, makes cookies to send to our U.S. troops overseas, is involved in community events through her local sorority, is an active member of the Pioneer Garden Club, and helps out with the upkeep and maintenance of the neighborhood pool. Gloria and her husband, James, have four children, 13 grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren.

Gloria has been a mentor to many young nurses and monitor techs throughout her career. She is a shining example of compassion and excellence in the work she does. Gloria received the Spirit of Mission Award given by CHI Health Mercy Hospital system, which is the highest honor given to employees and physicians. Gloria contributes daily to the organizational success by regularly demonstrating excellence in all four core areas: reverence, integrity, compassion and excellence. Gloria has touched many lives during her 50 years of service, she takes pride in her work, and is a testament to hard work and caring for others.

Gloria Whetstone is an Iowan who has made our community and state proud. She has dedicated her life to helping and serving others, and it is with great honor that I recognize her today. I know that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring her accomplishments. I thank her for her service and wish her and her family all the best moving forward.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SUMMIT OF HOPE PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Summit of Hope, which has become one of the most successful programs at reducing recidivism in the nation. Too many former inmates leave prison ill-prepared to find work and resume their lives, and the rate at which prisoners return to incarceration is far too high. The economic and human costs associated with high recidivism rates are unacceptable, and we must work for change.

The Summit of Hope is a collaborative effort between the Illinois Department of Corrections, the Illinois Department of Public Health and local organizations throughout the state. In 2014, over 13,000 parolees and probationers received resources and assistance which helps many of them along the path to successful re-entry into society. Overseen by Senior Community Outreach Administrator Marcus King, the Summit of Hope is an example of how we can work together to address our most pressing challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I will be joining Summit of Hope and community leaders at an event in

North Chicago, Illinois. I consider it an honor to be a part of their initiative.

COMMEMORATING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF TOM PARROTT

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I wish to commemorate the public service of Tom Parrott. Tom is retiring from the Social Security Administration after more than four decades of service to the millions of Americans who rely on Social Security. I serve as the Ranking Democrat on the Committee on Ways and Means, and over the years my colleagues and I and our staff have relied heavily on Tom's thoughtful and accurate advice as we crafted Social Security and Supplemental Security Income legislation. We and our constituents owe Tom our thanks for his careful stewardship of their contributions and the benefits they rely on to live.

Tom's roots at Social Security are deep, as his father of the same name and his mother served at SSA before him. In fact, Tom says he can remember polishing the family car so his parents could go to the movies with Mr. and Mrs. Bob Ball.

In January 1975, Tom began his service at Social Security as a claims representative in the Midtown Manhattan district office, before being assigned to the Rochester, New York and, subsequently, Redding, California district offices. In 1980, he was welcomed back to his home town of Baltimore as a policy analyst in the predecessor office of the current Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs. He then devoted himself for the last 35 years to working on federal legislation, providing impartial and knowledgeable counsel. He has been Acting Deputy Commissioner for Legislation and Congressional Affairs, and currently serves as Assistant Deputy Commissioner.

Tom's commitment to public service runs deeply. Prior to coming to Social Security, Tom was a VISTA volunteer and later a field health inspector working for the State with migrant farm workers in the potato and apple growing regions of western New York. Tom is a 1972 graduate of Denison University, and completed the Federal Executive Institute's Leadership for a Democratic Society program in 2005. He became a member of the Senior Executive Service in 2008.

As evidenced by his long and successful service in SSA's legislative affairs office, Tom has a keen eye for public policy, understanding the need to balance competing objectives in a politically and operationally workable fashion, and always with the Americans who rely on Social Security firmly in mind. We and our staffs have enjoyed working with Tom—one of his gifts is the ability to retain a calm demeanor and a sense of humor no matter what the situation. We have relied greatly on Tom's assistance and wise counsel over the years. We thank him for his service, and we wish him a well-earned retirement.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MS. JOYCE ANN BROWN

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Ms. Joyce Ann Brown of Dallas, Texas. Ms. Brown was wrongly convicted of aggravated robbery in 1980 and unfairly served over nine years in prison despite her innocence. Following her release in 1989, Ms. Brown used her story to fight for justice for those wrongly convicted in Texas and around the country. Her passing on June 13, 2015 leaves a void in the city of Dallas and I join the Texas community in giving our condolences to the Brown family.

Ms. Brown was raised in Dallas, Texas. In 1980, at the age of 33 she was accused of murder after a local robbery turned violent. Despite eyewitness testimony verifying her alibi, Ms. Brown was wrongfully convicted. Following her conviction, Ms. Brown refused to be a victim of her circumstances and fought for a dignified release.

After numerous appeal requests went unanswered, Ms. Brown was finally permitted a retrial and released on bond on November 3, 1989. After being incarcerated for nearly a decade for a crime she did not commit, she was finally able to see her charges dropped on February 14, 1990.

Following her release, Ms. Brown served as an assistant for nine years to Dallas County Commissioner, John Wiley Price and later founded MASS, Mothers/Fathers for the Advancement of Social Systems. Ms. Brown's organization aimed to use her experience and passion to help others who were wrongfully convicted.

Ms. Brown spent the remainder of her life advocating on the behalf of currently and formerly incarcerated populations with the goal of promoting their successful reintegration into society. Her autobiography Joyce Brown: Justice Denied remains as a testament to both the events that led to her wrongful conviction and her commitment to ensuring justice for all following her exoneration.

In honor of Ms. Joyce Ann Brown, a tireless advocate for justice, this statement will be entered into the congressional record on Tuesday, June 23, 2015. She will be remembered as a leader, trailblazer and true public servant for the state of Texas and beyond.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,689,167,905.61. We've added \$7,525,812,118,992.53 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could

have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
MR. JOHN R. ROZZO

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. John R. Rozzo. Mr. Rozzo was highly respected within the community for his career as an educator, his dedication to the community, and his love for his friends and family.

John was born on January 17th, 1941 to Samuel and Mary G. Airato Rozzo. He graduated from Girard High School in 1958 and afterwards attended Youngstown State University, where he received his B.S. in Education in 1963. John began teaching social studies and science at St. Edward School in Youngstown in 1962 while working towards his Master's in Education, which he received in 1968 from Westminster College. He eventually went on to serve as principal for St. Edwards School, Our Lady of Mt. Cannel in Niles, St. Dominic Elementary School in Youngstown, and St. Joseph Elementary School in Austintown before retiring in 2011. His legacy as a teacher and administrator lives on through all of his students whose lives he impacted through his work.

Mr. Rozzo was also a highly regarded leader. He was a man who constantly sacrificed his time for his community. As an educator, he served as regional superintendent, member of the Trumbull County Parochial Schools Principal's Advisory Board, the Diocesan Board of Education and Athletic Director. At St. Joseph parish, he was a lector, Eucharistic minister, and leader of prayer. Being the advocate for education that he was, John served as judge and checker for the Vindicator Spelling Bee for over 40 years. He also showed a fierce commitment to the Austintown Girls' Softball league by serving as a president, coach, manager and was inducted as a member of their hall of fame.

St. Joseph Parish named Mr. Rozzo man of the year, a title anyone in the community could agree he undoubtedly deserved. John is survived by his wife of 51 years, the former Janet M. Berard whom he married May 2, 1964; his children, Pamela J. Pasquale, Denise M. Rozzo, Alaina M. Chepke, and John A. Rozzo; his brother and sisters, Phyllis Soroka, Connie Nickell, Anthony Rozzo, Ginny Gustovich and Marilyn Bianco; his aunt, Fran Airato; his 10 grandchildren, his great-granddaughter, Leighton and many nieces, nephews, cousins and friends. John Rozzo leaves behind a great example for all of us to follow as a man of faith, community activism, and true leadership. He will be dearly missed.

THE MISSING BLACK MALE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, as the mother of two black men and grandmother of two black boys, we're here to talk about a crisis in our communities: the crisis of missing black men.

In order for us to understand where these men have gone, we must understand the root of the problem. Simply put, too many places in our nation are a tale of two cities. One city is bright, shiny and new—it's home to new condominiums and fancy restaurants. The other city is littered with boarded up stores, abandoned homes, and too many people without a job and without hope.

This disparity did not happen overnight. We've lived with these structural injustices for centuries. But it wasn't until race riots erupted in Watts, Chicago, and Detroit in 1968 that our government began to take notice.

After the riots, President Johnson convened the Kerner Commission to investigate the root causes of the unrest. The Commission found a nation "moving towards two societies, one black, one white, separate and unequal." Tragically, this report could have been written last week. In the last 50 years, these structural injustices have barely budged. And black men are still being pushed out of American society.

According to a New York Times report published in April, there is an estimated 1.5 million black men aged 24–54 who are simply missing from civic life. Let me repeat—one in six black men have disappeared from civic life. 1.5 million black men missing—that can be hard to visualize.

So think about it this way:

There are more African-American men missing nationwide than there are African-American men residing in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Houston, Washington D.C. and Boston, combined. Let me say that again: There are more African American men missing from our society than black men living in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Houston, Washington, D.C. and Boston—COMBINED.

Many have been lost to our jails and prisons, which disproportionately incarcerate black men. And others have lost their lives far too young. Some are the victims of homicide; others, the victims of a healthcare system that fails to care for them. This is tragic—but it's hardly surprising. The inequity of opportunity for black men starts at birth.

More than one in three black children are born into poverty. The cycle of poverty continues in school systems that institutionalize discrimination and racial bias. While black students represent just 18 percent of preschool enrollment, they account for 42 percent of preschool student expulsions.

We are talking about kids that are 2–5 years old—these kids don't even get a start, let alone a head start. And this crisis of inequality extends from education to the economy itself. Over the past four decades, the average unemployment rate for blacks has been DOUBLE the rate for white Americans.

And the current unemployment rate for black men over 20 stands at 10.2 percent—

that's higher than the national average at the height of the recent recession. For many black men, it feels like there is a permanent recession. In the world's richest and most powerful nation, it is simply inexcusable for the inequities to persist.

Mr. Speaker—this must be our call to action.

We must come together like never before to address the systemic inequalities that are endemic in our nation—inequalities that leave black men behind.

We know that one in six African American men are missing because they are incarcerated or the victims of premature deaths. To start undoing this crisis, we need a coordinated approach including legislation, local programs and broad national initiatives.

We must re-double our support of the President's My Brother's Keeper initiative. I encourage everyone, especially my Congressional colleagues, to encourage your local leaders to engage in this initiative, which builds ladders of opportunity and unlocks the full potential of boys and young men of color through a collaborative public-private partnership.

We must also look for innovation solutions that are currently working in our communities and bring them to the national stage. I am proud that Oakland Unified School District, in my congressional district, is the first school district to have a dedicated department to address the needs of African American male students. And we need more like it across the country.

These national and local initiatives are working but Congress also has a role. It's past time for us to get serious about addressing the lack of opportunity for black men and boys in this country.

Right now—today—in this chamber, there is legislation that can and will start moving the needle.

Legislation that will create real, good-paying jobs—legislation that will give everyone a fair chance at a job—legislation that will ensure a college degree is within reach for everyone, regardless of where they were born or what race they are. Legislation that will bring health equity and reform our broken criminal justice system.

In my role as co-chair of the CBC Task Force on Poverty and the Economy and Chair of the Democratic Whip's Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity, I am proud to be working with more than 100 of my colleagues, to advance policies that give black men—and really all Americans—a fair shot.

This work includes the Half in Ten Act (H.R. 258)—which would develop a national strategy to cut poverty in half the next decade. That's more than 22 million Americans lifted out of poverty and into the middle class in just the next 10 years by being strategic and coordinating our existing programs.

We also need to raise the minimum wage—and fight for a living wage because too many Americans are working full time and still struggling to make ends meet.

I am proud to cosponsor Congressman AL GREEN's The Original Living Wage Act (H.R. 122) and Congressman SCOTT's Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 2150), legislation that would increase the minimum wage for federal workers and the national minimum wage to \$12 by

2020, respectively. We also need to fight against the disparities that persist in our health care system. The Affordable Care Act was a good start but more is needed.

For years, the Congressional tri-caucus has championed this effort by introducing The Health Equity and Accountability Act (HEAA). Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY will have the honor in introducing this important legislation this Congress and I am proud to co-lead this effort as co-chair of the CAPAC Health Task Force.

This important legislation builds on the Affordable Care Act and puts us on track to eliminate health disparities in our country.

Lastly, we need to empower communities to build greater trust between law enforcement and communities of color. And we need to address chronic recidivism, which would be a huge step towards returning some of our "missing" men home to their families and communities.

That is why Congress should pass the bipartisan Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act (H.R. 1232), which I am a proud cosponsor of, to stop the militarization of our nation's police forces.

We need to pass the Police Accountability Act (H.R. 1102) and the Grand Jury Reform Act (H.R. 429) so we can ensure that deadly force cases are heard by a judge and there is more accountability among police officers.

I was also proud to lead a letter, signed by 72 of my colleagues, urging the President to adopt a fair chance hiring policy at the federal level for individuals who have been previously incarcerated. A fair chance hiring policy would level the playing field and help stop the cycle of recidivism that's plaguing our communities.

This is simply the right thing to do: the federal government shouldn't put up barriers to work for those trying to rebuild their lives after making a mistake. It is vital that Congress acts to ensure the tragedies in Ferguson, Staten Island, Oakland—in my district—and now Baltimore are not repeated.

Mr. Speaker, we can end the phenomenon of the missing black male. We must keep calling for action.

As Dr. King said in his "Two Americas" speech that he gave on April 14th, 1967 at Stanford University: "We must come to see that social progress never rolls in on the wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and the persistent work of dedicated individuals."

We must each be those dedicated individuals working for the social progress that is so desperately needed.

I urge my colleagues: act and act now—too much is at stake.

TRIBUTE TO THE DOWLING CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS GOLF TEAM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Girls Golf Team from Dowling Catholic High School

for winning the Class 5–A State Girls Golf Title on June 2nd, 2015 at Elmwood Golf Club.

Dowling Catholic High School has a proud tradition of strong athletic programs, with this being their 59th team state championship in school history. Members of the golf team include: Anne Gradoville, Allison Olberding, Erica Olberding, Hannah Toresdahl, Murphy Cavanaugh, Sydney Webb and Ella Dryer and Coach Ron Gray.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by these students demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent them and their families in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating the Dowling High School Girls Golf Team on competing in this rigorous competition and wishing them nothing but continued success.

RACHAEL TURNER TOPS THE CHARTS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rachael Turner for her continued success in Nashville as a country music artist. To find such success in Nashville's competitive country music scene is an amazing accomplishment.

Rachael, a Fort Bend Christian Academy graduate and Sugar Land native, has shown remarkable artistic ability and charisma while finding great success in the music industry. Rachael signed with Rustic Records where her two most recent singles, "Matches and Moonshine" and "Meet Me in the Middle" have both made it into the top 50 on the Music Row Charts. She most recently performed at the annual CMA music festival in Nashville. We hope to see you take the Houston Rodeo stage next.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Rachael for taking the country music industry by storm.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOX & GOOSE

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Fox & Goose Public House as they celebrate their 40th anniversary. As its owners, staff, and loyal patrons gather to celebrate this wonderful occasion, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring the Fox & Goose for their contributions to the Sacramento Region.

Modeled after the famous public house bearing the same name in the English town of Hebden Bridge, West Yorkshire, Sacramento's Fox & Goose has become a similarly thriving institution. Founders Bill and Denise Dalton, along with their daughter and current owner

Allyson Dalton, have successfully created a tradition of excellent quality and service that is an integral part of Sacramento's dining scene. Since its grand opening on January 15, 1975, Fox & Goose has truly embodied its name as a public house by providing a gathering place for all to visit with friends, unwind with a traditional English or American meal and enjoy their wide range of fine beers, wines, and Scotch. Every time that I am home, I find time to stop by for breakfast and enjoy one of their famous olallieberry scones.

Over its 40 year history, Fox & Goose has received a number of accomplishments and accolades. The restaurant is widely regarded to have the "Best Breakfast" in Sacramento, winning awards and honors in this category many times, and from a number of different publications. Additionally, Fox & Goose's Open Mic and Pub Quiz nights have provided a great deal of entertainment for many in the Sacramento community to enjoy. The environment created by Bill and Denise, and sustained by Allyson, has also become the centerpiece of the revitalization of Sacramento's historic R Street.

Mr. Speaker, as patrons gather for their 40th anniversary celebration, I am pleased to honor and recognize Fox & Goose for its important role in enhancing Sacramento's community. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing them continued success and thanking them for their service to the Sacramento region.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE DAMON J. KEITH

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a proud son of Detroit, Michigan and a true icon in the law and in the civil rights movement, The Honorable Damon J. Keith. Judge Keith, a Senior Judge for the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, is the subject of a new film entitled "Walk with Me: The Trials of Damon J. Keith." The world premiere of the film took place in Detroit on June 17, 2015.

It is truly fitting that Judge Keith's story be told, and that his contributions to our country be more widely known. The grandson of slaves, Judge Keith was born on July 4, 1922, in Detroit. Judge Keith's father worked in a Ford factory, and pushed his son to be the first person in his family to attend college. Judge Keith lived up to his father's expectations, graduating from West Virginia State College in 1943. He was drafted into the Army during World War Two after graduating, and he served in a segregated unit in Europe. His experience in Europe as well as upon his return to the U.S. had a significant impact on him. As he told the Detroit Free Press in 2013, . . . "after the war was over and I returned to the States, I could see white German soldiers riding in the front of the bus and going into restaurants in the States that said 'for whites only.'" This spurred Judge Keith to pursue a legal career.

Judge Keith attended the Howard University School of Law, where he was mentored by future U.S. Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. He received his degree in 1949 and returned to Detroit, where he later earned a Master of Laws from Wayne State University. In 1964, he founded one of the first African American law firms in Detroit. That same year, Judge Keith was elected co-chair of the Michigan Civil Rights Commission. The late Judge John Feikens served as the other co-chair and my brother Carl as general counsel where he observed firsthand Damon Keith's exceptional dedication to civil rights for all Americans. Just three years later, at the recommendation of U.S. Senator Phil Hart, President Lyndon Johnson nominated him for appointment to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan. After serving as Chief Judge of the District Court, in 1977 President Jimmy Carter nominated him to the Sixth Circuit. He was confirmed, and he remains there today.

His jurisprudence is notable for the number of landmark cases which came before him. Several of those cases had to do with issues of race and segregation, including *Davis v. School District of the City of Pontiac* in 1970, which was the first case in the North in which a federal court ordered integration, and *Baker v. City of Detroit* in 1979, in which he ordered the Detroit Police Department to carry out Mayor Coleman Young's plan to integrate the department. One of the other cases for which he is known is *U.S. v. Sinclair* in 1971, in which he ruled that President Richard Nixon and the Attorney General had no right to wiretap individuals in domestic security matters without a court order. The Sixth Circuit upheld Judge Keith's decision, as did the U.S. Supreme Court in *U.S. v. U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan*, which became known as the Keith case. And in 2002, Judge Keith wrote the Sixth Circuit opinion upholding a lower court decision in *Detroit Free Press v. Ashcroft*, which held that the Justice Department could not prevent the press and the public from witnessing deportation hearings of people suspected of having ties to terrorism.

Recognizing his leadership despite a difference in judicial philosophy, in 1987 Chief Justice William Rehnquist named Judge Keith as National Chairman of the Judicial Conference Committee on the Bicentennial of the Constitution. In this role, Judge Keith led his colleagues throughout the country in efforts to promote the bicentennial of our nation's foundational document.

In addition to his intelligence and his deep belief in the importance of equality for all people, Judge Keith is known for his respectful nature and his fundamental fairness. The director of "Walk With Me," Jesse Nasser, recently told the *Detroit Free Press*, "You're hard pressed to find anybody, whether he ruled for them or ruled against them, nobody will say a bad thing about him. Trust me, we tried. If we interviewed someone who was on the losing side of a case he ruled on, the first thing they'd say is, 'Before we get started, let me go on the record saying Judge Keith is an incredibly fair judge and an incredible human being.'"

Just as the legendary Justice Thurgood Marshall mentored a young Damon Keith, so

too has Judge Keith helped to guide many young people who, after having clerked for him, have gone on to achieve great things. Among those clerked for Judge Keith are Judge Eric L. Clay, who serves with Judge Keith on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals; former Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm; Lani Guinier, the first African American woman to receive a tenured professorship at Harvard Law School; and Jocelyn Benson, the Dean of Wayne State University Law School, which is home to the Damon J. Keith Center for Civil Rights and the Damon J. Keith Collection of African American Legal History.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most quoted line of all of Judge Keith's decisions came from *Detroit Free Press v. Ashcroft*, in which he wrote that "Democracy dies behind closed doors." Judge Keith has devoted his life to opening doors for all in society, and indeed in ensuring that all who serve in government are accountable to the principles upon which our nation was founded, and which have been enhanced and enriched over time. I encourage my colleagues to join me in thanking Judge Damon J. Keith for his truly excellent and inspirational service to our nation.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2685, THE
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AP-
PROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR
2016

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2685, the FY16 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill.

While I commend the House Appropriations Committee's support for our servicemembers and our national defense, I have serious concerns about the way this bill funds our military operations. As was the case with last month's National Defense Authorization Act, this appropriations bill uses the Overseas Contingency Operations budget as a backdoor loophole to get around sequestration by funding \$38 billion of the Pentagon's regular base budget activities with war funds—a blatant abuse of the budget process. Just last year, House Republicans criticized the abuse of the OCO loophole in their budget report, stating that it "undermines the integrity of the budget process" and that the Budget Committee would "oppose increases above the levels the Administration and our military commanders say are needed to carry out operations unless it can be clearly demonstrated that such amounts are war-related."

Moreover, in following the strategy of the Republican budget, this legislation begins the process of locking in sequestration for non-defense programs, which will have a devastating impact on investments critical to the nation. We need to get back to the table to have an honest debate about our budget and renegotiate the funding caps for both defense and nondefense. Only then will we be able to provide the necessary resources for our national security needs and to ensure we keep the nation's commitments to education, re-

search, infrastructure, and other crucial drivers of economic prosperity.

I also have serious concerns with a number of other provisions contained in this legislation. I strongly object to a measure which provides \$600 million to train and equip the so-called "moderate" Syrian rebels. As I have urged repeatedly, this initiative could have unintended negative consequences that will not serve our ultimate goal of defeating ISIS. Unfortunately, an amendment offered to strip this funding was not adopted.

I strongly oppose sections 8100, 8101, and 8102 of this bill, which prohibit funding for the transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees to both the United States and abroad. While we must pursue and prosecute terrorists that seek to do us harm, this facility—and the conduct within its walls—have only served to hurt our nation in the eyes of the world. It is simply un-American to hold individuals without charging them for a crime. I was disappointed that amendments offered by Congressman NADLER to strike these sections from the legislation were defeated. I also object to the inclusion of unrequested funding for many weapons systems, including \$1 billion for additional Army vehicles and weapons systems that the Pentagon said was not necessary.

I appreciate that this bill contains a Sense of Congress stating that this body has a Constitutional duty to debate and decide when to authorize the use of military force in the fight against ISIL. I support many aspects of the military operations the President is currently conducting against ISIL, including the use of American air power against ISIL targets and in support of Iraqi and Kurdish forces, as well as the deployment of limited numbers of American troops to help train and equip those forces. However, it has now been ten months since the President sent troops into Iraq and Syria and four months since the President sent Congress a proposed AUMF to combat ISIL. The President himself said he wanted to revise and ultimately repeal both the 2001 AUMF and 2002 AUMF yet we continue to rely on them as justification for our ongoing military operations. We owe it to our troops and the American people to pass a narrowly tailored AUMF that provides the authority necessary to degrade and defeat ISIL without dragging the United States into another unnecessary ground war in the Middle East.

For those reasons, I was disappointed that two amendments offered by Congresswoman LEE to sunset the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force Against and Al-Qaeda and associated forces and the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq were not adopted. In addition, an amendment offered by Congressman SCHIFF to prohibit the use of funds for Operation Inherent Resolve in the absence of an AUMF to combat ISIL after March 31, 2016 was defeated.

Despite my opposition to the overall legislation, I was pleased that a bipartisan amendment introduced by Rep. MASSIE and Rep. LOFGREN to limit funding for many backdoor programs within Section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act passed. I also support the increased 2.3 percent pay raise for our troops and their families. Finally, I support the inclusion of full funding of the President's request for U.S.-Israel Iron Dome missile defense program.

While this bill does provide much needed funding for programs that benefit our men and women in uniform, ultimately, it falls short in too many areas. It is my hope that many of my objections will be resolved in Conference with the Senate but I can't support it in its current form.

TRIBUTE TO MARY HILL AND
EREN SAGUN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mary Hill and Eren Sagun from Des Moines Roosevelt High School for winning the Class 2A Girls Tennis Doubles title.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by these students demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent them and their families in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating Mary and Eren on competing in this rigorous competition and wishing continued success in their education and high school tennis career.

REMEMBERING THE SOUTH CAROLINA SHOOTING AND REMOVAL
OF THE CONFEDERATE FLAG

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to speak out against the senseless loss of innocent lives resulting from another senseless act of violence.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the people of Charleston, South Carolina, the members of the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, pastored by the Rev. Clementa Pinckney, who was one of nine persons slain by a gunman motivated by hate.

Although tragedy has found its way into the lives of the individuals murdered and the lives of their families there has been some good found in this tragic loss.

Mr. Speaker, the legislature of South Carolina has decided to debate whether to remove the flag from the front of the State House building after public support from prominent legislators, community organizations, and the Governor of South Carolina have called for the flag to come down now.

When considering the removal of the flag the people must remember the nine lives that were lost due to senseless, insensitive, and hateful feelings that were influenced by the traditions represented by the Confederate flag.

The Confederate flag has been used as a symbol of hate, exclusion, and a brutally offensive past.

South Carolina should follow in the footsteps of Texas which refused to authorize license plates with the confederate flag on them, a decision upheld last week by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, Wal Mart, Amazon, Sears, and eBay all have made a decision to stop selling Confederate flag merchandise.

The Confederate flag does not represent the future of our great country.

We must embrace a spirit of inclusion and goodwill with a mission to eradicate hate and ignorance.

We can no longer allow our past to dictate our future, and must use this tragedy as an opportunity to eliminate symbols of hate that permeate through our society.

Mr. Speaker, as a country we must recognize the emotional pain attached to the Confederate flag, stand strong together and not allow a symbol of hate continue to divide our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 375 (H.R. 160) Medical Innovation Act, had I been present, I would have voted yes.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MARTHA ANN ELIZABETH "BROWN" BALL

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Martha Ann Elizabeth "Brown" Ball on her 100th birthday on August 17th.

Mrs. Ball was born in Cleburne County, Alabama on August 17, 1915 to Oscar Sr. and Mattie Brown.

At an early age, she married Omildred (Mill) Ball (deceased) and they had 15 children together including: Willie Ester Ball (deceased), Omildred Ball Jr., Tommy Jay Ball (deceased), Josie Lee Ball (deceased), Lela Francis Blackburn, Shirley Ann McCreary, Exa Lee Bell, Walter Lewis Ball, Susie Ann Jones, Paul Wilford Ball, Cynthia Deloise Ball, Catharine Ball (deceased), Katherine Ball (deceased), Madeleyn Renay McClendon and Antonio Ball.

Her favorite hobbies include: reading her Bible, quilting, playing dominoes, working crossword puzzles and attending the Senior Citizen Center.

Mrs. Ball sang in the Gospel Truett's, a gospel singing group, for over 20 years. Currently she attends church at Sweet Home Baptist Church in the Silver Run community. She is loved by her pastor and church family.

Most people that know her call her "grandma" or "Aunt Martha" and her children say Proverbs 31 best describes Mrs. Ball. Friends and family will celebrate her birthday mid-August.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the life of Mrs. Ball and wishing her a happy 100th birthday.

RECOGNIZING EVA AIRLINES DIRECT FLIGHTS FROM TAIWAN TO HOUSTON

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize another step forward in the great relationship between the United States and Taiwan.

This past Friday, June 19th, EVA Air began offering direct flights from Taipei, Taiwan to Houston, Texas. The inaugural flight, number BR-52, arrived at George Bush Intercontinental Airport shortly after 4:00 p.m. on June 19th.

This is the beginning of weekly direct flights from Taipei to Houston. In June there will be three flights a week which will be increased to four flights a week in July.

EVA Air is looking to serve the Taiwanese community of the Houston area by offering these direct flights multiple times per week. These communities are an important part of Texas and I am pleased that EVA Air has further facilitated travel between our nations.

EVA Air operates out of Taiwan and is their second largest airline. According to the JACDEC Airline Safety Rankings for 2015 (based on 2014 data), EVA is the 3rd safest airline in the world.

Taiwan and the United States already have an outstanding relationship that was codified with the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) of 1979. The TRA was created to allow our two nations to foster close ties and specifically "commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people on Taiwan."

The TRA enables our two nations to work and partner with one another in a way that is unique from all other nations, and these weekly flights between Taiwan and Houston are just the latest example of how compliance with the TRA continues to benefit our citizens 36 years after its passage.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as of today, we have only 3 more legislative days to act in order to re-authorize the Export-Import Bank.

Re-authorizing the bank is common sense. Sadly, however, the opponents of the bank are operating out of ideological fervor, not facts. We should be here dealing with and solving real problems, not endangering American jobs with fantastical ideology.

Contrary to the many assertions made against the Bank, the bank is an unbridled, market-driven success story which has long enjoyed bipartisan support and support from both unions and business alike.

The truth of the matter is that the bank is a vital free market economic engine for our manufacturers, exporters and job creators. This March alone, the Bank financed over

\$1.1 million dollars in exports in my South Texas District. Additionally, the Bank has supported thousands of jobs in my district over the past five years. These are good jobs in a very high-need area that would not have been possible without the Bank. In my home State of Texas, the Bank has financed \$4 billion worth of exports last year supporting thousands of hard working Americans.

We cannot and should not let the bank expire. Let us put an end to this nonsense. Mr. Speaker, let's have a vote.

HONORING KATHLEEN SHEEHAN

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the end of an era at Frontier Regional School in Deerfield, Massachusetts. After 35 years at Frontier, yesterday eighth grade science teacher Kathleen Sheehan retired. Kathy, or Sheehan, as her students call her, over the years wore a variety of hats and held a variety of teaching positions. She has served her entire teaching career at Frontier. Over her 35 years she has held many leadership positions, including Science Department Chair, Middle School Team Leader, Field Hockey Coach, and President of the Frontier's

Teacher's Association. Sheehan's impact and influence on the students and communities of Deerfield, Conway, Whately and Sunderland extended far beyond the classroom.

Always challenging her students to make the most of their education both inside and outside of the classroom, Sheehan proved a role model having taken her own advice. In 2003, she earned her law degree from Western New England College School of Law and immediately put her legal skills to use helping other teachers across the Commonwealth through the Massachusetts Teachers Association. She plans to continue this role as she transitions out of the classroom and onto retirement.

Finally, Sheehan's commitment extends not just beyond the classroom, but beyond the school year. As students move on from her middle school classroom, she continues to foster relationships and offer guidance as they navigate high school and plan for college. Once graduated, she continues to stay connected to and support her students. She will happily tell you how many college graduations, advanced-degree graduations, and weddings she has attended of former students. Sheehan values community and has tirelessly integrated herself into that of Western Massachusetts.

As we all know, teachers are a vital asset to society. As a role model for students and teachers alike, Sheehan will leave a legacy behind at Frontier which is unmatched by any other. On behalf of my constituents that attend

and have graduated from Frontier Regional School, I thank Kathy Sheehan for her commitment to education, her students and the community.

REGARDING ROLL CALL VOTES
376-378

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 23, 2015, I was unavoidably detained due to the necessity of attending to representational duties and committee responsibilities, including participating in Homeland Security Committee site visits to Family Detention Centers in South Texas. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

1. On Roll Call 376 I would have voted NO (H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015).

2. On Roll Call 377 I would have voted AYE (H.R. 805, Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters (DOTCOM) Act of 2015).

3. On Roll Call 378 I would have voted AYE (H.R. 2576, TSCA Modernization Act of 2015).